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

Also Present: Director Kimberly Diehm, Assistant Director and Head of Cataloging and Processing Anne Karr, Head of Youth Services Jessica Jones, Craig Galati with LGA, Jim Chachas with Hobbs Ong & Associates, Bond Counsel Kendra Follett, Jack Medall with PFM and community member Martin Einert. Present on conference call, Darren Hodge and Thomas Toepfer with PFM.

The regular meeting of the Library Board of Trustees was called to order at 5:03 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.

The Board determined item 5 would be discussed before item 4 and the reports would be saved until later so the Chair could leave by 6 p.m.

Jeff Breeden moved that the consent agenda, minutes of the regular meeting of December 19, 2018, and bills paid of $25,191.70 from the previous month be accepted as amended. Marita Rhinehart seconded. Motion carried.

IV. Reports:

When returned to at the end of the meeting, Marita expressed excitement for the Mid-winter ALA conference reports. Rachel mentioned she was envious of Henderson’s Friends of the Library success.

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. Discussion on a Resolution concerning the financing of library improvements; directing the notification of 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 thereof - Action Possible, Jeff Breeden/ Hobbs Ong & Associates/ Kendra Follett

Representing PFM, Jack Medall and Darren Hodge (on the phone) walked the Board through an update to numbers presented last year. In preparing the presentation they assumed a conservative debt service level. The first option depicted a 9 cent debt levy. With this coverage it would take 9 years to generate 1 year of debt service. Jeff asked if this was required by statute. Darren explained the one year’s debt service provided additional security for bond holders. Kendra shared the Department of Taxation allows for 1 year. Darren expressed the greater concern is about a turn in the economy.

Options at 9.5 cents and 10 cents followed. With no other questions about debt service, Darren presented the impact upon a homeowner. The presentation gave a breakout for both annual and monthly amounts for each scenario. Kendra spoke about affected entities which are specifically defined by statute. The library bond affects other entities such as the City of Boulder City and Clark County and it is not permitted to limit those other entities ability to levy the amounts they are permitted. Kendra explained the proposing entity (in this case, the library) is not considered, but she ran through the numbers allowed for other area entities.

The legal difference is $0.5252. She explained that $0.5234 is still available. Even adding the City of Boulder City and the County, the data presented showed the library bond will not affect them. This fits the statutory definition. In the resolution, Kendra said the Board will have to make a statement explaining this finding.

Next, Kendra discussed taxes by the State, Clark County, the School District, the City of Boulder City, and the Boulder City Library. She discussed the overlapping tax rate in the library’s district. She explained the Debt Management Commission (DMC) can set the rate at $3.64. With Boulder City proposing at same meeting, they will consider whether the proposals fit a public need. The total will exceed the 80% mark by 2.04% and the DMC may decide between essential and non-essential public need. Public safety, education, and health are the only essential needs. Everything else is non-essential. Both will be competing essential services. The library is not prevented from going forward, but the last bond request was below the amount of question and so there was no challenge. The Library and the City represent education and health respectively and both can be considered essential services. The amount for both is not too close to the cap but the DMC will have discussion because together the amount will be over the designated customary percentage.

Jack presented the timeline for reference and he outlined the steps required for getting to the election. Kendra addressed a question regarding passing a resolution. Jeff thanked the team for presenting the requested information. He then opened discussion by asking whether the Board felt the need to borrow this money or not. He mentioned they needed to pass a resolution, but asked to what scale? He noted Craig with LGA was available to answer questions. Based upon the timeline, he pointed out the Board would have to make
a decision that night. Rachel clarified they were discussing Option A at the end of the last meeting. The consensus at that time was to go with the presented amount of $7,400,000.

Ann shared she had spoken with friends and had discovered they will not be going out to a community that was split 50/50 but will have a huge hill to climb without enough time to do advertising or a poll. She determined they would need to talk to individuals who were opposed to the bond and find out all of the reasons why. She also mentioned time will be needed to work more on branding and to prove the library is not obsolete but has always been on the edge of technology. Ann stated she’d be willing to reconsider her stance of the month before. She also did not think they could do anything useful by using the medium term financing and doing a 2-million-dollar project.

Ann said she was willing to discuss this more with additional feedback and wanted to know if anyone else had any new perspective. Erica asked if they had any more information or a poll. Jeff asked for staff anecdotal information. Kim shared the perspective of colleagues who said it is too soon. Staff is concerned the public will feel the library isn’t listening and they are concerned it might seem to the community like a slap in the face. Jessica mentioned people do not want to compete with the pool and they think it has to be one or the other. Kim also explained there is public confusion about whether the library is connected to The City, or connected to the County library system. Ann said time is needed to make the community understand why it is important and why we are asking for money. Ann suggested taking step back and trying at a later election.

It was explained that this is the last municipal election Boulder City will hold. Going to the next general election in 2020 was mentioned but Marita expressed she felt a 5,000-person group at the municipal election would be far preferable to facing the problem of a presidential election year in 2020. If the Board has to wait, she suggested 2022.

Rachel agreed there is a problem with the library’s message and she expressed she thought the library would always face that challenge. The people the library services know the library and its value while those who do not use the library will make assumptions. She noted that both groups will be voting. If they wait, she stated they would have more time to focus; however, she did not expect that particular challenge to ever go away. Other than going door to door, she said it is hard to get the library message into the hands of those people who are not typically library users. She said with time the library can get better at it, but she shared she is not sure she feels comfortable spending money on a PR firm. She’d rather use that money for patron services. A discussion about perception followed regarding the Board’s position as caretaker of the community’s money.

Marita shared advice received which encouraged contacting key people in the community and asking for their support, thereby increasing the circle of influence. Rachel liked the grassroots personal approach to achieving advocates better. Ann was skeptical whether a mailer would help and Marita did not feel an election going against propaganda for a state senator, etc. would do the library any good. Erica brought up clarity of message and noted the focus should be on 3 things. She suggested meeting rooms as community space,
space for youth, and a third thing so the message could remain on point. She said if they
go for a 9.5 cent rate, that is only a penny over what the ending bond has been.
Addressing community confusion will be important. She felt professionals might help
them to achieve the best communication.

Erica addressed the fact she was absent the previous meeting and asked for clarification
on the three scenarios. Craig said they had created them in a vacuum because they did not
have a sense of the Board’s desire. Having intimate connection to the community
meetings, they assumed the three top priorities were the youth area first, the meeting
room shortage second, and the closer entrance third. Even the least expensive scenario
offers significantly more space than there is now.

Ann brought the conversation back to the loan Jim had come up with. They agreed they
could use that approach if they lost the bond initiative. Aside from interest rate changes,
Jeff asked Jim about the realistic possibility. Jim said if they complied with all the
required steps they would have an opportunity to do this approach within a year in the
19/20 budget. The group discussed the nearness of the budget process and mentioned
they could put it in the budget and have the option not to execute it.

Rachel expressed she was not convinced they had anything to lose by pursuing the bond.
She didn’t feel public opinion would come from the same people who will vote this time.
Ann expressed her conviction about the need for a PR firm. Rachel felt cautious about
how to make that happen. Kim shared about EveryLibrary and their pro bono work. She
said they advised defining the library’s message as well. Kim said they felt the library
would need to contact people and ask why they didn’t vote for the bond. Marita
emphasized the pro bono aspect of this advice, however, Jeff pointed out there is a charge
for the polling. Rachel mentioned her concern about how that might be construed. She
reiterated she didn’t see what the library had to lose.

Jeff went back to the timeline. They discussed when they would need to have information
available to those writing the ballot question arguments. It will all start with the Board
finding the champions within the next 30 days. Collecting information, assimilating it,
and dispersing it rapidly will all need to take place. He reminded the Board that a vote to
move forward would commit them to finding those community members who would lead
this political action forward. He asked if they could do all that. They discussed the
urgency of the timeframe and names of possible community advocates. Marita clarified
that Ann was still committed to the 7.5-million-dollar plan.

Ann moved that the Board accept the resolution concerning the financing of library
improvements; directing the notification of the Clark County Debt Management
Commission of the District’s proposal to issue general obligation bonds to general
obligation funds. Marita seconded.

As part of discussion of a finance question, Kendra mentioned they would have to select
the rate. Discussion ensued regarding the difference between a 9 cent versus a 9.5 cent
bond. The threat of a massive recession led the group to prefer the 9 cent option. Jeff
proposed an amendment to the motion to add - at a rate of 9 cents. Motion carried.
A 2-minute break was taken at 6:02 to allow for the exit of the Chair and at 6:04 Marita Rhinehart restarted the meeting.

2. Library Interest in 651 Adams Blvd - Action Possible, Jeff Breeden
   Marita noted there was nothing new from the City to report.

3. Discussion of plans to promote ballot issue – Action Possible, Kim Diehm

   Kim mentioned the price may be in the $16,000 range. Rachel is most interested in how they reach people. Kim guessed they would use the voter database which provides voter information. Marita suggested each Board member pick 2 people in the community to approach who are outside of their normal realm. She asked to see where they stand and ask them to be part of a committee.

   Personal phone calls and various groups and individuals were brainstormed. Erica confirmed they could talk to neighbors as a public citizen. Rachel mentioned talking to groups that use the library and are already friends.

   News articles and a media campaign were discussed. Getting the stories out was important to Ann. Rachel mentioned we do not have to climb Mt. Everest but only need to get to basecamp. Marita pointed out the statistical truth that we have 30% popularity, will never win over another 30%, and of the 40% remaining, only half need to be swayed.

   Marita asked what they needed to do by the following month. Kim hoped to have the survey started. Getting a list and creating a committee was agreed upon. Kim said to create the Political Action Committee (PAC), paperwork needed to be filed with the Secretary of State. Valerie McNay was suggested to start assembling the PAC. Rachel suggests brainstorming names. Marita asked the group to all create their own lists and in two weeks bring these names to Kim and then divvy up the list. Organizing techniques were discussed.

   Marita stated that two weeks would be the end of the month. By the end of the month the Board members planned to share their contact list with Kim and to let her know whether the individuals spoken to had said yes or no, so duplication could be avoided. Rachel made sure the approach to their “ask” was to help spread the word, request to hear their ideas, and ask whether the potential advocate would like to join the committee. Kim shared questions Bill (an advisor) had said to ask. She said, ask how important libraries are to them. Find out how the library compliments what they do. Do not ask for money first. Ask if we can count on their support, and ask if we can use their name on an announcement. Later, “Would you consider a donation?” can be asked. “Can I count on your support?” was considered an important message.

   Rachel remembered Craig’s comment about the price of a latte. She had been thinking about a slogan, Lattés for Libraries to illustrate how ridiculously inexpensive
the bond request really is. Marita said Bill had mentioned the need for 3 points as well. Discussion also led to the expressed need for a clear chart showing exactly how much cost would be incurred for the various assessed home prices. The wording of the bond issue was reviewed as a problem and Craig pointed out most people walk in to vote without reading the question. He explained most voters make up their mind based on the message. It has to be simple and at an 8th grade level.

4. Discussion of voter demographics - Action Possible, Kim Diehm

Kim informed the Board the library has a list from the Election Department. Samantha was able to manipulated data and it may be useful to them going forward. Each address is listed by code. She shared, they will be able to target individual neighborhoods if needed.

5. Incident Log information – Action Possible, Kim Diehm

Jeff had requested to see the information at the last meeting. Kim noted the reports help with staff training. Since the last meeting Gary Berger’s police volunteers have begun making a presence known. They walk inside and outside and discourage bicycle and skateboard use.

VI. Announcements:

1. Winter Reading Program, December 14 - February 25, 2019
   The theme is A Universe of Stories. Jessie was complimented on decorations.
2. Romance Book Club @Boulder Dam Brewing Co., 6pm, Thursday January 17, 2019
3. Galaxy Wine Glass Craft, 1pm Community Room, Saturday January 19, 2019
4. Library Closed for Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Monday January 21, 2019
5. After Hours Movie, 5:30pm Community Room, Friday January 25, 2019
6. Family Hockey Storytime, 1pm Community Room, Saturday January 26, 2019
7. Drop In Coding, 6pm Community Room, Monday January 28, 2019

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.

No comments were offered at this time.

VIII. Adjournment:

Erica Tietjen moved to adjourn. Rachel Hunt seconded. Meeting adjourned at 6:41 p.m.