Meeting date: Wednesday, February 7, 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 January 10, 2018 minutes (p. 2-6)
   b. Approval of January 22, 2018 study session minutes (p. 7-10)
4. Meet Aspen Walker, Community Engagement and Enrichment Manager
5. 2018 Canyon Gallery exhibitions – Jaime Kopke, Programs, Events, and Outreach Manager
6. Presentation on library districts – Jacqueline Murphy, Sr. Consultant Public Library Community Programs at Colorado State Library (p. 11-27)
7. Discuss planning and design of community dialogue about perceptions of safety in the library (p. 28-31)
   a. Information item: summary of community input received during Master Plan engagement
8. Master Plan project update (p. 32-42)
   a. Library Commission input on draft Master Plan - part one: Boulder Public Library and the Community
9. Library Commission update (p. 43-48)
   a. Items from commission
      i. Report out on meetings with City Council members
      ii. Discuss letter to City Council outlining library budget deficiencies
   b. Boulder Library Foundation update
      i. Select new representative
   c. City project representative update
      i. EcoDistricts
   d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission
10. Library and Arts Director’s Report (p. 49-58)
   a. Select volunteers to attend Feb. 21 Arts Commission meeting to discuss Library Master Plan
   b. North Boulder Library project team kick-off
   c. Update on City Council meeting with County Commissioners to discuss interest in forming a library district
   d. Boulder Center for the Performing Arts and the west bookend of the Civic Area
   e. Q4 2017 Library Use Statistics Report
   f. Maria Rogers Oral History Project 2017 Annual Report
11. 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: January 10, 2018 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.

Contact information preparing summary: Maureen Malone, 303-441-3106

Commission members present: Alicia Gibb, Joni Teter, Tim O’Shea, Juana Gomez, Joel Koenig

Library staff present:
David Farna, Director of Library & Arts
Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director
Maureen Malone, Administrative Specialist II

Members of the public present:
None

Type of Meeting: Regular

Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda [6:00 p.m., 0:00:00 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Gibb announced the addition of a discussion on funding for restroom renovations under Agenda Item 4.

Agenda Item 2: Public comment [6:01 p.m., 0:01:44 Audio min.]
None

Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda [6:01 p.m., 0:02:00 Audio min.]

Item 3A, Approval of December 6, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Gomez moved to approve the minutes, and O’Shea seconded. Vote 3-0, unanimous (Gibb and Teter abstained as they were not at the meeting).

Agenda Item 4: Discussion on library funding [6:02 p.m., 0:02:47 Audio min.]

a. 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
   • Teter sent some comments on the library funding memo ahead of the meeting (see handouts).
   • Gomez wondered who had input in the risk analysis for the different funding options (p. 6 of packet). Farna replied that he has done the analysis; in essence, the main risks in proceeding with the option to form a district are: council rejects the plan, or the library does get a funding ballot measure, but loses the election, causing council to lose trust/faith in the library and decide to defund the library.
   • Teter recommended that staff also be prepared to address risks around the library as a district, the primary one being the funding and making sure that the cost of managing the library and the mill rate are well adjusted. Farna explained that the library would immediately assume liability for PERA, and there would be a 10-12% increase in operating expenses to cover facilities, human resources, and attorneys. Teter encouraged staff to summarize this information somewhere for the public.
   • Gomez asked what the timeline for implementation would look like if the ballot measure to form a district should pass in 2020. Farna replied that the library would have until early 1st quarter 2021 to establish financial control of the organization, establish a governing board, take over HR functions, and take control of all public relations.
   • Commission had a few questions around forming a district that Farna suggested Jacqueline Murphy, Library Community Programs Senior Consultant at the Colorado State Library may be able to help answer during her visit at the February meeting:
     o How soon after the vote passes would the money get distributed to the library?
• Would there need to be a charter change in the same election as the ballot measure? Would we need to have the proposal for governance all worked out by the time of the election?
• Teter suggested that staff create an online FAQ page with reference materials to help the public understand the differences in operations if the library were to form a district (the duties of a governing board, the budget, etc.). Gibb added that it would be good to include the cost of transitioning to a district.
• Teter wondered at what point staff and commission can no longer advocate for the ballot measure. Farnan replied that it would be from the moment council certifies the ballot. Teter suggested that staff should get out ahead of the ballot and have the conversations with the public while they can.
• Teter commented that the city will likely maintain an interest in the north building of the Main Library around planning for the future of the west bookend of the civic area, regardless of whether they give up control of the building. Farnan replied that he has meetings scheduled with the city’s planning staff to discuss this and other relevant potential issues associated with separating from the city.
• Farnan asked whether commission has a preference between owning or leasing the buildings if the library were to separate from the city to form a district. Teter responded that she would want to know the financial implications of both options before making a recommendation. Gomez suggested that there might be an emotional component for the community if the city no longer owned the library.
• Gibb wondered what would happen to the North Boulder library funding if the library separates from the city. Farnan stated that he would suggest setting the mill rate in such a way that the district can pay the city back, and reminded commission that the goal is to become a great partner with the city.
• Teter recommended that staff also think about projecting where additional facilities might be needed to serve the people being brought in to the district, and the associated cost.
• Teter asked whether anyone in the finance department is looking at reallocating the general fund to stabilize library funding within the current city structure. Farnan replied that there is no new money, so the city would be faced with two significant hurdles: changing the charter to increase the mill levy beyond the current limit and adding an extra mill. Teter added that the city could also look at reallocating resources within the existing general fund or earmarking sales tax; it’s important to look at all the options to have a complete picture of the needs and challenges.
• O’Shea commented that as staff and commission are readying to lay out a path to propose a district and exit the city in order to figure out the funding shortfall, they need to consider the benefit and the cost to the both options (staying with the city or leaving to form a district). There is an opportunity to engage our patrons, and ask the community if they want us to become a district because we’re not being funded to the level we need to be to support their utilization; we need to consider how to sell the district option as a benefit to the voters and campaign to figure out who is going to support the initiative.
• Teter stated that community members are going to want to know why the city can’t find $3M for the library in a budget of $326M; the library doesn’t want to be in the position of making recommendations on where the money should come from, but if council does not want the library to exit the city, it is the city manager’s responsibility to provide possible strategies within the budget.
• O’Shea asked what it is that the library wants to come away with – funding, autonomy, engagement with our constituents? Farnan replied that the question since commission’s retreat has been – can the city afford to run the library that the community wants? Within the city, there has been no correlation between growth and success and funding; the library wants autonomy in terms of having better control over how it redistributes its money as well as transparency to the voters about how the library chooses to spend its money. O’Shea stated that it doesn’t seem as tenable to get autonomy and budget from the city.
• Teter commented that at this point, only one-third of the city’s budget is available for redistribution; the city is at the point where it can’t tax people anymore, but there’s no flexibility. It’s hard to evaluate police against parks or human services against library. Typically, departments set their own goals through master plans and evaluate themselves against those goals; what’s lacking is a process to go back and look at the whole set of departments and goals and budgets and evaluate based on what we know today to determine whether everything is funded at an appropriate level.
• Koenig stated that it seems like being autonomous would give the library a lot more flexibility in terms of the operations, and if staff didn’t have the city overhang, they might do things differently. Farnan replied that he came to work here because he believes in the city’s values, and he doesn’t see that changing in any way; staff also likes the culture and is proud of working for Boulder.
• Teter asked if there would there be any reason to be in a district if the library had totally dedicated funding. Farnan said that’s a hard question. Gomez then asked if it would be easier to get to dedicated funding than it would be to form a district. Farnan replied that that is the question, along with whether the city can afford to do it.
• Teter suggested that it might be worth asking Open Space and Transportation (departments that have
dedicated funding) about their experience with the budget process to find out how much autonomy they
really have over their own dollars.
• Farnan explained that the city is trying to change the metrics around determining success. The planning
process the city has in place for the general fund has an element of hubris – departments plan out 10-20
years into the future, and the things that the library is putting in this master plan are really things that
should have been done already. Farnan added that he’s not sure the current process is one that best serves
the community or the library.
• For the purposes of a marketing campaign, Teter asked whether we are looking to fully fund the library, or
make it autonomous; the autonomy conversation is sure to lead into the territory of how the city is being
run and whether the budget process makes sense, so it’s something to think about pretty carefully.

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
   • Gibb explained that the Op-Ed was two-fold – it helps define what the library is trying to do, which is gain
financial stability, and also provides the public with some background.
   • Commission reviewed the draft and discussed some suggestions for reworking it.
   • O’Shea commented that this Op-Ed should be considered the first element of the library’s marketing
campaign; if the campaign becomes politicized, this Op-Ed will provide some important background
information for the community. He offered to share the draft with some local influencers to get their initial
reaction.

f. Update on funding for Main Library restroom renovations
   • Farnan shared that the City Manager is going to recommend to council on Feb. 20 that they allocate $650k
for restroom renovations at the Main Library. He asked commission to draft a new letter to send to council
reiterating their support for the funding.

Agenda Item 5: Master Plan project update

[7:29 p.m., 1:30:00 Audio min.]

a. Schedule for review of the draft Master Plan document
   Teter sent some comments on the Draft Master Plan Document Outline ahead of the meeting (see handouts).
   • Gibb requested that staff include in the calendar any upcoming community involvement pieces. Phares
replied that nothing has been scheduled yet, but those events will get added to the master calendar.
   • Teter recommended that staff reach out again to the Landmarks Board keep them in the loop and find out
what particular interests they have in the Master Plan. Phares replied that staff plans to give them a memo
that highlights their interests, which are primarily around the future of the Main Library north building.
   • Teter wondered whether the Arts Commission has any interest in the Master Plan. Farnan replied he has
asked them about scheduling a joint meeting, but they have only shown peripheral interest in the north
building. Phares added that staff can provide the Arts Commission with updates at their meetings.
   • Following the upcoming publication of the Op-Ed and given commission’s stance that this is a campaign,
Farnan suggested that staff can do more to advertise the Library Commission meetings; if word gets out
that there is discussion of separating from the city, that might become a piece of community engagement
around the Master Plan.
   • Gibb wondered where the concept of a district would be included in the Master Plan. Phares replied that
she envisions it being included in Part Five: Investment Priorities and Funding Options; if there is a
recommendation from commission, it would also go in that section and be referenced in either the
introduction or letter from the director.
   • Teter asked where the Master Plan will address the homelessness issue. Phares replied that it comes up in
Part Two: Trends and Community Needs and also in Part Three: Goals and Commitments; she doesn’t
have a vision for how exactly that piece will look, but it can be pulled together as staff and commission
review the other pieces.

b. Plan for Jan. 22, 2017 study session
Agenda Item 6: Review and update commission master calendar and tentative schedule for priority upcoming agenda items

Teter sent some comments on the Master Calendar ahead of the meeting (see handouts).

Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:

- Teter asked what commission can say to the public now about when to anticipate completion of a North Boulder Library building, what the major steps are from here to there, and how they can get involved. Farnan replied that the earliest a building will open is the end of 2020; community engagement would begin with a broad discussion of the programming in the second or third quarter of 2018 at the earliest. Teter asked staff to add a project page to the BPL website. Phares replied that this can be done and there will also be an option online to submit questions and comments; commission meetings will be another opportunity for members of the public to receive updates and give input. Phares added that Antonia Gaona, the staff project manager, is keeping a list of community members that would like to stay involved and making sure they receive invitations to any public meetings.

- Teter asked where the homelessness discussion is on the calendar. Phares responded that it is listed under the February meeting as ‘commission / staff plan community dialogue’.

- Teter suggested bringing the Library Commission Master Calendar to the foundation’s executive committee to make sure that their items are listed in the correct months; any changes will need to be reflected in the agreement between the library and the foundation.

Agenda Item 7: Library Commission Update

a. Matters from the Commission
   i. Review Library Commission Handbook
      - Teter sent some suggested edits ahead of the meeting (see handouts).
      - Koenig suggested spelling out under Article VI that proxies are not permitted when determining a quorum (p. 26 of packet).
      - Koenig recommended adding a statement in the Overview of the Boulder Library Foundation that two commissioners serve as members on the foundation board (p. 38 of packet).
      - Teter suggested having the city’s finance staff review the budget calendar (p. 37 of packet).

   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
   Gibb shared that commission received a patron email after the meeting packet had been distributed (see handouts).

   Koenig reported out on his meetings with individual City Council members.

Agenda Item 8: Library and Arts Director’s Report

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

Commission discussed the February agenda item around planning the homelessness community dialogue. Phares stated that the discussion at the February meeting will be around determining the goal for the dialogue in order to inform who staff invites to participate and how the event is structured; she suggested having smaller discussions across several meetings on specific pieces of planning the event. Teter requested that staff reach out to Human Services to get an overview of services being provided at the new day shelter (beds, showers, storage, etc.). Gibb suggested creating a
summary of the common homelessness-related questions received by staff and their answers – or having a staff member join the discussion at a commission meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 9: Adjournment</th>
<th>[8:40 p.m., 2:41:05 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 8:40 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, February 7, 2018, in the Canyon Meeting Room at the Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, CO 80302.
CITY OF BOULDER  
BOULDER, COLORADO  
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING MINUTES

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission  
Date of Meeting: January 22, 2018 at the Main Library  
Contact Information Preparing Summary: Jennifer Phares, 303-441-4394  
Commission Members Present: Alicia Gibb, Joni Teter, Joel Koenig, Tim O’Shea  
Commission Members Absent: Juana Gomez  
Library Staff Present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts  
                     Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director  
City Staff Present: None  
Public Present: None  
Type of Meeting: Study Session  

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order and Approval of Agenda [6:05 p.m., Audio 0:00]  
New agenda item added after item 4. Debrief on the January 19 and 20, 2018 City Council Annual Retreat,  
meetings commissioners have had with individual members of City Council, and the Daily Camera.

Agenda Item 2: Master Plan project update: Review and input on part three: Goals and Commitments  
[6:06 p.m., Audio 0:01]  
Phares pointed out that the “vision statement for the next 10 years” and the guiding principles were new items  
that the commission had not seen before. Commissioners provided staff with the following input on the draft of  
part three of the Master Plan.

Page 3

- Add the number and type of invitations made for community participation, including an upcoming  
  article in the Daily Camera.

Page 4

- Change “Respond to our diverse community” to be proactive. Use “Reach out” rather than respond.
- Guiding Principles: Add volunteers and the Boulder Library Foundation to the principle on partnerships
- Provide numbers and monetary value of volunteer contributions, partnerships and other collaborations in  
  the appropriate places in the plan. Phares said this information will be presented in the finance section of  
  the plan, as well as discussed in the introductory sections of the plan. Teter added, “Show that BPL is  
  doing a good job leveraging resources by collaborating with the community.”

All goals:

- Recommended that the objectives be presented in phases, rather than using the business plan budget  
  labels (fiscally constrained, action, and vision).

Programs and Services (pages 5-7)

- Goals are focused on the new. Need to add a goal emphasizing that Boulder Public Library (BPL)  
  maintains high quality and strong participation of core programs. Maintaining core programs and  
  services is a higher priority than expanding programs.

Metrics (page 16): Highlight that the library is accountable and already tracking metrics for the core  
programs. Add an objective to the quarterly metrics reports, which are shared with the commission, that  
they be posted on the library website for the public.
Guiding Principle (page 3): Maintaining core programs and services is a priority.

Add introductory language in the goals that emphasizes maintaining the things the library is already doing. Farnan added, “State what it takes to maintain the ‘equilibrium’ of budget and quality of core programs and services, and bring the budget to a sustainable level. Teter added, “Show the commitment to supporting the current programs and services in addition to adding new ones.”

- Recommended reordering the goals to improve flow and keep the attention of the reader on the priorities. 1st - Civic Dialogue goal, then goals that address service levels, makerspace.

- Collection goal. Add description of the target amounts (are they high or low) and identify if this would put BPL on par with other benchmark libraries. Phares said this can be emphasized in the goal and in the finance section of the plan. Add “per capita” to glossary.

Facilities and Technology (pages 8-10)

- Recommended reordering the goals to improve flow and keep the attention of the reader on the priorities. 1st - North Boulder Branch goal, and then move up Network Bandwidth/Access goal. Move Gunbarrel Library Services goal down a couple of items. Safety and Security goal at the end. Commission discussed potentially highlighting the Network Access goal in this section.

- Facilities Sustainability Plan Update goal – Teter noted that the asset evaluation study and ROI study in the five-year cost estimate document (agenda item 2c) do not appear in this goal. Phares said those are library district research items and will be discussed in the finance section of the Master Plan.

- Address Safety/Security goal - Koenig asked where the restroom project appeared in the goals. Phares answered that it is in the second phase objective “Evaluate design and management options” on page 9. Gibb asked about the areas identified as potential concern, and then recommended removing the phrase “in areas of concern.”

Building Community and Partnerships (pages 11-13)

- Outreach goal – Staff expanded the goal to include defining term “underserved.” They anticipate developing objectives for each group. Some objectives have already been identified for outreach to the Latino community and are included under this goal. Commission recommended adding a bullet point to expand the underserved groups that BPL wants to serve in addition to teen and Latino.

- Cultivate Community Awareness goal and Cultivate Relationship With Patrons Who are Experiencing Homelessness goal (pages 12 -13) - Recommended moving the objectives related to serving the homeless to the Relationship With Patrons Experiencing Homelessness. Serving the homeless does not need to be highlighted in this section. Teter said it should be stated somewhere in the plan, but not necessarily as a highlight.

- Recommended reordering the goals to improve flow and keep the attention of the reader on the priorities. Lead with First Amendment goal. Underserved Communities goal. Followed by outreach to teens or patrons experiencing homelessness.

Organizational Readiness (pages 14 -15)

- Recommended reordering the goals to improve flow and keep the attention of the reader on the priorities. Move staff recruitment to top.

- Add an objective to Review Policies and Planning Documents goal to post the quarterly statistics on the library website.

b. Review and input on part four: Success Measures [7:49 p.m., Audio 1:43]

- Add that an annual report is created from the annual Library Research Service statistics, and the report is presented to the public.

- Phares asked for the commission’s input on the BPL standards. Add Collaborations and Partnerships. [It is mentioned under the first standard on page 17.] Somewhere in the Master Plan articulate the importance of volunteers’ contributions and describe that the request for an additional 0.5 full-time employee (FTE) for the volunteer coordinator is to expand the volunteer program.
• Program and event attendance. Teter asked if there was a way to capture what new things patrons found at the library in the last year.

• Facilities. Add a standard for why a library facility would be built in a certain place.

• Operating capital budget. What can we draw from the financial needs to track under this? What does sustainability mean? How do we know if the deficiencies have been addressed? Farnan suggested the funding per capita/per user.

• Sources and revenues are trending up. Stable and matching demand.

**c. Review and input on the five-year operating and capital cost estimate for the Master Plan goals** [This discussion in concert with the Master Plan part three discussion which occurred prior to part four]

• Farnan said it would be difficult to directly correlate the costs for each goal. A significant number of the FTEs are to maintain current programs and services, e.g. uniform hours at all of the library locations.

• Need to move “consultant costs” to Capital and One-Time Projects section.

• There was extensive discussion about how the information in the five-year operating and capital cost estimate document should be represented in the Master Plan. Teter said it is important to show that the Master Plan costs were thoroughly thought through. Gibb suggested we need to help the community connect the dots for where the library is, and where it needs to be, in terms of the budget. Teter said the Master Plan will show that the library needs money, and the commission needs to be prepared to explain why. The commission must understand the amount needed to operate the library annually. Koenig offered to assist staff with parsing and reformatting the information.

• Phares said the document shows estimates for current needs and expansion of programs and services desired by the community, it does not address the cost of potential growth during the term of the Master Plan. Farnan explained that a formula can be created to predict the possible labor costs if the collection budget is increased.

• Teter said an annual budget estimate is needed to inform the library district planning and determine the mill rate needed. Farnan said the GIS district boundary (“the map”) and budget analysis is expected in June and will be shared with commission. Farnan wants the commission’s recommendation on which unincorporated areas of Boulder county to include on “the map.” Koenig asked if there would be an opportunity to go back to the voters to adjust the mill rate. Farnan replied that the mill rate selected must provide enough capacity to fund ongoing operating costs and plans for expansion for at least 10 years.

• Farahan asked the commission if there was anything in the document that they were not comfortable supporting or speaking about with the community. Gibb wants to make sure we don’t have to go back and ask for more money. Teter said she wasn’t certain if the literacy festival project funding was represented as ongoing. Farnan explained what was in the estimate for the literacy festival project, and confirmed it includes estimating for ongoing funding. Need to annotate the operational cost heading to indicate that the five-year total is not an accumulated cost.

**Agenda Item 3. Questions for February 7, 2018 presentation about library districts** [8:03 p.m., Audio 1:58]

Gibb asked for additional questions from the commissioners for Jacquelyn Murphy Senior Consultant for Public Libraries and Community Relations, Colorado State Library, Library Development, who will be presenting about forming a library district at the February 7 Library Commission meeting. There was discussion about whether the city pays for the initial study (not the transition), and the upfront costs that will inform a decision about whether to begin forming a district. Farnan said the city would cover those costs, and that city staff from the City Attorney’s Office, Finance Department, and GIS staff are currently gathering information for the analyses now.

Is the City Manager’s Office (CMO) and City Attorney’s Office (CAO) in support of forming a district? Farnan said the CAO doesn’t weigh in on these matters. The CMO is waiting to hear from the Library Commission and City Council about their recommendation.
Does the city or the district pay for the costs of the transition? Does the district pay the city back for costs that it covers for the district? Farnan said this is a question for the CAO and would be addressed in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the city and the district. Farnan said there may be more flexibility with the transition than he originally conveyed to the commission. Other questions for Jacquelyn Murphy:

- Farnan recommended asking Murphy about the options for the transition.
- What are the negative consequences of forming a district?
- What are some lessons learned from successful and unsuccessful districts?
- What are the checks and balances for a volunteer board? How do we get assurance that this volunteer board is going to function well?
- What’s a realistic timeline for forming a district?

**Agenda Item 4. Debrief on the January 19 and 20, 2018 City Council Annual Retreat, meetings commissioners have had with individual members of City Council, and the Daily Camera newspaper.** [8:11 p.m., Audio 2:07]

Farnan said the City Council retreat was great, and that Council members Grano, Brockett and Jones spoke about the issue of library funding. Council members Morzel and Yates spoke to Farnan about it during a break. The library funding issue is on council’s workplan.

Farnan reported that he has a meeting with City Council and the Boulder County Commissioners next week to discuss forming a library district.

Farnan shared that Google is interested in working with the library. He pitched funding internet network fiber to the new North Boulder Branch Library or the makerspace. Google declined to fund either but suggested a couple of other projects the Aimee Schumm, eServices manager, is looking into. O’Shea asked if the funding would go directly to the library or through the Boulder Library Foundation. Farnan said it could go either way.

Farnan cautioned the commission that the momentum around the discussion of forming a library district may begin to pick up now that he is discussing it with several city colleagues and other departments are assisting with the research. Staff and commissioners will need to be prepared to answer questions from the community soon.

Gibb and Teter reported on the status of the opinion editorial (OpEd). O’Shea spoke to some people at the Boulder Chamber of Commerce to get feedback on the draft OpEd. They asked what the commission wants. Commission wants to promote a broad public discussion about both library funding from the city, and about forming a library district. Gibb and Teter met with Daily Camera reporter, Alex Burness about publishing the commission’s OpEd. Burness is planning to write an article using information from the draft OpEd to be published next week. [Editor’s note: the article was published on Jan. 25, 2018]

**Adjourned 8:26 p.m.**

**Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:**

The next Library Commission meeting will be held at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, Feb. 7, 2018 in the Main Library, Canyon Meeting Room
Possible Formation of a Library District.

1. Does Council support a citizen initiative to place a question on the November 2006 ballot asking voters to create and fund a library district?

2. Is Council willing to fund all or part of the district portion of the cost of the November election?

Process to create a library district:

The City and County could jointly form a library district by the City Council and County Commissioners each adopting a resolution or ordinance to that effect. Notice and a public hearing to discuss the creation of the district must be held before the resolution or ordinance is adopted. The resolution or ordinance must describe the proposed district boundaries, specify the mill levy and state that electors within the proposed district must approve any new tax before the district can be established.

A library district may also be created by a petition signed by 100 or more registered electors residing in the proposed district boundaries. The petition (which is submitted to the County Commissioners) must request establishment of the library district, state the names of the governmental units establishing the district, name the district, describe the district boundaries, specify the mill levy and state that the electors must approve the new tax before the district can be established.

Upon receipt of the petition, the County Commissioners may, following notice and a public hearing, establish the district by resolution or ordinance subject to voter approval of the tax levy to fund the district, or they may submit the question of establishment of the district and approval of the tax to fund it to the electors at the next November election. If the electors approve establishment of the district, the board of trustees of the district is appointed and a written agreement between the City, the County and the trustees setting out their respective rights, obligations and responsibilities must be effected within 90 days.

Cost of the Election:

If the formation of the district is by resolution or ordinance of the City and County, the voters residing in the service area of the district would still have to approve an increase in taxes to fund the district. The district would not be established unless the voters approved the tax increase because
the resolution or ordinance forming the district must be conditioned on voter approval of the new tax. In this circumstance, the County must pay the election costs if the tax measure fails unless the City and County agree to a different arrangement. If the formation of the district is initiated by petition, those filing the petition must post a bond with the County to cover all expenses connected with creation of the district, including the election costs. The County may waive the bonding requirement and, with the consent of the City, agree to pay the election costs.

The County is required to pay for at least half the cost of the district election if the initiating petition has valid signatures in an amount at least equal to five percent of the total number of votes cast in the proposed district boundaries for all candidates for the office of secretary of state at the previous general election. At this time, the County is unable to provide an estimate of the number of signatures needed to hit the 5% mark, but staff believes it to be several thousand.

If the voters approve formation of the library district, the new district covers the district’s share of the cost of the election.

The County estimates the district portion of the cost of the election to be $50,000 to $100,000. It is unlikely citizens will undertake the petition process to initiate the library district question if they must post a bond to cover all or part of the cost of the election in the event the measure is not approved. The County and City can agree to waive the bond, with the County then becoming responsible for the election costs if the measure fails, unless the City agrees to pay all or a portion of these costs.
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY
FORT COLLINS CITY COUNCIL

ITEM NUMBER: 35
DATE: July 18, 2006
STAFF: Brenda Carns
        Marty Heffernan

SUBJECT

Resolution 2006-075 Authorizing the City's Participation in the Proposed Fort Collins Regional Library District.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends adoption of the Resolution.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The 2007 library budget has a direct impact on the General Fund, projected at $3,851,000. These funds are primarily used to provide staff to run the library operations, as well as for books and materials. Internal services such as legal, finance, human resources, facilities maintenance, etc., provided by other City departments, but not currently billed to the library, cost the City about $371,000 annually based on projections from the departments providing these services.

The County projects that Library District revenue will become available after April, 2007. Funding to operate the libraries from January through April will be needed, even if the voters approve the formation of the new Library District. It is recommended the City loan the Library District sufficient funds to operate until the District's funds are collected. The District would then reimburse the City. It is also recommended that the City provide support services for the District without charge for 2007 to help make the transition from a City-run library to a Library District as seamless for the community and the staff as possible. The District Board of Trustees can then determine if the District will purchase some or all of these services from the City for 2008 and thereafter. These and other issues will be addressed in a Council-approved intergovernmental agreement between the District, the City and the County once the District is formed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A citizen group has petitioned for creation of a Library District that would include the City in its service area. Voters will be asked to form and fund the District in November. State law requires the City, as operator of an existing public library within the boundaries of the proposed District, to decide whether or not to participate in the District [C.R.S. §24-90-106(1)], and to consent to the County paying the costs of the election, rather than requiring the petitioners to post a bond to cover those costs [C.R.S. §24-90-107(3)(c)(II)]. This Resolution approves the City's participation, in the event the District is formed, and consents to the County paying the costs of the election.
BACKGROUND

City library services have been declining since 2002 due to budget cuts. Districts typically enjoy a higher level of local support than other types of public libraries since they are property tax based and the revenue remains relatively stable over long periods. Library Districts also capture revenue from growth outside of the City so that all who benefit pay the cost of library services. This allows the library to grow as the number of patrons using the library expands, without penalizing those who already pay for library services. A Library District will mean a higher level of service for the residents of Fort Collins and the surrounding area. A Library District will allow for such things as restoration of hours of operation, restoration of former levels of reference services, interlibrary loaning and borrowing services, youth outreach efforts, local history access and reinstatement and increase in community bookdrops. It will also be possible to increase programs and story times and the number of books available for the community to borrow. The District will also be able to build and operate a new branch library in southeast Fort Collins.
RESOLUTION 2006-075
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS
AUTHORIZING THE CITY’S PARTICIPATION IN THE PROPOSED
FORT COLLINS REGIONAL LIBRARY DISTRICT

WHEREAS, a citizens’ group has petitioned the Larimer County Commissioners for the creation of a new Fort Collins Regional Library District (the “Library District”), pursuant to Secs. 24-90-101 to 24-90-119 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (the “Library Law”); and

WHEREAS, the proposed Library District would include Fort Collins within its legal service area; and

WHEREAS, voters within the proposed legal service area of the Library District will decide at the November election whether to form the Library District and fund it through a property tax; and

WHEREAS, Section 106 of the Library Law requires the City Council, as the legislative body of a governmental entity that maintains a library within the territory to be served by the Library District, to decide, by resolution or ordinance, whether or not to participate in the Library District; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 107(3)(c) of the Library Law, the County Commissioners may pay the costs of the election for the Library District, rather than require the petitioning citizens’ group to post a bond to cover the costs, if the City consents; and

WHEREAS, City library services have been declining since 2002 due to budget cuts; and

WHEREAS, if approved by the voters, the Library District would capture revenue from growth outside the City as well as within, allowing the Library District to provide an improved level of service to residents of Fort Collins and the surrounding areas; and

WHEREAS, the details of how the City and the Library District would cooperate and make the transition from a City-run library system to a Library District would be addressed at a later date through a Council-approved intergovernmental agreement between the City, the County and the Library District; and

WHEREAS, the Council believes that participation in the proposed Library District would be in the best interests of the City and its residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS as follows:

Section 1. That the City of Fort Collins shall participate in the proposed Fort Collins Regional Library District should the Library District be formed pursuant to the provisions of the Colorado Library Law.
Section 2. That the City consents to the Larimer County Commissioners paying the costs of the election for the proposed Library District.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Fort Collins this 18th day of July, A.D. 2006.

________________________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________________________
City Clerk
Resolution 2006-118 Establishing the Fort Collins Regional Library District and Appointing Two Members of City Council to Serve on a Committee to Select Candidates for the Board of Trustees of the District.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends adoption of the Resolution.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The citizen initiative to form and fund the Fort Collins Regional Library District was approved by the voters on November 7. Pursuant to the Colorado Library Law, the City and County must establish the District forthwith and provide for its financial support no later than January 1, 2007. The Colorado Library Law also requires the City Council to appoint two of its members to a committee that will select the initial board of trustees (the Selection Committee). The County Commissioners must appoint two Commissioners to the Committee. Trustees selected by the Committee must be ratified by a two-thirds majority of the Council and a two-thirds majority of the Commissioners. The Council and Commissioners must act on the Committee’s recommendation within 60 days or the recommended trustees are automatically ratified.

The Selection Committee, with approval of the Council and Commissioners, must decide if there will be five, six or seven trustees. The initial appointments for the trustees (set by state law) must be for terms of one, two, three, four, and five years respectively. If there are six trustees, two will have five year terms. If there are seven trustees, two will have four year terms and two will have five year terms. Thereafter, the length and number of terms is determined by the District by-laws. Trustees may only be removed by a majority vote of the Council and the Commissioners upon a showing of good cause.

Once the District Board of Trustees is established, state law requires an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between the City, the County and the trustees must be effected within 90 days. The IGA must determine the rights, obligations, and responsibilities, financial and otherwise, of the parties to the agreement.

This Resolution appoints Councilmembers Ben Manvel and Karen Weitkunat to the Committee to Select Candidates for the Board of Trustees of the Fort Collins Regional Library District.
RESOLUTION 2006-118
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS
ESTABLISHING THE FORT COLLINS REGIONAL LIBRARY DISTRICT
AND APPOINTING TWO MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL TO SERVE ON A
COMMITTEE TO SELECT CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE DISTRICT

WHEREAS, on November 7, 2006, the voters approved a citizen initiative to establish and
fund the Fort Collins Regional Library District pursuant to Sections 24-90-101 to 606 of the
Colorado Revised Statutes (the “Library Law”); and

WHEREAS, Section 24-90-107(3)(a) of the Library Law requires that a petition to establish
a library district contain a request for the establishment of the district and the names of the
governmental units establishing the district; and

WHEREAS, the petition that was submitted to place the establishment of the Library District
on the November 7 ballot listed Larimer County and the City of Fort Collins as the establishing
governmental units; and

WHEREAS, Section 24-90-107(3)(g) of the Library Law states that if a majority of the
electors vote in favor of the establishment of a library district, the legislative bodies of each
establishing governmental unit shall forthwith establish such library district; and

WHEREAS, the Library Law further requires the City and County to each appoint two
members of their legislative bodies to a committee that shall appoint the initial board of trustees of
the Library District; and

WHEREAS, the Council wishes to appoint Councilmembers Karen Weitkunat and Ben
Manvel to such committee.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT
COLLINS as follows:

Section 1. That pursuant to the requirements of the Colorado Library Law the City, in
cooperation with Larimer County, hereby establishes the Fort Collins Regional Library District as
directed by the electors; provided, however, that such action is contingent upon the Larimer County
 Commissioners taking similar action.

Section 2. That Councilmembers Karen Weitkunat and Ben Manvel are hereby
appointed to represent the City of Fort Collins on the committee that shall appoint the initial board
of trustees of the Fort Collins Regional Library District.
Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Fort Collins this 21st day of November, A.D. 2006.

__________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
City Clerk
DATE: November 28, 2006
STAFF: Marty Heffernan

WORK SESSION ITEM
FORT COLLINS CITY COUNCIL

SUBJECT FOR DISCUSSION

Overview of Transition of Library Services to the Fort Collins Regional Library District.

GENERAL DIRECTION SOUGHT AND SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

Does Council have any questions or concerns with the proposed process to transition library services to the Fort Collins Regional Library District?

BACKGROUND

A group of citizens, following the provisions of Colorado library law, initiated a ballot measure asking voters if they wanted to create and fund the Fort Collins Regional Library District.

The library initiative was approved by the voters, directing the Council and County Commissioners to establish the District. The Council took action to establish the District on November 21st, and the Commissioners have also taken this action. The ballot measure establishes a 3 mill property tax on property within the District boundaries, estimated to produce $5,779,377 annually. The mill levy must be certified by the County by December 15th. The ballot establishes the District boundaries as those of PSD plus the City’s Growth Management Area. The boundary area excludes Wellington and Red Feather Lakes Library District in recognition of their decision to opt-out of the District.

Voter approval of the Library District means that library services will no longer be provided by the City of Fort Collins. Services will now be provided by the District. Consequently, General Fund support for library services, budgeted at approximately 3.6 million dollars for 2006, will be available for other purposes.

The property tax for the District will provide more funding than the 3.6 million dollars provided by the General Fund. The additional revenue will be used to restore over $500,000 in services that have been cut in recent years, increase hours of operation at the libraries, pay for support services (legal, human resources, accounting etc.) provide new services to areas outside the City, improve the collection and programs and open and operate a new southeast branch library.

The City is entering into an agreement with Bayer Properties to build and operate the new southeast branch in the retail development Bayer is creating at Harmony and Ziegler roads. Bayer will provide the City with 16,000 square feet of space on the second floor of an attractive, centrally located building in the center. Bayer will also provide the parking, roads, utilities and other infrastructure for the library. The City will pay Bayer for the cost of the second floor building shell
and will finish the interior of the building, using library impact fees from new residential development. The City will own the second floor space and has agreed to use the space for a library.

The Library District will be governed by a Board of Trustees, not by the City or the Council. The Trustees are like a Council for the District. The Trustees will be responsible for the District's revenues and budget, for District property, and for District employees and operations. Library employees will no longer be City employees but will become employees of the District.

Library District Trustees are selected by a committee of two Council members and two County Commissioners and ratified by a two-thirds majority of the Council and a two-thirds majority of the Commissioners. On November 21st, the Council selected Karen Weitkunat and Ben Manvel to be the Council representatives and the Commissioners have selected Cathay Rennels and Karen Wagner to be their representatives. State law does not impose a deadline for selecting the Trustees. However, because the District has been established and because taxes for the District will be collected and available for 2007 operations, it makes sense to select the trustees as soon as reasonably possible.

The Trustee Selection Committee will need to advertise for candidates, provide an application form, determine desirable qualities and qualifications, conduct interviews and recommend candidates for approval by the full Council and the Commissioners. State library law allows for 5, 6 or 7 trustees with their initial appointments being for terms of one, two, three, four, and five years respectively. If there are 6 trustees, two have five year terms. If there are 7 trustees two have four year terms and two have five year terms. Thereafter, the length and number of terms is determined by the District by-laws. The by-laws are adopted by the Trustees. Trustees are not compensated, except for expenses, and may only be removed by a majority vote of the Council and Commissioners upon a showing of good cause.

After the Trustees are selected and ratified, an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between the City, County and Board of Trustees must be effected within 90 days. The IGA will address the use, lease or ownership of the library buildings and personal property (like the books, furniture and furnishings); the partnership with Front Range Community College; the new branch library; the use of library impact fees and Building on Basics library technology money; the provision of support services (financial, human resources, operation services, etc.); risk management and liability issues; the transition of library employees from the City to the District; and similar matters.

Until the IGA is signed by all the parties, staff recommends library services continue as a City operation with a condition in the IGA that the City will be reimbursed by the District for the cost of these services. The District will begin to receive revenue from the property tax in April of 2007 and would be in a position to reimburse the City at that time. Staff also recommends that support services provided by the City to the library currently should be provided for all of 2007, without charge, to allow for a smooth and successful transition. These services are provided by current City staff and are included in the 2007 budget.
DATE: February 13, 2007
STAFF: Marty Heffernan

WORK SESSION ITEM
FORT COLLINS CITY COUNCIL

SUBJECT FOR DISCUSSION

The Intergovernmental Agreement Between the New Fort Collins Regional Library District, the City of Fort Collins and Larimer County.

GENERAL DIRECTION SOUGHT AND SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The City, County and the new District must enter into an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) within 90 days of the ratification of the District Board of Trustees. City staff intends to draft a proposed IGA to provide a framework for the discussions with the Trustees and the County. Staff is seeking Council direction on how the various issues to be addressed in the IGA should be presented in the draft agreement.

BACKGROUND

In November 2006, voters approved the creation of the Fort Collins Regional Library District and provided three mills of property tax to fund District operations. A committee comprised of two Councilmembers and two County Commissioners is in the process of selecting the District Board of Trustees. The full Council and the Commissioners must ratify the Trustees. Once the Trustees are ratified, state law requires the City, County and District to enter into an IGA within 90 days setting forth the rights, obligations and responsibilities of the parties.

The IGA needs to address a variety of issues to ensure the smooth transition of library services from the City to the new District. What follows is a description of the issues, some options for resolving them and staff’s recommended course of action.

ISSUE 1: HARMONY LIBRARY AGREEMENT WITH FRCC

Harmony Library

The City operates the Harmony Library pursuant to an IGA with Front Range Community College. The agreement has a 50 year term which began in 1996. The City does not pay rent. The IGA provides that the City will operate the library for the benefit of the students and the community. The City may assign its rights and responsibilities under the agreement with the College’s consent.
OPTIONS:

- Assign the agreement to the District with the College’s consent along with all of the City’s rights and responsibilities under the agreement with the College.

- Do not assign the agreement but contract with the District to provide library services for the City as required by the agreement with the College.

Staff Recommendation:

Assign the City’s Harmony Library agreement to the District upon gaining the College’s consent on the condition the District uses the facility to provide library services to the students and the community and fulfills all of the responsibilities of the City under the agreement with the College.

ISSUE 2: PERSONAL PROPERTY

The City owns a variety of personal property currently devoted to library services. This includes the books and materials in the libraries, shelving, computers, furniture, A/V equipment, check out machines and similar assets. The District will need these assets to continue to provide library services to the public.

OPTIONS:

- Give the property to the District for the purpose of providing library services to the community.

- Offer to sell the property to the District.

- Keep the property but allow the District to use it to provide library services to the community.

Staff Recommendation:

Give the property to the District conditioned on it being used to provide library services to the community. This option helps the District provide quality library services to the community and eliminates the City’s need to inventory and insure the property.

ISSUE 3: SUPPORT SERVICES

The City currently provides a variety of support services to the library operation. These include: human resources; accounting; risk management; purchasing; legal; information technology and facilities maintenance. The cost of these services is approximately $400,000 annually. Funding to provide these services is included in the 2007 budget. Council may wish to consider waiving the cost of support services until library operations are turned over to the District after the IGA is in place or for all of 2007.
OPTIONS:

• Offer to provide some or all of these support services to the District at cost.

• Offer to provide some or all of these support services to the District without charge for all or part of 2007 and at cost thereafter.

• Do not offer City support services to the District.

Staff Recommendation:

Offer to provide any or all of these services, except legal, to the District at cost beginning in 2008, or sooner. Do not offer City legal services because of potential conflict of interest issues and the benefit of having independent legal representation for the District.

ISSUE 4: BUILDING ON BASICS LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY FUNDING

The Building on Basics (BOB) capital program, approved by the voters in 2005, provided $5,950,000 for library technology. The BOB funding schedule provides the first yearly installment of $744,000 in 2008 with the last installment in 2015. The funding is to be used to provide the library with computers, software, databases and technology maintenance.

Options:

• Provide the BOB funding to the District on condition that it be used to provide library technology consistent with the BOB ballot language.

• Ask the voters to allow the City to use the BOB library technology funding for other City needs.

Staff Recommendation:

Provide the BOB funding to the District conditioned on it being used to provide library technology consistent with the BOB ballot language. Because BOB funding is primarily provided by City residents (sales tax), require the funding be used to provide the maximum benefit to Fort Collins residents and prohibit the funding from being used to provide technology which primarily benefits non-City residents.

ISSUE NUMBER 5: LIBRARY IMPACT FEES

The City has collected a library capital expansion (impact) fee on new residential construction since 1996. The current amount of the one-time fee is approximately $500 for an average size dwelling. The fee provides funding for new books and materials and additional facility space to serve the library needs of new City residents. The City has been saving most of these impact fees to build and provide a collection for a new southeast branch library. This library is presently being designed in partnership with the Bayer Properties retail development project. The branch library will likely use
most of the available impact fees. The question is whether the City should continue to collect library impact fees. The District does not have the authority to impose impact fees.

OPTIONS:

- Continue to collect a library impact fee on new residential development within the City and give the proceeds to the District to provide more books, materials and library space for the benefit of City residents.

- Work with the County to create a library impact fee for residents living in the unincorporated areas of the District and continue the City’s library impact fee.

- Discontinue the library impact fee.

Staff Recommendation:

Explore with the County the possibility of imposing a library impact fee on residents living in the unincorporated areas within the District boundaries and continue the City’s library impact fee. Provide the proceeds to the District to provide more books, materials and library space for the benefit of all District residents. If a fee on residents in the unincorporated areas is not feasible, determine at that time whether to continue the City’s library impact fee.

ISSUE NUMBER 6: LIBRARY EMPLOYEES

City employees working for the library are expecting to become District employees once library operations are transferred to the District. Staff is recommending that the transfer take place after the IGA has been signed by all parties. The City has an interest in ensuring that City library employees become District employees and that their pay and benefits are not diminished by the change in employers.

OPTIONS:

- Have the District agree to hire current City library employees and agree to provide the employees with a pay and benefits package at least equal in value to the pay and benefits currently provided to the employees by the City.

- Let the District decide who it wishes to hire and the pay and benefits it wishes to offer to District employees.

Staff Recommendation:

Have the District agree to hire current library employees and agree to provide them with a pay and benefits package at least equal to the pay and benefits currently provided to these employees by the City. Recognize the District has the authority to change or eliminate positions and job duties and also has the authority to terminate employees, as provided by law and adopted District policies.
ISSUE NUMBER 7: REIMBURSEMENT FOR 2007 OPERATING EXPENSES

The City is providing library services to the community until library operations are transferred to the District. The adopted 2007 City budget does not provide funding for library operations. The adopted budget is based on the City being reimbursed by the District for the City’s costs to operate the libraries until operations are turned over to the District.

Options:

- Ask the District to reimburse the City for costs incurred in operating the libraries in 2007.
- Do not ask the District to reimburse the City for library operating costs incurred by the City in 2007.

Staff Recommendation:

Ask the District to reimburse the City for costs incurred in operating the libraries until operations are turned over to the District. Condition the transfer of assets from the City to the District on being reimbursed.

ISSUE NUMBER 8: COUNTY ELECTION COSTS

State law provides that the County may seek reimbursement from the District for the County’s costs associated with the library district election. The County may wish to include a provision in the IGA for this reimbursement.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Chart comparing several Colorado Library Districts.
2. Power Point presentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library District</th>
<th>Did it purchase or transfer ownership from new District?</th>
<th>Was building ownership transferred to new District?</th>
<th>New District? Yes or No</th>
<th>Existing District? Yes or No</th>
<th>Was it transferred to new District?</th>
<th>Established Year</th>
<th>Building Sources</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>2004 No; leased.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extended contract</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>$1 for 20-year lease.</td>
<td>Note: Florida Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Original city money was used to establish.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Routt.</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mill levy continued</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mill levy continued</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Park Public Library</td>
<td>1969 Building ownership transferred.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$500/mo + utilities for one branch.</td>
<td>Note: Florida Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand County</td>
<td>1995 All branches were leased from the towns or county.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$500/mo + utilities for another branch.</td>
<td>Note: Florida Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa County Public Library</td>
<td>1992 Yes; at market price.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>1992 Yes; at market price.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeview Library</td>
<td>2005 Yes; at no cost.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mill levy continued</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District, Thorton</td>
<td>1969 No.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo City-County Library</td>
<td>1969 No.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>1976 No.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramquist Library</td>
<td>1986 Building transferred.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mill levy continued</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District, Greeley</td>
<td>1986 Building transferred.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mill levy continued</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not procured</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>North Carolina Public Library, Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) Impact fees cannot be collected by a District.
2) In all cases, collections, furnishings and equipment were transferred to District.

01/20/2007
The Library Commission requested a summary of the input received during the Master Plan community engagement related to safety issues and serving patrons experiencing homelessness to consider when planning a community dialogue about these topics. Jill Bradburn, one of BPL’s fabulous volunteers, compiled and organized all the comments recorded in the reports from the community survey and other engagement activities. The full reports are posted here: https://boulderlibrary.org/about/library-master-plan/events/.

The front page of the summary which begins on the next page is a numbered list of the reports reviewed. Each comment related to these two topics was sorted and recorded under Homeless, Safety, or both topics if both were referenced in the comment. Each comment is followed by the source number of the report from which it was taken.
Comments on safety or homelessness that were collected during Master Plan community engagement

Source Reference

1- BPL: Boulder Public Library Master Plan Draft Goals & Tentative Implementation Timeline
2- Draft Master Plan Goals Community and Library Staff Feedback Report
3- Community Engagement and Feedback Report
4- Teen Focus Group Report
5- North Boulder Focus Group Report
6- Gunbarrel Focus Group Report
HOMELESS

Number of times “Homeless or Shelter” used: 8

HOMELESS COMMUNITY MEMBERS One suggestion was to create a people experiencing homelessness advisory group to help guide what the library does, as an avenue for promoting library and city resources to this community, and to build positive rapport with the library. One patron shared his perception that NoBo staff and/or the community at the NoBo Corner Library do not like the homeless population. One patron remarked that they dislike homeless persons sleeping at or around the library. (2)

SAFETY One patron shared that she feels the library is safe. Another shared that she does not feel the library is safe and she is intimidated by other patrons she perceives are homeless. A grandparent shared his concern about safety at the Main Library. He said that he would not leave his grandkids there. He felt that it [environment at the Main Library] has changed over the years and is less welcoming. (2)

The library is noisier, dirtier, and a far less usable place than it used to be; too many tables with people sleeping or otherwise "crashing," and fewer books. Thanks for reading these comments from Gunbarrel. (2)

Use outdoor spaces for more practical things like edible landscapes and orchards that feed the homeless. Have a system of rewards for homeless like some of the churches. For example: [if they] pick up rubbish around the building and [they] get something [in return]. (2)

What do you consider the highest priority goals for the Boulder Public Library during the next 10 years? (2)

Security and deal with homeless issues (2)

“How do you not become a de-facto day shelter?” Frustration among avid users that this is not a “true library” (4)
SAFETY

Number of times “safe or safety and security” used: 13

Employ security services and technology that: protects the rights, health, and safety of library patrons, staff, and volunteers; ensures patrons’ use and enjoyment of the library; and preserves and protects the libraries’ materials, equipment, facilities, and grounds (1)

Improve library safety and security. Create plan to address safety and security in all facilities. (1)

SAFETY One patron shared that she feels the library is safe. Another shared that she does not feel the library is safe and she is intimidated by other patrons she perceives are homeless. A grandparent shared his concern about safety at the Main Library. He said that he would not leave his grandkids there. He felt that it [environment at the Main Library] has changed over the years and is less welcoming. (2)

The library is noisier, dirtier, and a far less usable place than it used to be; too many tables with people sleeping or otherwise "crashing," and fewer books. Thanks for reading these comments from Gunbarrel. (2)

Improve library safety and security*****
(*=number of times comment repeated) (2)

Respondents strongly agree with the statement “I feel safe at the library (63% Main and 89% Reynolds) (3)

Participants are very worried that a large NoBo Branch will turn into the Main Library and that they will no longer feel safe in the library. One participant expressed that she does not let her daughter go to the Main Library by herself because she does not feel that her daughter is safe there. (4)

Participate feel that the library should be A safe haven; be a safe place to visit. (4)

Intersection in front of library is dangerous for families with small children; poor sight lines, people stop past the cross walk (4)

There is a tension between feeling safe in the library and recognizing the need to be open to everyone in the community (4)

“How do you not become a de-facto day shelter?” Frustration among avid users that this is not a “true library” (4)

Participants feel that the Library should be a place to be safe and feel safe. A safe place for everyone – for young families, for teenagers, for adults, for seniors to gather. (5)
Review of part one: Boulder Public Library and the Community

A draft of the Master Plan update part one is Attachment A for the Library Commission’s review and comment. The draft contains notations in red text and comments to flag sections for staff that are yet to be completed. This part serves as the introduction to the Master Plan and summarizes the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan goals that were accomplished during the past 10-years. This part will be followed by part two summarizing trends, community needs, and what BPL is currently doing to address community needs. Part two will be shared with the commission in the March meeting packet.
Part One: Boulder Public Library and the Community

Role of Library in the Community
The role of the public library in North America is growing and transforming from a place that provides free and equal access to information, where people can get books; to include increased opportunities for obtaining 21st century skills, civic engagement, and social gathering. Public libraries are becoming an expression of their community’s vision, innovation and creativity.

Through active engagement, listening, and facilitating, libraries are identifying the community’s priorities, and adapting programs, services, and policies to help address the community’s stated needs. In this new role, libraries are also uniquely positioned to provide a platform and facilitate connections among community members, playing an active role in creating the social environment desired by its members. This necessitates library staff to consider broad community needs in designing and offering library programs and services. The Boulder Public Library has focused its mission to reflect this new role and to align with the Aspen Institute’s broad concepts of the public library as people, as place, and as platform. BPL’s own definition of these concepts follow, and its accomplishments during the past 10 years, its commitments, and goals for the upcoming 10 years are organized in this Master Plan using the headings.

The Library as People
The Boulder Public Library reflects the community, the people, and their values. Serving people is the core of its mission and is accomplished through creating connections, fostering relationships and resilience, and offering opportunities for the community and staff to participate collaboratively with one another. As a convener and connector, the library supports people with a diverse range of interests and needs, and new opportunities arise in bringing people together.

The Library as Place
The Boulder Public Library is a destination that anchors the community and strengthens its identity. It is a safe and trusted place where everyone is welcome to explore ideas, participate in civic dialogue, and find enrichment and entertainment in the programs and services offered. BPL provides the physical and/or emotional space for people to explore, learn, and connect. In a welcoming atmosphere, diverse needs can be met through the physical design of its facilities, the materials that are available, and the resources that guide personal empowerment.
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The Library as Platform

The Boulder Public Library facilitates creativity and innovation, providing resources, tools and experiences, that inspire learning and creativity, promote literacy, and cultivate connection. It is a platform for individuals or groups to drive their experiences and to connect with ideas and each other. The library as platform is a blending of people and place to inspire patrons to design their own educational, social, and cultural experiences.

Current Services, Resources, Facilities, and Programs

From five locations throughout the city, the Boulder Public Library (BPL) and its staff offers a wide variety of resources, and ongoing and short-term programs and services to the community.

Resources

Books, magazines, CDs, DVDs, e-books, e-magazines, audiobooks, databases, computers, internet, website, local archives and oral history, genealogy, meeting rooms, study rooms, gallery, theater, and the BLDG 61 Makerspace.

Services

Personalized customer service, information access and instruction, check-outs, interlibrary loan, holds, homebound delivery, library used bookshop, café, business development, community gathering spaces, rentals, printing, scanning, and copying.

Programs

Story times, annual summer reading, films, concerts, adult and family literacy, citizenship classes, teen programs, Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Mathematics (STEAM) programs, entertainment, exhibitions, skill-building workshops, edible learning garden, Conversations in English, and literary and author events.

Current Performance and Accomplishments

BPL measures performance based upon a variety of benchmarks as compared to some of its peer libraries in the nation, as well as how well it meets the Colorado Public Library Standards. The libraries that are used for comparison represent a wide variety of funding and governance structures, as well as unique service attributes making direct, one-to-one comparison ineffective. For example, some libraries have one facility while others, like BPL, have a network of branch libraries resulting in significantly different facilities maintenance costs. One of BPL’s important and unique characteristics is that the number of total cardholders is 33.5% more than the legal service area population. The only other library used for comparison that has more registered borrowers than the legal service area population is Westminster Public Library which is at 5%. BPL’s facilities also include a fully-equipped makerspace, a

1 Colorado Public Library Standards. [http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdelib/standards/index](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdelib/standards/index)

2 Boulder Public Library Benchmark Comparison Study, Margaret Sullivan Studio. 2017. [Insert link or reference appendix.] Comparison data is from Fiscal Year 2016.
traditional theater space and an art gallery, amenities which many libraries do not have. Benchmark comparisons need to be considered within the context of the service area population needs, and funding and governance structures of the libraries being compared.

Guided by input from the Library Commission and the community, BPL’s recent success is also attributed to the accomplishment of most of the goals and objectives in the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan.

Library as People

With nearly one million visitors a year, the library is one of the busiest public places in Boulder. Program attendance soared to 102,072 in 2016, representing 100% growth when BPL reorganized staff to concentrate on expanding its program offerings to include Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Mathematics (STEAM), and early literacy focused programs. Much of BPL’s success with programs can be attributed to informal collaboration and partnerships with local agencies, and generous donations of time and resources from local companies.

Foremost support for library programs comes from the community through the Boulder Library Foundation (BLF). The BLF is a 501-c3 nonprofit organization led by a volunteer board of directors and supported by individual donors and community partners. The BLF generously invests in innovative programs and partnerships through BPL that enrich the community. In addition to ongoing support of most programs and events offered by the library and the funding of start-up equipment and materials costs for the BLDG 61 Makerspace, the BLF donated one-time funding so that the library could build a Spanish language collection to fulfill one of the outreach goal objectives in the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan. In 2016, BPL facilitated the BLF’s hiring a community partnership manager to coordinate the launch of an annual membership fundraising program, called the Library League, a step toward meeting the funding goal of developing a gift giving program to increase monetary donations to the library.

Volunteers are also critical to the success of the library. In 2016, community members donated 22,000 hours, the equivalent of $570,000. Volunteers support staff by performing tasks that support daily library operations, maintain the Main Library used book shop, and they contribute directly to patrons by serving as literacy tutors for children and adults, teaching English as a Second language classes, teaching skills to patrons in the BLDG 61 Makerspace, offering drop-in tech help, capturing oral histories, involving children in the Summer Reading Program, welcoming thousands of people to the Jaipur Literature Festival, and delivering materials to patrons who are homebound.

BPL works closely with the Library Commission on library policy and planning matters. Five dedicated volunteers are appointed by City Council to serve the community on the Library Commission. The commission represents the community’s perspective to City Council on library matters. In 2015, the Library Commission initiated work on a long-standing goal: drafting changes to the city charter to clarify the commission’s powers and duties. The changes were approved by voters in November 2015.

---

Commented [PJ2]: Footnote: the national standard value of volunteer per hour.

[^2]: 2016 Colorado Public Library Statistics. Library Research Service. https://www.lrs.org/public/data/basic/?y%5B%5D=2016&g%5B%5D=allprog&refine_submit=Submit
ATTACHMENT A.

Updating the Library Commission’s powers and duties from the original charter language written in 1917 has improved focus on critical issues and created a more effective working relationship between the Library Commission and staff.

BPL also works with the Boulder County Employment Alliance to provide temporary employment opportunities in materials handling to qualified community members who have psychiatric disabilities. Vocational staff from Boulder County Mental Health provide support to these individuals to ensure a productive and valuable experience.

In 2014, BPL began a successful partnership with the Boulder Small Business Development Center (SBDC). The SBDC is a fast-paced, hands-on, economic development nonprofit – a public/private partnership housed in the Main Library with a mission that is aligned with BPL’s. SBDC supports the growth and resiliency of small businesses in Boulder County by providing free business consulting, practical workshops and events and connection to resources, including financing.

BPL’s partnership with the Boulder County Farmers’ Market to run the Seeds Library Café has helped to activate the library bridge space in the Main Library, creating a community hub where patrons can relax or meet with friends. Seeds Library Café staff also present programs that build community and educate patrons about the importance of buying local food and supporting local farmers.

BPL recently formalized its partnership with the Boulder Genealogical Society. Society members work closely with staff and use the resources at the Carnegie Library for Local History to help people conduct family and local history research. The society maintains a small collection of unique resources at Carnegie, which are available to patrons. Members also present educational classes and workshops on genealogical research to patrons at the library.

Serving children and families is a high priority for the library. The annual Summer Reading Program encourages the love of reading and learning for thousands of children and families through inspiring and engaging programs and literacy activities. BPL is able to further its reach into the community to serve children and families through several collaborative efforts. The George Reynolds Branch Library Reading Pals program is a collaboration with Fairview High School, which promotes literacy skills and a love of reading for children in early elementary school. Children are paired with high school students once a week for fun reading and literacy skills practice. The Boulder Reads Reading Buddies program is a long-standing partnership with the University of Colorado, in which children (Kindergarten through 3rd grade) are paired with University of Colorado undergraduate students for weekly reading, writing and literacy activities. These two programs emphasize exploration and discovery, and foster literacy and a love of reading. BPL is able to further its reach to children through collaborations with Boulder Housing Partners, Boulder Head Start, University of Colorado family housing, and Mapleton Early Childhood Center by offering story time programs.

Making the Boulder Reads program more visible and accessible to community members interested in improving their literacy skills was an objective in the 2007 Library Master Plan. While the library was not able to obtain funding to meet the intention of this objective, to move the program offices and community space to a more prominent location in the Main Library, Boulder Reads expanded its online presence through social media and a new website with an online application and menu of services.

The Boulder Reads program also expanded its offerings to include access to Career Online High School, a Cengage Learning program geared toward adults who want to earn a high school diploma, and created a
digital literacy curriculum for literacy tutors to teach their students 21st century life skills, such as using computers to apply for jobs, health insurance, etc.

In 2012, the library began publishing an email newsletter, BPL Now, to keep patrons informed about upcoming programs and events and new services. In 2016, BPL introduced a printed bi-monthly event and program guide to respond to patrons’ requests for a complete, printed list of library programs. In 2017, the library received ongoing financial support from the city’s General Fund to develop and implement a marketing plan to promote the wide variety of resources, programs, and services BPL offers to the community.

It goes without saying that the library staff have made these accomplishments possible. During the past few years, greater focus was given to increasing staff engagement and cultivating innovation and collaboration to better serve the public. This began with the staff collaborating to create a Customer Service Philosophy, and design a model for mobile service to meet the customer at their point of need.

Several internal organizational changes were then made that increased efficiency and allowed the library to expand programs and improve the quality of many of its fundamental services. Some of the most impactful improvements are that all incoming telephone calls are now handled by expert customer services specialists providing patrons with immediate assistance and reducing wait time. Centralizing phone assistance has also freed staff at the public service desks at all locations to devote more time to patrons visiting the libraries in person. BPL is also committed to recruiting qualified bilingual staff, when possible, to serve in many of the public facing roles.

BPL also received ongoing financial support from the city’s General Fund to offer staff necessary training and professional development to maintain and grow their skills with technology, information delivery, and community engagement and for hiring temporary staff to cover critical functions like materials handling and the customer service desks when standard staff members are on paid leave.

Library as Place

BPL’s Main Library, neighborhood branches and local history archive are popular destinations for the community. Significant investments were made in library facilities since the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan.
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The 2009 Library Facilities Sustainability Study, an objective of the facilities goal in the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan, provided guidance for investment in maintenance and renovation of library facilities and a geographic service area study to inform placement of new facilities or service points (e.g. book returns) in the city.

BPL addressed several 2007 Master Plan objectives by renovating the Main Library. The $4.9 million project was completed in April 2014 in collaboration with the Facilities and Asset Management (FAM) division of Public Works, and paid for by the voter-approved 2012 Capital Improvement Bond, Library Fund Balance, and FAM Facilities Renovation and Replacement fund. The architecture firm, studiotrope Design Collective, engaged the community to create a building design that activated underused or secluded spaces, reduced noise conflicts, and improved basic signs and wayfinding. The community asked for and received more X% meeting space, a child-friendly children’s area, an expanded teen space, and a new vibrant café. In addition to the many amenities, FAM took advantage of the construction schedule to address several major mechanical and building system improvements, including upgrading the building’s cooling system, replacing the clerestory windows to address roof leaks, improving the lighting control system, and replacing the flooring in the Canyon Gallery.

To encourage more use of the public meeting spaces in the libraries, each was equipped with new audiovisual technology and flexible furnishings. An online calendar and registration system was implemented to allow patrons to make reservations on their own.

[Add paragraph summarizing the building system replacement and mechanical system upgrades – all facilities at all facilities and describing the energy funding] Solar PV installation at the Main Library

In 2014, the NoBo Corner Library was welcomed by community members living in north Boulder. Hours were also expanded at George Reynolds and Meadows branch libraries without additional cost to the community by reorganizing staff resources. During 2015 and 2016, both the George Reynolds and Meadows branch libraries received modest renovations, reconfiguring staff space to improve efficiency of processing library materials and to create more welcoming, patron-friendly spaces. A 20-year lease was negotiated with the new owner of the Meadows Shopping Center for the Meadows Branch Library for no charge except the library’s share of taxes, insurance, and common area maintenance fees. This secured that location for the Meadows Branch Library through 2029.

Beginning in 2013, coordinated with the renovation of the Main Library, an investment was made in new, automated materials handling systems. The systems were designed to more efficiently process returned materials and reduce the number of physical touches to materials by staff. Materials handling systems were installed at the Main Library, and at the George Reynolds and Meadows branch libraries. These systems along with process improvements made by the materials handling workgroup has enabled all facilities to consistently maintain getting materials back to the shelf within 24 hours of their return. [Work in: Roof replacement in 2011 and major roof repairs 2014. Main Library flood proofing 2013.]

To begin to address community concerns about safety in the Main Library, the city increased BPL's budget to hire a contract security officer at the Main Library for 35 hours per week in 20XX. The hours
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were expanded to have one security officer on-duty all hours the Main Library was open to the public in 2010.

BPL coordinated with FAM to consolidate management of building maintenance and janitorial services to expand sharing of resources and improve overall efficiency. Operational budget resources were reallocated to fund an equipment replacement fund for new technology and equipment.

[Insert paragraph summarizing the Carnegie external renovations that have been completed since 2007 and any other improvements/investments the city has made in the facility. West and east easement 2009-2012.]

BPL coordinated with the city Information Technology (IT) Department to consolidate technical support staff resources for managing and troubleshooting the enterprise systems used by the library and to consolidate and relocate computer servers housed in the Main Library, which is in a high-hazard floodplain to the city’s data center. Improvements were also made to the procedures for backing up the library’s server data and Internet filtering was implemented on the wired and wireless networks for public use. Operational budget resources were reallocated to fund a computer replacement fund for new technology.

BPL as Platform

During the past 10 years, Boulder Public Library has transformed into a platform complete with resources, staff support, and spaces for patrons to engage in self-directed learning and enjoyment.

Since the 2007 Library Master Plan, BPL has responded to patron demand by diversifying the book and media collections into electronic formats. BPL partnered with several area libraries to rapidly grow its offerings of e-books and downloadable audiobooks by collectively purchasing these resources. Demand for electronic formats continues to trend upwards, and the way in which libraries purchase, maintain, and loan electronic formats continues to evolve and is still almost exclusively dictated by the vendors. The wide variety of platforms and purchasing agreements makes for challenging decisions for library staff to meet patron demand while getting the best value for the tax dollars received. The Boulder community's demand for physical books is still showing slight growth, while the demand for DVDs, music CDs, and CD audiobooks is starting to decline. The collections are maintained and acquisitions made following library industry best practices, the latest assessment tools, and input from community experts and volunteers.

In 2013, BPL introduced Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology to improve patron self-service and materials availability through efficient, timely processing of returned materials. There is now a small added cost to make each new book, DVD, and CD RFID-ready, which collectively reduces the buying power of BPL’s collection budget. In 2017, BPL received an ongoing increase in its operating budget to cover the cost of RFID tags. Many of the new and in-demand materials also arrive at the library shelf-ready, requiring minimal handling by staff to be available to patrons now that they are cataloged and processed by library book and media vendors, for added efficiency.

According to the Colorado Public Library Standards for traditional library materials (e.g. books, movies, music in physical and electronic formats), BPL has met the 2007 Master Plan benchmark of materials
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expenditure per capita ($10.21) being within the 75th percentile⁴. To continue to increase patrons’ use of BPL’s collection, library staff may want to look at ways to continue to improve upon the selection, maintenance, and promotion of library materials to increase total circulation per capita (14 items, currently above the 50th percentile) and the annual average item turnover rate (five times, currently above the 25th percentile).

BPL worked with its consortium partners (Mamie Doud Eisenhower Public Library in Broomfield and the Louisville Public Library) and other local municipal libraries to create a non-profit Flatirons Library Consortium (FLC). Consortium operations, formerly managed by BPL staff, were outsourced and the FLC opened its membership to more municipal libraries, adding Lafayette Public Library, Loveland Public Library and Longmont Public Library. The FLC has more than doubled its membership, making available twice as many books and materials to BPL patrons with no increase in direct cost. Further, expanding the FLC strengthened its member libraries’ ability to negotiate contracts with book and database vendors as a group, allowing all libraries to purchase more materials at reduced cost.

Recognizing the difficulty of patron access to important printed historic resources held by the Carnegie Library for Local History, BPL hired a technology consultant to assist with the design and procurement of a digital asset management system. The project included prioritizing the library’s local history collections for digital preservation, and updating collection management policies to align with industry best practices. The new system will increase patron access to the digitally preserved historic photographs and documents by making them available online through Carnegie Library’s website.

The community makerspace, BLDG 61, launched in 2016, attracting thousands of participants and winning multiple awards. BLDG 61 is a model for libraries internationally, and functions as a de facto incubator for innovators, entrepreneurs, and inventors with multiple patent applications and several businesses launching from the space in the less than two years it has been in operation. BLDG 61 programs have been sustained by a series of community grants. BLDG 61 is a high-tech shop with laser cutters and 3D printers, as well as a full-scale, advanced woodworking shop as well as opportunities for patrons to learn from and work alongside community experts. While not likely what library staff and the Library Commission envisioned when this goal was written more than 10 years ago, opening the BLDG 61 Makerspace at the Main Library has certainly fulfilled the intention of the goal for the library to provide a leading-edge space, state-of-the-art technology, outreach and training for patrons.

In the past 10 years BPL introduced several technology infrastructure upgrades to increase patron access to the Internet, computers, and software. Children now have access to computers that allow them to develop digital literacy skills, and participants are able to borrow and use laptop computers during technology and maker-focused programs. Similarly, the Boulder Reads program installed a computer lab to assist adults with improving their digital literacy skills, obtain high school equivalency credentials, apply for jobs, etc. With the shift to more patrons owning smartphones, tablets, and laptop computers, BPL addressed the access issue by implementing and expanding WiFi Internet access and began to offer access to the Microsoft Office software suite. While website technology evolves rapidly, BPL made incremental improvements to its website, catalog search interface, and introduced library account and

early literacy apps. To facilitate information sharing about library programs and services with patrons who speak languages other than English, the Google translate feature was integrated into the library website.

Opportunities for continued improvement
During the next 10 years, BPL will continue to build upon accomplishments designing programs and services to respond to the community’s aspirations and needs. Through community engagement, staff and Library Commissioners evaluated the relevance and priority of the objectives from the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan that were not accomplished due to time and budget constraints. Several of these objectives have been updated and are included in BPL’s new goals.

BPL was not able to fully address many of the outreach objectives. This included:
- Regularly gathering community input about programs and services to assess satisfaction.
- Programs and services designed to reach low-income families, youth, seniors, community members with special needs, and Latino community members.
- Programs that pair seniors and youth.
- Promoting BPL as an arts destination.
- Incorporating a homework help center with facilities expansion.

While BPL did make significant strides with improving and expanding facilities and updating technology during the past 10 years, a few objectives were not addressed, most of which are still relevant including:
- Building a full-service north Boulder branch library.
- Providing sufficient staff time to manage auditorium and meeting room technology to support expanded art and cultural programs.
- Installing consistent, patron-friendly directional signs in all library facilities.
- Creating a Carnegie library program plan to identify major building system needs and the required funding to address them, supporting its role as the conservator of Boulder’s history.
- Investing in a mobile technology information center that could be taken out into the community to engage underserved community members.
- Expanding the Main Library 1994 building to the west.
- Investigating opportunities for multi-function civic buildings in which the library would share space with other city departments.
- Moving the Boulder Reads program offices and public space to a more prominent location.

Financial sustainability continues to be an urgent priority for BPL. Funding objectives that were not fully addressed include:
- Obtaining adequate operating funds to improve the quality for custodial and security services and to create a fund for replacement of outdated and worn library furnishings.
- Conducting further research on options for library funding and governance.
- Creating a development office within the library to spearhead broad fundraising efforts for capital and one-time needs.
- Pursuing additional grant opportunities and developing a plan to increase library financial donations.
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- Develop an endowment to ensure the future of the Carnegie Library for Local History as both a historical site and a repository for Boulder’s historic archives.
Commission Memo

Meeting Date: February 7, 2018 – Main, Canyon Meeting Room

Upcoming Special meetings:

Interesting Upcoming Dates (from ALA Website)

Teen Tech Week - March 4-10, 2018

Teen Tech Week is a national initiative sponsored by the Young Adult Library Services Association and is aimed at teens, their parents, educators and other concerned adults. The purpose of the initiative is to ensure that teens are competent and ethical users of technologies, especially those that are offered through libraries such as DVDs, databases, audiobooks, and videogames. Teen Tech Week encourages teens to use libraries' nonprint resources for education and recreation, and to recognize that librarians are qualified, trusted professionals in the field of information technology. Teen Tech Week began in 2007 and has a general theme of Get Connected @ your library. The event is held annually during the second week of March. Contact ALA’s Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA, a division of ALA) with questions.

1. Items from Commission

Favorable Position for Updated Bathrooms

The Library Commission is pleased to see the city recognize the need for updated, ADA compliant, and gender neutral bathroom facilities. We reiterate our request to Council for support and funding of our Main Library restroom renovations. Additionally, we support planning to provide new public bathrooms within the Atrium and Municipal buildings. Over the past year, staff responded to our request to develop ADA compliant and gender neutral bathrooms by surveying best practices, analyzing opportunities at Main, and developing bathroom designs applicable to all city properties (see: Feb 2017 Library Commission packet for the FAM design that we unanimously and enthusiastically embraced). Our efforts with FAM should be leveraged and enhanced by other groups looking to modernize critical infrastructure. The broader implications of supporting these progressive requests move beyond capital improvements and speak directly to the City’s Community Perception Assessment - Safe And Welcoming Community Work Plan.

2. BLF Update (verbal)
3. Updates from Commissioners Representing the Commission in other Venues (verbal)

B. Civic Area
C. Canyon Complete Streets
D. EcoDistricts
E. Central Broadway Corridor Design Framework.

4. Update on Emails & Phone Calls to Library Commission

January 21
Hello Joni,

I noticed the upcoming meeting in today's Daily Camera, and I have been unable to find an agenda more expansive than "Master Plan Update." I am interested in whether the commission is going to expand on the funding ideas presented to the City Council in December 2017. Could you please enlighten me? Or point me to a detailed agenda?

Thank you. I picked your name from the list because I recognized you from other civic efforts you have been involved in. I appreciate your work to make our library the best it can be. I use it a lot.

With best regards,
Mary Eberle
Boulder
303 442-2164

January 22
Hi Mary –

Thanks so much for your interest in library doings, and especially for your interest in funding issues. We would really like to get a community discussion going around our library’s future and its funding before finalizing a recommendation in the master plan later this spring. We spoke with Alex at the Camera last week, and expect to see a news article this week or next.

Funding is a primary topic at tonight's discussion. Staff has been developing a detailed spreadsheet linking master plan goals and current funding deficiencies to estimates for staffing (FTE), operational and capital funding needs. We saw a preliminary draft last fall, and will be reviewing a much more complete version tonight. I’ve attached the packet, which includes a summary of the goals, proposed measurements of success,
and the funding needs’ spreadsheet. We welcome input from the public, so please share your thoughts and spread the word (after the meeting is fine FYI).

At our next regular meeting (February 7), we are planning an in-depth discussion of the pros and cons of library districts. Jacqueline Murphy, with the state library department, will join us to share her knowledge and experience of library districts around the state and the nation. It should be an interesting discussion. We are always happy to have public join us.

For future reference, our packets are typically posted to the Commission page on the BPL website on Friday before each meeting. Handouts, minutes and audio recordings are also posted to this page following meetings. The link to meeting packets is at the bottom of the Commission page, under the bios. I’ve copied that link below.

https://boulderlibrary.org/about/commission/archive/

Thanks again for your interest – and for your support of our wonderful library system!

Best - Joni

Mary Eberle via gmail.com
9:02 AM (1 hour ago)

to Joni
Hi Joni,

Thank you so much for getting back to me with this informative message. I now see the Commission Meetings info with the Meeting Packets & Minutes. It’s actually at the top, not at the end, under “About.” I’m sorry to have wasted your time when I could have tracked down the agenda by a little more hunting.

But the chance to learn about the research the Commission is doing on funding and particularly on library districts makes this email exchange very worthwhile to me. Here’s a bill that is coming up in the legislature that I think will improve Special District elections:

HB18-1039

Change Date Of Regular Special District Elections

My concern about special districts is that they and their operations and dedicated taxes are usually very far under the citizens’ radar. Therefore, I think that the most open way to fund government is to use the normal budgeting process. Has the Library Commission
considered asking library patrons to sign an online petition for the City Council to rethink funding of the library?

Thank you for the research you and the other Commissioners are doing and again for getting back to me. I look forward to the article that the Daily Camera will soon publish.

Best,
Mary

Hi, Mary - no worries about bothering me. Mo (our admin) is out right now, so tonight's packet isn't posted yet FYI.

Thanks for the note on the special district bill. Library districts are not special districts, FYI. They are governed by a separate, library district-specific statute. I'll add a question about whether this bill applies to districts to the list of questions we're putting together for Jacqueline's visit on Feb. 7th.

Personally, I share your reservations about government by district, and would emphasize that the Commission has not yet decided whether to recommend going that route. However, libraries (like all basic, non-sexy services) have a difficult time competing with the "flashy" items that tend to dominate elections, Council agendas and - ultimately - budgets. I think this experience (along with the "equity" issue: i.e., the patron base is not aligned with "who pays") is what has been driving the trend towards libraries moving into governance (and funding) by district. It's very difficult to manage day-to-day operations, adjust to changes in demand and plan for the future when you don't know what your budget will be. Districting has provided libraries with much greater funding stability.

In Boulder, the budget squeeze is further complicated by (a) the high proportion of funding that is already earmarked for specific purposes and (b) our community's appetite for adding new initiatives (especially land use related activities) to the workplan. I've clipped two diagrams from the City's 2018 Budget in Brief (below) to illustrate the challenge. As you can see, about 65% of City spending is earmarked to specific purposes, with the remaining 35% paying for the bulk of "basic" services operational needs, as well as most new initiatives. (The capital budget is equally constrained, with about 90% dedicated to maintenance). Proposing that the City to increase its general fund contribution to the library is a difficult "ask," since the money isn't there - and there are a lot of other needs/wants going begging.

Commissioners have been talking to Council members about this problem since last June, when the City decided to put the NoBo branch on the ballot. At that time, we pointed out that the library does not have the funding to equip and operate another branch without cutting services elsewhere (the biggest obstacle to NoBo construction
over the last 20 years in my experience). We asked for the November study session with Council to frame the library's funding issues and to ask that they make library funding a priority in the next two year workplan (which they established this last weekend at their retreat). We followed up with a letter and met with individual Council members to offer more depth on the needs and funding deficiencies. Although we've heard from Council members that the library is a priority, we have yet to see BPL funding rise up high enough on the priority list to warrant City analysis and in depth community discussion, both of which we think are needed.

At our January meeting, we agreed that it was time to raise the library's funding issues publicly. We developed a working paper summarizing the library's funding issues, which we are now in the process of sharing with community leaders. We also agreed to meet with the Camera and submit an Op-Ed about our funding needs. Since Alex decided to do a story, I think we will wait to see what the Camera's news article says before doing an OpEd.

So that's where we are right now. We will continue to noodle about how to best open and facilitate a community discussion about library funding, and welcome your ideas.

Thanks again for your interest and support.

- Joni

From: Benson Grayson

May I suggest the library acquire for its adult fiction collection "General Rahmani's Dilemma," (See attached link:) The book is available from Ingram Source and from Amazon.

https://www.amazon.com/General-Rahminis-Dilemna-Benson-Grayson/dp/0692048502/ref=tmr_hrd_sw_v_0?encoding=UTF8&sr=

The book's protagonist is one of former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein's senior military officers, wanted as a war criminal, who seeks sanctuary with ISIS. Forced to join a suicide mission to the U.S., he escapes his captors and disguises himself as an Anglican priest to elude both ISIS and American Security. In a small Montana town, circumstances oblige him to both live and serve as rector of the local Episcopal church, profoundly changing him.
See following ling to five star review of book.
The author, who served as a career intelligence officer and State Department Foreign Service Officer, was a Senior Research Fellow at the National Defense University. He is the author of twelve other published books, including "Saudi-American Relations," 1982, University Press of America, and five works of fiction.

Hi Benson,
Thank you for your email. The commission doesn't do a whole lot involving book requests. Your best bet is to fill out a Materials Request Form:
https://boulder.flatironslibrary.org/MaterialsRequest/MyRequests

Thanks!
Alicia
North Boulder Library Project Team Kick-off

The North Boulder Library project team kicked off their work with a visioning meeting on Thursday, Feb. 1. The intent of that meeting was to provide preliminary input about requirements and desires for the new library. This project description information will inform the development of the request for proposals (RFP) that will be issued for architects for the first phase of this project. The first phase of the project included in the RFP consists of outreach with stakeholders (including community engagement), site evaluation, and site selection. The successful candidate for the first phase may or may not be hired to continue in the design/build process for the new library.

Library and Facilities and Asset Management (FAM) staff have developed a preliminary and tentative timeline for this project as follows:

**2018**

Q1- Develop and issue RFP for architect
Q2- On-board architect and design stakeholder outreach
Q3- Active engagement with public stakeholders and library commission; final site selection*
Q4- Begin design, conduct environmental site evaluation

**2019**

Q1-Q3- Building design; site review; stakeholder check-in on library design and programming*
Q4- Permitting

**2020**

Q1- Bid process for construction and fiber installation
Q2- Begin construction

*Anticipated opening date: 2021*

*indicates primary opportunities for stakeholder engagement and public outreach

As this project progresses, bulletins and updates will be posted on the new project website: [https://boulderlibrary.org/about/north-boulder-branch-library/](https://boulderlibrary.org/about/north-boulder-branch-library/). The city will also publish a project landing page for the 2017 Community, Culture & Safety Projects. This page has not been published as of the date of this memo. A link will be provided when available.

**City Council / County Commissioner Meeting**

David did a brief presentation and discussed questions with City Council and County Commissioners at their annual meeting. Councilors and County Commissioners expressed interest in getting more information and continuing research. David will work with Michelle Krezek, in the County
Commissioners’ Office, to ensure that commissioners receive information packets as they become ready. Everyone expressed support for the library. The next two reports for City Council are the mapping data that council requested at the Nov. 28 study session, including a ‘heat map’ of users, and a defined map with pinpoints of resident and non-resident card holders. Staff is also preparing documentation on rough estimates of what a mill rate would look like per property owner, and another financial scenario that shows what a dedicated sales tax would look like.

**Boulder Center for the Performing Arts [BCPA] and the west bookend of the Civic Area**

The BCPA group has reconvened around a broader vision for the west bookend. The new concept is broader than their last proposal, and entails a form of partnership with the federal labs, the university, the city, and the business community for a “Nature, Science, Cultural campus.” The plan is very much in its early phases, but the group purports to be putting the business plan for ongoing funding support at the forefront of their efforts. They intend to do a proforma study, and will begin fundraising for such a study in the coming months. The BCPA board acknowledges that they left the Library Commission in the dark on their last pass through considerations, and hopes to be able to present ideas in a more deliberate fashion, beginning with a business plan, in the next year or so. The idea still includes the concept of a new building throughout the west bookend. They still have their sights set on the north building of the Main Library, as well as the West Senior Center.

**Q4 Library Use Statistics and the Maria Rogers Oral History Program 2017 Annual Report**

Both reports are attached.
2017 Q4 BPL Quarterly Performance

In Person Visits

Doors counts for BPL system held steady YTD over last year, with Meadows showing increases of 12%.

**Fig. 1 Door Counts Running Total YTD 2017 and percent change from 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door Counts</td>
<td>829521</td>
<td>906948</td>
<td>982412</td>
<td>840200</td>
<td>919057</td>
<td>996294</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>564048</td>
<td>615266</td>
<td>665254</td>
<td>570000</td>
<td>622005</td>
<td>673448</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>111258</td>
<td>122234</td>
<td>133602</td>
<td>123624</td>
<td>137116</td>
<td>150020</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>116917</td>
<td>128397</td>
<td>139237</td>
<td>112364</td>
<td>122324</td>
<td>131879</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>34760</td>
<td>38324</td>
<td>41402</td>
<td>34690</td>
<td>37948</td>
<td>41142</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>2917</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: NoBo counts adjusted by averages in March and April due to counter not tracking small children.

Patrons and Programs: PEOPLE & PLACE

**HIGHLIGHTS Q4: Partnerships with public and private community enterprises.**

- October hosted many Halloween themed programming, *Day of the Dead Spanish/English Storytimes* at Nobo & Main, *Haunted Library* at Reynolds, *Beetlejuice* showing at Meadows, Main and BLDG61 hosted *Costume Hack-a-thon* and Teen *Gross me Out*; Concerts *Ghosts, Ghouls, and Witches, featuring Soprano Ekaterina Kotcherguina*; Films *Old School Film, New School Film*, and several film workshops helped patrons preserve their films, and more importantly their memories. October also brought in *Open Studios* and *Ikebana Flower Show*.
- November offered many diverse learning and enrichment opportuniites. BLDG61 opened *Woodworking 101; CU Scientists* and *Astronauts* wowed children at the branches, *Dance is for Everybody* attendees and participants swayed through the library, much appreciated *Sensory Friendly Concerts* and *storytimes* were offered, and overflowing crowds attended the *Drag Queen Storytimes*. Students across the region attended the *Research Rendezvous* to work with history experts in the community on their National History Day projects.
- December started out with a bang with *CSED week* offering over 25 programs and bringing in hundreds to learn code, robots, and all things “geek”. We wound down the year with ever popular holiday themed concerts, storytelling, and cozy comforting Teen programs focusing on *tea and knitting*.

New patron registrations dropped off YTD over 2016 this quarter. Most of the decrease occurred in January with online registrations, although November and December were also down over 2016 MTM.

**Fig. 2 Running totals for new patron accounts YTD 2016-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Patrons</td>
<td>11945</td>
<td>12977</td>
<td>13776</td>
<td>11180</td>
<td>12038</td>
<td>12847</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*The range of partners and stakeholders can and should be broad, to include private sector businesses, local entrepreneurs, authors and publishers, technology experts, nonprofit organizations with shared priorities, journalists, educators, community foundations, library trustees, the public and more. The wider the reach in building partnerships, the greater the impact for libraries and the communities they serve.*”

Strategies for Success, Aspen Report p.32
## Programs & Storytime

### Programs & BLDG61 Events & Attendance Summary 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLDG 61 events</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLDG 61 attendance</strong>*</td>
<td>13902</td>
<td>14443</td>
<td>16091</td>
<td>6024</td>
<td>6955</td>
<td>7776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storytime Events</strong></td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storytime Attendance</strong></td>
<td>31137</td>
<td>34128</td>
<td>36250</td>
<td>29185</td>
<td>32252</td>
<td>34628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>22980</td>
<td>25225</td>
<td>26807</td>
<td>21023</td>
<td>23402</td>
<td>25171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>4507</td>
<td>4854</td>
<td>5102</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td>3864</td>
<td>4021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs Offered-Children</strong></td>
<td>408</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs Offered-Adult</strong></td>
<td>864</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs Offered-Teens</strong></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs Offered-Teen</strong></td>
<td>3963</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>4670</td>
<td>4131</td>
<td>5023</td>
<td>5297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>2903</td>
<td>3206</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>4569</td>
<td>4813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach: Events</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach: Exposure</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132597</td>
<td>132597</td>
<td>134597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach: Direct Contact</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12091</td>
<td>12140</td>
<td>12697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BLDG61 2016 outreach was reported as programming attendance which reflects as a false negative drop in 2017.

BLDG61 2017 outreach activities are included in the Outreach sums at the bottom of the sheet.

**2016 Outreach was reported as attendance for some venues (reflects as negative drops in 2017 programming).

The total % change in all activity when Outreach is added in 2017 is only about -5% (counting Direct only) and more on par with our trends. A detailed programming report is forthcoming to clarify this change.

Outreach metric is required for State Reporting as separate activity from Programs.
Circulation and Collections:
2017 YTD circulation increased +3% overall.

Fig. 4 Circulation, Interlibrary Loans/Borrows, eCollection and Database YTD Comparison 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation (collections)</td>
<td>1138285</td>
<td>1250982</td>
<td>1364874</td>
<td>1178997</td>
<td>1296019</td>
<td>1405509</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>737146</td>
<td>809441</td>
<td>881809</td>
<td>755683</td>
<td>829742</td>
<td>899845</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>175252</td>
<td>192789</td>
<td>210724</td>
<td>193144</td>
<td>212261</td>
<td>230280</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>190568</td>
<td>209558</td>
<td>229979</td>
<td>195621</td>
<td>215901</td>
<td>233881</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>35319</td>
<td>39194</td>
<td>42362</td>
<td>34549</td>
<td>38115</td>
<td>41503</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCollection Use</td>
<td>116581</td>
<td>127858</td>
<td>140529</td>
<td>136977</td>
<td>154730</td>
<td>170090</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Use</td>
<td>101592</td>
<td>112981</td>
<td>128146</td>
<td>141969</td>
<td>160307</td>
<td>179601</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds Filled (Collections)</td>
<td>143389</td>
<td>156856</td>
<td>171875</td>
<td>155832</td>
<td>172227</td>
<td>187463</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC Borrows incoming</td>
<td>56640</td>
<td>63123</td>
<td>69668</td>
<td>74625</td>
<td>82713</td>
<td>90801</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC Loans outgoing</td>
<td>43730</td>
<td>48097</td>
<td>52145</td>
<td>58813</td>
<td>65200</td>
<td>71587</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospector Borrows</td>
<td>22001</td>
<td>23744</td>
<td>25454</td>
<td>16614</td>
<td>18408</td>
<td>19972</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospector Loans</td>
<td>15594</td>
<td>17134</td>
<td>18710</td>
<td>13260</td>
<td>14552</td>
<td>15576</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holds Filled (collections) is the perspective of collections from each branch going to fulfill a hold, regardless of where the request originates. FLC borrows and loans are consortium member libraries borrowing from, or lending to, BPL. Likewise, Prospector Borrow and Loans are incoming or outgoing. As the consortium grew this year, it is noted that Prospector requests/borrows fall off.

Both databases and eCollections showed increased usage of 40% and 21% respectively.

PC Sessions & Reference Questions

PC Sessions ended with a decrease overall—we hope to have WiFi counts beginning in 2018. Reference transactions showed slight increase for 2017

Fig. 5 Reference Transactions and PC Sessions Q4 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Sessions</td>
<td>123358</td>
<td>135805</td>
<td>147645</td>
<td>119341</td>
<td>130018</td>
<td>140774</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>87314</td>
<td>95919</td>
<td>104327</td>
<td>83051</td>
<td>90401</td>
<td>97697</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>17712</td>
<td>19478</td>
<td>20976</td>
<td>17185</td>
<td>18943</td>
<td>20701</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>15076</td>
<td>16824</td>
<td>18516</td>
<td>16864</td>
<td>18204</td>
<td>19677</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoBo</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DART Ref Transactions</td>
<td>49026</td>
<td>49026</td>
<td>62123</td>
<td>51406</td>
<td>51406</td>
<td>64838</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

Overall visits and circulation are holding steady. Programs are leveling off at a sustainable and high performing level, while Outreach events in the community are increasing in number.

Libraries serve as lifelong learning centers with education being an essential part of their mission.

Outcome: The community is enriched by programs and services that offer formal, informal, and self-directed learning opportunities for all ages and abilities. 2016 Colorado Library Standards.
Manager’s Moment

Last year’s “moment” spoke about the planned changeover to a new platform for organizing and sharing content from all of Carnegie’s digital assets, including oral history. Quote: “The excitement of this opportunity is tempered only by the understanding of work to come, to transition all of the files and surrounding information into the new environment. The process might not be seamless, and it will not happen overnight. Nonetheless, we are excited by the possibilities and deeply grateful for the Boulder Public Library’s decision to pursue this initiative.”

So here we are, stepping into 2018, and every word of last year’s sentiment has held true. In fact, we still are in the process of tweaking and massaging parts of the new system—which does now hold our content!—to ready the website for public unveiling. For oral history, the functionality is showing to be superb: the same capabilities that had customized our previous online archive, as well as new features that yield better search returns; the ability to stream videos; and the ability to create online exhibits that combine content. To boil things down: Still excited; still grateful; still seeing possibilities.

This year I’ve had the opportunity to consider all aspects of MROHP in relation to our library and the community. This program exists because volunteers are invested in the idea of community knowledge and local history. As coordinator, my job is to harness volunteers’ energy, enthusiasm, and commitment; I hope my actions prove worthy of that output.

Note: Throughout this report, you will find quotes and sentiments expressed by one of our volunteers, written in response to an award nomination.

–Cyns Nelson, MROHP Program Manager
Presentation, Outreach, Collaboration

This year’s national Oral History Association meeting took place in Minneapolis, MN. As part of a panel, Cyns Nelson gave a presentation called “Engaging Audiences: Oral History and the (Public) Library.” She talked about how the Carnegie Library uses interviews to create conversation in the community and facilitate knowledge by bringing citizens into touch with their own stories. After describing the precepts, practices, and philosophic points that anchor the oral history program, she fielded questions. One audience member made contact after the conference, to receive further instruction in the hopes of launching a program at a “sister” Carnegie Library in Bryan, Texas.

MROHP was part of an intriguing event that blended art, history, and archives. The program was called Archives as Muse—eight different artists presented original work that was inspired by their interaction with content from eight selected repositories. Artist Esther Hernandez created a performance piece that came from her listening of an MROHP oral history, in which a dream sequence was vividly described. In addition to the exhibit, artists and archivists (including Cyns) participated in a public forum that explored the transformation of archival materials into contemporary creations. The event truly was inspiring!

Finally, something equally novel (or “book-ish”) emerged during the course of 2017: Cyns submitted a manuscript to Libraries Unlimited. The idea came from 2016’s Public Library Association conference, at which Cyns and two others presented on how libraries can give “voice” to their communities’ concerns by making their stories a shared resource. That session generated interest in a publication; and the submitted manuscript demonstrates the positive returns of choosing oral history as an investment of library resources. Perhaps 2018’s annual report will
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include an announcement of publication and a dust jacket.

Upcoming Rocky Flats Exhibit

During 2017, MROHP began formulating plans with BPL’s Program, Events, and Outreach team, to create an art exhibition related to the (now dismantled) Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant. Artist Jeff Gipe, who gained attention for his dramatic “Cold War Horse” statue, has now produced oil-on-panel portraits of individuals whose perspectives are part of the MROHP Rocky Flats interview collection. A portion of these pieces, along with other Rocky Flats art, will be on display in the Canyon Gallery at BPL’s main branch, starting in April of 2018. The gallery space is being retrofitted with a speaker system that will allow the play of audio excerpts from original oral-history recordings. MROHP is thrilled that voices from our collection will have increased exposure in such an impacting and artistic layout; and this opens the door to future projects, involving art and history/story within the purview of the Boulder Public Library.

OH Projects & Collaborations

Affordable Housing and Boulder Hospice
Notable in 2017 are two special collections—one started and one completed—focusing on the topics of affordable housing in Boulder and the history of Boulder County Hospice (now TRU Community Care). Interviews about affordable housing are being done by a CU group that acquired grant funding to study the issue from qualitative as well as quantitative stand points. Five interviews are in process, with upwards of 15 coming this year.

Also, MROHP volunteer Jerry Jacobson interviewed the four seminal figures involved in founding Boulder County Hospice. That organization celebrated its 40-year anniversary—and that presented a perfect opportunity to capture reflections, reminiscences, and recordings from founders.

People Who Make it Happen

Volunteers

Susan Becker
Sue Boorman
Megan Bowes
Dorothy Ciarlo
Kelly Crandall
John Dungan
Cynthia Girand
Jane Imber
Jerry Jacobson
Annie Jay
Carol Jordan
Sheryl Kippen
Tom Kremer
Leslie Lomas
Luke Lorenz
Helen McKeown
Ulla Merz
Miriam Murcutt
Joan Nagel
Jessica Oppen
Anne Marie Pois
Diane Rabson
Melodie Roschman
Jo Walsh
Carol Witz
Marvin Woolf
Tom Worrall
Library, Community, and Other Supporters

Carnegie Staff · BPL Staff · Boulder Public Library Commission · Boulder Library Foundation · Boulder County Parks and Open Space · Chris and Cathy Rogers · The Estate of George Bragg · Jim Beall & Susan Becker · Daniel Fairchild & Diane Rabson · Mary Wolff

A Special Thank You

Thanks to the Boulder Library Foundation for continuing to manage the MROHP endowment as well as donations that support our program. BLF can be found at www.boulderlibraryfoundation.org

The Maria Rogers Oral History Program

The voices in our collection build an understanding of place, time, community, and diversity.

Cyns Nelson, Program Manager · nelsonc@boulderlibrary.org · 303-441-1981 · Wendy Hall, Branch Manager

I realize that as a volunteer dedicated to this program, I may be biased. Nevertheless, I feel I understand the program’s contribution to the community over a significant period of time. I truly believe it is a treasure for the community, as well as an asset for the Boulder Public Library.”

The Boulder Public Library was nominated by Senator Michael Bennet for the 2018 National Medal for Museum and Library Service. In the nomination, Senator Bennet specifically cited the Maria Rogers Oral History Program.

The Maria Rogers Oral History Program @ Carnegie