

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: January 6, 2021	
Contact information preparing summary: Celia Seaton	
Commission members present: Juana Gómez, Joel Koenig (left during Item 8A), Jane Sykes Wilson, Steven Frost, Scott Steinbrecher	
Commission members not present: none	
Library staff present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director Celia Seaton, Administrative Specialist Jaime Kopke, Programs, Events, and Outreach Manager	
City staff present: Janet Michels, Senior Assistant City Attorney James Brown, Risk Manager	
Members of the public present: Sidney Fox	
Type of Meeting: Regular Remote	
Agenda Item 1: Review of Online Meeting Guidelines	[0:00:00 Audio min.]
Agenda Item 2: Reminder: Commissioners please log monthly volunteer hours Count Me In Boulder [0:00:10 Audio min.] The Commission logged their service.	
Agenda Item 3: Approval of agenda	[0:00:50 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order and Gómez asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Hearing none, there was a nod of approval from the commission for the agenda.	
Agenda Item 4: Public comment	[0:01:15 Audio min.]
Fox spoke in advocacy of resuming service with Prospector, echoing the “excellent letters” to the commission found in the packet . He has researched using University of Colorado’s library; it similarly does not offer Prospector. Prospector has long served as an aid both for acquiring popular books (which are so often accompanied by long reservation queues), as well as for university materials needed by senior auditors. He understands the budgetary restrictions which necessitated the termination of service. He recommended a better presentation of alternatives on the website where Prospector is no longer offered (e.g., Interlibrary Loan and Colorado Libraries Collaborate (CLC)). Fox also suggested a partnership between the Flatirons Library Consortium (FLC) and Denver Public Library (DPL) to take advantage of the latter’s wide circulation and contract with Prospector.	
Gómez thanked Fox for his attendance and input. Farnan can inquire about the collaboration between BPL and DPL, though this would require a bit of technical background facilitation. Fox offered his own services in researching the options and promised to reach out via email to commission with any further information.	
Agenda Item 5: Consent agenda	[0:14:19 Audio min.]
a. Approval of December 2020 Meeting Minutes: Gómez queried the group for changes. She asked for inclusion of the conversation regarding closed captioning as an added service. Steinbrecher had amendments to his conversation with Council Member Weaver. Frost moved to approve these minutes as amended, Koenig seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.	
Agenda Item 6: Discussion on Canyon Theater Rental Policy	[0:16:40 Audio min.]
Gómez discussed the idea of asking a potential user of the Canyon Theater (e.g., Girl Scouts, community knitting circle, or Alcoholics Anonymous) to come up with a million-dollar insurance policy before reserving the space. A public library should serve as the “city’s living room,” so barring any party who can’t afford the policy runs contrary the mission of a public library. She asked for the city’s response.	
Brown reported working through similar issues with Health and Human Services; he hopes to come to a mutual solution that does not present an unreasonable barrier to use of our facilities. Risk Management’s concern is the risk to the facility and	

protecting city assets. Human Services expressed very much the same concern with volunteers or contractors who might not be able to afford the insurance policy. In specific response to the groups mentioned by Gómez (Girl Scouts, Alcoholics Anonymous), he noted that often these organizations hold their own insurance policies for coverage.

The knitting circle example is one that likely does not have ready insurance at their disposal. If, after inquiry, it is determined that such a low risk is posed, the city would likely determine that no policy was needed to use facility. Certain users will always necessitate insurance, but negotiations to get increased limits or mitigate any risk are possible. He has worked with Parks and Recreation and Human Services to create a streamlined process that doesn't present an undue burden on staff or the public. Many applicants are known entities or similar enough to other known entities that the city can reasonably evaluate risk. This can also be determined through interview and application process.

Brown clarified that the million-dollar policy requirement is a common, and relatively low limit. He has not yet gathered information on whether the insurance requirement has dissuaded applicants from the process.

Initial review could categorize user groups and related protocol. Brown clarified his goal to exact a measure of due diligence protecting assets and public, not present a barrier to use.

Sykes Wilson wondered how the application/approval process will work for Kopke, who has a rental request timeframe (90 days) and quarterly sponsorships – both of which require significant lead time. Kopke suggested embedding a field into application forms requesting upload of insurance certificate with information about the requirements. She clarified that the Library is not currently staffed for running the Canyon Theater and these types of event; modification of the application could be an initial step.

Frost thanked Brown for his thorough explanation. He asked Kopke about some of the “legacy performers” inside the theater (e.g., Dance is for Everybody!) – would this requirement block such groups? Kopke noted that the dance festival is actually facilitated by the city, and city projects are likely covered by the city's own insurance. She agreed that some individuals/organizations may need assistance navigating the process. Brown noted preferred vendors who can provide relatively inexpensive single-event coverage.

Sykes Wilson wondered how taxing this process might be for staff. Kopke responded that it could present a “heavy lift,” albeit lightened by partnership with Risk Management and a template or tool to streamline the process.

It is “important to understand who we'd be keeping out,” noted Gómez, suggesting a tracking of applicants who were either unable to upload the form or pay the fee. Brown agreed – he would not want to bar entry or discourage applicants from even completing the form. It would not be an immediate disqualification of the application. He wishes to make the space as welcoming to all and safe for all as possible.

Kopke clarified for Steinbrecher that there is a 90-day advance notice for rentals and sponsorships, though she noted that there are frequently made exceptions. Steinbrecher suggested allowing an extra buffer to provide the heads up that this insurance must be secured in advance. Kopke agreed to consider such elements of proactive customer service.

Commission wondered whether buskers on Pearl Street have insurance, and Brown will inquire; he believes that is a part of the City of Boulder's permitting process.

Staff clarified that commission has time to consider finalization of this policy as rentals are unlikely until 2022 due to pandemic and staffing restrictions. Phares suggested fashioning an application which would determine the type of activities planned in the theater (which might eliminate the need to require insurance at all based on reported activity). She noted that this policy could easily be tabled for now since there are no imminent plans to open the space to reservation.

After discussion commission concurred on postponement of this policy until the summer months.

Commission wondered about boundaries around what exactly might “trigger” an event necessitating insurance coverage (“would moving piano two feet count as an insurable event?”) Brown explained that his work with other departments involved a review of the past 12-24 months of events to generate a list of categories that would require insurance, or not. Brown favors parameters that can be applied and administered by library staff. This helped these other entities streamline the process.

Steinbrecher wondered about the difficulty of compiling such a list. Kopke explained that she could provide a general summary; the recent layoffs meant some loss of institutional knowledge as a single person had previously handled all the events.

A proposal for the Boulder Library Foundation (BLF) to perhaps assist with the insurance need through grant funding was discussed. In response to Farnan's query, Brown responded that he was open to the idea of BLF buying a blanket policy. Farnan noted that this appeal to BLF for this insurance wouldn't likely present until the 2022 requests.

Gómez wondered how often the City received third-party claims. Brown estimated at least one claim a week, across all operations and departments.

For next steps, staff will compile the discussed list of activities from past two years and review with Risk Management and the City Attorney's Office to provide a template for future evaluation, planned for the September packet. Steinbrecher suggested using an intern or volunteer for this project of reviewing archive of applications to create list of common users. He defers to staff on how the form should be redesigned. Staff agreed to include this redesigned application form in the September packet with enumerated user categories to determine insurance requirement.

Agenda Item 7: Recap of 2020 library accomplishments and 2021 planning [1:16:30 Audio min.]

Phares: "adaptable" staff has done amazing work, still chipping away at Master Plan goals like the new north Boulder library building and the renovation of the George Reynolds Branch. In-house security and peer navigation roles are rolling ahead. Given the budget restrictions, priorities will need to be discussed. See [packet](#).

In response to Koenig's inquiry about the loss of personnel due to layoffs and furloughs, Farnan clarified that some of these positions were not lost, but rather are being held vacant. The managers of Carnegie, BoulderReads, and Resource Services are currently held open till end of the year but not filled until 2022. The eliminated positions, however, will need to be newly requested in future budget cycles. Farnan clarified that some items may be restored during a second adjustment to base done in the fall.

Commission agreed with staff recommendation to prioritize branch hours and the collection.

Responding to Sykes Wilson, Farnan relayed that the Library expects the "confidence of the community" to return well into the vaccination rollout. Programming outside story times would be a good transitional activity in the warmer months.

Gómez commended staff under the "brilliant and steady direction of" library leadership. Phares laid the credit at staff's feet: "they've made it happen."

Agenda Item 8: Library Commission Update [1:43:48 Audio min.]

- a. Items from Commission
 - i. Ongoing outreach efforts – Frost and Gómez had a "lovely meeting" with Council Member Rachel Friend. She expressed enthusiasm over the Library priorities and excitement about north Boulder branch, likewise "saddened" by cuts. Council Member Bob Yates and Frost exchanged "good repertoire" over email with plans to speak again. Teter and Gómez expect to meet with Council Member Yates next week. Gómez spoke with Mayor pro tem Junie Joseph who is a huge advocate for the library and sustainable funding.
 - ii. Commission discussed outreach efforts to potential Commission applicants.
- b. Updates from commissioners representing the Commission in other venues (verbal)
 - i. Boulder Library Foundation (BLF) update (Sykes Wilson/Koenig) – No meeting took place in December.
 - ii. Library Champions – joint efforts
- c. Update on emails and phone calls to Library Commission – see [packet](#).

Agenda Item 9: Library and Arts Director's Report [2:02:30 Audio min.]

- a. Update on library district discussion with City Council – Farnan reported that an item has been placed on City Council's calendar to discuss the Library District during the February 23, 2021 Study Session. A Public Hearing will take place on Council's April 6, 2021 agenda.
- b. One Book One Boulder final report – see [packet](#).
- c. Update on 2020 Adjustment to Base budget requests
- d. Boulder Library Foundation 2021 grant requests

e. Prospector Service Changes

f. North Boulder Branch Library update – out to bid by end of January with bid review in March. Groundbreaking planned by May 2021.

g. Update on current library services

Agenda Item 9: Adjournment

[2:29:15 Audio min.]

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

Date, time, and location of next meeting:

The next Library Commission meeting will be at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, February 3, 2021, through a virtual setting.

Commissioner Gómez approved these minutes on February 3, 2021; and Celia Seaton attested to it.