The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District met in the Las Vegas Library, Las Vegas, Nevada, at 2:00 p.m., Monday, November 1, 2004.

Present: 
Board: E. Sanchez, Chair  
V. Davis-Hoggard, Member  
K. Carter, Member  
A. Arthurholtz, Member  
A. Aguirre

Counsel: G. Welt

Staff: Daniel L. Walters, Executive Director  
Numerous Staff

Chair E. Sanchez, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Roll Call  
As listed above.

Agenda  
Trustee Carter moved to approve the Agenda as proposed. There was no opposition and the motion carried.

Possible discussion and direction to staff and the Board’s Legislative Committee regarding planning for the 2005 Legislative Session and responding to proposed legislation affecting the District. (Item III.A.)

Chair Sanchez indicated the purpose of the meeting was to discuss upcoming issues and provide direction to staff on preparing future Board agendas.

Executive Director Walters provided information regarding a Bill Draft prepared by the City of Henderson that could potentially alter the Library District’s boundaries. He provided background on discussion with the Henderson District Public Libraries (HDPL) regarding boundary issues during the past several years. In 2001, an interlocal agreement was signed by both districts changing the boundaries to give the area known as Anthem to HDPL. As part of that negotiation process, both districts supported legislation that created a process for future boundary changes, including a process for resolving disputes. This legislation was approved in 2001 and has yet to be used by the parties.

Walters stressed that the process that was agreed to by both districts called for mutual studies and financial analysis that would involve residents in determining the best way to provide library services to residential areas. The City of Henderson’s new proposed legislation asks the legislature to unilaterally change the boundaries without a study and without local input. The City of Henderson has initiated this draft bill even though it has no direct jurisdiction over the Henderson
District Public Libraries which is a county library.

Walters explained that a possible solution would be for the City of Henderson or the HDPL to petition the legislature to make the library a city library instead of a county library. That would result in their boundaries being coterminous with the city. This would change the library’s funding and governance but the boundaries would be coterminous with the city and future annexations would be automatic. There would still be issues to resolve concerning the Green Valley Library if they chose to pursue this option.

The District’s lobbyist and legal counsel have both suggested that the Board of Trustees could request the Clark County Board of Commissioners to mediate this issue as provided by statute rather than let it go to the legislature. The District’s position would be that neither the process that was created in 2001 has not been followed, nor the provisions of the Interlocal Agreement between the two districts.

Trustee Hoggard asked if HDPL has talked with the County Commission about this issue. She inquired what the financial implication of this bill draft would be for the District. Walters replied that he did not know if HDPL was working with any commissioners on this issue. He indicated that the purpose of the study would be to determine the financial impact on both districts and who was best suited to provide library service to the affected areas.

Chair Sanchez recalled the past correspondence with HDPL and stated that the Library District has a history of cooperation with Henderson. Considering this history we should be able to resolve boundary issues locally and not in Carson City. The County Commission should be the one resolving disputes as agreed to in the past. She indicated that staff should bring this issue to the Board of Trustees at the November meeting.

Trustee Arthurholtz inquired about the possibility that this bill draft will be like so many others that goes nowhere. She asked if this bill has backing. Walters replied that the city of Henderson has three bill drafts and has representation in the legislature so that he fully expects this bill will be heard.

Chair Sanchez reiterated that she believes the focus should be on using the process that is in place. It would be a shame if future funding issues led to the District having to turn away residents. The District has a history of serving everyone in the valley and our cross use shows the level of use by residents of Henderson. The failure of bond issues in both Districts makes it more important than ever for the two Districts to work together to provide the best library services possible to residents.

Trustee Hoggard agreed that it is best to resolve these issues locally and not at the legislature. She felt that representatives in Carson City were not as well versed in local library service issues.

Trustee Arthurholtz noted that even if LVCCLD goes to the Clark County
Commission to resolve this issue, the City of Henderson can’t be prevented from going to the legislature.

Chair Sanchez agreed but felt it was important to use the local process. She felt it was important to bring this issue before the full board in November.

Walters noted that based upon direction from the Executive committee he indicated staff would prepare a full report for the Trustee’s meeting in November. The report will include a strategy for meetings to initiate the process to resolve this boundary dispute locally.

Possible discussion and direction to staff regarding planning for future Board agenda topics, December – February, and possible discussion and direction to Board committees on future committee tasks. No action will be taken. (Item III.B.)

Executive Director Walters outlined the issues that will be brought to the Board of Trustees at meetings over the next few months. The District is planning to bring up wireless Internet access in urban libraries and this will require a revision of the Internet Policy. The strategic planning process calls for a draft of the new plan to be ready for the Board in January. Since this is likely to be a substantial document it will be available in January and schedule to be discussed in February. The procurement of a new automation system is underway and he anticipated bringing a recommendation to the Board in March. He indicated there is a need to schedule a Legislative Committee meeting prior to the session starting after the first of the year.

Trustee Hoggard suggested that considering the importance of the issues it might be worthwhile to bring the discussion of legislative issues to the Board as a whole. Walters agreed that this might be a good strategy and asked the Committee to consider whether they would like to hold a December board meeting for this purpose.

Chair Sanchez asked if there were other issues that may be on the horizon.

Trustee Aguirre requested that the Committee consider the possibility of a joint meeting with the School District Board to discuss Pre-K and family literacy. He felt that the two boards share a mutual interest in family literacy and a joint meeting to discuss this topic would serve as a symbolic means to emphasize this mutual interest in promoting literacy.

Chair Sanchez agreed that there are mutual goals in building a literate community and that it is desirable to build appropriate partnerships in this area. She suggested that this should be incorporated into the Strategic Plan that the library is creating to develop a strategy for strengthening a partnership with the School District.

Trustee Hoggard agreed that it would be good to build this into the Strategic Plan.

Trustee Aguirre thanked the committee for considering his suggestion and welcomed the opportunity to see this strategic incorporated into the Strategic Plan for future action.
Public Comment (Item IV.)  None

Adjournment (Item V.)  The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Sanchez, Committee Chair