California Library Services Board Meeting
December 3, 2014

California State Library
914 Capital Mall, Room 500
Sacramento, CA

**Welcome and Introductions**

President Maghsoudi called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on December 3, 2014 at 10:30 a.m. She asked those attending to introduce themselves.

**Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Florante Ibanez, Penny Kastanis, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Liz Murguia and Connie Williams.

**California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Gerald Maginnity, Janet Coles, Darla Gunning, Sandy Habbestad, Susan Hanks, Jarrid Keller, Lena Pham, and Elizabeth Vierra.

**Adoption of Agenda**
> *It was moved, seconded (Kastanis/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the December 3, 2014 meeting as presented.*

**Approval of Minutes**
> *It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the September 19, 2014 meeting as presented.*

**Closed Session Interview Panel**
> *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board includes its Chief Executive Officer on the interview panel for the exempt Administrative Assistant II position.*

**REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

**Board President's Report**

President Maghsoudi had recently attended the annual California Library Association Conference (CLA) held in Oakland in November. She had been busy as the Director of the Whittier City Library.

**Board Vice President's Report**

Vice President Murguia had been doing her usual work at her local library, but had nothing to report.

**Chief Executive Officer's Report**

State Librarian Lucas said that of the numerous occurrences at CSL since the September Board meeting, the CLA conference had the highest profile. He had been struck by the innovative things that were happening in public libraries around the state, and interested to learn about libraries in the state prison system. He had met some of Member Bernardo's colleagues from whom he had learned how some of the law libraries worked in California. This had been his first CLA conferences and found it to be a powerful learning experience.

**CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

**Budget and Planning**

**CLSA System Audit Reports**

Habbestad referred members to the packet document containing the results of staff's review of the Cooperative Library System audit reports. She noted that the San Joaquin Valley Library System had not had an audit report done since 2006, but were developing a new Joint Powers Authority agreement, of which regular audits would be a part. Habbestad and Gunning reviewed all the audit reports received and discovered no findings. Habbestad offered to make individual audit reports available upon request.

McGinity asked when the 49-99 System would complete an audit. Habbestad replied that one was being prepared and would be forwarded upon receipt. McGinity thanked the library systems for providing audit reports to the Board. He had not expected any findings, but was pleased to learn that proper use of taxpayer money was being tracked.

**BOARD FOCUS 2014/15**

**Broadband Update**

Keller presented a document entitled, Statewide Broadband Project Update, and reported that since the September meeting there had been progress and interesting developments with the Broadband Project. CSL had been looking for an administrative agent, referred to as the

"Statewide Broadband Aggregator." The aggregator would partner with CSL to serve as administrative and fiscal agent for state funds appropriated for broadband to California public libraries. The aggregator would work closely with the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC), CSL and the California library community to facilitate connectivity to E-Rate. Two applicants were submitted for the aggregator: 1) Southern California Library Cooperative, and 2) the Califa Group. An evaluation team gathered on November 12th, comprised of Karen Starr, Nevada State Library and Archives; Patrick Perry, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office; Kevin Nelson, San Joaquin Valley Library System; Robert Karatsu, Rancho Cucamonga Public Library; Gary Christmas, California Library Services Board; and Gerry Maginnity and Jarrid Keller from CSL. Following a recommendation to the State Librarian, Califa was chosen as the statewide broadband aggregator. The process of choosing the aggregator has prepared the way to connect California libraries to the CalREN backbone.

In early October, each interested public library was asked to submit a Letter of Agency (LOA) that would allow CENIC to apply for E-Rate discounts on their behalf. CSL received LOAs from 87 public libraries, which was approximately 50% of the jurisdictions, representing 525 branches. In early January, the price of a circuit would be made available from all the vendors, allowing libraries to determine exactly what their costs would be. Libraries would be contacted and given an opportunity to opt-in or opt-out of the E-Rate consortium.

There were many different factors determining why some libraries had chosen not to submit an LOA. Many of them had been in three- or four-year long-term contracts from which they had been unable to extricate themselves. Some library jurisdictions had been provided with mandatory network connectivity from their relationship to their city or county. In Keller's experience, a 50% return rate was exceptionally high for California. For some libraries, it might not be the right time. But those libraries who had returned the LOA had provided a very important piece of the project because it had given CENIC the information to begin designing a network and see how libraries could be connected.

Keller stated there were many complexities to connecting a library to a network. A formula that would help ensure a fair process to determine who would go first, second, third, and so on did not really work. Keller discussed the Connectivity Factors, referenced on page six of the handout.

First, there had been the LOA, about which he had just spoken. Next, there was the General Network Architecture. Among the multitude of different libraries, each one was very unique in how it connected, even at the level of the jurisdictions, with their headquarters and the individual branches connected to them. There were many different network factors to consider. Then, there were Existing Relationships to be considered, such as a particular library has with other libraries, with community colleges, and with K-12. Another factor to consider was whether the library was currently getting E-Rate.

Other considerations included existing connectivity contracts, termination fees, and equipment ownership. Then there was Facility Readiness to determine, and finally, the Last Mile issues. All of these factors went into figuring out how connectivity was to be accomplished.

The 87 LOAs, representing about 550 out of a possible 1100 individual libraries, had provided some of the basic engineering data that made it possible for CENIC to go out and get circuit connection options for libraries from telecom carriers. If a library had been rejected for the first phase did not mean that it had been eliminated altogether. It could apply again the following year, because E-Rate was an annual process.

McGinity asked if there was a way to characterize the representation of who submitted an LOA, whether the library was urban or rural. What percentage was from the northern, central and southern regions of California? Keller replied that he and Maginnity had been very surprised and pleased with the extent and fairness of the representation from all across the state.

Member Kastanis inquired whether an individual branch library within a county/city system could join the Broadband Project? Keller replied that branch libraries must come in with the jurisdiction as a whole. Maghsoudi asked whether any large library system had come in. Keller replied that the Los Angeles County Library system had joined. Bernardo stated that libraries like Los Angeles County may have already been an E-Rate member and would not need to re-apply. Keller added that many libraries had chosen not to subscribe to E-Rate because of the extraordinarily difficult application process. Many libraries had hired consultants to do E-Rate for them, until budgets became tight and there was insufficient money to do that. The Broadband Project had provided an opportunity for libraries to bundle and get an E-Rate discount.

The Network Architecture was another important connectivity factor. An exploratory must be done to determine how a library was currently connected. What kind of services did they have? Did they have web servers, a fire-wall, a router, and load balancers? What services were they

4

providing to other entities, such as schools or other types of libraries in their jurisdiction? There were many inter-related engineering analyses that had to be done in order to understand how to connect the libraries.

Leveraging Infrastructure was another huge factor to consider. Where applicable, if infrastructure was already in place at a nearby college or K-12 public school, i.e., if "the last mile" was already there, then why not leverage it for libraries? In a number of instances, libraries already had a connection to County Offices of Education, so those factors must be considered. An attempt was being made to do everything logically, using what was already in place to get the best bang for the buck and to make it easier over the long run. That was the engineering "deep dive."

The attempt was being made to determine what circuits a library had or had not been receiving E-Rate, and what the early termination penalties might be. Sometimes early release without a termination fee could be negotiated. A library already might be getting E-Rate on a circuit, but a provider might still insist on installing a separate one. Sometimes a provider would allow transfer of ownership, but not in all cases. Issues like these had to be worked through.

Then, there were issues of Facility Readiness. Did the library have the correct router? Did it have the correct internet card? Did it have dedicated power? Did it have a plywood backboard? These are just a few of the things that had to be in place to allow connectivity.

The last connectivity factor to mention was Last Mile, the final leg of the telecommunications networks delivering communications connectivity to the customer. This had been a nationwide issue. There were many libraries that already had fiber coming into their facilities, but many did not. The Broadband Project had provided an opportunity to evaluate what a library already had in place, what it might take to optimize what it had, and begin an initial build-out. Rather than libraries going about trying to connect on their own, the project's work would actually help drive demand.

Keller provided a sample scenario. For example, Whittier Public Library was first on the list to receive a broadband connection, and after the CENIC team had gone in, Whittier was found not to have dedicated power, thereby dropping Whittier down on the list. The variables were numerous, but the decisions were largely based on 1) whether the library had E-Rate, because very few libraries could afford to connect to Broadband without it; and 2) whether the facility was ready. Did it have the right equipment in addition to all the other stated factors?

1    Now that Califa officially had been named the project aggregator, together Califa, CSL and

2    CENIC could begin a "deep dive" into the technical aspects of broadband connectivity. The

3    libraries had done an excellent job of self-reporting, but it was important to take a very close look

4    at that data to ensure nothing was missing. Once solutions were fully engineered from the correct

5    data, it would be a simple matter for libraries to connect.

6    Beginning next week, a series of webinars would be sponsored to begin to talk about next

7    steps for committed libraries. The engineering deep dive would be initiated to understand what a

8    library's network really looked like, the easiest way to connect it to the backbone, and to

9    determine what sort of equipment might be needed at the library's facility to allow the

10    connection. Once that had been done, the governor's grant dollars could be appropriately

11    directed. The Broadband Project was not as far along as Keller had hoped it would be, but he

12    believed the right approach was being taken, verifying correct data and engaging libraries

13    intelligently in order to ensure success.

14    Lucas pointed out that in the months ahead there would be a second discount for libraries

15    through the California TeleConnect Fund (CTF). In addition, there would be a program to offer

16    grants from the one million dollars that the Board approved to help people connect.

17    Keller continued that there would be a lot going on in the next eight weeks. All the

18    participating E-Rate consortium libraries must be contacted, followed by engineering details.

19    After that had been done, there should be a better idea how much libraries were going to need

20    from the initial funding. Following on the example of the E-Rate consortium, putting together a

21    similar TeleConnect consortium was being considered, so that libraries could get all the discounts

22    for which they were eligible. Historically, libraries had not applied for these discounts, so this was

23    an opportunity to correct that and bring down monthly costs for libraries.

24    Lucas asked Keller to explain how the E-Rate and CTF programs could work to bring down

25    costs. Keller responded that it was very complex, with many factors, but E-Rate could reduce

26    costs up to 70%, and CTF up to 50% of the remainder. For example, theoretically a library could

27    bring down its connectivity expense from $1,000 to $150.

28    When asked whether CENIC was applying for E-Rate on behalf of everyone in the statewide

29    public library E-Rate consortium, Keller responded that it was, but only working in E-Rate

30    Category 4. Some libraries could decide to withdraw from the consortium in January, which they

31    were free to do, but they would lose their E-Rate discounts if they already had them; but at least

the original participation had allowed CENIC to begin the conversation about the best way to engineer the network to connect libraries. In theory, and prior to any discussion about an actual connection date, connecting libraries could begin as early as July 2015.

Keller stated that was all he had for the Board to date. He knew it was not quite what they had been looking for, but he considered the project to be in a very good place. Responding to a concern of Bernardo, Keller had no doubt that the funding would all be spent and a greater request for funding was needed to meet the demand.

McGinity recalled that the discussion at the last meeting had been about criteria and who would go first. What he heard Keller saying today was that the library systems most technically ready would be the first to go. Keller replied that was a pretty fair assessment; however, grant funds would be available to assist libraries who were not as ready as some others. Based upon his long engineering experience, some that appeared on paper to be technically ready, when it came to the actual installation, unforeseen technical factors might be discovered that revealed them to be less ready. Technical factors weighed heavily into this, determining more than 50% of readiness. Keller stated that the most technically ready would not necessarily receive grant money first. Maginnity and Keller were still working on criteria, currently in draft, with consideration of local income per capital, to help determine who would receive funding assistance and how much they would receive. New engineering data deriving from the technical dive would be supplied within the next eight weeks, helping to determine the final criteria. The grant process would be opened up to the jurisdictions in February. Funding would be awarded on a first come first served basis, in the order the applications were received from the jurisdictions. This approach was based on what other states had done and found to be most fair. It should be kept in mind that jurisdictions from among the 87 who applied could drop out of the E-Rate consortium; by January it should be known who would be remaining.

McGinity now heard Keller saying that the first applicants would receive funding first. Keller replied that each application would be evaluated; just because a jurisdiction got their application in early did not mean that they would be receiving assistance. Only some items were reimbursable, equipment, such as routers, switches, etc. There was only $1 million in CLSA funds. McGinity asked how the decision would be made to allot the funds if there was a $5 million need, but only $1 million to allot, in terms of who would be chosen, based on what criteria? Keller responded, implying his earlier statement that those decisions would be made at CSL in

accordance with the criteria of technical readiness and per capita income, criteria yet to be fully worked out in detail. Maghsoudi interjected that the decision in part would be determined by what the local jurisdictions were willing to contribute. For example, if grant funding covered up to 75%, but the local jurisdiction was unwilling to contribute the remaining 25%, it would not be able to participate in the Broadband Project. Lucas stated that it was principally an income per capita consideration. Member Christmas asked if per capita income and socio-economic factors overrode the technical factors. Keller responded that typically they went hand-in-hand; the better funded generally had better technical infrastructure. Christmas expressed concern about the importance of ensuring that people understood the selection process before any grant awards were made from the $1 million. Keller replied that there would be a lot more information going out to the jurisdictions, especially in light of the changes to the project that had emerged since last September. The new engineering data would assist in better evaluating what libraries were going to need.

McGinity wanted to know whether the Board would have a set of criteria to review and talk about at the next Board meeting. Lucas replied that a set of criteria would be drafted and forwarded to Board members in advance of their next meeting. He assured the Board that funding would not go out into the field before Board members had a chance to look at the criteria for distributing the $1 million.

Williams was concerned that due diligence would be done for the other libraries outside the 87. Keller replied that they had a pretty good idea why other libraries had not joined, but ideally the goal was that every public library in California would be connected to the CalREN Network, and that none would be lost in the shuffle. Some may decide to attempt to become connected without the E-Rate discount, or they could wait and apply next time. Lucas added that there had been some fairly extensive outreach and encouragement to induce people to submit the initial batch of letters. As to the status of the condition of the other library districts who had not submitted letters, a connectivity needs assessment survey had been sent to 97% of libraries two years ago. CSL had the data on their level of connectivity and Keller had gone through it to determine the primary factors, such as pre-existing contracts, insufficient funds, and city/county connectivity constraints. CSL was aware of the state of connectivity for all of the library districts.

Williams inquired, with respect to county services and libraries, if K-12 was being leveraged. Keller replied that the K-12s were well aware of the Broadband Project and libraries were

1   leveraging infrastructure wherever possible.   Lucas enlarged, saying there were rings of

2   connectivity, and sometimes the easiest way for a library to connect would be as part of a ring,

3   such as through county services.

4      Bernardo asked if the webinars would help better answer members' questions. Keller

5   answered that they would be more about the technical deep dive and not so much about grant

6   distribution criteria questions. But members were more than welcome to attend them.

7

8   **Digitization Update**

9      Lucas reported that there was not much to report on CSL digitization efforts since the Board

10  meeting in September. First steps had been taken to formulate a policy and determine need. One

11  thing that had come to light was the level of requests for material, with the highest coming from

12  the Sutro Branch of the State Library in San Francisco. They did not have a giant digitization

13  machine such as CSL had in Sacramento. Installing a machine there was being considered.

14     Through LSTA grant funding, staff in Library Development Services had been working with the

15  Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). The University of California (UC) worked with DPLA, and

16  San Francisco Public Library (SFPL), and Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) working through UC. CSL

17  was working to create an entity between these two great libraries so that smaller libraries could

18  work through it to have access to digitization with DPLA. They were working on determining and

19  prioritizing highest need and highest patron requests, then digitizing the materials in a format to

20  be delivered to UC, SFPL, LAPL, DPLA and other large entities. This offered a cost-effective and

21  efficient way of protecting treasures in California's public libraries.

22     Also, there had been some discussions at the State Capitol with regard to digitization and the

23  priority it should have for the state and its cultural treasures.

24

25  **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

26     Maghsoudi directed the Board's attention to the document, CLA Legislative Priorities for 2015,

27  that was in the packet.

28  Any questions could be addressed to Diane Satchwell, who was on the California Library

29  Association (CLA) Legislative and Advocacy Committee, or herself, who represented the Board on

30  that committee. Any information received by Maghsoudi would be forwarded to the Board.

1     Murguia asked about the minimum funding request in the CLA Legislative Priorities 2015

2     document. Was more money being requested than was received last year? The document

3     appeared to show an additional $5.25 million. Maghsoudi responded that this was a minimum

4     amount that the committee endorsed for the next budget year. However, this Board had not yet

5     discussed what it would like to see. Murguia than asked whether CSL had submitted its funding

6     request to the governor's office. Lucas replied that CSL had done so, requesting what was given in

7     last year's budget, as a minimum. The governor had stressed that last year's budget had been a

8     one-time occurrence. It was still uncertain whether it would show up in the January budget. Lucas

9     explained that there was an annual appropriation for CLSA of $1.88 million, plus another $2

10    million being requested. There was also a continuous appropriation, the $2.25 million, which

11    unless someone stopped it, would recur in the 2015 budget. The $1 million hardship grant would

12    go to help connect libraries to Broadband. Murguia believed the Board's role was to advocate for

13    what they thought was really needed. Kastanis asked whether Board members should advocate

14    on their own, as some members had done in the past. If so, what direction should be taken?

15    Maghsoudi pointed out that advocacy was usually done as a Board, not individually. Murguia

16    asked if the Board's position would differ from CLA's, as represented in the document before

17    them. Lucas responded that CLA was asking for the same amount received by libraries last year,

18    as a minimum. CSL had not asked for more this year, although it had tried to show that need for

19    Broadband hardship cases was greater than what had been provided. Christmas thought that

20    money for digitization would be helpful to most jurisdictions and would be worth requesting by

21    the Board. Murguia would like to see the Board push for more money, in addition to the $1

22    million grant for the CENIC Broadband Project, indicating how much more funding would be

23    needed, once the reports were received. Lucas added that those results could be taken to the

24    May revision of the budget to argue for greater assistance. He would be happy to forward

25    anything that the Board felt would be a smart and strategic use of state taxpayer dollars. Ibanez

26    asked if there were grants available for digitization. Lucas replied that was what the previous

27    discussion describing the Digital Library of America effort was about; with small libraries working

28    through LSTA funded digitization centers, such as San Francisco and Los Angeles Public libraries,

29    who in turn would be working through the University of California. This effort began as an

30    Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) grant.

1    Williams asked about the costs of digitization and how the Board could advocate to fund it.

2    Gunning responded, offering a little historical background. The entire Budget Change Proposal

3    (BCP) process was confidential, but the Board did have the ability to direct the State Librarian to

4    pursue funding through the BCP process. As those typically were due in late summer, the Board

5    could begin thinking now about what it wanted to see for the 2016-17 fiscal year. Lucas stated

6    that the Board could act by producing a letter that he could take to the Department of Finance,

7    stating that it was concerned about the state of California's cultural heritage. A letter would serve

8    as both an instruction to the State Library as well as a document of Board advocacy to the

9    Department of Finance (DOF).

10   Maghsoudi said that perhaps in April the Board could begin talking about the 2016-17 fiscal

11   year. Murguia and others suggested that something could still be done before May for FY 2015-

12   16. Williams and Christmas liked the idea of a letter. Lucas said he would like to give the letter to

13   DOF in February, well before the May Revise. Gunning offered to search for sample Board letters

14   from prior years to assist with the production of a Board letter. Bernardo suggested that a letter

15   from the Board supporting the minimum funding request could be drafted, as well.

16

17   **PUBLIC COMMENT**

18   Diane Satchwell, Executive Director of the Southern California Library Cooperative, Serra and

19   49-99, thanked the Board and staff for the time that they had taken to discuss public library

20   needs. She reported how the extra $1 million distributed had revitalized the three cooperatives.

21   They had re-engineered who they were and were working better as a collegial group. They were

22   doing more with resource sharing and had held some very productive workshops.

23

24   **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

25   Ibanez attended the SCLC *Turning Outward Community Assessment 101* session, headed by

26   Cindy Mediavilla and Virginia Walters, at the Fullerton Public Library. They encouraged public

27   libraries to look at how they assessed their own work and obtained guidance from their

28   communities. The workshop offered ways to conduct a community assessment, so as to learn

29   how to better serve the needs and interests of their communities.

30   Bernardo thanked everyone for their hard work. CSL staff had done an amazing job with CENIC,

31   considering all of its components. She thanked Lucas for his lead in the short amount of time

1  since his arrival. She appreciated the public libraries' consideration of special libraries as partners;

2  collaborations could only make libraries stronger.

3  Murguia thanked staff for all the good work and thorough reporting on the CENIC Project.

4  Williams thanked staff for her new Board member orientation. She announced that her

5  Petaluma Public Library had joined with her school library, which she ran, and Casa Grande

6  Library, and together they were putting on a free Comicon event for their county. It was a total

7  library cooperative event to which all were invited. Donations would be collected to cover

8  expenses.

9  Christmas recently had been on the evaluation panel for the aggregator contract. He had not

10  known much about how CENIC and the Broadband Project worked, but Keller and Maginnity had

11  been very helpful conveying their understanding of it. He thanked them for getting out the

12  Request for Application and responses, and expressing to the panel what were the project goals.

13  Kastanis stated that the California School Library Association, with which she once had been

14  very much involved, was about to have its annual state conference in San Francisco. It was 100

15  years old, which she found to be very interesting, as she thought she had been in it since the

16  beginning. She was also very involved with the Common Core curriculum, as well as the California

17  Reading Association. All of these associations, including CLA, seemed to connect together. But, as

18  was pointed out by someone in an editorial today, libraries were not getting the support that they

19  should. There had been many advances, especially in technology, which some have said will take

20  care of everything. But if kids could not use the machines in front of them, did not have books,

21  could not read, and were not read to, then it did not make any difference. At Sacramento State

22  University there was a wonderful collection of Greek cultural print materials, written in the

23  ancient Greek. It was one of the few collections like it in the United States. It was not well-utilized,

24  as that kind of research was not as common as it once had been. It was interesting to come to a

25  meeting like this, with people from different backgrounds, coming together and sharing what

26  they loved, which was libraries in general. She was pleased to be back on the Board and pleased

27  to see all of those present, connected by this shared interest in libraries.

28  Maghsoudi thanked everyone at CSL for the great job that was being done.

29

30  **Adjourned Open Session at 11:55am.**

31  **Resume Open Session Public Meeting at 4:35pm**

**REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

President Maghsoudi resumed the public meeting of the California Library Services Board at 4:35pm.  She reported that the Board concluded deliberations regarding the position of the Administrative Assistant II and a candidate had been chosen upon acceptance of the position.

**<u>AGENDA BUILDING</u>**

The Board agreed that it would forego the February 2015 teleconference meeting and hold an in-person meeting in April 2015. The first day would provide the Board the opportunity to make visits to Legislators at the State Capitol.  The second day would be the regular business meeting, with an LSTA Advisory Council meeting in the afternoon.  Habbestad would poll Board members for dates in the last two weeks of April.  The August or September meeting would be held by conference call.

**<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>**

President Maghsoudi adjourned the meeting at 4:42 p.m.