



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD

December 3, 2025

12:00 PM

IN-PERSON

MEETING

Special Meeting

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to Order at 12:08 PM

2. **ROLL CALL**

Members Present:

Member Mark Lupinetti

Member Meghan McGarrity

Member Tamina Painter

Member Adele Oliveira

Library Director Margaret Neill

Members Excused:

Member William Karnoscak

Member Aurora Hvidsten

Others Attending:

Sarah Piltch, City of SF Attorney

Maria Sanchez-Tucker, Community Services Director, City of SF

Newby Harrod, Friends of the Library Board

Henri Hammond-Paul, Community Health and Safety Director, City of SF

Therese Martinez, Project Manager, Clerk

Carina Julig, New Mexican newspaper reporter

Joan Marshall, Friends of the Library Board

Georgina McKee, Friends of the Library Executive Director

Lillian Letters, Friends of the Library Board

Mike Harris, Citizen, Guest

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

6. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD
December 3, 2025
12:00 PM
IN-PERSON
MEETING

7. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

8. NEW BUSINESS

Topics for Discussion with Community Health and Safety Director, Henri Hammond-Paul and Community Services Director, Maria Sanchez-Tucker:

- (1) Performance -based budgeting's impact on Community Services' and the Library's respective strategic plans
- (2) Deliverables for the revitalized Fogelson Library
- (3) County MOU
- (4) City support and promotion of the Library Protection Act
- (5) City attorney's review of the Library Advisory Board Charter
- (6) Budget challenges
- (7) City support of basic facility maintenance, such as weed and rodent control
- (8) Library budget to support Sunday operating hours
- (9) Library Advisory Board and the Friends of the Santa Fe Public Library Board collaboration with City Leadership to create positive outcomes

Mark Lupinett, Library Advisory Board President, opened the meeting stating they had an ambitious list to discuss, and turned over the floor to Henri Hammond-Paul and Maria Sanchez-Tucker.

Henri Hammond-Paul thanked everyone attending the meeting over lunch time to accommodating his and Maria Sanchez-Tucker's crazy schedules. He stated that it will probably be helpful to frame the topics as questions with specific answers, or what the group is wanting to learn more about.

Maria thanked the group for accommodating their schedules. She said she'd skip to number two (**Deliverables for the revitalized Fogelson Library**). They've had a lot of deliverables; she is working on getting all of them into big files. She will send Therese Martinez the files they have for the next regular Board Meeting. It can be part of the packet, and the Board can take a look at them.

Megan McGarrity asked if Maria could share some of the highlights of some of the things that are happening. What was the result of the assessment (by the Architectural firm RMKM) and how is that influencing the planning going on now?

Maria responded that it was very preliminary space planning, feasibility study. There was an architectural and engineering one also on the overall state of the building, and what upgrades are needed, such as the HVAC system. This will be useful going forward. There hasn't been much more done since (that). Henri added that it a huge project, yet exciting, and no small feat, to the order of tens of millions of dollars. He asked what is a realistic timeline, instead of expectations for seeing progress? He said he doesn't want it to take away how much potential there is there, and that is something that excites the community. One thing they have been thinking about is how do they create excitement and maintain it over years and make it a usable space? Using it actually as a place that people can go to and get inspired to what it can eventually be.



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD
December 3, 2025
12:00 PM
IN-PERSON
MEETING

That's been something that he and Maria, and Daniel (Hernandez, former MRA Director, and Mark Scott (City manager, interim MRA Director) have been talking about and thinking about. The steps that they can take to get to that version that they want, is going to require an enormous amount of capital (money), with a lot of that coming from advocacy and partner groups like this (Friends and the LAB -Library Advisory Board); individuals to support that vision. The second piece is vision, which is a community engagement component, contributing to what it can be. That's the subtext of the initial set of deliverables, launchpad for the design and development process worthy of a new city-center facility. Maria added that they need a facility that is fitting for the City and meets the needs of the community. That's what this group can help with is putting that message forward.

Meghan said her concern is momentum. This project has been going since 2017 (?) Midtown has launched and stalled, and launched and stalled. The other aspect of the Fogelson Library development is how it can invigorate the Midtown development, making it a gift to the community, but there's also a desperate need to address the La Farge Library. That space is not representative of our (the) City. People love the library because of the community it creates, but the facility itself fails with it's broken windows, ancient pool, etc. and are not representative of us. How do we not lose momentum?

Henri responded that the current momentum is different from what happened previously. There are shovels in the ground, buildings are going up, there is serious momentum happening. The Fogelson will be like a "crown jewel" in the center. Discussion continued on whether the City is keeping the Fogelson Library or building a new building. Discussion on the need for free parking and public transportation and these being bigger questions for the plan around Midtown (a 64-acre property/city center), and opportunities to engage with the MRA (Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency) that manages Midtown that can speak to the broader plans. Discussion on utilizing technology for the development of the building for a better customer experience. Discussion on creating public engagement.

Henri said there are two phases of the project. The first phase is addressing the integrity of the building; that the building is safe to be occupied. Once that is done, the next step is to find creative ways to drum up excitement through community engagement, and what can be done to maintain it in the interim, until it can be developed into what it can be long-term. Discussion on the status of the MRA, the City Manager being the current interim MRA director, new City administration coming in, making the building safe, preserving the building, using the building in the interim (flex work space for City staff, meeting spaces, community spaces, etc.)

Henri stated that currently they have \$100,000.00 from the State going towards managing/preserving the current collection that's there. Discussion on the future of the collection and the use of the money. Discussion on what needs to be done to make the building usable (HVAC, fire system, ADA, etc.). Discussion on not being locked into a design, creative thinking, communicating with the public, the assessment done.

Joan Marshall requested going back to the first bullet point (**Performance-based budgeting's impact on Community Services' and the Library's respective strategic plans**). She stated the budgeting process has already started. Her question is regarding competing needs. The City does not have enough money and how do they look at the



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD
December 3, 2025
12:00 PM
IN-PERSON
MEETING

budget for the overall department. How do they decide based on needs and performance measures? Resources are the challenge.

Henri responded that this kind of ties in with bullet point three (**County MOU**). It is a big picture, but a challenge in general. Everything is a trade-off. Everyone who works for the City wants to serve the public in some capacity. The fact that (the libraries) are not open on Sundays is not a lack of interest, will, or desire, it's a function of resource constraints. It's a reality of every city. It's expecting staff to do more without giving them resources. Performance-based budgeting is based on the idea that there is a fixed budget. Santa Fe's budget is dependent on gross receipts tax, a function of the broader tourism economy, economic trends in the country, recession, etc., based on metrics, it is what we care about, when it comes to the services we provide. When it comes to the library, it won't be exactly what was done last year, it is current priorities, operating hours (on a Sunday) need to be accounted for in the budget. If there is a flat budget, they need to reduce a subscription service, for example, (to accommodate the hours). By drilling down on things we care about as a collective, we can start prioritizing. Priorities can also be shifted around with a trade-off accounted for. How to increase funding is an important question. Discussion on the budget process, housing issues, food security, education, loss in federal funding and its impact on the City this coming year, what kind of a budget can be expected. Discussion on quality of services, great data kept by the libraries that can be used to demonstrate increased budget needs, usership, increasing numbers, all linking back to performance showing that with evidence.

Joan Marshall stated she'd like the City to think of the Library as a long-term investment in education, in improving outcomes and future success of children. Everyone wants soccer fields and swimming pool hours, but the investment in literacy and opportunity is a different sort of investment. What the Library has done well is focus on partnerships, which can leverage the resources of other organizations that are trying to address similar issues in different underserved communities. The Library is a truly equitable institution that is available for everybody, it levels the playing field. That's the Friends' role in supporting the Library, trying to increase the amount of money they are giving the Library. The pain point at the present is that there aren't enough staff to spend the money (for programs).

Lillian Letters added that they need to work on the Sunday (openings) (**Library budget to support Sunday operating hours**). They have families that have continuously said Sunday is the only day they can go to the Library. Discussion on being closed on Monday to accommodate Sundays.

Maria suggested conducting an hours assessment survey to get feedback.

Margaret Neill stated the libraries are currently open 54 hours a week per Branch, with multiple discussions on the possibility of Sunday services. Going in with the idea of no extra anything, they'd have to cut operating hours during the week, to operate seven days a week by closing earlier. They'd have to cycle staff and change their schedules weekly, which is a huge undertaking. Southside would be the best Library to be opened on Sundays. All three Branches opened is not a possibility, it can't be done with current resources.

Henri said this is a great point to bring into the budgeting discussion, to help the Governing Body understand the trade-offs.

Lillian Letters added that the Friends biggest sales for book sales were on Sundays. Discussion on experimenting with different options, closing on Mondays, while open on Sundays.



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD
December 3, 2025
12:00 PM
IN-PERSON
MEETING

Henri stated he'd like to speak on the **County MOU**. It's a complicated topic. Like it or not, City residents are County residents. City residents pay County taxes and pay into County services. The City is like the center of gravity for the region. The City currently subsidizes many users of our services. It's true for a lot of different services, not just the Library. They want to share the access/the wealth of what the City has. In practice, being open on Sundays and having resource constraints, it creates a question as to how do we meet the demand from the public, or the demand from other areas for being opened more, have a broader, larger collection, have different types of resources available, etc. One option is understanding who our users are, 18% of our users are County residents, and (a contribution of) \$25,000.00 a year that only goes to the Southside Library. The City has a 6.3 million dollar yearly operating budget, this (contribution) amounts to less than one percent (1%). We want these services to be accessible to everybody, but we also want them to continue to grow and be of stellar quality, and one logical way of doing it is thinking about renegotiating or opening the conversation with the County on what it looks like to have a more equitable contribution towards our operating (with the understanding) that the County is already using these services and we want to keep these services available. Other places have put in a nominal fee for people who are not (City) residents yearly. Discussion on legally doing this, it not being great to push the burden onto individuals, the breakdown of \$25,000.00 and 18% (13-14,000 users-estimate) residents and the per capita number, approximately 75,000 card holders currently, activity of users, basically \$2.00 per (County) user.

Meghan McGarrity said her concern is to create a more collaborative and strategic partnership between the City and the County when it comes to Library services. The LAB has discussed not wanting to undermine County efforts in supporting rural libraries or other initiatives they might have. What is concerning is that there doesn't seem to be dialogue or discussion, where they really do have an opportunity to come together, especially with something like Fogelson. If the County could fund one (staff) position, one librarian to come work on a Sunday, that would be tremendous. It would "move the needle forward".

Henri responded that they have started a conversation with the County. They are intending to sign the MOU. Initially they were not inclined to. \$25,000.00 on top of a 6.3-million-dollar budget is not in balance with staff time and services provided. The City and County are symbiotic entities, and there are great ideas on how to combine services and they are conversations that are really worth having. Discussion on the negotiation period for the MOU, room to increase the figure, the City being open for discussions, providing services for as many people as possible, difficult trade-offs, complicated decisions.

Sarah Piltch added that the handout with the previous agreement stated a September date, it does not say that terms cannot be re-negotiated. Discussion on if there are other ways that the County can provide support, that the City contributes approximately \$102 per user (versus \$2.00 from the County), when was the last time the County increased their contribution (+/- 5years).

Henri continued with the maintenance issue (**City support of basic facility maintenance, such as weed and rodent control**). He stated that there's good news, they have a quote that they are moving to execute on that would provide for annual maintenance of all three Branches for landscaping. Building maintenance is done internally through the Facilities Maintenance Division.



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD
December 3, 2025
12:00 PM
IN-PERSON
MEETING

As far as weed control and landscaping, it comes out to \$19,000.00 per year for all three facilities (libraries) combined. Individual departments are responsible for the funding. They are working on moving money around to execute the contract more quickly. He is trying to find funding that's not part of the Library's budget.

Joan Marshall asked if this would include a sprinkler system to keep the plants alive? Discussion on xeriscaping, which facilities have irrigation, the condition of the existing irrigation systems, monthly maintenance.

Henri stated it would start with an initial "deep clean". They know much it is, the money is there, they need to move things around to make it happen. City bureaucracy is a challenge. There are constraints they are up against.

Henri stated that budget challenges (**Budget challenges**), was this sufficiently addressed? Discussion on various challenges, ongoing funding, budgeting for ongoing maintenance, volunteering support from the community (La Farge Children's Garden with help from SFCC), the City doing the lion's share.

Mark Lupinetti said he'd like to give the back story on the draft Bill (**City support and promotion of the Library Protection Act**). This came from Representative Cates from Rio Rancho, who is very involved with the attempt to ban books at the Rio Rancho Library. There have been 4000 books banned in Texas, 2000 in Florida, there have been librarians threatened with criminal prosecution, so many have been quite actively consulting with Representative Cates, Senator Sedillo-Lopez, and others in the Legislature to get a Bill banning Book Banning introduced and passed in this coming session. The challenge this year is that it is going to be a short 30-day session. It's not going to be easy. There has been some momentum, and it would be nice to know if the City could participate actively in trying to push this along.

Maria commented that a question would be that as non-profits, you have to be a little careful about how you lobby, and how you advocate in making that decision.

Sarah Piltch stated she only been with the City for a few months, her understanding is that there is a meeting, that she's not sure if it's already happened, where the City Council (Governing Body) determines the Legislative priorities. Henri responded that Legislative priorities have been determined. Carina Julig commented that it is scheduled for a final vote on the tenth (of December). Henri added that the City has a lobbyist. This is something that needs to be looked into to get a more clear answer. Sarah added that as an individual you can do what you want. As the City or the Library Board, there are the City priorities, and it may be against the City code to lobby independently as one voice from the City. For a non-profit to lobby, is another question. Mark stated that members of both groups (LAB and Friends) have been active as individuals. If they could coordinate that with the City, if it's permitted, that might have an additional benefit, and help build momentum. Henri stated that staff cannot advocate, but the mayor-elect and councilors could be approached that this is a priority. Maybe there's a resolution or an ordinance (that could apply). Joan Marshall mentioned a letter-writing campaign to individual legislators asking for their support. Discussion on lobbying, advocating, and movement for a 501-C3. Discussion on the Speaker of the House not making it a priority for the last two years, and working with the NMLA (New Mexico Library Association) for a singular voice on the issue.



MINUTES

LIBRARY BOARD
December 3, 2025
12:00 PM
IN-PERSON
MEETING

Henri said that on the issue of the valuable outcome for the City, there are two things that can be achieved, one is that say, is specific, and secondly the City contributing at a state level. Discussion on exhibits on the subject at the Library.

Henri stated there were two issues remaining on the agenda, the **City attorney's review of the Library Advisory Board Charter**, and the **Library Advisory Board and the Friends of the Santa Fe Public Library Board collaboration with City Leadership to create positive outcomes**. He hopes they have started the last one. Mark said he was thrilled they had had such a thorough discussion of so many topics. Meghan extended a thank you for them coming to meet with (both groups) them. It's been really encouraging and inspiring. She hopes this (meeting process) can be standardized and having regularly, like once a quarter, so they don't lose sight of their shared objective and keep the dialogue going. Henri agreed. Maria stated that she didn't know if Sarah was involved in the conversation but she could forward the structure and how Erin (McSherry) had recommended on how to proceed (the **City attorney's review of the Library Advisory Board Charter**). They can make a final determination of the structure and how that works. Sarah responded affirmatively to Maria's offer to send information. Closing remarks on a quarterly meeting being added to the next Agenda for the Library Advisory Board's approval via zoom and in-person. Discussion on the figures discussed that they were estimations, not actual verified data/real numbers. Thank you's were extended all around. Various discussions on other topics.

9. **OLD BUSINESS**

10. **NEXT MEETING:** Tuesday, December 16, 2025, at the Southside Branch Library at 5:45 PM.

11. **ADJOURN:** Meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM.

Therese Martinez

Liaison

Chair