

JPA Review Ad-Hoc Committee Report

Submitted for November 2025 Commission Meeting

Purpose

The 2014 Joint Powers Agreement required the agreement to be reviewed once every ten years by the Library Commission, with written findings presented to the Members (Article VI, Section A, 15).

The JPA Review Ad Hoc Committee was formed by the Library Commission during the February 2025 Commission meeting to conduct the review.

Members

The members of the JPA Review Ad Hoc Committee were:

- Sarah Laggos, Chair, County of Sonoma/City of Santa Rosa Commissioner
- Deborah Doyle, Windsor Commissioner
- Fred Engbarth, Sebastopol Commissioner
- Brooke Greene, Cloverdale Commissioner
- Barbara Mackenzie, Rohnert Park Commissioner

Process

The Committee met eleven times over the course of eight months on Zoom and in person to conduct the review and draft the report. The Committee reviewed each Article of the JPA and each section within the Articles, and conducted an online survey for stakeholder feedback.

Summary of Review

The 2014 Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) for the Sonoma County Library is a functional and effective governing document that supports a strong, countywide library system. The agreement successfully coordinates the intention of participating jurisdictions, including the County of Sonoma and its incorporated cities, to provide countywide library services and collaborative decision-making through the Library Commission.

Since its adoption in August 2014, the revised JPA agreement has facilitated consistent and improved library services across the region, enabled the efficient allocation of resources, and strengthened accountability and transparency. It provides a solid foundation for library operations, strategic planning, and community engagement. The agreement has helped sustain and enhance library programs, infrastructure, and access to vital educational and cultural resources, especially with the passage and renewal of the library sales tax measure.

The review revealed opportunities for internal operational adjustments to improve clarity, efficiency, and responsiveness to current needs. These potential refinements are part of the natural evolution of any long-standing agreement and do not reflect a failure of the framework itself. Rather, they offer a chance to strengthen internal processes and enhance further collaboration.

The JPA Review Ad Hoc Committee recommends the Sonoma County Library Commission accept this report and recommendations.

Article Review

As part of an ongoing commitment to transparency, collaboration, and continuous improvement, the review examined each article of the 2014 Joint Powers Agreement for the Sonoma County Library. The JPA provides a stable and functional foundation for countywide library governance. While the agreement continues to serve its purpose well, the article-by-article review revealed opportunities to improve operational effectiveness and identified areas where adjustments might enhance clarity or efficiency. As a result, the recommendations do not suggest a structural overhaul, but rather aim to ensure the Library continues to evolve and adapt as necessary to meet the needs of the community it supports. Overall, the review affirmed the effectiveness of the current structure.

Article I: Purpose

The Committee noted the varied use of the terms ‘Partner’, ‘Members’, ‘Parties’, and other terms to describe the signatories of the JPA and encourages consistent use of one term – ‘Members’.

Article II: Powers

The Committee noted that many and various powers were authorized, but not required to be used, giving the Library flexibility within the scope of the agreement to adjust to the needs of the community over the long term. The Committee discussed a number of the powers for clarification, but did not make any recommendations.

Article III: Effective Date and Term

The Committee had no comments on this section.

Article IV: Membership

The Committee reviewed and discussed the membership process and noted the Library is not a Member of the JPA or a party to the agreement.

Article V: Library Advisory Boards

The Committee reviewed and discussed the structure, purpose, and role of Library Advisory Boards (LABs). While LABs historically served as a way to foster local community input, some members of the Committee were concerned the current model was no longer functioning effectively nor serving a clear purpose across the system.

Key themes included uncertainty around LAB roles and responsibilities, inconsistent engagement, and challenges related to compliance with public meeting requirements, in particular, the Brown Act. There was general agreement that LABs often struggle with recruitment, retention, and achieving quorums—especially in smaller communities or areas served by multiple branches under a single LAB. Additionally, the evolving nature of communication through digital tools, direct outreach, and staff visibility suggest that the Commission reexamine the LABs’ purpose and function.

Some members of the Committee suggest that the responsibilities of connecting with the public are already well-suited to Library Commissioners and staff, and that more flexible, modern approaches to community engagement might be more effective. These approaches could include more targeted outreach, stronger partnerships and communication with local officials, and improved opportunities for volunteerism and feedback not necessarily formalized through governance structures like the JPA.

Overall, the Committee recommends reviewing the role and purpose of the LABs through an ad hoc committee consisting of Commissioners, LAB members, and others, and proposes that future community engagement efforts remain adaptive, streamlined, and responsive without necessarily being embedded in the formal governance agreement.

Article VI: Governance

The Committee reviewed and focused on the roles, responsibilities, and structure of the Library Commission, with a strong interest in improving clarity, accountability, and support for Commissioners, as the Library Commission is a governing and decision-making body, not an advisory board, and responsibilities include budget and policy-making for the library system.

A key takeaway was the importance of developing a more detailed and consistent description of Commissioners' roles and responsibilities, potentially in the form of bylaws or supporting documents, and ensure a clear delineation of responsibilities between the Commission and Library administration. The Committee supported more consistent ongoing training and professional development for Commissioners to ensure they are well-informed and able to serve effectively.

In addition, there was discussion about how to handle concerns related to commissioner conduct. The Committee recommends adopting a code of conduct. It was acknowledged, however, that city / county appointing bodies hold the authority to address such issues and that their existing processes should guide any actions. The Committee also noted the importance of appointing Commissioners in a timely manner or having city council members serve in the interim.

The discussion also touched on questions of representation and the length of service for Commissioners. The Committee considered whether setting clearer expectations around terms could support broader engagement and whether the current structure reflected the varying needs of different jurisdictions. The Committee discussed the role of term limits for Commission appointments as well. There was also acknowledgment that aspects of the appointment process could be clearer and onboarding and training for new Commissioners can be more robust.

Finally, the issue of compensation was discussed. While Commissioners have always served without pay, a concern was raised that this may have limited who is able to participate.

The discussion emphasized the importance of refining governance practices to support a more inclusive, accountable, and well-prepared Commission while remaining flexible and aligned with the needs of the library system. Overall, the Committee recommends creating an ad hoc committee on the roles and responsibilities of Commissioners including:

- Reviewing and revising the Commissioner job description with a focus on skill-based and experience-based qualities.
- Clarifying the dual role of Commissioners who are appointed by individual jurisdictions while collectively governing the countywide library system.
- Creating a code of conduct and a process for communicating violations with the appointing body.
- Codifying the Commissioner terms to align with the JPA.
- Developing a recommendation for format, distribution, and presentation of annual reports to the Members.

- Crafting a summary document to share with JPA Members which clarifies the appointment timeline, process, roles and responsibilities, and/or application for Commissioners to share with the Members.
- Establishing clearer communication guidelines to promote transparency and awareness between Commissioners, administration, staff, community members, and JPA members.

Article VII: Commission Meetings and Voting

The Committee discussed reviewing the bylaws and internal policies on how meeting records are maintained, how long they are preserved, and the format in which they are kept, but did not make any recommendations to modify existing policies.

Article VIII: Officers, Committees and Liaisons

The Committee reviewed the language related to the Library Director's authority and responsibilities to evaluate whether it reflected current practices and organizational needs. The Committee considered adjustments to wording for clarity and relevance, including how the Director carries out the Commission's direction and how the library's service area is described. There was also conversation about certain administrative and financial oversight roles and how they are referenced, as well as the process for appeals, and the role of Commissioners acting as liaisons to other entities. Overall, the discussion focused on ensuring the Article remained clear, appropriate, and aligned with current library operations and governance, but did not make any recommendations.

Article IX: Library Budget, Tax Levies and Reporting

The Committee considered whether language related to funding sources was broad enough to allow for a wider range of potential revenue streams. There was also a discussion on the process for annual reporting to the JPA partners. The Committee discussed preferred formats and methods for sharing these reports and how to effectively manage their distribution to ensure clear communication and accountability. These topics can be reviewed and addressed by the recommended ad hoc committee on the roles and responsibilities of Commissioners, as referenced under the Governance section.

Article X: Services, Resources and Facilities

The Committee discussed the importance of providing a clear framework for the equitable distribution of available resources using the upcoming strategic plan and budget allocation model.

The Committee notes additional issues including:

- Absence of consistent lease agreements across jurisdictions and the implications for managing library facilities.
- The Library lacks authority to enforce JPA lease provisions with its Members, resulting in lease lapses and the absence of leases with one Member.

The Committee recommends the Director continue to prioritize signed leases with each Member.

The Committee recommends the Commission explore a framework for the equitable distribution of available resources.

Article XI: Termination and Withdrawal

The Committee had no comments on this section.

Article XII: Miscellaneous Provisions

The Committee noted the use of email as an appropriate method of communication.

Recommendation

The JPA Review Ad Hoc Committee recommends the Sonoma County Library Commission accept this report and its recommendation to establish two ad hoc committees to address the role of the Library Advisory Boards (LABs) and the roles and responsibilities of the Commissioners, and distribute this written report to the Members to meet the requirements of the JPA (Article VI, Section A, 15).

Stakeholder Feedback

The Committee created and distributed an online survey for stakeholders to provide feedback on each article of the JPA. The survey was distributed to:

- Elected Officials (Cities/County)
- City/Town/County Employees
- Friends of the Library members
- Library Advisory Board members
- Foundation members
- Measure Y Oversight Committee member
- Sonoma County Library employees
- General community

43 survey responses were received, which was not a statistically significant response rate, and are included in this report.

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/18/2025 15:05:39	Respondant A	Windsor	Library Advisory Board member (LAB)	ok
3/18/2025 16:32:28	Respondant B	Occidental Community Library	Library Staff	Sounds good as is. I like the clarification that the Library is not part of County government. Most patrons assume we are, by the way, because we are called Sonoma County Library. I correct that assumption all the time.
3/19/2025 10:41:49	Respondant C	Windsor	Friends of the Library member	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant A	ok	should include the names of all towns/cities currently in the Library System	should include the names of all towns/cities currently in the Library System	The LABs are not effective today. The stated purpose is too vague and there is no mechanism for the Commission to formally consult LABs on a regular basis. For example, LABs were informed but were not asked for input on Measure W. If there is not a real role for the LABs, we should not ask people to devote time to them.
Respondant B	Sounds good as is.	Just change the date.	Will CLOV, SEBA, ROHN & WIND be Members now?	Sounds fine.
Respondant C			Add Windsor	Labs are redundant and another layer of bureaucracy. They should be combined with the Friends group or ended completely.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant A	Shouldn't all the towns/cities be mentioned?	ok	ok	Article 6 mentions the possibility of multi-year budgets. Shouldn't the 2 articles be consistent?
Respondant B	Ok as is.	Ok.	ok.	
Respondant C	All terms should be no longer than 2 years.			

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant A	Are there current lease agreements for all branches of the library?	ok	ok	
Respondant B				
Respondant C				

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/19/2025 11:01:18	Respondant D	Petaluma	Library Staff	
3/19/2025 12:23:49	Respondant E	Cloverdale	Library Staff	This article looks like it's working well.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant D	<p>The language here is way too vague. Regarding section A, it is proposed the Library be able to assume any power "convenient to the operation of a free public library." Regarding B, it is proposed the Library be authorized to assume essentially limitless power because, taken literally (as all language deserves to be taken), the Library would be able to "perform all acts necessary for the exercise of common powers to carry out this Agreement." Besides the general concern, it is important to provide context. For example, as stated in Article 6, Section A, points 6, 7, 9, 10, et. al., the Library Commission is responsible for *adopting* or *approving* items, not for either adopting or rejecting, approving or denying. Thus, given the presentation of the language here, the Library would be able to push measures through the Commission because the Library has limitless power, and the Commission's responsibility is to approve items (see comments on Article 6 below).</p>			I believe points C and D should be more defined, less flexible.
Respondant E	This article looks like it's working well.	This article looks like it's working well.	For clarity's sake, it might be helpful to note under "A. Current JPA Members" the branches that are included as part the County of Sonoma (presumably Cloverdale, Guerneville, Sebastopol and Windsor).	This article looks like it's working well.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant D	The responsibilities of the Commission should be more binary in certain regards: it would be preferable to describe their duties as having to adopt or reject, approve or reject, not simply to adopt or to approve. Taken literally (as all language deserves to be taken), this would mean the Commission is tasked with the approval, not with the revision and critique of the items in question.	Regarding point F, I believe the Commission meetings should at least recognize the input the Library staff. The position that all voting power rests with the Commission is in itself questionable, but if there is no flexibility on that point, then a survey opinion or some sort of more inclusive input should be part of the voting process.		
Respondant E	This article looks like it's working well.	This article looks like it's working well.	This article looks like it's working well.	This article looks like it's working well.

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant D				
Respondant E	This article looks like it's working well.	This article looks like it's working well.	This article looks like it's working well.	

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/19/2025 12:53:23	Respondant F	Sonoma County Library	Library Staff	
3/19/2025 14:52:58	Respondant G	Sebastopol	Library Staff	I like this: "Commitment to County-Wide Library System. The Parties to this Agreement agree to collaborate and work cooperatively with one another and the Library in good faith to ensure the provision of library services to Sonoma County citizens across the regional countywide library system."

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant F			Many cities are missing from A, as well as the County of Sonoma for unincorporated areas.	
Respondant G	I think this is well worded and intended			

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant F				
Respondant G	"There is no limit on the number of terms a Commissioner may serve" - Consider rotational terms and/or limiting	Please consider setting general commission meetings at a time when public facing staff can attend, such as Mondays or Thursdays at 6:30pm	this wording needs clarification or amendment because of its vagueness: "{library director}... shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission."	

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant F	<p>My feeling on C2 is that the Library takes on more than their fair share for building maintenance and repairs, either because of time frames or the city being unwilling or unable to assist.</p> <p>Regarding these.</p>			
Respondant G	<p>"A. Services. It is the intention of the Parties that the services the Library presently offers to the public be continued at or above current levels in all of its regional branch libraries. Such services include, but are not limited to, the size and quality of collections, hours of operation, qualifications of staff, and availability of technology. The Library shall endeavor to increase existing levels of services, and the locations in which services are provided, as allowable."</p> <p>-Please ensure that supply meets demand, i.e. if demand for librarians is high at a branch, make sure to hire enough to deliver great community service and prevent burnout</p> <p>"B. Distribution of Resources. The Library shall distribute its personnel, financial and technological resources among the various regional library branches in an equitable fashion, unless such distribution is expressly restricted (such as conditions in a gift or bequest)"</p>			

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/19/2025 19:14:15	Respondant H	Windsor	Library Advisory Board member (LAB)	No change required
3/20/2025 17:35:53	Respondant I	Windsor	Friends of the Library member	
3/21/2025 15:01:18	Respondant J	Sonoma County Wine Library Association	Wine Library Association board president.	Approve, no changes.
3/21/2025 16:24:19	Respondant K	Santa Rosa	Measure Y Oversight Committee Member	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant H	Strike Artricle 2 sections 7 & 8, these functions should not be given to unelected officials.	Limit to 10 years	Article 4 A should be amended to include the Town of Windsor	Article 5 should be deleted entirely, this function is now carried out by the branches.
Respondant I				The LAB section is outdated. Friends of the Library organizations are fulfilling this role very effectively. The section should be eliminated. It is difficult to find people willing to serve on a LAB, when the Friends organizations are doing so much more.
Respondant J	Approve, no changes.	Approve, no changes	Approve, no changes	Approve, no changes.
Respondant K	#4. To acquire, construct, manage, maintain and operate any buildings, works, or improvements - specify LIBRARY buildings, works, or improvements (or pertaining to the library). What works well in Article 2: The listing of the Specific Powers is an effective way to spell it all out.		Did libraries like the Rohnert Park Library and Cloverdale Library join after 2014 and that is why they are not included in the sole Members of the Sonoma County Library? The Membership eligibility and "Member" Defined sections are spelled out and work well in this article.	Acronyms are great but I kept having to reference what "LAB" meant in Article 5.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant H	Article 6A (3)should be amended to include “An annual Audit should be performed by a qualified accounting firm and upon completion of the audit and not less than 60days from the ending of the fiscal year a report is presented to the commission and each member of the JSA”	No change		No change
Respondant I				
Respondant J	Approve, no changes.	Approve, no changes	Approve, no changes	Approve, no changes
Respondant K	#15 - continuing effectiveness. Maybe add the words, "continuing effectiveness" to the reviewer blurb up at the top. Looking at the articles from the lens of "continuing effectiveness" adds a little more clarity and definition when reviewing.	Article 7 is stated clearly and concisely, maybe just double check to make sure there have not been any changes or updates that need to be revised in the sections, especially to Section A & F, in the last ten years.	LAB - Library Advisory Board	

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant H	No change	No change	No change	The Library Advisory Boards offer no value add and the monthly meeting are a drain of resources on the local branches.
Respondant I				My comments about article 5 are really the only thoughts I have to contribute.
Respondant J	Approved, no changes	Approved, no changes	Approved, no changes	
Respondant K	The use of technology has grown tremendously at all the libraries in the last 10 years. Maybe revise the A & B sections to better fit the services provided through the Sonoma County Library website as well as the streaming services that can be accessed through the website at all hours of the day and night.			I have been a Measure Y Oversight Committee Member for over a year and found reviewing the different articles of this document to be very informative! Thank you for including me in this process and I'm looking forward to attending the Budget Workshop in Rohnert Park on April 16th. Also, I'm just curious because I did not read anything about Measure Y in any of the articles or in the full document. Is this because it started after 2014 (in 2016) or just that it does not pertain specifically to the Sonoma County Library Joint Powers Agreement?

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/21/2025 17:03:41	Respondant L	County of Sonoma	Library Staff	
3/24/2025 15:06:53	Respondant M	Windsor	Friends of the Library member	Need Library services in West County, like Bodega Bay.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant L		Confirm that the 2014 date referenced here would be the correct "effective date" once updates are made to the document vs. need to edit the date.	Just checking the list of County and Cities is complete and accurate as listed in A. I thought there would be other cities included in this list, but perhaps they will be added after this process.(Windsor, Rohnert Park, Cloverdale).	
Respondant M	4 and 5 contradict sharing building responsibility with the town/city.governing bodies		There is no list of additional Members, like Windsor.	D. Few annual meetings have occurred. C: LABs are not presenting annual reports. B: LAB Purpose is vague; does not really explain what/why LABs exist.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant L	B 1 of this article is very hard to follow and understand, therefore, hard to figure out what the terms actually are: limited or unlimited. Cannot comment, other than to suggest re-writing B 1 so the actual terms of commissioners can be clearly understood by most readers in future.		Wondering if A is accurate with respect to the responsibilities of the Director vs. needs updating. Also -- no reference to the more-recently created deputy director role. Would suggest updating to include deputy director and roles/responsibilities focus updates if applicable here in this document.	
Respondant M	<p>A.6: The previous Strategic Plans did not contain any forward looking goals, like "increase the number of Library cards by 1% a quarter". This is called OKRs (Objects Key Results) which is a common Silicon Valley procedure. State an Objective, then define measurable results for a specific time.</p> <p>B.1: need term limits for Commissioners.</p> <p>B.4: Unsure if the training for new Commissioners has occurred.</p> <p>C: need term limits for officers.</p>	<p>A: There was a loss of status and prestige when the meetings moved from the Santa Rosa City Hall auditorium to the RP Library conference room.</p>		<p>D: The annual report is filled with the State Librarian, and presented to the Commission, but it is not presented to the Members nor to the public. The State Report is a long list of dry statistics, but does not present a clear summary of "How is the Library Doing?"</p>

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant L	<p>Suggest editing last line of A. (to read) The library shall endeavor to increase the levels of service, and.....as needed and allowable.</p> <p>For B 1 -- Suggest editing to reflect more reasonable exceptions to variation in hours at other possible branch location beyond the reference to Central Santa Rosa Branch only: (FOG branches, etc).</p> <p>In B 2 - Suggest editing to more easily reflect main idea that these type of large donation/gifts are welcomed and can be donor designated but that the library director and commission will have final decision on acceptance of any donor specified or donor restricted gifts. -- I think it says that right now, but it's overly complicated and could be improved, made clearer.</p>			Interesting - thanks for including staff in the process.
Respondant M	C.1: Are there Leases in place for all of the buildings?			When the Director and staff moved from Central branch to the Headquarters building, they lost touch with the patrons. Hiding in their isolated (the Director's Doll House) building, they are alienated from the actual operation of the branches. They have abandoned the Friends groups. They operate in a clueless vacuum.

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/25/2025 10:42:56	Respondant N	Healdsburg	Library Staff	The Library has done a good job expanding library services throughout the County, particularly with the BiblioBus
3/26/2025 13:05:21	Respondant O	Petaluma	Library Staff	None

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant N				
Respondant O	None	None	None	None

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant N				
Respondant O	None	None	None	None

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant N	I don't think these sections on facility standards are clear enough, it says the Library and Members will plan together on major repairs but it doesn't say who has to pay for what, and it doesn't go into the range of improvements that are more ambiguous. For example, in front of the library the space could be greatly improved with outdoor benches/tables like those the City has installed in other areas of downtown Healdsburg, is that City or Library responsibility? It's fine if the agreement doesn't attempt to go into all the details but it should at least come up with a standard procedure for addressing improvements with the Members, our library facilities are falling behind other area resources and certainly other nearby libraries largely due to poor communication with Members and the Library's lack of clarity on responsibilities.			
Respondant O	None	None	None	None

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
3/27/2025 15:49:27	Respondant P	as a library employee I don't see myself as representing a particular city or community. I live in Rohnert Park which isn't an option on the list	Library Staff	
3/31/2025 9:35:42	Respondant Q	Healdsburg	Measure Y Oversight Committee Member	The County wide system has been working well.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant P	in section B10, suggest adding endowments			Eliminate the requirement of LABs in each city. Shift to a single countywide LAB group with representatives from each city that can bring forward input and suggestions from their respective service areas. The library operates as a countywide system, the library commission operates as a single governing body, the LABs should too. Also, either eliminate the requirement that LABs "shall present an annual report on the activities of the LAB to the Library Commission" or take steps to ensure the LAB(s) comply and actually do this.
Respondant Q	To the best of my limited knowledge, the financial aspects of the JPA are working well.	No feedback	Other cities in the County have become members under theis article.	How have LABS gathered community input?

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant P	<p>"Adopt a facilities maintenance plan at least once every three years" - consider changing to every five years; consider what the JPA member roles should be in this process since they own the buildings</p> <p>Commissioner seats are often left vacant for more than 60 days even though the JPA says "If a Member's seat on the Commission becomes vacant at any time, the governing body of the Member shall appoint another representative to fill the vacancy within 60 days" - consider reducing the size of the Commission or adding language allowing for longer vacancies in the event there are no candidates applying for an open seat or the appointing JPA body takes longer than 60 days. In particular, Cotati has a seat on the Commission but there is no library in Cotati. The joint County-Santa Rosa seat is also awkward.</p>			<p>please clarify "At least one month prior to the Commission's annual public sessions to be held on the budget, the Library Director and Chief Financial Officer shall hold a public discussion or workshop with respect to the budget." - this isn't clear and/or has never happened</p>
Respondant Q		<p>The Commission has carried out the duties set forth.</p>	<p>The roles of Library Director and Chief Financial Officer are clear.</p>	<p>The Allocation Policy for use of Measure Y, (now Measure W) sales tax receipts is clear and has been implemented.</p>

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant P	<p>this language causes trouble and confusion : "It is the intention of the Parties that the services the Library presently offers to the public be continued at or above current levels in all of its regional branch libraries. Such services include, but are not limited to, the size and quality of collections, hours of operation, qualifications of staff, and availability of technology" as well as "With respect to hours of operation, an equitable distribution of resources requires that all regional branch libraries be funded in a manner allowing them to remain open to the public the same baseline number of hours, with the exception of the Central Branch in Santa Rosa (which may be funded to allow it to remain open to the public for more hours than the other regional branch libraries)"</p> <p>The library's ability to offer services at or above the current levels depends on our revenue and the cost of providing such services. The hours of operation already vary for the Occidental, Forestville, and History & Genealogy Library. The size of collections and technology</p>			Thank you! Overall the JPA works very well and has amply served Sonoma County residents over the years
Respondant Q	This article provides for equity of services across the County.	No comment	No Comment	

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/1/2025 19:35:47	Respondant R	Santa Rosa	Library Staff	
4/2/2025 14:19:13	Respondant S	County of Sonoma	Measure Y Oversight Committee Member	
4/2/2025 20:34:38	Respondant T	Cloverdale	Elected Official	
4/4/2025 9:46:42	Respondant U	County of Sonoma	Library Staff	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant R				
Respondant S				
Respondant T				
Respondant U				I do not think the LABs are necessary any longer. They create a liability for the Library and are a lot of work for staff. The LAB members do not seem to know what they are charged with majority of the time and it creates frustration where there should be none. If we need to keep LABs I would suggest a Community LAB with 1-2 reps from each JPA member that meets to get community feedback when needed. SFPL has this model and the administrators for Public Services run these meetings, thus taking the work off of the Branch Managers for this task.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant R	Does the Commission actually perform A.8.?			
Respondant S	Article 6: A4: Since I am new to the committee, I am interested in knowing what kinds of additional sources of funding they might pursue.			
Respondant T			Would like to see an expansion on the duties and opportunities for the liaisons, specifically those who also serve on City Councils.	
Respondant U	I would love to see the Library agree to a Commissioner as well before appointed.			

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant R	A. Increasing services will not be possible without more public service staffing support. B. All regional libraries are open the same number of hours now. Central is not an exception.	B. Are we talking about commission members withdrawing? Or libraries withdrawing? This section is a bit confusing to me.		
Respondant S				I have read through all the articles. Since I am new to the committee I do not have any input at this time, just my question under Article 6.
Respondant T				
Respondant U				I think that the LABs are the most outdated portion of the JPA that creates a lot of work with little output. I think that the general concept can be tweaked, as listed above- or they could be taken away completely. I do think that some find value in this work, and if it does continue I think it should be done in a way that does not impact the staff or cause the library liability (per Brown Act requirements)

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/4/2025 16:17:06	Respondant V	Petaluma	Friends of the Library member	C and D are important.
4/5/2025 14:20:23	Respondant W	Petaluma	Community Member	A most noble goal.
4/7/2025 11:57:19	Respondant X	Windsor	Elected Official	The entity seems to be working well. The tax measure approved by voters certainly helped. The recent remodel of the Windsor facility was well received and I have noticed an increase in its use by the community.
4/9/2025 7:38:12	Respondant Y	County of Sonoma	Library Staff	Looks good.
4/9/2025 13:04:43	Respondant Z	Occidental	Community Member	
4/9/2025 15:18:07	Respondant AA	Santa Rosa	Library Staff	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant V			Does being a member mean I am a community member who takes out books? That was my understanding.	I'm hoping the LAB will support freedom to offer books without bias.
Respondant W	Apart from 'Mello Roos' taxes this seems right and proper.	I presume the new date of agreement is to be in August, X, 2025.	Pity that other cities are not JPA members.	One would think the LAB members election or appointment ought to be registered in what form, herein.
Respondant X			If I am not understanding, I assume Windsor is now "Member" of the governing body and the new Agreement will reflect this.	Question: Are the LABs required to comply with the same Brown Act requirements say as the elected bodies of the cities and Planning Commissions. I only ask because of the constraints and resources necessary to adhere to the open meeting laws. Do the LABs have any authority spending or contractual decisions are they strictly advisory and very different from the Commission which I understand are required by law to adhere to the rules
Respondant Y	Seems fine.	OK.	OK.	OK.
Respondant Z				
Respondant AA				

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant V		Sounds good.		
Respondant W	LAB members follow a similar pattern?	.666.. is Q, then?	CFO is governed only by LD, then?	Seems right and proper.
Respondant X	Perhaps an explanation of why Santa Rosa and th County have two appointments to th Commission and more importantly why when there is a vacancy, those two entities initially appoint a representative instead of the jurisdiction where the vacancy occurred.			
Respondant Y	OK.	OK.	OK.	OK.
Respondant Z				
Respondant AA	Consider adding limits for term limits for commissioners. The current composition needs to be diversified.			Annual report should also be posted to the library website for public knowledge.

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant V	When accepting gifts, it's important to note that the gift  is given freely without compensation through special privileges or need to accommodate requests from the gift giver. (Sort of like lobbyists seeking special considerations over and above the general public)			Is there a space for providing the community with assurances that the library will not ban books?
Respondant W	Canny bit here.	Good and meet escape hatch.	OK, although I am not familiar with legal term 'counterpart.'	
Respondant X	I expect there will be changes to this Article based on the Articles age and changes which have occurred			Thank you for asking.
Respondant Y	OK.	OK.	OK.	This survey did not highlight changes in the agreement, if any. I wish it had.
Respondant Z				All articles seem to be consistent and well thought out.
Respondant AA				

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/9/2025 16:17:15	Respondant BB	Santa Rosa	Library Staff	n/a
4/10/2025 9:35:37	Respondant CC	Sebastopol	City/County Employee	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant BB	n/a	n/a	Why are other townships/cities like Cloverdale, Guerneville, Sebastopol, et. al not specifically named?	I would very much like to see something written into the JPA about LAB members shadowing library staff on a semi-annual basis so they can gain real, working, practical knowledge of how libraries function within and for their communities so that LABs can make informed and useful decisions and advisories with regards to library policy.
Respondant CC				

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant BB	Please see my feedback on article 5; I think that idea should also be applied to commissioners.	I would like if Article 7 included a clause to make commission meetings that are open to the public as easily accessible to library staff as possible in an effort to encourage transparency and staff input.	n/a	n/a
Respondant CC				

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant BB	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Respondant CC	<p>The Library has largely not met the obligations under this section to establish uniform leases, which should be negotiated with the cities as part of the JPA renewal.</p> <p>Additionally, the Library has mostly not met the requirement to "work together to plan for the provision and payment of capital improvements and capital repairs to facilities operated by the Library, including but not limited to major repair and replacement of building structures . . ." While things have improved recently, this is a basic issue that the Library should address in reviewing the JPA, without assuming that the cities have primary responsibility for these major expenses.</p>			

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/10/2025 9:45:41	Respondant DD	Petaluma	City/County Employee	
4/10/2025 9:53:50	Respondant EE	Santa Rosa	Library Advisory Board member (LAB)	<p>It appears that Government Code section 6508.1 was amended effective 2019 to provide with regard to debts, liabilities, etc.: "However, the parties to the agreement may not agree otherwise with respect to the retirement liabilities of the agency if the agency contracts with a public retirement system." and also added a section defining "public retirement system":.</p>

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant DD				
Respondant EE	<p>It would be helpful to define "powers common to the Parties" (A). Also, can the Library promulgate ordinances? (B.12). In addition, the JPA is Government Code section 6500 et seq (D).</p>	<p>It appears that amended Government Code section 6508.2 (obligations to public retirement systems) affects Section 11.A and likely affects 3.B as well.</p>		<p>The LABs are an important intermediary between the public and the Commission and LAB members are valuable Library advocates, as evidenced by the recent tax measure campaign and election. However, there are likely too many LABs and some type of restructuring would make them more useful. Ideas for this include three LABs, one for North County, one for South County, and one for Santa Rosa. Another would charge the Commission with requesting information from the LABs on specific topics a few times each year. It would be helpful/more efficient if only one Library management person were required to attend the LAB meetings.</p>

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant DD				The Library might consider adding a "claims and bills" reporting process similar to what many cities have for transparency's sake. On a quarterly basis (or monthly), post a consent item to the Commission agenda reporting all AP transactions including vendor name, amount, date, etc. Similarly, some cities report contracts newly entered into over a certain dollar threshold.
Respondant EE	6B creates the basis for an entirely undemocratic voting process. See comments regarding Article 7 below.	Section F creates an entirely undemocratic voting process, similar to that of the federal Electoral College. The populations of the Commission members are approximately as follows: Cloverdale, 8,825; Cotati,, 7,430; Healdsburg, 11,137; Petaluma, 58,800; Rohnert Park, 44,546; Santa Rosa, 175,845; Sebastopol, 7,380; Sonoma, 10,619; Windsor, 25,828; and the County of Sonoma, 131,702 (rough estimate). Each member's voting power should be broadly apportioned based on its relative population. Anything else is very unfair to the constituents of the members with the larger populations.		

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant DD	Section C2 is vague and could lead to disagreements about the sharing of capital costs or substandard facilities in cities where there is either no funding or no political interest in funding capital investments in facilities. Without wanting to be overly prescriptive in the charter document, it seems there could be a better way to delineate the financial responsibilities of the library versus the cities.			
Respondant EE		See comment to Article 3.B regarding amendments to Government Code section 6508.1 effective 2019 concerning public retirement system obligations.	Notice provisions in F should be updated to add more modern forms of notice.	

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/10/2025 12:40:24	Respondant FF	Santa Rosa	Library Staff	The commitment to a county-wide library system works well in this section.
4/10/2025 12:59:43	Respondant GG	Rohnert Park Cotati (staff)	Library Staff	
4/10/2025 16:42:17	Respondant HH	Santa Rosa	Elected Official	Article 1 seems sufficient.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant FF				
Respondant GG				In my experience, the role of LABs is still unclear. I don't know if the answer is to better define it in this agreement.
Respondant HH	Since the Library acts independently for the most part it is difficult to discern whether or not A through D are being implemented in a fair and equitable manner.	Given it has been over 10 years since this Agreement has been reviewed it would behoove us to do a new review.	Okay.	Okay.

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant FF	That Commissioners must be Sonoma County residents works well in this section.	That each Commissioner shall have one vote and that no absentee ballot or proxy is permitted both work well in this section.	That decisions of the Library Director regarding policies, facilities, and materials may be appealed to the Commission works well in this section.	That the Commission may revise an adopted budget as may be reasonably necessary works well in this section.
Respondant GG				
Respondant HH		Sounds fine.	Okay.	Very good.

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant FF	That the Library shall distribute its personnel, financial and technological resources among the various regional library branches in an equitable fashion works well in this section.		That the Library shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the Parties and each of their respective officers, agents, and employees, from any and all claims, losses, damages, costs, injuries, and liabilities of every kind arising directly or indirectly from the conduct, activities, operations, acts, and omissions of the Library works well in this section.	
Respondant GG				
Respondant HH				Being a new council member, I don't know how often councils are updated on what is happening with the Commission and individual branches. It would be really helpful to know not only have the financial picture but also facilities, programs, and just more up to date information.

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/10/2025 23:13:55	Respondant II	Sebastopol	Elected Official	
4/11/2025 1:40:46	Respondant JJ	ROHNERT PARK (Not listed above.)	Friends of the Library member	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant II				
Respondant JJ				<p>Section D mentions a meeting once a year. Given Fiscal year is mentioned in Article 9, section E, when is the meeting held? Fiscal year is July 1 to June 30.</p> <p>--Should the meeting be worded once per Fiscal year?</p> <p>--Should Fiscal year be defined here as well?</p>

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant II				
Respondant JJ				Should Fiscal year be defined in Article 1 vs Article 9, section E? The reader could keep that reference in mind from the beginning, when reviewing all the other articles. Or leave it here, but also add it at the beginning?

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant II	<p>The Library has largely not met the obligations under this section to establish uniform leases, which should be negotiated with the cities as part of the JPA renewal.</p> <p>Additionally, the Library has mostly not met the requirement to "work together to plan for the provision and payment of capital improvements and capital repairs to facilities operated by the Library, including but not limited to major repair and replacement of building structures . . ." While things have improved recently, this is a basic issue that the Library should address in reviewing the JPA, without assuming that the cities have primary responsibility for these major expenses.</p>			
Respondant JJ		<p>Section B describes member withdrawing from the Library giving 1 year's written notice, really? Seems like an excessive span of time. Six months seems more reasonable to me.</p>	<p>Perhaps define 'counterparts' in section H? Reads kind of vague.</p>	<p>I can tell a lot of effort went into the review by the ad-hoc committee. No easy task!! Thanks for taking this review on and asking for our inputs. :)</p>

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/11/2025 9:58:11	Respondant KK	Cloverdale	Patron	The library is not an entity, group, business, corporation, or individual. It is a library, and the county libraries are each separate libraries, which may involve networks and grouped access for area (nearby county) patrons, but to say the JPA creates an individual is false. It is important to be clear and accurate.
4/11/2025 11:15:54	Respondant LL	City of Rohnert Park	City/County Employee	It is critical we remain a County-wide library system and cooperatively work as local communities with the Sonoma County library system.
4/11/2025 14:08:39	Respondant MM	Santa Rosa	Library Staff	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant KK	Centralized "powers", e.g. for employment review, etc are harmful to operational quality and represent a conflict of interest with the libraries' purposes (plural).	The "agreement" isn't even an agreement if not entered into by the actual patrons, individually.	Movement toward a membership or subscription based model of governance is the wrong direction.	Boards and committees degrade policy making, and result in the creation of unnecessary policies. Avoid groupthink in general.
Respondant LL	Work cooperatively with JPA members to address service gaps and deferred maintenance issues on library buildings.	It is important to update the agreement to ensure equitable service delivery among members.	Update the agreement to include all incorporated cities that are part of the JPA.	LAB article is adequate.
Respondant MM				The LABs have outlasted their usefulness and encourage constituents to feel the different municipalities are pitted against one another. The library (and the Commission) could get much better feedback if it were done in a way that did not rely on meetings governed by the Brown act. The commissioners already have local city councils to give them community feedback and many LAB members are frustrated with the experience as well. If LABs need to continue, they should all have the same bylaws and represent regions (rather than single libraires).

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant KK	Governance clauses are premature without call. Every policy is a confession of failing to empower local employees so that such policies aren't necessary. The goal should be to enable competent, empowered, local administrators who choose their own levels of involvement.	Meetings should be scheduled when there is a problem, not to create policies.	Titles, badges, special statuses and ranks are not called for in the libraries.	Budget items should be discussed openly, AFTER the budget becomes transparent. Before bookkeeping is reviewable by the general public, it may be assumed there is improper budgeting and embezzlement.
Respondant LL	Library Commissioners article seems adequate.	No feedback on this section.	No feedback for this section of the agreement.	Suggest annual update to member agencies on budget and service delivery related matters.
Respondant MM				

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant KK	Distribution of resources may be handled as needed, appealable to existing judiciary infrastructure if needed. There is no need to assume distribution problems before they exist. Cross bridges as they appear, in general	Withdrawal is irrelevant, since the agreement is inappropriate	Liability is a feature of individuals, not groups	Get your shit together
Respondant LL	Work cooperatively with member agencies to address deferred maintenance issues with facilities. In most cases, facilities are owned by the JPA members, but it is imperative the library system financially support any expansion/remodeling of existing library branches particularly after the passage of Measure Y.	No feedback on this section of the agreement.	No feedback for this section of the agreement.	Appreciate Sonoma County Library seeking this feedback.
Respondant MM	This is a good time to re-visit the topic of hours. Now things are good, but if there was an economic down turn it would be valuable to have more locations than CENT that could have differing hours.			

Timestamp	Name	I represent:	I am a:	Your Feedback on Article 1
4/11/2025 15:14:22	Respondant NN	Sebastopol	Past Commissioner and SCL Chair. Involved with the drafting of the 2014 JPA Review. Currently a member of the Sebastopol Regional Library's LAB.	Going well. The Library Commission, Administration, and JPAS Members should be working together on the development of a County-Wide Library System.
4/11/2025 16:42:31	Respondant OO	Santa Rosa	Library Staff	

Name	Your Feedback on Article 2	Your Feedback on Article 3	Your Feedback on Article 4	Your Feedback on Article 5
Respondant NN	No problem with the text of the JPA. There is some problem in the SCL' Commission and Administration in implementing it. Take, for example, Sections 4, 5, 7, 8 (as to bonds), 9, 10, 12, and 13. I feel there needs to be some training on the meaning and applicability of D (Restriction on Exercise of Powers).	Text does not need change..	Text does not need change..	The LABS, unfortunately, are under utilized by the Sonoma County Library Commission and Administration. The LABS have the potential of serving as a strong connection to the "voice of the community" in each region. This is what they were designed to do. It seems, however, that the SCL and Administration views the LABS as a burden. Therefore, to me, it is not a surprise that, on the one hand the LABS feel underutilized and discounted while the Library Commission and Administration treat them as of "no value" and even a burden. Some training on the fact that the LABS are, in essence. a separate but equal branch of the libraries structure is needed. Regretfully, this is another part of the JPA that the Commission and/or Administration seem to be confused over.
Respondant OO				

Name	Your Feedback on Article 6	Your Feedback on Article 7	Your Feedback on Article 8	Your Feedback on Article 9
Respondant NN	<p>Text does not need change. However, the JPA grant of authority to the Commission for oversight and fiscal accountability needs to be respected by the Library and asserted by the Commission. The Commission is, after all, the governing authority and has "oversight authority" over the Library Administration.</p> <p>Communication at the SCL is ineffective, at best, as it presently exists. In my opinion, for example, there is no reason to block off information sharing my claiming it is operational.</p> <p>The Library should establish a policy regarding "Confidentiality". Criticizing staff and JPA Members for sharing information, in an open and transparent manner, with one another about the library should not be discouraged. State law defines what "confidential" information is not the SCL.</p> <p>The Sonoma County needs more open communication and increased engagement with the community.</p>	<p>Text does not need change. However, the SCL needs more acoustically designed meeting rooms. The present system discourages public participation rather than encourage it. This is especially true with the management of Zoom meetings.</p>	<p>Text does not need change.</p> <p>Suggest some "tweaks" regarding the roles. Who is the client? Who is titled to the information? How does the Commission go about establishing "Advisory Committees" need clarification. The Commission's Officers do not have authority to act "on their own" or without a clear delegation of authority. Who do the LABs advise...the Library Commission and Director, as written...? What is an Advisory Committee?</p> <p>If some of the terms used in the JPA needs clarification/definition...now is the time to do so.</p>	<p>The text does not change. . The Library needs to do a better job in educating the community about its structure, budget, and operation. How about some public forums on these topics.</p>
Respondant OO				

Name	Feedback on Article 10	Feedback on Article 11	Feedback on Article 12	Additional Thoughts (if any)
Respondant NN	<p>The text of this part does not need change. It is clear in its stated intent, for the "equitable distribution of resources" and the need for a funding plan to meet that goal. However, there seems to be too much confusion, on the part of the Commission and Administration over the meaning of "equitable resources", and the development of a long term capital plan. Some education and training needs to be done in this area.</p>	Text does not need change.	Text does not need change.	<p>The text of the current JPA does not, for the most part, need change. However the implementation of the text by the Library Commission and Administration does need work.</p> <p>Terms used in the JPA Agreement need clarification to avoid confusion.</p> <p>The fact that the JPA is a statutory agreement and a public entity needs to be discussed and clarified. Active community engagement and efforts needs to be strengthened. Baries, under than those required by law, to governing and operation of the library need to be lined. The Library should be committed to governance that is open and transparent. Commissioner need to have a minimum education standard. The training could be developed with the JPA Members. on-going training keeps those who receive it up-to-date on development in the essential to govern a public library.</p> <p>I look forward to a JPA process which is open, inclusive, and transparent. The community and</p>
Respondant OO				Time to answer this survey is a challenge.