City of Lawton

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

Library of Tomorrow Council Committee

Special Meeting Agenda

Monday, August 24, 2026 | **2:00 PM** | **City Council Conference Room**

Recommending Body

"Official action can only be taken on items listed on the agenda. As a recommending body, the Committee may review and discuss agenda items, propose and enact floor amendments, and then choose to make a recommendation to the City Council or provide direction to the City Manager. The Committee may also defer items for further review, refer matters to the City Attorney, or send items to standing committees, boards, commissions, or authorities for additional study. In some cases, items may be postponed to a later date or removed from the agenda entirely."

Meeting Called to Order

Statement of Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314

Roll Call

Introduction of Guests

Business Items

1. Review and approve the minutes of the April 15, 2026 meeting.

2. Receive an update from City staff regarding the current building assessment request for proposals (RFP), discuss the way forward, and, if necessary, make recommendations to City Council regarding changes to the RFP and allowing the CIP ceiling project to proceed.

3. Discuss and consider adopting the attached draft framework for identifying core and secondary City-funded functions and functions funded through grants, and consider directing City staff to further develop and complete the framework. A snapshot of the proposed framework is included in the agenda packet, with the full Excel spreadsheet to be developed and provided if the framework is approved.

4. Discuss and consider adopting the attached draft decision-making framework utilizing a heuristic methodology, defined as a practical mental shortcut or rule of thumb used to solve problems or make decisions quickly, allowing the Committee to rely on the experience and judgment of Committee members rather than an expensive formal study. A snapshot of the proposed framework is included in the agenda packet, with the full Excel spreadsheet to be

developed and provided if the framework is approved.

5. Discuss and consider asking City staff to develop a citywide survey assessing citizens' desires for library functions, using the results of the functional analysis in Item 3 as a framework and incorporating areas discussed at the previous Committee meeting.

Adjournment

The City of Lawton encourages participation from all of its citizens. If participation at any public meeting is not possible due to a disability, notification to the City Clerk at (580) 581-3305 at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting is encouraged to make the necessary accommodations. The City may waive the 48 hour rule if interpreters for the deaf (signing) is not the necessary accommodation."

Item Title:
Review and approve the minutes of the April 15, 2026 meeting.

Initiator: Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Information Source: Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Background:
The minutes of the April 15, 2026 meeting have been drafted and are awaiting approval.

Once approved, the minutes will be published to the City of Lawton's website at www.lawtonok.gov.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Transparency

Exhibit:
Draft Minutes

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Approve the minutes of the April 15, 2026 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 04.15.26 Library of Tommorrow Committee Minutes

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

City of Lawton

Library of Tomorrow Council Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, April 15, 2026 **3:00 PM** **Lawton City Hall Council Conference Room**

Recommending Body

"Official action can only be taken on items listed on the agenda. As a recommending body, the Committee may review and discuss agenda items, propose and enact floor amendments, and then choose to make a recommendation to the City Council or provide direction to the City Manager. The Committee may also defer items for further review, refer matters to the City Attorney, or send items to standing committees, boards, commissions, or authorities for additional study. In some cases, items may be postponed to a later date or removed from the agenda entirely."

Meeting Called to Order

Meeting called to order by Chairman Kirby Brown.

Statement of Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314

Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk, confirmed compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314.

Roll Call

Present:
Citizen Volunteer Patty Neuwirth
Councilwoman - Ward 7 Sherene L Williams
Councilman - Ward 6 Bob Weger
Councilman - Ward 3 Kirby Brown
Councilman - Ward 1 Lane Hooton

Absent:
Citizen Volunteer- George Gill

Also Present:
Kristin Herr, Library Director & Ex-Officio Member
Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk
Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager

Introduction of Guests

The following guests introduced themselves:
Tanya Organ, Community Engagement Librarian
Bettina King, Library Deputy Director
Caitlin Gatlin, Communications and Marketing
Susan Kremmer, Library Board
Frantzie Couch, Library Board and Friends of the Library
Erlene Maroon, Citizen
Jim Maroon, Citizen

Business Items

1. Consider approving the minutes of the February 20, 2026 meeting.

Motion by Patty Neuwirth, Second by Lane Hooton, to approve the minutes of the February 20, 2026 meeting. AYE: Patty Neuwirth, Sherene L Williams, Bob Weger, Kirby Brown, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

2. Consider discussing and reviewing the February 24, 2026 City Council motion regarding the Library of Tomorrow Committee, including its appendices and prior Chairperson guidance.

Chairman Brown stated that the Committee's packet included the City Council motion regarding the Library of Tomorrow Committee, Attachments A, B, and C, and guidance previously provided by the former Chairman. He explained that he placed the item on the agenda so the Committee could review the direction it had been given and determine how to proceed with its work.

Chairman Brown stated that he had spent considerable time reviewing the materials and had attempted to develop a work breakdown structure based upon the direction provided. He said he continued to come back to the conclusion that the overall direction was very complex and asked the Committee members for their thoughts.

Hooton stated that he also found the material very difficult to follow and somewhat circular. He said what initially appeared to be a relatively simple roadmap became much more complicated as he reviewed the material.

Chairman Brown agreed and stated that he had reached a similar conclusion. He said the direction was sufficiently complex that organizing all of the information into a workable structure was difficult. Rather than attempting to address every component at once, Chairman Brown explained that he had reviewed the direction and extracted specific matters that he believed the Committee could realistically accomplish. He stated that the remaining agenda items for the meeting reflected issues he identified as short-term, achievable, or logical next steps while still remaining within the intent of the direction provided to the Committee.

Chairman Brown stated that another option would be for the Committee to attempt to rewrite the direction and return to City Council to request that it be changed or clarified. He said he did not believe that was necessary. Instead, he proposed continuing to work through the existing direction by identifying individual issues that could be addressed, bringing those matters before the Committee for discussion and agreement, and moving forward incrementally.

Chairman Brown asked whether any Committee member objected to that approach. No objections were expressed. He stated that he believed he had developed a logical breakdown of the direction that would give the Committee specific matters to work toward and accomplish.

No action was taken on this item.

3. Discuss whether the current CIP-funded, voter-approved replacement of the ceiling and fire suppression system is included within the Committee's charge and guidelines as outlined in Agenda Item 1, and consider approving a draft item for submission to the City Council.

Chairman Brown stated that he wanted to begin with the facts surrounding the existing project. He asked Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager, to confirm that approximately $2 million in Capital Improvement Program funding had been allocated for improvements to the library's ceiling and fire suppression system.

Burk confirmed that $2 million had been identified for the project.

Chairman Brown asked what action would be necessary to remove the current hold on the project and allow it to proceed.

Burk explained that a 120-day moratorium had previously been placed on the project to allow discussion regarding the future of the library and whether the City should move forward with the improvements. He stated that he believed the original 120-day period had expired. Burk said it was now for the Committee to determine whether it was satisfied with the direction being considered for the library and whether it wished to recommend that City Council move forward with the existing project.

Hooton asked for clarification regarding the scope of the existing project and whether it included lighting in addition to the fire suppression system.

Burk explained that the project included complete reconstruction of the ceiling, lighting, and fire suppression improvements.

Williams stated that when the Committee was reorganized under a new Chairman, she had assumed the 120-day period restarted.

Chairman Brown stated that he was not aware of anything in the Committee's direction that restarted the moratorium on the project.

Williams explained that she raised the issue because the Committee was also discussing obtaining additional citizen input through a survey. She stated that she believed citizens should be asked about the future of the library before the Committee proceeded too far with decisions regarding the existing building. Williams said she envisioned a survey that could ask citizens to consider options such as remaining in the current building, maintaining the current library with an extension of services at FISTA, or constructing a new library. She emphasized that citizen input was important before determining the long-term direction.

Hooton noted that the ceiling and fire suppression improvements had already been included in a voter-approved CIP project and, therefore, citizens had already voted to fund those improvements.

Williams acknowledged that the improvements had been approved by voters, but stated that the Library of Tomorrow Committee was subsequently formed because of concerns regarding the library and its long-term future. She said her concern was that the City could make the improvements now only to determine later that additional major improvements were necessary or that a different direction for the library was preferred.

Chairman Brown stated that he believed those were valid concerns. However, he said that regardless of the ultimate location or use of the library, the City would continue to own the existing building and he did not anticipate that the building would be demolished in the immediate future. He stated that improvements such as fire suppression and lighting would provide value to the building regardless of its eventual use.

Williams stated that her concern was avoiding the expenditure of money that could later be viewed as wasted and reiterated that citizens should have input into the future direction of the library.

Neuwirth stated that citizens had already provided input on these particular improvements when they voted to approve the CIP project.

Chairman Brown agreed. He stated that he placed the matter on the agenda because of the Committee's previous discussions, but believed the ceiling, lighting, and fire suppression needs represented a shorter-term issue that should be addressed regardless of the ultimate decision regarding the library's future. He asked Burk whether he considered the work to be necessary regardless of the long-term direction ultimately selected.

Burk stated that the concern about investing in the existing building had been one of the reasons the moratorium was originally discussed. At that time, the City was considering temporarily relocating a significant portion of the library's assets to FISTA, and former Chairman Randy Warren had raised the question of whether those assets should remain there rather than return to the existing facility. Burk said he understood that to be part of the original purpose of the Committee: to evaluate whether such an arrangement could be feasible on a permanent basis.

Burk stated that, with respect to the current funding, the City had an identified project approved by the citizens to improve the existing building and make it more usable. He said the City could eventually determine that the building should be demolished, replaced, or receive additional investment, but in the immediate future, unless the Committee was prepared to recommend permanent relocation or construction of another facility, he saw no reason not to proceed with the existing project.

Chairman Brown stated that consideration of permanent relocation, a new facility, or other long-term options returned the Committee to Williams' point regarding the need for citizen input, which would be addressed under a later agenda item. He said a meaningful, data-driven evaluation of all the directions and appendices provided to the Committee could require significant professional research and analysis. He estimated that obtaining the level of professional analysis necessary to fully answer all of those questions could cost approximately $100,000. He stated that he did not believe he was qualified to perform that level of data analysis and that considerable work remained before the Committee would be prepared to make a long-term recommendation.

Chairman Brown stated that, in his view, the citizens had already directed the City to complete the existing improvements by approving the CIP funding. He believed the City should proceed with that project while the Committee continued working through the larger questions regarding the library's future.

Williams reiterated that citizen input on the broader future of the library could be obtained relatively quickly and stated that she believed it was important for the Committee to hear from citizens rather than rely solely on the views of Committee members.

Neuwirth stated that the issue before the Committee was different because citizens had already voted to approve the existing project.

Williams stated that this committee was created subsequent to that vote being approved.

Chairman Brown asked if citizens would be asked for permission to fix the sealing when it was already approved by the citizens. He stated he doesn't understand.

Neuwirth stated her constituents are already upset that the voter approved project hasn't moved forward.

Williams clarified that she was not suggesting that the survey simply ask citizens whether the City should repair the ceiling. She said the survey she envisioned would address the broader alternatives previously discussed, including keeping the current building, keeping the current library while extending services to FISTA, or constructing a new building.

Chairman Brown stated that he agreed those broader questions needed citizen input. However, he viewed the approximately $2 million voter-approved project as an immediate need that should proceed independently of the long-term planning process.

Hooton stated that the project would improve an asset already owned by the City and should not necessarily be considered wasted even if the long-term use of the building later changed.

Williams questioned whether the investment could become wasteful if the City spent approximately $2 million now and then decided to demolish the building.

Burk stated that the Committee itself provided a public forum for participation because it was a publicly posted meeting where interested citizens could attend and provide input when permitted. He said the Committee could also hold a town hall meeting specifically to receive public comments if it wanted additional feedback before making a decision. He noted that doing so would require additional time for publicizing the meeting. The other option, he said, was to proceed with the project that had already been approved by the citizens.

Chairman Brown asked whether the work currently contemplated could still be completed within the $2 million budget.

Burk stated that one of the risks of continued delay was that the project would not become less expensive over time. He said the scope might eventually have to be reduced if costs increased beyond available funding. Burk reiterated that the Committee's role was to decide what direction it wanted to recommend to City Council.

Hooton stated that the Committee was appropriately considering what the library should look like 20, 30, or 40 years into the future, but that the City also had to address the library's immediate needs. He said the $2 million represented an investment in an existing City asset and appeared to be a sound short-term investment while the longer-term discussion continued.

Burk stated that the City currently had the $2 million authorized for the project but did not have additional funding identified for relocation, a new facility, or another concept for the future library. He said those other possibilities could be two, five, ten, or twenty years away unless City Council chose to redirect funding already approved for other projects, which he did not anticipate.

Neuwirth stated that planning for the ceiling project began approximately five or six years earlier. She said the library community, City staff, and others had spent considerable time determining how to address the building's problems and that the current project was the solution developed through that process. She also noted the importance of adding the fire suppression system, which the library does not currently have.

Burk stated that another CIP extension might be considered in approximately three or four years, depending on whether City Council chose to pursue another extension. At that point, additional library funding or other future options could potentially be considered.

Chairman Brown stated that this connected directly to the next agenda item regarding a comprehensive assessment of the existing facility. He said the Committee could not meaningfully compare long-term alternatives until it understood what investment would be necessary to keep the current building viable over time. He asked Burk to clarify the timing of a possible future CIP extension.

Burk explained that City Council had recently approved an extension of the existing CIP and that any future extension would depend on Council action. He stated that, based upon the progress of current projects, Council could potentially consider another extension in the future, at which time additional funding could be included. He noted that any such funding would ultimately have to go through the required financing and voter-approval process.

Burk further noted that the current program is a 2040 CIP, meaning the City technically has until 2040 to complete the project. He cautioned, however, that delaying the project until near the end of the CIP period could significantly reduce what the City could accomplish with the same amount of money because construction costs would likely continue to increase. He stated that this was one reason the City had been moving projects forward rather than waiting until later in the CIP period.

Chairman Brown stated that he had toured the library with Kristin Herr, Library Director, and had also walked through the building independently. He said the existing lighting fixtures were approximately 50 years old and clearly needed replacement. He stated that if City Council authorized the project to proceed, the design might need to be adjusted to remain within the $2 million budget, including consideration of moving costs and contingencies. Chairman Brown said he did not believe there would be support for exceeding the $2 million currently allocated.

Weger asked what would happen if the project were presented to City Council and the cost came back substantially above the $2 million budget.

Kristin Herr, Library Director and Ex-Officio Member, explained that the project included three additive alternates structured in anticipation of that concern. She also referenced previous discussion regarding alternative construction delivery methods, including construction manager at risk, and stated that there were multiple ways the City could approach the project depending on cost.

Chairman Brown stated that the current design had been costed in a particular manner and that there could be opportunities to identify a less expensive but still acceptable and modern approach.

Herr also noted that the project had been priced with Guernsey administering the project and that savings could potentially be realized depending upon how the City proceeded.

Burk raised another consideration involving recent City Council discussions about development of a theme park across the street from the library. He stated that the Committee could consider how that project might affect the operation, use, or future value of the library facility and whether the two facilities could complement one another.

Chairman Brown stated that, in his view, the voter-approved ceiling, lighting, and fire suppression work was separable from the Committee's consideration of the library's long-term future. He said it was unfortunate that the project had been delayed while the broader discussion occurred because voters had specifically approved the work. He said he had difficulty viewing the project as wasted money because the City would continue to own the building and fire suppression and lighting would remain necessary regardless of who eventually occupied it.

Chairman Brown reiterated that the larger discussion should consider the three general alternatives being discussed: remaining in the current facility, using an extension or alternative location such as FISTA, or constructing a new building. He said each option would have a cost and should ultimately be evaluated using data and realistic cost estimates. He stated that Item 3 should be addressed separately while the Committee continued its work to develop and evaluate those longer-term alternatives.

Hooton stated that the Committee's future work should focus on determining what realistic options actually exist for the library.

Chairman Brown agreed and stated that the purpose of having a Committee was to allow those alternatives to be discussed rather than for him to decide the outcome individually. He said there were many good ideas represented on the Committee. He reiterated his view that voters had directed the City to repair the ceiling and install fire suppression and that any long-term alternative developed by the Committee would require a separate financial plan.

Williams asked for clarification regarding the earlier reference to allowing approximately two weeks for additional public input.

Burk stated that he was attempting to identify a middle ground because Williams clearly wanted additional public input. He explained that, if the Committee wanted to delay action for additional input, a short period could be used to publicize an opportunity for citizen participation. He emphasized that he was not recommending for or against that approach but was simply explaining the available options.

Burk also addressed safety concerns contained in the former Chairman's guidance, including comments regarding families feeling uncomfortable entering the building and parents escorting children to the restrooms. Burk stated that he believed much of that concern was connected to the current LATS transfer operations located near the library. He said the City was working toward relocating the transfer center and believed some of those concerns could improve once the new transfer center was in place. He also stated that increased security at the library was being considered.

Chairman Brown stated he understood from the city manager that additional security was going to be provided.

Neuwirth stated that the library currently had only approximately 20 hours of security coverage and that additional security would be beneficial.

Burk stated that he understood the concerns raised by the former Chairman and had discussed some of them with him. Burk said he agreed that developing a long-term plan for the library was appropriate, but emphasized that proceeding with the existing project would not prevent the Committee from continuing to meet and determine what the library should look like in the future.

Chairman Brown agreed and reiterated that he viewed the existing project as separable from the long-term planning process. He stated that the Committee should resolve the immediate project and then continue with the broader work it had outlined. He said the future citizen survey should focus on the larger alternatives rather than asking citizens to reconsider improvements they had already approved. He also noted that the Committee would be discussing a comprehensive review of the existing building under the next item so that future decisions could be informed by the projected cost of maintaining the facility.

Motion by Lane Hooton, Second by Patty Neuwirth, to make a recommendation to City Council to approve moving forward with the Library Ceiling and Fire Suppression System project. AYE: Patty Neuwirth, Bob Weger, Kirby Brown, Lane Hooton. NAY: Sherene L Williams. Motion Passed.

Following the vote, Chairman Brown asked Blazek-Scherler to prepare the item for consideration by City Council.

Blazek-Scherler asked whether the Committee wanted the recommendation placed on the April 28, 2026 City Council agenda or the May 12, 2026 agenda.

Chairman Brown indicated that he preferred the April 28 meeting if the item could be prepared within the required timeframe.

Blazek-Scherler stated that she would prepare it for the April 28 agenda.

Burk explained that the project was already at a stage where City Council could authorize staff to proceed with bidding. He stated that the Council agenda item could reflect the Committee’s recommendation to continue with the ceiling project and authorize staff to advertise the project for bids.

Chairman Brown noted that the design might need to be reviewed to ensure the project remained within the $2 million available budget.

Blazek-Scherler stated that the agenda item could be drafted to receive the Library of Tomorrow Committee's recommendation to continue forward with the project and authorize staff to advertise for bids, which would allow the City to determine the actual project cost through the bidding process.

Chairman Brown asked whether that direction would provide staff with sufficient authority to proceed if approved by City Council.

Burk confirmed that it would.

4. Discuss a comprehensive review of curent library building infrastructure needs to remain viable for the next fifty (50) years and take action as deemed necessary.

Chairman Brown stated that the discussion under Item 4 directly followed the Committee's action on the previous item. He explained that if the Committee was going to meaningfully evaluate the long-term alternatives for the Library of Tomorrow, one of the fundamental pieces of information it needed was an understanding of the condition and expected useful life of the existing library building. The agenda specifically called for discussion of a comprehensive review of the current building's infrastructure needs.

Chairman Brown asked whether City staff had previously been directed to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the existing building and forecast what investments would be necessary over time to keep the facility in good condition.

Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager, stated that staff had not been given that direction.

Chairman Brown asked whether the Committee itself could direct that type of assessment or whether a recommendation would need to be made to City Council.

Burk stated that what Chairman Brown was describing initially sounded similar to a feasibility study that could evaluate not only the building, but potentially the current library operation and mission as a whole.

Chairman Brown clarified that he was not looking for a broader operational or programmatic feasibility study at this point. He said he was specifically interested in the physical infrastructure of the existing building, including items such as HVAC, safety systems, electrical wiring, heating, cooling, and other major building components. He stated that the Committee needed to understand the remaining useful life of the facility and the investment that would be necessary to continue using it over a reasonable period of time.

Burk asked whether a similar evaluation had already been completed.

Kristin Herr, Library Director and Ex-Officio Member, confirmed a study was already completed.

Burk asked Herr whether the previous study had addressed the entire building or had focused only on the ceiling project.

Herr stated that the previous study addressed only the ceiling.

Williams asked approximately when the previous ceiling study had been completed, suggesting it may have been around 2017 or 2019.

Herr stated that she did not remember the exact year.

Burk asked whether Chairman Brown was looking for a motion for a recommendation to City Council directing staff to conduct an evaluation of the building to bring it up to code.

Chairman Brown said he wanted to know how much life was left in the building and how much it would take to keep the building viable for perhaps another 20 years. Chairman Brown clarified that he was simply using 20 years as an example.

Herr stated that it might make sense to bring in Scott Vaughn to provide a narrative regarding what he already knew about the building and his engineering assessment.

Chairman Brown stated that would be up to city staff, not him.

Burk explained that Vaughn was under a professional services agreement with the City and was an engineer who assisted with a number of City projects. Burk stated that Vaughn could provide a report, or at least compose a report, regarding what he saw at the library.

Chairman Brown stated that he believed that information was pivotal. He said the Committee had decided to recommend spending the voter-approved money to fix the ceiling, and that matter was addressed. He stated that the larger question was how to evaluate the Library of the Tomorrow. Chairman Brown said a number of things would have to be accomplished, and if the Committee was going to develop three options, one of the things it needed to know was the life expectancy of the current building and how much money the City could expect to spend to keep it viable.

Chairman Brown stated that although the agenda referred to 50 years, he did not believe anyone could realistically assess the building that far into the future. He stated that a reasonable assessment might instead look at approximately 20 years.

Burk asked whether the intent was to compare that information against the potential cost of acquiring or building a new facility.

Chairman Brown stated that was correct, but clarified that the building assessment was only one part of the information needed.

NAME stated that another large part of the discussion would be what services would be provided in the library in the future.

Hooton stated that was one of the issues former Chairman Warren had discussed and agreed that the Committee did not yet know what future library services would look like.

Hooton also stated that some of that would involve speculation, common sense, and looking at what other libraries were doing. He stated that he had recently visited a library in Austin, Texas, and, in many ways, could not identify a significant difference between what that library was doing and what was being done locally.

Chairman Brown stated that he may have gotten the discussion out of sequence or had not explained himself well. He reiterated that the assessment of the current building was only part of evaluating the three different options. Chairman Brown stated that the existing building was something concrete that the City already owned. He said the Committee could obtain an idea of its condition without making a decision to spend the money identified in the assessment. He stated that he viewed the assessment as the first of several pieces of information the Committee needed.

Weger stated that the proposed assessment went hand in hand with the direction on page 29 under E-2, which stated that the Committee was to have an evaluation performed. Weger stated that the evaluation was within the Committee's charge.

Chairman Brown agreed and stated that was where he had pulled the idea from. He said he initially thought it should not be a significant cost and that City staff may be able to get it done.

Burk stated that the Committee needed a planning-level figure.

Chairman Brown agreed.

Burk stated that staff could obtain an estimate of what it would cost to conduct the evaluation and then compose an agenda item for City Council to consider authorizing the assessment.

Chairman Brown stated that was what he had extracted from the Committee's direction and believed it was a logical step because it would give the Committee a concrete fact. He stated that the Committee still had many other facts and pieces of information to gather before it would ever return to City Council to discuss remaining in the current building, building a new library, or pursuing another option.

Burk stated that a motion was needed to that effect.

Motion by Bob Weger, Second by Patty Neuwirth, to direct staff to get an estimate on an evaluation of the existing building and bring back an agenda item for Council to consider it and authorize funding.

Chairman Brown stated that he would expect the resulting assessment to provide information such as whether the building had another 20 years of useful life, what items would need to be redone during that period, and the estimated cost of that work.

Chairman Brown provided an example, stating that if keeping the existing building for another 20 years would cost $20 million, that would be a fact the Committee could use. If building a new library would cost $50 million, that would be another fact. The cost of moving the library to another location would provide another fact.

Chairman Brown stated that underlying all three of those facts would be the fundamental question of the library's core functions, the areas it should serve, and what the Committee believed the library would evolve into in the future.

Chairman Brown used his own collection of CDs as an example of how technology and the way people access media have changed over time. He stated that he had books of CDs from years ago that he no longer used and joked that the only reason the CD drive on his laptop still worked was to play The Lion King for his grandchildren.

Herr stated that Guernsey performs this type of assessment for other libraries and that either Guernsey's architect or another professional could perform the work. She stated that this was a common type of assessment and that Guernsey had performed similar work for other libraries.

Chairman Brown stated that he had tried to develop a work breakdown structure from the Committee's direction and had only been able to pull out approximately four or five concrete items. He stated that this assessment was one of the items the Committee could begin working on.

Blazek-Scherler advised Chairman Brown that a motion and second had been made but the roll call vote still needed to be taken.

VOTE ON MOTION: AYE: Patty Neuwirth, Sherene L Williams, Bob Weger, Kirby Brown, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

5. Consider directing staff to have the Communications and Marketing Department conduct a citizen survey to ascertain public input regarding the library and consider approving proposed survey items.

Chairman Brown stated that the next item was based on an idea Williams had raised during discussions with him, which he thought was a good idea. He noted that Williams had already begun working with staff on a survey.

Williams stated that the survey she had been working on was originally proposed to be completed before the Committee took the ceiling and fire suppression project recommendation to City Council.

Chairman Brown stated that the survey contemplated under this item would be different, but he believed the idea could be adapted.

Neuwirth stated that the Committee still needed to ask citizens what they believed the future of the library should be and what they would like to see.

Caitlin Gatlin, Communications and Marketing, stated that she had been reviewing the information provided to the Committee and appreciated having the background. She stated that when considering administering a public survey, she believed allowing the survey to remain open for only two weeks would be somewhat unfair because that was a very short period of time for citizens to receive and understand the information.

Gatlin stated that adapting the survey to focus on the future of the library would require more than creating a Google form and posting it on social media. She recommended developing a larger campaign around the survey. Gatlin stated that Communications and Marketing would need to work with the library and could conduct pop-up events or set up a table at the library to explain what the Committee was doing and get citizens excited about what the future of the library could be. She stated that a town hall or speakers bureau could also be used.

Gatlin stated that it would also be important to help citizens understand where the Committee wanted the process to go while being realistic about the timeline. She said the City should avoid creating an expectation that because citizens were being asked encouraging questions in a survey, they should expect to immediately see announcements that the library was receiving numerous new programs or a brand-new building. Gatlin stated that the City should keep expectations realistic while still getting citizens excited about the future of the library.

Williams stated that she had previously mentioned two weeks because the Committee had been trying to determine whether to proceed with the ceiling project and she was looking for a quick turnaround.

Gatlin agreed that two weeks would have been a quick turnaround.

Chairman Brown stated that he still believed conducting a survey was a good idea. He referenced page 38 of the Committee's materials and stated that he had developed a list based on what he had heard during the discussions.

Chairman Brown stated that he believed the list provided a starting point for Communications and Marketing. He said it was critical that the Committee obtain citizen input and noted that the list addressed both the physical library and its core services.

Chairman Brown stated that the items he had developed were simply ideas from his own thoughts and could be refined, but he believed they provided a starting point. He stated that he was not sure exactly what form the process should take, but believed there was a clear need to assess what citizens thought about the future of the library.

Hooton stated that the list contained a number of questions that could be incorporated into a survey.

Hooton stated that ten subject areas could potentially result in approximately 30 questions, and Chairman Brown acknowledged that may be too many.

Gatlin stated that she would recommend limiting the survey to approximately 20 questions at most.

Chairman Brown stated that the survey could include questions such as whether citizens liked the library where it was currently located and whether they would consider an alternative location. He stated that he did not know exactly how the questions should be structured but believed obtaining that information was very important.

Chairman Brown stated that citizen input would underpin the Committee's other work. He said the Committee needed to understand the cost of remaining in the existing building, the cost and projected timeline for constructing a new library, and whether there were other alternatives within the community, including potentially distributing pieces of library services to different locations. Chairman Brown clarified that he was not advocating for any particular option, but believed those represented the general areas the Committee needed to evaluate and develop pros and cons for before making a recommendation.

Neuwirth asked what direction or motion was needed to move the survey forward.

Chairman Brown stated that he had hoped Gatlin, and possibly Herr, could develop the survey. He asked Williams whether she wanted to remain involved in developing it since she had already been working on the issue.

Williams declined.

Neuwirth stated that a library representative should be involved in developing the survey.

Burk stated that staff's recommendation appeared to be a broader campaign that included opportunities for public participation.

Gatlin clarified that she was recommending multiple methods of outreach, including online participation, pop-up opportunities, and potentially setting up a table at the library where staff could explain the survey to patrons.

Burk asked how long Gatlin recommended allowing the survey to remain open.

Gatlin recommended at least one month.

Williams asked whether two months would be appropriate and referenced the timeframe used for another community survey.

Gatlin stated that the previous community needs survey had been conducted with the Housing Division and received 79 responses.

Neuwirth commented that 79 responses from the entire city was a poor response rate.

Chairman Brown stated that he was concerned about a similar response with the library survey but still believed it was important to conduct one.

Chairman Brown suggested that after the survey results were received, the Committee could hold a town hall or similar meeting to present the results and allow citizens to comment.

Herr stated that the survey could be promoted through the library after it was developed. She noted that it would also be important to obtain responses from people who do not currently use the library, rather than limiting the responses to library patrons.

Herr stated that tablets could be made available for citizens to complete the survey and that the library also had upcoming outreach events that could provide opportunities to encourage participation.

Gatlin stated that another concern with surveys was what happened after citizens completed them. She said citizens often wanted to know what action would result from the information they provided.

Neuwirth agreed and stated that citizens would want to know where the action was following the survey.

Gatlin suggested that the Committee could consider maintaining the survey for as long as the Committee remained active rather than limiting it to a single short survey period. She stated that the Committee could receive updated results at each meeting, such as the number of new responses and whether citizens' opinions had changed from the previous month. Gatlin said a continuing survey could help show how opinions changed over time as technology, the economy, and other circumstances changed.

Neuwirth compared the concept to maintaining a suggestion box.

Gatlin agreed.

Neuwirth also suggested using a speakers bureau because civic clubs and other organizations were frequently looking for speakers. She stated that representatives could explain the Committee's work and encourage people to participate in the survey.

Chairman Brown also suggested placing a kiosk in the library lobby. He went on to state that he did not want the Committee to get too far into determining exactly how staff should conduct the outreach because there were many possible methods. He stated that he did not object to allowing the survey to run for some time, but stated that he did not intend to chair the Committee for the next two and a half years.

Chairman Brown stated that he did not believe the Committee needed to exist for two and a half years. He acknowledged that the Committee had significant work to do but estimated that it could take approximately six to eight months, or perhaps as long as 12 months, to develop a cogent recommendation.

Gatlin stated that if the survey remained available for the duration of the Committee's work, the Committee could accumulate several months of citizen data.

Chairman Brown stated that he believed the Committee needed a survey and asked City staff to develop an alternative or proposal for how to conduct the survey and the associated outreach. He suggested that staff present the proposal at a Committee meeting in approximately one month and asked whether that timeframe was reasonable.

Gatlin agreed and stated that she could put together a proposal.

Weger asked about the Committee's 120-day timeframe for reporting back to City Council. He also asked whether the 120-day period restarted when the Committee was reorganized under the new Chairman.

Blazek-Scherler stated that, for purposes of the Committee's work, the 120-day period did restart. She clarified that the restarted period applied to the Committee's report to City Council and did not restart the moratorium on the ceiling project.

Chairman Brown asked whether that meant the Committee's report would be due in June.

Blazek-Scherler confirmed.

Chairman Brown stated that, as he understood it, the Committee owed City Council a report but did not have to complete all of its work within that period. He stated that it would not be humanly possible to answer all of the questions contained in the Committee's direction within 120 days.

Weger agreed.

Chairman Brown stated that the Committee could develop a plan and report to City Council in June regarding the work underway. He said the report could identify the core functions and other services of the library, the three general avenues the Committee was considering, and the survey being developed to gather public opinion.

Motion by Bob Weger, Second by Patty Neuwirth, to ask city staff to prepare a marketing/communications campaign to assess citizens' attitude toward the library of the future. AYE: Patty Neuwirth, Sherene L Williams, Bob Weger, Kirby Brown, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

Following the vote on Business Item 5, Erlene Maroon, Citizen, asked whether the process was moving forward to complete the currently needed repairs to the library, including the ceiling, lighting, and fire suppression improvements.

Chairman Brown stated that the project had been approved for recommendation and clarified that the project would still need to be approved by City Council.

Maroon thanked Chairman Brown for the clarification.

Chairman Brown explained that the Committee would provide its recommendation to City Council, and City Council would then consider whether to proceed with the project.

Maroon apologized for the interruption.

Chairman Brown stated that no apology was necessary and said that he had given her permission to speak. He noted that attendees at public meetings do not always understand that visitors must receive permission from the Chair before speaking.

Chairman Brown stated that the Committee would continue to follow that rule and thanked Maroon for her comments.

Adjournment

Motion by Sherene L Williams, Second by Lane Hooton, to adjourn. AYE: Patty Neuwirth, Sherene L Williams, Bob Weger, Kirby Brown, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion .

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:58PM.

Item Title:
Receive an update from City staff regarding the current building assessment request for proposals (RFP), discuss the way forward, and, if necessary, make recommendations to City Council regarding changes to the RFP and allowing the CIP ceiling project to proceed.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
On April 15, 2026, the Library of Tomorrow Committee recommended that City Council proceed with the library ceiling project. In a separate motion, the Committee directed staff to obtain an estimate for an evaluation of the existing library building and bring the matter back for Council consideration and authorization of funding.

On April 28, 2026, City Council tabled the ceiling project, authorized $32,000 from the CIP Contingency Fund for an evaluation of the existing library building, and referred the proposed building study to the Streets and Development Committee for consideration of the Request for Proposals (RFP).

On June 1, 2026, the Streets and Development Committee recommended that City Council direct staff to issue an RFP for an analysis of the library building, with the scope and specifications of the study to be developed by the Engineering Department. Staff subsequently advertised the RFP and received no responses.

Staff will provide an update on the RFP process so the Committee can discuss the appropriate way forward and consider separate recommendations to City Council regarding any changes to the RFP and whether to allow the CIP ceiling project to proceed.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Community of Choice Where Families Thrive

Exhibit:
RFP

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Make recommendations to City Council regarding changes to the RFP and allowing the CIP ceiling project to proceed.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. EN2201A-Lawton Public Library RFP

CITY OF LAWTON
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

2202 SW 3RD STREET, LAWTON, OK 73501 · 580.581.3385
WWW.LAWTONOK.GOV

Date 06/16/2026

RE: Engineering Project EN2201A-Lawton Public Library Building Assessment

The City of Lawton is requesting proposals from qualified consulting firms to conduct a comprehensive Building Condition Assessment (BCA), including environmental hazardous materials evaluation, of the Lawton Municipal Library located at 110 SW 4th Street, Lawton, Oklahoma. The assessment will support long-term capital planning, maintenance prioritization, and facility modernization efforts.

We have requested your firm, as with others, submit qualifications/proposals to the City of Lawton for these professional services. The proposal shall be based upon normal and acceptable standard professional engineering practices and City of Lawton Standards.

A question-and-answer meeting will be held from **2:00-3:00 pm on June 25, 2026** at 212 SW 9th Street, 3rd floor Conference Room. Please address your questions at the meeting. The Engineering Department contact is Mike Jones at (580) 581-3385 Ext. 1926.

The selected consultant shall provide services that include the following:

Architectural and Structural Systems

- Structural integrity, foundation, framing, settlement, and load-bearing components
- Building envelope, including roofing, exterior walls, windows, doors, and insulation
- Interior finishes and ADA accessibility compliance

Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP)

- HVAC systems: age, performance, efficiency, and code compliance
- Electrical systems: panels, wiring, lighting, emergency power
- Plumbing systems: supply, drainage, fixtures, and water heating
- Fire protection systems: alarms, sprinklers, suppression equipment

Site and Civil Components

- Parking, sidewalks, drainage, grading, and site accessibility
- Landscaping impacts on building performance

Energy and Sustainability Review

- Opportunities for energy efficiency improvements
- Building envelope performance
- Modernization and retrofit potential

Environmental Hazardous Materials Assessment

- Assessment of potential hazardous building materials, specifically mold, and moisture intrusion concerns
- Limited visual inspection and identification of suspect materials and areas requiring further testing
- Collection and laboratory analysis of samples, as necessary, by properly licensed environmental professionals
- Evaluation of indoor air quality concerns related to moisture or microbial growth
- Preparation of findings documenting the location, condition, and extent of identified hazardous materials
- Recommendations for remediation, corrective actions, and associated regulatory compliance requirements
- Identification of any immediate health, safety, or occupancy concerns related to mold conditions

Proposals submitted in response to this invitation should be limited to 25 pages and include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following sections:

I. **Project Understanding/Approach** – provide a restatement of your firm's understanding of the project as well as the firm's approach to designing a project of this nature.

II. **Scope of Work** - provide a brief summary analyzing the various tasks and summarizing the course of action your firm deems necessary for completion of the project.

III. **Project Team** – provide an organization chart and resumes of the key personnel who will be involved in the project.

IV. **Schedule** – provide a design schedule and clearly communicate the start and stop dates of tasks and their interrelation.

V. **Related Experience** – provide a record of all projects, specifically federal and state administered, similar in size and scope to this project in the past five (5) years. Each project should include the names and phone numbers of responsible individuals who may be contacted as references.

VI. **Insurance** – provide a Certificate of Insurance indicating your firm's professional liability and other insurance coverage or a statement indicating current coverage.

Proposals shall be limited to a maximum of twenty-five (25) pages, report covers, and separation tabs do not count toward that total. All qualification and proposal statements submitted shall be reviewed by the professional staff and the designated Council Committee on Engineer Selection to determine the qualifications of each firm. From this review, the Council Committee on Engineer Selection shall recommend a firm based upon the professional qualifications and technical experience of the firm. The City Engineer shall negotiate a contract with the highest rated qualified firm from the committee review. In the event a reasonable fee cannot be negotiated with the recommended firm, the City Engineer may negotiate with other qualified firms in order of their committee ranking with approval from the Council Committee on Engineer Selection.

Final selection and approval shall be made by the entire City Council, and after approval by the City Council, a contract will be prepared for execution.

Minimum requirements for Professional Liability Insurance and other insurance coverage shall be as follows:

Workmen's Compensation:	
Employer Liability	$ 500,000
Comprehensive General Liability and Bodily Injury:	
Bodily Injury	$ 125,000 each occurrence
Property Damage	$ 100,000 each occurrence
Combined Single Limit	$ 1,000,000 aggregate
Comprehensive Automobile Liability:	
Bodily Injury	$ 125,000 each occurrence
Property Damage	$ 100,000 each occurrence
Combined Limit	$ 1,000,000 aggregate
Professional Liability (Error and Omissions):	$ 500,000

Information derived from written responses shall be confidential, except as required for public information pursuant to State or local law. The evaluation of the qualifications will be made on the basis of the aforementioned requested information, but not necessarily limited thereto.

The City of Lawton reserves the sole right to review the qualifications submitted, waive any irregularities therein, and select or reject any or all firms that submitted proposals, should it be determined to be in the best interest of the City of Lawton.

Seven **(7)** hard paper copies and **(1)** .pdf copy of your qualifications/proposals should be mailed to:

City of Lawton
Engineering Department
2202 SW 3rd Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-4059

The qualifications/proposals must be received at the above address no later than:
2:00 p.m. local time on July 21, 2026 .

Please direct comments, questions, and any requests for information regarding this request for proposal to my office at (580) 581-3385.

Respectfully,

Mike Jones
Director of Engineering, City of Lawton

MISSION STATEMENT
To provide efficient, effective and responsive customer oriented service delivery.
To promote a quality of life based on harmony and cooperation.
To provide leadership and opportunity for Southwest Oklahoma

Item Title:
Discuss and consider adopting the attached draft framework for identifying core and secondary City-funded functions and functions funded through grants, and consider directing City staff to further develop and complete the framework. A snapshot of the proposed framework is included in the agenda packet, with the full Excel spreadsheet to be developed and provided if the framework is approved.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
A draft framework has been developed to assist in identifying and organizing Library functions based on funding source and function category. The framework is intended to distinguish between core and secondary City-funded functions, as well as functions supported through grants or other funding sources, and provide a structure for further analysis.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
Draft Framework for Functionality and Space

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Adopt the attached draft framework for identifying core and secondary City-funded functions and functions funded through grants, and direct City staff to further develop and complete the framework.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Draft Framework for Library Function and Space Analysis

Draft Framework Functional and Space Analysis

Function	sub funtion	amount	Funding	Space Required in SQ Feet	Per Cent Utilization	Category	Notes
Library Admin	Full time Staff 13		City Budget			Core Function	
	Part Time Staff 7		City Budget			Core Function	
	utilities	$111,000.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	supplies tools and equipment	$9,000.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	repair and maintence	$4,450.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	Contract maintence	$19,997.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	postage	$3,500.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	dues and memberships	$9,090.00	City Budget			Core Function	
Professional and Tech SVCs		$17,982.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	internet sub		Funding Sources				
	website subscriptions	l	Funding Sources				
			Funding Sources				
			Funding Sources				
Library Books		$102,500.00	City Budget			Core Function	
	CDs		City Budget			Core Function	
	Audio Books		City Budget			Core Function	
	Hard bound Books		City Budget			Core Function	
	periodicals		City Budget			Core Function	
	news papers		City Budget			Core Function	
Grants	product ??		Funding Sources			Grant Add on	
			Funding Sources			Grant Add on	
			Funding Sources			Grant Add on	
Other	Kid Space					Collabrative	
	Reading Spaces					Collabrative	
	Tech Areas						

Pull Downs
Funding Sources
City Budget
Grants
Other
Category
Core Function
Grant Add on
Collabrative

Item Title:
Discuss and consider adopting the attached draft decision-making framework utilizing a heuristic methodology, defined as a practical mental shortcut or rule of thumb used to solve problems or make decisions quickly, allowing the Committee to rely on the experience and judgment of Committee members rather than an expensive formal study. A snapshot of the proposed framework is included in the agenda packet, with the full Excel spreadsheet to be developed and provided if the framework is approved.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
A draft decision-making framework has been developed to assist the Committee in evaluating Library functions and priorities. The framework uses a heuristic methodology, defined as a practical mental shortcut or rule of thumb used to solve problems or make decisions quickly. In this case, the methodology allows the Committee to evaluate options without an expensive formal study by relying on the experience and judgment of Committee members.

A snapshot of the proposed framework is included in the agenda packet, with the full Excel spreadsheet to be provided if the framework is approved.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
Decision-Making Framework

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Adopt the attached draft decision-making framework utilizing a heuristic methodology, defined as a practical mental shortcut or rule of thumb used to solve problems or make decisions quickly, allowing the Committee to rely on the experience and judgment of Committee members rather than an expensive formal study.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Decision-Making Framework

Draft Library Decision Making Matrix

Location Options	Cost to Move	Cost to Procure	Useful Life	BLDG Sustainabilty	Provides Space Req'd	Meets Citizen Desires	Total
Remain in Current Building	2	2	2	2	2	2	**12**
Location 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	**12**
Location 3	2	2	2	2	2	2	**12**
Location 4	2	2	2	2	2	2	**12**
Location 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	**12**

Rank each item on a scale of 1 to 5

Cost to Move	Packing, Transport, Storage and time closed	(1 = little impact, 5 = huge impact)
Cost to Procure	Cost to procure physical sturcture	(1 = least expensive, 5 = most exensive)
Useful Life	how long will this building be useful	(1 = shortest life, 5 = Longest life)
BLDG Sustianability	How expensive to maintain the building for next 20 years	(1 = reasonable, 5 = very costly)
Space	Provides Space required from Utilization review	(1 = barely, 5 = best fit)
Citizens Desires	From Survey of citizens meets or exceeds citizens feedback	(1 = No, 5 = best match)

Item Title:
Discuss and consider asking City staff to develop a citywide survey assessing citizens' desires for library functions, using the results of the functional analysis in Item 3 as a framework and incorporating areas discussed at the previous Committee meeting.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
At its April 15, 2026 meeting, the Library of Tomorrow Committee discussed obtaining citizen input regarding the future of the library and directed staff to develop a communications and outreach approach to assess public opinion. The discussion included the importance of gathering input regarding both the physical library and the services and functions citizens want the library to provide.

This item allows the Committee to consider asking staff to develop a citywide survey focused specifically on desired library functions and services, using the functional analysis discussed in Item 3 and the areas previously identified by the Committee as the framework for the survey.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Community of Choice Where Families Thrive

Exhibit:
Agenda Item Commentary and Minute Excerpt from April 15, 2026 Meeting

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Request City staff to develop a citywide survey assessing citizens' desires for library functions, using the results of the functional analysis in Item 3 as a framework and incorporating areas discussed at the previous Committee meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Excerpt from April 15, 2026 Meeting

Agenda Item Commentary from April 15, 2026 Meeting

Item Title: Consider coordinating with the city communications group to conduct a citizen survey

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Councilwoman Williams

Background: City survey to ascertain citizen's input.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Exhibit:
Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Discussion and possible action to approve survey items

ATTACHMENTS:

Possible survey items:

- **BUILDING--**Your preference keep and maintain current library building, use alternate buildings or ask the citizens to plan for new building in the future.
- **Digital access and technology support** — providing internet, devices, digital literacy training, and help navigating online services.
- **Flexible community space** — adaptable rooms for meetings, classes, tutoring, workshops, and civic engagement.
- **Educational and workforce support** — lifelong learning, job-skill development, early literacy, and after-school programming.
- **Safe, inclusive public space** — a reliable, climate-controlled place for all residents, especially those without stable access to technology or quiet study areas.
- **Resource navigation** — helping residents connect with government services, community programs, and information they cannot easily access elsewhere.
- **Cultural and creative engagement** — makerspaces, media labs, local history preservation, and creative programming.

Minute Excerpt from April 15, 2026 Meeting

5. Consider directing staff to have the Communications and Marketing Department conduct a citizen survey to ascertain public input regarding the library and consider approving proposed survey items.

Chairman Brown stated that the next item was based on an idea Williams had raised during discussions with him, which he thought was a good idea. He noted that Williams had already begun working with staff on a survey.

Williams stated that the survey she had been working on was originally proposed to be completed before the Committee took the ceiling and fire suppression project recommendation to City Council. Chairman Brown stated that the survey contemplated under this item would be different, but he believed the idea could be adapted. Neuwirth stated that the Committee still needed to ask citizens what they believed the future of the library should be and what they would like to see. Caitlin Gatlin, Communications and Marketing, stated that she had been reviewing the information provided to the Committee and appreciated having the background. She stated that when considering administering a public survey, she believed allowing the survey to remain open for only two weeks would be somewhat unfair because that was a very short period of time for citizens to receive and understand the information. Gatlin stated that adapting the survey to focus on the future of the library would require more than creating a Google form and posting it on social media. She recommended developing a larger campaign around the survey. Gatlin stated that Communications and Marketing would need to work with the library and could conduct pop-up events or set up a table at the library to explain what the Committee was doing and get citizens excited about what the future of the library could be. She stated that a town hall or speakers bureau could also be used. Gatlin stated that it would also be important to help citizens understand where the Committee wanted the process to go while being realistic about the timeline. She said the City should avoid creating an expectation that because citizens were being asked encouraging questions in a survey, they should expect to immediately see announcements that the library was receiving numerous new programs or a brand-new building. Gatlin stated that the City should keep expectations realistic while still getting citizens excited about the future of the library. Williams stated that she had previously mentioned two weeks because the Committee had been trying to determine whether to proceed with the ceiling project and she was looking for a quick turnaround. Gatlin agreed that two weeks would have been a quick turnaround. Chairman Brown stated that he still believed conducting a survey was a good idea. He referenced page 38 of the Committee's materials and stated that he had developed a list based on what he had heard during the discussions. Chairman Brown stated that he believed the list provided a starting point for Communications and Marketing. He said it was critical that the Committee obtain citizen input and noted that the list addressed both the physical library and its core services.

Chairman Brown stated that the items he had developed were simply ideas from his own thoughts and could be refined, but he believed they provided a starting point. He stated that he was not sure exactly what form the process should take, but believed there was a clear need to assess what citizens thought about the future of the library. Hooton stated that the list contained a number of questions that could be incorporated into a survey. Hooton stated that ten subject areas could potentially result in approximately 30 questions, and Chairman Brown acknowledged that may be too many. Gatlin stated that she would recommend limiting the survey to approximately 20 questions at most. Chairman Brown stated that the survey could include questions such as whether citizens liked the library where it was currently located and whether they would consider an alternative location. He stated that he did not know exactly how the questions should be structured but believed obtaining that information was very important. Chairman Brown stated that citizen input would underpin the Committee's other work. He said the Committee needed to understand the cost of remaining in the existing building, the cost and projected timeline for constructing a new library, and whether there were other alternatives within the community, including potentially distributing pieces of library services to different locations. Chairman Brown clarified that he was not advocating for any particular option, but believed those represented the general areas the Committee needed to evaluate and develop pros and cons for before making a recommendation. Neuwirth asked what direction or motion was needed to move the survey forward. Chairman Brown stated that he had hoped Gatlin, and possibly Herr, could develop the survey. He asked Williams whether she wanted to remain involved in developing it since she had already been working on the issue. Williams declined. Neuwirth stated that a library representative should be involved in developing the survey. Burk stated that staff's recommendation appeared to be a broader campaign that included opportunities for public participation. Gatlin clarified that she was recommending multiple methods of outreach, including online participation, pop-up opportunities, and potentially setting up a table at the library where staff could explain the survey to patrons.

Burk asked how long Gatlin recommended allowing the survey to remain open. Gatlin recommended at least one month. Williams asked whether two months would be appropriate and referenced the timeframe used for another community survey. Gatlin stated that the previous community needs survey had been conducted with the Housing Division and received 79 responses. Neuwirth commented that 79 responses from the entire city was a poor response rate. Chairman Brown stated that he was concerned about a similar response with the library survey but still believed it was important to conduct one. Chairman Brown suggested that after the survey results were received, the Committee could hold a town hall or similar meeting to present the results and allow citizens to comment. Herr stated that the survey could be promoted through the library after it was developed. She noted that it would also be important to obtain responses from people who do not currently use the library, rather than limiting the responses to library patrons. Herr stated that tablets could be made available for citizens to complete the survey and that the library also had upcoming outreach events that could provide opportunities to encourage participation. Gatlin stated that another concern with surveys was what happened after citizens completed them. She said citizens often wanted to know what action would result from the information they provided. Neuwirth agreed and stated that citizens would want to know where the action was following the survey. Gatlin suggested that the Committee could consider maintaining the survey for as long as the Committee remained active rather than limiting it to a single short survey period. She stated that the Committee could receive updated results at each meeting, such as the number of new responses and whether citizens' opinions had changed from the previous month. Gatlin said a continuing survey could help show how opinions changed over time as technology, the economy, and other circumstances changed. Neuwirth compared the concept to maintaining a suggestion box. Gatlin agreed.

Neuwirth also suggested using a speakers bureau because civic clubs and other organizations were frequently looking for speakers. She stated that representatives could explain the Committee's work and encourage people to participate in the survey. Chairman Brown also suggested placing a kiosk in the library lobby. He went on to state that he did not want the Committee to get too far into determining exactly how staff should conduct the outreach because there were many possible methods. He stated that he did not object to allowing the survey to run for some time, but stated that he did not intend to chair the Committee for the next two and a half years. Chairman Brown stated that he did not believe the Committee needed to exist for two and a half years. He acknowledged that the Committee had significant work to do but estimated that it could take approximately six to eight months, or perhaps as long as 12 months, to develop a cogent recommendation. Gatlin stated that if the survey remained available for the duration of the Committee's work, the Committee could accumulate several months of citizen data. Chairman Brown stated that he believed the Committee needed a survey and asked City staff to develop an alternative or proposal for how to conduct the survey and the associated outreach. He suggested that staff present the proposal at a Committee meeting in approximately one month and asked whether that timeframe was reasonable. Gatlin agreed and stated that she could put together a proposal. Weger asked about the Committee's 120-day timeframe for reporting back to City Council. He also asked whether the 120-day period restarted when the Committee was reorganized under the new Chairman. Blazek-Scherler stated that, for purposes of the Committee's work, the 120-day period did restart. She clarified that the restarted period applied to the Committee's report to City Council and did not restart the moratorium on the ceiling project. Chairman Brown asked whether that meant the Committee's report would be due in June. Blazek-Scherler confirmed. Chairman Brown stated that, as he understood it, the Committee owed City Council a report but did not have to complete all of its work within that period. He stated that it would not be humanly possible to answer all of the questions contained in the Committee's direction within 120 days. Weger agreed.

Chairman Brown stated that the Committee could develop a plan and report to City Council in June regarding the work underway. He said the report could identify the core functions and other services of the library, the three general avenues the Committee was considering, and the survey being developed to gather public opinion. Motion by Bob Weger, Second by Patty Neuwirth, to ask city staff to prepare a marketing/communications campaign to assess citizens' attitude toward the library of the future. AYE: Patty Neuwirth, Sherene L Williams, Bob Weger, Kirby Brown, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.