Approved August 16, 2012

Library of California Board Meeting
February 16, 2012

California State Library
900 N Street, Room 501
Sacramento, California

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

President Anne Bernardo convened the Library of California Board meeting on February 16, 2012 at 9:00 a.m., and welcomed Board Members, staff and audience to Sacramento and called for introductions.

Board Members Present: Conchita Battle, Anne Bernardo, Tyrone Cannon, Victoria Fong, Jane F. Lowenthal, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity and Elizabeth Murguia.

Not Present: Judy Zollman.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the February 16, 2012 meeting as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board approves the draft minutes of the August 11, 2011 meeting as corrected.

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President's Report

President Bernardo summarized her activities, stating that she had been attending the California Library Association (CLA) Legislative Advocacy Committee meetings, mostly by conference call; and has sent emails to Board members about her role as liaison. She thanked

those who had taken steps to help with awareness of the Committee. President Bernardo attended the advocacy day in November 2011 and stated that it was very informative, the presenters were excellent, and it was well attended. She was happy to hear about the issues that libraries around California were facing, and what was needed for them to get on board.

She attended the California County Law Librarians meetings and Trustee Conference in the fall. It was good to hear what colleagues in the field were up against, especially in light of their relationships with public library colleagues.

She reminded Board members that she continues to sit on the Heartland Regional Library Network Board, which was still active and vital in central California. The council would be meeting next month.

President Bernardo recently participated with Anne Marie Gold in a review of LSTA. It was interesting to learn what LSTA funds had accomplished during the last five years.

Board Vice-President's Report

Vice-President Paymaneh Maghsoudi reported that the CLA Conference in Pasadena had been very successful thanks to the new joint management group of the Pacific Library Partnership and the Southern California Library Cooperative.

Whittier Public Library had been busy dealing with local issues, building a new library and expanding a branch library. The city council had decided to invest in the community and had just approved everything on Tuesday night. Invitations would be sent out for the new library grand opening in December.

She had been working on several grants through LSTA. She had also had a conversation with Anne Marie Gold about LSTA 5-year evaluation, and had attended an LSTA focus group in Southern California.

Chief Executive Officer's Report

State Librarian Stacey A. Aldrich gave the following report:

Renovation Project

She had been working on a couple of organizational projects. The California State Library (CSL) was preparing for two moves: the first at the Library & Courts I building. Although it was still under renovation, it should be done in November or December of this year. The move back was planned for early next year.

Aldrich had learned that a big groundbreaking event was done for LCI, but never a grand opening ceremony. To rectify that deficiency, some kind of special event would be planned for re-opening the renovated building.

Walkthroughs of LCI revealed amazing results where the renovators had knocked out obstructions to all of the blocked-off light wells. But due to the removal and relocation of the heating and air ducts from the light wells, about 18,000 linear square feet of collection space was lost. Fortunately, permission was granted to add more stacks to LCII, which should make up for the loss. Their strategic placement was now under consideration.

Aldrich next addressed the Sutro Library, in San Francisco, stating that the new building is almost complete. The move is planned sometime within the next two months. An enormous portrait of Adoph Sutro, deemed too expensive to install in the new Sutro Library, was being relocated to the Stanley Mosk Library and hung in a new section devoted to Adoph Sutro. Other pieces of the Sutro collection would be brought here, which would serve to inform people about the Sutro Library. A grand opening celebration was planned for next fall.

Library Budget and Staffing

Aldrich reported that $1.1 million had been removed from the State Library budget, because local assistance program funds had been zeroed out. The Department of Finance somehow determined that thirteen staff positions managed those programs and were no longer needed. However, as the CSL only had two staff who worked across many of those programs, with other staff working on parts only, Aldrich was trying to persuade Finance that it was really equivalent to around five positions total, not thirteen.

Member McGinity asked how many employees CSL had four years ago. Aldrich answered that there were 191 employees when she started, but 50 positions had been lost since then. He asked if staff had been reduced by attrition or layoffs; Aldrich responded that the Library had been lucky because there had been retirements as well as vacant positions that could be let go. Layoffs had not been necessary and even with the current budget situation she did not think that would be an issue. They had been working with Finance to sort it all out.

The challenge was that there also needed to be salary savings. Once the vacancies were removed, then salary savings were lost. That means greater reliance on student assistants and retired annuitants, the latter of which the Library had been relying heavily upon to return and fill some of the holes.

The Library was getting much more efficient at public service. Many phone calls had come from people confusing CSL with Sacramento Public Library, but a new phone system had alleviated that problem. Another challenge facing CSL was staffing of LCI after the move back into the renovated building; planning for that required flexibility. A new reference tracking system was being implemented, which should allow staff to work together and assist each other with questions. Texting would be enabled soon, allowing people to text CSL with a question.

Stanford Demographic Study

Another project, mentioned at the last Board meeting, was Understanding California's Demographic Shifts. The Stanford Center on Longevity was contracted to go through the Census and the American Lifestyle Study, and put together an overview and demographic profile for every public library jurisdiction in the state. The project was designed to help local libraries have strategic conversations around data. Suzanne Flint, Library Programs Consultant, was thanked for leading the effort and working directly with Stanford. To view each library's profile and the California Demographic Overview, go to the Publications tab on the CSL website, and then to Statistics.

Many of the libraries reported that they were having good conversations about those they served. Flint commented that the demographic information was delivered to all of the state legislators. Representatives of CSL were warmly received by many legislative staff, who told them that the information would be very helpful. She suggested that this information would be a good tool any time there were conversations with staff of state legislators.

Aldrich informed the Board that the Library also delivered the full set of demographic information, consisting of four binders, to the Governor's office. The Center on Longevity at Stanford sent a copy of the information directly to Senator Feinstein, who was reported to be excited about the data.

The population data had revealed some surprising facts. For example, recent California immigrant populations were being offset by nearly the same number of departing populations.

Also included in the study were questions, called Drawing Conclusions, provided to help libraries think about their data in context with the state, and with their communities.

Member McGinity asked for clarification about who had received the demographic information. Aldrich answered that it had been sent to all California library directors, who in turn would make it available to their communities. It was also available on the CSL website.

CSL and Stanford had purposely contrived to make the information very graphical and visual. Also, a webinar had been produced and given to the libraries to provide an overview of the project, with Stanford available to answer questions. The webinar was available on the CSL website, as well.

Member McGinity next asked whether this information had resulted in any new courses of actions for the State Library. Aldrich responded that the new demographic data, revealing major population and regional differences, would affect how the next LSTA plan was being written.

Jennifer Baker, St. Helena Library Director and representing NorthNet, stated that this document had been a huge tool for their community. Already the information had been presented at two community meetings, stimulating a conversation about it. It was being used to make changes to the budget and to write grants. It contained many interesting facts, facts specific to their community, facts about which they were ignorant, and confirmation of things about their community they thought might be true.

Member McGinity asked whether other state agencies had received the demographic studies. Aldrich answered that they were on the list to receive them. A full set of data was given to the Department of Education. Whenever interaction with other agencies occurred, CSL tried to pass the data along and to have a conversation with them.

Concerning the future of libraries, more content design and development should be done. A next step might be designing a tool that allowed people to mash up the data according to their own needs.

Member McGinity suggested that Aldrich address the Governor's general cabinet meeting for 20 minutes to get information out quickly. Aldrich responded that it was difficult to get into those meetings. Although she had a person that she went through, there was not much feedback.

When asked who paid for the demographics project, Aldrich responded that LSTA paid for the study. It took six months to complete at a cost of $100,000. This is why LSTA dollars were so important – it allowed CSL to do things like this. In response to another question, Aldrich said that the State Library sought out Stanford to do the work, having successfully worked with them before on the Transforming Life After 50 project.

Online Digital Literacy Tool

JobScout was another project about which Aldrich was excited. Looking at last year's public library statistics there were 181 public libraries jurisdictions, 1116 branches or outlets, with 96% of libraries providing some kind of job assistance. At the state level, Aldrich had been participating in an advisory group for digital literacy, concerned with how people were taught digital literacy skills. The statewide definition is almost a paragraph long, but digital literacy is really about having the skill and knowledge to use digital resources, to interact, to engage, to create, and to be a participant in society.

The advisory group had been working with the Link America Foundation, RealPolitech and the California Emerging Technology Fund to create an online digital literacy training tool that could be used in libraries, for people who want to learn how to find a job. JobScout is a pilot tool currently being beta tested right now in Yolo County, San Jose County, County of Los Angeles, and Santa Cruz County. After the kinks have been worked out, JobScout will be placed as a link on the State Library website.

JobScout was designed to be fun and non-intimidating for people who have never used the internet. Some social gaming features were planned for the future. A user could learn to do two things: take lessons and search for a job. A librarian could sit down with a user to get started. Afterwards, a user could use the modules and learn about a browser and how to open an email account. Each module tells the user how long it would take to complete. For each module completed, the user is awarded a badge. It begins with the basics the user needs to know, then continues with how to use the internet, how to do social networking, and how to build a resume and prepare for an interview.

When the user first logs on, an account can be created very easily, without any personal information other than a name. The pilot has revealed that users love the resume builder. Just fill in the blanks, using the examples, and the resume is placed into one of the standard formats. It is then saved into the user's account or printed out. Eventually, there will be a capacity to email the resume directly from the program to whatever job search site the user happens to be using.

The JobScout pilot has generated a lot of interesting feedback, with mixed responses on the cartoon characters - everything from "this is cute and engaging," to "this is too juvenile."

The advisory group is finding that seasoned job hunters are using JobScout for the resume builder, to search for jobs, and for social networking. But other users are beginning from scratch to learn how to use a browser and how to get a free email account.

LSTA money has been used to seed the development of this program and more needs to be raised to distribute this digital literacy tool to all the public libraries, including funds for support materials to help libraries train users. National attention has been focused on this program because the White House has been very interested in promoting digital literacy and job search skills.

Member Cannon asked whether portions of JobScout could be used in isolation. Aldrich answered that a new user must create an account and take a quiz to determine skill level. Depending on the test result, the site unlocks what the user needs to know, and as the user learns a new skill, another skill will unlock. At the very beginning, if the user does not know anything about computers, one thing at a time will open up. But the resume and job search resources do not require prior training modules. Eventually, JobScout will be customized for each individual library's available job search resources.

Member Murguia asked whether there had been coordination with EDD job centers. Aldrich responded that EDD had been at the digital literacy table and a partner in all the conversations. The primary focus of JobScout has been on helping people get the digital literacy skills they needed for job hunting and how to get people to find out about what libraries have to offer. Tie-ins with EDD have been discussed, but no one thing is going to be replaced. EDD has a new site ready to come out that will probably be linked on JobScout.

Using JobScout as a platform, more Scouts are being envisioned. For example, HealthScout for health information, and CivicScout to help people learn where to vote in elections, and how to find and evaluate information on the internet. It is really about literacy, with libraries helping people learn the skills they need. The Library is looking for the partners to make connections and work together to accomplish this goal.

Member Fong asked about the extent of progress on this project. Aldrich said it was growing every day, but the challenge was ensuring enough dollars to build back-end support after LSTA money was no longer made available. A representative from Link Americas Foundation has been looking at how to raise funding. Because California helped to fund JobScout development, the service will be free to California. If the platform is successful, it

will be made available at the national level, as other state librarians have expressed interest in having a tool like this in their libraries.

Member McGinity asked who would be using this tool and how many. Aldrich responded that how many used the library varied regionally and what segment of the population would use it was difficult to determine. People of all sorts tend to find available tools and put them to their own particular uses. Member Cannon commented that there are different levels of literacy. Aldrich added that a user had to be pretty literate to use JobScout. Having spoken to literacy people about it, someone who is illiterate probably would not be able to use it. The developers have been working on the language level in this program, as it is rather high.

Once the platform is stable, it will be translated for the large Spanish speaking population. Not just words will be translated into Spanish, but a "culturally appropriate" tool will be prepared for Spanish speakers.

A social networking piece will be rolled out in March, so that JobScout users will be able to talk with other people who might be looking for a job in a certain area. There are plans to create applications for telephones and iPads. When asked about privacy and protection issues, Aldrich responded that a safety module was still being developed.

Teenagers are reporting that they like JobScout, especially the gaming qualities. It seems to appeal to a wide range of people. Board Members can go online and take a look at it for themselves; Aldrich will forward any ideas or questions to the developers.

Internet Archive Project

Aldrich reported that the State Library has been working with the Internet Archive in San Francisco to make State Library materials and resources more accessible and free to the public. The CSL has a collection of interesting old newspapers and journals that people request and use, but had been inaccessible online. CSL has been working with the Internet Archive to digitize some of the collections, which are now available at their website, and soon will be made available on CSL's website.

To see what CSL has been digitizing, type *State Library* into the search topic box on the Internet Archive site. Aldrich is particularly excited about The Wasp, a mid-nineteenth century San Francisco newspaper. If we think politics are awful today, reading The Wasp will disavow that it is anything new. Political discourse was so nasty that "the sting of The Wasp" became a byword. It can be read online, or downloaded as a PDF or to a Kindle. Whenever Internet Archive produces a version of anything, they create it in multiple formats to ensure

wider access. Because CSL had a request for the California Constitution from 1849 to 1879, it too has been made available on the Internet Archive. CSL has set up a digitization station in LCII to digitize the unique publications in the collection not held by copyright. Digitized material is being put up on Internet Archive first, to be channeled through CSL's website later on, after its redesign has been completed.

In order to get more books out to libraries and the public, Internet Archive has created a lending library. California libraries may join by simply donating a book. The donated material, under copyright, is first digitized; then the physical item is locked away making it unavailable. Only one copy is available to loan online at a time. CSL is hoping to help Internet Archive provide more access for library users, as well as more access to information.

BUDGET AND PLANNING

Aldrich reviewed the Governor's budget proposed for last year, which eliminated all CLSA funding for FY 2011/12, approximately $12.9 million. In response, the California Library Association (CLA) went to work holding budget talks and informing legislative staff of the importance of CLSA, resulting in half of the previous year's appropriation ($15.2 million for the three local assistance programs) being returned to the State Library budget, which included $8.5 million for CLSA. The caveat was the trigger bill, AB 121, which stated if California did not get a $4 billion revenue stream by December 2011, program funding would be cut. The first trigger included five CSL programs: CLSA, Public Library Fund (PLF), California Library Literacy Services, California Civil Liberties Public Education Program (CCLPEP), and the California Newspaper Project. When the trigger was pulled in December 2011, all funding for these five programs was zeroed out, leaving no funding for CLSA Cooperative Systems and Transaction Based Reimbursements (TBR). The total loss of state funding for local library programs (CLSA, Literacy, PLF) for FY 2011/12 was $30,390,000.

In the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2012/13, again, there was a zero budget for all of the same programs. CLA is advocating getting funding back in the budget for these programs.

The library has been producing informational packets to explain why CLSA is important and what funding it requires as it is part of the LSTA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement for acquiring federal Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) funds, which was addressed later in the LSTA Advisory Council meeting. Aldrich stated that it will

be very difficult to get federal dollars from IMLS if California doesn't provide any state funding for its public libraries.

President Bernardo stated that some attendees at a recent CLA Legislative Advocacy Committee (LAC) meeting did not understand the implication of the loss of money through the trigger bill, or that it would affect federal dollars. Aldrich responded that although it had been explained, some folks thought the trigger would only reduce the budget, or that the Library was spending money up to the point of the trigger, not realizing that a pulled trigger eliminated all of the money.

Aldrich observed that another challenge for local libraries was finding ways to continue sharing resources, as local dollars were also cut. It was harder and harder to provide interlibrary loans when the cost of shipping is about $6 to $7 an item, and the state was reimbursing only $1.60 per item. Although it was a small reimbursement, without any state assistance libraries were considering charging patrons. She reminded the libraries that CLSA was still in effect and the rules concerning fees continued to apply.

Member Murguia asked what the maintenance of effort level was and what would be lost from the federal government if it was not met. Aldrich reviewed the table in the Board packet, which provided a detailed overview of the LSTA funding cycles from federal fiscal year 2009 to 2014. She stated that in addition to not meeting the MOE, the state may not meet the match as well. After a lengthy discussion, Aldrich summarized by stating that the maintenance of effort determines how much money can be received in the federal grant allotment, and the match determines how much of the grant allotment can be spent. If the State Library can only match 3%, then it can only spend 3% of its allotment. She reported that CSL could request a waiver for the MOE; however, there are three conditions for submitting a waiver to IMLS. The state must have had: 1) a natural disaster, 2) an unexpected financial disaster or economic issue, or 3) fiscal cuts that have been proportionally exacted across all state agencies. When determining a waiver request, IMLS looks at each state individually. Clearly, California does not meet the first two conditions, but it might qualify under the third condition; however, it could prove very challenging.

Member Cannon asked whether the State library would have another opportunity to present a case to the state. Could the Board do anything? Aldrich replied that the Board could write letters and speak with assembly members and especially the people on the budget

committees. Aldrich and Maginnity would be providing them information, but CLA is the voice for the public libraries.

Linda Crowe, speaking on behalf of CLA, stated that a huge campaign was conducted by CLA last year to get money put back into the State Library budget. CLA used CAPWIZ, an online legislative advocacy tool developed by ALA to make it easier to get information to legislators. It provides form letters and helps locate and send those letters to key people in the relevant jurisdictions or districts.

Aldrich has been speaking with folks at the State Capitol about the importance of the budget for library programs. She was not only concerned about CLSA and the affect those funds have on the federal dollars, but particularly concerned about the literacy programs shutting down, which served over 20,000 people. If you included family literacy programs, that number would rise to over 40,000 people served. With community colleges being cut, literacy programs were no longer available and most adult learners using public libraries for literacy would not go to a community college for literacy services. Libraries were one of the only places left where they had not disappeared from the community.

Member Lowenthal expressed that Board meetings be held while the legislature is in session in order to make visits. She also recommended the Legislative Roster as an important contact information tool.

President Bernardo reported that the CLA Legislative Advocacy Committee was developing Month in the District for March, organizing libraries and friends to talk to legislators. She would be forwarding that information from LAC. The CLA website explained some of the LSTA issues they were trying to measure. Aware of the importance of clear and simple information, CLA is working to convey an effective message to the legislators about the dire library budget situation.

Maginnity wanted to clarify the total loss of funding to CSL. Just over a year ago, the Governor proposed zero for the State Library budget. However, it was important to remember that the budget was over $30 million in FY 2010/11. Confusion resulted when the Assembly put half the money back in, so that when the trigger was pulled, it appeared to some individuals that the Library only lost $15 million; but it actually lost close to $30.4 million. This year, once again, the budget is back to zero.

Aldrich said that CLA is advocating for $15 million back into the budget for FY 2012/13. It is very important to have some money put back into the budget; otherwise it will be very

hard to make a case to IMLS that California should get a waiver. Last year twelve state libraries could not make MOE, and only ten asked for waivers. This year eighteen were expected to ask for waivers. Member McGinity inquired whether other state library budgets had been zeroed out. Aldrich responded that Texas was also zeroed out. However, a few states like Arkansas, Oklahoma and Wyoming were doing alright; but libraries like California and Texas were experiencing a double whammy, losing money at both state and federal levels.

Member McGinity asked whether anyone had spoken to former State Librarian Kevin Starr about doing an Op Ed piece in the LA Times, the Chronicle, or some other venue. Dr. Starr would be the natural choice to make a good public case explaining why libraries are important in the context of a Google universe. Aldrich remarked that it was a great idea and she would contact him. Member Bernardo encouraged Board members to contact friends to write letters to restore funds. Crowe reminded Board members that March is CLA's Month in the District, so it was important to target people and get in touch with the legislator from their own district.

Legislative Update

Aldrich addressed the two documents in the Board packet. The first, *A Report on Summit Proceedings*, was developed from a one-day meeting with public library directors to review the changes proposed by the CLSA Task Force for the California Library Service Act law, and gain consensus to those changes within the public library community. Particular areas of the law were identified that could be updated to allow better efficiencies for what needed to be done in the 21st century, rather than being constrained by conditions once relevant during the 1970s. Library directors were encouraged to evaluate and discuss anything additional they wanted to pursue. After several meetings with Senator Carol Liu about CLSA, the Senator offered to sponsor a bill that would make changes to the law.

The second document in the packet was sent to Senator Liu and provided the proposed changes to laws affecting California public libraries. Only slight modifications to achieve greater efficiency were being proposed. For instance, there are System Advisory Boards (SAB) for which money must be budgeted, even though they are redundant to other boards. The proposed changes would eliminate SAB.

Reference transactions have gone down at the regional level, with money better spent in other ways in those regions, so their elimination is being sought. There is a provision about special service programs, but there is no state funding. This program was intended for

cooperative systems to come to the Board and ask for funding, but federal dollars ended up being spent to fund the programs that the state failed to fund. The proposed change would eliminate this section of the Education Code.

The Library of California Act, never funded adequately, was built before the advent of the internet, at a time when resource sharing was being considered. It was meant to replace CLSA, but it never did and never will. To become more productive and efficient, a single law rather than two is sought. The plan is to eliminate the Library of California Act, while proposing language that ensures the LoC Board reverts to the California Library Services Board, which is basically what the Board oversees now.

These are the changes being sought immediately; but other changes are being considered over the long term, including definitions for resource sharing. At present, two definitions are used for direct lending, equal access and universal borrowing, which is very confusing. Aldrich also wanted to look at how partnerships can be created, as well as the dynamics around bringing together other kinds of libraries. She stressed making the language in CLSA for 2012 rather than 1977, while making the new law flexible and dynamic enough to thrive, with the further changes that occur every two years.

Member Murguia asked if Senator Liu would be carrying the legislative changes this year. Aldrich replied that the Senator had put in a spot bill as a placeholder, which would be edited to include the changes within thirty days. CLA would be working with her on that. Member Cannon asked whether the bill would pass unimpeded. Aldrich did not foresee any difficulty because the changes were small, the library community was behind it and the Senator was sponsoring it. The Senator wanted to keep passage of the bill in the forefront. The revised CLSA law would probably go into effect in January 2013. After it passes, the Board would be responsible for looking over and approving changes to the regulations. Habbestad had already begun searching for all the regulations affected by the changes.

RESOURCE SHARING

Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs

Habbestad stated that even though funding was not provided for the current fiscal year, the State Library was continuing to collect data from library participants to show the value of the program in securing financial support in the future. The first two quarter's ILL data showed a drop in the reported transactions.

Member McGinity asked whether any of the Regional Systems would close due to insufficient funding. In the minutes from the last Board meeting 49-99 and NorthNet indicated closing after six months, and Inland closing after a year. Aldrich replied that faster declines were being seen with other Systems, including Serra, which is struggling to survive. Maginnity added that some Systems had substantial financial reserves to sustain them, but the three that did not, NorthNet, Serra and Inland, were struggling. Closure seemed imminent for Serra and Inland.

Member McGinity asked if the State Library could assist in any way to prevent a System from closing. Aldrich responded that the State Library had used LSTA dollars to provide money to the regions to help them plan. For example, a facilitator was hired to help NorthNet figure out what a closure would mean for them and what options were available to remain open. They are still working through the logistics of that. With the Serra System, it is the libraries themselves that are really struggling. From the State Library's standpoint regional libraries are necessary – the state is just too big to do statewide initiatives without knowing how each region functions. So, the State Library has been having ongoing conversations and looking at how much federal money there is left to spend over the next six months. The Systems have been given planning money from LSTA and CSL has been considering how else it might help out the regions. If the libraries do not have resources and are unable to remain together, should the State Library assist them in becoming a part of another system? Or does the Library begin developing strategies to provide projects for the support of higher level needs for a region? Responding to a question from Member McGinity, Aldrich stated that regional Systems have gone from about twenty to fifteen, and then to eight in 2009. Some have predicted the eventual collapse into two Systems. However, the NorthNet System is huge, going from Sacramento and extending to the Oregon border, with some of its branches in very rural areas and quite distant from one another. The System's size and divergent needs of the libraries within itself presents challenges.

Maginnity gave another example, the San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS) in central California, extending from Kern County to Merced County. Since the early nineteen eighties, all of the SJVLS libraries had shared one automated library system, so they had intense resource sharing for years. CLSA partially subsidized their deliveries. Because of all the resource sharing, they received a tremendous amount of TBR funding through ILL. State reimbursement to member libraries was forwarded to the System, which helped hold costs

down for their members. Because they wanted to continue their close association, they were trying to figure out their future without state money.

Member McGinity asked if the cost for ILL referred to moving an actual, physical book or document from one building to another. Aldrich replied in the affirmative, but there was also the leveraging of databases, with money being spent to buy them. So, electronic content was being covered, too. As it stood now, the law was designed around reimbursement for the sharing of physical objects. As libraries moved toward electronic objects, we need to determine how they could be compensated. Furthermore, the question arises about what a collection looks like. One of the things being asked was why California did not have a single, statewide, integrated online catalog. And what would that look like. This is an instance of a new desire for leveraging at the State level not apparent before. Right now, there are many different types of catalog formats statewide. Aldrich would like to see more Print on Demand and sharing of electronic resources.

Member McGinity commented that only a small percentage of the population had access to things like ebooks. Aldrich replied that when talking about the future sharing and leveraging of CLSA resources, infrastructure was a huge, important issue. How was sustainable connectivity to be built for all libraries? And a second issue was that many libraries were now creating and building content about local history, local authors, etc. So how could the State Library ensure that such content was scanned into digital format and made accessible by sustainable connectivity?

Member McGinity next asked whether a case could be made to build this new vision for a certain amount of dollars, with another lesser amount proposed to sustain it annually from CLSA funding. Aldrich and others responded with an emphatic “yes.” Aldrich stated that in order to accommodate future spending in CLSA to create these resources, Senator Liu advised writing a library vision statement. There was already a one-page statement, but currently, a small group of public library directors were building a case and crafting a vision statement for California libraries, including what funding would be needed to realize it. The small group was working on the bone-structure of the statement, but there would be another meeting of all the public library directors in June to talk about how they could fill it in. A completed report stating the vision and how it could be realized and sustained was expected in the fall.

CLSA System Reference/Communications and Delivery/System Advisory Board Programs

Habbestad made available to the Board summaries of achievements derived from System Annual Reports submitted for Reference, Communications and Delivery, and System Advisory Board Programs. Member McGinity asked about a policy adopted by the Board in 1985 and whether it needed to be updated. Habbestad replied that it was still in effect and that System administration had been included in the original law, but it was never funded. On their own authority, the Board took action to fund the System administration piece from existing and new funding from each program.

LEGISLATIVE

President Bernardo directed attention to recent federal legislative activity. Aldrich stated that the federal focus of attention right now was on anything having to do with copyright, especially in relation to e-books. President Bernardo pointed out that President Obama had recently proposed awarding IMLS the same amount of funding this year as last year. Since the Board last met, the Governor signed SB 602, Senator Leland Yee's bill, the Reader Privacy Act, which established consumer protections for book purchases similar to long-established privacy laws for library records; and AB 438, Assemblyman Das Williams' bill, which imposes specific requirements if a city or library district intends to withdraw from the county free library system and operate with a private contractor. Aldrich stated that due to financial strain at the local level more people from around the state were talking about outsourcing their library management, asking what it would mean, how it would work and how the new legislation would apply.

President Bernardo concluded with mention that AB 597, Assemblyman Mike Eng's bill, California Financial Literacy Fund, was signed by the Governor.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jennifer Baker, Director at St. Helena Public Library, stated that CLSA funds made up 20% of her library's budget. With an additional loss of 20% of her library's general fund revenue, there would be a 40% budget reduction in FY 2012/13. Because of reserve funds, their library could continue to function for a year or two; however, if the budget problem was not resolved within two or three years, staff would be reduced to less than half and library hours reduced to three days a week.

Aldrich stated that statistics compiled on the CSL website, which are last year's data, showed libraries had lost 5% of their open hours, while people using the library had only dropped by 1%. With Wi-Fi access, people were bringing their laptops to access the Internet from outside the building, even when the library was closed. It was a challenge for the State Library to make folks at the Capitol aware that the results of decisions made today had consequences, such as branch closures, one to two years later.

Baker conveyed that with the loss of direct loan dollars, the library community was beginning to have discussions about charging patrons for service; however, it appeared that fees to recoup costs would be so high as to become a barrier to public service.

Aldrich stated that agreement had nearly been reached across California to establish a statewide library card, but with no funding, the incentive of sharing made it harder to do a statewide card. She and the library directors across the state wanted libraries in California to work together, share resources, and make access to library services easier for people. Even Santa Clara County Library, who is now charging $80 per year to non-resident users, would come back to the CLSA if funding was returned because they got enough flack for its decision to charge. But at this point, keeping the library doors open with the available money was the greater priority for many libraries.

COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Member Fong was very impressed with what had been said. There was a lot of innovation and looking ahead. She thanked Aldrich and staff for providing background information. As a long-term Board member she was seeing a shift, with new things coming and how they interface, not only on the money side, but on the legislative and mechanical sides. She continued to support the dedicated local librarians doing their best. She was fortunate to belong to a community that was in good shape. She wanted to have more information from the State Library in order to keep updated and more effective. She was really impressed with the Library's vision, and wanted to thank everyone.

Member Murguia wished to echo Member Fong. She really appreciated all the work that was being done, the initiative and progressive thinking, driven by tough times.

Member Cannon commended Aldrich and staff for the creative and innovative work being done, and for the flexibility in dealing with daily issues, in spite of the overall financial picture. Coming from an academic library, he appreciated having the greater library context

elaborated. Hearing about the struggles other libraries were having, he was thankful for the condition of his own. He concluded by saying he was happy to be on the Board and looked forward to serving.

Member Maghsoudi commended Aldrich and staff for their vision and good ideas. Coming from a local public library, she appreciated the benefits received from the State Library.

Member McGinity asked about attendance and engagement at the LSTA Focus Groups, as well as the Public Library Director's Summit. Aldrich replied that the Summit was organized in only two weeks, with about 130 out of 181 library directors attending. More expressed a desire to come, but it was too short notice. Overall, it was very well attended and the community was engaged.

As to the LSTA Focus Groups held so far, Aldrich continued that Fullerton was attended by more than 30 people from all types of libraries. San Diego County had fewer people, even with Imperial County represented at the meeting. They brought ideas that were unique to that area of the state. Sacramento was the next Focus Group scheduled and the largest group, with 50 people registered. San Mateo was the next largest after Sacramento; however, not many had signed up for Fresno. Ideascale was another way to generate and collect ideas, an online tool drawing not only organization leaders but other staff, as well.

Member Battle thanked Aldrich and staff for what they do. She was available for anything needed in Los Angeles County.

President Bernardo thanked Aldrich and was impressed with her ability to build consensus, and to keep her staff energized. She requested that Board members be kept informed, while she would provide them information about legislative activity. To help libraries survive these difficult times, she asked that the Board be called upon to assist however they could.

AGENDA BUILDING

Habbestad stated that August 16th had been chosen for the next Board meeting, with the state legislative calendar in mind. This allowed Board members a week and a half to contact legislators after they had reconvened on August 6th. Member McGinity requested that the next meeting begin at 9:30, so that the 8:00 a.m. flight out of LA could be taken, rather than the earlier flight, and which saved on overnight costs. It was agreed.

There was discussion to hold the next Board meeting at the new Sutro Library building in San Francisco, but it was decided to hold the meeting in Sacramento in order to make legislative contacts.

ADJOURNMENT

President Bernardo adjourned the Library of California Board meeting at 11:35a.m.