



**CITY OF PACIFICA  
LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**March 11, 2020  
6:30 – 8:00 P.M.**

**Sanchez Library  
1111 Terra Nova Blvd.**

**Call to Order**

- 1. Approval of January 8, 2020 Meeting Minutes**
- 2. Oral Communications**  
This portion of the agenda is available to the public to address the Committee on any issue within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on the agenda.
- 3. Citizen Outreach Program**
  - a. March – July Schedule**
  - b. Sharp Park Neighborhood Meeting**
  - c. Other Outreach Opportunities**
  - d. Brainstorm Incentives to Visit Pacifica Libraries**
- 4. Committee and Staff Communication**

**Adjourn**

THE CITY OF PACIFICA WILL PROVIDE SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED CITIZENS UPON AT LEAST 24 HOUR ADVANCE NOTICE TO THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE (738-7301). IF YOU NEED SIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE OR WRITTEN MATERIAL PRINTED IN A LARGER FONT OR TAPED, ADVANCED NOTICE IS NECESSARY. ALL MEETING ROOMS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO THE DISABLED.



# DRAFT

## MINUTES

January 8, 2020

6:30 P.M.

**CITY OF PACIFICA  
LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SANCHEZ LIBRARY  
1111 TERRA NOVA BLVD., PACIFICA**

**COMMITTEE PRESENT:** Cindy Abbott (CA);  
Caroline Barba (CB);  
Christine Bywater (CBy);  
Jerry Crow (JC);  
Kathy Long (KL);  
Ryan Kraske (RK);  
Andy Lie (AL);  
Ellen Ron (ER);  
Grace Sobieski (GS)

**COMMITTEE ABSENT:** Kai Doggett (KD);  
Anne Evers-Hitz (AH);  
Jean Mecorney (JM);

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISONS  
PRESENT:** Sue Beckmeyer (SB)

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISONS  
ABSENT:** Mary Bier (MB)

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Tina Wehrmeister (TW);  
Helen Gannon (HG);  
Josh Montemayor (JM);  
Sarah Coffey (SC)

**SMCL STAFF:** Julie Finklang (JF)

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Abbott called the meeting to order at 6:39PM.

**1. Approval of May 8, 2019; June 12, 2019; August 14, 2019; and October 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

Kathy moved to approve the minutes of May 8, 2019; June 12, 2019; August 14, 2019; and October 9, 2019 meetings; seconded by Ellen. Approve unanimously by members present.

Members present introduced themselves, identifying their role on the Library Advisory Committee.

**2. Oral Communications – None.**

### 3. Summary of Community Survey and City Council Direction

Planning Director Tina Wehrmeister provided a summary of the results from the most recent voter survey that was conducted in mid-October 2019 by FM3 to test support for a library bond measure. The summary was presented to City Council at the November 12, 2019 City Council meeting. Information from the survey that was conducted earlier in the year was used to inform the community outreach that was done. The October survey was a tracking survey, not as detailed of a survey, and took approximately 10 minutes instead of the longer 20 minute more detailed earlier survey. The purpose was to test any movement in perceptions of a bond measure following additional community outreach. Approx. 400 likely voters were surveyed, online and on landline and cell phones. The margin of error is +/- 4.9%. Results showed not much movement since the prior survey. Approx. 1/2 surveyed had visited one of the libraries in the past year; of those that did not visit, approx. 23% responded that another person in their household had visited the library in the past year. 2/3 had heard something recently about the library. Results showed that the messaging about needed improvements, retrofitting, replacement resonated with the community. Some sample verbatim responses were highlighted. Regarding the question about where people are getting information about the library project, the largest percentage 27% responded that they saw information in the local newspaper. However, the newspaper was not one of the main methods of the community outreach that was conducted. Outreach was primarily done through social media. There were a couple of OpEds by Tina Wehrmeister and by the City Manager that were published in the newspaper regarding the library project. Survey responses showed that people were divided on whether the libraries are large enough. 82% responded that libraries play a critical role in educating youth / teens. Only 45% agreed that the libraries are large enough for our city.

Kathy and Caroline commented that we would want the percentage that feel the libraries are large enough to be a low percentage. Tina agreed.

Tina presented a slide showing how data compared to the previous survey. Ellen asked if there was any way to know if the recent survey went back to the same people as the previous survey. Tina responded that they did not know; FM3 did not mention that. Tina summarized that the results show that perceptions have not shifted dramatically and that perceptions vary based on whether the respondent has used the library in the past year. For those that have visited the libraries, less agree that the libraries are adequate for the community's needs.

Cindy asked if there should be an invitation to visit libraries for those who are not going to the libraries. If they visited, they would have a much better idea of the condition and needs for the libraries. Cindy asked what incentive can we provide to visit.

Tina commented that we will need some brainstorming for incentives to visit the libraries. We talked about holding community meetings at the library, but the meeting spaces are small and access is difficult at the Sharp Park library.

Ellen asked about statistics for library cards issued and how many Pacificans have library cards, how many are children. She asked if the library is able to track the use of library cards. Julie responded that they track the library card use in the system, but not at which libraries they are used.

Tina continued with the survey results summary. There was a question that tested the draft bond measure language. 65% indicated support of the measure, but we would like to see that % higher.

There were lower levels of opposition to the measure than in the previous survey, and more moved to undecided. Voters younger than 40 yrs old are likely supportive.

Julie provided statistics on how many Pacificans (over 22,000) that have used their library cards, but does not know how many of those are children. Tina commented that Pacifica's population per the last census was about 39,000.

Tina continued summarizing survey results, indicating that for respondents with household income in the range of \$50K - \$90K, support for the measure dips, observing that this group would likely be the hardest cut by any new taxes. For length of residency, those residing in Pacifica for a longer period are less likely to support the measure.

Andy asked if there was information on renters v. homeowners in the data. Tina responded that information is not on these slides, but may be in the cross tabs.

Tina continued with the summary of the survey results, providing a sampling of responses to open-ended question about why those that would vote yes support the measure.

Cindy observed that the messaging about the need for repairs is important, hoping that people do not get too stuck on the idea of retrofitting.

Tina provided a sampling of responses to the open ended question about why those that would vote no do not support the measure -- most common reasons are that taxes are too high, cost is too high, the measure goes too far, and we do not need everything that is listed in the measure. After a more detailed explanation of the project, support for the measure increased to 67%, the percentage opposed decreased and more moved to undecided. In prior surveys, 70% had indicated support after hearing explanation.

Sue Beckmeyer commented that in the earlier survey, support went down after the explanation. Tina confirmed.

Ellen asked when the previous survey was done, was it during the summer, after the property tax bills?

Tina responded that the previous survey was done in February 2019.

#### **4. Citizen Outreach Program**

##### **a. Progress and Analytics**

Tina summarized the polling consultant's conclusions: about 3/5 have heard of the library project, our messaging is penetrating, the current level of support is comparable to prior surveys but opposition has softened. Support for the measure is within the margin of error for passage. The messaging is working, but has not yet impacted levels of support.

Kathy commented that people that use Sanchez Library may not like the idea of the open access model, but observed that the climate change issue for a reason for opposition previously is not an issue this time. She commented that the anti-tax people will likely not change their position.

**b. Messaging Adjustments and Other Efforts Based on Survey Data**

Tina continued that the BergDavis PR consultants recommended addition of actions with the messaging, such as looking for additional sources of funding. Staff met with Supervisor Horsley's office, and they are very supportive of the library project; Supervisor Horsley is willing to bring to the Board of Supervisors and action to possibly contribute funding for the library. Staff has talked to the Foundation for San Mateo County Libraries, which is working countywide and with local foundations for funding for the San Mateo County libraries. They can set aside dedicated contributions to specific libraries. Staff has done research into possible grants and reached out to the Gates Foundation, finding that money for capital improvements is difficult to come by. Tina suggested speaking to other property owners in the Sharp Park area to see if there is potential for public / private partnerships, mentioning parking as one of the most expensive components for the Sharp Park library and the need for parking in the Sharp Park area. There is potential for some collaboration on the parking aspect.

Ellen mentioned that Jackie Speier's office was approached regarding a designated space for veterans in one of the libraries, and that there could possibly be some funding there. Julie mentioned that she was involved in that project and it was a small amount of money, mostly for materials and training – the library donates the space and the program should be self-sufficient and volunteer run.

Kathy asked about the status of a potential change to the law to lower the threshold needed to pass a bond measure for libraries / education.

Sue Beckmeyer mentioned that the bill is not dead, but is not expected to go through.

Ellen mention the threshold would be 55% to pass through a constitutional amendment, but there were lawsuits in SF that stopped it.

Kathy thought that for educational bonds the threshold was lowered to 55%. Caroline commented that the Peninsula Library Foundation found that this did not seem to apply for libraries.

Kathy mentioned raising money in SF, where philanthropists seem to be apt to give to symphonies, etc. and not to the library. She mentioned that there are corners in the SF libraries that have special rooms for specific communities such as gay / lesbian / transgender community space, small business / job center space, Chinese community space, etc. where money can be raised from donors of specific communities of interest through a public / private partnership.

Tina commented that the City Council received the report with the results of the survey at the November 12, 2019 Council meeting and directed staff to continue outreach.

Ellen commented that she agreed with Eric Ruchames that the 4<sup>th</sup> reason working against the library last time was that not all Councilmembers were supportive, and one was against the plan. It is a helpful change that now all Councilmembers support the plan.

Cindy asked that if the 4 main reasons for opposition have been removed, then shouldn't we see more of a positive change in support. She commented that the big issue is the money.

Kathy agreed that money is the issue for the opposition. She feels that there is a problem with younger people in the 18 – 35 range not voting. The newer residents that she spoke with in the outreach at the picnic in the summer were supportive, but did not vote.

Ellen asked if that would still be true in November of this year. For the \$56M cost, it might be helpful to point out the cost of buildings and renovations, construction costs now and that public buildings costs are typically higher. Also, we are planning for 2 libraries now, not just one. It would be helpful to break down the cost into a monthly average per person and an average cost per year, like we did for the estimate of \$17 / \$100k assessed value for the previous bond measure. Will need that information for this plan. For seniors, the 2 buildings closest to Sanchez library are subsidized housing, so they will not get hit with the cost. Renters will not get hit with the cost, and also there is the statewide rent control going into effect. She observed that the residents living here the longest will have a lower cost than the newer residents.

Cindy heard a lot of comments about the size – that the plan is too big and that there are plans to include things that are not necessary. Kathy observed that many of the spaces are designed to be multi-purpose, flexible spaces.

Cindy also heard from property owners with multiple properties that were concerned about paying more of the cost due to owning more properties. She heard this from people that she was surprised were against the library measure.

Sue mentioned the option of a Mello-Roos bond instead of a general obligation bond. Mello-Roos bonds allow for some kinds of carve-outs, for instance for seniors or considerations that can be made similar to parcel taxes for exemptions. However, Mello-Roos bonds are generally hard to explain and are typically met with suspicion. She asked Andy about his experience with the parcel tax for the schools.

Andy said that they don't usually do much campaigning for the education bonds / parcel taxes, as people are generally in favor. They did a survey and a mailer prior to the passage of the parcel tax last year. They also did a budget "road show" to educate people on school budgets, how schools are funded and provide a budget comparison to other school districts. He commented that a lot of people are not aware of how cities are funded. There is a need to establish a basic understanding of city funding. He suggested a one-page FAQ about city funding, including show what percent of taxes goes to the city, schools, water district, etc. He said that the average assessed value of property in Pacifica is still approx. \$400k. Must distinguish assessed value from market value.

Ellen thought that a problem with the Mello-Roos bonds is that you don't have a fixed number. Kathy thought that the carve-outs allowed under Mello-Roos for special groups might raise red flags for some.

Sue commented that general obligation bonds tend to be more easily explainable.

Ellen commented that people should know that the city pays for the buildings for the libraries, but the county pays for the library services and that funding for the libraries is not taking away from street paving. Andy agreed, indicating that goes back to the need for education about city funding.

Sue likes the idea of a one-page FAQ about city funding, and also suggested short minut-long video explanations. Ellen asked about how to get people to see the videos. Caroline

suggested Connect With Pacifica e-newsletter. Cindy mentioned social media. Kathy mentioned NextDoor. Ellen commented to make it controversial to get more attention.

Josh mentioned that information about the library project is still being included in Connect With Pacifica, and that there has been 2,300 unique visitors to the project website to-date. There are new clicks every week.

Caroline asked if there was an uptick in page visits after the December Friends of the Library Book Sale. They passed out library project postcards at the sale. Josh confirmed that there was an uptick in website visits. Cindy mentioned the Pacifica Democrats meeting where she and the City Manager presented about the library project, and that could have driven some interest in the project webpage, also.

Sue commented that Cindy did a great job with the Democrats presentation. People were leaning in and were engaged and focused. The editor of the Tribune was present. Tina mentioned that a very positive article about the library project was written in the Tribune. Sue commented that Sherm would be a good advocate and helper for information about the library project; he likes the idea of building community.

### **c. Receive Feedback on Building Banner Mockups**

Tina reminded that group that in past meetings they suggested putting up banners on the library buildings about the library project. Josh created some mockups of building banners and worked with John the Sign Guy on sizing. The size would be similar to the size of the existing banner at Sanchez. The suggestion was one banner at each library on the outside.

Ellen asked if Evette Davis saw the mockups. Tina replied that Evette Davis helped with the designs.

Julie asked about placement of the banner at Sharp Park, with concern about how well it can be seen driving past. Tina thought it could be on the retaining wall. Julie mentioned that the Foundation had a banner at the old Wastewater Treatment Plant where the mural is now when that had been the site for the new library. She was concerned if the banner was placed along Hilton Way near the book drop people would not notice it. Ellen asked about ways to elevate the banner.

Christine asked if the slogan on the mockup had been tested. She suggested changing the wording to, "Support the Pacifica Library Project" so that it is connected better to the library project. The current wording about better libraries does not make her think of the library project, but she thinks of the library services which are great. Caroline and Ellen both commented that was a good point. The consensus was to select the banner with the image of the new Sharp Park library to place at the Sharp Park library, and the banner without the image at Sanchez.

Cindy asked about other locations for placing banners, such as the intersection by Stuckey's, the Community Center, schools, Sanchez Center for the Arts.

Ellen asked if the banners would all be the same size. She suggested placing one on the lot next to the Japanese restaurant on Highway 1. Caroline suggested considering weather conditions, which make it difficult for mounting free-standing signs. Cindy suggested checking with Parks, Beaches & Recreation for placing banners at child care sites such as Fairmont.

Tina reminded the group that staff was focused on the call to action for banners to be placed at the library locations, which was a suggestion from a prior meeting.

Ellen offered to table information outside supermarkets, and suggested a table-sized banner to hang. She is willing to staff the table and answer questions about the library project. Tina suggested checking with John the Sign Guy for making a tablecloth. Ellen mentioned during Fog Fest, a banner was used for the parade and then was placed at the table in the booth following the parade. She mentioned the child care banners that are placed at the intersection by Stuckey's under the overpass, which are very visible and a good location.

#### **d. Sharp Park Neighborhood Meeting(s)**

Tina mentioned the Sharp Park neighborhood meetings that are planned for the Sharp Park Specific Plan and General Plan update work that the city is doing. Cindy is trying to put together a meeting about the library project specifically for the Sharp Park residents. They need to identify a date; they are considering holding the meeting at the Sharp Park library.

Tina mentioned the Sharp Park Specific Plan meeting that will be held on Wednesday, January 29 at the Little Brown Church at 6:30pm, and thanked Jerry for helping secure the meeting location. She mentioned that at the Plan Pacifica meetings, people ask questions about the library. She would like to get volunteers to table with library information at the first part of the meeting as people are entering. Ellen and Caroline volunteered, and Ellen asked if they could get a tablecloth by that date. Tina will have printed library FAQs for the table, postcards and the panels with library project information. Mayor Pro Tem Beckmeyer mentioned Andy Lie's comment suggesting an infographic regarding how City funding works. Tina will check with Assistant City Manager Hines about putting something together. Josh suggested registering via EventBrite if planning to attend the meeting on Jan. 29.

Julie Finklang asked about the plan for the Sharp Park neighborhood meeting for the library project. Tina replied that the plan was still being worked out for that meeting.

### **5. LAC Member Presentation Outreach Report-out**

Cindy reported regarding the Pacifica Democrats meeting presentation focused on the library project at which she and City Manager Woodhouse presented. She mentioned continuing with outreach regarding the library project. She asked for suggestions for additional outreach methods and asked if the online outreach is still running.

Tina confirmed that the online outreach is still occurring, but not as frequently. Information is still posted in Connect With Pacifica. Staff needs to get answers to some questions from the public is working on finding additional information.

Ellen mentioned including information to emphasize that this is a smaller library than planned last time, and that the plan includes 2 libraries.

### **6. Committee and Staff Communication**

Cindy mentioned receiving an outreach toolkit for the library project and asked if that would go out to all Library Advisory Committee members.



Tina introduced new Library Advisory Committee members Ryan Kraske, representing the Planning Commission, and Grace Sobieski, representing the Economic Development Committee.

Ellen asked if there are any vacant positions on the committee. Sarah replied that only the Chamber of Commerce rep and Bond Oversight Committee rep positions are vacant; there are no at-large member vacancies currently.

Julie handed out San Mateo County Libraries Annual Report packets to committee members, and mentioned that the Annual Report was presented to the City Council at the November 25, 2019 meeting.

Mayor pro Tem Beckmeyer asked if the Foundation for San Mateo County Libraries was fully formed. Caroline stated that it was. Mayor pro Tem Beckmeyer asked if the Foundation meets monthly. Julie said that she would talk to Raquel España and mentioned the Foundation's website at [investinsmcl.org](http://investinsmcl.org). She stated that they had a kick-off meeting a couple of months ago.

Ellen asked for postcards to have available at the Sanchez Library for the Friday storytime. Julie mentioned giving out the postcards previously, but stated that the younger generation is not interested in paper – some take pictures of it. Christine Bywater suggested QR codes, which they can take a picture or scan.

Sarah stated that the Census 2020 is coming, watch for postcards in the mail in March. It is important that everyone is counted.

Andy Lie mentioned that the Jefferson Union High School District is one of a handful that sued JUUL for their advertising targeting youth. He referred to a Press Release that was issued before the holidays.

Cindy Abbott stated that this Friday from 7 – 9pm is the first opening of the year at Sanchez Art Center.

Kathy Long mentioned that she will not be able to attend the meeting in February.

MEETING ADJOURNED 7:57 p.m.

---

Cindy Abbott  
Library Advisory Committee Chair