

From: Trizna, Robert J.
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 5:42 PM
To: Pat Lamb (plamb@crowleylamb.com); 'Burkum (Karenbcommunications)'; Stevan Dobrilovic; Joseph Egan; Charlene Foss-Eggeman; 'FossChar2 (charlene.foss@lexisnexis.com)'; Judy Rayborn; Michael Reardon; 'Josh Kiem'; Gareth Kennedy (kennedyg1@gmail.com)
Subject: Tonight's meeting - Director hiring

Trustees:

I would have liked to deliver the following points at tonight's meeting, but before I knew what would be on tonight's agenda I undertook to host an event at the Harp & Fiddle. Hence, this e-mail.

Please do not approve the new version of "STEP 7" of the Director Candidate Recruiting Process. Not only is it the antithesis of H.I.T.A. but it is also a dis-service to the taxpayers of this community who make the Library possible.

Trustee Reardon was spot-on in this comment (as reported in the minutes of last week's Personnel COW) that the "hiring for a public position [especially the highest staff position at the Library] means more transparency than in a corporate position." That is because the taxpayers deserve transparency not only as to the qualifications and salary demands of a director candidate but, even more importantly, transparency in the way each of you trustees discharge the duties of your stewardship of our iconic Library. They deserve the ability, via transparency, to hold you – individually and collectively – accountable for your decisions, both good and bad; for your analyses, both keen and flawed; and for your comments, both profound and preposterous.

Consequently, they deserve that transparency as to your discussions and deliberations about both a candidate's qualifications and about the salary offer – and any negotiations that may result. They deserve to see and hear not only about a candidate's qualifications but what each of you think about those qualifications. They deserve to see and hear how zealously you ensure that they get the most bang for their bucks when it comes to paying for the services of what is the equivalent of the Library's CEO.

And they deserve to see and hear it before consensus is reached and decisions are made, not after they have become a *fait accompli* and "public input" has effectively been rendered irrelevant. Remember: Although IOMA permits closed sessions, it does not require them. You have the power to empower the public by meaningfully including them in the hiring process, as well as the power to neuter the public by resorting to secretive Star Chamber proceedings.

I read Karen's analogy that "taxpayers are like shareholders in a public company, and shareholders aren't involved in the hiring of the CEO of a company." My first reaction was: How ironic, given her dissent when I or others would suggest that the Library needs to operate more like a business.

Respectfully, her analogy also fails on several substantive grounds, not the least of which a private company is not subject to IOMA or FOIA. More importantly, however, is that if you don't like the way Apple or IBM is being run, you don't have to pack up your family and move to another town that's run better or differently. You simply call your broker, sell your shares, and buy something else.

When it comes to salary, frankly I'm amazed that at least a salary range has not been publicly identified – for the benefit of both the candidates and the taxpayers. Both of those groups should know, going in, what they are looking at.

That would force the Board, in the first instance, to come up with a range of salary that should satisfy the definition of "fair" – with a Board discussion of what is "fair" conducted in the sunlight (or fluorescent light). Once the taxpayers are

convinced you have been good stewards in arriving at that "fair" range, you can negotiate with the knowledge and strength of knowing that your constituents support you. That shifts the burden onto the candidate(s) to justify their demands for the higher end of that range instead of the lower end; or for a salary in excess of that range.

In conclusion, please have the courage to trust The People, your constituents, rather than fear them, hide from them, and neuter them. Don't sacrifice their right to transparent and accountable Library governance in favor of the selfish economic interests of the director candidates and a hired-gun consultant.

Regards,

A constituent.

Robert J. Trizna

Robbins, Salomon & Patt, Ltd.

180 North LaSalle Street

Suite 3300

Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 456-0190 (direct)

(312) 782-9000 (general)

(312) 782-6690 (fax)

<mailto:rtrizna@rsplaw.com>

www.rsplaw.com