Members Present: Jeff Breeden; Chair, Marita Rhinehart; Vice Chair, Ann Langevin, Rachel Hunt, and Erica Tietjen.

Also Present: Director Kimberly Diehm, Assistant Director Anne Karr, Jim Chachas of Hobbs, Ong & Associates, staff member Mary Ann Venghaus, and members of the community, Martin Einert and Deanna Duffy.

The regular meeting of the Library Board of Trustees was called to order at 7:09 p.m. by Chair Jeff Breeden.

I. Pledge of Allegiance Led by Erica Tietjen

II. Citizen Participation: Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be acted upon until provisions of Nevada’s Open Meeting Law have been completed. Therefore, any action on such items must be considered at a later meeting. Public comment is generally limited to 5 minutes per person.

There were no comments at this time.

III. Consent Agenda: Matters considered routine by the Board of Trustees and which may be enacted in one motion. Any item, however, may be discussed separately per Board member request. Any exceptions to the Consent Agenda must be stated prior to approval.

Jeff wanted to address Part 5, Number 2 on the agenda. He clarified the 10-million-dollar figure will be closer to 10.57 million dollars.

Marita Rhinehart moved that the consent agenda, minutes of the regular meeting of March 28, 2018 as amended, and bills paid of $66,476.72 from the previous month be accepted. Ann Langevin seconded. Motion carried.

IV. Reports:

Kim gave an update on the 75th Anniversary celebration. She reported invitations were sent, the walls prepared for the student artwork, and shared details about the remainder of Friday’s preparations.

Ann commented that she liked the banner in the amphitheater. Jeff gave kudos to the staff for personally picking up the grounds. He commended the care that demonstrated. Ann referred to the PLA reports and noted that she was glad staff had enjoyed the experience. Jeff asked Kim how regularly story events are offered and he wanted to know an average attendance number.

She responded that storytimes are presented, every day but Thursday and the attendance can generally range from 5 to 15. They conversed about outreach and the National Reading Month visits the department had made. Marita reported the excitement shared with her about the youth programs and praised the inclusion of crafts and other activities that are provided.
V. Report/Discussion/Action Possible: The agenda items in this section are for discussion and for possible action. The items may be heard in any order; two or more items may be combined for consideration; an item may be removed from the agenda; or discussion related to an item may be delayed at any time.

1. Architectural Firm LGA Update/Community Meeting - Action Possible, Craig Galati/Jason Jorjorian

Craig explained the “final” deliverables they had to present would change a little more by the event on Friday. He reported that preparation by the anniversary celebration date was a big goal, but he expressed excitement that the week had arrived. He indicated a custom cake LGA had brought for the occasion as a way of thanking the Board and the staff for the trust and faith which had been placed in them.

Craig mentioned that while more design and interaction will be needed for the next phase of the project he feels the library now has the tools to help get people excited and to assist with the bond issue.

Jason showed what they were proposing as presentation boards for Friday. He noted a monument sign they had included for the street corner. He also highlighted the cover for the stage, the area off the café, the play area, the balcony, and the new drop-off entrance. He stated that the presentation boards were the culmination of all the things the community and staff had talked about. Discussion occurred about the new element, the entrance sign. The need for visibility and yet being cognoscente of the sign ordinance were both brought up. The involvement of a landscape architect in the future was mentioned.

The second plan Jason featured has a legend and shows the library as viewed from above. A little more embellishment had been added since the previous version. A few more comments had been received and these new ideas were implemented in the plans. For example, Jason pointed out ballers for protection at the entrance. A surprise feature exhibited was the word “Read” cast as a shadow on the ground.

Jeff asked if there was a way to demonstrate the lock down door on the presentation board to show the area closed to public while other sections remained open. The Board discussed the importance of security and visually imparting that part of the design to the public.

Next Jeff mentioned the image seemed crowded and Marita asked about shelving in relation to what the library currently has. Craig indicated that Samantha had given them future growth numbers and LGA was able to meet those numbers in the design both upstairs and in the youth area. The shelving space in relation to how it is now was reviewed, and the radial pattern in Nevada room was noted.

Jason pointed out the basement development since the previous model. LGA had worked to show the notion of color in the kid’s activity area. Marita spotted something new in the section labelled area 6 and was informed she had found the “surprise” and it would be
revealed later in the presentation. Jason brought attention to how the teen area had been opened up more and he pointed out the window seats.

Jason said each board size is 3½ feet wide by 33 inches tall. He unveiled the artistic rendering of the new entry. It was anticipated the revealing of the tower would impress the public. Bold signage above the canopy from the drop-off was a new feature Jason introduced. He explained they thought the current base color could work, but for the metalwork they picked an “orangey” color. Marita asked whether the stark white cover over the amphitheater lighting could be changed to a similar color. This possibility was reviewed. Finally, Jason noted the landscape and foreground would receive a bit more attention before the anniversary celebration.

The next board featured the exterior revisions. New windows along the east side will bring in light. A vertical fence without footholds is included to discourage climbing. A mesh material was displayed on the rendering for the play area. Jason explained they had a drone fly over the library to get the aerial view. As a springboard from this image, the Board had another discussion about storage and future parking needs.

The new element in the youth area was then revealed. The word “imagine” was pictured built into the wall. More embellishment was included on this board. Kids’ participation in the library can be accomplished via the fun dome chairs and the built in tree structure.

Jeff asked about the possibility of presenting a similar embellishment for the teen section. Marita agreed that since the teens were so engaged in sharing at the first meeting, it would be nice to provide a similar rendering for them. Both Jason and Craig addressed the impossibility of producing quality fine renderings in the short time frame. The solution of producing inspiration points from other libraries in order to offer an impression of possibilities was agreed upon. Craig stated this library will have the largest youth area in the Valley when the renovation is complete. LGA agreed to produce another presentation board.

Logistics about presentation board space requirements for Friday’s event became the next subject of conversation. Comments and questions were then made. Rachel shared her enthusiasm for the ceiling design in the youth area. Craig, pointed out ways in which it can be decorated for different holidays because of the open grid. The vibrant space was celebrated. The audience was also invited to share in the conversation. Deanna asked about the size of the door into the lower level storage. She questioned whether the design could allow for a semi-truck delivery. Similarly, firetruck ease of access was addressed. Kim asked about an exterior pathway between levels. Jason stated it is an element that was discussed but had not been included in the image. A natural path as opposed to a concrete one would be preferred and Jason also noted the significant grade difference.

Kim wanted to know whether the design goes over the City’s line. Jason confirmed that it does overstep it. Discussion ensued about easements and access agreements. Mary Ann asked where the additional parking was included in the design image and Jason addressed her question. Marita inquired about the relief panels that had been suggested but not discussed. Craig expressed his desire to give a sense of permanence by including a block which states,
“Established in 1943.” There will be lots to talk about in the next phase, like the color. Craig and Jason said they had looked at the new high school relief and think it is especially stunning at night. The LGA representatives were thanked for showing their work and for sharing their excitement. The three month turn-around timeframe was celebrated and the firm was praised by the Board.

2. Determine debt levy on $10 million bond (adjusted to 10.57) - Action Possible, Jeff Breeden

Jeff established that the decision is based upon the estimates provided. He referred to page 6 of the report and clarified the lowest rate they could use would be 11 cents. That will be an increase from the current 8.5 cents. Jeff stated the decision between 11 cents and 12 cents depends upon how quickly they wanted to develop the savings and still not shock the population. Rachel expressed her preference to have money in reserve more quickly. From the payment schedule, she felt more comfortable with the faster rate. She felt the impact to the community was not vast between the choices.

Ann cautioned the group to understand the senior citizen perspective and to consider their reticent approach to adding to their property taxes. Jeff helped by calculating that for a person on a fixed income the difference would be $1.00 a month on a $400,000 home. He ruminated that not all homes are that size.

Marita expressed her discomfort with waiting until the library was nearly half-way through the loan before the reserve could be built up. She said she would like to see that happen sooner. Jeff pointed out they faced scenarios modelled at 11, 11.5, and 12 cents. He stated they would have to decide so the resolution could be placed on the ballot in November. Noting there were other representatives of the community present, Jeff asked for their input. The response he received was from the perspective of a small house owner who would not mind a 30 cent a month increase.

Jeff introduced that it was appropriate to talk about the length of time it would take to build the reserve. The options would be 6 years at 12 cents, 7 years at 11.5 cents, or 9 years at 11 cents. Even six years seemed like a long time to the Board members. Erica pointed out that 12 cents was an artificial cap they had set themselves. Deanna offered that as a library user she utilizes well above the payment she makes as a property owner and she would be fine with paying the increase. Erica asked about the general pass/failure rate for other projects historically in Boulder City. She wanted to get a sense of overall buy-in.

Ann offered that she did not remember the cost of the building where the Senior Center is now, but she said the current building cost 4.5 million. Her concern is being able to sell the fact that the renovation and bottom floor of this project is so much more. The audience could not remember the last bond. They recognized that what gets people up-in-arms in this community is selling land. After discussion they determined they did not know the answer to the question.

The group agreed they would prefer to get to the reserve at the six-year mark. More discussion ensued about perceptions. Rachel pointed out that for those people enthused about
the library who want to see the bond passed, the difference between 11 and 12 cents will not matter. Erica noted that the majority of the public will not know of the debate over a penny and if they are not interested in supporting the bond, they will not be interested in any amount. She expressed her desire to choose on the safe side of the buffer. Ann leaned toward the 11.5 cent option but she expressed that her greatest desire was to see success with the build-out and to obtain voter approval. Jeff reminded everyone that the amount was being set for purposes of politics and passing the bond. Future unknowns would dictate what amount the rate would change to as it has throughout the history of the current bond.

Marita Rhinehart made a motion on the debt levy of 10.57 million to set the property tax at 12 cents annually. Rachel Hunt seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Craig advised the Board to get their message out first before it could be told from another perspective. Means of sharing the word were discussed. Use of the renderings, presentations, and interviews were all agreed upon. The points to highlight were also brainstormed. The café, the teen area, a reception area for amphitheater weddings, having food on this side of town, birthday parties, and the cost comparison for DVD and music checkouts versus purchase were some of the topics brought up. The need for a fact sheet was decided upon. A coupon to be given out at the grand opening was also suggested.

3. Discussion on a Resolution concerning the financing of library improvements; directing the Secretary to notify the Clark County Debt Management Commission of the District’s proposal to issue general obligation bonds; providing certain details in connection therewith; and providing the effective date hereof – Action Possible, Kendra Follett.

Kendra could not be present. Since there was a number decided upon, the resolution was the next required step. After consultation with Jim, Jeff read the language of the resolution which would notify the County they would like to borrow $42 a year at the rate of 12 cents for a $100,000 home. There were no questions on the resolution.

Jeff moved to approve the resolution concerning the financing of library improvements and directing the chairman to notify the Clark County Debt Management Commission of the District’s proposal to issue general obligation bonds in the amount of $10,570.00 with an annual property tax rate of 12 cents resulting in an estimated increase in the property taxes that the owner of a new $100,000.00 home will pay which will average $42.00 per year. Marita seconded the motion. Some discussion followed. Rachel stated the new number made it sound like the increase was from zero. Jeff asked if that needed to be clarified in the resolution. Jim said they could clarify that 3.5 cent difference when talking to the public. It did not need to be stated in the resolution. After discussion it was put to the vote. Motion carried unanimously.


The Budget Hearing will need to be changed to Thursday May 24th. Jim explained that it must be held on the third Thursday in May. Kim will present the tentative budget for review.
[A cake break was taken at 8:25 p.m. to share with the members of LGA before they departed from the meeting. The meeting was called back to order by Jeff Breeden at 8:44 p.m.]

Kim went through the tentative budget. She started on page 3, which relates to Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees. She reminded the Board that the total tax rate is 0.2239. On the following page she discussed each column. The page related to property tax rate and revenue reconciliation. Assessed valuation multiplication and the abatement were explained.

Kim asked Jim to explain the maximum allowed. The library’s allowed rate is up to 0.2093, but because of abatement law, it can only go up by a maximum of 3%. Jim explained about the rolling 10-year average in the CPI. The lesser of either 3% or the rolling 10-year average can be used. He said this year the library has not reached the 3%. He shared, property tax revenue is capped at a 3% growth rate.

Kim brought attention to column N relating to debt, but there were no questions. Page 5 summarized the general fund, the capital projects fund, and the debt service fund. Page 6 offered a summary of estimated expenditures. Jim pointed out the Transfer Out column and explained if there are more resources than expenditures, he and Kim will make a transfer into the capital projects fund since the library does have legitimate projects. They plan a $225,000 transfer from operating revenues this year.

The revenues on page 7 were discussed next. Last year, actual property tax revenue ended at $797,157. This year has achieved the estimated $767,603 and may come in about $50,000 higher. Jim indicated that end-of-year operating costs traditionally are the heaviest for spending at this library. Fine revenue is down because children’s fines were dropped this past year. Jim explained they always budget conservatively, so short revenue should not be a problem. Marita asked why property taxes are lower. Jim shared it has dropped three times during the time they spent building the tentative budget. It led to them discovering the error. Kim pointed out the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) refund and indicated that it had been reimbursed as indicated in column 2. She shared Martha would bring this up every audit to make sure the County knew they owed the library this amount.

Page 8 shows all expenditures. Salaries are shown as if they are filled all year. If someone leaves, the library will be saving some money there. Next year, less is projected in benefits and a little more is budgeted for salaries. Jeff asked whether materials were included in Capital Outlay and Kim verified that was correct. Retiree insurance will also be built in to give flexibility. A cushion will be available to pay out accumulated sick leave and that type of expenditure. Ann questioned a figure and Jim indicated it was a reflection on paper of a transfer from the Credit Union last year.

Page 9 related to the capital projects fund. Jim mentioned the only thing of significance was that it is always available to draw from so the Board will not have to go through a budget augmentation process. Jeff asked about the figure in the current year expenses and determined that it was the LGA expense.
Kim then went over the Debt Service Fund from pages 10 & 11. Jim explained the primary take-away from these pages relates to the fact that at the end of June there is one figure, but the very next day the debt service payment will be due. He estimated $351,336 which is about $10,000 more than he expects the library to actually pay on July 1st.

Jeff asked about the repayment of the debt service and asked about the Capital Projects Fund as a source. Jim explained a General Obligation Bond is the most stable funding possible. Jim does not anticipate the library will need more than it will have. If the reserve is achieved more quickly than anticipated, the property tax rate will go down. He explained the Capitol Projects Fund will take care of major capital expenditures not covered in the budget. He illustrated examples such as a painting project, air conditioning failure, or re-carpeting the building. Date corrections were discovered on page 12. There was no discussion on page 13.

Kim pointed out some details on page 14. Large Print has been added through Brodart so more funding has been given there. Hoopla was a grant and will be a new expense. EBSCO has a legal reference database which has been added and is a new expense. Marita asked about Mobile Beacon. Kim explained the new Hot Spots purchased have an activation cost. Jeff offered a question about the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District automation service assessment going down. Kim noted a typo and clarified the number had never gotten that high. She reminded the Board about the change to Sierra. She pointed out the difference in the Envisionware expense. She explained the library uses them for RFID maintenance and last year mobile printing was also attached to that expense. She shared history about HVAC companies and identified why more funding is being allotted next year. The Proquest cost has increased because Ancestry.com was added. One-Click was not getting the use she thought it should be getting, so Kim explained the library had switched to Hoopla.

A discussion followed when Jeff asked about line item numbers sent to the County being accounted for in a different line item. He noted figures not lining up. The salary figures will be fixed by submission of the final budget. Ann questioned whether grounds maintenance might need more funding. Jim noted that the library never spends the amounts budgeted. All agreed the coding issue between the library and the County needs to be resolved. Kim expressed confidence in her numbers but provided example of the conflict between County reporting and library reports. The Board was satisfied Kim has the authority to move figures within sections and came to understand the difference between the County and the library figures.

Next month the budget will be reviewed and then filed. Marita thanked Jim and Kim for including the tax rate history in their packets and Jeff acknowledged the time and effort they had put into the preparations.

5. Selection of Trustee to attend American Library Association Conference - Action Possible, Kim Diehm

Registration for the 2018 ALA conference has opened. Hillary and Kim are the tentative staff attendees. Discussion ensued about schedule availability and who has been offered the
opportunity to attend as a Trustee. After examination, it was determined Marita will be funded to attend the June 21-26, 2018 New Orleans conference.

VI. Announcements:
1. Boulder City Library 75th Anniversary Celebration w/Family Movie, 5pm, Community Room & Amphitheater, Friday, April 20, 2018
2. Superhero Saturday Comic Book Fair, Noon-3pm, Community Room & Amphitheater, Saturday, April 28, 2018
3. Boulder City Library Board Meeting, 7pm, Board Room, Thursday, May 17, 2018

Jeff added the May 3rd Debt Management Commission (DMC) meeting at 9 a.m. at the Clark County Government Building. Several representatives need to be there to answer questions and help them to clear the first hurdle.

VII. Citizen Participation: Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be acted upon until provisions of Nevada’s Open Meeting Law have been completed. Therefore, any action on such items must be considered at a later meeting. Public comment is generally limited to 5 minutes per person.

There were no comments.

VIII. Adjournment:

Ann Langevin moved to adjourn. Erica Tietjen seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.