

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: August 1, 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, Jane Sykes Wilson	
Library staff present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director Celia Seaton, Administrative Specialist City staff present: None Members of the public present: None	
Type of Meeting: Regular	
Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda	[0:00:01 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. and Teter noted potentially moving Item 7 up after the budget update to schedule the debriefs together. There was a nod of approval from the commission for this amended agenda.	
Agenda Item 2: Public comment	[0:03:04 Audio min.]
None	
Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda	[0:00:44 Audio min.]
a. Approval of May 24, 2018 Study Session Meeting Minutes: O’Shea moved to accept the minutes, Koenig seconded, and they were unanimously approved. b. Approval of June 6, 2018 Meeting Minutes: Teter sent in editorial comments by email (see handouts). Gomez moved to approve these minutes as amended. O’Shea seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved. c. Approval of June 14, 2018 Meeting Notes: Teter sent in editorial comments by email (see handouts). O’Shea moved to approve as amended, Koenig seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved. d. Approve Warner Charitable Trust – Koenig moved to approve, Gomez seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved. Teter noted the need for a letter of appreciation, Koenig will update the previous version, and Phares will ensure its conveyance.	
Agenda Item 4: 2019 Library budget 2018/2019 update	[0:03:14 Audio min.]
Farnan invited any questions on the budget update. Farnan said he can provide 2019 data once it is ready for public viewing and the commission can discuss at September’s meeting. For now, per Farnan, it’s shaping up balanced with some negatives and some positives: “given the relative flat nature of the revenue for the city, it is going to look okay for us.” Teter asked about staff layoffs and Farnan said he can not answer that at this time. One-time capital improvement for the bathroom renovation was approved, with construction planned in 2019. Teter asked about “practical effects” of the removal of fines from the library’s balance sheet. Farnan – we would no longer be collecting fines – discussion of this elimination of fines is planned for December and the practice could go into effect immediately. No negative budget impact fiscal impact. Whatever revenues are collected go back into the general fund.	
Agenda Item 5: Debrief of July 24, 2018 City Council Study Session	[0:07:00 Audio min.]
Teter and O’Shea reported on the session, discussed possible follow-up with council members, and invited questions. Sykes Wilson inquired about process and procedure navigating paths for further direction with council against council’s full docket. Some council members requested public forums and inviting Fort Collins library district representatives to come report on their experience; with how busy council’s schedule runs, how does one decide on what pieces to involve moving forward? Farnan will resurface these possibilities, specifically the Fort Collins suggestion, with the city manager while checking the capacity of future council agendas. He noted that council’s schedule is indeed booked solid through the end of the year and the first quarter of 2019. However, depending on priorities, their schedule can shift. He anticipates that the council presentation in November will involve the finance department and city manager’s office of the city – “a broader city front than heretofore.” Teter asked if the commission should be present and Farnan said it is their prerogative; Teter expressed interest. Early September should bring a kick-off meeting with the selected financial analysis consultant.	

Gomez said that the council reactions were “fascinating” and fell across the spectrum in surprising ways. Farnan appreciated the candid nature of the opinions shared by council. He also gained a better sense of the emotional attachment felt toward the library. Teter thought it would be good for commissioners to reach out to council members individually to assist in further conversation. She thinks sharing the commission’s journey toward their present position would be helpful in providing information and clarifying misconceptions. Teter felt the response was positive overall, as she heard the council majority as open-minded to the idea of a district.

O’Shea spoke about the importance of clarity and cohesion going forward in outreach and digital presentation in concert with the Boulder Library Foundation. Council wants options, not a “pitch.” A “mixed bag of opportunities” can be presented, conveyed in a way that invites council to feel informed but also welcome to ask questions or point out gaps. Guiding navigational strategy over the next few months. Commission needs to have a cohesive voice and utilize visuals to illustrate budget needs. Teter expressed the emergent need to reach out to council within the next month while the topic is still fresh and “top-of-mind.”

Teter noted the valuable captured minutes from January, February, and March meetings speaking about districts with visitors from Fort Collins and Berthoud.

Farnan asked O’Shea what he means by council deciding to “fully fund.” O’Shea – tricky. He would like to see a dedicated funding source for the library but understands the need to look at options. While preferring the district due to dedicated funding and autonomy, O’Shea is open to city-involved solutions. Farnan estimates that there will be essentially six scenarios explored by the comprehensive financial analysis which he then enumerated. The scenarios include covering the difference with sales tax increase or property tax increases, fully funding (\$12 million) with a dedicated tax (could be combination of property and sales), and two district scenarios with two separate boundary lines (which would be only funded through property tax.)

Teter agrees about O’Shea’s negotiating mindset but she feels that unless there is an institutional change of backing through dedicated funding, then staying with city is not an option. Teter noted the need to clarify with council that this is not a request for funding “above and beyond” – O’Shea: “we want to sustain this current lean machine.” Koenig: “We’re all singing from the same song-sheet.” Gomez and Sykes Wilson volunteered to work on talking points that they will aim to get set by August 15. Commissioners then discussed council member meeting arrangements.

Gomez asked about BLF’s role if districting occurs. Farnan – it shouldn’t change – BLF is an independent body that supports the library, though perhaps charter language would have to be altered if “City of Boulder” is specifically named. Overall, Farnan felt that the study session was a “homerun” for the master plan.

Agenda Item 6: Debrief of July 14, 2018 Library Commission Retreat [0:59:49 Audio min.]

Teter reported on a follow-up item with BLF; she will concentrate on turning the table into a Gantt chart over the next few days. Koenig plans to create a spreadsheet with contacts to keep in mind for library promotion.

Agenda Item 7: Library policy review and update: Update to Carnegie Library for Local History Policies [1:04:40 Audio min.]

Jennifer explained that this constitutes commission’s first look at the revised policies. After incorporating commission’s edits, staff would bring forms to city attorney for review; these policies would then return to the commission in September for potential approval. Teter clarified that tonight’s conversation surrounds input, not approval. Koenig asked about gross revenue of Carnegie in a year. Phares responded: under \$10,000, probably closer to \$5,000 or \$6,000. Those monies typically go into the general fund. The commission queried whether the revised policy would affect this figure. Phares: some fees are just aimed at keeping patron requests to a reasonable level, and the adjustments will likely have little effect on actual revenue. Teter proceeded to review the updated policy page by page with the commission.

- P. 17 – Teter questioned the purpose and meaning of “noncurrent records.” Phares noted that this was also questioned at the Leadership Team meeting by staff. There is not capacity for Carnegie to manage to keep records of all the current businesses in Boulder. Phares will rephrase for clarification.
- P. 18 – Teter suggested incorporating a sidebar with examples of donatable materials, i.e., we accept this but not that.
- Gomez made the editorial recommendation to remove semicolon in the piece beginning “collection with highlights including...” as only two items are listed.
- P. 19 – Teter questioned where the historic City of Boulder records reside – are they in the city’s archives? Phares will inquire and report back. Teter suggested that these would be more accessible to the public through the Carnegie collection as opposed to Central Records.
- P. 20 – Suggestion to insert reasoning (limited space) beside the need for notice of class/group visits.

- Gomez questioned the imperative “keep voices and conversation low.” She wonders whether this has practical reason or is rather a remnant of historical library stereotype that no longer applies. Koenig noted the confined physical space of Carnegie. Sykes Wilson: Carnegie is a bit intimidating, perhaps eliminating this piece could make it seem friendlier. Phares will inquire and report back.
- P. 21 – “Only pencils” are allowed per guidelines – the reasoning was questioned. Phares noted that this is common policy in archive spaces. Teter thinks clarification is needed that this refers to personal notes, not notations to place in the books. Also helpful to provide explanation of why pens are problematic.
- Photographs section – Teter questioned whether there should be a preface of “if something is not already digitized...” regarding requests. Phares will find out about the high-definition downloadability.
- P. 22 – O’Shea noted a typo – “three business day.” Sykes Wilson also noted consistency issue of “3” vs “three.”
- Gomez suggested including a line for the place to mail the compact disc. Phares indicated that this space is on the front. Gomez clarified – what if a patron wants it mailed elsewhere? Phares made a note to amend this to include additional space for separate address.
- P. 24 – Gomez questioned the intention behind the check box stating “yes or no I am willing to donate a complimentary copy of any book or film...” Phares – “...that they use photographs in.” She will revise to clarify.
- P. 25 – bullet 6 – donations will only be accepted from businesses no longer operating. Same issue as previous discussion on “noncurrent” and yet accepting items from a business that has been around for 80 years and wants to donate historical items.
- P. 31 – Wendy Hall had noted that Carnegie does not want patrons to fill this form out if the materials won’t be accepted. Thus, it probably won’t be posted online but rather provided directly to those whose collections will be received.
- P. 33 – Koenig asked if these fee figures are much different from the present situation. Phares: no, pretty much the same.
- P. 36 – Teter asked whether the oral histories are downloadable. O’Shea questioned the meaning behind “secure email address.” Phares will investigate.

Teter asked for a slide on Carnegie to add to the collection for the digital presentation. Phares will acquire this from Hall and get it into the slide deck. She asked for a time frame; Teter requested by end of the month. Farnan spoke some about the research that the public does with Carnegie’s collection ranging from genealogy to property line dispute resolution. Teter: communication should be adjusted if the intention is to encourage people to go to Carnegie to socialize or meet up. Phares indicated that Carnegie would need more staff to be used in that capacity. Teter noted that it will be interesting to see how the use of space shifts as digitization grows.

Agenda Item 8: Library Commission Update

[1:40:47 Audio min.]

- a. Items from Commission
 - i. Commissioner update on outreach to stakeholders – already discussed earlier in meeting.
- b. Boulder Library Foundation update – none.
- c. City project representative update
 - i. EcoDistricts – Koenig and Gomez volunteered for the next round of input for Alpine Balsam and the East Bookend – Seaton will send along updated memo from Alice Huang once ready.
 - ii. Civic Area East Bookend
- d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission

Gomez also inquired whether REFORMA (National Association to Promote Library and Information Services to Latinos and the Spanish-Speaking) could be included for recognition in the next library newsletter as they provided microgrant funding for catering. Teter: good catch.

Agenda Item 9: Library and Arts Director’s Report

[1:43:30 Audio min.]

- a. OPEN Data update [Open Data Catalog](#)
- b. Library usage statistics

Koenig asked about the Summer Reading Program (Summer of Discovery) statistics. Registration was slightly lower, but completion rate was higher than last year. Statistics were bolstered by nearly 1,000 adults signing up this year.

Commission was asked whether they would prefer to read these statistics as links or keep them in the packet. The commission agreed on links.

Agenda Item 10: Adjournment

[1:59:15 Audio min.]

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

Date, time, and location of next meeting:

The next Library Commission meeting will be at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, September 5, 2018, in the Canyon Meeting Room at the Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, CO 80302.

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