Meeting date: Wednesday, March 7, 2018
Location: Meadows Branch Library, 4800 Baseline Rd.

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 February 7, 2018 minutes
4. Discussion on forming a library district
   Guests, Robin Gard, former co-lead of Fort Collins library district campaign and Poudre River Library Trustee and Mary Atchison, former co-lead of Fort Collins library district campaign and Poudre River Library Trustee.
5. Update on Main Library restroom renovation project funding
6. Master Plan project update
   a. Review of Master Plan draft part two trends and community needs – rescheduled for April 7th library commission meeting
7. Library Commission update
   a. Items from commission – Update on Commissioner conversations with City Counselors
   b. Boulder Library Foundation update
   c. City project representative update
      i. EcoDistricts
   d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission
8. Library and Arts Director’s Report
   a. Changes to Homebound Delivery Program service model
   b. Q4 2017 Web use statistics
   c. BPL call center statistics
9. Adjournment

2018 Library Commissioners
Alicia Gibb, Chair Joni Teter Tim O’Shea Juana Gomez Joel Koenig
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Board/ Commission:</th>
<th>Library Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting:</td>
<td>February 7, 2018 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information preparing summary:</td>
<td>Maureen Malone, 303-441-3106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission members present:</td>
<td>Alicia Gibb, Joni Teter, Tim O’Shea, Juana Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission members absent:</td>
<td>Joel Koenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff present:</td>
<td>David Farnan, Director of Library &amp; Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maureen Malone, Administrative Specialist II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimee Schumm, eServices Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspen Walker, Community Engagement and Enrichment Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaime Kopke, Programs, Events, and Outreach Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim McClelland, Patron Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others present:</td>
<td>Jacqueline Murphy, Sr. Consultant Public Library Community Programs at Colorado State Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sara Wright, Colorado Library Consortium (CLiC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the public present:</td>
<td>Mary Eberle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Meeting:</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda</td>
<td>[6:01 p.m., 0:00:00 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 2: Public comment</td>
<td>[6:02 p.m., 0:00:40 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda</td>
<td>[6:02 p.m., 0:01:01 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3A, Approval of January 10, 2018 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gomez moved to approve the minutes, and Teter seconded. Vote 3-0, unanimous (O’Shea was not yet present to vote).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3B, Approval of January 22, 2018 Study Session Minutes [0:07:15 Audio min]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teter requested that a statement be added to the last bullet on p. 3 of the minutes to clarify that the amount for the literacy festival shown in the cost estimate table (p. 21 of study session packet) represents the total city cost, not the library’s portion. O’Shea moved to approve the minutes as amended, and Teter seconded. Vote 3-0, unanimous (Gomez abstained as she was not at the meeting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Meet Aspen Walker, Community Engagement and Enrichment Manager</td>
<td>[6:03 p.m., 0:02:34 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 5: 2018 Canyon Gallery exhibitions – Jaime Kopke, Programs, Events, and Outreach Manager</td>
<td>[7:32 p.m., 1:23:10 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commission skipped ahead to Agenda Item 6 due to technical difficulties, and came back to this item later in the meeting.

See handouts for presentation.

O’Shea commented that the gallery is doing some really incredible things, and requested that staff post the full 2018 exhibition schedule on the website, so that people can plan around the exhibits, as opposed to just happening upon them.
Commission sent some questions to Jacqueline Murphy in advance of the meeting (in bold below).

**Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:**

- Murphy explained that the two major pros for forming a district are: 1. because they are property tax based, districts have been found to be more sustainable, and 2. districts have a dedicated board, which provides direct accountability to taxpayers for library services, as opposed to the city, which has a panoply of municipal services they need to provide. The major con to forming a district is the upfront and long-term maintenance costs associated with the responsibility for insurance, human resources expenses, maintenance of buildings, etc.

- **If the ballot initiative is successful, is there a defined limit of time for the transition period, or is that established through an MOU?** Murphy explained that a district will certify its budget on Dec. 15 of every year. The library would go to election to form a district in November of any year; if the ballot initiative passes, the district would need to seat a board in time to certify a mill levy by Dec. 15, which would be imposed starting the following Jan. 1. The tax revenue would come in the following year, meaning a two-year lag. Within 90 days after the initial board is in place, the district must enter into intergovernmental agreement (IGA); the statute does provide for an extension as needed, so every detail does not need to be ironed out before going to the ballot box.

- Gomez asked if the district would be borrowing funds for a year due to the lag caused by the fact that taxes are collected in arrears. Murphy replied that the district would most likely borrow funds from the city in order to cash flow. Wright added that since tax dollars are collected in arrears, it can be part of the IGA that the tax money collected from the library’s existing designated mill levy be passed through to the new district’s bank accounts; that’s not enough to run the library, but it’s something to keep in mind when thinking about the cash flow.

- Teter asked which entities would be involved in the IGA. Murphy explained that if the district is going outside city proper into unincorporated areas of the county, then the county would be one of the organizing jurisdictions along with the city and the district.

- Teter asked who appoints the trustees. Murphy replied that representatives of both the city and the county would seat the initial board; the statute is very specific about how the initial board is formed, and the terms are staggered (1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-year terms) for a 5-member or 7-member board. The city and county have ongoing approval of the board members. Farnan wondered if there are any metrics in place to determine board representation. Murphy replied that there is nothing in the library law, but Arapahoe County, for example, is a very diverse area and they appoint board members based on the different regions within the district. Wright added that Berthoud was able to keep its existing advisory board as the initial district board to make for a smooth transition, and members were assigned new terms in accordance with statute; the bylaws can then address how the board shall represent the nature of the district going forward.

- Teter wondered how a county clerk certifies a ballot on a district that doesn’t exist yet – does everyone in the county vote, or just the people who would be in the district, and how do you identify those people? Murphy explained that it tends to work best when a new district aligns with an existing taxing boundary (i.e. school or fire district), but you can designate a boundary other than existing taxing boundaries; the county’s GIS mapping department and the county clerk can help identify the list of voters that would vote in the election. Farnan commented that he has already looked into this and there is no overlapping district that this library district would be able to correlate with, so it will require detailed mapping.

- Gomez asked how it is decided who pays for the cost of the vote. Murphy responded that it is a point of negotiation, but in general, the city or county pays up front and if the vote passes and the district is formed, the new district reimburses for the election cost.

- **What is a typical amount of time for the transition to a district?** Murphy explained that this depends on a number of factors. Part of the IGA may be an agreement to agree upon real property transfers, employee transitions, and other particulars. The district needs to decide if it will continue to receive services (i.e. human resources, accounting, and IT) from the city and pay at cost.

- **Does an MOU typically occur after a district election, or are those things ironed out in advance?** Murphy replied that staff should have preliminary discussions with the approving jurisdictions around real property, employees, expenses, etc. in order to determine the feasibility of going forward with the expense of a campaign.

- **Does an entity independent of the city or county have to pay for the campaign to become a district?** Murphy explained that a YES committee composed of people who are passionate about the library would be formed and then file as a Committee for Political Action (PAC) with the Secretary of State to be able to accept donations and fund the campaign.
• How would the library hire legal counsel to represent the future district’s interest in negotiations with the city and county? Murphy stated that if a YES group has already been formed and has resources available, they can pay for counsel; otherwise the city can finance some of the preliminary discussions.

• What costs can we anticipate associated with the transition period? Murphy explained that it depends on what services are contracted back to the city (for human resources, payroll, etc.).

• How are funds distributed to the district? Murphy explained that the county assessor would disburse funds to the new library district just as they do other taxing entities in the district (metropolitan, parks and recreation, etc.) receiving their proportionate share of specific ownership taxes.

• Does a governing board need to certify receipt of disbursements from the county? Murphy replied that the county treasurer is the custodian of all monies for the library, which are then transferred into a special fund called the public library fund. Technically the library district could have to go through the county for every disbursement, but nobody does that; instead, the law provides that, at the request of the board, the treasurer can transfer money into the custody of the library board with the stipulation that the board carries a bond (as insurance that the district is correctly managing the money that the county is disbursing) and performs an annual audit.

• Are there templates from the state library for the transition process? Murphy said the state has some sample timelines that might be helpful for the campaign and strategy piece, and the Secretary of State has a timeline for the actual election. The library’s consultants can help develop a comprehensive timeline that has the election part, statutory election code part, and the timeframe going forward.

• Does pending legislation around House bill 18-1039 affect library districts, or is it limited to only “special district” elections? Murphy replied that to her knowledge, it only affects special districts; if something changes, the state library will send out a notice with information.

• Teter asked what the pros and cons of a Regional Library Authority (RGA) are, and why no one has chosen to go that route. Murphy explained that in the case of an authority, two governments are getting together to agree to share costs, but unless the promise to share costs is voted, it is subject to annual appropriation and could be unraveled from one year to the next. With a district, there is voter approval for a property tax in perpetuity.

• Teter expressed concern about the decision-making powers of a governing board. Murphy explained that no individual board member has authority in any decision making; there are checks and balances in place – the board acts as a body and needs a simple majority to pass any action items. The city and county have the authority in perpetuity to remove a trustee, and it can also be written into the bylaws that the board has the ability to remove a member.

• Teter wondered how debt accrual is kept under control, particularly with capital projects. Murphy replied that most districts finance capital projects through certificates of participation, similar to a lease purchase agreement in that the lender owns the library facilities and the district makes lease payments to the lender. There is also a provision in the library law for municipal bonds. Murphy stated that this would be a good question to broach with the public finance attorney that helps draft the ballot question – they will be able to model different financing proformas to inform the ballot question.

• Murphy stated that if contracting for services with the city, the city’s policies for those specific services will govern during that transition time until the district brings those services in house and writes its own policies.

• Farnan asked if the de-Brunging would be a third ballot item when going to election to form a district, or part of one of the first two ballot items. Murphy recommended finding the right public finance counsel to help with drafting the ballot language.

• Gibb wondered whether staff are generally in favor of this transition, and if they see a lot of change in their roles or overhead. Murphy recommended asking the representatives from the Poudre River district that are planning to attend the March meeting.

• Murphy confirmed that due to tabor, if a library district needed to increase its funding, it would have to go back to the voters for approval. Wright recommended setting the mill levy as high as you think the voters will tolerate to avoid having to go back and ask for an increase.

• Teter wondered how to sway property owners that receive library services, but are not currently paying anything, to increase their property taxes to fund the library district. Wright shared that in Berthoud, they had an excellent campaign election committee that met often and crafted good, simple messaging; it will require a lot of one-on-one conversations and word of mouth. Murphy added that staff should have a strategy conversation with the consultant about being very specific in the ballot language in terms of how the funding will be used.

• Since Gibb’s term on the commission is nearly up, she gave the commission a few things to consider:
  1. In a district scenario with property tax based funding, growth in the city means growth in the library budget. If the library stays with the city, Gibb urged the commission to think about ways to ask the city for a plan for growth in the city budget. The library needs to make up for the funding deficit it has experienced over the years, but also plan for growth in the way that a property tax could allow for growth.
2. Don’t forget during this process about the images in the Carnegie collection that were digitized using City of Boulder money, but are owned by Museum of Boulder.

Commission took a 10-minute break and then went back to Agenda Item 5.

Agenda Item 7: Discuss planning and design of community dialogue about perceptions of safety in the library
[7:48 p.m., 1:38:34 Audio min.]

a. Information item: summary of community input received during Master Plan engagement
   - Teter sent some comments ahead of the meeting (see handouts).
   - Kopke shared some ideas for an embedded campaign of both active and passive programming that focuses on understanding and creating empathy around homelessness. Commission expressed support for staff to move forward with Kopke’s proposal.
   - Gibb expressed surprise about how few comments there were around homelessness and safety in the community survey (p. 28 of packet), and wondered if commission is making a problem where there isn’t one since overall the majority of people answered that they feel safe in the library.
     - Teter agreed and suggested that instead of putting an emphasis on safety in the library, they might focus on this ‘empathy campaign’ with the public face while still dealing with behavioral issues as a separate piece.
     - Farnan stated that there may only be a few people expressing concern, but they are loud and sometimes indignant; staff has also brought the issue of their perceived safety up to commission, so he does not want to minimize the issue. It comes back to a perception issue, which is typically framed around the homeless and the people’s perception that their safety is in jeopardy.
     - O’Shea stated that he still thinks the perception issue is strong; there is a perception that some things are bad because they are unfamiliar. If an effort is going to be made around this issue, the perspective from both sides needs to be considered. The library is a public place of perception and reception, and there is an opportunity to explore that beyond just homelessness and transience, which gets to some of the civic dialogue that staff would like to see.
     - Phares explained that in a place where different people come together, there is always going to be friction; staff can address issues that come up, but can’t prevent them from happening entirely. Some people want staff to control the way in which people they find objectionable use the library so that it’s ‘more comfortable for them, when those other people have just as much right to do things within the library’s rules as anyone else does.
     - Farnan stated that in a way, Kopke is proposing is to embrace this as a part of the library’s brand, and embracing who we are and what we stand for will invite criticism. We’re not going to solve the issue, but it is our hope to inspire people to have a conversation, not just here but at home.
   - Teter suggested Boulder Talks, a collaboration between CU communications department and City of Boulder, as a potential resource in the community, adding that it is always great to get student energy around issues such as this.
   - O’Shea suggested that there may be an opportunity to activate Library League members as community advocates for this kind of dialogue.

Agenda Item 8: Master Plan project update
[8:23 p.m., 2:14:05 Audio min.]

a. Library Commission input on draft Master Plan - part one: Boulder Public Library and the Community
   - Teter sent some comments ahead of the meeting (see handouts).
   - Gomez recommended more boasting of staff accomplishments. Phares agreed that these can be called out somewhere in the plan, but explained that this particular section is meant to call out accomplishments for goals laid out in the 2007 Master Plan.
   - Teter wondered why it is important to keep accomplishments for goals laid out in the 2007 plan separate from unplanned accomplishments. Phares replied that that is how other Master Plans are structured. Farnan added that staff is trying their best to follow the template; it could be risky to do otherwise since this is what council is familiar with.
   - Phares will find a place to call out unplanned accomplishments; once the whole plan is together, commission can review it and make suggestions for moving pieces around as needed. Phares explained that while the plan does need to call out what has been accomplished to convey the library’s relevance and get things we need going forward, this is really a plan for where we’re going in the next 10 years and what we will need to accomplish that.
• Gomez suggested reframing the statement that “BPL was unable to fully address” certain objectives under opportunities for continued improvement (p. 41 of packet) to sound less negative. Gibb commented that this language may be fine as is because it reiterates that the library did not have the funding to accomplish these goals and that is on council. Teter stated that not all of these objectives are going forward since they are no longer priorities, and wondered if there is a way to highlight the objectives that have been identified as ongoing needs for the next plan.

• Teter stated that she is not sure the way the priorities are laid out in the timeline will be clear to council; she suggested presenting what the library absolutely needs to have and then the things it would be great to do for growth. Farnan replied that that is a risky approach, but stated that staff can do an exercise with commission at a future meeting and have further discussion on how to lay out the priorities for council.

AGENDA ITEM 9: LIBRARY COMMISSION UPDATE [8:57 p.m., 2:48:09 Audio min.]

a. Matters from the Commission
   i. Report out on meetings with City Council members
   ii. Discuss letter to City Council outlining library budget deficiencies
      Farnan encouraged commission to write another letter to council reiterating their favorable position on updating the restrooms at the main library. The city’s chief budget officer will make a recommendation about whether the library may use its reserves for this purpose, which she will present at the March commission meeting. Phares explained that the reserves is a collection of salary savings over the years – it has been used to fund various things over the years including the Master Plan project and a portion of the main library renovation – but since the charter change, it is no longer accumulating money.

   Teter shared that Council Member Weaver suggested that commission send a letter before council’s general fund discussion in May that outlines the library’s current funding deficiencies.

b. Boulder Library Foundation update
   i. Select new representative
      There was some initial discussion about who will replace Gibb as one of the commission representatives on the foundation board. Commission will officially appoint a new representative in April.

c. City project representative update
   i. EcoDistricts

d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission

AGENDA ITEM 10: LIBRARY AND ARTS DIRECTOR’S REPORT [9:15 p.m., 3:06:13 Audio min.]

a. Select volunteers to attend Feb. 21 Arts Commission meeting to discuss Library Master Plan
   Farnan explained that there needs to be a brief discussion with the Arts Commission about the future of the Canyon Theater to find out if they place a value on it being a performance space. O’Shea volunteered to represent the Library Commission at the meeting.

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

AGENDA ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT [9:24 p.m., 3:14:33 Audio min.]

There being no further business to come before the commission at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

Date, time, and location of next meeting: The next Library Commission meeting will be at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, March 7, 2018, at the Meadows Branch Library, 4800 Baseline Rd., Boulder, CO 80303.
To: Library Commission

From: David Farnan, Library and Arts Director
       Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director

Date: March 2, 2018

Subject: Information for discussion on forming a library district

Purpose

This memo provides preliminary information about projected library operating and capital funding needs from the draft Boulder Public Library Master Plan, and from the analyses underway comparing the two, possible funding and governance models under consideration for the Library, municipal and library district.

Background

The 2018 Library Master Plan has several exciting goals which include:

- Expansion of libraries in north Boulder and Gunbarrel,
- Growing the increasingly popular BLDG61 Makerspace,
- Increased outreach to underserved community members, and
- Activating the Main Library Canyon Theater and Civic Area.

It also addresses significant funding shortfalls that have occurred over the past 15 years and proposes personnel and operating funding to catch up the library’s budget to address a vast increase in output measures over the past four years, including

- Library visits up more than 10%,
- Library hours open to the public up by 11%,
- Program attendance up more than 100%,
- Materials circulation up 10%, and
- A 20% increase in new cardholders.

These increases have occurred with no additional staffing.

The master plan estimates that an increase of $2.6 to $3 million in annual operating support will be required to redress these shortfalls and to expand services. Likewise, approximately $8 to $10 million in one-time capital funding will also be required. [Note: $5 million of this capital funding will be allocated from the renewal of the Community, Culture, and Safety tax, approved by the voters in 2017 for the north Boulder branch library.]

Finance options

Municipal funding

An increase in annual operating support from the current $8 million to $11 million is required by 2023. Approximately, $5 million in capital funding is also needed.
Library district funding

The city will save the current $8 million annual library budget to use for other purposes, and will potentially generate $1 to $2 million in annual revenue through the library district contracting with the city for services including: payroll, Human Resources, facilities maintenance, and IT until the library district hires its own staff to manage these services. For example, the Poudre River Public Library District continues to pay the City of Fort Collins for payroll and Human Resources services 10 years after becoming a district.

It is important to note that BPL staying with the city or forming a library district represents a significant financial impact – estimated to be as much as $65 million swing over five years for the city budget. For example, if BPL remains with the city and the Master Plan is adopted and the current five year plan is implemented, an investment from the city of approximately $20 million over the course of five years will be required [$3 million annual increase in ongoing operational funding equates to $15 million in five years, plus $5 million in one-time capital funding for a total of $20 million total in new costs over five years.

On the other hand, if BPL forms a library district the city would save the current library funding of approximately $8 million annually for a total of $40 million over five years – and it could potentially generate approximately $1 million annually in revenue by contracting city services such as Human Resources and payroll with the library district for a total of $45 million in savings and earned income over the course of five years. On a standard balance sheet, forming a library district could save the city approximately $40 million [the current budget over five years to run the library], the $20 million in future costs over the next five years to implement the master plan goals, and generate approximately $5 million in new revenue for services. This is a preliminary draft estimate and the exact dollar amounts will vary, but it does elucidate the magnitude of this decision when projected over a period.

Taxes under the city funding model

At present, Boulder Public Library (BPL) receives funding from a dedicated 0.03 mill rate on City of Boulder residential and commercial property. In 2018, this will generate approximately $1.27 million for the library. This translates to approximately $25 in taxes for the average household in the city [$850,000 property value]. It is proposed that this tax would sunset if BPL forms a library district.

Taxes under a library district model

Analysis of three potential geographic models is underway for a library district. Each model would expand beyond the city limits of Boulder. The following table shows a preliminary estimate of the required mill rate within each area to generate sufficient revenue to meet the library master plan goals and contract with the City of Boulder for payroll, Human Resources, facilities maintenance, and IT services; and the average annual property tax revenue generated on a per household basis.
### Mill rate analysis

At the November 28, 2017 City Council Study Session, Council Member Brocket requested information about potentially adjusting the city’s current 11 mill property tax levy to offset the property tax cost associated with forming a library district for city residents.

Each property tax mill levied from city taxpayers generates approximately $3.7 million, annually. If the property tax mill rate was reduced by 1 mill, the mill rate and tax collected for the library district for library services would remain the same. However, the total tax levied from property owners within the city of Boulder would be reduced by 1 mill.

If the library district was formed within the city of Boulder, city residents would be charged property tax at the rate of 2.8 mills instead of 3.8 mills. This would result in an overall tax increase for city residents of $190 instead of $260 annually. For residential property valued at $850,000 this is a net difference of approximately $69 less annually. A similar analysis has not yet been conducted for the other areas in the table above.

In the five-year example described in the finance option section earlier in this memo, the city could potentially save and earn approximately $65 million if BPL forms a library district. If the city were to reduce the current property tax rate by 1 mill, the amount of the estimated savings would be reduced. In this scenario, city property owners would pay about $69 less in annual property taxes which equates to approximately $18.5 million less in aggregated collected revenue for the city over five years – thus changing the total swing amount from $65 million to $46.5 million.

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Population</th>
<th>Approximate BPL Cardholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Area (BVCP)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVCP area plus Niwot and mountain neighborhoods</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BPL Cardholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>133,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are approximately 80,000 active BPL card holders living within the city of Boulder (74% of the population). This is a very high level of cardholder saturation. By comparison, 44% of Denver’s residents are library cardholders. Within the boundary of the Boulder Valley Comp Plan, there are 90,000 active BPL cardholders. Within Boulder County, there are 113,000 active BPL cardholders.

Library district governance

Colorado Library Law defines that library district boards consist of five to seven members appointed by a local governing body. See quick guide http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdelib/ggcomparisonldandrla . In that a proposed library district would encompass the city of Boulder and a small portion of Boulder County, staff recommends that board member appointments be apportioned based upon the percentage of population. The current Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan area has approximately 120,000 residents, of which 108,000 are within the city of Boulder. Given this, the City Council would appoint six of the seven board members and the Boulder County Commission would appoint one board member. This procedure for appointing board members would be established in a memorandum of understanding between the City of Boulder, Boulder County and the Boulder Public Library District.
To: Library Commissioners

From: David Farnan, Library and Arts Director
Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director

Date: March 2, 2018

Subject: Update on Main Library restroom project funding

Capital project funding decision

General Fund capital funding is reserved for projects managed by the Facilities and Asset Management (FAM) division of Public Works, and supplemented by voter-approved capital funding initiatives. For the 2018 city budget, capital funds were requested for many unfunded projects that reside in General Fund-supported departments, including the renovation of the Main Library restrooms. The restroom renovation project includes facilities with an all-inclusive design.

The Library currently has approximately $2 million dedicated reserves in the General Fund that can be used for one-time expenditures for library purposes only. Several scenarios for funding the City’s capital projects from the General Fund Capital Improvement Program and other sources will be proposed for council’s consideration at the April 3, 2018 City Council meeting. This will include using part of the library reserves in the General Fund for the Main Library restroom renovation project.

Preliminary estimates for the library restroom renovations were approximately $650,000 in 2016 and are being updated to include costs for final construction design documents and construction escalation costs.

Request for Library Commission’s favorable recommendation

Per the Boulder City Charter, Article IX, section 134, the Library Commission’s favorable recommendation is required for expenditures of revenues from gifts, bequests, and donations and proceeds from the sale of any library property that are in the Library Fund. While not required for library reserves in the General Fund, David Farnan requests the Library Commission’s favorable recommendation to use part of the approximately $2 million of library reserves in the General Fund for the Main Library restroom renovation project.

Next steps for the Main Library restroom renovation project

Library staff will partner with the FAM staff to manage the project. Engagement of an architect and construction contractor and final project planning is tentatively scheduled to begin later in 2018 pending a decision on funding. Timing on project start is contingent on the staff time available as the same staff team is managing the north Boulder branch library project and planning for that project began in January 2018.
Staff was not able to complete the draft of Part two: Trends and community needs of the Master Plan in time for the Library Commission’s review at the March 7, 2018 meeting. This was due to the timing of the resignation of Library’s Administrative Specialist II. Recruitment was initiated immediately for this critical position and more than 100 applications were received and reviewed for the position. Several candidates were selected to interview on March 8 and 9, 2018.

The review of the draft part two is rescheduled for the April 7, 2018 Library Commission meeting. Each review for the remaining parts was shifted to one month later, and one of two final reviews of the complete plan was removed to accommodate this change. The review timeline has been revised to reflect these changes https://boulderlibrary.org/about/library-master-plan/.
Library Commission Memo

Meeting Date: March 7, 2018 – Meadows Branch Library

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.

Freedom of Information Day - on or around March 16

Freedom of Information (FOI) Day is an annual event on or near March 16, the birthday of James Madison, who is widely regarded as the Father of the Constitution and as the foremost advocate for openness in government. Each year, the James Madison Award and the Eileen Cooke State & Local Madison Award are presented by the American Library Association Washington (DC) Office on Freedom of Information Day to recognize those individuals or groups that have championed, protected, and promoted public access to government information and the public's right to know.

1. Items from Commission

Summary of BPL additional budget requests (Attached)

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

None
Summary of BPL additional budget requests
2019-2020 + NoBo

Summary of additional FTE requested: [$$]

Programs and events:
4 FTE for the programs and events team, who work all branches. These positions are needed to meet demand from current programs’ growth, including additional programming for NoBo, youth and Latino patrons

E- services:
6 FTE for e-services. These positions include:
   1 FTE current MakerSpace, converted from fixed term to permanent
   2 FTE for projected Maker facility at NoBo
   1 supervisory FTE for Maker team across all locations
   2 FTE to support patron-facing technology and maker activities at all branches

Volunteer services:
.5 FTE for volunteer services support. BPL relies heavily on volunteers, who provide the equivalent of ~ 10 FTE each year in in-kind services.

Communications/marketing/graphics design
.5 FTE for communications marketing/graphic design. Marketing has been identified as a need since the 2007 Master Plan, and was flagged by many patrons in the current master plan. (An additional .5 FTE will be requested in 2021.)

Front line public services staff:
8 FTE for front line public services staff. These positions include
   [X] to fully staff the NoBo branch
   [X] to fully staff other branches to maintain consistent hours across the BPL system.
   {David: Gunbarrel is included and should be called out or dropped?}

Summary of additional ongoing annual operational costs (estimates) [$$]

Security:
$160,000 to provide drop-in security at branch libraries, including NoBo. (There is presently no security at branches.)

Janitorial:
$52,000 for a day porter at Main to meet current cleaning needs
$24,000 for janitorial services at NoBo
Collections:  
$125,000 each year (through 2022) to meet metric [X]

Courier services:  
$8,000 to meet higher courier costs from increased use of holds (FLC system) and NoBo expansion ($12,000 additional by 2022) (Projected 5% increase in costs)

Technology:  
$14,000 to expand wifi access to meet demand and for increased costs in automated materials handling

Public furniture replacement:  
$25,000 (periodically required for all branches to address water and tear)

**Maintenance and utilities:**  
{David: I can't parse this one - what is Main, all branches, NoBo, Gunbarrel? I assume these are ongoing?}  
$156,000 - 2020  
$192,000 - 2021  
$200,000 - 2022

---

**One time operating expenses? (estimates) [$$]**

**Marketing campaign:**  
$30,000 - 2019

**Website redesign:**  
$90,000 - 2019

---

**Capital costs - Main (estimates) [$$]**

**Bathroom renovation:**  
$650,000  
{Is this higher now?}

Because funding does not appear to be available from the City budget in 2019, Commission is recommending that this project be funded from the BPL reserve

**Space reconfigurations (computing area and others) plus improved way finding:**  
$280,000

---

**Costs specific to NoBo (estimates) [$$]**

**Capital construction:**  
$5,000,000

Construction-related studies:
$260,000

Collection (initial):
  $400,000
Furniture:
  $75,000

Technology & infrastructure:
  $330,000
  {David: I assume this does NOT include extending wifi to the mobile home park?}

MakerSpace equipment:
  $125,000

New facility ongoing NP operating costs: {What is this?}
  $30,000

Summarize FTE for NoBo? Front line staff, Maker Space, (shared) programs and technology

Totals - 2019 & 2020

Annual operating

Capital
Changes to the Homebound Delivery Program Service Model

The Homebound Delivery Program supports quality of life and provides important connections for many of BPL's senior patrons. In support of the BPL's updated mission (developed as part of the Master Plan update) changes were made to the program to encourage more personal connections between program participants and volunteers, provide more personalized service to the program participants, and provide meaningful opportunities for volunteers to contribute to the library and the community. Refocusing the program's service model also created the opportunity for BPL to focus more staff time to provide outreach into the community. See the program web page for more information about the program.

Kate Kelsch, volunteer services coordinator, will oversee the team of volunteers who run the program for the library. She will accept applications from patrons interested in receiving home delivery and confirm their eligibility, match participants with volunteers, and recruit new volunteers for the program as needed. The book selection and delivery functions, including gathering participants' holds and checking items out, will be done exclusively by volunteers.

Special Services transition to outreach
In 2017, the special services coordinator position which had oversight of the Homebound Delivery Program (held by Donna El Tabib) was transferred from Administration to the Community Engagement and Enrichment division, the job description was revised and retitled to programs, events, and outreach (PEO) specialist - outreach. To address needs for more outreach that were identified during the community engagement phase of the Master Plan update, the PEO specialist-outreach position will now focus on outreach and offsite STEAM and early literacy programs to reach underserved members of the community. That position reports to Kathy Lane, PEO coordinator. Celine Cooper joined BPL on Monday, Feb. 26, 2018 as the programs, events, and outreach specialist – outreach.

Assisting patrons who are participating in the Homebound Delivery Program will be shared between Volunteer Services (with Kate coordinating the volunteers) and the Patron Services team (helping program participants and their volunteers with placing holds, resolving account issues, etc. just as they would for any other patron.

Q4 2017 web use statistics (Attachment A.)

2017 BPL call center statistics (Attachment B.)
Digital Services Performance & Improvement Dashboard
Fourth Quarter 2017

Boulderlibrary.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Statistics</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>77,590</td>
<td>77,175</td>
<td>72,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>193,428</td>
<td>189,187</td>
<td>173,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Users</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>35.97%</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
<td>42.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>374,467</td>
<td>368,053</td>
<td>334,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Sessions</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Year Statistics</th>
<th>2017 17vs16</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>17vs 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Users</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>37.12%</td>
<td>42.99%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Sessions</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Website use is up across the board.

Top 11 boulderlibrary.org Site Pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>pageviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 boulderlibrary.org/index.php</td>
<td>Site Home Page</td>
<td>181,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 calendar.boulderlibrary.org/index.php</td>
<td>Library Calendar Home</td>
<td>8,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 research.boulderlibrary.org/staff</td>
<td>Staff Quick Links Page</td>
<td>7,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 calendar.boulderlibrary.org/booking/study-rooms</td>
<td>Study Room Reservation</td>
<td>5,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 boulderlibrary.org/services/meeting-rooms/index.php</td>
<td>Study and Meeting Room Info</td>
<td>6,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 boulderlibrary.org/card/index.php</td>
<td>Your Library Account</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 research.boulderlibrary.org/eCollections</td>
<td>eCollections Home</td>
<td>4,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 research.boulderlibrary.org/research</td>
<td>Library Research Home</td>
<td>7,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 calendar.boulderlibrary.org/booking/meeting-rooms</td>
<td>Meeting Room Reservation</td>
<td>3,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 research.boulderlibrary.org/research</td>
<td>Research Home</td>
<td>3,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 boulderlibrary.org/locations/main/index.php</td>
<td>Main Library Home Page</td>
<td>2,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library calendar traffic is significantly up.
Library Catalog (boulder.flatironslibrary.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Statistics</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>44,376</td>
<td>42,446</td>
<td>35,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>160,959</td>
<td>153,632</td>
<td>122,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Users</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>789,047</td>
<td>713,684</td>
<td>590,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Sessions</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library catalog is showing increased use.
The data for the full consortium has been dropped from this report since we now have a years worth of data detailing our library catalogs use.

### Top 10 Searches on boulder.flatironslibrary.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Search Exits</th>
<th>% Search Refinements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 really good book</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>98.26%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 little fires everywhere</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
<td>48.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 wonder</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>26.26%</td>
<td>52.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 harry potter</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23.49%</td>
<td>38.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 manhattan beach</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>30.47%</td>
<td>46.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 *</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 brene brown</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>31.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 a gentleman in moscow</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.71%</td>
<td>36.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 minecraft</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>49.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hillbilly elegy</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25.41%</td>
<td>50.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We had a FaceBook post in Oct. about a young man searching the catalog for a "really good book". The post included a link to the search in our catalog. This caused the top search to be "really good book".

Above are the top 10 words users entered into the catalog search. If the search results are useful, the percentage of search exits & refinements will be low.

### Library Mobile Phone & Tablet App (Boopsie)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App Stats</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Queries</td>
<td>70,858</td>
<td>67,585</td>
<td>82,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloads</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalog queries through the Boopsie app continue to drop.
Our goal was to increase Facebook post reach by 20% over last year. The above chart shows the Library social media team increased post reach 38% over the previous year.

We continue to see strong growth in our Facebook account. Our team created 112 posts, that’s 1.5 posts a day, with an average of 125 engagements (clicks, likes & comments) per post.

### Top 5 Facebook Post for the Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>#happy2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155810079681827">https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155810079681827</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twenty literary would-you-rathers from mcsweeneys.net</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155596654746827">https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155596654746827</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boulder County Courthouse Christmas (Carnegie)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155758076106827">https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155758076106827</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kids in goat cart (Carnegie)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155684644646827">https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155684644646827</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Really Good Book search</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155639772941827">https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155639772941827</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Newsletters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Newsletter (every other week)</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mail list subscribers</td>
<td>36,355</td>
<td>35,259</td>
<td>29,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% open it</td>
<td>22.44%</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% click it</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cardholders are automatically subscribed to the newsletter. This causes our subscriber list to increase steadily, but the percent open rate to be lower.
### Meeting Rooms Summary 2017 (rooms opened Mar 15, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Meeting Rooms</th>
<th>Unique Users</th>
<th>Percent Occupied 2017</th>
<th>Percent Occupied 2016 (3/15 - 12/31)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe Room</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Creek Room</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff Room</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatirons Room</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Branch Room*</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds Branch Room</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2016 Meadows closed 4/25 - 5/31

### Study Rooms Summary 2017 (rooms opened Nov 1, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Rooms</th>
<th>Percent Occupied 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Lib Study Rooms (2 rooms)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Study Rooms (4 rooms)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds Study Rooms (2 rooms)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Wide Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Web Sessions**

- **Users**: 44,376  
  - Growth: 4.5%
- **Sessions**: 160,959  
  - Growth: 4.8%
- **Pageviews**: 789,047  
  - Growth: 3.1%

**Summary**

- **Avg. Session Duration**: 00:05:01  
  - Growth: -6.7%
- **Number of Sessions per User**: 3.63  
  - Growth: 0.2%
- **Pages / Session**: 4.9  
  - Growth: -1.6%

**Top Search Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>Total Unique Searches</th>
<th>% Search Refinements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. really good book</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. little fires everywhere</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>48.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. wonder</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>52.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. harry potter</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>38.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. manhattan beach</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>46.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. brene brown</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>31.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. a gentleman in moscow</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. hillbilly elegy</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. minecraft</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>49.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Users: 231,276 (83.0%)
Sessions: 523,580 (59.2%)
Pageviews: 2,247,071 (42.4%)

Avg. Session Duration: 00:04:35 (-26.1%)
Number of Sessions per User: 2.26 (-22.1%)
Pages / Session: 4.29 (-13.8%)

Web Sessions

Search Term | Total Unique Searches | % Search Refinements
--- | --- | ---
1. wonder | 551 | 51.18%
2. harry potter | 466 | 31.82%
3. really good book | 460 | 0.41%
4. little fires everywhere | 394 | 50.33%
5. dog man | 259 | 55.77%
6. before we were yours | 250 | 42.9%
7. Wonder | 249 | 31.62%
8. star wars | 241 | 28.46%
9. manhattan beach | 238 | 52%
10. captain underpants | 232 | 44.64%
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2017 BPL Call Center Statistics

Narrative

After launching in May 2016, 2017 was the first full year of Call Center statistics. While the average number of calls per day dipped slightly from 2016, the average hold time decreased by two seconds despite the average call time increasing by one second.

The peak hours for calls have remained 9am to 12pm consistently since opening. The busiest single hour in 2017 was 130 calls between 9am-10am on August 20 (the day before the Solar Eclipse and the desperate search for eclipse glasses!).

Note: Our call software, Cisco Finesse created a more robust reporting platform in 2017, so that accounts for the larger number of data points compared with 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls Answered</td>
<td>24,254</td>
<td>15,396</td>
<td>+57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Calls per Day</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Calls per Hour</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hold Time</td>
<td>9 seconds</td>
<td>11 seconds</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Wait Time (includes phone tree message)</td>
<td>23 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Call (Talking) Time</td>
<td>2 min 11 sec</td>
<td>2 min 10 sec</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Calls Answered</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Calls to Patrons</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1 Total Calls YTD 2017 and percent change from 2016

*2016 figures include 7 months (210 days) of data