**Name of Board/ Commission:** Library Commission  
**Date of Meeting:** July 14, 2018

**Contact Information Preparing Summary:** Jennifer Phares 303-441-4394

**Commission Members Present:** Joni Teter, Tim O'Shea, Juana Gomez, Jane Sykes Wilson, Joel Koenig  
**Commission Members Absent:** None

**Library Staff Present:** David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts  
Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director

**City Staff Present:** None

**Invited Guests:** Tim Plass, Boulder Library Foundation (BLF) Chair  
Tim Williams, Boulder Library Foundation

**Public Present:** None

**Type of Meeting:** Annual retreat

**Agenda Item 1:** Call to Order and Approval of Agenda  
The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

**Agenda Item 2:** Library Director’s Update

**North Boulder branch library project update**  
Update on architect selection: Work AC (Work Architecture Company) of New York [https://work.ac/](https://work.ac/). Contract finalization is underway. Staff project team decision was unanimous for the architect selected. Architects will be back in town in early August 2018 for community engagement activities. The activities will focus on the community’s vision for the north Boulder branch library. Dates are forthcoming. High-level overview of site selection considerations and an exploration of potential partnerships were provided.

Teter asked about the estimated project costs that are $1.7M more than the $5M collected from the Community, Culture and Safety Tax and if it will be taken out of the Library Fund. Farnan said Development Excise Tax, Impact Fees, and old Library Fund Balance would be used to supplement the project. Teter said in future conversations with the BLF and the community, north Boulder and Gunbarrel branch library capital funding may not need to be lead issues in the messaging about overall library funding needs. Those capital costs would be covered by funding already collected and designated for the library. Sykes-Wilson asked for the anticipated opening date. Farnan said late 2021. Discussion ensued about some of the initial community input received. Plass advised the architect should engage a local partner to facilitate getting through planning process.

**Update on 2019 library budget development**  
No update. Farnan hopes to have more information for August 6 Library Commission meeting from the City’s Executive Budget Team (EBT). Farnan said EBT asked why eliminating late fees (fines) was not part of the library’s budget proposal. Farnan said the timing is not right. Staff may bring a policy discussion about eliminating fines to the commission in early 2019.

**Agenda Item 3:** Create a working agenda for upcoming year based off the master calendar  
[9:38 a.m.]

**Master calendar of consistently reoccurring agenda items.**  
No comments or changes. Plass said that BLF is going to begin having a June/July retreat and an August meeting.

**An updated agenda item schedule**  
Timing of Internet Safety Policy may conflict with preparation for the November City Council Study Session. Commissioners agreed to adjust the schedule as needed rather than reschedule policy items now. Teter asked when the commission preferred to discuss eliminating fines. Not a fiscal issue, more one of optics. Gomez prefers to discuss it this fall rather than put it off. Commission asked staff to provide information about the impact on libraries that have eliminated fines. Commission agreed to take the matter up as scheduled. Plass suggested that eliminating fines could be a goodwill action to take during an election when the library is on the ballot. Teter recommended the commission should consider an overall maker program/space policy to replace the BLDG 61 Makerspace policy since a makerspace
Agenda Item 4: Library Commission Update

Review of Boulder Library Foundation retreat, July 7, 2018

O’Shea reported the annual retreat focused on strategic planning. BLF has engaged consultant, Why For Good [https://www.whyforgood.com/] to develop branding and messaging for the role of the BLF. Four pillars areas were discussed including capital support for the north Boulder branch library and the BLF’s role in supporting future ballot initiatives involving the library. Work will continue in these areas.

Plass said a few years ago the board decided it should be more community facing, do more fundraising, and create more partnerships. The board reaffirmed this during the retreat. The Library League program is being evaluated. BLF is fortunate to have investment income to support library programs and it wants to diversify the income stream to become more sustainable. The appropriate advocacy role for the BLF in a potential ballot measure involving the library was also discussed. Plass said there was interest from the board in advocacy but also concern from a few members about if the BLF should be out there in front with its name on the campaign as the issues come up. Members are absolutely interested in advocacy, but not sure what that completely looks like. It will get better defined as discussions move forward. It is an opportunity for the BLF to be a partner in moving sustainable funding ahead for the library.

Teter said listening to what Why For Good was hearing about the library from the community was interesting. As a board member, she wasn’t clear about what the objectives of the retreat were and what she was supposed to do with the information received. She acknowledged that the BLF has a relatively new board but was surprised by its lack of knowledge about BLF history, how the library works, and the relationship between the BLF and the library. She recommended doing some board development and reviewing the legal agreement between BLF and BPL. The misperceptions that were shared by board members and Why For Good that concerned her were: that the BLF drives library programs and the notion that the BLF needs to build awareness by differentiating itself from the library. It isn’t a successful strategy and she doesn’t believe that previous boards were interested in being more community facing. The BLF is integral to the library having impact in the community. Discussion ensued about BLF history and defining the BLF’s role.

Plass said one of the goals of the retreat was to familiarize the board with Why For Good. Prior to the retreat only the BLF marketing committee was involved in working with them. This was a progress check-in, not the finished product which might have left some board members floundering a bit. The BLF’s relationship is more nuanced, and he believes more separation is needed to be successful at fundraising and for telling the BLF’s story. He believes there is a place for the BLF to be out in the community and for having its name better known. Teter said the notion that BLF creates community impact on its own is a different message than the BLF creates community impact through the library. It is an opportunity for the BLF to be a partner in moving sustainable funding ahead for the library.

Discuss the conversation that took place at the retreat about what board members thought about the BLF’s role. Plass said that board members may be frustrated because they want to do things that are more encompassing than fundraising. They want to do policy work and be on the cutting edge of new programs and innovation. While the BLF charter doesn’t particularly allow for this, he believes there is a way to do it through the library. He wants to keep the board members who are creative and have big ideas interested and engaged. This is a conversation to have with the library. Farnan suggested looking at the structure of the Los Angeles Public Library Foundation. The LA Public Library gets a ton of money but is also a conduit for the foundation. The library is the platform. Sykes Wilson asked for the timeline for Why For Good. Plass said the BLF will have most of the work product by October 2018. Farnan said he hopes it is October not December because we’ve waited a long time to acknowledge the donors. Why For Good’s work is due right after the Jaipur Literature Festival where BLF is largest local individual donor yet not reaping the benefit of that.

Farnan asked about Library League. The board did see the value in continuing a membership. He asked if the changes were to the benefits of being a member. The board didn’t see much value in the Library League brand. Library League members would become BLF members instead. O’Shea said that Why For Good is managing the transition but he is not clear about how they will hand it off to the BLF. Plass said the BLF wants to acknowledge BLF supporters and doesn’t want to lose them. Discussion ensued about the Library League.

Teter asked the commissioners to generate a list of questions or needs that can be taken to the BLF board later in the meeting about core library needs or the awareness campaign.

15-minute break at 10:34 a.m.
### Agenda Item 5: Prep for joint study session with City Council on July 24, 2018

#### The Boulder Public Library Master Plan

No discussion on the document.

#### Presentation to City Council

Farnan gave an overview of what to expect during the study session. Teter asked how the information in the April 12, 2018 Information Packet (IP) memo to council connected to the July 24, 2018 council study session. Farnan said it is referenced in the study session memo and may be part of the discussion. Staff and commission reviewed the presentation slides and commissioners provided input on editing the slides and adding other relevant information to the presentation.

Discussion ensued about the scope of the proposed financial analysis. Teter said the scope was not likely to be clear to council and that staff would need to unpack it during the presentation. Koenig asked about logistics for the July 24, 2018 council study session. The commission asked O’Shea to be the main spokesperson for the Library Commission.

Discussion ensued about whether the city or the county puts forward a ballot initiative and how many signatures are needed if it is community initiated. Further research is necessary on these items.

---

### Agenda Item 6: Library Commission development of outreach presentations

Teter asked for feedback for slides or script. Need to complete a slide on the Carnegie Library for Local History. Gomez asked that a timeline with dates for when things are happening be added if possible (e.g. the new north Boulder branch library). Teter said the only timing they have is on the north Boulder branch library project which is part of that slide. Discussion ensued about the commission’s presentation to Boulder Rotary Club. The 15 to 20-minute presentation was well received. O’Shea asked who keeps the presentation documents. Teter said it could be shared on Google drive with all commissioners. O’Shea suggested it be shared via the BLF site. Plass suggested post some of the slides on BPL’s digital signs. O’Shea asked about timing on updates. Teter suggested when the annual report is completed each year. Plass said that the BLF has a series of slides that are being shown on the BPL digital display.

---

### Agenda Item 7: Discuss roles and information needed for campaign development for any possible upcoming election on library funding and what the election path looks like chronologically

Teter created a post-it note timeline of major activities for a possible election in 2019 or 2020 (See attachment).

The following topics were discussed as Teter presented the timeline: questions for BLF involvement, people in the community who might be able to support an election, timing to develop fact sheets and stakeholder groups.

Gomez asked about timing of the financial analysis. Farnan said an RFP will be issued if council approval is received at the July 24, 2018 study session. Gomez asked whether post-its representing the expenditure timing should be added. Plass said any requests for BLF funding support must be approved by vote of the board and be allowed within the BLF charter and 501c3 limitations. He would also like to define the BLF’s role as leading the campaign or its members serving on campaign committees. Teter wants to coordinate with BLF so that BLF’s efforts to brand/fundraise for theBLF don’t conflict with brand/fundraise for the library and an election campaign. O’Shea asked if library could be a platform for campaigning e.g. bookmark distribution. Farnan said it would likely not be permitted.

Farnan asked when the commission would like to be in touch with advisors from the Kim Seter law firm, the Colorado State Library and EveryLibrary. Koenig and Teter will head a subcommittee to work on planning, beginning in July 2018. Plass recommended that Farnan maintain separation from the campaign planning. Sykes-Wilson asked if the consultant’s role would be to do the community engagement (yellow items) or the legal (orange items). Teter said they would do the campaign management (blue items) and the filings. Sykes-Wilson asked if the treasurer needs to be someone well known in the community. Teter said typically it is someone well-known because that is who is listed on campaign materials. Gomez asked if it is someone well-known politically.
Plass said whomever is going to get votes. Plass requested regular updates from the Library Commission at the BLF meetings on campaign planning. Koenig said it is important to keep staff up to date. Teter said that could be done during matters from the Library Commission during the monthly meetings. Teter requested a September BLF agenda item for questions from the Library Commission.

Sykes-Wilson asked Plass and Williams how they thought the Library League would continue. She thought that many Library League members would be willing to volunteer for a campaign. Williams said the name and the brand of Library League is proposed to go away but not the concept. Plass said the intention is to keep those members engaged in supporting the BLF and the library. Teter recommended reaching out to the members individually to thank them and inform them of opportunities to get involved. Sykes-Wilson asked if the volunteers for the library might be asked to participate. Plass suggested that at some point polling be done. Farnan said the county offered to do some polling. Teter asked about timing of polling, early spring? Farnan said it will be critical if/when the county gets involved before a district boundary is determined. O'Shea summarized the following questions for the BLF.

Questions or topics to discuss with the BLF at the September 2018 meeting
- Would the BLF be willing to fund the hire of a campaign manager for a citizen’s initiative?
- Should a legal consultant/lawyer be hired to represent the district/ negotiate for the district?
- What do we need to know to not run afoot of 501c3 limitations and the BLF charter?
- How to move forward as a foundation?
- The treasurer needs to be a known person in the community. Who is the most effective face to put forward to the community?
- Are there members of the BLF board that would like to participate on a campaign committee?
- Does the BLF have recommendations for people outside of the Library Commission and the BLF to consider for participation on a committee or stakeholder input?

Plass said the discussion is going to be multi-part and the September 2018 BLF meeting would be an introduction to the board members and an opportunity to ‘get the temperature’ of the board. Teter said the she and O’Shea’s next steps are to reach out to the outside advisors and aim for September 2018 to report back to the Library Commission. Teter suggested that the BLF think about what advocacy means. Plass said that funding parts of the campaign will have budget impacts which the BLF will need to discuss. BLF is aiming to have budget decisions made in November 2018 but they could do a budget supplemental meeting if needed. Teter said as a BLF board member, she thinks getting a sense of where the board is at with funding/participation is important by October 2018. Farra suggested also looking to other community members for funding.

Agenda Item 8: Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 3:09 p.m.

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:
The next Library Commission meeting will be held at 6 p.m. on Wed., Aug. 6, 2018, in the Main Library Canyon Meeting Room.

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

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Library Commission web page at http://boulderlibrary.org/about/commission.html