A. **Call to Order.** Chair Leep called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

B. **Roll Call.** Assistant Director Szegda took the roll call.

- **Present:** Bugna, Chambers, Hadrovic, Leep, Lemons, Pandey
- **Absent:** Cohen
- **Staff:** Interim Library Services Director Sean Reinhart, Assistant Library Services Director Nick Szegda

**Public Comment.** Chair Leep called for public comments. The following public comments were received:

- Written public comments submitted in advance of the meeting from: Pam Jones, Lynne Bramlett, and Pushpinder Lubana. (See Attachment M-1).
- Jim Lewis asked that the Commission discuss safety and emergency procedures at a future Commission meeting.
- Pushpinder Lubana advised the Commission that she would like to rescind her statement of interest (see Agenda item C4, staff report) and urged the Commission not to merge the Commission and the BHNLAC group.
- Julie Shanson asked that siting considerations be included in the Belle Haven Space Needs Study; suggested that the proposed computer lab would be more flexible if a laptop cart were used; and spoke in favor of keeping the BHNLAC as a standalone committee until the new branch library is completed.

C. **Regular Business**

**C1. Approve the minutes from the January 28, 2019 Library Commission Special Meeting**

**ACTION:** Motion/second (Leep/Lemons) to approve the January 28, 2019 meeting minutes. Motion approved unanimously.

**C2. Review and discuss the library strategic plan update 2019-2020**

- Commissioner Lemons asked in the Belle Haven branch library was still a top priority. Interim Director Reinhart affirmed.
- Commissioner Hadrovic asked staff if item 2.3.g – improving the collection and services at the branch for adults – could be prioritized. Interim Director Reinhart affirmed.
- Commissioner Pandey noticed a typo in item 2.4.c. Staff indicated that it would be corrected.
- Chair Leep asked if a new plan would be developed in 2020. Interim Director Reinhart affirmed.
- Staff will incorporate Commissioner comments into the plan and return at a future Commission
C3. Review and discuss the Belle Haven Branch Library space needs study. Interim Director Reinhart gave a brief presentation of the survey results filtered to show the responses of Belle Haven residents compared to responses from all residents. Assistant Director Szegda gave Commissioners a report on the results of the most recent focus groups.

- Commissioner Hadrovic asked when the Commission would see the next iteration of the study. Interim Director Reinhart reported that the City Council will review the study at their March 12 meeting, and the Commission at their March 18 meeting. The final study is scheduled to be approved at the April 9 City Council meeting.

C4. Recommendation to merge the Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee with the Library Commission by expanding the Library Commission from seven to eleven members. Interim Director Reinhart gave a brief presentation of the staff report, and advised that the City Council would make the final decision at their March 5 meeting.

- Commissioner Lemons noted that BHNLAC and the Commission share a common goal to move forward to a new branch library in Belle Haven, and that a merger would still provide the opportunity for a subcommittee of interested Commissioners to focus on the details of planning and construction of a new branch library. She stated that with the advent of district elections the Belle Haven neighborhood now has an advocate on City Council. She added that while progress on the new branch library has been slower than many would like, progress is being made and is accelerating. She concluded that she will defer to whatever City Council wishes for the future of BHNLAC and the Library Commission, but she supports the merger proposal and supports having BHNLAC members and Belle Haven stakeholders formally join the Commission to participate in the deliberations.

- Commissioner Hadrovic expressed her agreement with Commissioner Lemons’ comments, and noted that while she also defers to City Council’s wishes in any event, she supports having BHNLAC members and Belle Haven stakeholders join the Library Commission. She added that merging the two groups would create more opportunities for synergy, and she welcomes the input of Belle Haven stakeholders on the Commission. She noted that the creation of a new branch library is the Library Commission’s top priority.

- Commissioner Pandey asked staff why there would be any opposition to the proposed merger. Interim Director Reinhart responded by outlining the concerns expressed by community members about lack of transparency and community engagement in past city processes related to the branch library and the Belle Haven neighborhood in general. He noted that recent significant changes in city leadership, including new City Council members, a new City Manager and new Library administration, have resulted in a clear new direction that emphasizes community engagement and transparency going forward.

- Commissioner Bugna expressed her support for the proposed merger, citing efficiency and clarity. She added that having two separate bodies makes deliberations less clear and more disjointed. She noted that Menlo Park Library is one citywide system that would be better served by having a unified body and a unified process that is inclusive of all voices.

- Chair Leep expressed her support for the proposed merger, and added that having two separate bodies makes the overall deliberation process less transparent because neither body will necessarily hear all views and voices directly. She added that she believes it is important to have Belle Haven stakeholders formally part of the Library Commission, and she expressed her hope
that BHNLAC members and Belle Haven stakeholders will serve on the Library Commission if City Council approves the proposed merger.

- Commissioner Chambers expressed her support for the proposed merger. She noted that the Belle Haven library project is the top priority and main focus of the Library Commission. She added that expanding the Library Commission to have additional members will strengthen the Commission’s capacity to manage the extensive work ahead.

ACTION: Motion/second (Leep/Lemons): The Library Commission recommends that City Council merge the Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee (BHNLAC) with the Library Commission, expand the Library Commission membership from seven to eleven members, and prioritize currently serving BHNLAC members and/or eligible Belle Haven community members for appointments to the four newly created Library Commission seats. Motion approved 5-0-1 with five in favor, none opposed and one abstaining (Bugna).

C5. Review and update: Library Commission tentative agenda calendar. Commissioners added the following items to their tentative agenda calendar by general consent:
- Safety policy review – June 2019
- Explore options for including youth voices on the Library Commission – September 2019

C6. Discuss Library Commission report to City Council. Assistant Director Szegda provided a brief overview of the Library Commission’s current work plan and recent accomplishments. Discussion ensued.
- Chair Leep indicated that she will prepare a draft presentation and present it to the Commission at the March meeting.

D. Informational Items

D1. Report from the Library Director. Interim Director Reinhart provided brief updates:
- Little Free Library applications are due March 1
- The Library Foundation is sponsoring a Youth Poetry Contest, to be announced later this week
- The Menlo Gates project ribbon-cutting will take place on March 17 (St. Patrick’s Day)

E. Commissioner Reports

E1. Individual commissioner reports. Commissioner Hadrovc provided a brief update on the recent Parks and Recreation Master Plan Oversight and Outreach Committee meeting.

F. Adjournment. Chair Leep adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.

Attachments:

Written public comments submitted to the Commission (see Attachment M-1):
- Pushpinder Lubana
- Pamela D. Jones
- Lynne Bramlett
Hi Nick and Sean,

I am withdrawing my statement of interest about serving on the Library Commission as part of a merged group with the Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee (BHNLAC).

Instead, I believe more than ever that a separate BHNLAC is needed. So I'm reattaching a proposed revised charter for that Committee that I emailed you a few weeks ago. I'd like the city to consider my proposal as a starting point for how we can move forward with a new BHNLAC.

As you likely have let the City Manager know about your idea to merge BHNLAC with the Library Commission, I've copied her in this email.

For context, when I agreed to your proposal of merging the two in our meeting on Friday, Feb 8, I wasn't fully aware of my community members' desires and viewpoints. Since our meeting, I've received considerable feedback from key stakeholders in Belle Haven as to why the City should not merge BHNLAC with the Library Commission for the crucial work ahead. This feedback only confirmed my original opinion when we met on Feb 8.

As a recap of the events that led to today, I originally sent you a proposed revised charter for the BHNLAC (attached). You then invited me to a Feb 8 meeting to discuss your counter idea of merging the Library Commission with the BHNLAC. Despite my reservations, I agreed to your proposal of merging the two groups. The meeting with just the two of you didn't allow us to hear from other voices regarding the matter. During our meeting, we also seem to have forgotten the public input expressed at the last Library Commission meeting. That public input led to the LC supporting the idea of keeping a separate Belle Haven Committee. Council has also received public support for a separate BHNLAC. When we met, I also wasn't fully aware of my community members' desires and viewpoints. I was also mindful that having two groups would add to staff time. So I went along with your proposal despite my doubts and reservations.

In retrospect, instead of the three of us having a private meeting, it would have been better to have held a public forum where the community could have been weighed in on the decision. My community's needs have traditionally been neglected by the city and it is my firm belief that keeping BHNLAC alive with a revised charter will be the right step for the city. I can assure you that filling the seats on BHNLAC will not be a problem. Our community wants to fully engage with the process. I respectfully request that the City do the right thing for Belle Haven in this matter.

Thanks,

Pushpinder
Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee Revised Charter (Draft Rev #1)

Recommendation prepared by Pushpinder Lubana, member, BHNLC.
Dated: Feb 3, 2019

Background
At their October 17, 2017 meeting, Council approved the formation of the Belle Haven Library Advisory Committee (BHNLC). As described in the Library Staff Report 17-243-CC: “A City Council appointed 7-member advisory committee would begin by participating in the Library Needs Assessment project and would continue to provide input to staff and consultants as the branch portion of the system improvements moves forward. Staff suggests that the Committee be comprised of one member each from the Library Commission and the Library Foundation, two members of the City Council, and three resident members from the Belle Haven neighborhood.”

At the January 28, 2019 Library Commission meeting, Library commissioners and BHNLC Committee members present wanted to continue the BHNLC but in a new form. At Council’s Jan 29, 2019 meeting, members of the public also advocated to continue the BHLAC. In response, Council recommended that the committee continue in a new form.

Revised Charter and Composition
The BHNLC is established as an Advisory Committee with a primary focus on the Belle Haven New Library project. Once the project is complete, the work of the Committee shall cease and the Committee shall be dissolved. The Committee meets at least monthly, and on an as-needed basis. Acting in an advisory capacity, the BHNLC should have the following powers and duties at each phase of the project:

1. Strategic Inputs Phase
   a. Provide inputs on short-term improvements needed for the Belle Haven Library as we move forward with the new branch library
   b. Review and provide inputs on the annual budget for the Belle Haven Library’s programs and services
   c. Work with staff to solicit feedback regarding library service needs in Belle Haven through tools such as surveys, community gatherings, and workshops.
   d. Support staff in their efforts to engage in public outreach to solicit substantive feedback and opinions on the Belle Haven Library project and related services.
e. The BHNLAC may form Ad Hoc Subcommittees for the purposes of information gathering on specific issues, thus creating more community involvement and more in-depth visioning.

2. Design Phase
   a. Once Council approves a Master Plan for a new Belle Haven Branch Library, the BHNLAC will continue to work with staff through the design phase, to include, but not limited to environmental consultants, design professionals, project management professionals, and project contractor.
   b. Help staff with its efforts to identify a suitable site for a new Belle Haven Library and its efforts to secure funding.
   c. Coordinate with synergistic City efforts involving City facilities in the Belle Haven Community, such as those at the Onetta Harris Community Center.

3. Build Phase
   a. During the project build phase, the BHNLAC will continue to work with staff, as appropriate, to provide feedback on project priorities and direction.
   b. Assist staff and the City Council with the identification and development of donor recognition opportunities throughout the project.

The BHNLAC will consist of up to seven (with a minimum of 5) appointed Menlo Park resident members and one City Council member. Preference will be given to those actually living or working in Belle Haven.

The makeup of the Committee members is encouraged as follows:

- At least one member should represent local educational institutions
- At least one member should represent a family, community or civic organization that focuses on improving opportunities for residents in Belle Haven
- At least one member should represent the Belle Haven Neighborhood Association
- At least one person should represent religious organizations in Belle Haven

Cadence of meetings (monthly)
The Committee usually meets the second Monday (?) of each month at the Belle Haven Library from 6:30 p.m.-8:30 p.m.
Good Evening,
Do to conflicting meetings I am unable to attend the Library Commission meeting Monday evening.
Attached please find my comments on C4.
Thank-you,
Pamela Jones

--

_The impossible dissipates when I becomes WE._
24 February 2019

Chairperson Leep, Vice Chair Bugna, Commissioners and Staff,

Your continued support to ensure a branch library is built in the Belle Haven neighborhood is greatly appreciated.

The Menlo Park Police Department is holding a community meeting at 6:00 pm Monday at the Belle Haven Neighborhood Center. This meeting was scheduled several weeks ago. In addition, the Planning Commission has several items on their agenda that deeply affect our community. Items **C3-Belle Haven Branch library space needs study** and **C4-Library Commission Expansion from seven to eleven members** on your agenda are extremely important the Belle Haven neighborhood. Traffic makes it impossible to attend both meetings. As the major stakeholders in the new Belle Haven Branch Library the neighborhood directly affected must be included in all discussions.

Please reschedule the above two items **C3 & C4** until your regularly scheduled meeting in March.

I am concerned about the recommendation from staff to disband the BNLAC and increase the Library Commission to eleven members with the four new members representing the Belle Haven community stakeholders. The approved motion 10172017 by the City Council states “**ACTION: Motion and second (Mueller/Carlton) to appoint a Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee, that would be charged with advising staff and consultants throughout the City of Menlo Park system improvements in the Belle Haven neighborhood, and would include a Spanish speaking member… The motion passed unanimously.**”

This motion implies continuation until completion as indicated in staff report “17-243-CC Analysis. Appoint a Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee A City Council appointed 7-member advisory committee would begin by participating in the Library Needs Assessment project and would continue to provide input to staff and consultants as the branch portion of the system improvements move forward. Staff suggests that the Committee be comprised of one member each from the Library Commission and the Library Foundation, two members of the City Council, and three resident members from the Belle Haven neighborhood. Typical Commission selection procedures to seat the Committee members would take place at a future City Council meeting, following an application process.”

Discussion by BHNLAC committee members and residents at the BHNLAC 09242018 meeting and Library Commission 01282019 meeting, requested the continuation of a separate committee until ground breaking. It is interesting that library staff met with individually four remaining BHNLAC members after expressing their desire to continue at their 09242018 meeting. It should also be noted that residents indicated support of a separate committee.

You may also want to discuss with Complete Streets Commissions their experience with an eleven-member commission. I also recognize that staff capacity is a consideration in this recommendation.

In summary, this item should be rescheduled for further discussion. This issue does not need to be a part of the upcoming goal-setting.

Again thank-you,

Pamela D. Jones
Hello Commissioners,

I apologize for the length of the attached and that I could not send it sooner. However, I have tried to write it in such a way that you could skim it as needed. I am in Colorado and unable to attend the meeting. As many of my comments pertain to Belle Haven, I will copy Cecila Taylor.

I'm attaching public comments and a list of participants to the Nov 2017 meeting that was referenced in the current strategic plan staff report. I am blind copying you based on the general request of staff that we do this when writing an entire commission.

Lynne
Strategic Plan Update Meeting (Nov 2017)

27 invited people (15 City or Library Employees and 12 other). Bolded names meant they were present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role and/or official Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda Abbott</td>
<td>City of MP, Librarian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Becker</td>
<td>City of MP, Librarian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Holmer</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Flanagan</td>
<td>City of MP, Librarian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Szegda</td>
<td>City of MP, Assistant Library Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wilkins</td>
<td>City of Menlo Park Library Employee – Senior Librarian. Head of Children’s Department. Official Branch Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herberto Madrigal</td>
<td>City of MP, Library Assistant I (as per website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanca Madriz</td>
<td>City of MP, Library Assistant II (as per website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Quinonez</td>
<td>City of MP, Library Assistant I (as per website) but Assistant II as per what’s on his business card. Also Volunteer Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rani Singh</td>
<td>City of MP, Library Assistant III (heads circulation?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weaver</td>
<td>City of MP Library Employee – Outreach Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Knapp</td>
<td>City of MP Library staff (but not listed at website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherise Brandell</td>
<td>City of Menlo Park, Community Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Schweigart</td>
<td>City of Menlo Park, Community Services Department, Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Bonham</td>
<td>City of MP, Community Services Department, Recreation Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex McIntyre</td>
<td>City of MP, City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Bramlett</td>
<td>City of MP, Current Library Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann McQueen</td>
<td>Former Library Commissioner. Retired middle school teacher. Went to library school with Jennifer Wilkins. Also worked with Jennifer Wilkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Halaby</td>
<td>Library Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Meissner</td>
<td>Friends of the Library volunteer and long-term community volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hass</td>
<td>Friends of the Library, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Jones</td>
<td>Friends of the Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Blonde</td>
<td>Friends of the Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Corman</td>
<td>Library Foundation, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Flanagan</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Forrester</td>
<td>Keplers (bookstore) Literary Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bales</td>
<td>Literacy Partners (raises money for Project Read efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Marsouk</td>
<td>Techy Kids, Founder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not invited

- All library employees, including the temps (some have worked as temps for 3, 4 and 10+ years)
- Library Support Groups:
  - Entire current library commission
  - Linda Carlson, Literacy Partners
  - Historical Association (President)
- Stakeholder Leaders in Belle Haven
  - Schools:
    - Belle Haven Elementary
    - Mid Pen High School
    - TIDE Academy (new high school in Belle Haven)
    - Beechwood Academy
    - Willow Oaks Elementary
  - Non Profits
    - Boys & Girls Club
  - MP Non Profits:
    - Children’s Development Center
    - Senior Center
  - Faith Community
  - Business Community
- Community Leaders
  - Belle Haven Neighborhood Association (Rachael Bickerstaff)
  - Belle Haven Action (Julie Shanson & Cecilia Taylor)
  - Others know to MP, such as Michele Tate of Housing Commission
- School Stakeholders in rest of Menlo Park
  - Local School Boards
  - Principals of local schools and pre-schools
- Children’s day care located near library
- City Council representative to library (Ray Mueller)
To Library Commission
Date: Feb 25, 2019

Re: PUBLIC INPUT
From: Lynne Bramlett, former Library Commissioner (Sep 2014-April 2017)

Unfortunately, I am out of town and not able to attend tonight. I apologize for the long public comment and that I was unable to send it to you sooner. I take the time to prepare and send you feedback towards the goal of our learning from the past towards the goal of a more community-based and inclusive public engagement process for future library-related efforts.

C1. Approve minutes from the January 28, 2019 Library Commission meeting

Correction to minutes under: D3: Library System Improvements Project (LISP) update

- Lynne Bramlett …She also pointed out that the January 15 staff report 19-001-CC contained inaccurate information and omitted details, which created a biased report. The staff report asserts that “Multiple studies conducted by the City in 2015, 2017 and 2018 concluded that the current Belle Haven and main library facilities are outdated and insufficient to meet community needs now and into the future, and should be replaced with new facilities.” The referenced 2015 report only stated, “The Main Library Facility is aging and a comprehensive facility assessment needs to be completed to determine future directions” (2). The staff report also omitted details as to the significant public opposition to the Main Library project expressed by the public, including in the 2017 City Satisfaction Survey.

C2. Review and discuss the library strategic plan update 2019-2020

The assertion that the Library Commission played a key role in the process to develop the strategic plan is incorrect. The facts show otherwise.

The library provides an overview of its strategic planning process in the Menlo Park Library: Strategic Plan 2016-2020” (11-13).” I’ve added to these details with information from related documents and my own personal recollections. I’ve been as careful as possible in supplying the details. I will break the details in the Strategic Plan document into the customary phases for strategic planning.
Strategic Planning Discovery Phase. The “discovery phase” was conducted by 4 Library staff members and two consultants. This group may have arrived with assumptions that led to confirmation bias. Additional relevant documents, such as those from the Connect Menlo/Belle Haven Visioning Process (taking place in a parallel process) were not included in their review.

Reviewing a more complete list of documents might have led to putting a new Branch Library in Belle Haven as a higher strategic priority. The document, “Focus Group to Determine Library Needs in Belle Haven” is listed as a reviewed document. The title implies that Focus Groups were conducted. They were not. I wrote this document and it was only a preliminary plan for Focus groups. The Library Commission turned this document over to the consultants under the assumption that they would conduct some focus groups. I didn’t realize until they finished that no focus groups were conducted.

Strategic Planning Vision Phase. The vision phase did not widely involve the MP community. Meetings were by invitation only to a mostly insular group of people. Interviews were conducted with a limited group. All main segments of the MP population and stakeholder groups were not represented, especially those in Belle Haven.

More inclusive strategies to involve all parts of Menlo Park were needed in a process to determine the needs of the MP community for library services for years to come. A strategic plan advisory committee, that included representation from respected community leaders, neighborhood associations, school districts, non-profits and the library support groups – along with library staff and city administrators would likely have led to a more inclusive and thorough process.

Strategic Planning Refinement and Decision-Making Phase. Six people, at private meetings, made the decisions that led to the Strategic Plan. According to the Library Strategic plan document, this group consisted of the Library Director and 3 other library employees and the 2 consultants.

After these six people developed their plan, it was presented as a fait accompli to the Library Commission and perhaps to a few other groups. The Library Commission was not asked to weigh in on the priorities.

The completed Strategic Plan 2016-2020 was presented to the City Council on October 11. I was present at that meeting. The library’s presentation to Council included few details, and did not include the idea of building a new Main Library.

Instead, a series of public workshops should have been scheduled so the public could review and provide input into a draft library strategic plan. The plan should then have been revised to reflect the public’s input.
Nov 2017 Strategic Plan update meeting. I was the only library commissioner invited to this meeting, despite my protests and requests that all library commissioners be invited. I have my “invitation” and email correspondence at home and I can supply this if it’s needed. As justification for only inviting me, I was told that I was the Library Commission Chair when the Strategic planning process was underway. However, I was not the chair when the process commenced.

Please see the separate list of invited people to this meeting. This further illustrates my point that the Library Commission was not deeply involved in the Strategic plan’s development.

MP Library Strategic Plan Timeline 2016-2020 & Related Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Related Documents</th>
<th>Observations &amp; Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2014</td>
<td>Operational and administrative audit of the library department</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Operational and administrative audit of the library department</td>
<td>The high-level presentation to Council did not include all the recommendations in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Who was interviewed for the audit? What was the public notification process? I cannot recall the Library Commission, at a public meeting, being asked for our input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2016</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Team identified community characteristics and assess needs</td>
<td>Susan Holmer 3 additional library staff members 2 consultants</td>
<td>Community &amp; Library Facts Report – Appendix A (not at website)</td>
<td>Lack of broad stakeholder perspectives may have led to flawed assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions that the Strategic Planning team held were not identified and named so they could be evaluated for validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete data sources were reviewed. These could easily have led to flawed assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Related Documents</td>
<td>Observations &amp; Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2016</td>
<td>Consultant-conducted Half day workshop with 30 stakeholders</td>
<td>30 members of the Strategic Planning group. Specific names not included in Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The meetings were not publicly noticed and open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that this group consisted of the same people invited to the Nov 2017 update. (See separate list.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2016</td>
<td>Two Community Forums</td>
<td>“Broad cross section of over 40 individuals”</td>
<td>No known report. However, I learned about a “notes” handout that I have at home.</td>
<td>The stated list in the Library Strategic plan document is not broad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The March 14, 2016 Library Commission minutes states that “A city and library staff workshop will be held on the morning of April 21 and a forum for invited members of the public on the evening of the 21st.” These were not publicly noticed forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Related Documents</td>
<td>Observations &amp; Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2016 | Interviews of 9 Community Leaders and Stakeholders | • Nancy Andrus, MP Resident; librarian, Sunnyvale Public Library  
• Cherise Brandell, Director, Community Services Department  
• Anna Chow, former Library Foundation, Small Business Owner  
• Clay Curtin, Assistant City manager  
• Clark Kepler, Library Foundation; former owners Kepler Books  
• Alex McIntyre, City Manager  
• Peter Ohtaki, City Councilmember  
• Jill Parker, Library Foundation  
• Anne Wellner De Veer, former Library Commissioner | Menlo Park Library Strategic Planning: Report on Stakeholder Interviews: Appendix B | The Community Leaders and Stakeholders list consists mostly of city staff and library insiders. It notably omitted stakeholder representation from Belle Haven, schools, non-profits, neighborhood associations, etc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Related Documents</th>
<th>Observations &amp; Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 21-</td>
<td>Community Survey</td>
<td>334 usable responses</td>
<td>MP Library: Community Survey 2016 report (Appendix C)</td>
<td>The Strategic Plan Report does not include all 26 questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was the referenced survey the one that the Library Commission developed? If so, this was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a survey with a limited distribution list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why were some surveys tossed out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Workshop</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Group (30) and</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>The meeting was not publicly noticed. I am not sure who was invited. If the same people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>as those invited to the Nov 2017 meeting, the group consisted of library staff, library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>insiders and only one Library Commissioner (Lynne Bramlett)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Developed</td>
<td>Consultants (2) Susan Holmer</td>
<td>MP Library: Strategic Plan 2016-20</td>
<td>Six people developed the Strategic plan and determined the priorities. Their ideas were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 other library employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>not validated in public meetings. The plan was presented to the library commission as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>fait accompli</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Related Documents</td>
<td>Observations &amp; Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2016</td>
<td>October 11, 2016: Library Strategic Plan Presentation to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>The high-level presentation included few work plan goals. The goal of building a new Main Library was <em>not</em> included in the presentation. The complete Library Strategic Plan was <em>not</em> attached to the Council’s agenda packet. The public and council would have had to make an effort to get more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 16, 2017</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Check in Meeting. Update meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic plan milestones with status updates.</td>
<td>I was the only library commissioner invited to attend this meeting. This was despite my protests and the request that the entire library commission, and stakeholders from Belle Haven, be invited. Attached is the list of 27 people along with my details as to their backgrounds. I was also told that I was invited because I attended the previous Strategic Planning meeting. I remember being invited to one meeting that I got a substitute for my class for, so that I could attend. However, I do not remember who was invited or how the invitation was presented to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Strategic Plan Update

Give my lengthy report above, I am not going to take more commission time to provide specific feedback on the Library’s update to its Strategic plan.

However, especially given the past controversy regarding the Main Library building project, I suggest that this important topic be the subject of at least two community workshops where small groups of 6-8 people can discuss the plan with volunteer facilitators. That could go a long way towards helping the public to feel heard and able to weigh in on library priorities. I suggest that Library Staff, and possibly Council, attend and listen in on the conversations. That would make for a much more meaningful public engagement process that trying to discuss it as a Library Commission agenda topic. That limits the public to 3 minutes each and it stifles interaction. Please let me know if I can be of any help.

C4. Recommendation to merge the Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee with the Library Commission by expanding the Library Commission from seven to eleven members (Attachment)

I suggest that this item be tabled as it conflicts with an important Belle Haven meeting at the Neighborhood Service Center with the Police Chief.

If you do discuss it, I am completely against the idea of merging the BHNLAC with the Library Commission. At your last commission meeting, members of the public advocated for keeping the separate group. That led to the LC endorsing the idea. I was then at the Council meeting where more members of the public advocated for a separate group. In response, Council gave staff a general directive to come back with a BHNLAC plan.

I also point out that Jacqui Cebrien’s attached email of support includes her offer of changing her words should what she writes not be helpful enough to library staff towards their ends. To me, that illustrates that Cebrien has lost her objectivity in this particular matter and is too concerned with serving staff interests.

Given the past marginalization of the Belle Haven Community, I think they need a separate Belle Haven Library Advisory Committee with a new charter and a different kind of resident group serving. The new charter should be time-limited through the building of a new Library in Belle Haven. Such a group could also be an incubator for a new and more positive way that the City can work with the Belle Haven community.

Further, a 11-member Library Commission would also create an unwieldy group. Further, the current library commission seems more interested in advising library management than in hands-on project-related efforts. Right now, a hands-on effort will be needed to bring a new Belle Haven Library to fruition. We need a separate advisory group, along with people serving who have the needed skill sets and connections to get the project done!
C6. Discuss Library Commission quarterly report to City Council (Attachment)

Main Point: The Analysis section inaccurately states that staff customarily prepared the Library Commission’s update to Council. This has not been the practice for at least since Sep 2014 when I joined the Library Commission.

The staff report asserts that “The Library’s Commission’s past practice has been to discuss the content of their quarterly updates at a scheduled meeting, and then have staff return with a formatted update presentation which is approved at a subsequent meeting.”

When I served on the Library Commission, the commissioners (not staff) prepared the update to Council. The initial updates were very informal and short. I remember the prior Library Director telling the commission to “keep it brief” and to put “nothing in writing.” She clearly wanted the commission to say very little to Council regarding our activities.

Whether that was her goal alone, or possible her goal based on the directives of our prior City Manager, I do not know. However, I will point out that it’s impossible for Council to think strategically on matters unless they have enough information.

After one such informal and very short presentation to Council, the Commission decided that our updates to Council needed to supply more information. I remember being on a subcommittee with Kristina Lemons where we developed a short report that Kristina delivered. We next started the general tradition of preparing PowerPoint presentations. When I gave the talk, I prepared my own PowerPoints. Over time, delivering the talk did become the responsibility of the Chair unless he/she was not available.

I am disturbed that the staff report rewrites the history to make it appear that a custom has been established that is not the case.

I would not turn the responsibility of preparing your quarterly updates over to staff. That would give up more of the commission’s already limited power to staff. If you let staff start to develop these updates, the residents’ voice will be diminished. Instead, Council will increasingly hear Staff’s voice! Anyone preparing a presentation has much control over shaping the final message. Staff could include subtle changes that might not be noticed and caught by the commission. You may also like resident observers who follow and who make the time to comment.

My public comments in this email already point out three instances where I point out inaccuracies in recent library staff reports. This alone presents a cautionary tale towards the idea of turning your quarterly report over to staff. Instead, I suggest that you retain this responsibility to better safeguard the public’s interests by your delivering a resident-prepared and focused quarterly presentation to Council.