

Minutes of the FutureVision Library Working Group (LWG)
Grand Forks Public Library, Second Floor
February 28, 2012

LWG Members Present: Molly Soeby (Co-chair), Sandi Marshall (Co-chair), Dan Bussian, Ray Siver, Wilbur Stolt, Shana Wiley, Kristi Mishler, Barry Wilfahrt, Meg Berg, Rolf Paulson, Gary Malm, Ginny Tupa

LWG Members Absent: Ken Vein, Dane Ferguson, Cynthia Shabb, Diane Bjerke, Karyn Hippen, Brady Hansen, Michelle Willman

Others in Attendance: Wendy Wendt, Brian Schill, Fawn Behrens-Smith, Mike Goldstone, Mark Schill, Matthew Leiphon

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 5:05pm by Co-Chair Molly Soeby

Project Scope: Sandi Marshall introduced the project and outlined the objectives of the Library Working Group: 1) Determine a library building solution that makes the most sense for the residents of Grand Forks City/County for the long term given changing community demographics and technology; and 2) offer suggestions on funding options for this recommendation.

Group Introductions: Molly Soeby led group introductions. Each member introduced themselves, offering a single word to describe their personal view of libraries.

Process Discussion: Mike Goldstone led the group through a discussion of the process and group norms for carrying out work. The LWG will submit recommendations, but has not direct decision-making authority itself. The LWG should define success by creating an authentic process that focuses community voices and builds trust across the community. Project success is tied to process success.

Goldstone led a discussion about norms for LWG work. The group discussed the process by which it will arrive at consensus to make decisions. Group members agreed that the LWG will be a working group, engaging in work outside of regular meetings, and LWG members should commit to making LWG work a personal priority.

Unpacking the “No”: Mike Goldstone led a discussion about the community’s process leading up to the 2011 library vote. Members presented reasons why the vote failed. A distinction was made between “technical” and “adaptive” work. There may be technical reasons why the first vote failed, but underlying the vote the adaptive problem of community trust about the outcome of the library project. The group agreed that a primary task of the LWG is to gather input in order to build community trust and to better define the library’s role in the community. Why does Grand Forks need a library at all? This question must be answered before technical questions dealing with expansion or funding.

Meeting closing: LWG Co-chairs will submit interim homework to LWG members to gather input on issues unable to be covered in the first meeting, such as framing and messaging. Future meetings will occur roughly every three weeks on Thursdays.