

Meeting date: Wednesday, Dec. 5, 2018

Location: Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Canyon Meeting Room

Meeting start time: 6 p.m. (Note: There is no access to the building after 8 p.m.)

1. Approval of agenda
2. Public comment
3. Consent agenda
 - a. Approval of Nov. 7, 2018 minutes
 - b. Approval of Nov. 14, 2018 minutes
4. Update on north Boulder branch library – Antonia Gaona, Public Services Manager and Michelle Crane, Facilities Design and Construction Manager
5. Policy discussion:
 - a. Expand eliminating library fines to all users and on all materials
6. Debrief Nov. 27, 2018 City Council Study Session on Sustainable Library Funding and next steps
7. Discussion of community education on library funding needs and options
8. Library Commission update
 - a. Items from commission
 - i. Approval of annual letter to city council
 - ii. Commissioner update on outreach to stakeholders
 - b. Boulder Library Foundation update
 - c. City project representative update
 - i. EcoDistricts
 - ii. Civic Area East Bookend
 - d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission
9. Library and Arts Director’s Report

10. Adjournment

2018 Library Commissioners

Joni Teter, Chair

Tim O’Shea

Juana Gomez

Joel Koenig

Jane Sykes Wilson

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: November 7, 2018 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.	
Contact information preparing summary: Celia Seaton, 303-441-3106	
Commission members present: Joni Teter, Juana Gomez, Joel Koenig, Jane Sykes Wilson, Tim O’Shea	
Commission members not present: none	
<p>Library staff present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director Celia Seaton, Administrative Specialist Kathy Lane, Programs, Events & Outreach Coordinator Antonia Gaona, Public Services Manager</p> <p>City staff present: Sam Veucasovic, Facilities Coordinator III, Facilities & Asset Management Michele Crane, Facilities Design and Construction Manager, Facilities & Asset Management Sam Cohn, Communications Specialist II, Communications Jim Robertson, Director, Planning, Housing & Sustainability</p> <p>Members of the public present: Dan Wood (WORKac), Spencer Martin, Laura Duncan, Charlie Hager, Sharon Procopio</p>	
Type of Meeting: Regular	
Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda	[0:00:05 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order and Teter asked if there were any changes to the agenda. It was noted that Agenda Item 4 was moved to follow Item 5 as Lane had a scheduling conflict. There was a nod of approval from the commission for this amended agenda.	
Agenda Item 2: Public comment	[0:00:24 Audio min.]
Spencer Martin, 1270 Rosewood 80304, noted his intention to listen to the north Boulder library presentation.	
Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda	[0:00:50 Audio min.]
<p>a. Approval of October 3, 2018 Meeting Minutes: Teter requested an adjustment from “Isaac Andres” to “Jeff Quick” in the notation regarding BLF financial matters, correcting her misstatement. O’Shea moved to approve these amended minutes, Koenig seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.</p>	
Agenda Item 4: Library Program update	[1:25:20 Audio min.]
<p>Lane presented on CSEd week which is coming up December 1-8, an event representing extraordinary collaboration with CU, BVSD, BLF, local tech company workers, and others. All ages and abilities are welcome for this opportunity to work with technology and play with coding, and computational thinking. Gomez asked about age limit and Lane responded that teens and adults will have opportunity. Lane welcomes commission to attend, particularly the finale “mini-makerfair” in the Canyon Theater. O’Shea offered to assist with reaching out to Google in partnership.</p> <p>Next, Lane presented on BeeChicas and Pollinator Appreciation Month, sharing photos of the native bee hotel adjacent to the library on the southern creek side. The commission members received honey gathered from the roof of the library’s BeeLiterate Hives by the BeeChicas.</p>	
Agenda Item 5: Presentation: north Boulder branch library project	[0:01:50 Audio min.]
<p>Presentation on the conclusion of Phase 1 of this project. Gaona introduced the guests in attendance, both representation from the WORKac team as well as the City of Boulder FAM department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wood spoke to the three-month intense process so far realized. Goal of immersive familiarization with Boulder and the library itself, establishing criteria used to analyze the two sites. Reading boulder as “a city in nature.” 	

Psychological importance of mountain proximity and celebration of water inform ideas of working with gravity/waterways and natural rugged aesthetic. Callback to Olmsted's Master Plan of Boulder, uniting city through waterfront. Also considered cultural context of community in Boulder: progressive "frontier mentality," helm of humanist "Chautauqua Movement," utopian ideals.

- Worked to engage community and library, conducting visioning sessions that clarified needs, energy, community, technology, etc. More than 250 participants engaged at events. Distilled to 14-point criteria system to compare the two sites (ie., connection to outdoors orientation, cost, pedestrian/bicycle access, ability to accommodate full program and flood protection.)
- Presented slides of hypothetical "Program Adjacencies" to join elements with their physical space – e.g., quiet space near the outdoors realm, children with playground.
- Maximizing sustainability in the building, aim toward Net Zero. Sustainable systems in the visible architecture – water (recirculation), wind (natural ventilation cutting edge sustainability), sun (energy harnessing), and earth (heating and cooling).
- Map of the two sites presented Site 1 as a privately owned, existing building located in flood plain. Site 2, owned by city, rests outside floodplain. Discussion of setback, easements, parking, access, etc. Spoke about meeting with COB Planning to discuss creation a possible access road joining 13th and 14th to eliminate the roundabout that currently sits in the middle of the plot. No room for expansion exists within Site 1. Costs comparable.
- 2.9-4.4 criteria of site scores. Strong recommendation of second site, excited to dive in to the design.

Gaona explained that Phase 2 concerns design; the WORKac architects will return in December to present design elements. Preapplication process will be shared with commission in December to kick off the Design Phase 2, concept review planned for March. Robust community engagement process planned (with design charrettes, etc.); researching and synthesizing information is very important to WORKac. Gaona spoke to the responsive and thoughtful process and later check in with the community in the spring. Phase 2 runs until mid-2020 – this hopeful timeline with construction in 2020-2022.

Teter welcomed public comment; Laura Duncan spoke, introducing herself as a resident, teacher at Boulder High School, and user of library. She expressed confusion trying to "square" the public urging for outdoor space with the proposal - how will the large parking lot enhance outdoor space? Also seeking clarification around impetus behind the plan for a makerspace when the report indicated only 2% of public encouraging the endeavor: "feels like we are trying to squeeze more stuff in to get a bigger building ... I don't get it from the numbers." Farnan responded that he appreciated her comments. Responding to the data, he agreed that just the 5-10 people had urged the makerspace at the sampling of the public at that event – however, he referenced the previous survey conducted in 2017 wherein 25% were north Boulder residents who claimed their highest priority to be a makerspace and a larger NoBo library. Teter noted the commission's role to speak for the library more than site and design elements. Teter assured Duncan that the public process will surely work through many of her concerns. Gaona responded that the outdoor space heavily threw preference toward Site 2 and emphasized intention to be conscientious; project's website will announce upcoming community engagement opportunities.

Teter welcomed questions or comments about the site recommendation report from the commission.

Gomez thanked Wood for all the research and insight on the Boulder community. Referencing the community engagement when meeting at the mobile home park – as at least half of the responses were in Spanish, she wondered if these were included. Yes, these were translated and included in the report. Gomez asked for clarification around the target of LEED silver versus Gold or Platinum. Crane responded that this was a council directed mandate – LEED Silver. However, with the new threshold, though not yet adopted as policy, is Net Zero with climate goals.

Teter asks for the design elements to be sensitive to the budget restrictions of the library – she doesn't want "bleeding edge" design to eclipse programming needs etc. Crane agreed with her, emphasizing her intention to make efficient, smart decisions around sustainability, "not just checking boxes."

O'Shea wondered about the depth of foundation in terms of potential expansion downward with Site 2. Geotechnical survey has not yet been completed. Civil engineer on the WORKac team clarified that a basement is unlikely due to the nearby creek and water table. Wondering about potentiality of expansion- what would expansion look like. Wood: zoning

similar on both sites, maximum = 15000 sq. feet. O'Shea asked about the bike path and Wood responded that the assumption is that those can be moved around. O'Shea also questioned the utility of the 28 parking spaces presented – will this accommodate all staff and patrons? Gaona noted that this is very close to code as well as the current parking space at Meadows and GRB. Peak need for 20 spaces; code specifies 30.

Sykes Wilson asked about maintenance of the outdoor space. Currently, the main branch's playground and outdoor space is maintained by Parks and Recreation (P&R). Farnan: P&R is preliminarily interested in assisting with funds and construction. Gaona views a good prospect of partnering particularly with the complimentary sites at the library and the newly reconstructed Violet Park.

Koenig spoke to a potential agricultural partnership with open space conservancy efforts to assist in funding a community garden space.

Teter: this looks very responsive to what we have heard. Though appearing as bigger space than Reynolds or Meadows, BoulderReads and the makerspace would be elements distinct to the north Boulder branch accounting for this need. Also noted broader community use for this space when BR is not in session. Access with site two is her main concern - how would vehicles get to the building? Gaona referred to ongoing transportation studies with consultant Fox Tuttle Hernandez; more information will be gathered by the end of the month. Careful study of average daily traffic counts and anticipated additional traffic at nearby intersections. Teter asked about the number of bike racks. Crane clarified that though the exact figure will be partially dependent on code, she can assure covered storage use as well as charging stations will be made available. Question around previously discussed WiFi options for mobile home parks. Farnan spoke to the larger city-initiated Broadband backbone project which will precede this plan and incorporate fiber.

Group thanked Wood for all his work and the update.

Agenda Item 6: Review and input on 2019 Library Commission application questions [1:44:40 Audio min.]

Koenig had sent in some possible suggestions. Teter preferred replacing existing questions as opposed to increasing the inquiries.

After some discussion, Koenig noted that he is “fine with the existing questions.” The group seemed in consensus of this approval. Teter believes the current questions successfully aim toward the goal of understanding if an applicant is aware of the responsibilities inherent in the role and how that applicant functions as part of a larger body.

The following adjustments to the existing questions were suggested:

6. Have you reviewed previous library commission meeting minutes, or documents related to the current Library Master Planning process? What thoughts do you have about recent decisions and/or plans?

Modify to account for the 2018 Library Master Plan's recent adoption.

9. Some members of the public perceive that the library has a problem providing a safe and secure environment. How do you propose to balance concerns regarding safety and security with providing “free and open access” in a public setting?

Revise to “perceptions of unsafety” as opposed to “concerns regarding safety” to reduce implication of actual problem.

Group agreed on accepting the current questions with these revisions. Seaton will relay to the City Clerks Office.

Agenda Item 7: Review and input on 2019 Library Commission meeting schedule [1:55:47 Audio min.]

The proposed schedule included in Director's Report. Group agreed that January 9, 2019 will work better than January 2, 2019 for the first meeting of the year. Regarding March's retreat, group agreed to invite the new commissioner (if known by that date) to ease transition. Koenig asked about process for onboarding new commissioners; Teter explained that the chair usually reached out to the new member. Farnan noted that he does as well; he also meets with the applicants beforehand.

Agenda Item 8: 2019 library budget update and library requests for 2018 2nd ATB [1:58:50 Audio min.]

Farnan reported there should be no surprises there but invited any questions.

Agenda Item 9: Library Commission Update

[1:59:50 Audio min.]

- a. Items from Commission

- i. Planning for annual letter to City Council – Koenig and O’Shea volunteered to draft this document which will likely be informed by November’s Study Session. Koenig noted he will get a draft prepared by the December commission meeting.
- ii. Commissioner update on outreach to stakeholders
 - 1. Discussion with EveryLibrary
 - 2. Visit with Pikes Peak Library District, Colorado Springs administration - Koenig spoke to the amazing building and space with several maker spaces-grappling with approach to the homeless. They’ve been a separate district for decades – totally independent of the city, very impressed with their Chief Librarian and CEO, John Spears. Their CFO, Mike Varnet (a “guru on TABOR and Gallagher,”) also extended offer of assistance. Teter noted their fundraising structure as bifurcated into a friends group (surrounding branches, bookshops, volunteers, smaller gifts etc.,) and a foundation (which meets just four times a year to deal with “heavy hitter” fundraising).
- b. Discussion of follow up from Seter and Vander Wall response to question – none.
- c. Boulder Library Foundation update – none.
- d. City project representative update
 - i. EcoDistricts - Gomez spoke about attending the open house regarding the Alpine Balsam where 6 proposals were presented (maximizing office space to maximizing housing and everything in-between). Most people were interested in mixed use possibilities.
 - ii. Civic Area East Bookend – none.
- e. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission.

Around 25 people planned at Koenig’s residence for the gathering of core library supporters – Farnan will kick it off with an inspirational report on the library, the newly minted master plan will be made available. Group discussed framing of the evening’s events.

Agenda Item 10: Library and Arts Director’s Report

[2:30:00 Audio min.]

- a. Automatic renewal of library materials – Farnan expressed excitement for this upgrade. Automatic renewal on due date will occur unless there are existing holds on the item.
- b. Update on Main Library Restroom renovation – Farnan invited questions. Gomez: in the presentation a year ago, the suggestion arose to create a more private space to prevent direct view into the room, yet the gender specific bathrooms appear to still open straight into the hallway. Farnan and Phares will bring this input back to the design team. O’Shea questioned the line of sight issue he observes in the all-inclusive restroom’s plan and ways to reduce the attractiveness of this “hang out spot” behind the wall. Koenig asked for a timeframe and Farnan responded that construction is planned for the first quarter of 2019, with completion hopefully before the end of summer.
- c. Q3 Performance Measures reports – posted here: <https://boulderlibrary.org/about/>
- d. Inclusivity update – Farnan relayed Jaime Kopke’s invitation to the commission to attend “Comfort Soup.”
- e. 2019 Boulder Library Foundation grant requests – intent to ask 250,000 from the BLF – fits into the BLF goals around marketing – desire to be main sponsor or owner of festival events – e.g. CSEd week. Teter noted the importance of providing an attendance/impact report to provide to BLF. Teter: are you including the up to \$25,000 for advocacy? Farnan – if BLF indicates their desire to do that, they can take it from the total which “shouldn’t be too difficult.”

Agenda Item 11: Adjournment

[2:46:20 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, November 14, 2018, in the Canyon Meeting Room at the Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, CO 80302.

APPROVED BY:

ATTESTED:

Board Chair

Board Secretary

Date

Date

DRAFT

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: November 14, 2018 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.	
Contact information preparing summary: Celia Seaton, 303-441-3106	
Commission members present: Joni Teter, Jane Sykes Wilson, Tim O'Shea	
Commission members not present: Joel Koenig, Juana Gomez	
<p>Library staff present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director Celia Seaton, Administrative Specialist</p> <p>City staff present: Kady Doelling, Budget Officer, Finance Patrick von Keyserling, Director, Communications Hannah Combs, Senior Budget Analyst, Finance</p> <p>Members of the public present: Robyn Moore and Matthew Dempsey, George K. Baum & Company; Crystal Schimpf, Colorado State Library; Paul Sutter</p>	
Type of Meeting: Special Meeting	
Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda	[0:00:05 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order and Teter asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Teter suggested breaking the single agenda item into five sections to facilitate the process: (1) presentation, (2) public comment, (3) commission questions and discussion, (4) discussion of written recommendation to council, and (5) discussion of the presentation at the November 27 th study session. Teter also noted that there are two commission members absent tonight who have been in the discussion via email (see handouts). There was a nod of approval from the commission for this agenda.	
Agenda Item 2: Presentation of Financial Analysis (see handouts)	[0:02:10 Audio min.]
<p>a. Library Commission Q & A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teter: re: pie chart on slide (7) - which service level underlies the assumptions in the pie chart? Hannah: "2019 budget, maintain service levels" • Teter questioned how the major library renovations relate to the annual capital and maintenance expenses. E.g., where does Reynolds' roof where land? Response—that would be one-time, slide 39 indicating capital outlay, Farnan pointed to FAM's 10-year schedule based on their budget going forward and Teter clarified that the capital and major library renovations are "over and above that." Reynold's roof is indeed within capital and maintenance. • Teter questioned the parenthetical figures – were these included in the base when calculating the cost in municipal scenario? Response – no. The City does not currently have a fund balance for the library. • Slide 17 – Teter asked whether noted figure includes both FAM and capital? Response – yes. • Slide 19 – Teter questioned the difference in numbers between this and Table 3 in the memo – Dempsey replied that they took an average of the five years in Slide 19 whereas Table 3 shows what the requirement would be finding for an extended period of time. Joni suggests clarifying this in the memo. • Slide 32 uses 2019 budget as base- Teter clarified that this does not include cost allocation piece. Teter feels this is confusing when indicating total cost to run the library. Response- we needed to get the full costs of running the library, need to know administrative costs to be sure they are covered. If library became a district, presumption that there wouldn't be a big personnel shift re: layoffs. O'Shea suggests a footnote included to clarify this data. Doelling notes that this is the minimal amount of reductions in city funding requirements if a library district is formed within the city boundaries. Commission agreed this would be a good footnote as "these numbers will land differently with different audience" (O'Shea). 	

Commission Questions

- O’Shea inquired about expiring taxes and the potential of reallocation of expiring taxes to assist in library funding. Doelling responded that there are expiring taxes that will occur throughout the next ten years, e.g., in 2020 capacity of .15. “The City has plenty of opportunities to fund various initiatives.”
- Teter encouraged including the pie chart from Slide 7 in the memo. She notes that explaining that this is the 2019 maintaining status quo level would be helpful. Re: the cost allocation piece, commission stated its interest in specific administrative costs. Suggested adding footnote with list of what is included in the 3.4 million.
- Slide 12 - identify that the “annual capital and maintenance expenses” is the FAM list as that term will be familiar for City Council. Major library renovations are assuming that something is going to happen.
- Slide 14 - Expanded boundary; commission suggested explanation of the logic and goal to capture as many patrons as we can – possible footnote that 90% are captured here.
- Joni suggests including the patron locations map.
- Slide 19 - Teter suggested a footnote explaining why 2024 is such a “large chunk.”
- Slide 19 - Commission confused by capitalization of “GAP” and suggested alternative.
- Slide 28 - Teter suggested including this table in the memo.
- Teter asked to specify “Interdepartmental charges.” Doelling: direct costs to put away money for computer replacement, etc. mostly annual replacement costs. FAM item on detail page is for fixing and cleaning the facilities, not the backlog. Part of operating costs. Backlog number was provided by FAM. Teter: what happens to FAM backlog if not accounted for in the library’s budget? Transferred to FAM per Doelling. Teter – sales tax increase would go into the library fund? Doelling: many options, could be its own fund, could connect with the old library fund, could be in general fund earmarked for library expenses. Clarified that the dollars would be Library’s, not FAM’s.
- Slide 29/30 – Sykes Wilson wondered whether it be helpful to put what increase that is over current amount, to show the minimal increase. Farnan – we could capture this roughly.
- Teter- suggestion to clarify between the tables in the memo and the presentation. Matching table titles would be helpful. Encouraged putting “as much of the meat in the memo” to give council members time to “digest” before they view the presentation at the meeting. Teter recommended getting all information in one place.
- Pie chart- Teter- 13.4 million means maintain service levels. Would be interesting to see the dollar amount for expansion level. Phares noted this would be 15 (18.3- the 3.3) million – Teter asked this to be noted.
- Schimpf commented on the importance of telling the story of the master plan, in context of these numbers. She brought up a question on Page 13, Table 9 of the memo: under library district, the line for governing entity notes City Council and Commission. She noted that the establishing entity would be Council and Commission, but the governing body would be the board of trustees. Phares: this can be amended to establishing entities – board of trustees under library district.
- Sykes Wilson: we need to figure out the amount asked for from the Boulder homeowner once all the figures have been distilled. Beneficial to indicate amount average City of Boulder homeowner currently pays.

Discussions of written recommendations to council

- Teter doesn’t favor the use of “vision” in the “vision/expansion” phrasing (page 3 of the drafted message to City Council). Need to identify that this is not the first time that this issue has been brought to city council – “we are building upon history.” O’Shea noted his strike-outs and Teter noted some minor additions. O’Shea edited as the discussion progressed.
- Sykes Wilson – noted approval of highlighting the page 3 paragraph. Teter noted adjusted language to clarify the user figure arrived for the base.

Move to approve this memo as amended, Sykes Wilson seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved. Suggested inclusion as an attachment to the Study Session memo for November 27th.

Discussions of the presentation at the November 27th study session

- Teter indicated the possible audience beyond City Council through Channel 8's coverage. O'Shea spoke in support of "leveraging [their] stage" to help advocate. Suggestion to include a Carnegie slide. Teter: Great opportunity to get community conversation going.

Agenda Item 3: Adjournment

[2:17:00 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, December 5, 2018, in the Canyon Meeting Room at the Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, CO 80302.

APPROVED BY:

ATTESTED:

Board Chair

Board Secretary

Date

Date

DRAFT

DATE: Nov. 30, 2018
TO: Library Commission
FROM: Antonia Gaona, Public Services Manager/Project Coordinator
Michele Crane, Facilities Design and Construction Manager

SUBJECT: Project Update for North Boulder Library

This memo provides a project update for the north Boulder branch library.

LATEST NEWS

Phase two of the north Boulder branch library project kicked off in November 2018 with a city meeting of subject matter experts, including representatives from the following departments/divisions: Library and Arts, Transportation, Planning and Human Services, Facilities Maintenance and Operations, Infrastructure Services, Information Technology, Parks and Recreation, and Public Works. The subject matter experts were briefed on the status of the project and provided their insight and expertise about important considerations, possible next steps, and potential areas for collaboration with other city departments and projects.

The project team for the north Boulder branch library made a pre-application submission which includes drawings and technical questions about the site to Planning and Development Services. This is the first step in the regulatory process and will help inform the team about requirements for concept and site review submissions to the Planning Board. Pre-application drawings include basic site plan, location plan, conceptual massing that shows proposed height, and diagrammatic floor plans. In addition, the team submitted technical questions which will help the architects and consultants prepare for a full site review process anticipated early in 2019.

WORKac is finalizing scope of work and contract with a local architect consultant to help with phase two of the project and to serve as a local point of contact. Jeff Dawson, AIA, Principal Architect from STUDIO Architecture is the architect consultant who was selected. He is very well versed in Boulder's regulatory review process and has completed many construction projects in the city.

Once the final contract for phase two is in place the design team will advance the schematic design phase of the project and will develop design concepts that respond to the library's goals for the project, community input and program requirements. An early task in this phase will be to complete the first cost estimate on a conceptual design to guide decision making as the project advances and ensure what is being developed is within the budget identified.

UPDATED TRAFFIC STUDY

The library's project team commissioned a traffic and parking study from Fox Tuttle Hernandez

Transportation Group (FTH) in August 2018, during site evaluation – phase one, to determine the anticipated amount of traffic a new library would generate in the areas and the proper amount of parking to test fit into site layouts for the two sites being consider.

Once the preferred site was identified, the project team engaged with FTH to conduct a follow-up study to procure existing daily traffic counts on adjacent streets, and to determine how those streets would compare to other residential and mixed-use neighborhoods in Boulder with the added traffic anticipated with the addition of a new library.

The project team confirmed with the city’s Principal Traffic Engineer, that all roadways in the area immediate to the library site at 4540 Broadway (at 13th St., 14th St., Rosewood Ave.) are classified on Boulder's "City of Boulder Streets" map as "Residential", or local roadways. There is no traffic volume threshold tied to the classification, which is the lowest classification in the roadway hierarchy (Freeway, Expressway, Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, Collector, Residential).

The study concludes that the roadways that will serve the north Boulder branch library currently have very low traffic and when anticipated library traffic is added, the traffic volumes remain low (less than 1,000 vehicles per day) from a traffic engineering perspective. The total anticipated traffic is low when compared with other residential or mixed-use streets in Boulder. Please see comparable cross-sections in the attached report (**Attachment A**). The conclusion is that there will be no “roadway capacity” issues, since the roadways in consideration could accommodate many times more traffic than is projected. Similarly, the report concludes that it will be easy to cross the street as a pedestrian or access parking areas at adjacent residences. In this context, the additional traffic added by the new north Boulder branch library will be easily accommodated by area roadways and well within or below the range of traffic typically occurring on similar roadways throughout Boulder.

NEXT STEPS

Principal Architect from WORKac will attend the Jan. 9, 2019 Library Commission meeting to present the design concept for the branch library, prior to the project entering concept and/or site review. The tentative schedule for next steps for this project to occur in early 2019 are as follows:

- **Jan. 9, 2019** - The architects will present design concept ideas to the Library Commission.
- **1st Quarter 2019** - The project team anticipates submitting the project for concept and/or site review (likely in January) with the Planning Board. Specific dates for this process are to-be-determined.
- **March 2019**- The project team and the architects will host a series of community engagement events focused on interior design and programmatic planning for both the inside and the outside of the library.
- **May 2019**- As a community check-in, the project team and the architects will share work with the community which summarizes the input received during the March engagement sessions and connect how that input was incorporated into the library design. This will be

may allow them to spend more time to assist patrons with other library needs. The staff member responsible for the accounting tasks related to overdue fines estimates that eliminating the collection of overdue fines would reduce the time by thirty percent that is devoted to reconciling transactions for the cash registers and the library patron database, addressing errors, and assembling and recording deposits. These accounting tasks are still required for the other revenue the library collects. The time saved in the accounting process could be applied to other critical accounts payable, budget monitoring, and reporting tasks.

Eliminating overdue fines does not directly translate to an appreciable, discreet increment of a position in any workgroup. Each staff member is required to perform several other essential functions during the time that they may also be collecting or accounting for overdue fines. In all cases, the staff time spent interacting with patrons about overdue fines and accounting for the revenues would be directed toward more meaningful customer service and essential administrative functions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends eliminating library fines for all patrons and materials beginning on March 1, 2019 except for materials borrowed from the [Interlibrary Loan \(ILL\) program](#). The ILL program is a service provided to patrons, so they may borrow rare or hard-to-find materials that are not available through the Flatirons Library Consortium (FLC) member libraries or Prospector. The lending library's loan policies apply to materials borrowed through ILL. BPL staff reviewed these proposed policy changes with other FLC member libraries. Several FLC libraries are planning to adopt similar policy changes in the future.

Below is a summary of the proposed changes to the BPL checkout policy regarding overdue fines and the elements of the policy that would remain in effect.

Policy elements proposed to change:

- No accrual of overdue fines on materials
- Existing overdue fine balances will be waived

Policy elements that will remain in effect:

- Materials will still have [due dates](#)
- Courtesy and overdue notices will be sent on the same schedule
- Bills will be sent for materials not returned after three weeks
- Materials that have been billed and not returned after 5 weeks overdue will be referred to a [collection agency](#)
- Replacement and processing fees for lost or damaged items will be still be charged

A March 1, 2019 implementation allows staff time to prepare information to update the library website and library account brochures. Staff does not recommend publicizing the elimination of overdue fines prior to initiating the change as it is likely to cause confusion for patrons and may lead to patrons asking staff to waive overdue fines before March 1, 2019. This could cause unnecessary tension during patron interactions, as the date approaches. Waiving individual fines is

time consuming. All previously accrued overdue fines will be waived through an automated, batch process on March 1. Once implemented, the policy change will be communicated on the library's website, in the newsletter, and through social media. This timing aligns with another positive change for patrons which is the holds allowance is increasing from 10 to 25. Staff plans to promote these two changes at the same time.

CONCLUSION

The decision to go fine free focuses on building positive relationships and removing barriers to access and promoting literacy, pillars of BPL's [mission](#). Eliminating overdue fines removes one of the most uncomfortable and negative interactions staff have with patrons and will foster relationships based on trust rather than punishment.

NEXT STEPS

Once the Library Commission has determined its recommendation, staff will provide an update to City Council as an Information Packet item.

QUESTIONS FOR COMMISSION

1. Does the Library Commission have any questions about the information provided?
2. What additional information, if any, does the Library Commission need to inform its recommendation about eliminating overdue fines?
3. Does the Library Commission support staff's recommendation to eliminate overdue fines for all patrons and materials?
4. Does the Library Commission support the proposed implementation date of March 1, 2019?
5. Does the Library Commission support staff's plan to promote these changes?

Excerpt from the memo for the Oct.2, 2018 City Council [agenda item](#), consideration of the 2019 budget.

Library Services and Programs

INFORMATION ABOUT ELIMINATING LIBRARY OVERDUE FINES

Elimination of late fees or overdue fines is a policy trend for public libraries in the United States. Several Colorado libraries including [High Plains Library District](#) (HPLD) (Weld County, Colorado), [Berthoud Community Library District](#), and [Anythink Libraries](#) (Adams County, Colorado) have implemented no overdue fines policies on most or all of their items. [Denver Public Library](#) announced plans to eliminate overdue fines in January 2019. Most members of the [Flatirons Library Consortium](#) (FLC), of which [Boulder Public Library](#) (BPL) is a member, are planning to institute similar policies at each of their libraries in the next year.

Fines impact on materials returns and overdue rates

Most of the growing body of library literature assessing the effectiveness of charging overdue fines to encourage the timely return of borrowed materials indicates that the practice has minimal influence on whether patrons return materials on time.

A 1983 Library Journal (LJ) article *Hard Facts About Overdues* by Patsy Hansel and Robert Burgin summarizes the findings of an overdue fines study conducted in public libraries in North Carolina. The authors concluded that there was no significant relationship between overdue rates (the proportion of overdue materials to the total collection) and whether a library charged fines or restricted the borrowing privileges of patrons with overdue materials. Libraries that do not charge fines tend to get their books back more slowly, but they ultimately get more of them back.

The 2017 Library Journal Article *Doing Fine(s)?* by Jennifer A. Dixon based on a 2017 LJ survey of a random selection of public librarians (454 respondents) reported that only 14 percent of borrowed materials are returned late with patrons in larger library systems slightly more likely to return items after their due date, and that 88 percent of overdue materials are returned within one week of the due date. The author also noted that time spent collecting these fees can cost hundreds of dollars in staff time from library budgets.

In June 2015, HPLD went fine free. Information shared with staff was that 95 percent of their materials are returned within a week of the due date and that libraries across the state that have eliminated fines are experiencing a similar return rate. For HPLD, eliminating the one-to-one transaction that must occur to manage overdue fines significantly reduced the number of staff hours spent conducting transactions that on average only yield one or two dollars.

It is common practice for libraries to charge “lost” item fees for materials that are not returned. Typically, these fees result in a block on the patron account preventing the patron from checking out more materials until the charges are resolved. BPL has a ten-dollar fines and fees limit on patron accounts. When an account reaches or goes over the limit, the account holder must return items and pay enough to bring their account balance under ten-dollars. BPL issues bills for “lost” items for the retail price of the item plus a five-dollar processing fee. If a patron returns a billed item, the cost of the item is waived, and the patron is responsible for the only the processing fee. The catalog records for

Commission Memo

Meeting Date: December 5, 2018 – Main Library, Canyon Meeting Room

Interesting Upcoming Dates (from [ALA Website](#))

[Teen Tech Week](#) - March 3-9, 2019

[Freedom of Information Day](#) - on or around March 16

[D.E.A.R - Drop Everything and Read](#) - April 12

[National Library Week](#) - April 7-13, 2019

[National Library Workers Day](#) - April 9, 2019 (Tuesday of National Library Week)

[Preservation Week](#) - April 21-27, 2019

[Children's Day/Book Day - El día de los niños/El día de los libros \(Día\)](#) - April 30

[GLBT Book Month™](#) - June

[Library Card Sign-up Month](#) - September

[Banned Books Week](#) - September 23-29, 2018

[Teen Read Week](#) - October 7-13, 2018

[National Friends of Libraries Week](#) - October 21-27, 2018

1. Items from Commission (verbal)

2. Report on Commissioner's outreach to stakeholders and resources for community conversation

1. Debrief on November 10 gathering of library supporters (verbal)

2. Links to resources from the November 27 Council study session on library funding options

As part of the Council study session, Library Commission provided an overview of where the library is today and its historic funding deficiencies, along with our take on the best options to fully fund our library. Commission's slide deck (pdf) can be accessed at

https://drive.google.com/open?id=15mcElgt-iAFDa_rHuOMABzbV1yXztYKE

A video clip of Commission's presentation is available at

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1c4h9skXt1yuWVbBgTp28MLPOpkxxXmc3/view?usp=sharing>

Video of the full Council study session on library funding is on the City's You Tube channel at

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VDIIAL--jhk&list=PLB84283F9D1453EF3#action=s_hare

The Council study session packet is at

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1yfH_-mwYMVU0NI9Iii-UHwdRkUAVuo8y

11/28/2018 Daily Camera article

http://www.dailycamera.com/news/boulder/ci_32297258/boulder-will-ask-residents-weigh-library-district

Shay Castle's contemporaneous reporting of the study session on Twitter is at Twitter Moment: "Boulder Council Library Funding Study Session 11.27.18 - Shay Castle" <https://twitter.com/i/moments/1067860395174457344>

3. BLF Update (verbal)

4. Updates from Commissioners Representing the Commission in other Venues (verbal)

5. Update on Emails & Phone Calls to Library Commission