

Library Board Chairman T. Kiernan called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

- 1.0 ROLL CALL** – Chairman T. Kiernan, N. Wilkes, P. Harycki, D. Sweet, B. Shaw and E. Leonard (virtual). Also Present: Pres. D. Besson, Trustees: M. Bennett, T. Brinkmeier, J. Chesney, K. Meleski and I. Thomson, and M. Eternicka (virtual). Staff: Library Director S. Lewin-Lane. Other present: Administrator S. Kulik Village Attorney J. Wesolowski. Audience (8).

2.0 VILLAGE OFFICIALS REPORT

- 2.1 Ben Hunt Facility (Library) Discussion on facility needs and funding options with the Library Board and Library Foundation** – Library Foundation members present: Pat Laughlin, Maryann Lindberg and Jonathan Cagle (virtual).

D. Besson commented that the Foundation had received questions he prepared in advance and requested that the Foundation members respond to those questions. M. Lindberg commented on the status of the Foundation is that the bylaws are in draft form, that they are still seeking members and the foundations mission is to support the Library and the Ben Hunt Facility. In regards to the question about capital planning, M. Lindberg indicated commented that the Foundation is not involved in any capital planning and that their job is to raise money. She commented that she has opinions that are hers alone but that the foundation was there to support the Library irrespective of her opinions on any matter. That is the Library Board and Village Board and that after the plan is developed it could be submitted to the Foundation for financial support and the Foundation Board would vote on whether to contribute to any particular plan. M. Lindberg commented that each question resulted in the same response from the Foundation in that the Foundation does not direct any projects unilaterally and that the Boards would do these things.

T. Kiernan commented that a meeting he had with P. Laughlin that the mezzanine issue was brought up and that what was being reported tonight was counter to that in regards to the planning of the Library project. P. Laughlin responded that the mezzanine is not something the foundation has talked about. T. Kiernan inquired what they talked about. P. Laughlin commented that it was about the bylaws, recruitment and raising funds. T. Kiernan inquired about the board member make up and who the active board members were. M. Lindberg commented it was her, J. Cagle, P. Laughlin and Nancy Wilkes. T. Kiernan asked about Village Board member. D Besson asked about the Library Board member being on the Foundation Board but that there were questions about a Village Trustee being on it that has not been responded to. M. Lindberg commented that when the Foundation originally met, they had much to learn regarding the entire process. She commented that now that they are moving forward, she has found that other foundations do not have elected officials on it in order to keep the politics out of the Foundation and that they are moving away from having a Village Trustee on the Foundation Board.

N. Wilkes commented that the Library should come up with a work plan to present to the Foundation and recognizing that it would take time to raise any funds.

D. Besson inquired about a process to ensure the Foundation and the Village are not competing for the same donor dollars. M. Lindberg stated at this time absolutely not. They may be having fundraising events that bring money in but that the Village, if they know they need something, should not be waiting for the Foundation to raise the funds.

D. Sweet inquired how the Foundation would respond to restricted donations that may not align with Library Board and Village Board plans. Is there any way the Foundation can

assure the two boards that funds raised in general without a restriction will be available to the Village for various needs? M. Lindberg commented that the Village or Library would request the funds for a specific project and the Foundation would discuss that request and approve or deny it. The specific donations could be addressed by letting the Village Boards know that it was restricted and to see if they want to move forward with whatever the donor requested. T. Kiernan commented that when the Foundation endorsement was requested, it was with the understanding that the Village Board would have representation which was a material matter relative to the endorsement. It sounds like this has now changed and the Foundation does not want the Village Board member as part of the Foundation. At the meeting where the endorsement was initially approved, everyone was talking about the roof, siding and windows while the mezzanine and elevator were off the table. The Village Board and the Library Board have had contentious matters in the past over who governed monies of the Library and who controlled the facility needs. That contention has been cleared as both Boards understand that annual adopted appropriations, special revenue funds and staffing matters reside under the control of the Library Board but that the building and its capital repairs and so on are the Village Board's purview. N. Wilkes commented that it is too early in the formation of the Foundation and that the Foundation is learning how to do this. T. Kiernan commented that to N. Wilkes point, that perhaps it was premature to have endorsed them. S. Kulik commented that it is now a clear understanding between the Boards that any funding for Library repairs would not be under the Library Board's control and it remains with the Village Board until the Village Board considers the project complete. The Library really has no say in the facilities in a definitive manner relative to the repairs but of course the Village Board would listen to whatever input was offered. Operating funds are 100% under the Library Boards control while any building project funds are 100% the Village Board.

J. Cagle (virtual) commented that these are volunteers and that they are just trying to help. He commented from the beginning the idea was to support the Village and the Library. D. Besson stated that the concern is about the two groups going after targeted funding and competing with the Foundation. He commented that he is hearing that the Foundation may choose not to fund a project. He commented that the first meeting was a huge step of us all working together and that does not appear to be the case now. J. Cagle commented that the Board and the Foundation would notify each other so that competing funds are not an issue. M. Eternicka commented that he is hearing widespread apprehension over the Foundation's ability to solely discern the distribution of funds generated. He proposed a commitment from the Foundation to allocate funds for building and operational needs first, prior to any visionary proposal. This would hold true regardless of the operating year. M. Lindberg commented that she had already said that several times and that she doesn't want to talk about the mezzanine or the elevator and would like to hear that the two Boards are grateful for the concept. D. Sweet commented that they are grateful but that the main conflict is in the beginning stages while priorities are being developed. As time progresses and the Foundation is raising funds, they could work toward specific targets and any donors at that point would be the Foundation soliciting but concern is about future boards and Foundation members would not be in agreement about the overriding goals. N. Wilkes commented that it could be developed into the bylaws.

K. Meleski expressed frustration over the deterioration of the building that has occurred under previous administrations. He commented on the initial plan for a referendum was not undertaken. D. Sweet commented that the only reason was a political one as the public safety referendum was on the ballot. D. Besson commented he was correct and that referendum failed for a \$30 increase so it is highly unlikely a library referendum would have passed. I. Thomson commented that long term strategic planning takes patience and relationship building. He commented he is grateful for the Foundation and that he proposes a grant

application similar to the Holz Family Grant that would show the criteria of what the application of funds could be for. He commented that it could include that any capital improvement funds requested would have to have joint support of the Library Board and the Village Board.

N. Wilkes commented that she had already engage certain firms for bids that had gone out and that she was concerned that it wasn't going to be used. D. Besson commented that he wanted it clear that no bids have gone out. S. Kulik commented that public construction doesn't work that way. That it requires statutory processes be followed. She commented that bids cannot be solicited without requests for proposals to develop a scope so all required sealed bids are able to compete fairly. N. Wilkes commented she doesn't know why they can't just have contractors come out and look at the building and send bids. S. Kulik commented that the law does not allow that. She also commented that contractors want assurance a project will advance before we ask them to commit their staff and resources. S. Kulik also commented she does not have the expertise to draft these RFP's and it took her 8 weeks to complete the water trust RFP. She commented that what she is hearing is roof, siding and windows and moving towards completing those items.

D. Besson commented that he feels the Foundation needs to be more fully developed and that the Board was premature in endorsing them but he looks forward to figuring how they can work together. M. Lindberg commented that she would only be one vote on any request for funding and that it would take more than her yes or no to move anything forward. They are here to support the Library.

P. Harycki commented that the two Boards need to work towards the roof, siding and windows and as the foundation develops they can join in. She asked what the next steps would be. S. Kulik commented that the Village Board would need to have staff develop a project budget. She commented that a definitive plan needed to be agreed to as to expansion or repair. What she is hearing is repair. N. Wilkes agreed that the two Boards are about getting the repairs completed.

D. Sweet commented he is not interested in looking backwards and finding fault as what matters as what they do going forward. He agreed that the repairs need to be completed under whatever legal processes are required.

2.2 Notice of Village Board Resolution authorizing a 2024 Non-Major Special Revenue Fund Budget Amendment – S. Kulik reported that it was approved by the Library Board and that in order to true up the financial software, the Village Board should approve the request as well.

Motion (Thomson, Meleski) to approve Resolution 24-19 authorizing a 2024 Non-Major Special Revenue Fund Budget Amendment; motion passes unanimously.

3.0 ADJOURNMENT – Motion (Shaw, Wilkes) to adjourn Library Board at 8:10 p.m.; motion passes unanimously.

Seth Harrison/ (e-signature)

Seth Harrison, Assistant Library Manager

Distribution: Library Board, Library Director, Library staff, Village Administrator, Village Board, MCFLS
Post: Library Bulletin Board, Village Hall Bulletin Board, Fire Department