

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: May 24, 2018 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.	
Contact information preparing summary: Celia Seaton, 303-441-3106	
Commission members present: Joni Teter, Tim O’Shea, Juana Gomez, Joel Koenig	
Commission members absent: Jane Sykes Wilson	
<p>Library staff present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director Celia Seaton, Administrative Specialist</p> <p>City staff present: None</p> <p>Members of the public present: None</p>	
Type of Meeting: Study Session	
Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda	[0:00:10 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order at 6:11PM Teter outlined the agenda’s two items.	
Agenda Item 2: Final review and input on draft 2018 Master Plan content	[0:00:00 Audio min.]
<p>Teter asked the group how they would like to advance through the document. Gomez suggested proceeding by calling out sections chronologically to pool comments and the group agreed. Teter had sent her notes in through email in advance (see handout).</p> <p>First section discussed was the executive summary, which was new to the commission. Gomez encouraged replacing some of the instances of “sustainable” with a synonym. Having said that, she suggested highlighting (in either executive summary or in the next section) how the library aligns with nearly every point on Boulder’s Sustainability Framework, more than any other city entity. Farnan and Phares stated that they don’t disagree, but the city does not see the library primarily serving beyond the “Healthy and Socially Thriving” category. Teter stated that this highlight could potentially be placed in a Library Commission foreword.</p> <p>Introduction- no revisions suggested</p> <p>Part 1, up to pg. 10 of the document- Koenig asked about mentioning seniors on pg. 9. Teter asked about specific successes regarding this demographic. Farnan: none specifically, but the numbers are impressive (3x the amount of senior services). Phares clarified that programs are geared toward adults “of all ages,” except for the Homebound program which does primarily serve seniors. Teter states that she sees it fitting more into the goals section as opposed to the accomplishments. Teter suggested including language that speaks to the diversity of the audience.</p> <p>Page 11-20- Phares clarified the meaning behind the percentages on the chart on p. 17.</p> <p>Page 21-30- Teter asked about the organizational flow of the charts/tables and their descriptions. Phares explained and Teter agreed with her reasoning. P. 29- question raised on whether increased budget request for expanding hold services should be placed under expansion or current community demand. Teter reported her patron experience at Meadows where cramped space has led to holds stored in carts up against the check-out area. Her impression is that it has become a “real pinch point.” Gomez reported that she has not experienced that issue at Reynolds. Farnan noted that he was unaware of the space issue at Meadows. Phares indicated the bullet point under “address community demand” that calls for increases in personnel, adequate space, and courier services for current needs. The expansion on the service ended up in service expansion because the first step is to maintain “what we have” – this was the logic behind column placement. Teter stated that she defers to the staff decision.</p>	

Pp. 31-39- no revisions suggested

Pp. 40-50- Koenig complimented the graphics and found the pie charts helpful.

Pp. 51-60- Regarding “advantages of district,” Gomez suggested adding the fact that district funding is more “nimble” and “responsive” in terms of meeting the needs of the library more quickly. Challenges should include campaigning for the vote. Phares suggested emphasizing the effort that would be required in both scenarios.

Part Six Implementation- no revisions suggested

Appendix A starting on p. 55- Gomez asked about the benchmark comparison table. Phares clarified that this table will change slightly as she plans to adjust figures and add notation. Gomez also wondered whether subheadings could be used as opposed to the current alphabetical order (she felt this organization was tough to read through). She also questioned whether “Turnover Rate” should be footnoted; Phares agreed and will add one to make sure it is properly defined.

Appendix B- Gomez noted a grammar issue in the sentence that begins “Creation a community forum.” Phares will edit. O’Shea noted a font variation on the first page of Appendix B at the second row. Phares clarified that this wasn’t intentional and will adjust to align font.

Appendix C- GIS mapping provided an adjustment of metrics. Koenig thinks these figures around the needs and financing, especially in comparison to other Colorado libraries, are dramatic and essential to the argument. Teter agreed that the necessity becomes even starker with the data Phares provided.

Teter indicated that the group had reached the end of the Master Plan in this review. Phares reported that additional graphics will enrich the design; she thinks the commission will be pleased with the end result. Teter asked if there are substantive changes that will come from the city managers office; the response was unknown at this point. Teter asked whether the commissioners can be made aware if there are any important changes; Farnan and Phares agreed.

Farnan mentioned an observation from the library conference he had recently attended in Colorado: districted libraries have been struggling a bit due to the Gallagher Amendment. Teter asked about footnoting information into the Master Plan regarding TABOR and the Gallagher Amendment since they provide some important political background.

Agenda Item 3: Plan for Library Commission foreword in the Master Plan [0:42:39 Audio min.]

Teter asked the commission whether it wanted to progress with the foreword and, if so, what content should be included. If desired, the commission needs to create a plan before the June meeting. Being a city master plan, Teter noted the inherent need to follow a specific format set with a city management perspective but also stressed that this should serve as a guiding document for the library’s future. The purpose of the foreword would be for the commission to present their recommendations with the principle focus on financial sustainability of the library, involving summary discussion of the declining revenues over last decades. Teter questioned whether the group wants to advocate for funding from specific (more robust) tax revenues or go beyond this support to mention districting. Gomez: “I am all for declaring our preference.” Koenig – “definitely.” O’Shea – “I concur.”

If the commission can place its “unique voice” into the Master Plan, it will be a worthwhile opportunity to shape public perception as well as help inform future commissioners. O’Shea wondered about precedence. Koenig asked for the director’s thoughts. Farnan stated that he has informed the city manager that this foreword is a possibility; at the same time, he hopes that the commissioners will endorse and embrace the items in the Master Plan even if they want to go a step further. O’Shea asked if there was anything contained in the Master Plan that commissioners felt uncomfortable submitting; there was no disagreement - all agree with endorsement. Phares noted how the commission has been more deeply involved in constructing the plan than most city departments where the advisory group typically sees the final draft for approval.

O’Shea questioned whether there should there be a push to change charter around the levies, etc. for an upcoming election. Teter- property tax seems to be the preference and so that would have to go to an election. The commission can state that they don’t favor a dedicated sales tax due to the volatility of sales tax revenues.

Teter again broached whether the commission wants to go the additional step of directly recommending districting. Gomez was in favor. O’Shea spoke to the importance of diplomacy; he suggested specifically supporting the Master Plan even if suggesting how this extra step of autonomy will advance accomplishment of the library’s goals. Teter asked O’Shea whether he thinks that the commission should go beyond recommending funding through property tax and bring up districting. O’Shea: it would be hard to argue for districting if the city solves needs by stepping up with support through

other financing. Recognizing growth, districting is a more reasonable approach to addressing future needs. Districting takes the long-term view that Boulder's city services are attractive, and the population base extends beyond city limits (so funding that recognizes the size of the user base is necessary). Teter suggests language of "matching patron base with the tax base." Farnan spoke to data he finds compelling – to go from an \$8,000,000 budget to a \$12,000,000 budget through property tax funding, it will cost individual residents of Boulder \$60/household. In an independent district, for \$80/household, the entire \$14,000,000 budget could be accounted for. An objective of the foreword is to get approval to hire a consultant to do the necessary and thorough cost and benefit analysis of the public served.

Koenig – "we need to come on strong in this foreword." O'Shea mentioned the importance of straddling the middle path – he noted the difficulty in floating a master plan for the future when there has not yet been internal resolution with the city's current plan for library funding. Teter stressed that though she is heartened that council is solution-minded, these were just ideas for a short-term fix and she believes these possible resolutions don't go far enough. She expressed the commission's need to help frame council decision by indicating boundaries for funding that match the patron base. She feels it is unlikely that the city will want to fund the library with property tax. O'Shea asked for the districting counterargument. Gomez has heard none; the district libraries were all glad to have made that transition. Koenig: "this is not a radical concept – forming a district," noting that most library systems are districts. Teter: the fundamental philosophical argument is whether to trust in elected officials or voters. If one believes that voters should control decisions and wants to make sure this piece gets "covered," then districting is the logical path. If one instead chooses to trust elected officials (with their charge to balance funds across a wide array of municipal needs), it could be kept as an arm of the City. Farnan: no elected official wants to increase taxes, but this will be necessary either for the city (to support the library) or for the library (to support districting). Framing the argument in terms of legacy and not in terms of a failing is helpful; supporting an increase in taxes can be aligned with protecting the legacy of the library.

Koenig asked about volunteers to craft this foreword. Teter offered to frame it and O'Shea will assist. Teter will strive to get something crafted after the upcoming Memorial Day weekend. Final tweaks can be made after commission's June meeting. Koenig, O'Shea, and Gomez all plan to attend the July 24 study session with council.

Agenda Item 10: Adjournment

[1:24:20 Audio min.]

There being no further business to come before the commission at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35PM.

Date, time, and location of next meeting:

The next Library Commission meeting will be at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, June 6, 2018, at the Carnegie Library, 1125 Pine St., Boulder, CO 80302.

Commissioner Teter approved these minutes on September 5, 2018; and Celia Seaton attested to it.