

**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 funding 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). <p>Commission Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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