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I am a reasonably well educated and mentally healthy person who is rested and housed and familiar with the system of social services, yet I struggle to understand it. I wonder how someone who has mental health issues, is addicted, is sleep-deprived and hungry can be expected to navigate this system.

Elizabeth Robinson, former Boulder Homeless Court Navigator

INTRODUCTION

This proposal to the Boulder Library Commission concerns bringing best practices to serving our homeless and other at risk populations via on-site peer navigators and licensed clinical social workers.

Libraries across the country have become de facto day shelters for people experiencing homelessness, among other vulnerable communities.\(^1\) Offering compassionate, competent, connection-focused assistance for patrons facing not only homelessness, but also housing and food insecurity, and mental health issues—such as teen suicide—would no doubt provide “information to transform lives and strengthen our community,” in keeping with the library’s mission.

Finding a way out of homelessness can be a great challenge, one our previous homeless court navigator, Elizabeth Robinson described as follows:

“I am a reasonably well educated and mentally healthy person who is rested and housed and familiar with the system of social services, yet I struggle to understand

---

it. I wonder how someone who has mental health issues, is addicted, is sleep-deprived and hungry can be expected to navigate this system."²

Robinson’s hands on approach to building relationships was much appreciated, but we propose that having to first get caught up in the criminal justice system to access such aid unnecessarily burdens both people experiencing homelessness and the carceral system. The cost alone of jailing people for minor citations, many of them homeless, is estimated to cost between $1,000,000 and $1,400,000 per year.³ Incurring a criminal record makes exiting homelessness all the more difficult because employers and landlords often perform background checks.⁴

Providing support in the library as proposed herein will not only greatly benefit at-risk patrons, but librarians and other patrons as well. Having professionals with, among other things, significant de-escalation skills, will decrease the number of potentially distressing interactions librarians experience, and increase safety for all patrons.

Boulder Homelessness: The Need And One Author’s Personal Story

It is estimated that as of January 2017, there were 600 adults and families living in homelessness within Boulder County at the time of HUD’s Point In Time count. According to the March 2019 Homeless Solutions for Boulder County (HSBC) report, 75% of this population sought services in the city of Boulder. While the national average of those living in chronic homelessness (single adults with a disability and living in homelessness for a consecutive 12 months) is around 24%, the HSBC report indicates that over 55% of those experiencing homelessness identified as being homeless for 12 consecutive months over the past three years, and 70% reported a disability.⁵

Those living in chronic homelessness are apt to tri-morbidity, or substance misuse and or a mental health condition along with a chronic medical condition. This group of unique individuals are commonly high utilizer lists within the local mental health, municipal court,

⁴ Id. at 15.
county jail, and detox. It is estimated that the costs incurred to the Denver community associated with one adult living in chronic homelessness averages around $43,000.6

My own (Livovich) personal community cost as a previously chronically homeless and high utilizer of services in Boulder was significant and provides an example of the expenses incurred by people experiencing homelessness in Boulder.

From April, 2014, to August, 2016, over a period of 28 months, I received a total of 51 charges, 46 being municipal and petty charges related to the criminalization of homelessness. I served a total of 266 nights in our county jail at a cost of $140.29 per night, for a total of $37,317.7

During the same 28 months, I spent a total of 72 nights in our local detox at $300 a night billed to our Medicaid system at a total cost of over $21,600.

Thus, just counting jail and detox, my stays cost nearly $60,000—and this does not include my ER visits and shelter stays. My story is not unique, and the need for and benefit of resources such as social workers and peer navigators in the Boulder public libraries, the subject of this paper, are significant.

BENEFITS OF LICENSED CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS

Social Workers’ Training Prepares Them To Address The Needs Of Those In Need

Licensed clinical social workers have training that make them uniquely qualified to do homeless outreach services at the library. Social work education involves intensive clinical training, including two years of supervised hands on practice under the direct supervision of a more experienced clinician. In addition, it has a focus on "systems theory"—a way of understanding that posits that a family, community, or society may have elements of pathology as well, and that to better the health of any one of those areas will improve the health of the individual and vice versa. Social workers are known for their case management skills, but case management arises out of this theoretical orientation.

Many of the homeless patrons of the library are thought to suffer from serious and persistent mental illness. Social workers are well equipped to help those suffering in this way. "Social workers are one of the five core professional groups in the mental health field. In the public and community mental health sectors, social workers have well-established expertise in working with people with serious mental illness and associated

---

6 Housing Solutions Boulder County, supra note 5.
problems. They also have a strong and emerging role in the private sector. Social workers are the second largest allied health profession providing mental health services."

Some of the major roles of social workers include:

- Identifying and reaching out to those in need.
- Assessing people's needs and implementing a plan of action.
- Helping people adjust to major life changes.  
- Responding to crisis situations.
- Connecting people with important resources and support.
- Evaluating social services and support programs.
- Providing advocacy for people when needed.
- Following up with people to ensure circumstances are improving.

**Social Workers As Outreach Workers At The Library**

The roles noted above are all integral to the functionality of the library outreach workers we propose:

1) Identifying those in need in a public space such as the library will require tact and discretion as well as trained observational skills, as those from many walks of life frequent the library.

2) Assessing needs and creating a plan of action is another important aspect of this role. The situations that homeless people face are generally multifactorial. An ability to rapidly and accurately assess a situation in such a way that the multiple constituencies that all use the library feel attended to is an outcome that social workers are uniquely positioned to deliver.

3) A library social worker can help those that are newly homeless, a devastating life change. Evidence suggests that rapid rehousing of homeless people is one of the single most effective interventions, both in terms of preventing ongoing homelessness for the individual as well as preventing ongoing expensive emergency interventions.

4) Responding to crisis situations: psychiatric social workers work in a variety of settings that address suicidality or other forms of mental health crisis, such as

---

emergency rooms and mobile psychiatric evaluation teams. In the library, the social worker could briefly assess the individual, advise about whether the Mental Health Partners crisis team or the Edge team is appropriate, coordinate the visit, as well as to coordinate communication with any collateral agencies or individuals.

5) Connecting with important resources and support: *This would be one of the most integral duties of the library social worker*, although it is important to note that forming a trusting relationship is a prerequisite for a homeless person to accept referrals. However, there are many agencies and resources in Boulder and the Denver Metro area that can provide practical assistance people experiencing homelessness, and linkage to these resources should form the focus of this role. The practical needs of people experiencing homelessness are immense and range from medical issues, mental health issues, lack of formal identification, assistance with benefits, literacy, job search, and housing search, to name a few.

The other roles that social workers can play are less central but still needed in this role. Program evaluation should be tasked to this person or persons, with benchmarks designed to count numbers of contacts, number of individuals, numbers of repeated contacts, types of services delivered, types of referrals requested and types of referrals completed. An advocacy role would likely develop naturally over time, after the social worker(s) and library staff have accumulated accurate data and can communicate their needs to city government.

It is also important to note that many individuals who use the library may not actually be homeless, but may be in crisis, suffering from addiction, mental health issues, poverty, or other serious issues like domestic violence or being a teen runaway. A staff social worker or workers can/could be used to address any of those in need of help accessing appropriate social services. A prime example of other possible benefits to having social workers on staff at the library is to provide another resource in the community for teens or others contemplating suicide, which has unfortunately become far too common in Boulder and Colorado.¹¹

---

PEER NAVIGATORS: PEOPLE WITH LIVED EXPERIENCE PLUS TRAINING UNIQUELY QUALIFIED TO ASSIST PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS

The Skills And Services Of Peer Navigators

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration (SAMHSA) defines a peer specialist as “[a] person who uses his or her lived experience in recovery from mental health illness and/or addiction, plus skills learned in formal training, to deliver services in behavioral health settings to promote mind-body recovery and resiliency.”

While this definition is specific to the behavioral health and substance abuse world, over the past decade, the roles of peer specialists have expanded into other services that include homeless shelters, the criminal justice system, education, and in community-based environments, such as public libraries.

Peer specialists/navigators require lived experiences relevant to the areas they provide support, must maintain their own recovery and overall wellness, and receive peer specialist training (80 hours). This training focuses on SAMHSA’s four dimensions to recovery: Home, Health, Community, and Purpose with core competencies in trauma informed care and strength-based, person-driven, supportive approaches.

Unlike a court navigator, peer navigators are not limited to working with high utilizers associated with specific court systems and jails. Peer navigators have the ability to work with and support anyone in need and in a variety of settings, regardless of criminal justice affiliations. They have the ability to reach those most likely to opt out of services or slip through the cracks prior to reaching high utilizer status and before incurring costly community resources. Their activities can also be organizationally tweaked to best meet current needs and support staff.

Peer Navigators Have Demonstrated Successful Outcomes In Libraries

Peer navigators provide unique insights to local resources and navigation from their own lived experiences. They provide as realistic role models and have abilities to develop rapport and establish trust with peers unlike other social service roles. Their own recovery

---


journeys can inspire and empower those they support. They are agents of change, not prescribers.

In 2015, Denver Public Library employed its first social worker to address the needs of patrons experiencing homelessness. In 2016, the library, in partnership with the Department of Justice and Denver’s Department of Human Services, employed a total of three part-time peer navigators who focus on active outreach with the library and connecting those in need with the right resources. Funds obtained in the total of $41,152 from the Justice Assistance Grant allowed the program to flourish. In 2015, a total of 434 individuals were served, and by 2016, 1265. Nearly a 200% increase.

A peer navigator at Denver Public Library who previously held various positions within the library recently described the frustration of working as a library clerk prior to becoming a peer navigator:

“As Circulation Clerks, we can find information for people but can only dedicate a limited amount of time to each person. We have to be conscious of the advice we give, we cannot fill out forms for customers nor can we touch the keyboard they may be using, which is true for customers who have never used a computer or don’t speak English. We can recommend resources but cannot navigate them for folks. These are a few of the limitations I encountered daily, which left a sour taste behind, as I wanted to help individuals but couldn’t do so to the extent that they needed.”

Elizabeth Robinson, former Boulder Municipal Court Navigator, when asked about number of clients she helped to achieve housing, shared that:

I am pretty sure it was 35 to 36 people in two years, though 7 more people I worked with got housed right after I left, so maybe it would be fair to say closer to 40 to 42. It should be acknowledged that all of that was done in collaboration with other agencies- Colorado Coalition for the Homeless, sometimes Mental Health Partners, often the Shelter or Lee Hill, sometimes Boulder Housing Partners. As for the library, I would say that I very often went there to find people, as it was the most reliable place for tracking people down, and that the library is the only place most people can check Facebook and email. Facebook has been a central way that I’ve been able to keep in touch with people for purposes of letting them know when their medical/mental health/court appointments are or helping them with I.D. So,

---

The library is not only a safe haven, it is a central and practical resource for those experiencing homelessness.

The library is in a unique position to connect with those most likely to opt out of services and experience tri-morbidity, including addiction. Peer navigators can connect with this population and provide support and information regarding resources pertaining to treatment and other identified needs while inspiring hope.

**SUMMARY**

The Boulder public library system is one of the few spaces our homeless community finds refuge on a daily basis. People experiencing homelessness suffer greatly, and while the Boulder municipal court system aims to provide assistance to them once they enter the criminal justice system, such as by offering the services of a court homeless navigator, providing similar or expanded services at the library removes the requirement that they be arrested or given citations before getting help accessing complicated but beneficial resources.

Licensed social workers and peer navigators would possess applicable experience, education, and knowledge to assist people experiencing homelessness, as well as other vulnerable community members, in positive ways that current staff, while perhaps willing, are not as equipped to do. Having such professionals employed at the library would not only provide available aid to those in great need of assistance in a non-threatening environment, but would very likely reduce tension between such persons and other library patrons and staff.

It is quite likely the cost of providing these services in the library would represent an overall savings to the city of Boulder. This is supported by the fact that we spend tens of thousands of dollars for just one person experiencing homelessness who may go through court, jail, detox, and the emergency room, as one of our authors did routinely in her 28 months homeless in Boulder.

Exiting homelessness is a difficult and arduous effort for many in our community. These community members find solace and respite in our libraries, and we ask that you strongly consider providing resources in the form of licensed social workers and peer navigators skilled at working with and providing aid to them.
Hi, all -

I plan to speak at public comment at tomorrow's meeting tomorrow to share some draft documents with the Library Commission. Several Council members suggested that it would be helpful to have recommendations on how to address key issues in the library district IGA. On behalf of Boulder Library Champions, I've prepared a memo with IGA recommendations, based on past discussions of Library Commissions. The memo is in 4 parts:

1. IGA recommendations and rationale.
2. Comparative timeline for formation of a district (by resolution or petition).
3. Summary history of capital expenditures on each library facility over time, with a brief history of each facility's evolution.
4. Summary of Boulder County funding for BPL.

I would appreciate Library Commission's review and input on this memo before submitting it to Council and the City Manager later this month.

Thanks, and see you tomorrow.

Joni Teter
DRAFT Memorandum

To: Boulder City Council
   Boulder Library Commission

cc: City Manager Jane Brautigam
    City Attorney Tom Carr & Deputy City Attorney David Gehr
    Library Director David Farnan

From: Boulder Library Champions

Date: December 4, 2019

Subject: Timeline & Recommendations on Key Issues in the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for a Boulder Library District

First, congratulations to all of the new Council members, and welcome back to returning members. We are excited to work with you in the coming year and are optimistic that this year, working together, we can finally resolve our library’s funding woes.

As you know, Boulder Library Champions circulated petitions to get the question of forming a library district on the 2019 ballot. The County Elections Clerk certified our signatures and provided a statement of sufficiency on June 20, 2019. The City Manager asked us to withdraw our petition until 2020 to give Council more time to work through issues associated with forming a library district. In exchange, staff committed to recommend that “exploring sustainable library funding, including a potential library district, [be] a council work plan priority in 2020.” The previous Council reviewed and agreed to this plan on June 18, 2019. We understand that Jane has included this item on the January 17-18 Council planning retreat, and we appreciate staff’s follow-through.

Over the past several years, we’ve spent a lot of time studying the issues surrounding library funding, including thorough analysis of library district operations and what is required to transition to a district. Last summer, we prepared in-depth analyses of Boulder’s over-subscribed budget, our library’s funding needs, and how a library district can help with both problems. During the City Council campaign, we held two public meetings to spark community conversation, and met with every Council candidate to share what we know and answer candidate questions. We pledge to continue to serve as a resource to Council members as you collectively dive into these issues.

The immediate question you face is whether to choose to form a library district by resolution, or have voters decide the issue in November 2020. (The question of funding for the library district will be decided by voters regardless of how the district is formed.) In either case, Council must enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the County Commissioners to address central aspects of library district operations and to establish terms of transition from a municipal public library to a district public library.

We believe that forming a library district by resolution is the best approach. In this scenario, Council and the County Commissioners will appoint library district trustees and negotiate an IGA before the community votes on funding in 2020. This strategy gives Council and the community time to work through questions of transition and funding before the election. Having an IGA in place before the 2020 election gives the community certainty before the vote.
If the district is formed through petition/ballot, funding must be provided to the district by January 1 following the election. In this scenario, Council and the County Commissioners must appoint trustees shortly after the election and negotiate the IGA within 90 days.

Attached is a concurrent timeline, outlining required steps and dates by which major actions must be taken when forming a district by resolution versus petition/ballot (Appendix A).

Several candidates and past Council members suggested that it would be helpful if we provided recommendations on how to address key issues in the IGA. Those recommendations are outlined below. We are always available to answer questions and would be happy to discuss these recommendations in more detail.

I. Library Facilities

A. Transfer of Existing Library Facilities

In its November 27, 2019 memo to Council, staff summarized the ways in which library facilities can be conveyed to the district:

- Deed library buildings, properties, and other assets to the library district at no cost, minimal annual cost, or one-time cost.
- Lease library buildings and properties to the library district at a determined rate such as, fair market value, original cost, or a different rate set by council.”

We believe that library facilities should be transferred to the district at no cost, for several reasons.

1. Building our library system has truly been a community effort. All library facilities were developed, and their underlying sites purchased, with funds specifically designated for library purposes. These funds were obtained through direct citizen action; community votes; community donations and bequests; excise taxes/impact fees; and state/federal grants. Our library system was built by our community and library facilities will remain in service to our community as part of a library district.

Community members obtained funding for our first library, the Carnegie branch. Carnegie’s major renovation (1984) was funded entirely through community contributions and grants. The George Reynolds branch was built with funding from a bequest, community contributions, and federal grants designated for library construction. Bond measures to construct and expand Main (1959, 1971 and 1987), Reynolds (1987), and Meadows (1987) were on the ballot through Library Commission initiative and direct citizen action. The community voted funding or a major renovation of Main in 2011, and construction of a NoBo branch in 2017. Appendix B contains an overview of each library facility’s funding history.

Although residents of the unincorporated county could not vote on library funding measures, they contributed sales tax dollars by shopping in the city. Until the mid-1990s, Boulder was the County’s retail center and county residents had few options to shop elsewhere. Both County and in-city residents made substantial direct contributions of money, time and materials to grow and maintain our library system, The County Commissioners also contributed funding to the Boulder library system to help pay for county users from from the mid-1940s until 1989. (Boulder and other municipal libraries regularly complained that the County’s financial contributions were insufficient to cover library use by County residents. Appendix C contains a summary of Boulder County funding for our library from 1946-1989.)
2. The first City Charter (1918) established the Library Commission, and gave the Commission responsibility to control the public library and administer gifts made to the library. Title to property obtained on the library’s behalf (by any means) was vested in the City, with the Commission to “take charge of and have the management and custody” of the property.” In the words of a 1956 city attorney opinion, library properties are “held in trust by the City for the use of the People for library purposes.” These charter provisions remained in effect until 2015, when voters approved Charter amendments (initiated by the Library Commission) reflecting the Commission’s current role as an advisory body. All of our existing library facilities were constructed/expanded before the 2015 change.

3. We want to empower the library district to use creative tools to meet our community’s future library capital needs. Ownership of property puts the library district in the best position to pursue capital contributions, grants and public-private partnerships. Grantors are reluctant to give large capital gifts to leased facilities. Private and non-profit organizations need certainty when entering into facility use and revenue sharing arrangements (which city policies currently restrict). Long term control is essential if we want our library to continue its long term - and very successful - history of leveraging tax dollars with private contributions and grants.

4. In our extensive review of Colorado library districts, we learned that deed transfer or a very long lease (typically 99 years), for a token price ($1/year) was the approach taken by almost all communities. In communities with multiple branches, transfer agreements were sometimes negotiated site-by-site, reflecting broader community interests in specific parcels or who has responsibility for long term maintenance. We think this approach makes sense for Boulder.

   If one or more buildings is transferred through a long term lease, that lease could include a clause that the building would revert back to the city, or the city has a first right of refusal on disposition of the property, if it ever ceases to function as a library. In this scenario, the district would assume all maintenance and backlog and insurance for that building going forward.

B. Transfer of the NoBo Branch

Like existing library facilities, it makes sense to transfer ownership of the NoBo land and building to the district. The site was donated to the city for library purposes. Design and construction is being paid for with sales tax revenues voted by the community for a NoBo branch; development excise taxes and impact fees designated for future library construction; Library Fund moneys (which can only be used for library purposes - see below); and community donations.

C. Responsibility for Capital and Ongoing Maintenance Needs for Library Facilities

Assuming that the library district has long term control over library properties, it makes sense to put financial responsibility for ongoing maintenance, the maintenance backlog and future capital needs on the library district. Our library buildings are aging, and heavy usage has created a lot of wear-and-tear. All library patrons have benefited from use of these facilities over the years, and contributed to the wear and tear. It is equitable for all library patrons to contribute towards the costs of repair - city taxpayers should not bear this cost burden alone. The library district would spread costs among ~ 90% of patrons, providing the most equitable means to fund the maintenance backlog, ongoing maintenance and future capital and operating costs.

   The current estimate for the library’s facility maintenance backlog is about $5 million (including soft costs. GKB estimated $800,000/year to address over this backlog over 5 years. Library

\[1\] Fort Collins offers a good example of this approach.
facilities represent ~25% of City's maintenance backlog. Library staff are currently updating the library's Facilities Sustainability Study (last completed in 2009) and FAM is currently preparing a master plan for all city facilities. Cost estimates are likely to increase with further analysis of building deficiencies and rising construction costs. Appendix B also includes an overview of capital maintenance needs (backlog and future) for each library facilities, based on current understanding.

Responsibility for maintenance of exterior grounds is best addressed on a case-by-case basis. Reynolds and Carnegie are free-standing buildings with no other municipal uses nearby. Placing responsibility for maintenance of landscaping and parking lots on the library district makes sense. The new NoBo branch is adjacent to a neighborhood park, and Main is surrounded by the Civic Area park and municipal parking lots. Both the city and the library district will have important interests in exterior maintenance, and the IGA should clearly define who is responsible for what.

II. The Library Fund and DET/Impact Fees

The library fund was established in the 1918 charter to hold contributions and bequests to the library, library grants, and proceeds from the sale of library property. As staff noted in its November 27, 2019 memo:

Library monetary assets in the Library Fund and any other funds that have been collected for the library (e.g. Development Excise Tax, Impact fees, proceeds from the sale of the Blystat-Laesar House, and direct contribution from the Library Fund to Facilities Renovation and Replacement (FRR) would be transferred to the library district.

We agree with staff's analysis. The 1918 charter provided for an appropriation of not less than ⅓ of a mill in property taxes which was dedicated to the library. The charter established a Library Fund into which proceeds from the .333 mill levy were deposited, along with all other moneys “collected by the librarian or that may be derived by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise, for library purposes.” This provision was not materially changed in the 2015 charter amendments.

III. Transition of Employees

Great library staff make a great library system - and we have the best. Our community is fortunate to library staff who knowledgeable, skilled and dedicated to serving our community’s needs. It is critically important that transition to a library district be as seamless as possible. The IGA should ensure that library employees retain their current jobs, salaries & benefits, and that that the district will continue to pay a living wage. Retirement benefits (PERA) would stay with employees, while the liabilities associated with paying pensions shifting to the library district.

Some library staff are members of the Boulder Municipal Employees Association (BMEA) and their eligibility to continue as a BMEA members (should they choose to do so), is a question that needs to researched. Forming a district by resolution would allow time for research and negotiations to occur before the district is established. Library staff deserve straight talk about what transition to a library district would mean to them, and we recommend that the library director be empowered to have frank discussions with staff about transition to a district early in the new year.

IV. Administrative overhead

Our library's 2020 operating budget is about $9.1 million. This amount does not include funding for capital projects (backlogged and new), nor does it reflect all administrative overhead costs. The city provides the following administrative services for the library, paid for from the general fund: payroll, human resources HR, finance, information technology (IT),
facilities maintenance, communication, legal, insurance and city council/board support. Last year, the city put a price of $3.4 million on these services, which provides a reasonable ballpark estimate of administrative costs to operate a library district. (The $3.4 million was benchmarked against costs incurred for similar services by other Colorado library districts.)

The transition will be most seamless if the library district contracts back to the city for most administrative services, paying through hourly billing or at a negotiated rate. Legal counsel must be separately retained by the district, and the district would likely want its financial officer. Payroll, HR, facilities maintenance and IT could be provided by the city for the first 2-3 years. During that time, the city and district could explore which services might be provided to the district on a long term basis, and which services might be more effectively provided through other means.

For example, the district may operate most effectively if it pays the city for use of cable fiber, while maintaining its own IT services. City policies computer/tablet acquisition/replacement limit library program opportunities and don’t always meet patron needs. The library also loses grant opportunities under current city IT practices (including $75,000/year from the State’s E-Rate assistance program for libraries and schools). Our library’s community outreach is also limited by the city’s website and policies around use of social media. The district may also wish to make its own arrangements for ongoing maintenance (janitorial services and small repairs) to get service better suited to the library facilities’ heavy public use at lower cost.

During the 2-3 year transition period, the district could put all administrative services out to bid to evaluate the best and most cost effective options. Results could be shared with the city, and could be helpful in finding efficiencies within the city’s “cost allocation services.”

**Conclusion**

Forming a library district is the best path forward to fulfill our community’s vision for 21st century library services. The Boulder Library District offers a sustainable, predictable and equitable funding model to meet current demand and to fulfill our community’s aspirations for the future. A library district enhances taxpayer accountability because its leadership is focused solely on the library. The Board of Trustees is accountable to all patrons, (not just city residents), and budgets are transparent and accessible (with annual reports required to taxpayers and establishing entities). A library district would also free up General Fund dollars that the city can allocate to other priorities.

We hope that this information is helpful as you consider formation of a library district by resolution in the spring of 2020. We are available for questions and conversation and look forward to working with you on this exciting opportunity.
Appendix A
Timeline for Formation of a Boulder Library District
# Appendix A
## Library District Formation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>District Creation by Council Action</th>
<th>District Creation by Petition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder County Elections Clerk issued a statement of sufficiency to secure an election based on signatures submitted by petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2020</td>
<td>Resolutions by City Council and County Commissioners to form library district</td>
<td>Public hearings are required before adoption of the resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petitioners re-start petition drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution components: describe legal service area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and provide that electors must approve proposed mill levy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint initial board of library district trustees (5 or 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain legal counsel for district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-May 2020 (w/in 90 days after Council’s resolution)</td>
<td>Establishing entities and Trustees enter into Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)</td>
<td>Negotiations between petitioners and establishing entities re: district boundaries and mill levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish deadline for district to obtain voter approval for funding (2-3 election cycles is typical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>District Creation by Council Action</td>
<td>District Creation by Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Terms for transition of library services to district: | - Library district board appointment and its powers, duties and responsibilities (w/in statutory boundaries)  
- Allocation of monetary and capital assets, including conveyance of library real and personal property  
- Transfer of municipal employees to the district (salary, benefits transfer, district assumes PERA obligations)  
- Transitional funding (for first year, while property taxes are being collected) and internal service provision  
- Internal services (if any) provided by contract from the city  
- “Generally providing for a mutually beneficial relationship or separation as parties desire” | Petitioners re-submit petitions and request a place on 2020 ballot |
| May 1, 2020      |                                     | County provides City with written notice of petition | City may choose to create district with County, allow petition to proceed or opt out (30 days before County creates ballot title) |
| June-July 2020  |                                     | County Commissioners may create the library district by separate resolution | |
| August 1-30, 2020 | County Commissioners place library district funding question on ballot | County Commissioners place 1 or 2 questions on ballot:  
- District formation  
- District funding through property tax levy | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>District Creation by Council Action</th>
<th>District Creation by Petition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2020 (election day)</td>
<td>Voters approve formation of the district</td>
<td>Establishing entities must appoint board of trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2021</td>
<td>Deadline to provide funding for a library district after a successful election</td>
<td>Deadline to provide funding for a library district after a successful election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2020-January 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written IGA completed within 90 days of trustee selection (see rows 9-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2021</td>
<td>Ballot question: changes to City charter required to reflect change in library governance:</td>
<td>Charter changes include elimination of the . 333 mill property tax levy established for library purposes in 1907, enshrined in the charter in 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Section 69 - Department of Library and Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Section 130 - General provisions concerning advisory commissions. Remove references to the library commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Section 132 - Library commission established. Section 133 - Powers and duties of library commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Section 134 - Library fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Carnegie Building

The Carnegie Branch Library is an historic 4,000 square foot facility located at 1125 Pine St. in central Boulder. It is a specialty branch housing a collection of local historic materials. Built in 1907, Carnegie is the oldest building in the library portfolio.

Today, Carnegie has structural deficiencies, a failing boiler, and is in need of interior renovation and maintenance. The roof was replaced in 2006. Carnegie’s space capacity has been exceeded, and there is need for modern archival storage (on or off-site). The hours that Carnegie is open to the public were substantially reduced five years ago to allow staff to work on digitization of documents and photos (a move that will reduce space demands and make the collection more readily accessible to the community).

2018 appraisal
Building: $893,000
Land: $643,000 (site is 5588 sq ft, includes 2 parking spaces on alley)
Parking: Retain two on-street spaces
• One handicapped space, not reserves for library use, not general use and frequently full all day
• One loading space dedicated to Carnegie, informally shared with Museum of Boulder

CARNEGIE LIBRARY
Estimated Market Value = $1,534,900

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION For the purposes of this report the Carnegie Library includes one building and one parcel of land.

ZONING RH-2 Residential High 2

BUILDING VALUE Adopted value of the building: $892,299

LAND VALUE One parcel of land included the building and 2 parking spaces off the alley. Estimated value of the Land: $642,620 (5,588 sq ft X $115/sq ft)

TOTAL VALUE $1,534,919 rounded to $1,534,900

Building the entire building
Land the parcel of land that includes the entire building and the 2 off-alley parking spaces
Zoning RH-2 Residential High Density 2
Carnegie Opportunities and Constraints

Known capital maintenance issues that remain unaddressed today include:

• Brick & stone site walls are deteriorated.
• There are voids in the crawlspace brickwork that should be filled and mortar joints that need repointing.
• The stone cornice should be re-flashed to improve drainage.

Boulder Public Library Facilities Sustainability Study

• The brick parapet has deteriorated. While it is currently protected by sheet metal flashing, the HSA recommends repairing the parapet and installing a stone cap to match the original.
• The wood windows and trim need repainting. The HSA recommends matching the original ivory/tan color as documented in historic photographs.
• The pine flooring in the main reading room was patched with oak. The HSA recommends refinishing the floor and replacing the patches with pine to match the original.

An Historic Structure Assessment prepared in 2005 summarized Carnegie’s major programmatic issues. The Executive Summary concluded that:

“Perhaps the most intractable problem is that the building has reached a point on the interior that there is no additional archive space available to provide for the future expansion of the library’s collections. The site is so tight that there are no viable alternatives for an addition. An addition on the roof would be very difficult to achieve due to the very significant negative effect on the historic character of the library. The same problem exists on the interior; it would be disastrous (from the point of view of architectural integrity) to add a mezzanine in the large reading room. One excellent possibility is to dig a full basement under the building; another is to transfer collections and/or departments to an off-site location.” (Historic Structure Assessment SHF#2003-HA-083 – The Carnegie Branch Library, Boulder, p. 7)

The 2018 Library Master Plan found:

Long-term obstacles to the Carnegie’s function as a local history archive include limited space, limited resources, and the difficulty of inserting archival-grade climatic controls into a historic structure. Ongoing digitization projects and offsite storage of digitized material are the best options for reducing the space pressure on the Branch. identifies three major goals for the Carnegie Branch:

2018 Master Plan goals for Carnegie include:

• Create a facility restoration plan for the Carnegie Library for Local History.
• Acquire additional archival storage.
• Create a Carnegie library program plan to identify major programmatic and building system needs, develop cost estimates and identify funding to address them, supporting Carnegie’s role as the conservator of Boulder’s history.

Summary of Carnegie Capital Expenditures
& Funding To Date

1869-1907
Various community groups operated Boulder’s public reading room. Funds were generated through various forms of fundraising with occasional donations from City Council.

1903
After five years of unsuccessful attempts to persuade the city to build a public library, the Library Board obtained a pledge from Andrew Carnegie to construct a library building. The promised grant came with conditions: the city had to pledge sufficient operating funds provide a suitable site to build the library.

1904
City Council allocated $1500 (.333 mills in property tax) in ongoing operating costs for the public library. Hoping to avoid costs to buy land, council offered to build the library next to the jail. This site was rejected by Carnegie.

1905
The current site on Pine Street was purchased at a cost of $2,750.

1907
The Library Board oversaw construction of the building and the new public library opened in February, 1907, at cost of $14,137.15. paid for with a $15,000 donation from Andrew Carnegie.

1918
Boulder’s City Charter was adopted by voters on the third try. The Charter established the Library Commission, and gave the Commission responsibility to control the public library and administer gifts made to the library. The 1/3 of a mill in property taxes was included, dedicated to the library. The Charter also established a Library Fund into which proceeds from the .333 mill levy were deposited, along with all other moneys collected by the librarian or that may be derived by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise, for library purposes. Title to property obtained on the library’s behalf (by any means) was vested in the City, with the Commission to “take charge of and have the management and custody” of the property.”
1932
The City addressed some major structural problems in the building - a sagging southwest corner and cracks in the foundation - but lacked funds to address other issues (including a leaking roof, failing boiler, and windows in need of replacement).

1934
Repairs to the Carnegie building were performed through an initiative by the Women’s Club, facilitated by CWA labor. Improvements included roof repairs, new steps for the front of the building and a lighting system.

1945
The community passed a bond measure to build a new city hall with a wing for the library and space for the Historical Society Museum.

1946
The Library Commission decided not to replace a failing furnace because they expected the Carnegie building to be used for only a few more years.

1949
An inspection of the library building revealed that extensive repairs were needed to the roof and east wall (which was in danger of collapse). The city attorney assured the Library Commission that the city would pay for repairs. Later that year, the council voted a maximum of $2500 to pay for repair of the east wall.

1951
The new city hall was under construction, without the library and museum space. A new city manager city proposed to build a separate library building for a cost of $85,000. The Library Commission reviewed plans and determined that the space was too small and facilities inadequate.

1953
Repairs to the Carnegie building were estimated at ~$3000, and the Library Commission asked the city for help. They were told by the city manager that no money was available for Carnegie building repairs.

1959
The community passed a $450,000 bond issue to fund the new library by 62%. The bond was initiated by the Library Commission and placed on the ballot through a community campaign.

1961
The library vacated the Carnegie building, moving into the newly constructed space at 9th and Canyon.
1979
Council approved use of the Carnegie building as a local history archive, managed as part of the library system. The library and Library Foundation launched a major fundraising campaign to pay for renovation costs.

1980-1984
Total cost for renovation were around $340,000, paid for entirely through grants and community contributions.

2005
An Historic Structure Assessment identified long-term obstacles to Carnegie's function as a local history archive, including limited space, limited resources, and the difficulty of inserting archival-grade climatic controls into a historic structure.

2006
The Carnegie Building roof was replaced in 2006. JENN: THIS NOTE IS FROM THE 2018 MASTER PLAN. HOW WAS ROOF REPLACEMENT FUNDED?

2007
$350,0000 from sale of the Blystadt Laeser house (Library Fund) was allocated to restore the foundation and dig a basement beneath Carnegie for archive and storage.

2009
The library completed a Facilities’ Sustainability Study for all library facilities, and multiple issues were identified for Carnegie. $276,000 was allocated that year for exterior repairs at Carnegie: $171,000 from State Historical Fund and $105,000 from library operating dollars set aside for capital maintenance (the Facility Renovation and Replacement Fund). JENN - WERE HVAC IMPROVEMENTS PART OF THIS WORK?

SEE 2018 MP NOTE, BELOW
P. 21 Carnegie Library Building Improvements
During the past ten years, renovations and major repairs were completed to the exterior of the Carnegie Library for Local History. Interior improvements including an HVAC upgrade and construction of basement were also completed.
The total for these renovations was $290,000 which was partially funded by a Colorado State Historical Society grant and the City’s General Fund. Is this the final cost? CIP only include projected costs.

2013
The city’s Capital Improvement Program included masonry repairs at Carnegie as an unfunded need at an estimated cost of $275,000.

Main Library

At 93,000 square feet, [2009 Facilities Plan] the Main Library contains over 75% of the library’s collection and over 80% of the library system’s square footage. The Main Library is a 93,000 square feet building located at 1001 Arapahoe. The building was constructed in three stages, beginning with what is now the North Wing (at 9th and Canyon).

1961: The North Wing, on the corner of 9th and Canyon - 23,899 sq. ft.

1974: First extension across Boulder Creek - 14,680 sq. ft.


2018 appraisal
Land and building $24,073,000 - 88,672 sq. ft.

Building only $17,305,000
South parcel $5,046,000 (50,464 sq. ft.)
South plaza and drop-off $1,721,600 (17,216 sq. ft)

No land on the north side of Boulder Creek was included in the appraisal.
North Wing Opportunities & Constraints

The North Wing’s first floor contains the Canyon Theater (225 seat auditorium), an open-plan art gallery that serves as exhibit space for community art and receptions, a small meeting room, the Small Business Development Center, the BLDG 61 Maker Space and the Channel 8 studio. The second floor has offices for Boulder Reads and the city’s Arts program.

The North Wing has functional deficiencies and is in need of upgrades in critical areas including mechanical, electrical, and energy systems. The boiler has exceeded its functional lifespan and is in need of replacement. The roof was last replaced in 1999. Rooftop HVAC units were replaced in the 1992 renovation, and the auditorium Air Handling Unit was replaced in 2006.

The North Wing and its site also present a variety of redevelopment challenges. In a 2016 joint meeting between the Library Commission and the Landmarks Board, the following issues were identified and discussed.

**Flood constraints** (both high hazard and floodplain). A detailed analysis of flood risks and potential mitigation for the Main library was conducted as part of the Civic Area West Bookend study in the spring of 2015.
Portions of the north and south wings of the library, along with the connecting bridge, are located within the High Hazard Zone. As a result, according to city regulations, the entire library building is subject to requirements which prohibit expansion of the footprint, an increase in square footage, and the level of improvements that can be made to the building. Flood mitigation improvements to the existing structure could be implemented to enhance safety and lower flood risks.

City flood utility staff advised that higher risks north of the creek suggest limitations on assembly type uses in the North Wing. “For example, a regularly used performance/assembly space creates a higher risk to life safety and is a use that is less appropriate for this location. More informal uses such as a seating space for the café and small community groups have a lower risk potential. This leads to a recommendation that consideration be given to relocate these uses elsewhere in the long-term as part of facilities planning and the update to the Library Master Plan.”

**Height restrictions, flood requirements and zoning setbacks** work together to limit the developable bulk and footprint of the site. Flood regulations require that the building be elevated above current grades. Setbacks limit the ability to move the building north (farther away from the flood zone). The North Wing is already two stories, and the low elevation of adjacent Boulder Creek (where height limits would be measured) reduces the effective building height.

**Bringing this nearly 60 year old building up to modern green building standards** ((30% better than IECC 2012 IBC International Building Code 2012) will require extensive and expensive work (including electrical systems, HVAC, lighting, insulation, and windows).
Historic value. The North Wing, attached bridge and 1974 addition (now part of the south wing) are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. An historic district could be created with these buildings plus the already landmarked Municipal Building. Landmarking could help with flood issues, because FEMA permits some exemptions for historic buildings. At the same time, landmarking could complicate renovation by limiting what would be done with exterior walls and building height.

Canyon Theater
The Canyon Theater is underutilized due to lack of staffing for equipment and fixed seating/fixed stage which limit possible uses the fixed floor plan. During the 2018 library master planning process, some ideas for renovation of the North Wing were explored. Replacing the sloping floor, permanent seating and permanent stage with a multipurpose space that would open opportunities for a variety of community uses. The 2018 Library Master Plan identifies upgrading or reconfiguring the Canyon Theater as a +5 years priority. A study to determine the feasibility of renovating the North Wing was funded in the 2019 budget at $105,000 from [impact fees? or Library Fund?]

---

1 North Wing eligibility is under criterion A (association with events that have made a contribution to broad patterns of history) and criterion C (as a characteristic type and period of architecture associated with renowned local architect James Hunter). The 1974 addition is also eligible under criteria A & C, per criterion G for buildings less than 50 years in age.)
BLDG 61
The 2018 Master Plan also identifies expansion of the BLDG 61 Makerspace +5years priority.

ARE THERE ANY MAINTENANCE BACKLOG ISSUES TO CALL OUT FOR MAIN?
see note below

2015 CIP - unfunded needs
Remodeling and refurnishing several areas of the Main Library, including the second floor areas and bridge, relocation of the Arapahoe entrance, addition of 1,000 sq ft. to the second floor, renovating the basement and north wing, and various HVAC and minor repairs. Estimated cost $5,347,900 plus $10,620 O&M.

South Wing Opportunities & Constraints
The South Wing contains the children’s library, teen space, reading rooms, meeting rooms, computer area, stacks, public restrooms and staff offices, with storage and the automated book sorter in the basement.

A major renovation of the South Wing was completed in 2015. The North Wing has functional deficiencies and is in need of upgrades in critical areas including mechanical, electrical, and energy systems. The automated book sorters must be replaced every ten years, and Main's book sorter will need to be replaced ~2027 at an estimated cost of

Flood constraints
Most of the 1974 addition and the northernmost portion of the 1992 addition are in the High Hazard Zone. The entire South Wing is in the 100 year floodplain.

The Civic Area West Bookend study included analysis of some potential development opportunities and how flood improvements might make more of the site developable. This analysis looked at opportunities for structured parking, and additional buildings west and east of the present Main library.

“Structured parking that could accommodate 300-400 spaces, wrapped with a building for other uses (such as for the West Senior Center or relocated/expanded Library space) is possible west of the Main Library on Arapahoe. This would require relocation of existing housing on the site, which based on its current configuration is prone to flood risk. This potential approach would both support a continued or increased program of activity while improving flood safety through site reconfiguration and the relocation of existing surface parking spaces, consistent with the adopted Civic Area Master Plan.
Future redevelopment opportunities also exist just east of the library along Arapahoe Ave. This opportunity would allow for a possible consolidated library campus south of the creek should the library consider this to be a desired option in the future.”

These improvements assume flood improvements are made to the Gregory Creek Drainage Channel and relocation of the existing 14 unit housing facility between Main and the Señor Center.

Historic status
he 1974 addition is eligible for listing in the National Register. The 1992 addition is not eligible for listing.

Summary of Main Library Expenditures, Estimated Costs & Funding Sources

1961
The 28,300 square foot new public library (now the North Wing) was completed in 1961 at a cost of $499,400. Funding came from the Library Commission-initiated 1959 bond issue for $450,000 bond issue (passed by 62%), a bequest from community member Nell Buckingham to furnish the adult reading room; a $500 gift from the “combined service clubs;” interest on library financial investments; sales tax refunds; and the general fund (primarily for running water and sewer lines).

1974
In 1974, a 14,680 square foot was completed for $795,000, paid for with $555,000 from a bond election initiated jointly by the Library Commission and the city. Funding above the grant amount included $165,000 from revenue sharing dollars and $75,000 from a federal grant. The two-story addition was built on the south side of Boulder Creek, connected to the North Wing by a bridge elevated above the floodplain on pillars clad in glazed tile. The addition included a children's library, media center (where people could listen to music, view visual media or use a darkroom), public meeting space. The new public access television studio (which the Library Commission had overseen since 1972) was also located on the second floor.

The Boulder Public Library Foundation was incorporated in 1974 by the Library Commission “to help you help your library through tax-exempt gifts.”

1987
After a months-long battle between Council and the Library Commission, a .38% sales tax increase with a $14 million bond was placed on the ballot and passed by 63%. The Sales tax increase was dedicated to library purposes through 2011, with an agreement that the library would pay the city $250,00 per year for administrative services. Projects listed on the ballot issue included expansion of the Main library; renovations and expansion of the Reynolds Branch; interior construction costs for the new Meadows Branch (in development review at the time); and operational funding to
restore library hours and buy more books. Funding for a Gunbarrel branch was dropped during negotiations with Council prior to the vote. The Library Foundation conducted polling in 1986 to gauge support for the ballot measure, and spent $4000 on the election campaign.

1988
A fight over location of the Main library expansion divided the community. The city manager, library director and Library Commission wanted to create a second 40,000 sq. ft. “main library” at the (then vacant) Watts Hardy Dairy site. The Planning Department, Planning Board and downtown businesses wanted the Main library to be expanded downtown, strengthening the city’s central core. When council voted (6 to 3) to accept the Watts Hardy proposal, a citizens group formed and successfully petitioned on the ballot to keep the expansion downtown. The community voted to keep Main downtown by 58% in a December special election.

1992
The Main expansion was completed in 1992 at a cost of $11,037,500. The work included a 55,385 square foot addition and a 38,507 square foot renovation of the North Wing and 1974 addition. The North Wing’s open plan, central stacks area was reconstructed as the current 225 seat auditorium with a reception area/exhibit space in the entry. The Library Foundation purchased computer equipment and funded some renovation construction services, painting, information systems consulting, the auditorium curtain and plants for the library.

2008 CIP
The Main library roof was replaced at a cost of $511,000, funded from library operating dollars set aside for capital maintenance (the Facility Renovation and Replacement Fund).

2010
Canyon Theater's lighting and sound system was replaced at a cost of $120,000, allocated from library operating dollars set aside for capital maintenance (the Facility Renovation and Replacement Fund). Wasn’t there also a later (c. 2015) upgrade to Canyon Theater equipment?

2011
Faced with a large backlog of projects in need of funding, City Council decided to pursue a city-wide, $49 million bond proposal to address “significant deficiencies” in the capital maintenance backlog. Renovation of the Main Library was included among the 120 identified projects. The ballot measure passed by just under 75%.

The Library Facilities Sustainability Study was completed for a cost of $50,000, funded through impact fees.
2014
Flood proofing was performed on all 3 sections of Main at a cost of $400,000 funded from Capital Investment Strategy bonds. WHAT IS THIS?
Work included concrete flood walls around the North Wing courtyards; additional protection to mechanical cores and doors in the bridge and 1974 addition; and flood walls added around the Main library atrium.

The concrete plaza in front of the North Wing was replaced at a cost of $147,000, funded from library operating dollars set aside for capital maintenance (the Facility Renovation and Replacement Fund). Reduced to $80,000 in 2014 CIP?

2013
Automated materials handling systems were installed at Main, Reynolds and Meadows between 2013-2016 and will need to be replaced after ten years at an estimated cost of . ESTIMATED COST TO(These automated sorters process returned materials more efficiently and reduce the number of physical touches to materials by staff, with substantial savings in FTE).

2015
The Main Library was fully reopened after extensive renovations. The $4.9 million project was primarily funded by the voter-approved 2011 Capital Improvement Bond, supplemented by revenues from the Library Fund, and impact fees). IS THIS CORRECT?

Main 2011-2015 renovation costs in the city budget
From 2015-2016 CIP spend plan for 2011 bond
2012 actual $12,481
2013 actual $289,353
   (From 2015 operating budget, capital line item, 2013 actual: $289,353 (Capital Development Fund))
2014 actual $2,202,879
   (From 2016 operating budget, capital line item, 2014 actual: $ 2,202,879 (Capital Development Fund)
2015 actual $669,113
2016 projected $26,175
2016 Total $3,200,000
2017 TOTAL Main library renovation costs $4.8 million
I can’t trace the Main renovation line items in city budgets after 2017

The project include renovating and relocating the children’s area; creating a new, larger Teen Space and a “maker” space; relocating and renovating the fiction, music and movies area; replacing outdated electrical and data distribution systems; repairing clerestory windows; improving Americans with Disability Act accessibility; replacing worn carpeting; providing facilities for café service on the library bridge; and installing additional HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) equipment to improve building cooling.
Improvements were made to library services without additional cost to the community. Hours were extended at George Reynolds and Meadows branch libraries by reorganizing staff resources, and patron access to library books and materials was increased by expanding and reorganizing the Flatirons Library Consortium (a cooperative project among 12 local libraries).

At the Library Commission’s request, the Boulder Charter was amended to reflect the Commission’s present role as an advisory board to Council and the Library Director. The Library Foundation board pledged at least $250,000 per year for five years to support library programming. Over the last five years, the Foundation has granted more than $1.8 million to the library.

**2016**
In 2016, the BLDG 61 Maker Space was opened in the under-utilized loading dock and staff maintenance shop in the North Wing (behind the Canyon Theater). Space renovation was funded by $60,000 [from FRR?] and the Library Foundation donated [how much?] to fund equipment purchases. Library staff and FAM designed and constructed the space to accommodate a woodworking shop complete with a large CNC (Computer Numerical Control) router, a classroom equipped with laser cutters, and a tech lab. A ventilation system for the large equipment and other safety equipment were installed to keep staff and patrons safe while using the space.

**2017**
Design for renovation of the Main library bathrooms was funded at $75,000 from [impact fees? or Library Fund?]

**2019**
A study to determine the feasibility of renovating the North Wing was funded at $105,000 from [impact fees? or Library Fund?]

I can't find anything reflecting costs for the Main bathroom renovations in the city budget.
Reynolds Branch

The Reynolds Branch Library is a 9,650 square foot facility [2009 Facilities Report] on the corner of Table Mesa Dr. and Stanford Ave in southwest Boulder. The site is 47,300 sq. ft. and contains lawns, trees and a parking lot.

This 50 year old building has significant capital maintenance needs. There are several leaks in the roof (suggesting a flawed roof replacement in 2000), cracks in the south wall, and a failing boiler. A comprehensive approach is needed to address this aging building. Fixing the boiler and roof is expensive and would not improve the building’s energy performance or address its carbon footprint. Consideration should be given to gutting or replacing the Reynolds building within the next ten years. There may be opportunities to relocate this branch to another location (in the Table Mesa shopping center or nearby). In past conversations, the City has expressed interest in using this site for a fire station.

2018 appraisal
Building: 10,371 sq ft $1,586,000
Land: 47,300 sq. ft $1,798,000
The site includes a parking lot, lawn and trees.

Reynolds Branch Opportunities and Constraints

The Reynolds building is 50 years old and does not meet today’s building code or energy efficiency requirements. Capital maintenance costs may approach $8 million over the next ten years, without bringing any gains in energy efficiency or CO2 reduction. Within the next ten years, a decision will be required to either gut the
building, replace it, or relocate the branch to another nearby site. In past years, the city has expressed interest in using this site as a fire station.

Known major capital maintenance issues include:

- A leaking roof (suggesting a flawed roof replacement in 2000). These leaks appear to be occurring primarily at the flat-roofed portions of the building. Full replacement of the roof at flat-roofed areas may be necessary to resolve the issue.
- A crack was noted in the south wall, adjacent to the courtyard, in 2007.
- The boiler at Reynolds is on its last legs and likely to fail in the next few years.

Parts of the Reynolds Branch site are within the 100 and 500-year floodplain. The current footprint of the branch has been carefully shaped to remain outside the floodplain. However, any future additions will need to be either of flood-resistant construction or restricted to the 1,500 sf of open space land outside the flood zones.

**Summary of Reynolds’ Capital Expenditures & Funding To Date**

**1968**
Total cost to buy the site and construct the building was $109,360. Donations and grants provided $90,000, and the city contributed $19,700. The building was constructed as one large room.

**1987**
In 1987, former Library Commissioners serving on the Library Foundation board mounted a petition drive to get a .4% sales tax increase, dedicated to the library, on the ballot. After a months-long battle between Council and library supporters, a $14 million bond issue (funded by a .38% sales tax increase in effect through 2011) passed by 63%. This funding was dedicated to library uses.

**1990**
The Reynolds Branch had a $100,000 interior renovation, using funds from the 1987 $14 million bond issue dedicated to library uses.

**1993**
The branch was closed in October to facilitate construction of a 4300 sq ft OR WAS IT 5,580 sq. ft.? addition.

**1994**
The Reynolds Branch re-opened with a a $975,000 addition using funds from the 1987 $14 million bond issue dedicated to library uses.
2008
A 10kw solar array was donated to the library by Bella Energy.

2013
The Reynolds branch was flooded in September, 2013, closing the library for two months. Flood repairs and replacement furnishings were paid for from City contingency funds, reimbursed by insurance, and from [library reserves]. JENN, IS THIS CORRECT? DO YOU KNOW THE AMOUNT?

2016
The George Reynolds branch libraries received a modest renovation at a cost of $75,000? Funding came from impact fees dedicated to library uses (Capital Development Fund).

Meadows Branch

The Meadows Branch Library is a 7,812 square foot facility located in leased commercial space in the Meadows Shopping Center (Baseline and Foothills Parkway). It currently serves southeast and east Boulder, including Gunbarrel residents.

2018 appraisal
The Meadows branch was found to have no market value because lease terms restrict the property to library use. The lease is also not assignable.

A 20-year lease is in effect through 2029. The library does not pay rent, but pays a share of share of taxes, insurance, and common area maintenance fees.

Lease terms

Landlord after twenty years from the Commencement Date, the Tenant shall have the option to extend the Lease upon the same conditions for an additional period of time equal to the total period of time that Safeway or the comparable anchor tenant is a Tenant at the Shopping Center.

(a) Permitted Use. Tenant shall use the Premises for a branch of its public library and shall not use or permit the Premises to be used for any other purpose.

ASSIGNMENT AND SUBLETTING

Tenant shall not assign this Lease or sublet all or any part of the Premises.
Meadows Opportunities and Constraints

The Meadows Branch is cramped relative to its high circulation. It receives heavy use by nearby neighborhoods (serving families and seniors) and people driving in from the eastern part of the Boulder Valley. Because it is a leasehold, the library has minimized capital improvements in the space.

There may be future opportunities to relocate this branch into a larger, more visible space within the shopping center. However, the appraiser noted that the the library occupies a large rentable space in a shopping center where frequent turnover and extended vacancies already challenge the landlord’s expected rental revenue.

Meadows’ History, Capital Expenditures & Funding To Date

In 1987, Loftus-Coburn Development proposed a major renovation of the Thunderbird shopping Center (today’s Meadows Shopping Center). After neighborhood opposition threatened to derail the project, the developer proposed to “donate” an east boulder branch library as part of the design. The approved design called for a direct entry from Safeway into the branch library (which did not materialize).

The Meadows Branch library opened in the newly renovated Meadows Shopping Center in 1988. The library spent $675,700 to build out the interior space (paid for from the 1987 bond measure). Estimated cost to construct the building exterior was $1 million, paid for by the developer through development review exactions. The library “donation” became a 20 year lease during the development review process (after Planning Board and Council approval). The center was sold to a commercial real estate investment trust after completion, and has changed hands several times in the last 30 years.

During 2015, the Meadows branch library received modest renovations, reconfiguring staff space to improve efficiency in processing library materials and to create more welcoming, patron-friendly spaces. **JENN: WAS THIS LIBRARY FUND $$? $150,000 for both?**
North Boulder (NoBo) Branch

The NoBo Corner library is an existing 570 square foot, leased facility located on the corner of Broadway and Yarmouth Avenue. It opened in March, 2014 as a pilot project.

The building contains a small multi-purpose room with patron chairs (used for story hours and other programs), a very small staff office and circulation desk, and shelving for the library collection (now dominated by patron holds).

Boulder Housing Partners leased space to the library for $1 per year for five years. Opening costs were $265,000 from the general fund for furnishings, equipment and an opening collection of 900 books for children and adults, a small Spanish language collection, and 200 DVDs. JENN, IS THIS CORRECT?

The NoBo Branch library is planned for a site at Violet and Broadway. The site was donated to the community in 1998 for use as a library. The community approved $5 million for capital construction as part of the 2017 Community Culture and Safety Tax, and planning and development review are now underway.

Outreach to the community began in August 2018 and continued into the 2019 design phase. Site selection and programming have been completed, and the project is currently in the city’s development review process. A public hearing on the concept plan was held before Planning Board in May, 2019. Approval of site review and concept planning is expected to continue into early 2020, with construction beginning in late 2020 or early 2021. The new north Boulder branch library is expected to open in 2022.

Summary of NoBo Expenditures, Estimated Costs & Funding Sources To Date

NoBo construction costs

The current cost estimate for construction is in the range of $10.5 to $12 million dollars. Higher costs are driven by construction cost escalation, green building requirements, climate commitments, and costs for street and plaza improvements that may be imposed on the project during development review. Bids for site work will be obtained in January, 2020, with construction bids following in May.

Currently available funding is around $9.2 million dollars from the following sources:

A. $5 million from the 2017 Community, Culture and Safety Tax (CCSV2) ballot measure, designated specifically for the NoBo branch
B. $3.5 million from Development Excise Tax (DET)/Impact fees and Library Fund reserves:
   1. DET and impact fees were collected specifically for library purposes.
   2. The Library Fund is a pooled repository of revenues generated from four main sources:
a. The one-third property tax mill levy that is dedicated to the library in the charter;  
b. Gifts and contributions given to library;  
c. Proceeds from the sale of library property or assets;  
d. Accrued interest on the fund balance.  

C. $.7M from general fund, added by council in the 2020 budget.

Unknowns that will drive construction costs:

- **Including a full maker space.** Community input identified a maker space is a very high priority for the branch. This is the only library specific item, and could possibly be funded through donations and grants.

- **A connection of 14th Street to the adjacent south private property line** was recently identified as a requirement per North Boulder Subcommunity Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. A cost estimate for the street connection is forthcoming. If the village center proposal proposed in 1997-2002 had been approved, this street connection would have been provided by the developer. Now that the property is publicly owned, the city is responsible to pay for any street connections. Using funding designated for library services to pay for a street connection is not appropriate: street improvements should be paid from the Transportation fund.

- **Plaza improvement/connections to Broadway.** Included in the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan’s “Village Center,” these improvements were assigned to the developer who originally planned to construct commercial space in this area (including a library branch to be donated to the city). It is not appropriate to use funds designated for library services to pay for a neighborhood amenity.

- **Development of a children’s playground on the east side of the NoBo library.** The eastern portion of the site abuts Violet Park, an undeveloped neighborhood park managed by Parks and Recreation. Funding is identified in the Parks Department’s 2021 budget to improve portions of Violet Park, but the Parks’ involvement in development of a playground is unknown. Plans will be finalized and prioritized in 2020.

- **Cost to make the library a “showcase for meeting Boulder’s Climate Commitment”** (one of the project’s 4 major goals. Use of recycled steel from the Alpine-Balsam deconstruction project may provide some savings in construction costs.

Approximately $1.2 million of one-time funds will be required for furniture, fixtures, technology and equipment, and an opening day collection, some of which may be funded from DET and impact fees collected for the library and/or Library Fund reserves.
Staff are investigating opportunities to reduce project costs and make up the funding gap through a combination of grants, donations, and Library Fund reserves. The library anticipates receiving a capital donation of $1.5 million from the Boulder Library Foundation to bring the North Boulder Branch Library total project budget to $10 million.

**Related Projects**

**Greenways**
The NoBo library site is adjacent to Four Mile Creek, and the high hazard zone overlaps the property’s southern edge. There is also an existing multi-use bike path along the Four Mile Creek corridor. Improvements are planned to this corridor in 2020 - 2022, using revenues from the dedicated stormwater utility and funding from the 2017 Community Culture and Safety ballot issue.

Fourmile Misc Flood Mitigation (Stormwater Mgmt funds, 2020)
$202,775

Fourmile Canyon Creek greenway (CCSV2, 2020-2022)
$3,500,000

**Public Art**
The NoBo branch is one of six locations targeted for public art in 2021. Funding of $400,000 is allocated from the 2017 Community Culture and Safety ballot issue and capital enhancement funds.

**NoBo Fit-out and Operating costs**

In 2021, the North Boulder Branch Library will require approximately $830,000 in ongoing personnel (public desk and makerspace staff) and operating funds for security, equipment maintenance, courier service, etc. This is in addition to the current annual personnel allocation for the NoBo Corner Library, as those staff members will be reassigned to the new branch library.

Ongoing building maintenance and utilities costs are currently estimated at $300,000, annually.

Ongoing operating funds for grounds maintenance is another emerging need that will need to be addressed through a joint 2021 budget request from the library and the Parks and Recreation Department. Cost estimates for grounds maintenance are forthcoming.
Projected Costs to Open a Gunbarrel Corner Library

The 2018 Library Master Plan identified opening a Gunbarrel corner library as a + five year goal. The city’s 2018 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) budget for that year included $3-4 million line time for a Gunbarrel branch ($3-4 million to lease space for a corner library pilot.) The 2019 CIP says:

*Opening a Gunbarrel Corner Library:* Similar to the service model of the NoBo Corner Library, BPL would seek a partnership with a developer or other agency to rent space for a small branch library that is conveniently located near the business center in Gunbarrel. Tenant finishes for the project would be eligible for use of Development Excise Tax or Impact Fees collected for the library. A preliminary estimate for the ongoing O&M required is about $350,000.

The 2020 CIP continues to identify operational funding for a Gunbarrel branch as an unfunded need.

In 1981. A $750,000 budget item originally intended to pay for services in Gunbarrel was re-purposed to other uses.

In 1987, citizens successfully petitioned to put a sales tax increase/library bond issue on the ballot library bond. Funding for a Gunbarrel branch was included in the citizen initiative, but dropped during negotiations with Council. The proposed sales tax increase was reduced from .4% (citizen petition amount) to .38% (eliminating the Gunbarrel branch),

The Gunbarrel Community Center Plan was adopted in 2004, and amended in 2006. The purpose of the Gunbarrel Community Center Plan is to provide a blueprint for the Gunbarrel commercial area that will result in a viable and vibrant, easily accessible, pedestrian-oriented center to serve the Gunbarrel subcommunity.

The city’s 2012 Capital Improvements Program budget said:

> There are no planned capital improvement projects from 2012-2018 within the Gunbarrel Community Center plan area. Future capital improvements will include street and sidewalk improvements and bicycle and trail connections. Improvements in the long-term could also include potential library and park facilities if appropriate locations and new sources of funding are identified.

The 2018 Library Master Plan identified opening a Gunbarrel corner library as a + five year goal.
City of Boulder Capital Funding Sources for Library Projects

The city’s Department of Public Works, Facilities Asset Management (FAM) Division manages these funds. Dollars contributed by departments and collected through the development review process are pooled and reported as aggregate numbers in public budget documents. The library’s annual contributions to these funds, and impact fees collected for library growth, are reflected only in internal budget documents. When a decision is made to use revenues from these funds for a specific project, that expenditure is shown in both the library and FAM budgets as a capital expenditure.

**Equipment Replacement Fund (ERF)**

The library makes an annual contribution to the ERF based upon FAM’s inflation-adjusted projections for future replacement of major equipment which are based upon industry standards. The funds within the ERF are used at the discretion of library staff, subject to ERF policies and procedures. Any unspent funds in a given year fall to ERF balance to be used to offset future year’s contributions or alternative equipment purchases.

Equipment must meet the following criteria to be included on the ERF:

1. Tangible in nature and does not lose its identity if removed from original location
2. Have a useful life of more than one year
3. Have an original cost of at least $5,000

- The ERF cannot cover vehicles, buildings, building materials/machinery, fixtures, or land/land improvements.
- Furnishings are not included in the ERF; they are funded out of the library’s operating budget.

**Facility Renovation and Replacement Fund (FR&R Fund)**

The library makes an annual contribution to the FR&R Fund based upon a combination of FAM’s facility capital renovation and replacement projections as well as savings for future renovation projects envisioned by library staff. The funds are used at the discretion of Library Administration subject to FR&R Fund policies. The FR&R Fund is used specifically for major maintenance, renovation, and replacement of capital facilities and equipment and is defined according to the following criteria:

1. Maintenance: maintenance of existing building systems or components where the cost exceeds $3,000 per repair
2. Renovation: replacement of 50% or more of a building system or component
3. Replacement: replacement of 100% of a building system or component. HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) and fixtures are included in FR&R.

**Capital Development Fund**

The Capital Development Fund is funded with past balances of Capital Development Excise Taxes and ongoing collection of Impact Fees. The Capital Development Excise Taxes and Impact Fees collected on behalf of the library can only be spent on capital facility expansion and materials expansion for library purposes. Capital Development
Funds are programmed and spent at the discretion of FAM in conjunction with staff within the recipient departments. Fees collected on behalf of the library (and all other impact fee departments) are shown in Funding Summaries in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) budget (Volume II).

In 1987, a Development Excise Tax (DET) was instituted to fund capital improvements related to growth. In 2010, the city shifted away from collecting DET in favor of collecting Impact Fees (which have more expansive funding rules). These fees are assessed on commercial and private development projects and are to be used to fund capital expansion of municipal facilities necessary to support growing demand for city services. The recipient departments of Capital Development Excise Tax and Impact Fee funding are: Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Police, Fire, Human Services, and Boulder Public Library. Capital Development Funds are programmed and spent at the discretion of FAM in conjunction with staff within the recipient departments.
Appendix C
History of Boulder County Funding for the Boulder Public Library

Boulder's population was 12,958 in 1940. It had risen to 18,000 by 1945. The library commission asked the county to pay a 50 cents per capita fee for use of the library by county residents. The county attorney ruled that this fee would be unconstitutional and suggested the the library directly charge county patrons 50 cents/person instead. The library commission decided against this fee, and looked towards a county ballot measure creating a library fund to benefit the Boulder and Longmont libraries.

In 1946, the Boulder and Longmont libraries asked for $500 each from the county to help defray costs incurred through county users. The request was approved for the following year’s budget. In 1948, the library asked the county commissioners for more than $500 “because of a large number of new families who have moved to the environs of Boulder.” All of the surrounding libraries asked for budget increases that year to account for increased use. In 1952, the library calculated that it was spending about $2.50 per person on county users. The county provided $800 to defer county user costs.

In January, 1959, the library started charging non-residents for library cards, collecting $893 over the course of the year. The city manager and library director met with the county to ask for an increase above the $800 currently being provided, pointing out that the percentage of county users had increased from 3.9% in 1952 to 23.6% in 1958. The county commissioners declined the request.

In 1960, the county provided BPL with an $800 stipend to serve County residents. County residents obtained a grant from the Colorado State Library for BPL to operate a bookmobile for County residents. The Boulder library dropped out of the bookmobile project in 1961 to focus on construction of the new library. All County funds for library services went to the bookmobile. At the end of the year, county residents asked the county to take over the bookmobile, which they declined to do. Instead the County increased the stipend to BPL to serve County residents.

In 1962, Boulder County paid BPL $10,000 to serve County residents. In 1963, Boulder County this was raised to $19,000. In 1964, Boulder County the stipend for county users was raised again, to $25,000.

From 1965-1972, Boulder County continued to pay BPL (and other county municipal libraries) a stipend to serve County residents, based on a formula of 50 cents times the city’s population. No written agreement was in effect. From 1972-1975, funding from the County to serve county residents was changed to a formula based on library annual operating costs.
In 1975, the County Commissioners allocated $100,000 to be shared among all five Boulder County libraries - substantially less than requested. The libraries began exploring ways to cut back on services for county residents. Based on applications for library cards, 25-30% of new BPL cardholders were from portions of the unincorporated County not served by a library in 1976. Library directors from Boulder, Longmont, Louisville, Lafayette, Ward and Broomfield told the County Commissioners that the County had failed to live up to its agreement to provide funding for library use by County residents. Based on the 1972 formula, BPL argued that it should have received $112,00 from the County, but only $56,000 was provided.

In 1979, the city and county entered into an agreement to trade library services for county residents in exchange for health services for city residents (provided through the Boulder County Health Department). The agreement lapsed in 1989 and was not renewed.

In 1980, the Boulder public library coordinated development of an inter-library loan system (today’s Flatirons Library Consortium) with neighboring libraries using grant funds. Boulder library served as project manager, with the Boulder Library Foundation serving as fiscal agent for grant funding. Grant funding obtained for the interlibrary loan system in 1980 (Irving Communications) was $70,000. Development of the interlibrary loan system continued through 1990, funded by three grants totaling $627,000.

A metro-wide library district was proposed in 1984, including Boulder and four other (unidentified) metro counties. The Boulder County Commissioners declined to join.