

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: February 6, 2019 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 Aimee Schumm, eServices Manager</p> <p>City staff present: None</p> <p>Members of the public present: None.</p>	
Type of Meeting: Regular	
Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda	[0:00:11 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order and Teter asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Teter noted the addition of an item under the Library Commission update to discuss agenda for the 2019 Commission Retreat. See handouts . There was a nod of approval from the commission for this amended agenda.	
Agenda Item 2: Public comment	[0:00:44 Audio min.]
None.	
Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda	[0:00:48 Audio min.]
<p>a. Approval of January 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes: O’Shea noted needed edit on the date for the next meeting. Gomez noted two edits, one regarding her input on the public comment format and one regarding the February 28, 2019 meeting date planned for Alpine Balsam. Gomez moved to approve these amended minutes, O’Shea seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.</p>	
Agenda Item 4: Library Policy Update	[0:02:21 Audio min.]
<p>a. Public Hearing: draft Computer Use and Internet Safety Policy – since the policy was last reviewed in 2017, there have been additional filters to the wireless internet. Schumm noted that the library is fully compliant with the Federal Children’s Internet Protection Act (CIPA), meaning potential eligibility for the FCC’s E-rate funding. This funding would be more necessary in the event of districting when the library might not be getting its internet service through the City. Teter asked for an explanation of E-rate. Schumm clarified that it is a government subsidy for hardware, fiber, etc. - up to 90% discount for those who qualify, many schools take advantage of it. This year, it didn’t appear advantageous considering the low rates already obtained through the City. O’Shea asked about the City’s charge for internet and Aimee replied that it is a minimal charge determined by bandwidth. Schumm noted that in a district scenario, she might research the possibility of “piggybacking” off BVSD – partnerships are encouraged with E-rate. Staff welcomed commission questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P. 7 at the bottom – Koenig asked for clarification about the juveniles without a library card getting a guest pass to use the computers – does a guardian supervise? Aimee said that is recommended if there is a need but not enforced. • Schumm explained that the filter is set on server level through Cisco, based on categories reviewed by the leadership team (e.g., dark web, pornography). Teter suggested an additional line “if you want more information about the kinds of sites the library filters, contact...” to direct those who are curious about the filter categories. O’Shea asked about filter levels through ConnectBoulder and the actual library computers. Schumm: these are filtered to the same degree. She would like to have filtering be controlled at the patron station as opposed to needing to submit IT HelpDesk ticket. A patron can only log into a PC appropriate for their age (determined by “patron type” in the library card code). • En Español links: Gomez asked about the source of the “terrible” translation she found through following website link, volunteering herself to edit grammar. Phares noted that there are translators used 	

by the City who could also be recruited to assist. Teter: this falls in alignment with the master plan goals for further outreach to Latinx community.

- P. 8 – O’Shea questioned whether there have been complaints about juvenile access to the systems. Farnan noted that he has heard parental complaints about websites that are mostly gaming and dating sites, not illegal sites. O’Shea voiced his comfort with the wording. O’Shea moved to accept the policy as adjusted (adding the direction to more information about the filtering system), Koenig seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.
- b. Review preliminary changes to the library rules of conduct and examples of rules prohibiting use of abusive and derogatory language – Phares explained that the documents provided are “first blush” for commission review. Teter remembered from the last conversation that the reason that we could not enforce was due to not having the right language, and this necessitated creating a rule and not a policy, “so we’re in rule land.” The commission agreed. Teter noted confusion with the present organization of the rules. Would it make sense to call out disruptive behavior separately? Phares remembered that the disruptive piece was the overview since it is overarching “blanket” that can be used for most situations. Farnan clarified that general is often better than specific when defending a suspension. CAO recommended removing references to things that were too broad and couldn’t be applied in the law, eschewing overgeneralizations. Farnan noted his understanding that it is a subjective decision to place an item in the rules or the overview. Koenig asked if this draft incorporates staff input and Phares replied just leadership team so far. After commission input, she will review with staff and CAO; a draft will return for commission review in March. Sykes Wilson recommended “bullying” language inclusion. Teter suggested including “gestures” and “intimidating” from the Lafayette examples. She leans toward paragraph format as opposed to the list, as this seems to have more emphasis. The commission agreed. Phares noted she will also bring an updated suspension form in March.
- Teter asked about the “terms of use” referenced in the second rule – she recommended adding this to the list of definitions.
 - Gomez- regarding the service animal policy, definition, and licensing requirements; Phares noted just ADA accepted animals which includes dogs and ponies. Staff explained that it can only ask what service the animal provides. If reasonable answer, and the animal is not disruptive, that is fine. If they do not have a reasonable answer, they are told that they are welcome but their animal is not. If the animal is not controlled, the person has to leave. Sykes Wilson asked about Seeds; reply – same as rest of library.
 - O’Shea suggested explicitly noting marijuana consumption alongside the presently noted “tobacco products” under 5. Teter recommended revisiting this piece with CAO to better frame the boundary.
 - Right of appeal – Koenig asked whether library staff takes part in the appeal process? Farnan: yes. Initially goes through civic court (with potential appeal then to the County although that has not occurred in recent memory).
 - Gomez noted another problematic translation en Español under the Unattended Children Policy. Phares will get new translations made once the language has been finalized.

Agenda Item 5: Library Commission Update

[0:43:23 Audio min.]

a. Items from Commission

i. Discuss agenda for the March 9, 2019 Library Commission Retreat

- Teter suggested some agenda and business items by email (see [handouts](#)): 1) suggestion for discussion from CAO addressing boundaries that commissioners should keep in mind when working on the funding campaign, 2) discussion of whether there are any active projects that would be impacted by a shift to a library district (and what those impacts might be), and 3) library’s strengths and weaknesses among different user groups within the patron base and the broader community. Phares drafted a version of the retreat agenda for review. See [handouts](#). Teter clarified that item 7 was meant to refer to any positive or negative impacts to active projects, not “shift in priorities” Gomez asked whether staff feedback will be received for item 8; Phares replied yes. Would you have proposals? Reply: no, just identifying the strengths and weaknesses. Resolving weaknesses could be a later session. Gomez has a suggestion to add issue of “public input,” format of public comment so that all commissioners are on the same page with this piece that may become more routine with the upcoming projects. Phares noted that in the past, there has been a 3-minute allowance whereby secretary keeps the time and interrupts the public as needed. Previously, the chair has said that commission can choose or not to address the item later in the meeting. Often comments will pertain to the agenda. All questions and comments should be directed toward the commission. Teter noted the balance of engaging people and having a meaningful conversation. She recommended not having a commission meeting be the first time that the public is viewing something. She invited any further feedback by email.

- ii. Commissioner update on outreach to stakeholders – summarized in the commission memo by Teter (see [packet](#)).
- iii. Community education activities – Plan A/Plan B discussion
Staff’s ideas about what should be on the A/B list and how to better personalize these statistics (stories, anecdotes, pictures) to make these relatively abstract concepts real for community members. Teter noted connection to previous discussion of strengths and weaknesses; this as a “city library product” that would be on the funding webpage (potentially also “fodder for the campaign.”) Phares indicated her intention to add an item on security at all facilities to an updated draft – Teter suggested including in March packet. Although planning for additional security at the eventual NoBo branch, Phares noted that the branches don’t currently have security – their issues are similar but much more infrequent. Farnan stated that Carnegie doesn’t have a need for additional security presence. Gomez highlighted discussion of a mobile unit (bookmobile). Teter noted that in the event of a ballot measure by petition whereby county commissioners do a resolution, funding would be specified – in that context, this list will be an important piece.
- iv. Retreat Planning

- b. Boulder Library Foundation update – Teter reported that tomorrow’s meeting will continue funding request discussion. O’Shea noted ongoing effort to develop fundraising plan alongside marketing plan. Year-end letter was a success, garnering donations of ~\$18,000 so far. Sykes Wilson will be taking over O’Shea’s spot on BLF. Gomez asked if Teter is planning to stay on BLF; she replied that it is unlikely due to concentration on the upcoming campaign. Gomez queried whether a capital campaign for NoBo branch will be at cross purposes with the districting campaign; O’Shea explained that there is still some “TBD” on this integration. Teter suggested that Gomez and Koenig discuss taking on the other commission representative seat. Last meeting saw an approved RFP for the website designer; 2 responses being considered in tomorrow’s meeting. Leslie Blaser has taken on the position of administrative support as BLF staff.
- c. City project representative update
 - i. EcoDistricts
 - ii. Civic Area East Bookend
 - iii. Alpine Balsam – Gomez noted 2/28 meeting.
Gomez noted the August REFORMA meeting planned at the library; she will reach out to Seaton to reserve the space.
- d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission – in the [packet](#).

Agenda Item 6: Library and Arts Director’s Report

[1:17:16 Audio min.]

- a. Report on outcome of City Council retreat
- b. Update on library polling project – Teter requested Monday’s meeting notes to be included in March packet for tracking. Two council members recommended more time to be comfortable with the questions and to receive comments. Phone survey projected now for late March or early April with the online version running concurrently.
- c. Revised commission meeting plan – Phares will send out this week.
- d. 2019 budget increases and branch program goals – Koenig questioned the dropped patronage at GRB and Farnan replied that he would like to drill down a bit deeper to figure out the numbers. There is an aging of the population that frequents GRB.
- e. User map expanded area/city
Farnan noted that he is comfortable with the numbers indicating patron base outside the city. Main argument is matching funding base with patron base. Teter noted upcoming Valentine’s Day meeting with Kim Seter.

Agenda Item 7: Adjournment

[1:30:15 Audio min.]

Farnan invited any suggestions to help recruit library commission applicants. 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, April 3, 2019, at the Meadows Branch Library, 4800 Baseline Road, Boulder, CO 80303.

Commissioner O'Shea approved these minutes on April 3, 2019; and Celia Seaton attested to it.