

**Humboldt County Library Board of Trustee Special Meeting
Tuesday August 15, 2017 5:08 pm**

Board of Trustees (all present)

Barbara Duncan, Co-Chair
Georgette Olsen, Co-Chair
Susan Putnam, Trustee (NEW as of 8-8-17)
Mary Agnes Boni, Trustee
Mary Beene, Trustee

Representing Humboldt County

Humboldt County District Attorney – Civil Division - Gabrielle Carr
Humboldt County Administrator – Dave Mendiola
Assistant Administrator/HR Director – Abel Del Real-Nava

Co-Chair Barbara Duncan called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m.

Co-Chair Duncan opened the meeting with public comment. She instructed people in the audience to limit public comment to 3 minutes and not repeat something already been stated.

Approximately 11 people spoke in support of Cyndi O. Approximately 23 letters were read into record in support of Cyndi O. The majority of the letters were received from people Cyndi O. worked or associated with prior to moving to Winnemucca. Some of the letters were from Nevada library agencies and libraries. Comments ranged from what she has accomplished at the Humboldt County Library since she became library director to positive comments on how she is/was to work with.

Approximately 10 people voiced concerns about Cyndi O. and the state of the library since she became library director. Two letters were read into record from employees of the library. Comments ranged from changes made at the library to work environment.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr provided the Library Board of Trustees information on the process of this meeting. She explained that Ms. O can request the session be closed. Ms. O stated she wants will waive the closed session. Mrs. Duncan asked about information provided from the investigation, of which some is confidential. Ms. O waived the right to confidentiality.

Co-Chair Duncan read the agenda item: **REVIEW OF INVESTIGATION INTO LIBRARY DIRECTOR MISCONDUCT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)** *Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding character, misconduct or professional competence of Library Director Cyndi O which may include disciplinary action of reprimand, suspension or termination of employment. THIS ITEM MAY BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO NRS 241.030. Any action will be made in open session. For discussion and possible action.*

Chief Deputy District Attorney told the Board they will first hear the information, or the summary of the information of the investigation that was conducted by the County Administrator and the HR Director. She advised Library Board of Trustees that once they consider the evidence they can deliberate regarding the

decision. She further explained to the Board they can only consider the items on the agenda as the public comments have a much broader range.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr explained the Board would receive information from the Administrator and HR Director. You can ask them any questions that will help you. They may or may not have witnesses that they may like to bring forward. Then Ms. O will have an opportunity to present information in her defense. One you've heard all of the information you will have an opportunity to discuss actions you'd like to take in line with the items that are on the agenda. Questions can be asked at any time.

County Administrator Dave Mendiola approached the Board. Mr. Mendiola introduced Abel Del Real-Nava, Assistant County Administrator/HR Director. Mr. Mendiola told the Board about the County's Personnel Policy, specifically portions dealing with the rights of the employees. He explained some employees are protected under a collective bargaining agreement so they are afforded certain rights. Mr. Mendiola explained that until a written notification, signed by the employee is received, the policy is to not do anything. He went on to say that for about the last six months he has been approached by people in the community voicing concerns about the library. He acknowledged that there have been positive changes at the library since Ms. O became library director. Mr. Mendiola referred to the meeting that took place on July 24, 2017 between himself, a representative from the employees' organization, Abel Del Real-Nava and four library employees. Information from that meeting and signed statements from the employees are in the package provided for this meeting. From information received at this meeting an official investigation was started. Mr. Mendiola said they worked closely with POOL/PACT lawyers and legal staff. Mr. Mendiola explained Humboldt County is part of POOL/PACT which a governmental organization who have lawyers and HR specialists who help with this kind of thing. Mr. Mendiola went through the process of interviewing both the employees and Ms. O. They look for consistency and that the written statements align with statements made during the interviews. After all the information gathered was reviewed by POOL/PACT and the HR Staff it was recommended to terminate Ms. O.

Mr. Del Real-Nava read statements from the four employees. Concerns voiced in the statements is what they focused on during the interviews. He stated "with these statements as well as other statements that were given we felt it was warranted to, in order for us to conduct a proper investigation to place Cyndi O and Joy Holt on paid administrative leave with pay and I want to emphasize *with pay* because that is not a disciplinary action – we felt in order to get the employees to cooperate and give us full detailed information that it was important to separate the management from the library and we felt that was effective in, at least, building the trust to getting the information that we got."

Mr. Mendiola told the Board the final determination made by himself and Mr. Del Real-Nava was that termination was warranted. Trustee Duncan asked if the POOL/PACT lawyers and HR representatives agreed with the recommendation of termination. Mr. Mendiola said it was POOL/PACT's opinion that what occurred was a violation of County policy. Trustee Putnam asked if the two employees who recently left the County were fired or if they quit. Mr. Del Real-Nava explained they were two of the four who met with administration and they resigned the next day. The reason for their resignations was they felt they were retaliated against after the meeting in the Administrator's office. Trustee Putnam asked about the meeting with the rest of the library staff. She wanted to know what Mr. Mendiola and Mr. Del Real-Nava felt the main purpose was. Did they want Cyndi fired, were they frustrated, did they want the problem corrected? Mr. Mendiola said the staff was not asked directly what they wanted done. He said their job was to collect the information and find out if the complaint violated County policy. The Trustees would have to ask the

Staff the question of what outcome they wanted to see. Trustee Putnam said the reason she asked these questions is they have been given three qualities. The first one being the Board does nothing. The second being some form of probation with a caveat. The third being Ms. O is fired. Trustee Putnam indicated she believes in second chances and needs more information. Mr. Del Real-Nava told the Board, regarding second chances, that Ms. O was previously given a chance based on a prior disciplinary issue. At the time, Ms. O said she brought the issue to the Board Co-Chairs. Trustee Putnam asked about training that is required every two years. Mr. Del Real-Nava said Ms. O was required to do all of the training over again, which is both web based. Mr. Mendiola explained the training requirements for employees and how training sessions are chosen. One of the training sessions has to do with harassment, which is provided annually to every two years.

Trustee Putnam asked about an anonymous letter the County received. She asked if Ms. O knew about the anonymous letter. Is there some kind of warning? If she never saw the letter she never had a warning of what was to come. Mr. Del Real-Nava explained how they came to the investigation into harassment and hostile work environment. Mr. Mendiola said he did not know if Ms. O knew about the letter. He told the Board approximately every two weeks he, Ms. O and Ms. Holt would have a staff meeting to discuss things going on at the library. Mr. Mendiola indicated on two different occasions, over the last six weeks, he informed Ms. O and Ms. Holt that he had heard things in the community. One was a rumor that there were employees unhappy at the library. He said he told them the same thing he told the Board earlier, he doesn't take them seriously until the letter shows up on his desk with a signature and a written statement. It was a week or so later that the employees showed up.

Co-Chair Duncan asked if during the staff meeting when Mr. Mendiola brought up complaints he had been hearing, did Ms. O or Ms. Holt have any response to that. Mr. Mendiola said he did not give specifics, it was here say. Mr. Mendiola referred to one employee he was aware of who worked with Abel on some concerns they had. This employee was one of the four who showed up at the meeting. When all four employees showed up and voiced concerns, it changed the game from their perspective and from POOL/PACTS perspective. Mr. Mendiola said there were three other employees who corroborated the statements of how people were treated. These employees did not have desire to step forward and write a signed statement. Trustee Beene said everything in the report is negative. Did they talk to anyone in the library that could give positive input? Mr. Del Real-Nava indicated there were two or three employees who had positive input. He said they heard positive, but tough and fair, changes have been made. Mr. Mendiola explained the questions were formed to be open ended. This gave people the opportunity to say yes or no. They also had the opportunity to expand on the answers and some did, there were positive comments.

One of the Trustees asked about the statement in the memorandum that the Board of Trustees is legally forbidden from dealing with personnel issues. Mr. Mendiola he did not know if they were legally forbidden. He referred to the Humboldt County Commissioners and how they are required to stay out of personnel issues. Decisions about personnel issues go to the administrator's office. Mr. Mendiola said he thought it would create a difficult environment if a Board dealt with personnel issues.

The Board of County Commissioners stay out of the business of personnel issues. Their job is to make decisions on you know, budgets, every decision that the County has to make but the personnel issues come back to this office for me to deal with them. And so the same thing is here. I think that creates a very

difficult environment where a board is dealing with personnel issues too. I mean you are, you are a volunteer board, and so you deal with items on your agenda that are brought to you and I deal with personnel issues. The Trustee said her concern that this got out of hand, was there something that could have been done sooner. Mr. Mendiola said the policy could be changed to address anonymous letters and explained how this could become a challenging situation. He said until someone puts it in writing, brings it to the Library Board and it is truly a problem they would take over, start an investigation, that's when the coaching begins. The Trustee asked how they can avoid this from happening in the future.

Trustee Putnam said she remembers Ms. O coming to the Board and talking to them about how discipline would work. After reviewing the information provided she said she never thought it would be so strict. It appears that every little an employee did was a write up. She indicated that in the Library Board Trustee policy they can't tell Ms. O how to do her job. They could help Ms. O change the policy. Mr. Del Real-Nava explained the County has its own policies which are approved by the Board of Commissioners. Trustee Duncan asked if Ms. O was following the County policy or her own policy when the write-ups were prepared. Mr. Del Real-Nava explained the County policy applies to everybody. Each department may have its own directives that correspond with that department. The overall personnel policy applies to everybody. Several of the Trustees asked if what Ms. O provided them were directives, more stringent than the County policy. Mr. Del Real-Nava told the Trustees any disciplinary issues and anything regarding personnel in the policy handbook is what has to be followed. There was discussion about write-ups and if they contradicted the County policy. Mr. Del Real-Nava said they found that Ms. O violated County policy. *(Note: listening to the audio it seems there are two things being discussed...write-ups of library personnel and findings of violation from Ms. O. 15:06:28)*

Mr. Mendiola said Ms. O has the right to manage the library any way she wants. The whole point is you cannot violate the County Policy. What the Board has before them is a group of employees who came together. They are at a place where they can't talk to Ms. O or Ms. Holt because they are always together. Mr. Mendiola gave an example of where there may be two directors and if you have a problem with one you can go to the other and express your concerns. It was established in the interviews and statements that this was not possible at the library. Mr. Mendiola referred to some of the concerns voiced by the employees in the interviews and written statements. He also talked about a discussion he had regarding "coaching", a written reprimand. There seemed to be a lot. Mr. Mendiola said in most departments you will have one employee who is a problem. You deal with that employee through verbal and written warnings, maybe some training. Mr. Mendiola said you seldom do this on such a consistent basis. After a while you create an environment where the employee is not comfortable, even scared, to voice concerns.

Trustee Putnam said the Board thinks that Ms. O and the staff at the library are tremendous. She would agree that Ms. O has been micromanaging. Trustee Putnam said there should be some form of probation with caveats. Have someone who could ask staff how things are going. She again stated she is a believer in second chances. Mr. Mendiola indicated it is the Library Board of Trustees' job to make a decision. The County's job is to gather information and determine if there has been a violation of County Policy to the degree enough to make a recommendation. Co-Chair Duncan and Trustee Putnam voiced their thoughts on fixing this issue. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr cautioned the Board to remain impartial and objective as they have not heard all of the evidence or from both sides. She asked Mr. Mendiola is he had any witnesses or other documents. Was there anything else he wished the Board to consider. Mr. Mendiola said there might be some employees present who could answer the Board's question of whether

they would stay if it was recommended to keep MS. O on. There was discussion between a Trustee, Mr. Mendiola and Mr. Del Real- Nava regarding coaching and/or personal training Ms. O received.

Co-Chair Duncan stated she thinks the Board should put emotions and personal feelings aside and work with the facts presented both by the County and Ms. O. Co-Chair Duncan asked if there were any employees who would like to speak to the Board. Heather Hill approached the Board. She said she feels damage has been done and does not know if she could continue to work with Ms. O. She went on to comment on bosses who encourage and inspire employees. Ms. Hill said there have been great changes at the library. Co-Chair Duncan asked what Ms. Hill would do if the Board gave Cyndi a second chance. Ms. Hill said she did not know. She would continue to work at the library and see how things went. She would keep her options open other employment. If someone new came in as Library Director, she would stay. Chief Deputy District Attorney asked if there was any other employees who would like to answer questions from the Board. Co-Chair Duncan said there would be a break at 7:34 p.m. to reconvene at 7:42 p.m.

Cyndi O approached the Board. (An unrecognized voice was heard as Ms. O was setting up at the front table. The individual on the other line asked "What's going on?" Ms. O picked up her phone and told the individual that she was getting ready to present. The Voice on the other end said "OK. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr asked who was on the phone. At that point it was determined the voice was that of Mr. Peter Smith, an attorney representing Ms. O. Ms. Carr pointed out that Ms. O should have alerted the Board to his presence on the phone). Ms. Carr instructed Ms. O to address only the investigation and the policies related to the investigation and not move into unrelated issues brought up in public comment. Ms. O stated she would like to address the reason she was hired: to bring a greater sense of professionalism to the library; to advance technology and to refresh the system. Ms. O stated her assessment of the situation is not a matter of harassment, it is a matter of addressing and changing an organizational culture deeply ingrained before she got here. Ms. O stated her assessment:

- When I did arrive, it became clear from the beginning that there was a toxic, immature and unprofessional environment from the perspective of the team.
- There was a history of insubordination – they either would not or could not talk to the Assistant Director and the Director.
- As the Board understands and knows there was a prior investigation into the conduct of the assistant director.
- Our team has a history of going around the (library) administration to address different kinds of concerns that should be with the Library Board - again triggering an investigations and lawsuits
- There is an engrained culture of either being unwilling or unable to have a professional conversation.
- I have gotten plenty of feedback from the staff that there was this perception of the Director and Assistant Director being a parent or principal, and they were the children or students. This is not conducive in trying to develop a professional environment.
- Obviously, my role is to help them be professional and elevate them.
- Allegations of throwing staplers, fingers in chest and yelling and humiliation on the public floor. I do find it interesting that I'm being accused of things and reported on things that happened prior to me being here.

Co-Chair Duncan asked Ms. O if she had written statements from employees regarding previous occurrences. Ms. O. said when she first arrived she spoke one-on-one with the every person on staff. Several of the staff reported they had never been in the Director's office before or they had only been in the office when they were in trouble. The perspective was any sort of feedback provided was being in trouble. Ms. O said she witnessed the Assistant Library Director, at the time, publically humiliating staff. She instructed this person to act professionally when on the floor. Ms. O went on to tell the Board of her one-on-one meetings with staff. She said the conversations and actions of Staff showed a fear based culture. Ms. O said shortly after Ms. Holt was hired some employees approached the Board with complaints and concerns about her. The employees did not voice these concerns to Ms. O. She gave another example of the mindset of the employees she was dealing with.

Ms. O referred to meeting minutes and staff meeting agendas to demonstrate how they worked on attitude and expectations of the employees. She said at the meetings she talked about team building, the critical need for policy with team members providing feedback and direct the rules. They talked about representing a united front. She said there are many aspects of library work that do not fit into a cut and dry, step-by-step process. Ms. O spoke about how tasks are performed in a checklist manner. She told the Board the expectations of the team and herself:

- 1) Integrity and Honesty: These are critical and fundamental. We cannot be a strong team without them.
- 2) Communication: Talk with your team members, ensure you know what they are doing and vice versa. Share if you notice something that can be done better. It is not a personal attack. It is simply making us better and stronger.
- 3) Diligent Use of Time: We get paid to do a job and provide a service to the community. Your time should be filled with meaningful, prioritized activity. Strong work ethic and initiative are none negotiable.
- 4) Exceptional Customer Service: We are here to serve community and our interactions with the customers must be respectful, professional and productive. This applies not only for our external library customers but also for our internal customers, each other. Establishing good rapport with our customers is equally as important as fulfilling their informational needs.

Ms. O said at the first meeting, with employees, she shared an inspirational she received from one of her mentors. She also shared a personal statement about why it is an honor and privilege to work in libraries. She told staff she wants to help them thrive. She said she always made a point to be communicative, transparent and open about where she is coming from and where she expected the team to go.

Ms. O shared a number of staff meeting agendas and minutes, which illustrated her style and approach to items along with specific issues at any given time. She said that every meeting from December 2015 to August 2016 they reiterated the baseline expectations of integrity, honesty, communication, exceptional customer service and diligent use of time. Ms. O explained her approach to discipline which is encouraging and helpful. She said her belief and tactic is you provide training, feedback, encouragement opportunities to improve. At some point if you do not see improvement it will move to the realm from coaching to disciplinary steps.

In July of 2016, the management team of the County was provided training on the FRISK Model of employee coaching and documentation. The FRISK has four steps: Coaching (unofficial/verbal);

Conferencing (unofficial/verbal); Written Warning; Written Reprimand. Ms. O said the Library embraced the training being the library is a County department. The FRISK Model training gave them the tools to standardize things and keep things equal and fair. Ms. O made the comment she finds it amusing to be considered micromanager. She said she encourages independent thought, independent judgement and empowerment of the team. She said they have to have the willingness and capacity to make good judgement based on the policy and procedures, as they know them.

Ms. O said one of the complaints leveled is that they are not consistent, they change their minds all the time and direction is unclear. She showed the Board e-mails that reflected different aspects of her management style and the way she communicates with the team. The examples she provided addressed being consistent and clear with directions; a training checklist; a holiday potluck; the draft of the library's policy asking for the team's input. She said these emails show she engages the team, soliciting feedback establishing an expectation of professional communication and meeting deadlines.

Co-Chair Duncan asked if the staff members have adequate time in front of the computer to be reading these throughout the day and answering them. Do they have five minutes in the morning, during their lunch or maybe five minutes before they leave? Ms. O said everyone has adequate time on the computer and they make sure the employees have at least a week before having to provide feedback. She said there have been a couple of instances where there was a quick turnaround. Ms. O reminded the Board that when she first got here there was no e-mail for the library. Trustee Duncan asked if everyone at the library was trained how to use email. Ms. O said she assumed that everyone who worked in the library had adequate email experience in their personal lives. She said there were a couple of employees who struggled initially. They received one-on-one help. Co-Chair Duncan asked if employees are comfortable using email and no one has issues with it. Ms. O said she is not aware of any issues. Trustee Putnam said one of the complaints was they were slow on the computer, maybe not as fast as expected. Ms. O said one of the expectations and direction from the Board was to modernize technology in the library. The goal is for any team member to be able to help customers with at least basic computer questions, intermediate would be better, advanced would be the best. They have provided power point training for some staff who struggle with that. They have provided cataloguing training to individuals identified to perform cataloguing. Co-Chair Duncan said there are statements saying there are employees who are computer illiterate. If they are, how are they able to do the computer training? Ms. O said she is unaware of this. When she arrived, everybody was able to use the integrated library system, which is the online catalog, check in/check out and customer account features. That is a baseline ability on computers. Co-Chair Duncan asked if, in the initial one-on-one meetings, employees were asked their about computer experience. Ms. O said she admits she came into this situation assuming the library staff had certain baseline abilities with computers. This assumption comes from her experience in the library field. As she learned about it, she tried to fix it. She gave an example of power point training provided to help staff learn with instructions to tell her what they learned and how the materials provided helped them do their job and better help customers. Ms. O gave an example of a PowerPoint training on the computer with another team member who could help. This training took an hour. The employee answered the questions on what they had learned with Ms. O responding to practice and keep a list of questions to ask. She said she was providing training and support, soliciting feedback to make sure the information has been integrated and encouraging them to learn and grow on that topic.

Co-Chair Duncan asked if this employee had time during her workday to do the self-training. Ms. O explained they discuss, at staff training, prioritizing time, streamlining and looking for ways to be more efficient. Trustee Putnam said one of the complaints is they were having to stay after work, take work home because they did not have time. Ms. O said two of the individuals who mentioned this were told explicitly to not take work home or stay late. Co-Chair Duncan said the complaint was they were told they would be written up if they did not take work home. Ms. O told the board some of the employees have embraced the changes while others have not. Ms. O went on to tell the Board that the one-on-one meetings were just that, one-on-one. She and Ms. Holt split up the team to talk with the employees. Co-Chair Duncan asked if those embracing the changes were the younger or older employees. Ms. O indicated they were on the younger side. There was discussion about cultural differences between someone 45-50 and those under the age of 40. Ms. O said they always talked about the need for training, to embrace learning. She said one of the most important pieces of her job is to provide the team with tools and knowledge and the resources to do their jobs. Trustee Putnam voiced her concern that 7 out of 10 employees either signed the complaint or were witness to things.

Ms. O again voiced concern about the misperception of the employees that if they received any feedback, they were getting in trouble. She still believes this is a holdover with deeply rooted ideas. They are trying to address and overcome these ideas. She explained how she has told employees what they are receiving is feedback; this does not mean you are in trouble and it is not personal. The feedback is designed to show them there is opportunity for improvement and other ways to do things, and opportunity for growth and learning. Co-Chair Duncan mentioned a comment regarding feedback, you told them "if you're not happy you can go"; "if you don't want to be a team member you can go". She asked how this is positive feedback. Ms. O said she noticed many things in the report that were skewed and twisted. The way things are presented in the report is not the way it was presented. She said there have been discussions on the direction the library is moving with the implementation of changes. They want everyone to be happy. They have explained if there are things the employee(s) are not agreeing with in the library and the way it is going, it will result in unhappiness, decreased work productivity and have a negative impact on the customers.

Co-Chair Duncan referred to what is being investigated, which is misconduct and character. She spoke about professionalism and what appears to be a lack of professionalism in some comments allegedly made by Ms. O. Ms. O said in making some of the comments, her intent was to illustrate what they are dealing with and what they have been faced with as far as an organizational culture that is a little bit adverse to change and receptive to feedback. There was further discussion between Ms. O and Co-Chair Duncan regarding the perception of the feedback being negative; how employees are afraid to go to Ms. O and talk about their concerns.

A Trustee asked Ms. O about a couple of incidents reported by employees. One was an employee was asked to keep a log of everything they did. The other had to do with employees being written up because they did not greet Ms. O or Ms. Holt when they came into the building. Ms. O explained her perspective on door greeting and the fact there are external and internal customers. If she walks in the front door and sees that the team does not even look up to acknowledge who is coming in the front door, how can she be sure that they are greeting all the customers. Co-Chair Duncan asked about employees greeting customers if they are busy with another customer. Ms. O said she understands if the employee is busy with a customer they would not be likely to acknowledge someone walking in the door. A Trustee said in it

seemed that employees felt they were a little bit trapped into something for which they would be written up. Ms. O said she can't change the way a person interprets things. All she can do is be consistent in the application.

Ms. O explained the way the disciplinary process works according to the Humboldt County Personnel Policy. This is in response to a question from one of the Trustees regarding disciplinary action of an employee. Ms. O said that up until a couple months ago they had been using a training model provided by the County. She found out that there was confusion between the FRISK model versus what is written in the policy. Trustee Putnam said this explains comments from employees that they want it one-way then you want it another way. You change your mind on how to do things. Ms. O explained there is a difference between policy and procedure. She gave examples of policy: how many items a customer can check out a book; who can get on a computer; what customers need to get a library card. She then explained procedure is operational, how they get things done internally in the library. The policy was created last year and updated this year. Procedures are more influx. Ms. O said one of the primary objectives is to evaluate the processes and procedures in place and look for ways to streamline them, ways to make them more efficient. This goes into cross training, into trying new ideas to see if they will work. Trustee Putnam asked if it is explained to the employees what works and what does not work, do you ask their opinion. There was more discussion between Ms. O and the Board about feedback, communication and perception.

Co-Chair Duncan asked if Ms. O thinks communication with employees has increased, decreased or stayed the same. Ms. O said it has decreased. Ms. O addressed the perception that she and Ms. Holt are joined at the hip. She indicated this is not true. She also addressed the concern that they share an office. Ms. O said she took the feedback and made a point to talk to people on the floor and make herself available when Ms. Holt was not present. She said there is always the opportunity to email her confidentially. Ms. O said she continues to reiterate that if she does not know about a problem, she cannot fix the problem.

There was discussion on Ms. O's previous disciplinary incident. Co-Chair Duncan asked why Ms. O did not come to the Library Board regarding this incident. Ms. O indicated she was embarrassed and ashamed. Co-Chair Duncan asked Ms. O if she felt that way did she not think some of the employees might feel embarrassed or ashamed to trust her, to tell her that she was being a bully by harassing them, that she is creating a hostile work environment. Ms. O she has tried to stay open and encourage communication and feedback. She said that she understands there was a situation about the way things were, prior to her employment. Her intent is to move forward with the team. Ms. O indicated she cannot force people to talk to her. The discussion continued regarding an employee and a poor evaluation. Ms. O explained there had never been a disciplinary action taken against this employee. She explained the evaluation process to the Board.

Ms. O addressed a few more emails. One was thanking the team for stepping up and doing a great job. Trustee Duncan questioned the professionalism of one email regarding cleaning the restrooms. Ms. O said that she felt it was appropriate to address the issue in a more direct manner and be more insistent. She said she expects the staff to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars and keep things clean and orderly. Ms. O referred to another email regarding the condition of items. The email discussed the proper process to take in books. They must catch items needing repairs prior to placing them back on the shelves. She gave an example of this. One of the Trustees asked about the \$500 fine for destroying library books. Ms. O

said this is per NRS. At one of the Library Board Meetings, someone questioned the fines and fees. Ms. O explained the fines and fees.

Co-Chair Duncan said in the report they received there was mention of double standards. She asked Ms. O if she and Ms. Holt talked about what they were going to do, did they let the employees know. Trustee Duncan said from reading the report it sounds like Ms. O would say one thing, then Ms. Holt would say one thing then Ms. O would say something else. There does not seem to be a standard. Ms. O said this is not true. She went on to say from the beginning they have worked to cultivate the ideas of taking the initiative and being engaged in their work. Ms. O talked about an issue with chairs not being pushed in on the public floor. She pushes in the chairs and has asked employees to do the same. Ms. O also said she wants to see the computer stations neat: the mouse and keyboards in the proper place. She said this came up in Ms. Holt's annual review where the team were allowed to provide anonymous feedback. Ms. O said the issue is if she is always pushing in the chairs, she is not encouraging the initiative and engagement of the rest of the team. She shared an experience from her career. Ms. O said her supervisor told her that she is the manager and paid at a certain level to perform certain functions. Ms. O said she is paid at a certain level to do strategic activities. Staff is paid at a certain level to do more operational and tactical activities. If she is always pushing in the chairs, what are the team members doing. Why are they not engaged, not maintaining situational awareness of the space, why are they not actively trying to keep things neat and clean? Ms. O said she started to cultivate and develop the sense of initiative with the team. Ms. O read another email as an example of keeping employees in the loop. The email was regarding the change in the key system for the County.

Co-Chair Duncan again spoke of Ms. O's character and professionalism. She referred to the report and the handling of employee issues. She asked about an employee having to go to the copy machine to sign paperwork after being written up. Ms. O said employees have a choice of signing the paperwork in her office then she or Ms. Holt would make copies or the employee could get the copies. In the instances in the report, the employee chose to go to the copy machine. Co-Chair Duncan referred to comments made by Ms. Holt that appeared to be threatening or belligerent. She said the comment was made in an encouraging joking manner. Ms. O said again, this goes back to the perception of the employee(s). Co-Chair Duncan voiced her concern that seven out of ten employees filed reports of harassment and hostile work environment and Ms. O keeps going back to it was a 'misrepresentation or taken out of context'. Ms. O said she comes at this with nothing but good intentions and the desire to help and empower the team. She said she cannot control the way the employees perceive her.

Co-Chair Duncan asked about an employee who was promoted and was told she would not receive a salary increase based on her step increase due to finances. Co-Chair Duncan pointed out that Ms. Holt received a 5% increase, reduced from the requested 15%. She feels this is a contradiction. Ms. O explained the promotion of the employee and said the employee received a commensurate raise within that grade. Ms. O told the Board Ms. Holt took on the duties of the previous assistant director and the work of three full time staff. Co-Chair Duncan asked if this allowed staff members to complete trainings plus their normal duties. Ms. O said yes, it did. She pointed out that out of the 89 pages of supporting documentation in the report 44 of those pages were hand written notes from one individual.

Ms. O gave an example of empowering the team and encouraging communication. The example was about issues an employee was having with online cataloging. She referred to the email, which demonstrates collegiality. Ms. O said she knows there are complaints in the report about them

encouraging team members to use their best judgement based on their knowledge of the policy and procedures. The complaint also says the employees then get in trouble they use their best judgement. She shared examples where employees made decisions that came from a place of no rather than yes. After an incident, they discuss it at the next team meeting. They talk about what happened and how to come to a better decision.

A Trustee asked about Ms. O wanting a culture of yes not no; how she wants her employees to be proactive and make decisions on their own. The Trustee referred to an incident at the McDermitt library. The librarian made a decision regarding the usage of computers by posting a sign limiting computer access. Ms. O asked about the sign and was told it is a holdover from the previous branch manager. The report stated kids were on the computer playing games and watching scary movies. Ms. O said she explained to the librarian that libraries have values of openness, non-censorship and access to information. It is not the library's job to dictate what access people can or cannot get. Ms. O told the Board there is a time limit on computer use. Another concern Ms. O voiced is staff withholding documentation from the public and not willing to help people on the computers. Ms. O addressed the lack of communication from Staff. She was not aware that there was an issue at the McDermitt Library until she read the report. She reviewed more emails to Staff about library policy, to make sure everyone is aware of the changes being made. Ms. O said there has been a fair amount of discussion about emergency and crisis management. Ms. O read a welcome email, which sent to a new employee. The email asked that the employee contact Ms. O with any questions. This employee emailed back and indicated she had none.

Co-Chair Duncan asked Ms. O is she was surprised who went to Mr. Mendiola and complained about bullying and harassment. One of the people had only been employed by the County for 6-7 weeks. Ms. O said she was not surprised due to an incident the week before. She told the Board over the last year she has interviewed this individual three times. She said she was clear and upfront about the changes being made, the expectations and the direction the library was going which were different than it had been. Ms. O said her impression from the employee was that she came back into the job and expected things to be the same. Ms. O said as this individual progressed through her training and they started talking about expectations and productivity they received a little push back, some resistance. She said the incident in question that drove home the point showed it was evident that this was not a good fit.

Ms. O told the Board that maintains a daily log, takes notes, of everything she does. She referred to a particular day and read the entry. This was a meeting with a particular team member upon that team member's request. The conversation related to comments made by Ms. Holt to one team member about another team member during a one-on-one with Ms. Holt. It became apparent that there was misinterpretation about what was said, by the team member meeting with Ms. Holt. There was clarification where the discussion took place. Ms. Holt gave the team member a tentative answer to a question with Ms. O giving a different impromptu answer in a staff meeting, which was later amended through a team email. Co-Chair Duncan said this would be an example of saying one thing and doing another, you contradict yourselves. Ms. O acknowledged she should have handled the situation differently. Ms. O went on to read the entry. There were questions about the bookmobile and operation while Mrs. Dufurrena was gone. Ms. O said during the conversation with the backup driver (Mrs. Rookstool) she reinforced that she and Ms. Holt's standard mode of operating is to ask questions for fact-finding, brainstorm and make a decision. Ms. O continued to read from her notes. During the conversation, Mrs. Rookstool mentioned that employees had a hard time talking to Ms. Holt. Ms. O read from her notes that Mrs. Rookstool

misinterpreted a normal conversation, made assumptions and did not address her concerns with her directors. Addressing concerns with her directors had been discussed about in the staff meeting the prior Thursday. Ms. O went on to tell the Board that is why Mrs. Rookstool received a coaching memo. Trustee Putnam said some of this is perception. It started out as you said this then it went from bad to worse. She said Mrs. Rookstool felt intimidated by that. Ms. O went on to read from the log, which was about the meeting with Mrs. Rookstool. Trustee Putnam voiced her concern that it was still two people (Ms. O and Ms. Holt) confronting one person which is intimidating. Ms. O said the conversation was between herself, Ms. O, Mrs. Rookstool and Mrs. Dufurrena. There was discussion about a discrepancy regarding what occurred at this meeting. A Trustee asked if notes were written directly following the incident. Ms. O said she documents daily on her computer.

Ms. O questioned the content of a letter provided to the County by Mrs. Dufurrena. She asked why there is a quote from her testimony during her investigation interview in the letter. She said she is under the impression the investigation and interviews were confidential. How did this quote arrive in someone's written letter? Mr. Mendiola explained during the interview with Mrs. Dufurrena there was a question regarding Ms. O's comments taken from the report and if they were accurate. This was a follow up question in the investigative process. He asked Mrs. Dufurrena to supply a written affidavit supporting her comments.

Co-Chair Duncan pointed out that they did not receive the report until that day at 11:30. She asked Ms. O if there was anything else she wanted to show or mention to the Board. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said she recognizes Ms. O has provided information about conduct that complies with policy. She asked Ms. O if she had any evidence that show she did not violate the policy as supported in the investigation report. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said she encourages Ms. O to provide that evidence for the Board to consider. Ms. O stated that is what she has been doing. A Trustee commented this sounds like a he said, she said situation. It was requested that Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr asked the question again as it was confusing. Ms. Carr said she is asking Ms. O to address the allegations of misconduct, not give examples of when she complied with policy. She said it is relevant for the Board to hear evidence that shows she did not violate policy. It was mentioned again, by several Board members that this is he said/she said. Ms. O said this comes down to assumptions that have blossomed into a perceived problem. If there had been open communication, none of this would have developed. Trustee Putnam said the problem is the people who are complaining are saying when they wanted to have the open conversation they felt like they were dinged for it, they were written up. They are citing examples of this. Ms. O said she thinks two allegations of reprisal have been addressed satisfactorily with the Board. One accusation of reprisal, the documentation was issued before the complaints were lodged, that is not reprisal.

Trustee Putnam asked about the brochure thing. Ms. O said she has a string of emails from January to now. The emails provided both positive and need for improvement feedback on the flyers. The same problems kept cropping up consistently despite them being addressed. If they talk about the same thing ten times, she is going to get a little sterner. Trustee Putnam said some of the stuff seems frivolous. She said she was trying to keep Ms. O's first comment: "This is the way professional people behave and this is why I do this" in her head. Trustee Putnam referred to work that an employee has done to bring people to the library. She said she is doing a tremendous job. Why are they picking over a brochure? This is not in the complaint but Trustee Putnam said she is trying to be in the employee's shoes. Ms. O said when she provides feedback it is never personal it is provided with the intent to improve the quality of the work

product. They are creating information materials and public documents in the community – they want them to be excellent. When things are ok, they will kick it up a notch.

Ms. O indicated this employee had the opportunity to provide feedback, even anonymously, and she did not. Ms. O said she would like to address something related to feedback. She spoke of the County's exit interview policy. Two previous employees went through the process and provided feedback. She said she asked for that feedback and was told it would be provided to her. She then was told any feedback would be saved for her annual evaluation. Ms. O said she voiced her concern that she did not feel withholding the feedback would allow her to improve. There was conversation between Ms. O and Mr. Del Real-Nava regarding this issue.

Co-Chair Duncan said what is hard for her to understand is Ms. O told the Board she wants feedback and open communication. She then referred to the documentation that says four employees are willing to sign their name and three agree with them that when they tried to provide feedback or go to her they felt intimidated, bullied. Co-Chair Duncan said she has seven out of ten people saying this is happening, and Ms. O says it is not happening. She asked Ms. O if there is anything she can provide the Board that says they are wrong and she is right. Ms. O said aside from what she has provided that demonstrates their efforts at inclusion, empowerment, training, communication, integrity, all she can say is they are up against an ingrained culture and perception that any form of feedback is being in trouble. There is some aversion to change and an unwillingness to accept responsibility for behaviors. Ms. O said there is a distinct difference between bullying and harassment, which is by nature personal. There is also a difference in expectations to higher standards and holding people accountable. One of the allegations is they have unreasonable expectations. The team members who have received write-ups were written up for failure to meet deadlines, failure to participate in training classes provided. Trustee Putnam asked if Ms. O has written up suggestions for other employees, not the ones complaining. If so, did they get better, were they resentful? Ms. O said they thrived. There is one employee who is pursuing her certification. She initially struggled but took some feedback and has soared. Another employee used to shake and she is now applying what she has learned at work to her personal life. Ms. O noted feedback she has received from the Board and the public is that things are good at the library; they have notice employees who are flourishing. Ms. O acknowledged everybody is an individual, everybody has different thresholds for change and ambiguity, and everybody has their own unique interpretation of communications. She thinks the progress they have made and what they have accomplished so far is awesome. Co-Chair Duncan asked Ms. O that if this mentality is ingrained has she ever stepped back and said I am going to slow down, spend more time with the employees individually. Ms. O indicated she has. She went on to say it is important to make sure everyone is ok and making progress. She mentioned that in management and technology classes they talk about the fact that there are early adopters, the general population and lagers. She said this is a process, there are growing pains and change can be scary. Ms. O she is confident that every decision she makes is with the best intentions for the library and the community. Co-Chair Duncan asked if all these extra steps were taken from the one-on-one, she saw what was lacking, why they have this report. Ms. O said they had not shared with her their concerns for these issues. She cannot fix what she does not know.

Ms. O's attorney Mr. Smith said he wanted to reiterate the board has the obligation to make the decision on this, not the County Administrator. He said the definitions in the personnel manual about harassment and bullying are vague. He told the board he would hope they would talk to the complaining witnesses and

judge the credibility and seriousness of their complaints. What he has seen in the record does not have much substance. Mr. Smith said Ms. O is well spoken and he thinks she has done her job in describing the situation.

Ms. O said she had a few closing comments. She voiced her concerns about this situation. She believes it could set a tenuous precedent with the team. She said this comes down to establishing expectations and holding the team accountable for those expectations. Ms. O said her fear is that they will regress. Customer service would suffer, progress would slow, and programs would stagnate. Without a degreed librarian they will not comply with the state library, minimum public library standards – without that they will not be eligible for grants and the strategic projects will fall by the wayside. She listed off those projects. Ms. O said they have been challenged with an aversion to change, either an unwillingness or inability to accept feedback. She said they need to work on assuming responsibility and not operate under assumptions. Ms. O said she is dedicated to the task they are doing at the library, she is invested in the community. There has been amazing progress and the community deserves an excellent library. She told the Board she would like to continue.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told the Board to make sure they have had sufficient time to review all of the documentation provided and all of the evidence that has been presented. She asked the Board if there was anything they felt they needed to see, that is necessary to make an informed decision. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said she mentioned this because the issue was raised by Mr. Smith to take the opportunity to hear from employees make a statement in person if they so choose. She went on to say this is about facts, what is the policy and what is in the best interest of the County and this Library, not from a place of emotion or a place of personal feelings. She told the Board this is the objective they have to meet. Is there evidence sufficient for that finding? If there is what is your next step based on? She asked the Board is they are ready to deliberate and make a decision or is there additional information they need. Is there additional time to review the information?

Trustee Beene said she has been on the board for six years and was on the board when they hired Ms. O. Ms. O was the most qualified person. Trustee Beene went on to speak about the environment at the library when Ms. O was hire. The staff was not trained; there was disorganization and no discipline. She reviewed things that Ms. Allen had started which Ms. O took on: the Denio project, repurposing library space, purging unread books, cleaning the garage. Ms. O brought up the ADA standards, trained employees, she has received many grants, which has saved the county money, is active in the community. The November review was positive. Trustee Beene went on to speak of the summer learning program, which was well received and went on despite the confusion this investigation caused. This speaks well for training and organization.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr asked the Board again if there is any additional information, they need in order to make an informed decision. She went on to tell the board that the accomplishments, the innovations and the changes in her capacity as library director are not relevant to what they are deciding. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told the Board what they are looking at today is did she engage in conduct that violated policy and is there evidence to support that. If so, is it egregious enough or sufficient enough to warrant termination? She told the Board she wants to clarify, from an evidentiary perspective, it is not one person versus another person and credibility. It is a number of individuals and whether or not their statements and information from the investigation is sufficient enough for you to believe. Based upon the facts that there has been conduct by Ms. O that violates County policy. Is it enough to be harassment,

retaliation or bullying? If it is any of those things, the policy of the County is no tolerance. If the Board makes that finding, an act consistent with the policy would be termination. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said she cannot tell the Board what to do; she is letting them know their duty is limited and very specific.

Trustee Putnam questioned other disciplinary measures, which were mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that were not so clear-cut. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr explained that disciplinary process pertains to employees who are not at will. She explained the difference between at will employees and an employee who is not at will. A couple of the Board members asked if they couldn't do one or the other, could they do probation.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told the Board she appreciates what they are saying and the difficulty of the situation. She explained she is addressing this from the legal perspective. If the Board makes a finding that these policy provisions have been violated to the extent of retaliation, bullying, harassment; where staff members feel fear and intimidation and you keep her there you are creating an environment that is potential liability for the County because they represent the citizens. There is also a policy for the employees to work in an environment where they are not fearful, intimidated, bullied or harassed. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told the Board if they make a finding based on the evidence presented to them then the only option, from a legal perspective, is to go with the recommendation of the County Administrator, the HR Director and POO/PACT counsel. They are not making these recommendations lightly. Trustee Putnam asked what if they try to protect Ms. O and protect the Staff as she previously suggested. If the alleged behavior continued then they could fire her. She said she is not trying to make less of the allegations but she believes in second chances. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told the Board she is not telling them they cannot. She said she is letting them know they increase the risk of liability for the County when you do so. The allegations have to do with misconduct.

Co-Chair Duncan asked if any of the Board had any questions they would like to ask Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr. A Trustee asked about interviewing the employees and would this have to be done in an open meeting. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said they would. Trustee Duncan asked if there were any other questions for Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr. There were no additional questions.

Co-Chair Duncan make a motion, based on the facts presented in the investigation findings that Ms. O violated Humboldt County policy and misconduct regarding her character and professionalism in her position. Based on the recommendation of the County Administrator, our HR Department, POOLPACT and lawyers in HR they need to terminate Ms. Cyndi O from the Library Director positions of Humboldt County. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr explained there are two things Trustee Duncan can do in making the motion. She can ask for a second and then there can be further discussion and then vote. Trustee Duncan asked if anyone supported her motion. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr further explained if there is no second, the motion fails. The other option is to take the motion to discussion and then take it to a vote. Trustee Duncan asked if there was any discussion. Trustee Boni said she would like to discuss the terminology. Where is the line between bullying and harassment versus professional expectations? She said she sees both sides of the situation. There is a gray area and the need to decide was this truly bullying and harassment or was it a misunderstanding about someone pushing hard because they wanted the best for the library. Trustee Beene voiced her perception of the issue at hand regarding the employees. She said she is sure the ladies who brought this forward felt they were being picked on. She said she is sure Ms. O has made mistakes, moved to fast, and maybe she was not as personable as she should be.

Trustee Beene said she can't see, in her mind, that the employees were bullied or picked on. Trustee Duncan pointed out the number of employees corroborated what took place. Trustee Putnam commented that due to Ms. O having a military background she is a hair stricter than the rest of them. Trustee Putnam said she keeps going back to perception, which is nebulous. Trustee Putnam said she does not want Ms. O to go, she said there is some way they need to work together. She said she is a second chance person. Trustee Beene spoke about the three employees who corroborated. There were two weeks of questioning and these people work together every day. She said she wonders how the questions were asked; she wonders how the staff was informed. These things all change a person's perception; it changes how they view what happened.

Mr. Del Real-Nava told the Board they worked closely with legal counsel on how to approach and investigate. They ran all questions through legal and received professional advice on what questions to ask. Trustee Beene commented he is talking to someone who is not always thinking the legal way, legal advice being the best. Trustee Putnam commented they were kept out of the whole situation, not knowing anything until 10:30 that morning. She commented the Board is proud of the library staff. Trustee Putnam said she is sorry this is happening. She commented that when Ms. O was gone and not allowed in the library everything continued so she had to have done something right. Trustee Duncan said she agreed with Trustee Putnam. From the minute Ms. O walked through the doors she has done a great job. Trustee Duncan mentioned some of the accomplishments and said she is proud of the hard work Ms. O has done. That being said Trustee Duncan told the Board she has to look at the facts from the investigation. She is voting based on the facts which are she bullied, she harassed and made a hostile work environment. A Trustee commented that one of her concerns is a comment made by Mr. Mendiola about how this came out of nowhere, like an avalanche. There were never any issues brought to the Board, the Administrator or HR until this point. The Trustee continued to say had that happened maybe it could have been resolved and maybe the employees would not have gone through what they went through. Trustee Putnam asked how they could make a suggestion similar to probation. How can they assure they can work together? If Ms. O is at will, in two or three months they could fire her.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said the Board is looking for a win-win. She said her concern is having a significant number of employees being in an environment that is either hostile, harassment, bullying or fear of retaliation. If the Board were looking for something in the middle, because Ms. O is an at-will employee termination can happen immediately, a time would not need to be set. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr gave the Board an option of recommending Ms. O work with the HR Director and Administrator to either engage in some form of counseling or mediation or sessions with the employees to mitigate the fear, intimidation and issues that they perceive. Then this could be brought back to the Board for an update on progress. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said she does not want to go against a number of individuals with expertise in this area are saying and then create an environment where the employees are going to leave. Trustee Putnam said she still thinks it is perception of the employees of what happened. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr pointed out to the Board that if a number of employees say they are being harassed or retaliated against and the evidence supports that, whether she intended it and didn't recognize she was doing it becomes irrelevant. Those employees are fearful for their jobs, of retaliation and harassment. The fear is real, whether it is intended or not. A Trustee asked how do you change or judge perception. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told Trustee Putnam she appreciates where she is coming from. She explained they have to look at the report about policy. If an employee violates policy, there are different levels of discipline. If an employee of the County engages in conduct that

violates the policy and they find that and it is egregious enough for termination, which is what the recommendation is, then the Board should seriously consider that because of liability perspective.

Someone from the audience asked about public comment prior to making a motion. They were told it would be taken at the end of the meeting. The same person asked if Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr was an employee of the County. This person pointed out it is the Boards decision, to make the decision and Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr is being biased in her position. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said she has a duty to the County and citizens of Humboldt County. The Board cannot make decisions that are arbitrary, they cannot make decisions not based on evidence and she has to guide them. This is what she is attempting to do.

Trustee Putnam asked Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr if they try to please everybody what are the options. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said an option is that she be directed to coordinate with the HR Director and County Administrator to identify remedial steps or action steps that could rectify the situation that is identified in the memorandum. Co-chair Duncan asked if this is done, what about the employees. There was discussion between Trustee Putnam and Co-Chair Duncan regarding perception. Trustee Beene asked if it would be possible in the motion to include a face to face with Mr. Mendiola, Mr. Del Real-Nava and Ms. O along with the complainants to resolve some of the issues. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr said this is what she was talking about, to engage in some sort of counseling, mediation, or opportunity for them to rehabilitate their working relationships. Co-Chair Duncan asked the Board if this is what they want to do and the facts are true, then they are liable. Does the Board want to take on the liability? There was discussion between Co-Chair Duncan and Trustee Beene regarding possible liability, the recommendation from the POOL/PACT lawyers. What is fact and what is evidence. A Trustee said she does not think any of this is made up. She said she thinks there is a degree of was this someone pushing very hard for professionalism and their perception was "I was being bullied". In reality it was 'I want you to improve, we've got to improve to this point' and her verbiage could have been perceived as bullying. The Trustee added she did not think Ms. O ever thought she was intentionally harassing employees. She said it's a degree, does it fall into bullying and harassment or is it professional. Co-Chair Duncan asked to figure out that degree they shouldn't take the advice they have been given by the DA, POOL/PACT and County Administrator. A Trustee said they are taking the advice, but taking the advice and accepting the advice are two different things.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr clarified that at the last Board meeting they went over the duties, responsibilities and limitations of this Board. The specific duty you have with regard to the library director is to appoint, evaluate the performance of (performance doesn't include discipline) and dismiss. Chief Deputy District Attorney Carr told the Board they could make a recommendation to the Administrator and HR Director about the disciplinary portion of it, but if you're not dismissing then the discipline and how to deal with it through the Humboldt County employee manual and policies is under the HR Director and County Administrator. That is a little bit beyond your specific authority. Your motion would be to dismiss or not dismiss. You could include in your motion a recommendation that the County Administrator consider mediation or counseling or some sort of remediation to address the complaints. Co-Chair Duncan asked what if we make a motion and everyone agrees that we do counseling, coaching everything to rectify with the employees and we give it a time span of 30 – 60 – 90 days. She asked the Board if we leave this decision to them and they come back in the 30- 60 – 90 days and say our recommendation is to fire her. Are you, the Board, willing to fire her or are you willing to extend it for another 20 – 60 – 90 days? Trustee

Beene said if there were irreconcilable differences, she would be ok with that recommendation. Mr. Mendiola spoke of the decision to make the recommendation of termination to the Board. He said they would be more than willing to work with Ms. O to right the problem. The following motion was made by Trustee Putnam and passed 4-1 with Co-Chair Olsen and Trustees Beene, Boni and Putnam voting aye; Co-Chair Duncan voting nay.

I move to have Cyndi O retained in her job as library director. I recommend that Cyndi O coordinate with our County Administrator and our Human Resource Director to rehabilitate, reconcile the allegations set forth in the memorandum. A report will be given to the Library Board 90 days from September 1, 2017.

Co-Chair Duncan asked for public comment. Elaine Nye said she could relate to both sides of their predicament. She is currently a director/co-director of a non-profit agency in town. She can relate to having to work with staff. She spoke positively about Ms. O. She said there is training and are consultants out there.

Sena Loyd, Carson City Library Director addressed three concerns she wanted to comment on.

Mr. Nelson commented on rumors Mr. Mendiola heard. Things should have been addressed at that time. He commended the Board on hiring Ms. O. He spoke of job criteria, collusion of Staff.

Heather Hill, library employee, reiterated her difficulties as a staff member.

Mrs. Rookstool reiterated her difficulties as a staff member.

Someone spoke asking the employees give Cyndi another chance.

Nella C. said she would recommend going forward Cyndi and the employees communicate, be specific about change.

Spencer, former federal employee spoke of years of training in difficulty of culture and awareness.

Nora commented on Cyndi being denied feedback from employees who had left.

Co-Chair Duncan asked if there was additional public comment. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 11:08 p.m.

Barbara Duncan, Co-Chair