

MINUTES
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES' NAMING LIBRARIES POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
NOVEMBER 10, 2016
(approved January 12, 2017)

The Board of Trustees' Naming Libraries Policy Committee of the Whole of the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District met in regular session in the Clark County Library, Las Vegas, Nevada, at 4:30 p.m., Thursday, November 10, 2016.

Present: Board: S. Moulton, Chair M. Saunders
R. Ence Y. Yturralde
S. Bilbray-Axelrod K. Crear
R. Wadley-Munier F. Ortiz
J. Melendrez

Counsel: G. Welt

Absent: M. Francis Drake - excused

Staff: Dr. Ronald R. Heezen, Executive Director
Numerous Staff

Guests:

S. Moulton, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. She congratulated Trustee Bilbray-Axelrod on her election to the Nevada Assembly.

Roll Call (Item I.) All members listed above represent a quorum. Trustees Crear attended via telephone and was present when the meeting began. Trustee Wadley-Munier called in at 4:35 p.m., Trustee Bilbray-Axelrod was on the phone when the meeting began and arrived in person at 4:39 p.m. Trustee Yturralde arrived at 4:39 p.m.

Public Comment (Item II.) None.

Agenda (Item III.) Trustee Ence moved to approve the Agenda as proposed. There was no opposition and the motion carried.

Discussion and possible Committee action regarding review and revision of the District's Naming Libraries and Guidelines for the Naming Committee. (Item IV.A.) Development and Planning Director Danielle Milam led Trustees through a discussion of different options for a new proposed Naming Libraries Policy based upon discussion at the Naming Libraries Policy Committee meeting on October 13, 2016.

Ms. Milam would like to take the feedback from this meeting and bring back a draft Naming Policy in January, 2017 to the Committee and the Board. If further meetings are necessary, staff will schedule them. Milam presented issues gathered from the review of naming policies and guidelines gathered from the Clark County School District, UNLV, and 15 other national public libraries. At this meeting she and her staff will gather feedback and recommendations on what issues to include, modify, and/or reject in the next iteration of the Library District's Naming Policy.

Ms. Milam reminded Committee members that the *Naming Libraries Policy (Naming Policy)* and *Guidelines for the Naming Committee*

(*Guidelines*) were adopted in 1992. The major elements of the District's current *Naming Policy* and *Guidelines* are as follows:

1. The documents consist of a brief and general *Naming Policy* and a companion *Guidelines* document.
2. The documents give the Naming Libraries Committee the sole responsibility of considering and recommending naming proposals to the Board of Trustees to accept, modify or reject.
3. The documents were written at a time when the Board was not interested in naming buildings other than by location.
4. The documents reflect a preference for naming parts of buildings by the function of the area.
5. The documents do allow for honorary and gift naming opportunities for designated areas within the buildings, but provide no detail on what level of gift is appropriate.
6. The documents specifically bar the Board from approving an honorary naming opportunity for any former staff of the Library District.
7. The *Guidelines* stipulate that the board consider each naming opportunity separately.

Since 1992, no naming requests have come to the board. All new buildings have been named by location (street names or county enterprise names). Two older buildings retained non-locational names (Clark County and Rainbow). There have been no honorary or gift naming opportunities approved for parts of buildings.

The Naming Libraries Committee met on October 13, 2016, to review the *Naming Policy* and *Guidelines* under the current context of seeking additional revenues for new construction and renovation projects.

In that discussion the Board of Trustees all agreed that the Board has the sole power to accept, modify, and reject naming opportunities.

Issues raised in the course of the committee discussion included whether and/or how the policy should consider honorary naming opportunities, gift naming opportunities tied to cost-recovery, archival and operational management of honorary and/or gift naming, and signage.

There was also a discussion on whether the policy and guidelines should remain very general or be more detailed, with a clear, equitable, and transparent process for naming opportunity approval.

There was acknowledgement that review and potential revisions to this policy present opportunities at this unique time in the Library District's history:

- Gift naming opportunities could augment budgets of the two existing capital building projects in Mesquite and East Las Vegas. While the Library District has already committed the funds to launch both projects, the *Naming Policy* guides solicitations for supplemental project income.
- The policy will also shape solicitations for supplemental funds for new site and renovation projects that align with the board-adopted Vision 2020 strategic plan and that will be detailed in the Facilities Master Plan, which is now in Request for Proposal review.
- Signage issues covered in the *Naming Policy* will intersect with development of signage guidelines developed for the Facilities Master Plan.
- Signage issues will also be influenced by the Library District rebranding initiative that will involve logo redesign and brand design guidelines. The Rebranding Request for Qualifications is now in development.

Ms. Milam said there was also a recommendation by Chairman Saunders to propose a naming opportunity for the Widmeyer Trust gift of \$3 million which was pledged to the East Las Vegas building project. Action on this specific gift naming proposal will be put on hold until the refinements to the *Naming Policy* are complete.

Issues for Consideration:

1) Policy Purpose.

LVCCLD: The current Library District policy does not have an explicit purpose stated but makes reference to a preference for locational building names to identify their location most accurately to the largest number of residents in their service areas.

UNLV: The UNLV policy purpose more explicitly states that the policy purpose is to facilitate generous acts of donors who recognize the full potential of the organization and can make a gift to catapult the organization to the next level. An opportunity to transform the organization and profoundly influence the lives of students and members of our community in need.

CCSD: The CCSD policy purpose focuses heavily on the selection of a school namesake as the highest honor bestowed upon an individual who has made an everlasting impact in the community and to honor educators, students, and community leaders of the highest character.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Purpose of location naming opportunities

- b) Purpose of location and honorary naming opportunities
- c) Purpose of location, honorary, and private-public naming opportunities

When Chair Moulton opened this item up for discussion, Committee members started going right into discussing naming opportunities, however, when reminded that this part of the discussion was concerned with the policy purpose, Committee members agreed that more clarification and options should be available, choice (c).

2) Policy and Guidelines. Structurally, the LVCCLD *Naming Policy* is a separate document from the *Guidelines*. The policy is brief and general. The guidelines provide minimal criteria for naming opportunities and approval processes.

All other naming policies that were reviewed by staff combine these two documents, so that opportunities, criteria, and a detailed approval process are located in one place, providing for consistent, equitable, and transparent treatment of potential donors during the proposal and approval process.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Keep separate documents
- b) Combine into one document

Committee members favored combining the two documents into one, choice (b), with Trustee Ortiz reiterating that the District must set up some sort of document archival history to document the history behind different policies and actions.

3) Locational Naming of Library Buildings. The current *Naming Policy* and *Guidelines* stipulate that all library buildings be named for their location. With few exceptions, other national library naming policies reviewed show a preference for locational building names, to make it easy for the public to find or identify the building locations over time.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Maintain current policy of naming buildings for location purposes only
- b) Provide for building names that are only honorary
- c) Provide for building names that are only tied to gifts
- d) Provide for building names that are locational and honorary or gift-based

Based upon the lively discussion that occurred for Item 1), regarding location naming issues and concerns, Ms. Milam proposed to bring back

this item for more discussion and as an action item.

4) Honorary and Gift Naming Opportunities. The current policy allows for functional, honorary and gift naming opportunities for defined areas inside the building. Many library policies provide for naming opportunities outside the library walls as well as fund naming opportunities related to collections, endowments, or other special funds.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Naming opportunities only for designated spaces inside the building
- b) Naming opportunities for designated spaces inside and outside the building
- c) Naming opportunities for designated spaces inside and outside the building, endowments, collections, and other special funds or purposes

Committee members supported choice (c), feeling it would provide donors with a great sense of ownership and participation.

Chair Moulton was concerned about the process if a naming opportunity needed to be rescinded. She felt that the naming opportunities should not go so far as to trees or benches, but that those listed in (c) provided many avenues for interested donors. Trustee Wadley-Munier favored certain criteria for specific areas. Counsel Welt noted that each category would have specific criteria. Trustee Ortiz emphasized that there should be a clause that would allow the District to remove a name for a felony conviction or moral turpitude.

5) Honorary Naming Opportunities. The present *Naming Policy* provides that naming opportunities can be made in honor of persons "who have made a significant contribution to the Library District." The *Guidelines* stipulate that the Naming Committee shall not consider naming an area or room of the library in honor of present or past paid staff members of the Library District.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Keep these "honorary name" stipulations
- b) Broaden the definition of "honorary" person to persons with a reputation, legacy, or contribution to the library and/or related missions in education, literature, library service, community legacy, and/or the world of ideas
- c) Lift the ban on "honorary" naming opportunities related to present or past paid staff

Dr. Heezen began the discussion by saying he favored naming opportunities for monetary gifts only due to his experience at other locations. Trustee Ortiz believed there were other ways to honor individuals. Chair Moulton wanted to consider honoring past staff in some way. This was another area with much discussion and Ms. Milam agreed to bring this item back for further discussion at the next meeting.

6) Naming Opportunities Based on Financial Contribution.

Neither the current *Naming Policy* nor the *Guidelines* have specific details related to gift thresholds. While the *Guidelines* refer to a "substantial monetary gift," there is no detail or definition provided for minimum gift thresholds or cost-basis criteria.

The CCSD, UNLV, and other library policies have specific detail criteria for naming gifts:

UNLV – Has created a "menu" of designated rooms or space naming opportunities with a price for each. For example, a Group Study Room is \$25,000; a Group Study Alcove is \$10,000; a Study Booth is \$5,000; and a Study Table is \$500. These opportunities have been defined by UNLV staff.

CCSD – Requires that only portions of school facilities or nonschool facilities can be named via a private-public funding partnership. The policy requires a minimum of 30% of the non-school building cost and/or needed laboratory or technical equipment.

Other Library Policies – On the whole, the trend seems to be that 51% of land acquisition, assessed value of the building, renovation costs, construction costs, furniture-collection-equipment costs, ongoing operating costs, and/or recognition signage costs be recovered in order to have a naming opportunity on a building or in a designated area inside or outside the building.

For the most part, the practice of setting objective cost criteria has been instituted to recognize (and not discount) substantial "public" investment in the building. The practice has also been put in place to avoid scenarios that involve negotiating a gift with donors in public meetings, and to set expectations that donors will be treated fairly, equitably, and with transparent approval processes.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Keep the general definition of "substantial monetary gift"
- b) Set a percentage threshold for gift naming opportunities related to cost recovery (building valuation, project cost, square foot cost, equipment cost, furniture cost, collection cost, minimum contribution to endowment, or other quantitative measure)

Committee members favored choice (b) as many felt that it was too difficult and too divisive to try to define "substantial." Committee

members wanted transparency and did not want to discount public investment. They wanted naming opportunities to tie into the actual costs and be based upon specific guidelines that are easy for the donor and the public to understand. Committee members wanted to maintain the Board of Trustees as the final authority to modify or reject a gift.

7) Fundraising Campaign Naming Opportunities. The current policy provides for individual naming proposals to be brought to the Library Board of Trustees on a case-by-case basis via the Naming Facilities Committee. To facilitate fundraising for multiple parts of a new project or for multiple-project fundraising campaigns, some libraries have created a process to identify multiple naming opportunities as part of fundraising campaigns.

With the Mesquite and East Las Vegas projects underway and with multiple renovation projects on the horizon as the Facilities Master plan is completed, it may be desirable to create an "Fundraising Campaign" process for identifying multiple naming opportunities related to capital project fundraising campaigns. This would facilitate and expedite the solicitation of multiple gifts, with relative certainty that the Board would give final approval.

The process for a Fundraising Campaign naming opportunity would differ slightly from the individual proposal process. In such a case, Library District staff would bring a set of naming opportunities tied to a fundraising campaign to the Naming Facilities Committee for review and recommendation to the board. The Board would review and approve of a conceptual menu of fundraising naming opportunities and the Foundation would be authorized to actively seek donations tied to the naming opportunities identified in the approved plan. Staff would submit individual proposals for Board ratification, modification, or rejection, in alignment with the approved Fundraising Campaign plan.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Keep the case-by-case approach
- b) Create a Fundraising Campaign Naming Opportunity option in the *Naming Policy*

Committee members wanted to increase the funding opportunities available to donors and favored choice (b).

8) Naming Opportunity Approval Process. The present policy requires proposals to go through the Naming Facilities Committee, but there is not much detail about that process. Most other policies that were reviewed require the naming opportunity proposal to be in writing with specific terms of agreement including purpose, use, amount of gift, payment schedule, and gift duration. Some require that a legal document be signed based on the conditions of Board approval. Others require that all media on the gift be held until the Board has voted approval and a final legal document is signed.

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Keep the process vague
- b) Describe the details of an approval process that includes a written proposal
- c) Describe the details of an approval process that includes a written proposal and legal agreement document that details the conditions of Board Approval
- d) Provide for media coverage only when Board approval and the legal gift document are finalized

Committee members favored a policy that contained the terms donors would be seeing in the final agreement (memorandum of understanding) so there would be transparency for both donors and the public, favoring choices (c) and (d).

9) Conditions for Rescinding a Naming Opportunity. At present, the *Naming Policy* is silent on conditions that might lead to rescinding a name, renaming, or terminating the naming agreement due to natural disaster, new construction, program or room use change, the name comes into disrepute or conflict with the Library's mission, if the flow of funds ceases before the agreed time, and/or if the duration of the naming opportunity extends beyond the normal life of a room or area (10 years?)

Options for committee consideration:

- a) Policy remains silent but terms are included in legal naming opportunity agreements
- b) Policy explicitly lists the conditions for rescinding a name or renaming.

Committee members favored choice (b) as they believe this provides transparency to both donors and the public.

10) Signage. The Library District will create recognition signage standards that are consistent with Library District facility signage and branding standards. Designs for Walls of Honor will consider maintenance, ability to update, and archival activities over time. The Library District will designate a department to have the responsibility for archiving and managing naming opportunity documents and signage, including managing the terms of signage and returning honorary or gift signage to honorees or donors at the end of the naming opportunity term.

Committee members agreed with the signage proposal with Trustee Ence requesting that the District's signage should agree with community signage standards and Trustee Yturalde requesting that every opportunity for branding be explored.

Minutes - Board of Trustees' Naming Libraries Policy Committee Meeting

November 10, 2016

Page 9

- 11) Next Committee Meeting.** Chair Moulton said that this will be scheduled for January 12, 2017. She then took the opportunity to thank Ms. Milam for her hard work on research and development of an updated policy. Ms. Milam thanked Development Office Manager Sherry Walter for her assistance.

**Public Comment
(Item V.)**

None.

**Adjournment
(Item VI.)**

Chair Moulton adjourned the meeting at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Moulton, Committee Chair