

1 Approved February 16, 2012

2
3 Library of California Board Meeting
4 August 11, 2011

5
6 California State Library
7 900 N Street, Room 501
8 Sacramento, California
9

10
11 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

12 Vice-President Anne Bernardo convened the Library of California Board meeting on August
13 11, 2011 at 9:00 a.m., and welcomed Board Members, staff and audience members to
14 Sacramento and called for introductions.

15 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Victoria Fong, Jane F. Lowenthal, Paymaneh
16 Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Elizabeth Murguia, and Judy Zollman.

17 **Not Present:** Conchita Battle and Tyrone Cannon.

18 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Stacey A. Aldrich, Gerry
19 Maginnity, Sandy Habbestad, Rush Brandis, Jacquie Brinkley, Suzanne Flint, Darla Gunning,
20 and Carla Lehn.

21
22 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

23 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the*
24 *Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the August 11, 2011 meeting as*
25 *presented.*

26
27 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

28 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the*
29 *Library of California Board approves the draft minutes of the August 12, 2010*
30 *meeting as corrected.*

31
32 **ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2012**

33 Vice-President Bernardo called on Members Maghsoudi and Zollman to report the slate of
34 Board officers for 2012. The following actions were taken by the Board.

35 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the*
36 *Library of California Board elects Anne Bernardo as President of the Library of*
37 *California Board for the year 2012.*

38
39 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the*
40 *Library of California Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the*
41 *Library of California Board for the year 2012.*

1 **LIBRARY OF CALIFORNIA BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE**

2 Vice-President Bernardo directed attention to next year’s Board meeting schedule. February
3 16th is proposed for Budget and Planning, if needed, and August 16th for regular CLSA business
4 and the meeting of the LSTA Advisory Council. Member Lowenthal asked to read an addendum,
5 arguing for a change of date for August. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that a Board
6 meeting be held while legislators were in session so that Board members could make visits while
7 in Sacramento. The Board would be polled for a late August or September 2012 date.

8
9 **RESOLUTIONS**

10 Member Lowenthal read the proposed Board Resolution for Penny Kastanis.

11
12 **It was moved, seconded (Fong/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the**
13 **Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution**
14 **2011-01 for Penny Kastanis. (See Attachment A)**

15
16 Member Fong read a proposed Board Resolution for John Kallenberg.

17
18 **It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that**
19 **the Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution**
20 **2011-02 for John Kallenberg. (See Attachment B)**

21
22 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

23 **Board Vice-President’s Report**

24 Vice-President Bernardo reported on activities during the last year. She served as liaison to
25 the CLA Legislative and Advocacy Committee, which has been very informative and diligent in
26 calls for action. Members were thanked who attended and were involved in advocacy efforts
27 during last year’s CLA Snapshot Day, Legislative Day, Day in the District, and the CLA Annual
28 Conference. Additionally, Bernardo has been involved in publicizing 120 years of County Law
29 Libraries. She has been keeping up with the Calix postings and has tried to forward those of most
30 interest to members of the Board. She also has been doing Google alerts on Library news stories
31 from around the nation.

32 Bernardo reported that on September 16, 2010, the State Board of Education adopted the
33 School Libraries Standards for California Public Schools.

34 Bernardo wished to recognize and congratulate CSL retirees for their years of service,
35 including Ira Bray, Bessie Condos, Richard Hall, Kathy Low and Linda Springer.

1 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

2 State Librarian of California, Stacey A. Aldrich, gave the following report:

3 **State Library Organization**

4 The State Library budget is flat this year. The Governor has been supportive of the
5 organization as a whole; however, the library has received its first budget exercise and must
6 return \$342,000 in general fund monies and another \$67,000 in special funds. If the library's
7 proposed budget reduction plan is approved, the CSL will be released from the hiring freeze. We
8 have had a number of retirements this year; the various sections of the library will be looking to
9 fill some vacated positions. Library Development Services (LDS) will be hiring a new person, in
10 addition to Darla Gunning, who recently has taken Ira Bray's position in LDS to handle
11 statistics, digitization and other duties as assigned. She had been the head of Technical Services
12 before moving to LDS.

13 **Renovation Project**

14 Currently, the State Library has two buildings undergoing renovation. The Library and
15 Courts Stanley Mosk Building is still under construction but making headway. The unattractive
16 reference desk has been removed from the circulation room to expose a beautiful floor mosaic.
17 The original light wells are being restored, which allows the two statues, *Inspiration* and
18 *Wisdom*, to be bathed in natural sunlight. It is hoped that this room can be turned into a high-
19 tech, Wi-Fi, sit-down-and-do-some-work center. We are hoping to turn the grand reading room
20 into an amazing visitor space. Photographs of the library from the 1920s are being examined in
21 order to lay out the furniture in the same manner as it was back then, with exhibits of materials
22 the library contains. The building is scheduled for completion at the end of December 2012.
23 Library staff and collections should be moving back into the building by early spring of 2013.

24 The other building project is the Sutro Library in San Francisco, which has been a ten-year
25 project in partnership with San Francisco State University. The University has renovated their J.
26 Paul Leonard Library and the Sutro Library will now become integrated with them, taking the
27 two upper floors, levels five and six. That building is slated to be done in early 2012, with a
28 moving date in spring of next year. This will be a much nicer space for the Sutro collection,
29 which contains a first edition portfolio from Shakespeare from 1624, as well as one of the finest
30 genealogy collections in the nation.

31

1 An unfortunate side of both spaces is that they have smaller areas to hold the collections. In
2 order to open up the light wells in the Library & Courts building, the heating and cooling
3 systems must go in the stack area, losing about 18% of the space for the collection. The library
4 is considering how best to cope with this lack of space, with the possibility of some offsite
5 storage. The Sutro Library will have some additional space in that it will have the new onsite
6 robotic Library Retrieval System (LRS), consisting of many rows of stacked bins accessed by a
7 robot.

8 **Gates Foundation**

9 Two years ago the State Library received a Gates Foundation grant for *Opportunity Online*.
10 This grant was designed to assist libraries to upgrade their online connectivity bandwidth to at
11 least 1.5 megabytes per second or greater. Seventy libraries who met the conditions of the grant
12 were upgraded. Currently, in this second grant year, broadband training is being implemented for
13 library directors, regular staff, and IT staff. Training for the directors consists of what needs
14 attention, how to articulate why more bandwidth is needed and what is received with more
15 bandwidth. For staff, similar training will be conducted, but not as focused on policy, but rather
16 on the idea of what broadband is and how it works. And for the IT staff, training will focus on
17 how they can better manage their resources to get the most out of the connectivity. In some
18 areas, how networks have been configured has led to loss of full capacity.

19 **Libraries as Conveners**

20 In the spring of this year, CSL convened a training session titled, *Libraries as Conveners*,
21 which was more of a piloted training because no material really exists on the topic. The training
22 was held in Sacramento, where approximately fifty people met to discuss the issues of how to
23 bring communities into the library if an issue or problem arises within the community so the
24 library can be seen as a place to meet and have conversations to make positive change in their
25 community. *Libraries as Conveners* is still experimental, with concerns about political
26 implications, but progress is being made, with some libraries really beginning to step out into
27 their communities.

28 **Digital Literacy**

29 The State Library continues to work with the *Digital Literacy Plan*, although it has been
30 hitting some ebbs and flows due to recent changes in leadership. CSL originally committed to
31 supporting two things: 1) creating a tool to determine what people need to know, to find out
32 whether they are “digitally illiterate,” and 2) discovering a tool to find out what skills are

1 actually needed. In addition, this year the Library is looking to create a *Digital Literacy Family*
2 *Program* that could be “in a box,” because family literacy programs have been found to be very
3 successful. Adding the digital component to that would engage the community in a different
4 way. CSL is also talking with Sunne McPeak, CETF, about using their *School at Home* project,
5 which has a *Laptops to Families* program coupled with training for laptop users before the laptop
6 can be taken home, as a model for the library program.

7 **Sustainability Conference**

8 In March, the State Library invited California Public Library Directors to a *Sustainability*
9 *Conference*. Due to all the funding changes that have been happening across the state, it was
10 thought to be a good time to do three things: 1) bring public library directors together to
11 strengthen the network of leaders in the state; 2) talk about what are the common values and
12 goals of the 183 library jurisdictions, in order to begin advocating in California with one voice;
13 and 3) build some action plans towards the future. The result was a taskforce formed to carefully
14 scrutinize and discuss the California Library Services Act (CLSA) and whether it is really the
15 right thing to support California libraries for the 21st century.

16 Also during the *Sustainability Conference*, two marketing professionals were invited to come
17 in and do some training with the directors around the topic *What’s Our Message?* We will
18 continue working with them and another small taskforce to talk about what could be the message
19 for California libraries.

20 **Siskiyou County Library Update**

21 The Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors was going to close all of their libraries, with
22 6,000 square miles served by only eleven library branches. LDS Bureau Chief Gerry Maginnity
23 and State Librarian Aldrich travelled to Siskiyou to present them with alternatives to save their
24 libraries. Through grant funding support, Joan Frye Williams and George Needham went into the
25 community and spoke with people, then determined a way forward for them to continue to have
26 library services but at reduced cost. The model they came up with was to turn the main branch at
27 Yreka into the center of a library hub. The libraries were presented with a menu of opportunities
28 for services from which to choose and what level of services they could afford. So, if they
29 wanted a full-blown library, it cost “x”; if they just wanted a place to check out books, it cost
30 “y.” Siskiyou County has implemented a new, open-source, integrated library system catalog,
31 which should help to keep costs down. Also, they will be installing self-checking machines to
32 reduce the number of necessary staff. The new model has been very successful. Siskiyou County

1 and the Board of Supervisors are pleased to be a potential model for how other communities
2 might find a way forward. Jon Torkelson temporarily left LDS to serve as Interim Director for
3 about six months, during this period of reorganization. The State Library appreciates that he
4 offered to take the time to help Siskiyou, but is now looking forward to having him back as one
5 of the library's part-time consultants. Gerry recently helped with interviewing candidates for a
6 new library director, so they should have one in place soon.

7 **Gates Foundation Benchmark Project**

8 The first new item to report is that the State Library has been working on a couple of new
9 projects. *The Gates Foundation Benchmark Project*, supporting public access technology, has
10 been a huge project for CSL this year. The Gates Foundation originally began supporting
11 libraries by providing them with computers. Then they moved from supporting libraries with
12 computers to assisting them with broadband connectivity. Their next step, which they decided is
13 very important, is advocacy, ensuring that leadership has the opportunity and the language
14 necessary to articulate the value of sustainable technology access in the public library. Like the
15 movie *Ben Hur*, the *Benchmark Project* has a cast of thousands, with people from many different
16 library organizations from all around the nation. They have been working together to develop a
17 tool for libraries to use for good conversations in their communities about why they need public
18 access to technology. California is one of three designated pilot states, along with Texas and
19 Oklahoma. California received a \$50,000 grant to do forums in the state to gather information
20 about what it will take to induce libraries in California to adopt benchmarks and what would be
21 helpful for them in order to use these benchmarks. Consultants K.G. Ouye and Pauline Mingram
22 worked with CSL to conduct two forums. Aldrich returned yesterday from a meeting in which
23 the derived data was used to inform the process, resulting in a 3-page first draft of benchmarks. It
24 is designed with three areas: 1) organizational management, 2) those engaged in the community
25 and decision makers, and 3) demonstrated value of services provided. We are trying to figure out
26 what are the measurements that actually determine that value. The benchmarks are still being
27 reviewed but are due for completion in September.

28 There are two libraries in California scheduled to begin the *Benchmark Pilot Program* in
29 September: Sacramento Public Library and Salinas Public Library. Training for the pilot
30 program libraries will begin in September.

31

1 The data gathered from the benchmark forums is helping to inform the State Library how
2 best to write and apply for another grant from The Gates Foundation. They will provide the
3 support to implement the *Benchmark Program* at other libraries in California besides the pilot
4 sites. This has been a very big project occupying a considerable amount of Aldrich's attention.

5 **Digital Inclusion Forum**

6 The second new item to report is the *Digital Inclusion Forum*, sponsored by the *Institute of*
7 *Museum and Library Services (IMLS)*. It was mandated in the *National Broadband Plan* to
8 include a digital inclusion framework, or guidelines for communities, not just libraries, in
9 thinking about digital connectivity. California has been selected as one of four states to have this
10 *Digital Inclusion Forum* to solicit feedback on the framework that has been designed. The
11 meeting for California will be held in Los Angeles on September 12th and 13th, with former State
12 Librarian Susan Hildreth visiting in her capacity as Director of IMLS. The guest list was selected
13 on the basis of very strict IMLS protocols. A challenge presents itself because we have two
14 similar programs, *IMLS's Digital Inclusion Framework* and the *Gates Foundation Benchmarks*.
15 The Gates Benchmark program was started before IMLS's National Broadband Plan came out.
16 An attempt is being made to find meaningful ways to articulate these two programs so that they
17 are not confusing to our libraries in California.

18 **e-Books**

19 Aldrich has been working with other state libraries at the national level through **Chief**
20 **Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA)** as part of a small taskforce concerning e-books.
21 The group put together a study last year around how libraries should start thinking about e-
22 books. It has been a groundbreaking document, with seven different scenarios, which has opened
23 up some very good conversations at all levels. Numerous groups are working on the future of
24 e-books, what they will look like and how they will be accessed. Linda Crowe has headed up a
25 group for the American Library Association (ALA) called Equal Access to Electronic Resources.
26 Other groups include Digital Public Library, which is coming out of the east coast academic
27 environment, and Internet Archive. Another one, Unglued, will have people vote for books they
28 would like to be free to the public, and then they will work with the publishers to figure out the
29 cost. People will then be able to donate in order to make the book available for free, that is, to
30 make it become "unglued."

31

1 The e-book field is wild and chaotic at the moment, but libraries are focusing on copyrights
2 and access issues. With respect to electronic books for libraries, two big things are needed. First,
3 libraries need platform-neutral content; they cannot have a single content for one device. Many
4 devices like tablets and i-Pads will be used by the public, with more new devices coming out all
5 the time, so the one content for one device scenario makes it more difficult to create a borrowing
6 model. A second major need is for models to be found that work for publishers, authors, and
7 libraries. Libraries do not want to prevent publishers and authors from making money, but they
8 are concerned that people have access to publications. Publishers who will not allow electronic
9 content to libraries deny access to entire populations of users.

10 Another issue for libraries is the difference between renting and owning electronic content.
11 Already, libraries have begun renting content, but if a community that uses rented content should
12 run out of money and cease to pay the rent, then all of that content will be lost to the library and
13 the community will lose access to those electronic resources. Libraries should be able to own
14 content. Currently, there is a conversation about Overdrive, one of the major e-book vendors, and
15 Kansas State Library, which has severed the contract between them. Kansas City Public Library
16 signed a document stating that it owned its electronic content, but Overdrive disputes that, saying
17 the content is just rented. Overdrive's dominance in the market place is going to be challenged
18 by 3-M's Cloud Library, Barnes and Noble and perhaps others. Clearly, the e-book market is
19 going to be flooded with other vendor choices soon.

20 Aldrich was very excited to announce that CSL recently signed a statewide contract with
21 Bookflix e-books for kids, a vendor of Scholastic. Open to everyone, the children's content
22 should be accessible onsite from any California Public Library or remotely online through a
23 library website. Bookflix offers fiction and non-fiction, centered on many engaging topics. It is a
24 great literacy tool; e-books can be read to the user, the reader can read along with them, or they
25 can be read directly by the reader. Although Internet-based and readable on an i-Pad, for
26 example, Bookflix's e-books are not downloadable to devices. Access to Bookflix is about a
27 penny per person per year. CSL is supporting it for two years throughout the state with federal
28 funds, but will be deriving a pricing model to see about continuing it. Aldrich thanked Linda
29 Crowe and Heather Teysko from Califa for managing the huge Bookflix project.

30 **Democracy in the 21st Century**

31 The California Council for the Humanities received a grant for a project on the theme of
32 democracy: *What is a Democracy in the 21st Century?* California libraries are a partner in the

1 project and CSL will be supporting libraries to do particular book discussions surrounding the
2 topic of democracy. Accompanying these discussions will be a traveling exhibition that relates to
3 democracy.

4 **Stanford Demographic Study**

5 Lastly, the State Library is working with Stanford Center for Longevity to do a demographic
6 study in the state of California. They are compiling data so that libraries can make good
7 decisions about the future of their populations and what kinds of services to provide. Stanford is
8 analyzing historic content for trends that each community should consider to prepare for their
9 future; whether the community has an aging population or a younger population changes the
10 focus about what services to provide. We hope to get 183 unique reports. Some of the data will
11 be at the county level because it is unavailable at the local level. CSL will be offering training for
12 libraries on how to think about demographic information and how it relates to serving local
13 populations. The CSL contact for this study is Suzanne Flint in LDS.

14 **Questions and Answers**

15 Member McGinity asked whether any studies had been done about overall library usage,
16 such as who uses libraries and what do they do. Aldrich replied that national studies had been
17 done, of which California had been included. For example, the recent study by the Gates
18 Foundation and IMLS included California, with perhaps some breakouts of data specifically on
19 California. But no single study has been done on California. A couple of years ago, CSL and
20 Rosario Garza, SCLC, worked with the Zogby Polling organization to poll Californians on how
21 they find and use information. Telephone calls were made and website links established to
22 receive answers to polling questions. That data probably has not changed too much since then,
23 but nothing surprising was really learned. It was confirmed that people begin with Google search
24 to find information; they prefer to look on their own before resorting to a librarian. A lot about
25 the usage behaviors of patrons was learned, but not a lot about the library. Maybe the time has
26 come to do a new study on both.

27 Member Lowenthal asked whether the question had been proposed as to why people do their
28 own research. She has found that many people do not believe they need a librarian or a library.
29 Aldrich responded that that particular question had not been asked. Her sense from her reading
30 and conversations, however, was that people today are self-service oriented, and feel that is good
31 enough for them. In general, many traditional reference questions, like the height of Mount
32 Kilimanjaro, are very easy to find for oneself on the web. By the time people come to a librarian

1 for help, they have looked extensively on their own. So, they come with an expectation that
2 librarians should know things that are not accessible on the web. It is the more detailed research
3 questions that are the main kinds of reference assistance being requested today. At this level it
4 becomes apparent how limited the availability of detailed information is on the Internet. Studies
5 are showing that researchers are relying more on the web and not diving deeper into their matter,
6 and that important detail is being missed. The challenge for libraries as contact creators is how
7 we can make more information more accessible.

8 Member Fong asked whether Opportunity Online Broadband training for Library Directors
9 included training for a new generation of librarians through Library Schools. Aldrich clarified
10 that it is a program to assist existing Library Directors to articulate broadband capacity issues
11 and why more of it would be needed. Broadband connectivity is not only about electronic access
12 to the world, but the ability of libraries to push out an increasing volume of content such as
13 video, photographs, online exhibits, etc. Although the training is open to anyone, relevant people
14 are being targeted for invitation.

15 There is a wider educational issue here. Offering organizational development as part of a
16 library science curriculum has been an issue with some library schools, who do not believe
17 teaching library organization management is within their province. Aldrich believes that is not
18 right. The informational side that library schools provide is good and necessary, but the
19 organizational side is too. Conversations with library schools about this issue are ongoing.

20 In connection with the broadband discussion, Member Fong inquired as to whether the State
21 Librarian was in contact with the private commercial companies who offer broadband. Aldrich
22 replied that she had not contacted them for the training. An emerging problem, however,
23 following the recent push to get and increase broadband capability, is that the telco rules in the
24 state of California are beginning to create access issues for libraries. For example, in one small
25 community, Madera Public Library would have to pay \$1600 dollars per month for a mere T1
26 line, which refers to a specific type of copper or fiber optic telephone line that can carry more
27 data than traditional telephone lines. If the T1 line is being used for telephone conversations, it
28 plugs into the office's phone system and can carry up to 24 digitized voice channels. If the T1
29 line is carrying data it plugs into the network's router and can carry data at a rate of 1.544
30 megabits per second. However, other areas in the state may receive a gigabyte (1 gigabyte =
31 1000 megabytes) of data carrying capacity for \$200. Connectivity and broadband capacity are
32 huge issues and challenges for libraries as more content goes digital and is made available to the

1 public. Perhaps data compression strategies may form part of any connectivity solution, but the
2 “pipes” must be big to handle what libraries are planning to do. The State Library is working
3 with CENIC, the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California, who included CSL
4 in their broadband grant to connect some libraries onto the “fiber backbone.” However, some
5 challenging unintended consequences have ensued. When a library that was supported by
6 Sacramento Public Library’s connectivity got a boost to its connectivity, Sacramento Public then
7 had to boost its own connectivity to that library, as well. A domino effect was produced.

8 Member Fong admired the Family Digital Literacy Program, but wondered who paid for
9 high-speed internet access after a family receives a free laptop. Aldrich admitted that providing
10 internet access had been a challenge. However, a new Comcast program just announced allows
11 \$10 per month internet access to families who qualify for the School Lunch program.

12 Member Fong asked about the tension between the two programs, *IMLS’s Digital Inclusion*
13 *Framework* and the *Gates Foundation Benchmarks*. Aldrich replied that they are two different
14 frameworks. The Gates Foundation is creating tools to enable a conversation about broadband
15 connectivity, while the IMLS tool is about having a conversation in the community. Meshing the
16 two together will be challenging and it is unclear what it will look like. The role of the State
17 Library is to provide opportunities, but communities must decide what works better for them.
18 Maybe *IMLS’s Digital Inclusion Framework* works better for some libraries, perhaps *Gates*
19 *Foundation Benchmarks* for others. But the Gates Benchmarks are important at the statewide
20 level because what is being learned from the locals could really be used to articulate trends at the
21 statewide level. Aldrich would not like to see exclusive use of one framework over the other, as
22 the statewide conversation is better facilitated using apples to apples.

23 24 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

25 **CLSA Baseline Budget**

26 Habbestad reported that in the Governor’s signed budget, in the CLSA appropriation
27 included \$8.5 million dollars to fund the statewide mandated programs through the Cooperative
28 Systems, Interlibrary Library Loan and Direct Loan programs. Staff looked at various scenarios
29 to distribute the \$8.5 million. We wanted to fund the Systems at a level so that they would
30 remain viable to their Public Library members and possibly keep their doors open. We also
31 looked at what the percentage cuts would mean for the public library resource sharing. It was
32 decided to use the previous year’s System allocation and reduce the baseline by 15%, which

1 would fund System service at a little over \$2.3 million. This amount represents about 27% of the
2 total \$8.5 million appropriated. The balance of almost \$6.2 million would then fund the
3 Interlibrary Loan and the Direct Loan programs at a level that would provide some
4 reimbursement for the sharing of resources to non-resident borrowers. Staff is recommending
5 that the Board adopt the 2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget as presented in the documentation to
6 this agenda item.

7 Member Murguia asked for the reasoning behind the 40% reductions to TBR versus 15%
8 reduction for the Cooperative Library Systems. Aldrich explained that the Systems were asked to
9 report what zero percent reduction and 50% reduction would look like. Considering the
10 importance of the regional Systems, in their capacity of administering products and in creating
11 resource sharing, there viability is highly desirable. If they were to sustain cuts that were too
12 great, some of them would fail. Libraries win either way, whether they receive assistance directly
13 or via the regional Systems. But the latter approach allows for economies of scale to the
14 individual libraries.

15 TBR is not funding, but rather reimbursement, so it is like icing on the cake for the library
16 jurisdictions. For the smaller library systems, the reimbursements makes very little difference, as
17 the amounts may be negligible. But for the larger systems, it can make a difference. Santa Clara
18 County Library was receiving a million dollars before it decided not to participate. The next
19 largest amount going to a library was \$400,000. Although there is a huge reimbursement range,
20 libraries do not depend on TBR. TBR has been very poorly funded for many years, so much so
21 that it may be considered a mere token.

22 Member Fong commented that TBR isn't just icing to her local library, Belvedere/Tiburon,
23 where they have a great collection and great local support. They look at their substantial TBR
24 return as an investment in their book collection, but never as a budget breaker. Aldrich added
25 that had TBR been more of a dependency or a budget breaker, a different budget decision
26 probably would have been made.

27 The following action was taken by the Board.

28 ***It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the Library of***
29 ***California Board adopts the 2011/12 CLSA Budget as displayed in the chart entitled***
30 ***"2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget Recommendation" and that the aforementioned chart be***
31 ***included in the minutes of this meeting. (See Attachment C)***
32

33
34

1 **CLSA System Plans of Service**

2 Habbestad reported that CLSA Plans of Service were received from each of the eight
3 Cooperative Systems. This year the cooperatives were asked to provide only a preliminary plan
4 of service instead of the full budget packet because of the uncertainty of the state budget. Exhibit
5 A in the packet is a compilation of those plans. The Systems were asked to provide three
6 scenarios based on the different funding levels. A summary of the plans indicate that all Systems
7 have delivery to their members as one of their top priorities. Each System will provide some
8 level of second level reference, either through System's staff or by contracting with another
9 System for the service. Most Systems will fund database subscriptions for their libraries. One
10 System has stated that they have issued staff furloughs. At least two systems have already laid-
11 off administrative and reference staff. If the trigger bill is enacted to eliminate the CLSA funds, it
12 is most likely that 49-99 will shut down. The Inland Library System would last about one year
13 and then shut down. NorthNet would last six months and then shut down.

14 Member Bernardo asked whether LSTA funding would be lost if the trigger is pulled and
15 \$8.5 million is cut from the budget. In response, Aldrich first set the context for how budget
16 decisions are reached, explaining the federal grant cycle. Every year the State Library receives an
17 LSTA grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services that is good for two years. Each
18 year the new grant funding is received and a report is made on the previous year's grant.
19 Normally, \$16.4 million is received, but this year it was down to \$15.4 million. The State of
20 California authorizes \$19 million each year, because the State Library always has two pockets of
21 money for the two grant cycles, the new incoming grant amount as well as the previous year's
22 grant. The \$19 million is often misleading, giving the appearance of more funding than was
23 actually received.

24 With that new money, CSL is always reporting on old grant funding, which actually
25 determines the future grant. Reports must include state funding that supported the two-year grant
26 cycle, which covers three state fiscal years. CSL must pro-rate the funding received over three,
27 nine and twelve months. When the state of California makes cuts in budget years, and the money
28 is not available, it then begins to effect how CSL reports. The first report to be impacted if the
29 library is not funded would be in 2012, when it would have to report that it could not meet
30 maintenance of effort. It was estimated that it would be about a 19% drop in funding.
31 Traditionally, the federal IMLS has reduced grant funding by the same percentage that the state

1 of California reduced its funding. The other option would be to request a waiver. If IMLS
2 granted a waiver, they would give full funding.

3 The worst case scenario would be reported in 2013, were the library not to receive state
4 funding in each of the next two years. Funding would drop 83% in 2014/15. Of course, CSL
5 would be asking for a waiver for each year that the maintenance of effort is not met. The long-
6 term issue is: what is the state of California putting toward libraries? Although the trigger
7 language is tied to this year's budget only, and once the funding is reduced or eliminated, it is
8 very hard to get it back.

9 Another concern is that although CSL currently has federal funding, it is holding off on
10 grants while waiting to see what will happen with state funding. CSL may need to try different
11 kinds of grants to keep things going. However, we do not want to get caught in the trap of
12 backfilling all of these grant programs with LSTA funds, because in the long term we do not
13 have that money. Nor is it known how much money there will be from the federal government in
14 next year's budget. It could drop even lower, below \$15 million.

15 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
16 *Library of California Board approves the CLSA Preliminary System Plans of*
17 *Service for the eight CLSA Cooperative Library Systems submitted for fiscal year*
18 *2011/12, and after knowing the final outcome of the state budget, request Systems*
19 *to submit revised plans and budgets that reflect the programs and services provided*
20 *with the funding available from CLSA.*

21

22 **RESOURCE SHARING**

23 **CLSA Consolidations and Affiliations**

24 Habbestad reported that the City of Camarillo broke away from the Ventura County Library
25 system in January 2011. A copy of the ordinance creating the municipal library and a copy of the
26 city council's resolution are included in the packet. The Camarillo Library is requesting
27 affiliation with Southern California Library Cooperative with the effective date of July 1, 2011.
28 The SCLC Administrative Council approved the request for membership contingent upon the
29 adoption of this motion. Last year the Board approved the change in membership from Ventura
30 County Library, from Black Gold to SCLC. As well, three other library jurisdictions in Ventura
31 County have joined SCLC. Santa Paula Library District is currently the only library jurisdiction
32 in Ventura County still remaining a member of Black Gold. Staff is recommending that the
33 Board approve the affiliation of Camarillo Public Library with SCLC.

34 Member Lowenthal asked what would be the consequence of saying "no" to this proposal.
35 She was worried about privatization of public libraries and the possible unintended consequences

1 of decisions like this one. She explained that some cities, municipalities and counties across
2 California have decided that they cannot afford to have libraries, so they have been choosing to
3 hire private management companies to run libraries like a business. Camarillo and Santa Clarita
4 have already done that.

5 Aldrich responded with an alternate view of what Member Lowenthal stated about
6 privatization. What is being done is not privatization of libraries, but rather the outsourcing of
7 management. Privatization would mean that a community is not paying for a library at all. In
8 such a case, library users would have to pay for their own service. In some communities that
9 wanted their own city library, they pulled away and began outsourcing. Then, when the library
10 was well-established, the community took on the management of it. Calabasas City Library is a
11 successful example of this approach. The State Library is unable to evaluate how local libraries
12 manage themselves. There are state laws and rules with which libraries must comply. Rather,
13 Aldrich's chief concern is with the difference of having a library versus not having one at all. If
14 outsourcing the management of a library is the only way to ensure its existence, then that is the
15 way to go.

16 If the Board were not to approve the affiliation of Camarillo Public Library with the Southern
17 California Library Cooperative, then the people of Camarillo would be unduly punished.
18 Because of a decision made by their City Council, they would be denied access to the basic
19 resources that are available to a library system. Aldrich does not recommend disapproval.

20 Rosario Garza reminded the Board that Camarillo has been an associate member of SCLC
21 since January 2011. She also pointed out that due to the way systems are structured, it is not the
22 public library that joins a System, but the city, as the governing jurisdiction, that joins. It was the
23 City of Camarillo that joined SCLC, not Camarillo Public Library. The following action was
24 taken by the Board.

25 ***It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the***
26 ***Library of California Board approves the affiliation of the Camarillo Public***
27 ***Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative; and further moved to***
28 ***accept the request to waive the September 1, 2010 filing deadline for 2011/12***
29 ***affiliations so that this request becomes effective July 1, 2011.***
30

31 Habbestad reported on the motion to approve the affiliation of the Santa Clarita Public
32 Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative. The City of Santa Clarita broke away
33 from the Los Angeles County Library System in August 2010, creating an independent
34 municipal library. They have requested and been accepted as a member of SCLC, contingent

1 upon approval of this motion. The documentation for this affiliation request is provided in the
2 exhibits to this agenda item.

3 ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Zollman) and carried unanimously that the***
4 ***Library of California Board approves the affiliation of the Santa Clarita Public***
5 ***Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative; and further moved to***
6 ***accept the request to waive the September 1, 2010 filing deadline for 2011/12***
7 ***affiliations so that this request becomes effective July 1, 2011.***
8

9 Habbestad reported of the withdrawal of the Santa Clara County Library system from the
10 Pacific Library Partnership (PLP). The Santa Clara County Board approved an \$80 annual non-
11 resident library card fee, and by doing so, is no longer eligible to participate as a CLSA System
12 member. This action was in response to reductions, potential elimination of state funding, and an
13 increase in demand for library services from non-residents. Santa Clara County Library has, by
14 far, exceeded other library jurisdictions in the amount reimbursed through TBR funds, receiving
15 annually over \$1.2 million in Direct Loan payments. In comparison, the next highest library
16 reimbursement averages about \$400,000.

17 Linda Crowe, CEO of PLP, added that there was more to Santa Clara's decisions than just
18 the state funding reductions. It was also the funding difficulties of nearby San Jose Public
19 Library, which at the time was planning to reduce open hours to three and a half days per week.
20 That did not happen. However, anticipating a surge of patrons from San Jose Public Library,
21 Santa Clara County made what may have been a precipitous decision to charge non-resident fees
22 and withdraw from PLP. The effect has been that patrons are now using there local libraries
23 more rather than Santa Clara County. Previously, people were using libraries in the region
24 interchangeably, before Santa Clara began charging; however, the other libraries in the
25 surrounding communities continue to serve patrons from Santa Clara County and other libraries.
26 A long-term issue for Aldrich is whether making it harder for people to use public libraries will
27 result in loss of support. Aldrich stated that Santa Clara did not seem to be worried about
28 diminished service due to the loss of \$1.2 million.

29 Member McGinity asked a question about funding. Once Santa Clara County Library pulled
30 out of the System, which was effective on July 1st of 2011, should they decide to come back,
31 would they still lose all of the state money for the year? Linda Crowe responded in the
32 affirmative. However, they could apply for re-admittance for the following year. Aldrich pointed
33 out that forfeited funds are redistributed to the other public library systems. Unfortunately, loss
34 of funding adversely impacts libraries affiliated with Santa Clara County.

1 **CLSA Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs**

2 Habbestad reported on the annual cost study survey results for the Transaction Based
3 Reimbursement (TBR) Program and reviewed the rates proposed for FY 2011/12. The following
4 action was taken by the Board.

5 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
6 *Library of California Board adopts, subject to the concurrence of the State*
7 *Department of Finance, reimbursement rates for the 2011/12 fiscal year as*
8 *follows: for CLSA interlibrary loans, a reimbursement rate of \$6.60 per eligible*
9 *transaction; for CLSA direct loans, a reimbursement rate of \$1.09 per eligible*
10 *transaction; and that the Chief Executive Officer inform all participants of the*
11 *2011/12 reimbursement rates as soon as Department of Finance concurrence is*
12 *obtained.*

13
14 Habbestad presented the motion for consideration for prorating the CLSA loan
15 reimbursement programs for 2011/12. TBR participants were reimbursed at 25.2% of the total
16 amount claimed for FY 2010/11; the total cost of the program was over \$40 million. Current
17 projections indicate that the total cost for FY 2011/12 may decrease from the previous year. The
18 major reason for the decrease is the withdrawal of Santa Clara County from the System, which
19 will decrease reimbursable Direct Loans by over 2 million transactions. Payments to libraries
20 will begin after January 1, 2012, as directed in the State Budget Act of 2011.

21 Member McGinity questioned the cost survey and asked what the cost driver was to the
22 seemingly erratic cost fluctuations reported from year to year. Habbestad responded that the
23 survey mainly gathered data about the staffing levels and salaries of staff that do the tasks
24 associated with providing an interlibrary loan and direct loan transaction. Only the handling costs
25 are included in calculating the reimbursement rate, not the delivery of the item. Unfortunately,
26 the survey used to capture data from participants is dated and in need of revision. Aldrich added
27 that this was part of the whole discussion about CLSA and how monies are being used. The
28 taskforce that is reviewing CLSA will be considering whether this is the right way to distribute
29 the money to help libraries the most. Member McGinity asked that a revised formula be devised
30 for a more accurate report. Aldrich responded that we could discuss with the Systems the best
31 way to survey libraries to get a sense of the costs associated with loaning materials to non-
32 residents. However, it is very difficult to get accurate detail even with standard forms and
33 definitions. It was agreed that this topic should be further analyzed and revisited by the Board in
34 a year. The following action was taken by the Board.

35 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the*
36 *Library of California Board directs its Chief Executive Officer to withhold 90%*

1 *from all CLSA ILL and Direct Loan Program reimbursement payments*
2 *throughout the 2011/12 fiscal year and that, after determining the full State cost of*
3 *the TBR programs, directs the CEO to prorate the final payment equitably if*
4 *insufficient funds remain in the program appropriation. It was further moved to*
5 *authorize the CEO to make a one-time adjustment in the prorata percentage in*
6 *order to pay all participants equitably if actual transaction data increases at a rate*
7 *that would not pay each participant equitably.*
8

9 Habbestad reported that transaction levels continue to be at some of their highest, with over
10 36 million Direct Loans and 3.6 million Interlibrary Loans made to non-resident borrowers last
11 year. Staff is recommending the Board authorize its CEO to submit a Budget Change Proposal
12 (BCP) for FY 2012/13 if she deemed it appropriate, given the state fiscal climate.

13 Member Murguia asked if this BCP request was being considered amongst other requests for
14 additional funding. Aldrich replied that traditionally BCPs have been submitted for TBR and
15 PLF. However, this year it is likely that the only BCPs will be for maintaining the offsite storage
16 for the Sutro and Stanley Mosk libraries and preparing for the move. Vice-President Bernardo
17 added that this motion provides the authority to submit the BCP, if appropriate.

18 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
19 *Library of California Board gives its Chief Executive Officer the authority to seek*
20 *additional 2012/13 local assistance funding through the BCP process.*
21

22 **CLSA System Reference**

23 Habbestad report on the annual approval of System population and membership figures
24 required in order to calculate the System Reference Program allocations. She reminded the
25 Board of the revised policy allowing two or more cooperative systems to consolidate and retain
26 the same funding level by adding together the allocations for each of the consolidated systems.
27 Changes in the population this year include the two new library jurisdictions, Camarillo and
28 Santa Clarita libraries, joining SCLC; and the withdrawal of Santa Clara County Library from
29 PLP (Pacific Library Partnership). The following action was taken by the Board.

30 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the*
31 *Library of California Board approves the System Population and Membership*
32 *figures for use in the allocation of CLSA System Reference Program funds for the*
33 *fiscal year 2011/12.*
34

35 **System Annual Report Summaries from FY 2009/10**

36 Habbestad presented a summary of System Annual Reports in the packet exhibits for each of
37 the cooperative systems for FY 2009/10 and the achievements of the performance objectives set

1 for System Reference, Communications and Delivery, and Advisory Boards. System Annual
2 Reports for FY 2010/11 are due at the State Library on September 1, 2011 and will appear in the
3 next Board meeting packet.

4 In responding to Member Fong's question regarding System Reference, Aldrich explained
5 that System Reference in libraries has been dropping exponentially across the board. The
6 Systems have taken second-level reference questions forwarded from local libraries not equipped
7 to handle the question. But those questions have been declining, so now consideration is being
8 given to how funding may be better utilized elsewhere.

9 Member McGinity inquired about the dramatic shift in reference. Aldrich responded that
10 fewer staff is needed for reference at the System level due to falling demand. At the local level,
11 libraries are re-purposing the kind of activities they are doing. Some libraries are taking
12 professional staff away from the public desk in order to attend to more in-depth research
13 questions, or providing community outreach, or work on specific programs like homework help
14 and workforce development. Basic reference questions may now be handled by library para-
15 professionals for the most part.

16 Rosario Garza, SCLC, stated that Pasadena Public Library recently re-purposed their
17 reference librarian's group. After several months of study, it was found that few in-depth
18 reference questions were being asked by patrons. Rather, the questions were about the location of
19 restrooms, or the photocopier and other inquiries of that sort. So, a new service model was
20 enacted, moving to a single service point that replaced what used to be the circulation desk.
21 Now, when a genuine reference question is asked, a reference specialist comes out to assist the
22 patron individually. What has been found is that reference service has become quicker and more
23 efficient and staff has been freed up to work on special projects, such as assisting local
24 government in serving Pasadena residents.

25 A recent study has shown that SCLC experienced a 23% reduction in reference questions in
26 the fiscal year that just ended from the previous fiscal year. In the last ten years, questions
27 submitted to SCLC from System member libraries have gone down 82%. This indicates that the
28 reference model needs to change. And that is why SCLC is working with the State Library on the
29 redesign of CLSA.

30 Member Lowenthal asked about the online *Ask A Librarian* reference tool. Garza responded
31 that SCLC stopped supporting it two years ago because the cost per question for the *Ask Now*
32 project was extremely high and was found not to be a good use of LSTA money; however, some

1 individual libraries continued to use it on their own. The County Law Library group continues to
2 take part in the *Ask Now* project.

3
4 **LEGISLATIVE**

5 Vice-President Bernardo moved on to federal legislative issues and referred to the packet
6 summary review of legislative positions that the Board had taken over the years on various
7 issues. Aldrich referred to a handout listing current federal legislative bills and issues monitored
8 by ALA. She remarked that copyright, internet neutrality and assuring access were issues being
9 followed with particular interest. Of most concern at the federal level was that The Institute of
10 Museum and Library Services (IMLS) continue to be funded, as it is California's source of
11 LSTA grant monies. There are several proposed options to deal with the deficit by different
12 members of the House and Senate that are considering reducing the amount of federal funds that
13 come down to libraries. Directors of State Library Agencies are following this closely and
14 looking for whom to tap to ensure continued funding.

15 Nationally, there has been a huge rise in the use of libraries in all states, but a precipitous
16 decline in the amount of funding they are receiving. There is also a trend toward the formation of
17 new organizations that seek to do what libraries already do, such as: Work Force Development,
18 Health Information, Early Learning, Early Literacy, etc.

19 Aldrich reported that the good news was that LSTA was re-authorized, but that every
20 institution was up for scrutiny, especially the arts. The National Endowment for the Arts and the
21 National Endowment for the Humanities had been targeted and severely cut. IMLS not only
22 provided LSTA funding, but also the Laura Bush 21st Century grants, which are used for library
23 development. Some grant funding for digitization had also been provided. There has been talk of
24 removing everything but LSTA, while cutting it deeply.

25 Member Murguia asked if there were identifiable House and Senate advocates for libraries, a
26 national leader for whom this cause is a passion. Aldrich answered that most California
27 representatives, like Doris Matsui, were very supportive of libraries. However, while Boxer and
28 Feinstein were supportive, libraries were not high on their priority list. Senator Harry Reid had
29 been quite supportive. Member Lowenthal stated that there were several who had advocated for
30 LSTA, but they were not in California. She noted that calls to legislators often garnered verbal
31 support of libraries, but not a commitment to funding support.

1 Vice-President Bernardo next moved on to state legislative issues. She stated that she sat on
2 the CLA Legislative Advocacy Committee as Board Liaison this past year, while Member
3 Maghsoudi had been involved as well, in her capacity as President of CLA. Vice-President
4 Bernardo directed members' attention to a table listing legislation that CLA had been following
5 for the 2011-12 session. Aldrich called attention to SB 445, the California Public Records Act,
6 insuring the privacy of patron electronic records, not just circulation records, in libraries.

7 Member Maghsoudi referred to AB 438, outsourcing library management, stating that CLA
8 chose to take a close watch position on this bill. It was difficult to take a pro or con position
9 because of the many jurisdictions with divergent stances represented on the CLA Advocacy
10 Committee. Many local jurisdictions were strongly opposed to this library management bill.
11 Initially, the bill required a vote from local citizens before a city could outsource the
12 management of their library. Then it changed to allowing the city to outsource by jumping
13 through multiple hoops. Local control is the essential issue, and it was not just about libraries but
14 all local government service. Some librarians were very concerned about outsourcing, while
15 others were concerned about local control, that is, the local jurisdiction being able to decide what
16 would work for their community.

17 Member Murguia asked about companies providing library management services. Aldrich
18 replied that there is just one company, Library Systems & Services (LSSI). So far, they have
19 provided service to sixteen libraries nationwide. In California, five public libraries utilize their
20 service: Camarillo, Moorpark, Riverside County, Santa Clarita, and Shasta.

21
22 **BOARD FOCUS**

23 Aldrich updated the Board with an overview of the results of the CLSA Taskforce, which
24 came out of the two-day Sustainability Conference with Public Library Directors in March 2011.
25 Aldrich stated that the conference was attended by directors from very rural libraries small to
26 very large urban libraries, and by representatives from the cooperative systems. Member
27 Maghsoudi attended as a Board representative and as the director of Whittier Public Library.

28 Members were referred to the document in their packet: CLSA Taskforce Update, which
29 focused on three things: 1) What are we trying to accomplish with CLSA? 2) What are the pieces
30 that we can let go of now? and 3) Are their possible models for the future of CLSA? One of the
31 conversations was about whether CLSA should be modified and salvaged or completely
32 eliminated and a fresh beginning made.

1 The first consideration was what new elements should be added to future CLSA resource
2 sharing. Some changes the taskforce wished to include were: 1) connectivity and delivery, both
3 physical and digital; 2) incentives for sharing local resources; 3) ensuring that patrons have equal
4 borrowing access throughout the state, no matter where they live in California, which links to the
5 taskforce's goal statement: *We believe that California libraries exist to connect, collect, share*
6 *and preserve resources so that all residents can access information, ideas, knowledge, and each*
7 *other*; and 4) Digitization, how the electronic world affects how materials are moved and shared,
8 an issue not addressed in the current CLSA.

9 The taskforce reviewed, page by page, the CLSA law and regulations to insure that they were
10 understood before changes were suggested. There are several current structures in CLSA that
11 could be easily changed to improve CLSA. For example, the System Advisory Boards and are no
12 longer needed. System Reference is no longer as crucial of a service as it once was and it could
13 be deleted. Also, the Consolidations and Affiliations program requires the borders of the library
14 be contiguous as a requirement for a library to belong to one of the eight Regional Library
15 Systems. Why must Systems with libraries that may have similar service needs share borders in
16 order to affiliate with one another? In response to a member requesting an example, Rosario
17 Garza responded that if the City of Rancho Cucamonga wished to join SCLC for services, SCLC
18 would need to get an exception to the contiguous borders requirement from the LoC Board. That
19 is because Rancho Cucamonga is several cities removed from the nearest SCLC library. Aldrich
20 provided the example of ebooks as a type of service that might be shared. Or any leveraged
21 content that one System has that a library jurisdiction would like to share.

22 Aldrich next pointed out that there was no funding for Special Services Programs, as was
23 provided for in the CLSA regulations. LSTA funding has actually supported many Special
24 Service Programs. So, it was possible that this provision could be eliminated.

25 Definitions of residency were found to be no longer workable and relevant and needed to be
26 updated.

27 References to LSCA, the predecessor to LSTA, were still present and needed to be changed
28 and standardized.

29 The taskforce also discussed The Library of California Act (LoC). The original intent was to
30 implement LoC and replace CLSA. However, LoC was funded for three years only, resulting in
31 little for the LoC Board to manage other than CLSA programs. There has been good consensus
32 from the library community to repeal the LoC Act and focus energies on one law, an updated

1 CLSA. If that were to happen, the LoC Board would revert to the California Library Services
2 Board (CLSB), with whatever changes were decided to be made to CLSA.

3 The next part considered by the CLSA Taskforce, possible models for the future, was the
4 more difficult one. It was agreed that Regional Library Systems are still needed to help deploy
5 services. But they are also needed to represent the interests of the regions. It is very difficult in a
6 state the size of California for CSL to represent the entire state. But what a new model of the
7 Regional Library Systems could look like, including management and responsibilities, is still to
8 be decided.

9 How can funding be used to support a new model? If System-wide reference is no longer
10 considered viable, maybe that funding needs to go toward internet connectivity. Or maybe that
11 funding is better utilized for more types of delivery, not necessarily physical delivery, but print-
12 on-demand, electronic delivery, or digitization of information. An attempt is being made to
13 broaden the scope of what the Regional Systems could be doing.

14 The taskforce was divided into four groups, which resulted in four pictures being drawn of
15 what CLSA could look like. A webinar is planned for August or September in order to update
16 California Public Library Directors about the results of the CLSA Taskforce, as well as to get
17 their feedback on it. More about CLSA will be provided at the California Library Association
18 Conference in Pasadena in November of this year. An update was given to Senator Carol Liu's
19 office and a meeting is scheduled to discuss next steps, what the Senator's expectations are, and
20 how she can help us.

21 Aldrich is also seeking CLSA feedback from all of the LoC Board members. Is the network of
22 libraries in California being supported in the manner in which it needs to be supported? Member
23 Lowenthal asked who was on the taskforce. Aldrich replied that a small cross-section of
24 representative rural and urban libraries was selected. She explained the need to use a small
25 group, such as the taskforce, and then use the "pebble effect" where the taskforce takes the
26 information to the larger group (library directors), and then information flows back. Too large of
27 a group makes it difficult to accomplish anything.

28 Aldrich stated that she is concerned about the sustainability of the general fund for any of the
29 local assistance programs, so she is looking at the possibilities of revenue generating as a means
30 of funding CLSA beyond the general fund. One suggestion from a graduate from the Eureka
31 leadership program this year, was that California Drivers' licenses could be used as a library card
32 for a small fee. For instance, for two dollars, with 16 million drivers in California, there is a lot

1 of potential revenue. The costs of libraries have increased with things like connectivity,
2 computers, and the electricity to manage connectivity. So there are additional costs to
3 communities in ensuring access. Trying to think entrepreneurially, another suggestion for
4 enhancing revenue might be that the Regional Library Systems could digitize for communities
5 and not just for libraries, raising funds from those communities and thereby returning money
6 back into the System.

7 Member Murguia remarked that local libraries were funded in many different ways. They
8 often had difficult time raising revenue. She cited a recent election with two sales tax proposals
9 to fund the library in Crescent City, that lost by fifty votes due to a two-thirds majority
10 requirement. Whatever is done, Aldrich stated that a tax for libraries required that taxpayers see
11 what good their money was doing, what difference was being made, what access was being
12 provided. With the exception of roads, fire and police, libraries are one of the most visible
13 examples of the benefits of government service. Member Murguia humorously interjected that
14 libraries are certainly more popular than jails. To which Aldrich retorted that more libraries
15 would probably mean more literate people and fewer jails.

16 Aldrich stated that development of very robust CLSA services should be flexible enough to
17 allow for change in ten years time, should that become necessary with new things to do. How
18 money is managed and spent must not be unduly locked in place, as it is now. Perhaps services
19 should not be written into law in a too detailed manner, but rather emphasis should be placed on
20 library service outcomes and patron access.

21 Member McGinity asked when a bill would be ready. Aldrich said that the small changes
22 probably could be made soon. Larger issues would take longer, as a near consensus must be
23 achieved in California in order to ensure success. The LoC Act took nearly fifteen years to
24 complete! After getting input and feedback and playing out some scenarios in order to think
25 through the implications, including intended and unintended consequences, it would take about a
26 year or a year and a half to complete.

27 Member McGinity asked what would be needed from the LoC Board. Would Board approval
28 be sought at next summer's meeting? Would a draft proposal be prepared for the February Board
29 meeting? Aldrich responded that Board input definitely would be desirable. Realizing that not all
30 members could attend, it would be helpful if one or two members were at future CLSA
31 discussion meetings. In actually changing the law, as the main supporter of CLSA, the California
32 Library Association (CLA) would be involved. Member Maghsoudi would be attending the

1 meetings as President of CLA. Information could be sent out to Board Members for feedback.
2 Board approval would be necessary to move this project forward.

3 Member Fong approved of the effort to change CLSA; however, she cautioned against
4 throwing away the original intent of the LoC that included all types of libraries, and which was
5 fifteen years in the making. Maybe a broader structure could be established that would allow
6 greater flexibility. Reverting to CLSA would mark a return to support of public libraries only.

7 Member Fong recommended similarly that the Reference system be retained and supported,
8 keeping open the possibility of another kind of Reference, perhaps a second Internet Reference
9 system that has not yet been conceived and may be designated in other words. Much time, effort
10 and money had gone into getting the legislation to build and support LoC, so perhaps CLSA
11 should be built upon and modified to allow greater openness and flexibility.

12 Aldrich responded that the goal was not to make CLSA only for public libraries, but to
13 enhance it more broadly. From personal observations and conversations around the state of
14 California, mention of the unfunded LoC has elicited an expression on peoples' faces as though
15 they had just sucked upon a sour tart. For them, the unsupported regulations have been like the
16 proverbial albatross around the neck. If there is going to be change, it would be better to focus on
17 having one act in place to make sure resource sharing functions well. Once the format is down,
18 then the focus could shift to the other players and partners to invite to this effort. One of the
19 challenges as librarians is that we were not evolved to work cross-purposely.

20 Aldrich reported that the taskforce discussed how CLSA and LoC were very bureaucratic and
21 written with process and not actual benefit in mind. Rather, the focus should be on the benefit to
22 the people who are being served. But how that is done should be very flexible. Member Fong
23 commented that she would like to see just that. She has grown weary of an emphasis on
24 infrastructure. She wanted to ensure that a comparison of CLSA and LoC was made in order to
25 retain and enlarge necessary structures. Aldrich answered that Habbestad actually did make a
26 comparison to find similarities and differences, so those results are being considered during this
27 process. It was thought that the resulting document had been previously supplied to the Board,
28 but Board Members expressed a wish to have it again.

29 Member Fong pointed out that there was no state funding for special service programs now,
30 and many program components had not been funded in the past. But it appeared that soon the
31 LSTA federal programs may not be funded either. Libraries could not count upon that funding.
32 She suggested that libraries may want to consider charging for library cards.

1 Aldrich responded that no matter what is done, the fewer barriers erected by libraries, the
2 better would be the use of libraries by patrons. More barriers resulted in fewer library patrons.

3 Member Maghsoudi stated that the taskforce had gone through the LSTA legal document line
4 by line and page by page. She expressed her view that it most definitely needed a complete
5 overhaul. Otherwise, it would limit the functionality of the State Library as well as the libraries
6 across California, libraries trying to work together. LoC came about due to resource sharing, but
7 it is not guidelines that are needed.

8 Aldrich apologized for not communicating more with the LoC Board last year. A better effort
9 will be made to do so around topical areas this year. We would like to use the Board's time well,
10 to better utilize its expertise and to engage what is of interest to the Board.

11 Member Maghsoudi encouraged other members to attend the CLSA webinars. It would be
12 interesting to hear first hand what those who are practicing librarians have to say about this
13 information.

14 With respect to the changes that are being made, Member Fong would like to get a sense of
15 the standards for libraries and library services of the future. In the past, there were guidelines for
16 what a good library should have in place. Aldrich stated that this always makes for an interesting
17 discussion. Some states have minimum standards for what makes a good library. In California,
18 that would be an interesting challenge. Often the State Library receives inquiries for direction on
19 troublesome issues. Because of the way they are set up, County Libraries are more amenable to
20 assistance from the State. But municipal and city libraries do not allow much flexibility to help.
21 The CLSA discussion was more focused on standards for the Regional Systems, which have
22 functioned quite differently from one another up to now, so that the State Library might better
23 assist them.

24 Member Fong, referring to Aldrich's aforementioned ripple-effect, stated that if more were
25 known about what makes a good library, she could go back to her neighbors and constituents and
26 advocate for specific library improvements. Concrete standards assist in garnering support and
27 donations. Aldrich responded by referencing the Gates Foundation Benchmarks as being a very
28 good starting point for library standards. The challenge is that every library community is
29 different. Some communities may have a high number of PhDs per capita with wealth, where the
30 desire is for electronic content and wi-fi. Other areas may have no free access to the internet
31 except for the library and the patrons may have rudimentary computer skills and are doing job
32 development. It is very difficult to find a common standard. Member Maghsoudi did not think a

1 standard could be established successfully. Wide disparities of wealth make that impossible.
2 Aldrich found that the four funding models with Joint Powers Authority, City, County, and
3 Special Districts also show the difficulty in establishing a standard for libraries.

4 Aldrich next called the Board's attention to copies of the e-book study before them. Provided
5 by the consulting company Pinpoint Logic, it is about conversation and seven different scenarios
6 for libraries to think about. Hundreds of people were interviewed in all sectors of the e-book
7 world: librarians, e-book creators, device creators and contact providers. Another study that will
8 be sent to Board members is the Price-Waterhouse Report on e-books, probably one of the better
9 overviews on what is happening with e-books at this moment. Member Maghsoudi stated that
10 3-M is producing there own Cloud e-book, with two public libraries, Pasadena and Glendale,
11 deciding to use it.

12

13 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

14 Vera Skop, Coordinator, Serra Cooperative Library System, questioned if regulations were
15 necessary if there is no longer any state funding, and wondered if this was part of the taskforce
16 discussions. Aldrich responded that even without funding, the Act is still in place, although a bit
17 dormant. Nonetheless, it would be a good time to make improvements and show examples of
18 how it is working better with the changes. Some LSTA projects have been funded as pilot
19 programs to demonstrate whether a new proposal can work in the CLSA realm. However, if all
20 funding were to be lost, going back to every library charging for service, it would be a very
21 challenging uphill battle to recover state funded resource sharing programs.

22 Annette Milliron DeBacker, Executive Director, NorthNet Library System, asked if Plans of
23 Service are to be redone now that the Board has adopted a baseline budget; or do we wait until
24 January to see if funding remains in the state budget? Habbestad responded that if there is
25 funding, the baseline budget part must be redone. Whether services will change depends upon
26 the amount of funding. Aldrich pointed out that there is a possibility that funding may not be cut
27 entirely, but only portions may be taken. So, there may be another reduction, or funding could be
28 lost altogether.

29

30 **BOARD COMMENTS**

31

1 Member Maghsoudi began by stating that usage at her local library, Whittier Public, had
2 increased considerably. Her library was fortunate to be in a community that was very supportive.
3 As an example that people still value libraries, she reported that over 3,000 people came to the
4 Summer Reading Program celebration. During the summer, more than 25,000 books had been
5 read from two locations. Whittier was beginning an expansion and remodel of a branch library,
6 which indicates the level of support the local council and community provides. She encouraged
7 other librarians to continue their work.

8 Member Zollman welcomed new Board Member Gregory McGinity. She reported that in
9 Oakland this past year, fourteen out of eighteen libraries were going to close; but the community
10 rallied by finding lawyers, picketing, marching and being arrested for violating public space, all
11 in support of libraries. All of the libraries are open now, although some are at reduced levels of
12 service. Working with Oakland school children in very poor communities, Member Zollman was
13 pleased that they still had this resource open to them.

14 Member Fong welcomed Member McGinity, expressed appreciation for his good questions,
15 and looked forward to working together. Like Member Maghsoudi, she was fortunate to be in a
16 community very supportive of libraries. She looked forward, with hope, to the legislative
17 changes that were being considered even though the lack of funding was depressing. She thanked
18 CSL staff for the information that had been prepared for the meeting.

19 Member Murguia welcomed Member McGinity to the Board and congratulated the esteemed
20 new officers of the Board. She was very interested in the rewrite of CLSA and looked forward to
21 engaging with it over the next several months. As public resources contract at every level, it
22 becomes more important to ensure that the Systems are as efficient and responsive as they can
23 be. During these hard economic times, there has been a huge increase in library usage in her
24 community. As a private fundraiser for the public library in Humboldt County where she lives,
25 she has seen that there is still interest from the community to respond and donate funds to the
26 library foundation in support of her local library. Libraries have not become isolated and
27 obsolete, although they do face challenges to survive. She looks forward to being more engaged
28 during this next year.

29 Member Lowenthal began by thanking the community for being present and helping the
30 Board to better understand what is happening in the field. She thanked CSL staff for preparing
31 the information to aid in the Board's understanding. She also thanked Vice-President Bernardo
32 and Member Maghsoudi for taking on their additional leadership roles. She offered her

1 assistance and involvement in the matters discussed today. She went on to welcome Member
2 McGinity and having learned of his background and passion for children's education,
3 acknowledged his great value to the LoC Board. To close her comments on a cheerful note,
4 Member Lowenthal stated in March of this year, the City of Los Angeles had Proposition L on
5 the ballot, which would increase the library's diminishing service hours and book budget.
6 Fortunately, the measure passed with a 63% super majority vote securing Los Angeles Public
7 Library's funding for years to come, with enough money to restore service to 2008/2009 levels.

8 Member McGinity thanked the Board members for their welcoming remarks. He was very
9 glad to be a part of this esteemed body and looks forward to contributing over time. He thanked
10 Maginnity and Habbestad for the orientation session yesterday and Aldrich for their conversation
11 today. He asked if the State Librarian has complete discretion over the use of LSTA funds, or
12 does this Board or some peer group provide review to assist in its use? Or do people send grant
13 applications for your review and final decision? Aldrich responded that many years ago the
14 Board, in its role as LSTA Advisory Council, reviewed each individual grant. Now it functions
15 in a more advisory role with respect to LSTA. The State Library shares information with the
16 Advisory Council who provides input to ensure that the State Library is paying attention to other
17 areas where money could be invested.

18 Vice-President Bernardo thanked everyone for attending the Board meeting. She appreciated
19 the dedication to libraries and work done in the field. The California Library News Report
20 frequently contains good stories about California libraries. She was very proud of the library
21 profession, especially considering the tremendous work that librarians do under the challenging
22 conditions. Vice-President Bernardo welcomed Member McGinity and acknowledged the hard
23 work of the State Librarian and her staff.

24

25 **ADGENDA BUILDING**

26

27 Vice-President Bernardo next invited the Board to prepare an agenda for the next Board
28 meeting in February 2012. Aldrich advanced CLSA and the budget for consideration. Member
29 Maghsoudi took this opportunity to invite anyone interested to attend the CLA Conference in
30 Pasadena on November 11-13. A special package has been arranged for Board members and
31 Trustees at a very nominal fee of \$75. You get to listen to legislative updates, attend a luncheon
32 recognizing Senator Liu, and go to an award reception recognizing programs and individuals
33 throughout the state for their contributions to libraries. The CLA website has registration

1 information. Vice-President Bernardo concluded that the CLSA legislation and budget were on
2 the agenda for February.

3

4 **ADJOURNMENT**

5

6 Vice-President Bernardo had a request to adjourn the meeting in the memory of John
7 Kallenberg, who passed away on July 4, 2011.

8

9 **It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Zolman) and carried unanimously that the**
10 **Library of California Board adjourn the meeting in the memory of John**
11 **Kallenberg.**

12

13 Vice-President Bernardo adjourned the Library of California Board meeting at 12:50 p.m. in
14 memory of John Kallenberg.

Library of California Board Resolution 2011-01

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Penny G. Kastanis for her distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her term of service as a Member of the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to honor Penny for her outstanding public service representing the Public-at-Large since her appointment by former Governor Gray Davis on January 14, 2003; and

WHEREAS, Penny has advocated for libraries, and especially school libraries, at the state and federal level on behalf of the Board and the greater library community, and extended her knowledge and expertise in education and school library services to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to honor Penny for her distinguished service to the Library of California Board as its President from 2008-2010; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that Penny was on the Executive Planning Committee for the Sierra Valley Library Network from 1998-2001, and helped to frame the programs of the Library of California, enacted in 1998; and

WHEREAS, Penny has served as Executive Director for the California School Library Association (CSLA), and was named the recipient of CSLA's Honorary Membership Award in 2000, a lifetime achievement award given to an outstanding retiree for distinguished contributions to the profession and organization over a sustained period of time; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that Penny is a member of many other professional organizations, namely the American Library Association; International Reading Association; and the California Reading Association, where she served as Chair of Authors Presentations at the State Conference in 2000; and as President of the Sacramento Area Reading Association in 2000 and 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to recognize Penny's outstanding contributions to school libraries, to education, and to the people of the State of California to learn and obtain information through our libraries.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

*the Library of California Board
extends its sincere appreciation and deep regard to*

PENNY G. KASTANIS

*for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 11 August 2011*

Library of California Board Resolution 2011-02

WHEREAS, on July 4, 2011, the Library of California Board, California State Library and the library community was saddened by the sudden loss of one of its dedicated colleagues, John Kallenberg; and

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board wishes to express its heart-felt sympathy to his wife Ruth, and their family; and

WHEREAS, the Board, staff, and library colleagues throughout California and beyond will always remember John as an intelligent and gracious professional who spent most of his career as Director of the Fresno County Library system, and the System Coordinator for the San Joaquin Valley Library System, until his retirement in 2003; and

WHEREAS, John continued to provide outstanding public service to libraries when he was first appointed to the California Library Services Board by former Governor George Deukmejian in 1990, and his subsequent reappointments in 1994 by former Governor Pete Wilson, and in 1998 under new legislation, to the Library of California Board; John's final reappointment came in 2003 by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger prior to his retirement; and

WHEREAS, during his tenure on the State Board, John served with distinction as its President from 1996-1998, and again in 2003; served as the Board's Vice-President in the proceeding four years, from 1992-1995; and chaired numerous committees; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that John was a very active member of many library organizations, including the California Library Association, where he served as its President in 1987; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that

*the Library of California Board
extends its sincere sympathy and deep regard to
the family of*

JOHN K. KALLENBERG

*for his distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 11 August 2011*

2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget Recommendation			
Program	2010/11 CLSA Baseline Budget	Proposed 2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget	Percentage Reduction
Transaction Based Reimbursement	\$10,182,000	\$6,182,900	39.3%
Cooperative Library Systems	\$2,726,000	\$2,317,100	15.0%
Total	\$12,908,000	\$8,500,000	34.1%