



City of Beaver Dam, Wisconsin
Library Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes
1701 N Spring Street (Temporary Location)
Friday, November 14, 2025
7:45 AM

1) Call to Order – Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 7:45am by Library Board President Kevin Luebke.

Present: Kevin Luebke; Brandon Krause; Mike Devitt; Liberty Bell; Heather Rasmussen; Connie Fiegel; Jamie Kratz-Gullickson; Eric Schumacher-Rasmussen

Excused: Frank Ferree

Also present for all or part of the meeting: Sarah Cournoyer, Library Administrator; Aaron Svetly, Technical & Public Services Librarian; Cal Hemling, Wells Fargo Advisor; Larry Bierke, City Administrator

2) Presentations & Reports

a) Endowment Fund Report

Hemling stated the current value of the portfolio is \$2.072 million and the ratio is currently 72/30 with the majority of the portfolio in cash due to the renovation project. He recommends the Library Board consider what the goal is and the ratio desired to help grow the portfolio again following the renovation.

b) Financial Secretary Report

Schumacher-Rasmussen presented the report noting a recording error in the notes field of the portfolio register which did not affect the totals; they are correct as shown.

c) Gifts and Acknowledgements

Luebke read the list of donors to the Endowment Fund and the Next Chapter renovation. The Library Board acknowledged all donors listed.

d) Library Administrator Report

Cournoyer briefly highlighted Noble's snow removal plans, noted the Mayor had included the Library's renovation during her presentation on municipal development at the 2026 Economic Update Luncheon, and implementable takeaways from the WLA conference.

3) Consent Agenda

On motion by Rasmussen, seconded by Bell, the Library Board approved the Consent Agenda as presented.

a) Approval of the Oct. 17, 2025 Meeting Minutes

b) Approval of Invoices Paid

c) Informational Items

Included the preliminary October 2025 Expenditure to Budget Comparison, the October Monthly Report, the December events calendar, and the 2026 Library Board meeting dates.

4) Discussion & Possible Action

a) Library Closed Dates 2026

Following a brief discussion, on motion by Bell, seconded by Kratz-Gullickson, the Library Board approved remaining open on Friday, April 3 (Good Friday) and Friday, November 27 (the day after Thanksgiving), and closing on Saturday, December 26, 2026.

b) Renovation Project Update

Cournoyer provided an update on the renovation project and progress at 311, noting that she attends bimonthly meetings and the project is on schedule. She reviewed the change orders included in the packet. She also reviewed the project budget and expense sheet, and answered questions from the Board on same.

Endowment Fund: Invoices and/or Transfers

On motion by Rasmussen, seconded by Devitt, the Library Board approved the ACH transfer of \$292,600 from the money market to the endowment checking account and for Cournoyer to cut a check from the account to Creative Constructors in that amount for draw #2.

On motion by Devitt, seconded by Krause, the Library Board approved the payment of invoice 202511029 from PRA in the amount of \$1,891.86 from the endowment fund checking account.

c) Fundraising Update and Proposals

Kratz-Gullickson reported that friendraising and fundraising is proceeding according to the timeline presented to the Library Board. The \$1.2 million grant submission for the DOA Grant for Local Projects was submitted on Monday, 11.27.25. The timeline for the DOA grant approval process was included in the packet. Kratz-Gullickson also noted that the donor wall had been referred back to the Design Committee; that she was preparing two letters with one being a year end thank you to donors and one being a year end ask to potential donors; that she'd be submitting a Rotary community grant with Cournoyer following the meeting; and shared an example of the screenprinted tote bags she was donating as a fundraising campaign for shop local/small business Saturday.

On motion by Devitt, seconded by Rasmussen, the Library Board approved the naming rights for donors as presented.

Cournoyer shared that long-time library volunteer Barb Marthaler passed away on October 24, 2025, and that she and Anita Streich attended the visitation. She recommended that the Library Board consider a memorial patio stone in recognition of Marthaler.

On motion by Kratz-Gullickson, seconded by Bell, the Library Board approved a patio plate for Barb Marthaler in honor of her thirty (30) years of service to the Library.

d) CLOSED SESSION, if necessary. Motion to adjourn to closed session pursuant to Wisconsin

Statute 19.85(1)(f), considering financial data or personal histories of specific persons. Specifically, to discuss data regarding library donors and/or potential donors.

n/a

- e) Reconvene in open session to take action on library donors.

n/a

- f) Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy

Cournoyer provided background and other information relevant to the draft policy. Trustees provided input and asked questions during discussion. Rasmussen requested that her email to Cournoyer from October 17, 2025, be entered into the minutes as they reflected her concerns with AI use (see below). The Library Board instructed Cournoyer to bring the policy back for review in six months.

I will preface these comments with an acknowledgement that I have strong ethical concerns about the widespread adoption of generative AI technology which guides my commentary, but I recognize that I am likely in the minority in preferring a complete ban on the use of generative AI, and I recognize that it is appropriate for the library to develop a policy at this time.

Overall I feel that this policy is a reasonable compromise, and many of the permissible uses listed I consider to be solid implementations of analytical AI.

That said, I have a few concerns about the policy as currently written:

1. "Permissible Uses: User Assistance"

Policy references use of "AI-powered chat bots or virtual assistants to 'answer common queries, and direct patrons to appropriate resources'

Concern: Generative AI Hallucination and legal exposure

Context: One known drawback to generative AI is the tendency to "hallucinate" resources/answers that are respectively non-existent/incorrect. Air Canada was required to honor a bereavement fare policy hallucinated by its AI chat agent.

Fortunately, in terms of the library's policies and FAQs, I do not foresee many opportunities for an AI agent to hallucinate a truly detrimental answer. However, I am more concerned about use of AI to direct patrons to community resources. Is there potential legal exposure to the Library/its staff/the Trustees if an AI agent directs patrons to "resources" that are non-existent, outdated, or factually incorrect in a way that causes material harm to the patron?

Reference: <https://www.bbc.com/travel/article/20240222-air-canada-chatbot-misinformation-what-travellers-should-know>

Possible remedy: Clarify policy to state "direct patrons to appropriate *library* resources"

2. "Permissible uses: Communication and Marketing"

Issue: Staff use of AI in content creation

Context: Most if not all of the major generative AI models were trained on creative materials harvested without the permission of the copyright holders (in the case of

general creative work publicly posted on the internet) and pirated copies of published works. I have a strong ethical objection to encouraging the use of generative AI in the creation of documents and materials meant to be used in a public-facing capacity.

While I would not make use of AI for this purpose myself, I can accept a compromise that allows generative AI to be used in the initial drafting and/or idea generation stage of the process, as long as the final product has been checked for accuracy and AI generated content is not a substantive portion of the final materials.

Ultimately, we are in the "business" of information and appreciation/access to culture. Our patrons are lovers of writing and supporters of authors, and may have a strong negative reaction if the Library is found to make use of models trained off the stolen creative work of others. I also feel that making broad use of AI in this area could be seen to "dilute" the value of the services provided; in short, if staff use AI to regularly create materials or provide information, how are we "adding value" to our patrons' experience versus them using these same tools on their own?

Reference: Settlement in Bartz v. Anthropic class action lawsuit

Multiple articles about companies facing backlash from their customers for using AI generated imagery, including Wacom and Wizards of the Coast (I can provide links if desired)

Possible Remedies:

- Insert a statement similar to the following into the policy: "AI output shall not make up a substantial portion of the finished work product, and large passages of AI-generated text shall not be included verbatim. The reputational risks of causing controversy by obviously AI-generated final output are too significant to allow substantial amounts of AI output to be used directly in public materials"
- Specifically clarify that no AI-generated imagery will be used in final promotional materials

Point 3: Acquisition of Collection Materials

You have previously talked about staff making an effort to not add AI-generated books to the collection, and I know you had mentioned a time where you had to remove a book that had been found to be AI generated.

Given the hallucination problem, and the widespread availability of print-on-demand through Amazon and other vendors, AI-generated materials that have not been edited or fact-checked often include information that is unusable (i.e. "impossible" cross-stitch or crochet patterns) or dangerously inaccurate (i.e. an AI-generated book on mushroom identification for foragers).

Question: Do we want to include a statement about not adding AI-generated materials to the collection, since it seems like you currently have an unwritten policy in that regard? Certainly we can make exceptions in the future if, for example, an AI-generated book becomes a bestseller and is the topic of patron requests to add to the collection, but I think our default stance should be to not spend library resources on AI-generated non-fiction/reference materials.

While generally solid work, I respectfully cannot vote to accept this policy as currently drafted most strongly in relation to the issues in Point 2, above. I hope to have the

opportunity to work with you and the rest of the Trustees on a revised version of this work.

Thank you!
Heather Rasmussen

On motion by Kratz-Gullickson, seconded by Fiegel, and with an abstention from Rasmussen, the Library Board approved the Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning Policy as amended.

5) Any Other Business

a) Items for future agendas

b) Announcements

6) Adjourn

On motion by Devitt, seconded by Schumacher-Rasmussen, the Library Board adjourned at 9:01am.