#### SAN JUAN ISLAND LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Special Meeting for the Purpose of a Work Session Windermere Conference Room, Friday Harbor December 15, 2015

**Members Present:** Glenna Hall, Fred Henley, Barry Jacobson, Mark Madsen, Lynn Weber/Roochvarg

Staff Present: Laurie Orton, Carrie Lacher

Facilitator Present: Lynne Hobbs

**Call to Order:** President Lynn Weber/Roochvarg called the work session to order at 9:00 a.m. Work session focus: Discuss and develop public input process as part of Library Facility Exploration begun at Work Session #1 on May 26, 2015.

Public Access: None

### **Agenda Approval**

Lynne Hobbs reviewed the agenda and the proposed process for the day with Board members. Lynn Weber/Roochvarg also announced to the Board that she and Barry Jacobson had initiated the Library Director's annual review process and information would be forwarded to the Board and staff within the next week.

# Review Actions from September 15, 2015 Work Session

Lynne Hobbs reviewed action items with the Board and updated items as of December 15:

Action	Description	Owner	Complete by
1.	Budget for facility work sessions and public exploration process	MM/LO	October Board Meeting DONE
2.	Draft survey questions (on current agenda for discussion)	LWR/BJ	November Board Meeting DONE
3.	Draft letter for library facility advisory group candidates; planned to be sent early January (draft on current agenda for review and discussion)	BJ	November Board Meeting DONE
4.	Send Laurie additional names for first Advisory Group list (initial list on current agenda for review)	MM	December work session DONE & IN PROCESS
5.	Present data from school district	MM	December work session IN PROCESS
6.	Gather data re: use of building by public (send info to Laurie); suggested to review & collate past building related costs	LO	December work session NOT READY

7.	Report population trends impacting library services and tax revenue	MM	December work session IN PROCESS
8.	Contact information for candidates of Advisory Group – on current agenda for review & discussion	LO	December work session IN PROCESS
9.	New FAQ about facility exploration – on current agenda for review & discussion	LWR	December work session DONE
10.	Phone calls to advisory group candidates	ALL	Not addressed
11.	Advisory Group meetings		Not addressed
12.	Conduct surveys, focus groups, public meetings		Not addressed

## **Review Principles of this Process**

- 1. Keep all stakeholders apprised of the schedule, process, and outcomes of the facilities consideration process.
- 2. Listen actively without preconceptions.
- 3. Receive all input from all sources as worthy of thoughtful attention and consideration.
- 4. Withhold from decision making until all input has been evaluated with stakeholder participation throughout.

# Review and Edit – FAQs for use in public information campaign, letter of introduction, survey, advisory group list

Lynn Weber/Roochvarg introduced a review and discussion about the draft FAQs and explained that she tried to address all potential FAQs that would be needed. These would not necessarily all be used at the same time but could be used when in an appropriate setting and situation. The full list of FAQs was intended as a resource document. It was agreed by the Board that it was not necessary to edit the FAQs until they were to be actually shared with the public either in a public forum or on the Library website.

**ACTION ITEM**: Send suggested edits/changes to Lynn Weber/Roochvarg so she could continue to work on the document.

Discussion developed regarding various aspects and concerns of the draft FAQs:

- basis of development
- when in the process these would be shared with public
- · concern regarding potential perceived point of view/bias
- may be a perception of a certain outcome
- data still being gathered
- certain sections could be pulled out to use for various purposes

Fred Henley expressed concern that building maintenance was swallowing up the 1% budget increase allowed by law so as a result, Library operations are stagnating or reversing. He believed this information needed to be shared with the public in the initial

stages of the facility process. Lynne Hobbs suggested developing a graph to show this trend. It was noted that the current level of Library services would not be able to keep up with the cost of living. The Library's current levy rate was .489. If no increasing building costs, the Library still could not keep up with costs of maintaining its current level of services.

**ACTION ITEM**: Fred Henley to develop a graph or statement to depict trends in building costs and the costs of operations plus services. This could perhaps be combined with information regarding trends in maintenance and service calls.

The Board was in agreement that information needed to be presented to the public in such a way that there was no forgone conclusion. Discussion developed regarding:

- creating and implementing a process involving the public that did not presume a decision by the Board
- use of focus groups
- use of focus groups to complete survey
- · questions and tasks for different focus groups
- · potential outcomes of focus groups
- use of town hall/larger public meetings
- timing of potential ballot measure
- how information would be presented so that it is factual but also helpful to enable public to provide informed feedback; certain elements were considered:
  - o information Board has gathered so far
  - o alternatives Board has been considering
  - o education regarding libraries of the future
  - mission of library

## **Quick Process Check**

Lynne Hobbs led the Board in summarizing the morning's discussion. Lynne noted that although the discussion seemed diffuse and difficult, she felt it was critical for the Board in developing and clarifying its next steps.

## Initial Discussion to Clarify Next Steps in public process

- Board spent some time discussing timing of next steps within the context of the current local political climate and potential upcoming ballot measures by other entities:
  - consider public outreach for third quarter of 2016; this timing could also capture input from summer residents
  - o consider other upcoming ballot measures and impacts on community
  - o consider participation level by the public during summer season
  - o consider delaying next steps with public until first quarter 2017
    - better timing considering upcoming local and national political events
    - allow time for exploring public/private partnerships
    - allow time to pursue different types of community support
    - Board could explore developing a Library foundation:

- define distinctions between roles of the Friends of the Library and a new Library Foundation (as an example, Anacortes Library had an informative brochure on this subject)
- funding capabilities of a Library foundation and other private support
- allow time for Board to develop clearer consensus about the process
- Board discussed differences between renovation and building a new facility in light of facilities needs and necessary funding.

**ACTION ITEM**: Mark Madsen will find out specific dates of other ballot measures during 2016.

Continue Review and Edit of FAQs for use in public information campaign, letter of introduction, survey, advisory group list

# Survey

Lynn Weber/Roochvarg distributed hard copies of the San Juan Island Library Building and Services Survey that she and Barry Jacobson developed and that included several annotations from a professional, local pro bono consultant. A second document was also distributed that was a "clean" version that accepted all of the annotations and changes. These documents had been shared electronically with the Board prior to the work session. The Board was therefore able to review and discuss in depth:

- consultant suggested removing or merging draft Questions 4 & 5 asking for three words describing the San Juan Island Library of today and of the future:
  - agreement that these questions could provide helpful information for the Board
  - o could solicit "feelings" about Library
  - o could be utilized for word clouds and other uses
  - o a "do no harm" question that is not data driven
  - agreed to keep these questions in the survey but put them immediately after Question 2
- discussion of proposed edits to and agreement on Question 8 regarding age ranges of survey participants and how this information would be used by Library; suggested ranges:
  - 0 18-29
  - 0 30-44
  - 0 45-64
  - 0 65+

**ACTION ITEM**: Barry Jacobson updated the survey questions based on consultant feedback and Board discussion and emailed this to the Board. DONE.

Lunch Break at 11:50 pm. Session reconvened at 12:30 pm

# Continued Discussion of prioritized steps and decisions for public process, etc. Library Facility Focus Group Discussion

Board reviewed a compiled list of proposed names and discussed to ensure this represented a broad cross section of the public, corrected spellings and information, and otherwise worked to update the list. The Board also discussed how to most effectively and when to utilize this list. It was agreed the objective was to select a representative group with which to start the public outreach process in order to get helpful initial feedback. This group could develop into a larger group that would then be split into several smaller focus groups. The Board also identified underrepresented population segments.

The Board discussed and agreed to the following public process:

- check for balanced representation on list of invitees: review and finalize fourth quarter 2016
- 2. all on list (names could be added) would be invited
- 3. invited to participate in focus groups on multiple dates/times starting in early December 2016
- 4. focus groups convened early First Quarter 2017
  - a. introduce topic with background information
  - b. test the survey and provide feedback
  - c. hear their questions
  - d. ask: what is missing from survey?
- 5. revise survey by March 31, 2017
- 6. send out survey with a four-week return deadline early April 2017
- Board would analyze responses and develop a report to share with the public by mid May 2017
- 8. Possible public hearing or public meeting to officially receive responses from the public June 2017
- 9. Board would make a decision on a course of action June/July 2017

Board agreed that during 2016, time could be spent on working on other actions regarding facility exploration such as collecting background information, determining potential costs, exploring the development of a Library foundation, learning about the bond process, etc. Board planned to discuss these topics further and develop a related timeline at its regular January 2016 board meeting.

# **Action Planning:**

- 1. Edits of FAQs to Lynn: ALL
- 2. Statement/graph of costs for building and for operations plus services: Fred Henley
- 3. Timeline of ballot measures during 2016: Mark Madsen
- 4. Update survey questions and email to Board: Barry Jacobson/DONE
- 5. Review and summarize action items from prior Board work sessions: Lynne Hobbs
- 6. Conduct survey and public meetings first quarter 2017: ALL

### **REVIEW OF WORK SESSION PROCESS**

- Firm agenda with board input helpful
- Guidepost materials to use as reference was helpful
- · Keep mission statement and core values as part of the work session packet
- Keep poster of principles and values on display during work sessions
- Meeting space and delivery of food items worked well
- Watch budget needs for the planning process

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Barry Jacobson moved and Fred Henley seconded to adjourn at 2:57 pm. Carried.

Respectfully submitted:

**Board Secretary** 

**Board President** 

Approved: