

CITY OF GLENDALE LIBRARY REVIEW COMMITTEE

5909 North Milwaukee River Parkway
Glendale, Wisconsin 53209

Due to rising cases of COVID-19 this meeting will be conducted via Zoom

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83215234358>

Meeting ID: 832 1523 4358

One tap mobile

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, January 13, 2021

6:00 p.m.

1. Call to / Roll Call
2. Approval of the December 2, 2020 meeting minutes.
3. Convene to Closed Session per Wis. Stats. §19.85(1)(e) for Deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session (Interviews with potential Consultants to assist with the Committee in the Review Process)
4. Reconvene to Open Session and Regular Order of Business.
5. Discussion/Approval of a Consultant to assist with the Committee in the Review Process
6. Set next meeting date.
7. Adjournment

NOTICE: Although this is NOT a meeting of the Glendale Common Council, a majority of Council members may be in attendance. No action or deliberation by the Council will take place.

– Upon reasonable notice, efforts will be made to accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities.

City of Glendale Library Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2020

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair via Zoom

Roll Call: Present: Amanda Seligman, Catherine Hansen, Helaine Glass, Benjamin Koziol, Lin McCracken, Mary Lynn Cinealis, Lyndsay Smanz, Katie Wood. Absent: None.

Other Officials Present: Rachel Safstrom, City Administrator and Kaela Sullivan, Administrative Secretary

Approval of the October 14, 2020 meeting minutes

It was moved by Ms. Glass, seconded by Ms. Seligman, to approve the October 14, 2020 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion/Approval of a Consultant to assist with the Committee in the Review Process

Based on the proposals submitted by Godfrey's Associates and Sarah Keister Armstrong and Associates. the committee discussed the similarities and differences between the two potential consultants for assisting with the committee in the review process.

Ms. Glass, Ms. Cinealis, Mr. Koziol, and Ms. Hansen expressed their attraction for Godfrey's Associates and hesitations within the Sarah Keister Armstrong and Associates proposal. Ms. Glass was impressed with the experience Godfrey's Associates has. Ms. Cinealis, Mr. Koziol, and Ms. Hansen expressed their admiration of Godfrey's Associates' proposal, as it was extremely detailed, the projects were explained in-depth, and the organization investigated the background of Glendale. However, Ms. Cinealis understands Sarah Keister Armstrong and Associates has completed projects within the region, which may be beneficial. Additionally, Ms. Cinealis explained each potential consultant only had one first impression, so it was beneficial for Godfrey's Associates to surpass what was asked of them, and there is always an option of asking Godfrey's Associates to remove unnecessary topics within the proposal, if necessary.

Ms. McCracken, Ms. Smanz, Ms. Seligman, and Ms. Wood stated their pull towards working with the Sarah Keister Armstrong and Associates, rather than Godfrey's Associates. Ms. McCracken and Ms. Wood are hesitant that Godfrey's Associates is nationally based, so the scope of work may be different than the committee's desire. Ms. Seligman added her concern of Godfrey's Associates' attempt at both a proposal and a sales pitch. Ms. Smanz respected Sarah Keister Armstrong and Associates for keeping the proposal within the scope of what was originally asked of them, instead of making assumptions within their proposal.

Administrator Safstrom explained that Godfrey's Associates' proposal may be too rushed for what the committee is prepared for. Administrator Safstrom reiterated that although Godfrey's Associates exceeded what was requested of them, Sarah Keister Armstrong and Associates provided information based on the RFN. Additionally, Administrator Safstrom clarified that price is non-negotiable within the bidding process. The committee may inquire whether Godfrey's Associates would be willing to continue the partnership through phases 8-18, while also

determining if Godfrey's Associates could represent a report for phases 8-18. Administrator Safstrom clarified the City's budget of \$40,000 and Ms. Wood explained that both organizations equate to the same price, roughly.

Ms. McCracken, Ms. Wood, and Ms. Hansen suggested an interview process and reference check for both consultants and asked what the process entails. Administrator Safstrom stated she would choose three references from each client list and the chair would ask 4-5 questions to each consultant at the next meeting. Ms. Safstrom stated the interviews would be held at 6:00 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. as closed sessions, with an open session for discussion at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Safstrom will email the entities tonight and place a notice. Ms. Wood suggested that each committee member offer Administrator Safstrom one question for the interview process by Monday, December 7, 2020.

Set next meeting date

Ms. Wood stated the January 13, 2021 Library Review Committee meeting will be hosted via Zoom at 6:00 p.m.

Ajournment

Motion by Ms. McCracken, seconded by Ms. Glass, to adjourn the Library Review Committee meeting of December 2, 2020 at 7:06 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by Kaela Sullivan, secretary