California STATE LIBRARY

FOUNDED 1850

PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE, SHAPING OUR FUTURE

Library Development Services Bureau
900 N Street, Suite 400
P.O. Box 942837
Sacramento, California 94237-0001
(916) 653-7532 phone
(916) 653-8443 fax

The California Library Services Board

Anne R. Bernardo, President
Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Vice-President
Greg Lucas, Chief Executive Officer
Brandy Rose Buenafe
Gary M. Christmas
Aleita Huguenin
Florante Peter Ibanez
Penny Kastanis
Gregory F. McGinity
Peter Mindnich
Elizabeth O. Murguia
H. Eric Schockman, Ph.D.
Connie Williams

April 8, 2016
BOARD MEETING

MEETING NOTICE

California Library Services Board
April 8, 2016
9:30am – 4:00pm

For further information contact:
Annly Roman
California State Library
P.O. Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001
(916) 323-0057
annly.roman@library.ca.gov
http://www.library.ca.gov/loc/board/agendas/agendas.html

Meeting call-in locations are as follows:

California State Library
Stanley Mosk Library & Courts Building
914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Fresno County Public Library
2420 Mariposa Street,
Fresno, CA 93721

Fullerton Public Library
353 W. Commonwealth Ave.
Fullerton, Ca 92832

Huntington Beach Public Library
7111 Talbert Ave.,
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Ontario City Library
215 E. C Street,
Ontario, CA 91764

Pacific Library Partnership Office
2471 Flores Street,
San Mateo, CA 94403

Redding Library
1100 Parkview Avenue
Redding, CA 96001

Southern California Library Cooperative
248 E. Foothill Blvd., Suite 101
Monrovia, CA 91016

Woodbury University
7500 N. Glenoaks Blvd.
Whitten 128
Burbank, CA 91504

A. BOARD OPENING

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   Welcome and introductions of Board members, staff, and audience
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
   Consider agenda as presented or amended
3. **Approval of September 2015 Board Minutes** – *Document 1*
   Consider minutes as presented or amended
4. **Board meeting date for Fall 2016 -** *Document 2*
   Discuss the date for the next Board meeting
5. **Nomination of Board Officers** – *Document 3*
   a. Discuss the procedures for election of Board Officers
   b. Consider Nominating Committee for 2017 Board Officers

B. REPORTS TO THE BOARD

1. **Board President's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting
2. **Board Vice-President's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting
3. **Chief Executive Officer's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting
4. **Broadband Update Report**
   Update on technology improvement grants and broadband efforts

C. CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION

BUDGET AND PLANNING
CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2016/17 – *Document 4*
Consider 2016/17 Preliminary Budget for CLSA. This will include discussion of the existing $1.8 million in funding, proposed additional ongoing funding of $1.8 million, and potential uses of proposed one-time funding of $3 million.

RESOURCE SHARING
CLSA System-level programs – *Document 5*
Review and discuss System Annual Reports, FY 2014/15

D. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

1. **CLA Legislative Advocates' report**
2. **Consider federal and state legislative issues -** *Document 6*
3. **Board reports on Legislative visits**

E. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2016/17

Becoming entrepreneurial – public/private partnerships

F. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment on any item or issue that is under the purview of the California Library Services Board and is not on the agenda

G. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Board member or officer comment on any item or issues that is under the purview of the California Library Services Board and is not on the agenda

H. OLD BUSINESS

Board Strategic Planning Session

I. AGENDA BUILDING

Input on agenda items for subsequent Board meetings

J. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn the meeting

<div align="center">

California Library Services Board Meeting
September 3, 2015

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

</div>

Welcome and Introductions

President Maghsoudi called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on September 3, 2015 at 2:08 p.m. She asked those attending to introduce themselves.

Board Members Present: Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Alita Huguenin, Florante Ibanez, Penny Kastanis, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Peter Mindnich, Eric Schockman, and Connie Williams.

California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Gerald Maginnity, Janet Coles, Wendy Hopkins, Cindy Mediavilla, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, and Annly Roman.

Adoption of Agenda

> *It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the September 3, 2015 meeting as presented.*

Approval of Minutes

Member Schockman brought up that the Minutes needed one change. On page six, line eleven, the tenth word should have been "states" not "state."

> *It was moved, seconded (Bernardo/Ibanez) and carried by a vote of 8 ayes and 2 abstentions (Christmas/Mindnich) that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the April 28, 2015 meeting as corrected.*

Board Resolutions

> *It was moved, seconded (McGinity/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board waives the reading of CLSB resolution 2015-01 for Sandy Habbestad.*

1   Member Bernardo brought up that there was a typo in the resolution. In the third paragraph,

2 first sentence, the fifteenth word should have been "principal" not "principle."

3   *It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the*
4   *California Library Services Board adopts CLSB resolution 2015-01 for Sandy*
5   *Habbestad as corrected (See Attachment A).*

6

7 **Election of Board Officers for 2016**

8   The Nominating Committee, Members Schockman and Williams, gave an overview of the

9 behind-the-scenes work they had done over the last few months. Member Schockman stated the

10 committee used a process set up by Sandy Habbestad that involved polling the Board on their

11 preference for President and Vice-President. Based on the polling, the Nominating Committee

12 put forward Anne Bernardo as the nominee for President and Paymaneh Maghsoudi as the

13 nominee for Vice-President.

14   President Maghsoudi announced that the Board would also consider nominations from the

15 floor. No additional nominations were made.

16   *It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Williams) and carried unanimously that the*
17   *California Library Services Board elects Anne Bernardo as President of the*
18   *California Library Services Board for the year 2016.*

19

20   *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the*
21   *California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as Vice-President of*
22   *the California Library Services Board for the year 2016.*

23

24 **Board Meeting Schedule for 2016**

25   President Maghsoudi brought up that some of the Board members were interested in more in-

26 person meetings. Members Williams, Ibanez, Christmas, and Kastanis all agreed that it took

27 longer to handle the Board's business over the phone so they would prefer meeting in-person.

28   Member McGinity felt that one in-person meeting and one phone meeting was sufficient given

29 the Board's work load. He stated that if the Legislature gave the Board more resources or

30 flexibility, then it would make sense to have more in-person meetings.

31   Library staff had recommended that the April 2016 meeting be a phone meeting and the

32 September 2016 meeting be in-person. Member McGinity asked why this was as the April 2015

33 meeting had been in-person. Annly Roman responded that in April 2015 the Board had handled

1   the LSTA advisory portion of their duties. Prior to April 2015 the LSTA advisory session had been

2   held in the fall. Staff had suggested having the fall 2016 Board meeting in-person because that

3   meeting would typically be the longer of the two.

4   Member Christmas commented that part of the reason for having the April 2015 meeting in

5   person was for Board members to meet with their legislators. He was wondering if that had

6   happened and, if so, how it went. Several members expressed that they felt in-person meetings

7   with legislators/staff were helpful and face-to-face meetings in April and September to meet with

8   legislators was suggested. Member Bernardo brought up that, although she would prefer in-

9   person meetings for both meetings, the benefit to an in-person April meeting was that the

10   legislature would be in the middle of the legislative session, whereas September is at the end.

11   She felt that the Board had been able to handle the LSTA component sufficiently at the April 2015

12   meeting and still get a feel for where the grants were going and how they were being handled.

13   Members Williams and Ibanez felt that it could be productive for Board members to go in one

14   group, have pre-set up appointments, and target legislators with specific issues. It was asked if

15   the State Library could put together a list of relevant issues for the Board members. Member

16   Huguenin suggested having taking points on particular issues that they could leave with the

17   legislators so that staff can be made aware of the issues and messaging would be consistent.

18   Member Williams asked if in January or February the State Library could discuss what the

19   potential issues might be and put together a packet for them. Annly Roman stated that the

20   legislature would reconvene in the beginning of January but would not finish introducing bills

21   until almost the end of February. Many of those bills would be spot bills, which would not be

22   amended into their final form until almost the end of March. Annly Roman stated that there

23   might be issues on the table from the 2015 session but it would be difficult to tell what the new

24   issues would be until at least March. Connie said that made sense.

25   It was determined that Annly Roman would create information pieces on relevant legislative

26   issues for the Board to take to the legislator meetings and that she would petition the Board

27   members for any issues they would like incorporated into the materials.

28   Annly Roman summarized that the Board wanted to meet in person, in Sacramento, in early to

29   mid-April, and that they wanted to come up a day early to meet with legislators. Additionally, the

1   Board wanted the State Library to schedule legislator meetings on their behalf and provide them

2   with issues and information that could be left with legislators. Annly Roman said that she would

3   put forward a Doodle poll with date options for the Board to indicate when they are free.

4   Barbara Howison, Riverside County Library System, commented that she thought it was great

5   to have an opportunity to sit-in and listen to the discussion. She requested that the meeting in

6   Sacramento have a call-in line so that those located in Southern California could participate. State

7   Library staff replied that it was possible to establish call-in sites in Southern California where

8   people could listen to the meeting but that any call-in locations would have to be open to the

9   public for participation and noticed on the Agenda. Member Christmas stated that he thought it

10 would be useful to establish sites in Southern California and other areas around the state. State

11 Librarian Lucas agreed to accommodate those sites.

12

13 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

14 **Board President's Report**

15   President Maghsoudi reported that she continued to attend the California Library Association's

16 legislative meetings on a regular basis and she attended ALA. Additionally, the Whittier Public

17 Library hosted an event for the Library Foundation at which Greg Lucas was the Keynote Speaker.

18

19 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

20   State Librarian Lucas reported an additional $2 million to the Literacy program that the state

21 library helps administrate through local public libraries. He stated that he had just signed letters

22 adding five more libraries to the program, partially because of the additional revenue. The funds

23 would help with the backlog of people who want to learn to read but have been unable to

24 participate in the literacy program because of a shortage of volunteers.

25   The Governor and the Legislature also added $4 million to the $1 million that the Board

26 contributed to the Broadband project. Lucas was not sure if the legislature would continue to

27 allocate money for those kinds of technology improvement grants, but he felt the new money

28 showed the commitment of the administration.

1   Another item in the budget was $1 million for a pilot project to conduct Career Online High

2   School. That program offered participants the ability to get their high school degree online. Once

3   a participant entered the program they had 18 months to complete it, but, depending on how

4   many units they already had, some had finished in as little as five months. The $1 million would

5   provide about 870 scholarships to cover entrance into the program.

6   The Career Online High School program required an assessment component prior to beginning

7   to make sure that the people entering the program had the discipline, capacity, and gumption to

8   finish. The assessment, provided by the company running Career Online High School, had an

9   online and an interview segment and cost around $60,000. This cost had been a barrier to

10   individual library jurisdictions that wanted to participate in the program. Under the pilot project

11   the state paid one central assessment cost, removing the financial barrier to public libraries'

12   participation. State Librarian Lucas felt he was not understating it to say that the program could

13   be transformative. The State Library was finishing up the administration guidelines and State

14   Librarian Lucas thought the program would be up and running in October.

15   Member Williams asked who, within the public libraries, was going to shoulder the

16   management and financial personnel responsibility for the assessment. Janet Coles, the State

17   Library staff member managing the project, stated that public libraries would not have to conduct

18   an assessment. There was an online pre-assessment process that involved a self-assessment and

19   then a two week prerequisite course. These were designed to determine if the students would be

20   successful in the program. Then the students were interviewed by the library staff. If they passed

21   both those assessment segments they were eligible to receive a scholarship. Janet also clarified

22   that through the scholarship the student received an online coach, access to tutors, and an

23   academic call center as part of the Online High School Program.

24   Member Bernardo asked in the $1 million put toward Career Online High School fell under the

25   California Library Services Act. State Librarian Lucas clarified that it was a general fund

26   appropriation and did not fall under the Act.

27

28   **CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

29   **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

1 **System Plans of Service and Budgets**

2   Monica Rivas stated that the first issue to be addressed by the Board was the 2015/2016

3 California Library Services Act system population and membership figures. She stated that there

4 were very slight changes to the actual figures, and these were previously approved by the Board

5 at the April meeting. These changes were the withdrawal of Hayward Public Library from the

6 Pacific Library Partnership, the re-affiliation of the Santa Clara County Library to the Pacific Library

7 Partnership, and the re-affiliation of the Huntington Beach Public Library to the Santiago Library

8 System.

9   Gerry Maginnity pointed out that on the Hayward Public Library letter that there was some

10 incorrect information. He believed that there had been some confusion with PLF and TBR. On the

11 letter is said that "...in order to receive PLF public libraries are required to be members of

12 systems...", but that was not true. He said that he was not sure what was intended but his feeling

13 was that there was some confusion with acronyms. To receive some of the reimbursement money

14 for direct loans libraries did need to be a member of a cooperative library system. To get

15 reimbursement money for interlibrary loans you were not required to be a member.

16   Member McGinity asked if the Board could get some kind of report to show how the system

17 communication and delivery program workload and system demographics had changed over

18 time. He wanted to see if there was any analysis or observations that might suggest different

19 policies the Board should be considering. He asked if library staff could produce something,

20 covering the last 10 years, for the 2016 fall meeting when the Board would be considering the

21 2016/2017 information. Monica Rivas and Annly Roman indicated that they would have that

22 information for the 2016 fall meeting.

23   *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that*
24   *the California Library Services Board approves the System Population and*
25   *Membership Figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the fiscal year*
26   *2015/16.*
27
28   *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the*
29   *California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Plans of Service and*
30   *Budgets for the nine cooperative Library Systems, submitted for fiscal year*
31   *2015/16.*
32

1 **RESOURCE SHARING**

2 **Broadband Update**

3   Gerry Maginnity reported that the California State Library just finished up its first round of

4 grants. The State Library sent out 37 grants and those libraries are working on connecting to

5 CalREN. For the start of the year two process, libraries have been asked to submit their Letter of

6 Agency, which then gave CENIC permission to proceed ahead and do an RFP for them, by

7 September 15, 2015. Once that deadline passed the State Library would have an idea of how

8 many libraries might be participating. Last year 88 libraries completed the Letter of Agency and

9 about 40 went to contract, so not every library asked for a grant. About $1 million was awarded

10 and there was over a one-to-one match so it seemed like libraries were gearing up for the

11 program.

12   Member McGinity clarified that in the first round of grants we had more money than we had

13 applications. Gerry Maginnity confirmed that statement and expressed that the priority was for

14 the main libraries to be connected. Maginnity said that the assumptions on how that money

15 would be allocated were based on the fact that 88 libraries did the Letter of Agency. Staff did

16 learn that just because a library did the Letter did not mean they would go through to contract.

17   Member McGinity expressed surprise that when the request went out to libraries the priority

18 was the main library in any given city or county. He asked if the Board had known about the

19 prioritization of main libraries in advance. He thought that two meetings ago the Board had been

20 clear that they wanted input about how that money was going to be allocated. Whether the

21 priority was the right one or not, he thought that the Board should have had a chance to weigh in

22 on any decisions about which libraries or communities were going to receive funds. Member

23 McGinity asked if consideration was being given to another set of grants and if so, would the

24 Board have a chance to weigh in on the priorities for those grants prior to letters going out.

25 Member Kastanis indicated that the Board had never taken action on grants prior to them going

26 out before.

27   Gerry Maginnity indicated that if the Library had to come back to the Board it could have some

28 serious ramifications for libraries proceeding to the contract phase. He thought priority should

7

1   continue to be given to the main library and the second priority would be the branches. Maginnity

2   asked if the Board had other priorities they should be discussing.

3   Member Huguenin expressed that the priority should be to increase awareness since so few

4   libraries went to contract. Gerry Maginnity clarified that there were lots of factors that went into

5   why a library did not proceed to contract. Member Huguenin suggested that they develop a way

6   to help the libraries whose information was incorrect or incomplete, preventing them from

7   proceeding with the process. Susan Hildreth, representing Califa, clarified that the issue was not

8   that things were done incorrectly. The Letter of Agency allows CENIC to represent the library in a

9   bidding process to determine the most effective or cost effective circuits. CENIC and Califa

10 worked closely with all the interested parties to make sure they were making the right decision

11 and, in some cases, as libraries delved into the process, they found existing contracts with other

12 providers or issues with bad timing. It was more about getting to really know the details of the

13 process. Libraries need to submit a Letter of Agency if they are even want to explore the project,

14 so they are encouraged to submit the Letters even though all of the libraries will not necessarily

15 make it to the end point.

16   Diane Satchwell, representing 49-99, Serra, and SCLC, indicated that there was a great variety

17 of applicants, so this process did provide an avenue for rural libraries to participate. The reason

18 some libraries questioned applying in year one was that they wanted to see how the process

19 rolled out so that they could participate in year two.

20   President Maghsoudi asked Member McGinity if he had any specific criteria in mind. Member

21 McGinity responded that he did not have anything specific but he thought the Board had wanted

22 to weigh in on criteria being considered. He expressed concerns about priorities if the situation

23 arose where the grants were oversubscribed and had more libraries applying with needs that

24 exceeded the allocated funds. In that case there would be a scarcity of resources and he felt that

25 it was the responsibility of the Board to determine how those resources were allocated.

26   Member Christmas remembered that the Board did talk about broadband priorities and that

27 there was some discussion about the approach. He thought he remembered discussion about

28 Main libraries but he was unsure if the Board voted or if it was just a discussion. Member

29 Christmas felt that since library staff had already started, it would slow the process to change the

1   priorities so he is comfortable moving forward. He did feel that in the future the Board should

2   have a more thorough discussion before the process starts. President Maghsoudi suggested

3   putting it on the Agenda for the next Board meeting.

4

5   **Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs**

6   Annly Roman stated that the Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan program was funded through

7   CLSA money until about 2011. The program had not been funded for several years but the state

8   library had still been having local libraries give reports on their statistics. Annly Roman reported

9   that since the program was not funded the California State Library would no longer be requesting

10   those annual reports.

11

12   <u>**BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2015/16**</u>

13   Annly Roman reported that entrepreneurship had been discussed at the April 2015 Board

14   meeting and the Board had indicated that they wanted to continue the discussion. State Librarian

15   Lucas mentioned that the most common public/private partnerships in the library world were

16   Friends groups and things of that sort.

17   State Librarian Lucas provided several examples of community partnerships happen in

18   California. The city of Riverside got new computers for the library through a long standing

19   relationship with local law firms that trade out their desk top computers each year. The State

20   Library has a Lunch at the Library program with the California Library Association with about 100

21   libraries around the state participating. In many cases libraries participating in that program are

22   also partnering with local food banks and other groups. East Palo Alto, for example, brought in

23   Ravenswood, a volunteer team that provides medical care in a clinical format to lesser served

24   communities. State Librarian Lucas felt the examples show that partnerships were being pursued

25   by a lot of individual local jurisdictions. He was not sure how to promote that at the state level

26   and would welcome anyone's ideas.

27   The caveat on the Career Online High School scholarships that requires, for every scholarship

28   the State sends to a library, libraries to come up with a scholarship on their own is an example of

29   encouraging building community partnerships. State Librarian Lucas pointed out that in some

1 jurisdictions the local economic development arm has been really interested in the Online High

2 School program because if people get high school degrees they will get better jobs, earn more

3 income, pay higher taxes, etc. He stated that he could lay out some of the different faces of

4 public/private partnerships if that would help focus or frame the discussion.

5 Member Williams commented that she thought this discussion was initiated because of Career

6 Online High School and relationships between public libraries and businesses, such as Gale. She

7 asked if the discussion would include things like the purchase of statewide online databases. State

8 Librarian Lucas said he hoped it would because a lot of taxpayer money could be saved by having

9 a statewide license for databases. He felt that there would be a benefit not only for libraries but

10 for public schools and state government as well. Member Williams commented that most states

11 have at least one statewide database and she felt that statewide databases and collaboration

12 between multi-type libraries should be the main discussions. State Librarian Lucas pointed out

13 that there was resistance from the makers of the databases because it was better for them to

14 have multiple contracts.

15 Member Williams asked what the Board would need to do to move this from a thought process

16 to an action process. Member Christmas liked State Librarian Lucas' suggestion of staff coming up

17 with some key areas that the Board could focus the discussion around. He thought the Board

18 could have a more productive discussion if the State Library could come up with some ideas that

19 would get the word out on different partnerships.

20 Member Ibanez stated that even with database sharing, everyone has their own constituency

21 that they are accountable to in terms of how they spend their money and who gets covered by

22 which database. Their law school had conflicts between different campuses about who could use

23 which database even though, theoretically, they are supposed to be the same campus. He

24 expressed that hopefully they could figure out how dialogs could be started in different areas.

25 In regards to multi-type library collaboration State Librarian Lucas brought up a group on the

26 Monterey Peninsula, MOBAC, which involves every kind of library on the Peninsula including the

27 university, public libraries, community college, naval institute, etc. The MOBAC partnership has

28 every library on the peninsula talking to each other, making it easier for them to find common

29 ground. He is not sure how to replicate it statewide but it seems like a good first step.

1   When he was in New York he asked the Librarians if they had a single library card for the New

2   York, Queens, and Brooklyn areas.   The librarians said no; the libraries had not really

3   communicated in the past. They did come together, however, over infrastructure needs. Their

4   facilities were getting so bad that they felt the best way to sell upgrading them was to work

5   together. The libraries did a joint report on their needs and as a result they are now more inclined

6   to talk to each other and look for different ways to unite their voices. State Librarian Lucas said he

7   would look into how the New York dialogs started.

8   Tom Vose, Director of the Palmdale City Library, commented that the public doesn't

9   understand why libraries are not already communicating and working together. He felt that

10   libraries working together would also give more leverage with legislators. Legislators from the bay

11   area wouldn't care about libraries in Modoc County, but they would care about the California

12   library system.

13   Susan Hildreth commented that MOBAC, Monterey Bay Area Cooperative, was one of the

14   legacy, initial CLSA systems. MOBAC is a part of the Pacific Library Partnership but MOBAC was a

15   geographically isolated group that continued to do a lot together. PLP supported them as much as

16   they can. She felt that it was interesting to hear the discussion because as the resource sharing

7   systems have evolved over the years, depending on where you are in the state; there are still

18   some really tight knit individual groups that now have morphed into larger groups.

19   Additionally, she commented, representing the Califa group, that one of the initial responsibilities

20   and motivations to form the Califa Group, a 501c3 non-profit that serves the public libraries in

21   California, primarily, was to do aggregate buying for libraries. They continue to do that and have a

22   number of contracts with various vendors and they negotiate reduced prices. So they have some

23   of that in place and would certainly be willing to try to operate on a larger scale.

24

25   **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

26   President Maghsoudi reported that the California Library Association (CLA) Legislative

27   Committee was working with the State Library to come up with a letter that would go out to the

28   field on a possible construction bond, probably for the 2018 Ballot. State Librarian Lucas clarified

11

1 that, realistically, 2018 was the soonest you could do a statewide campaign for a bond measure.

2 He did not think that, logistically or politically, 2016 made sense.

3 President Maghsoudi said that CLA would be sending out a letter soon with a needs

4 assessment for library construction money throughout the state. CLA was also working on their

5 legislative priorities for 2016.

6

7 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

8 No additional comments from the public.

9

10 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

11 Member Ibanez reported that in November the UCLA Diversity Forum was planning an event at

12 the Los Angeles Public Library, Central Library to promote more diversity within the profession.

13 They had invited Jose Aponte from San Diego City Library to be the Key Note Speaker.

14

15 **OLD BUSINESS**

16 Annly Roman reported that the Board Strategic Planning Session had been brought to the

17 Board before. The suggestion was to have someone come in and advise on strategic planning for

18 the Board's direction. It was something that the Board had discussed wanting to put on hold until

19 there was a fully appointed Board. The item was left on the agenda to keep it on the Board's

20 radar for continued discussion if they would like to revisit it. Board members agreed that it would

21 be best to wait till they met in person to discuss strategic planning.

22

23 **AGENDA BUILDING**

24 President Maghsoudi called for any additional agenda items of interest to Board members.

25 None were brought forward.

26

27 **ADJOURNMENT**

28 President Maghsoudi adjourned the meeting at 3:36 p.m.

29

California Library Services Board Resolution 2015-01
In Honor of Sandy Habbestad

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Sandy Habbestad on the occasion of her retirement from the California State Library on July 31, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to honor Sandy for her 38 years of dedicated service to the California State Library; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to recognize Sandy's 13 years of exemplary service as the principal staff for the California Library Services Board, where she: developed agendas; composed resolutions, minutes, reports and motions; and ensured that the Board meetings complied with California's Open Meeting laws and operated efficiently; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that she has also greatly benefited the Board and the people of California in her work as the California State Library Act Program manager; and

WHEREAS, the Board wished to distinguish Sandy for her consistent demonstration of good judgement, outstanding work ethic, and positive attitude in providing service and assistance to all Board members, program stakeholders, and California State Library staff and patrons; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the members of the California Library Services Board do hereby commend Sandy Habbestad on her years of dedicated service, to the Board, the California State Library, and the people of California, and congratulate her upon the occasion of her retirement from the California State Library; and

BE IT FRUTHER RESOLVED, that

Sandy Habbestad

Shall be honored by the California Library Services Board for her years of leadership, service, and contributions to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 03 September, 2015

13

AGENDA ITEM: 2016 Meeting Schedule and Locations

2016 Proposed Board Meeting Schedule		
Date	Location	Activities
Late August -Early September?	Sacramento?	Regular Business Annual Budget Meeting Election of Board Officers for year 2017 LSTA State Advisory Council on Libraries Meeting
Late March-Early April?	Teleconference?	Budget and Planning Election of the Nominating Committee

BACKGOUND:

California Library Services Act (CLSA) regulations specify that the Board shall conduct bi-monthly meetings; however, Section 20118 (c) states:

"(c) Nothing in this regulation shall be construed to prevent the state board from altering its regular meeting dates or places of meetings."

Staff will provide members with a Doodle poll to determine the dates for 2016 meetings.
The question for Board members is when to schedule a face-to-face meeting in Sacramento.
A calendar of upcoming and future library-related events and dates is included to this agenda item as Exhibit A.

CALENDAR OF UPCOMING LIBRARY-RELATED EVENTS AND DATES

The following is a list of upcoming library-related events and dates worth noting:

2016		
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Membership Meeting	April 26-28, 2016	Vancouver, BC
SLA (Special Libraries Association) Annual Conference & Info Expo	June 12-14, 2016	Philadelphia, PA
ACRL (Association of College & Research Libraries) at ALA	June 23-28, 2016	Orlando, FL
ALA (American Library Association) Annual Conference	June 23-28, 2016	Orlando, FL
AALL (American Association of Law Libraries) Annual Meeting and Conference	July 16-19, 2016	Chicago, IL
IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions) General Conference & Assembly	August 13-19, 2016	Columbus, OH
California State Legislature Adjourns for 2016	August 31, 2016	Sacramento, CA
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Membership Meeting	September 27-28, 2016	Washington, D.C.
State Bar of California Annual Meeting	September 29-October 2, 2016	San Diego, CA
WestPac (Western Pacific Chapter – AALL) Annual Meeting	September 29-October 2, 2016	Jackson, WY
Educause Annual Conference	October 25-28, 2016	Anaheim, CA
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Library Assessment Conference	October 31-November 2, 2016	Arlington, VA
CLA (California Library Association) Annual Conference	November 3-5, 2015	Sacramento, CA
LITA (Library Information Technology Association) National Forum	TBD	TBD
California State Legislature Reconvenes	December 5, 2016	Sacramento, CA
2017		
ALA (American Library Association) Midwinter Conference	January 20-24, 2017	Atlanta, GA
CSLA (California School Library Association) Annual State Conference	February 2-TBD, 2017	TBD, CA
PLA (Public Library Association) Leadership Academy	TBD - Spring	TBD
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Association Meeting	May 2-4, 2017	Philadelphia, PA
SLA (Special Libraries Association) Annual Conference & Info Expo	June 18-20, 2017	Phoenix, AZ
ACRL (Association of College & Research Libraries) at ALA	June 22-27, 2017	Chicago, IL
ALA (American Library Association) Annual Conference	June 22-27, 2017	Chicago, IL
AALL (American Association of Law Libraries) Annual Meeting and Conference	July 15-18, 2017	Austin, TX
State Bar of California Annual Meeting	August 24-27, 2017	Anaheim, CA
AASL (American Association of School Libraries) National Conference	November 9-12, 2017	Phoenix, AZ

Document 3

AGENDA ITEM: Nominating Committee for 2017 Board Officers

ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consider
candidates to the Nominating Committee for 2016 Board Officers

---

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that
the California Library Services Board appoint _____ and _____
to the Nominating Committee to select Board Officers for 2017.

BACKGROUND:

California Library Services Act regulations, Section 20116 (a), state that, "The state board
shall annually elect a president and vice-president at the first regular meeting of each
calendar year." It has been Board policy to elect Board officers at the last meeting of the
calendar year so the new officers may begin their term in the new calendar year.

The Board will appoint two of its members to serve on the Nominating Committee and to
report to the Board at its fall meeting the slate of Board Officer for 2017. In the absence of
regulations prescribing the form and method for electing officers, according to Code of
California Regulations Section 20127, the CLSB is guided by procedures set forth in
Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, Chapter XIV, Nominations and Elections.

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA Budget for FY 2016/17

ISSUE TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consider the preliminary
      CLSA budget for FY 2016/17

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the
      California Library Services Board adopt, contingent upon the passage of the State Budget
      Act, the 2016/17 CLSA budget as directed in the Governor's Proposed 2016/17 Budget,
      totaling $3,630,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the
California Library Services Board direct the California State Library staff to gather and
summarize input from libraries across the state for usage of the proposed $3 million in one-time
funds for consideration by the Board at the Fall 2016 meeting.

BACKGROUND:

The governor's proposed budget, released in January for 2016-2017 fiscal year, includes a
proposal to provide $4.75 million in new funding for the California Library Services Act. This
money would be in addition to the $1,880,000 that is currently appropriated under the CLSA. Of
the $4.75 million, $1.75 million is ongoing, roughly doubling current spending under the act. The
remaining $3 million is one-time money.

Ongoing funding
Absent a desire by the board to change current policy, staff considers the additional ongoing $1.8
million subject to the allocation formulas the board has already created for the cooperative library
systems in the state. Proposed expenditure of these new ongoing funds will be reflected in the
plans of service prepared by the systems that the board is scheduled to review at its meeting this
fall.

One-time funds
The governor's proposed budget is silent on how the $3 million in one-time funds should be
spent, largely because it is a decision that rests with the board. At the same time, cooperative
library systems and their member libraries should have the maximum amount of input possible in
determining the most strategic uses of the $3 million.

The board derives its authority from the California Library Services Act, in Article 3, Administration, Section 18724,where one of the duties for the Board is *"To expend the funds appropriated for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this chapter. "*

Latitude is given in the Act as to how the Board may allocate the funds in the following areas:

- *Article 4, Local Public Library Services,*
  Sec. 18730. Special Services Programs.
  - o   *Any public library or combination of public libraries may submit proposals to the state board for Special Services Programs within the service area.*

- *Article 5. Library System Services*
  Sec. 18745. System communications and delivery.
  - o   *Each system shall annually apply to the state board for funds for intra system communications and delivery.*
  - o   *Proposals shall be based upon the most cost-effective methods of exchanging materials and information among the member libraries.*

  Sec. 18746. System planning, coordination, and evaluation.
  - o   *Each system shall annually apply to the state board for funds for planning, coordination, and evaluation of the overall systemwide services authorized by this chapter.*

The one-time funding approach has been used in the past. The governor's 2014-2015 budget included a $2 million one-time funding augmentation was included in the CLSA budget line item and adult literacy. Ultimately the Board allocated $1 million of the CLSA augmentation be divided among cooperative systems, using the approved formula, for local communications and delivery efforts. The remaining $1 million was allocated to help libraries improve their broadband connectivity.

Recommendation: Staff is recommending:
A. The board adopt the preliminary budget for $1.8 million in ongoing funding so that partial payments can be made to cooperative systems as soon as the State Budget Act of 2016 is signed.
B. Given the one-time nature of the $3 million appropriation, the board should direct State Library staff to gather and summarize input from libraries across the state to assist in determining the most strategic uses of the $3 million in one-time funds. Reports and recommendations would be presented to the board at its fall meeting.

RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE:
Review and approve System Plans of Service and Budget for FY 2016/17.
Review of input regarding most strategic uses of the $3 million in one-time funds
Approve a plan of action for the use of the $3 million in one-time funds

CLSA Preliminary System Budget Allocations - FY 2016/17
Communications and Delivery Program

System	Baseline Budget	System Administration	Total	2015/16 Total
Black Gold	$ 120,549	$ 30,137	$ 150,686	$ 78,219
49-99	$ 120,587	$ 30,147	$ 150,734	$ 78,244
Inland	$ 306,963	$ 76,742	$ 383,705	$ 199,287
NorthNet	$ 655,785	$ 163,946	$ 819,731	$ 421,844
PLP	$ 556,748	$ 139,187	$ 695,935	$ 360,102
SJVLS	$ 192,761	$ 48,191	$ 240,952	$ 125,087
Santiago	$ 168,830	$ 42,208	$ 211,038	$ 109,595
Serra	$ 216,946	$ 54,236	$ 271,182	$ 140,833
SCLC	$ 564,831	$ 141,206	$ 706,037	$ 366,789
TOTAL	$ 2,904,000	$ 726,000	$ 3,630,000	$ 1,880,000

Totals are based on May 2015 population figures from the Department of Finance to be approved by the California Library Services Board at its April 8, 2016 meeting.

P:sh/my doc/Prelim system allocations 2016/17

Possible mechanics for expending one-time funds

The board derives its authority from the California Library Services Act, in Article 3, Administration, Section 18724, where one of the duties for the board is "To expend the funds appropriated for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this chapter. "

The Act addresses fund allocations in the following ways:

1) *Article 4, Local Public Library Services,*
   a) *public library or combination of public libraries may submit proposals to the state board for Sec. 18730. Special Services Programs.*
   b) *Any Special Services Programs within the service area.*
2) *Article 5. Library System Services*
   a) *Sec. 18745. System communications and delivery.*
      i. *Each system shall annually apply to the state board for funds for intra system communications and delivery.*
      ii. *Proposals shall be based upon the most cost-effective methods of exchanging materials and information among the member libraries.*
   b) *Sec. 18746. System planning, coordination, and evaluation.*
      i. *Each system shall annually apply to the state board for funds for planning, coordination, and evaluation of the overall system wide services authorized by this chapter.*

Options for the Board to consider:

1) Allocate all or a portion of the one-time funds to the systems using the allocation formula already approved by the board.
   a) Each individual system would be required to add an addendum to their plan of service outlining their plans for the additional funds.
   b) The plans would then be reviewed and approved by the board.

2) Allocate all or a portion of the one-time funds to the Special Services Programs component of the Act.
   a) The board directs State Library staff to gather and summarize input from libraries across the state to assist in determining the most strategic uses of the one-time funds.
   b) Reports and recommendations would be presented to the board at its fall meeting.
   c) The board approves a plan of action for the use of the one-time funds at its fall meeting.
   d) The board directs State Library staff to put out a call for proposals.
   e) Proposals are received, evaluated, and summarized by State Library staff for recommendations to the board at its following meeting.

3) A combination of options 1 and 2.

Exhibit C

SANTIAGO
LIBRARY SYSTEM

Date: March 24, 2016

To: California Library Services Board

From: Mary McCasland, Chair, Santiago Library System (SLS)
         Stephanie Beverage, Vice Chair, Santiago Library System (SLS)

Re: Recommendations to California Library Services Board for proposed CLSA
         funding

The Santiago Library System is grateful for the new CLSA funding the Governor has
included in his proposed budget. We appreciate the opportunity to provide input to the
Board regarding the allocation of the proposed on-going and one-time funds.

The additional $1.8 million will allow the systems to continue to provide the essential
functions of communication and delivery as well as support for the administration of
these important systems. Technology has changed the way systems share materials
and some of these funds have also been used by the systems for shared digital content
such as e-books and e-magazines. The systems are diverse. We are in support of the
current allocation formulas currently being used and feel it is also important to have the
opportunity for some flexibility in how the funds are used within the systems.

The additional $3 million one-time funds is a wonderful opportunity to strengthen the
services libraries provide and will give systems opportunities for additional resource
sharing that will benefit library users. Santiago Library System libraries include the
following as priorities:

- Early Literacy – Libraries are seeing parents and caregivers flock to early
  learning storytimes and programs. Additional funding for new and innovative
  programs will have a lasting benefit on the children and the State overall as we
  set our young children up to succeed throughout their early education.
- A very strategic opportunity one of our libraries is considering is to serve the
  underserved by a cooperative effort to generate counts of Library user data by
  Census tract, in order to help identify underserved areas in our communities and
  help target future services on those areas. We have an immediate opportunity to
  use this information in the Early Development Index (EDI) project in cooperation
  with the Children and Families Commission of Orange County and the UCLA
  Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities. The EDI maps
  percentages of at-risk and vulnerable children on several key markers of school
  readiness. Library user counts by Census tract could be overlaid with EDI data to

identify correlations between library use and school readiness, and also help identify areas that the libraries can target for early development programs and services. This is one example of how the information can be used to benefit our communities.
- Collaboration with schools to get library cards in the hands of all of our students so they may benefit from online access to eResources as well as print resources.
- Adult education programs such as Career On-Line High School opportunities and adult literacy programs to educate the adult learners in our communities.
- Digitization projects are also important to our libraries, but don't always make it to the top of the list when competing with the literacy needs of our communities.
- Many of our libraries are taking advantage of the critically important CENIC project and are benefiting with amazing broadband speeds while reducing monthly costs. Funding for CENIC should remain a high priority. The potential for greater Statewide collaboration through the expanded network capacity of CalREN is a game changer for the Library community.
- We think allowing a portion of the funds to be used for administrative costs for these projects is also important as is a requirement to report the outcomes for the proposed use of funds.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our input regarding the CLSA funding. We are happy to provide additional information or respond to your questions.

Sincerely,

Mary McCasland
Library Director
Buena Park Library District
marymac@buenapark.lib.ca.us
714-826-4100 Ext. 121

Stephanie Beverage
Director, Library Services
Huntington Beach Public Library
stephanie.beverage@surfcity-hb.org
714-960-8835

cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian

2

Pacific Library Partnership

To: California Library Services Board

From: Jane Chisaki, Chair, Pacific Library Partnership (PLP)

Re: Recommendations to California Library Services Board re 2016/17 proposed CLSA funding

Date: March 24, 2016

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments to the Board on the critical allocation of the proposed on-going and one-time funds for the California Library Services Act (CLSA).

Ongoing Funds - $1.8 million

We support the staff recommendation that the on-going $1.8 million would be allocated to systems by the current allocation formulas created by the Board. These additional funds would support the critical essential functions of our systems – communications and delivery – and also support funds for the administration of the systems. In recent years, these funds have also been used to support costs for digital content (e-books and e-magazines) where the purchase of the resource was shared by three or more member libraries. It would be helpful if the definition of eligible resources could be expanded to include databases, streaming music and video and other e-resources.

One-time Funds - $3 million

We believe that the $3 million in one-time funding should be spent strategically in support of resource-sharing which is the hallmark of CLSA and in support of programs that will have a significant statewide impact. Both PLP and NLS have recently participated in strategic planning activities and have identified service priorities for the systems that could be initiated or strengthened with these funds. Below are some possible programs:

- Student Success Cards – In order to better leverage the investments that public libraries are making in their digital and print resources, develop a state-wide initiative to ensure that every student in a public K – 12 classroom has convenient access to those resources. Several public libraries have initiated this service using the student ID to generate a virtual library card that provides online access for students to all public library e-resources. This program which also could include print resources would be enhanced by a statewide platform providing coordination through systems and county offices of education, educational materials for teachers and parents and possibly extended delivery by connecting existing public library delivery systems with public school delivery systems.

- Statewide E-resources - Although statewide aggregated e-resource purchasing has been challenging in the past due primarily to costs, these state funds could be leverage with federal and other funds to initiate a portfolio of e-resources that could be curated to be useful for public library and school collections. This statewide purchase could free up some local resources currently spent on these resources to be used for other material that was more tailored to the needs of the individual communities. This service is available in most other

states. These resources could be supported with a combination of federal, state and local funds. Here is a good example of students in Massachusetts who can access e-resources from their G-mail accounts - http://mblc.state.ma.us/grants/licenses/blog/category/gale/.

- Statewide Virtual Library Card – Although there is much local pride and identity in unique community library cards,   we have the opportunity to create some kind of virtual statewide library card that could provide access to e-resources that were made available by any public library in the state that participated in CLSA - the electronic version of the universal borrowing program. The virtual library card could be issued along with a driver's license or a statewide identification card – we could identify a convenient and fairly universal process that most residents use and determine how we could integrate the virtual card creation in to that process. This card could greatly enhance the use of public library resources and lead to further utilization of print resources as well.
- Planning, Coordination and Evaluation of System-wide Services – This is an activity that is specifically outlined in CLSA (Sec. 18746). Participating libraries want to identify their customer base, target new audiences, and determine the effectiveness of programs and services both at a local and system level. There are a number of services that provide frameworks for this research and analysis (Analytics on Demand, Civic Technologies, Orange Boy). The development of a statewide platform to provide access and technical assistance for audience, program and service evaluation would be beneficial for all the state's libraries in order to provide more effective services. (PLP is using local funds to develop a system-level data analysis tool with Analytics on Demand which can be shared with other systems as a pilot for this analysis.)

There are many other important public library service priorities for the wide variety of audiences we serve – early literacy, special needs, adult literacy, GED and high school success, senior services. These services are critical yet the 2016/17 proposed funds have been allocated to the California Library Services Act in support of its primary mission – enhanced resource-sharing of all types of materials providing access to knowledge.

We also recommend the following:
- Make one-time funds available for the use of the nine CLSA cooperative library systems.
- Identify two - three key funding priorities.
- Request systems to prepare proposals to implement programs in support of those priorities.
- Establish a minimum level of funding that could be requested by each system.
- Provide incentives for systems to cooperate on projects.
- Require benchmarks/outcomes be established for all proposals.
- Allow a portion of the $3 million to be used for administrative costs for these projects.

We would be glad to provide further information or respond to any questions. Please contact Susan Hildreth, PLP CEO at 650-349-5538 or hildreth@plsinfo.org.

cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian

To: California Library Services Board

From: Mel Lightbody, Chair, NorthNet Library System (NLS)

Re: Recommendations to California Library Services Board re 2016/17 proposed CLSA funding

Date: March 24, 2016

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments to the Board on the critical allocation of the proposed on-going and one-time funds for the California Library Services Act (CLSA).

Ongoing Funds - $1.8 million

We support the staff recommendation that the on-going $1.8 million would be allocated to systems by the current allocation formulas created by the Board. These additional funds would support the critical essential functions of our systems – communications and delivery – and also support funds for the administration of the systems. In recent years, these funds have also been used to support costs for digital content (e-books and e-magazines) where the purchase of the resource was shared by three or more member libraries. We strongly recommend the following:

- Definition of e-resource sharing be expanded to include streaming content services (music and film) and other types of digital resources, databases, etc.
- Zip Books, a customer-centric alternative to inter-library loan http://califa.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Zip-Books-for-Rural-Libraries-FAQ.pdf and other innovative services to modernize and streamline the inter-library loan process be eligible for funding within the communications and delivery program.

One-time Funds - $3 million

We believe that the $3 million in one-time funding should be spent strategically in support of resource-sharing which is the hallmark of CLSA and in support of programs that will have a significant statewide impact. Both PLP and NLS have recently participated in strategic planning activities and have identified service priorities for the systems that could be initiated or strengthened with these funds. Below are some possible programs:

- Statewide E-resources - Although statewide aggregated e-resource purchasing has been challenging in the past due primarily to costs, these state funds could be leverage with federal and other funds to initiate a portfolio of e-resources that could be curated to be useful for public library and school collections. This statewide purchase could free up some local resources currently spent on these resources to be used for other material that was more tailored to the needs of the individual communities. This service is available in most other states. These resources could be supported with a combination of federal, state and local funds. Here is a good example of students in Massachusetts who can access e-resources from their G-mail accounts - http://mblc.state.ma.us/grants/licenses/blog/category/gale/.

- Support for Broadband Equipment - We appreciate the support of the Governor and the Legislature for public library connectivity to California's high speed research and education network (CalREN) and funds for equipment to make that connection happen. A number of NorthNet member libraries are taking advantage of that opportunity. Yet the costs for equipment to connect to this network as well as local one-time costs to provide access to the network and to support the initial up-front cost of circuits before federal and state discounts are applied make this opportunity unattainable for libraries in rural and geographically isolated communities where libraries may be the only access point to the information superhighway. Building on your previous investment, we would encourage you to consider continuing that support as a possible use of some or all of these one-time funds.

- Statewide Virtual Library Card – Although there is much local pride and identity in unique community library cards, we have the opportunity to create some kind of virtual statewide library card that could provide access to e-resources that were made available by any public library in the state that participated in CLSA - the electronic version of the universal borrowing program. The virtual library card could be issued along with a driver's license or a statewide identification card – we could identify a convenient and fairly universal process that most residents use and determine how we could integrate the virtual card creation in to that process. This card could greatly enhance the use of public library resources and lead to further utilization of print resources as well.

- Student Success Cards – In order to better leverage the investments that public libraries are making in their digital and print resources, develop a state-wide initiative to ensure that every student in a public K – 12 classroom has convenient access to those resources. Several public libraries have initiated this service using the student ID to generate a virtual library card that provides online access for students to all public library e-resources. This program which also could include print resources would be enhanced by a statewide platform providing coordination through systems and county offices of education, educational materials for teachers and parents and possibly extended delivery by connecting existing public library delivery systems with public school delivery systems.

- Planning, Coordination and Evaluation of System-wide Services – This is an activity that is specifically outlined in CLSA (Sec. 18746). Participating libraries want to identify their customer base, target new audiences, and determine the effectiveness of programs and services both at a local and system level. There are a number of services that provide frameworks for this research and analysis (Analytics on Demand, Civic Technologies, Orange Boy). The development of a statewide platform to provide access and technical assistance for audience, program and service evaluation would be beneficial for all the state's libraries in order to provide more effective services. (PLP is using local funds to develop a system-level data analysis tool with Analytics on Demand which can be shared with other systems as a pilot for this analysis.)

There are many other important public library service priorities for the wide variety of audiences we serve – early literacy, special needs, adult literacy, GED and high school success, senior services. These services are critical yet the 2016/17 proposed funds have been allocated to the California Library Services Act in support of its primary mission – enhanced resource-sharing of all types of materials providing access to knowledge.

We also recommend the following:

- Make one-time funds available for the use of the nine CLSA cooperative library systems.

- Identify two - three key funding priorities.

- Request systems to prepare proposals to implement programs in support of those priorities.

- Establish a minimum level of funding that could be requested by each system.

- Provide incentives for systems to cooperate on projects.

- Require benchmarks/outcomes be established for all proposals.

- Allow a portion of the $3 million to be used for administrative costs for these projects.

We would be glad to provide further information or respond to any questions. Please contact Mel Lightbody, NLS Chair, at 530-538-7240, mlightbody@buttecounty.net or Susan Hildreth, NLS Administrator, at 650-349-5538 or hildreth@plsinfo.org.

cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian

SCLC

DATE: March 25, 2016
TO: California Library Services Board
FROM: Glenda Williams, Chair, Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC)
SUBJECT: Recommendations to California Library Services Board
                2016/17 Proposed CLSA Funding

The Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC) Administrative Council appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Board regarding the proposed ongoing and the one-time California Library Services Act funding for FY 2016/17.

Overview

A goal of the nine library cooperatives in the State of California has been to work together to provide improved communication and access to the member libraries and their residents. The System Coordinators recently met and discussed ways to maximize potential funding on a statewide level to facilitate meeting this goal. As a result of a brainstorming session in January of this year, the system coordinators worked together, with Maureen Theobald (Black Gold) taking the lead, to create a statewide information sharing platform. Member libraries contribute information to the development of a clearinghouse of policies and procedures, fines and fee structures, job descriptions and more. This is one example of a collaborative project driven by the input of the member libraries to utilize CLSA funds which are critical to the operation of resource sharing between CLSA libraries.

Ongoing Funds- $1.8 million

SCLC supports the staff recommendation that the ongoing $1.8 million would be allocated to the systems using the current allocation formula created by the Board. SCLC directors participated in a workshop to strategically plan how CLSA funds would be used and determine the most advantageous projects to be shared by three or more member libraries. These funds are critical to the Communication and Delivery of our system, as well as the administration of the system.

One-time Funds- $3 million

The consensus for projects utilizing the one-time funds toward statewide resource sharing for member libraries will be a considerable benefit to their respective residents. SCLC Directors participated in a workshop to develop future initiatives and also suggested using funds to engage innovators from the university lab and/or private sectors. Involving pioneers and developers from outside the library industry will help us drive past simply repurposing our past practices, leading to more transformative, breakthrough innovations. In addition to creating new-model business plans for programs such as the following, investing now to integrate "outside" industry visionary thought into the library planning process could lay the groundwork for future transformation:

- Mental Health- Libraries are facing an increasing challenge with homelessness and patrons suffering from mental health related issues. Azusa has a successful model that addresses these issues and could be replicated to create neighborhood community resource specialists to assist staff in addressing issues related to the homeless and mentally challenged patrons by partnering with local agencies currently offering services. Ideas could include portable showers, portable laundry services, legal aid and access to health care. The specialist can be hired to work with three or more libraries. This supports one of the State Librarian's initiatives.

- Statewide Resource sharing- Resource sharing is a cost effective way for the cooperatives to maximize services. Maker spaces have become a popular mechanism to target specific

interests. It is suggested to use the one-time funds to create roving maker space vans and/or maker space boxes that can be shared within the cooperative. In addition, design a digitization van to support the digitization project currently being developed by the State Library.

- Statewide E-Resources- Libraries provide core e-resources at the local level which can be very costly and duplicative. The State Library can be the backbone for California libraries by developing a statewide e-resource sharing platform for e-books, e-magazines and California specific newspapers. This would free up local funding and enable libraries to focus more effort on community needs. With the decline of school libraries, students could also benefit by having access to these resources.

- Statewide Library Card- It is the goal of libraries to provide material that meets their community needs. This can be a costly undertaking and difficult based on limited space. Having the ability to share materials throughout the state enhances the patron's experience and their ability to access a wider range of materials. One service some libraries are using is LINK+, a resource-sharing network that provides direct requesting of books and media from over 70 libraries of all types in California and Nevada. Partnering with LINK+ to use a statewide library card would be a financial benefit to libraries and their users.

- Statewide Databases- Similar to the statewide e-resources, a statewide database platform hosted by the State Library would benefit all libraries in California. There are a variety of databases such as EBSCO which would benefit educational needs, workforce investment and more. Analytics on Demand is a database to benefit libraries and their ability to recognize the demographics in their community. The ability to access databases remotely increases the sphere of the library.

- Citizenship- Immigration services are provided by some libraries. Utilizing the experience and expertise of current models would benefit libraries throughout California. One example is a program called Inspired Citizenship. Patrons are partnered with a coach to prepare for the citizenship test, which currently has a 100% success rate for the patron. USCIS is also a good partnership for this program because they have resources designed for libraries. Funding would provide much needed resources to promote and present the program. This initiative not only benefits the individual, but the community where they live and work.

The Southern California Library Cooperative would be glad to provide you with additional information or respond to any questions. Please contact Diane Satchwell at 626-283-5949 or dsatchwell@socallibraries.org.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian

DATE: March 25, 2016
TO: California Library Services Board
FROM: Laura Einstadter, Chair, 49-99 Cooperative Library System
RECOMMENDATIONS: California Library Services Board 16/17 Proposed CLSA Funding

The 49-99 Cooperative Library System's Administrative Council appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Board regarding the proposed ongoing and the one-time California Library Services Act funding for FY 2016/17.

Ongoing Funds- $1.8 million

49-99 supports the staff recommendation that the ongoing $1.8 million would be allocated to the systems using the current allocation formula created by the Board. 49-99 directors participated in a workshop to strategically plan how CLSA funds would be used and determine the most advantageous projects to be shared by three or more member libraries. These funds are critical to the Communication and Delivery of our system, as well as the administration of the system.

Recently 49-99 used their CLSA funds to contract with LINK+ for their services. LINK+ is a resource-sharing network that provides direct requesting of books and media from over 70 libraries of all types in California and Nevada. Services will begin in late May. CLSA funds made this possible to improve delivery of materials to the member libraries.

One-time Funds- $3 million

The consensus for projects utilizing the one-time funds toward statewide resource sharing for member libraries will be a considerable benefit to their respective residents. 49-99 Directors participated in a workshop to develop future initiatives and suggest the following programs:

- LINK+: LINK+ is a resource-sharing network that provides direct requesting of books and media from over 70 libraries of all types in California and Nevada. 49-99 added this service this fiscal year. 49-99 no longer needs to process time-consuming InterLibraryLoan requests, reducing staff time and costs. It also provides a wide variety of material otherwise not available in their libraries. 49-99 libraries contribute unique material specific to their historically rich area. LINK+ would benefit all libraries in California and create a universal library card for California residents.

- Statewide E-resources: 49-99 is challenged with providing e-books and e-magazines with their limited budgets. Creating a statewide platform of e-resources would provide a valuable resource to their communities. This would free up local funding and enable libraries to focus more effort on community needs. With the decline of school libraries, students could also benefit by having access to these resources.

- Statewide Databases: Similar to the statewide e-resources, a statewide database platform hosted by the State Library would benefit all libraries in California. To better serve the residents, libraries need data for decision-making purposes. Analytics on Demand is a

database to benefit libraries and their ability to recognize the demographics in their community. Another noteworthy database is EBSCO which benefits schools, workforce investment and more. The ability to access databases remotely increases the sphere of the library.

- Digi-bus: Technology changes rapidly. Libraries want and need to take the lead and offer the newest most advanced technology devices. The rural libraries struggle to keep up with the changes and then try to figure out the best method to offer these to their patrons. A Digi-bus would provide current technology devices such as hotspots and 3-D printers. It would travel around the cooperative stopping at libraries, flea markets, special events, etc. It would also work as a promotional tool showing off the libraries, while educating the public.

- Shared Knowledge Platform: Library staff constantly share and request policies and procedures through global email requests. Since all cooperatives wanted this program, the System Coordinators worked together, with Maureen Theobald (Black Gold) taking the lead, to create a statewide information sharing platform. Member libraries contribute information to the development of a clearinghouse of policies and procedures, fines and fee structures, job descriptions and more. This is one example of a collaborative project driven by the input of the member libraries to utilize CLSA funds which are critical to the operation of resource sharing between CLSA libraries.

49-99 would be glad to provide you with additional information or respond to any questions. Please contact Diane Satchwell at 626-283-5949 or dsatchwell@socallibraries.org.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian

BLACK GOLD
COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SYSTEM

To: California Library Services Board

From: Ned Branch, Chair, Black Gold Cooperative Library System

Subject: Proposed CLSA funding recommendations

Date: March 25, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed additional California Library Services Act (CLSA) funds for FY 2016-17. This is an excellent opportunity to apply the funds in both existing and new ways to leverage the abilities and strengths of the systems.

Ongoing funds:

Staff has recommended the ongoing $1.8 million be allocated to systems by the current allocation formula. We support that recommendation since delivery and communications are critical to our system's function. The additional funds would allow us to supplement our very active digital download programs with new titles. Use of those products is nearly doubling each year and it we are unable to keep up with the demand with our current budgeted funds.

One-time funds

We recommend the one-time funds of $3 million be used to again further the strength of the CLSA system's resource sharing capabilities. We hope that the funds are made available for the nine CSLSA cooperative library systems and a minimum of level of funds should be available to each system. Several initiatives could be identified and made available, and each system could select and apply for those which would best serve their members. Initiatives which the Black Gold Cooperative would find most useful would be:

Statewide E-resources. Public libraries should take charge of information literacy. Schools are ill equipped to handle these efforts and every school district seems to have different levels and standards for information literacy. The public library is the solution; we just need support for these collaborative efforts. One of our libraries identified computer technology and test books as tools that are very much needed.

Evaluation of Services. It has been very difficult to determine how our services are being utilized. Non-users of library services are particularly hard to identify. Products and services are now available to get at this information, and Analytics on Demand was recently used by one of our members to help gauge the need for a new branch. They found the information they gathered was extremely useful and would support use for all of our members. This would also allow us to look at use of digital resources at the system level in order to derive better information on how those services are being used and what could be improved.

Moveable "Library of Things" – Not every library has the capability of housing or funding a full "Library of Things." This proposal would have the system members create sets of loanable items that could move around the system via delivery for patrons to use. Libraries could also use them for programming. They would be centered on a theme; suggested themes for this could be Music (musical instruments, amplifiers,

metronomes, sheet music or music books), Science (microscopes, chemistry sets, telescopes, electronic kits, books of lab experiments.)

Thank you again for the opportunity to make suggestions on how the funding could be spent. We would be happy to provide more information if needed. Please contact Maureen Theobald, BG Executive Director, at mtheobald@blackgold.org or (805) 543-1093.

Cc: Greg Lucas, Black Gold Administrative Council

Exhibit I

Serra Cooperative Library System

DATE: March 25, 2016
TO: California Library Services Board
FROM: Sherri Cosby, Chair, Serra Cooperative Library System
SUBJECT: Recommendations to California Library Services Board
             2016/17 Proposed CLSA Funding

Serra Administrative Council appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Board regarding the proposed ongoing and the one-time California Library Services Act funding for FY 2016/17.

Ongoing Funds- $1.8 million

Serra supports the staff recommendation that the ongoing $1.8 million would be allocated to the systems using the current allocation formula created by the Board. Serra directors participated in a workshop to strategically plan how CLSA funds would be used and determine the most advantageous projects to be shared by three or more member libraries. Serra has taken advantage of using the CLSA funds for e-books and e-magazines. These funds are critical to the Communication and Delivery of our system, as well as the administration of the system.

One-time Funds- $3 million

The consensus for projects utilizing the one-time funds toward statewide resource sharing for member libraries will be a considerable benefit to their respective residents. Serra Directors participated in a workshop to develop future initiatives and suggest the following programs:

- LINK+: LINK+ is a resource-sharing network that provides direct requesting of books and media from over 70 libraries of all types in California and Nevada. Serra has wanted to add this service. It equalizes their collections for the smaller libraries and it would add value to the larger systems as well. LINK+ would benefit all libraries in California and has the potential for a universal library card for California residents.

- Statewide Resource Sharing: Resource sharing is a cost effective way for the cooperatives to maximize services. Maker spaces have become a popular mechanism to target specific interests. It is suggested to use the one-time funds to create roving maker space vans and/or maker space boxes that can be shared within the cooperative. Other ideas included play and learn islands to share due to the high cost of the product and provide the opportunity to design a digitization van to support the digitization project currently being developed by the State Library.

- Statewide E-Resources: Serra currently uses OverDrive and Zinio for e-books and e-magazines. The libraries provide core e-resources at the local level using the CLSA funds, but they are still very costly. The State Library can be the backbone for California libraries by developing a statewide e-resource sharing platform for e-books, e-magazines and California specific newspapers which would increase the number of titles and copies currently available. This would free up local funding and enable libraries to focus more

effort on community needs for the CLSA funds. With the decline of school libraries, students could also benefit by having access to these resources.

- Digi-bus: Technology changes rapidly. Libraries want and need to take the lead and offer the newest most advanced technology devices. The libraries struggle to keep up with the changes and then try to figure out the best method to offer these to their patrons. A Digi-bus would provide current technology devices such as hotspots and 3-D printers. It would travel around the cooperative stopping at libraries, flea markets, special events, etc. It would also work as a promotional tool showing off the libraries, while educating the public.

Serra would be glad to provide you with additional information or respond to any questions. Please contact Diane Satchwell at 626-283-5949 or dsatchwell@socallibraries.org.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian

[Type text]

INLAND
LIBRARY
SYSTEM

Date: March 28, 2016

To: California Library Services Board

From: Tonya Kennon, Chair, Inland Library System (ILS)
     Michelle Perera, Vice Chair, Inland Library System (ILS)

Re: Recommendations to California Library Services Board for proposed CLSA funding

The Inland Library System extends gratitude to the California Library Services Board for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed California Library Services Act (CLSA) funds for FY 2016/17. We are thankful for the CLSA funding included in the Governor's proposed budget and view it as an opportunity to bolster systems, strengthen existing services and support essential new services.

We support the recommendation for $1.8 million in ongoing funds to be allocated to systems using the current allocation formula. Our support of this recommendation is driven by the fact that communication and delivery are fundamental to system services and support for administration of the systems is vital. The funds also provide an opportunity to supplement e-books, e-magazines and other such popular shared digital services to assist with meeting demand. To meet the needs of the diverse systems served, we support the opportunity to enhance flexibility with regard to use of the funds within the systems.

We recommend the $3 million in one-time funds be used to strengthen resource sharing for the benefit of all communities. We suggest funds be used to support multiple statewide initiatives that speak to the needs of the diverse communities served by the systems. The following initiatives would most benefit the Inland Library System:

A Card for Every Student – State support of an initiative to provide a library card for all K-12 students for the benefit of stronger educational support through increased access to resources.

Statewide e-Resources – While our systems are diverse, there are many e-resources that are duplicated across systems without the advantage of economies of scale. Public libraries are the information hub for all and should provide a base level of e-Resources in support of information literacy and the increasing need for remote access to information.

Digitization – Public library archives and local history collections hold some of the most important about and for our communities. It is imperative that the information is not lost and access to the information is enhanced. Many libraries do not have the funds to digitize their

collections. A statewide initiative in support of robust regional digitization centers within public libraries is needed to advance this work.

System Administration – Strong systems are key to advancing the work of public libraries and supporting statewide initiatives, as well as administering and managing reporting of CLSA funded projects.

Mobile STEM Labs – Public libraries should be a foremost promoter of STEM education. Funding to purchase items to loan and for programming will assist in this endeavor and will keep libraries at the table when discussions about STEM education are taking place in our communities.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on how the CLSA funding should be allocated. We are happy to further discuss the information herein or answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Tonya Kennon
Library Director
Riverside Public Library
tkennon@riversideca.gov
951-826-5713

Michelle Perera
Library Director
Rancho Cucamonga Library Services
michelle.perera@cityofrc.us
909-477-2720 x5055

Cc: Greg Lucas, State Librarian
    Inland Library System Administrative Council

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA System Annual Report, FY 2014/15

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

CLSA funds continue to support the Communications and Delivery (C&D) program at the cooperative system level. In FY 2014/15, C&D funds supported all or a portion of each System's physical delivery of materials. Some Systems provided communications activity through virtual attendance at various meetings and use of their website and listservs for facilitating communications to member libraries. Exhibit A provides a summary of activities and how communities benefited through state funding. Exhibit B displays a summary of the actual workload statistics for 2014/15. Exhibits C and D provide a brief history to show how statistics for communications and physical delivery have fared over time.

Expenditures for 2014/15: Exhibits E and F display CLSA and local funds expended in support of System Administration and C&D. See Exhibit G for a summary of local member contributions.

RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE:
Consideration of 2016/17 System Plans of Service.

Staff Liaison: Monica Rivas

California Library Services Act
System Program Annual Report – FY 2014/15
Communications and Delivery Program

System	Goals for Meeting the Needs Through CLSA	Were Goals Met – How did the Community Benefit?
Black Gold Cooperative Library System	The primary goal is to provide delivery of materials to patrons as quickly as possible.	CLSA funds were used to partially cover the delivery contract. Black Gold members share an Integrated Library System (ILS). The community benefited because patrons are able to request items from libraries several hundred miles away and receive them very quickly, sometimes as soon as the next day. This greatly increases the number of items available to patrons of any one library and especially useful for patrons at our very small and rural branches. **Use of One-Time State funding:** The additional $41,754 in state funding was used to purchase titles for the shared OverDrive collection. Due partly because of the added funds, the Black Gold Cooperative had 355,540 OverDrive checkouts in 2014/15, a 22.8% increase from the 289,427 checked out in 2013/14. The OverDrive circulation increases by a considerable amount each year and we have difficulty supplying all the titles and copies our patrons want, so having the additional funds from the State Library was extremely appreciated.
49-99 Cooperative Library System	The primary goal is to provide delivery of materials at least twice a week to member libraries. The System population is dependent on the availability of materials from member libraries.	CLSA funds helped to provide needed materials throughout the System service area through the delivery system. Patrons were able to request materials owned by other libraries continuing the movement of materials and maintaining a high level of community satisfaction.

49-99 Cooperative Library System Continued		**Use of One-Time State funding:** Due to the high cost of delivery, much of the one-time funds were used to pay the balance of the delivery costs. An assessment is in process to determine the best of model of service for delivery and the greatest return on investment.
Inland Library System	Delivery of physical materials remains high in priority for members.	CLSA funds provided for the physical delivery of materials to all 19 public library members. Items were delivered within 10 working days for 95% of the time using the Riverside County Library system delivery, courier service, UPS, and the US Postal Service. Patrons in rural and geographically isolated areas benefited because of ILL services. The communities benefited by having access to the collection of all Inland member libraries, and receive materials from neighboring libraries in a timely manner. Because of the vastness of Inland (over 35,000 sq. mi.), the goal of facilitating virtual attendance at Admin. Council and all other meetings of member library staff, has been met with a subscription of GotoMeeting, enabling members to attend via VOIP or telephone. The Inland website was continually updated and recently revamped. The community benefited by having libraries whose leaders and staff work effectively with each other on a regular basis. **Use of One-Time State funding:** The one-time funding was used to ensure that all residents of Inyo, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties have access to e-resources. Although the economic situation in ILS's three counties slowly

Inland Library System Continued		improved, collection budgets were tight, and most libraries found it difficult to meet customer demand. A few members had no local e-resource funding at all. ILS purchased the e-book collection of 20,000 titles offered through Enki and an e-magazine collection of over 130 titles through Zinia. Califa provided training on its Enki product and held three workshops for 30 staff members. Residents of the Inland Empire had access to substantially enhanced e-resources and member libraries were better equipped to meet the growing demand in materials available through broadband
NorthNet Library System	Delivery has been identified by member libraries as the highest priority. We are able to meet our goals for communication and delivery by supporting connections tailored to best meet the needs of individual member libraries and enable them to share resources for the benefit of end users.	CLSA funds provided connections that best meet the needs of individual member libraries. Delivery of materials was accomplished through contracts with two different vendors that provided deliveries to a number of the member libraries. When issues were identified by staff and vendors they were corrected through careful assessment and planning. In addition to the contracts administered by the System, libraries in Marin County administered a contract for delivery of materials among those libraries and were allocated CLSA funding for that purpose. The cooperation of libraries with several different ILSs agreements greatly improved and encouraged the sharing of resources through interlibrary loan on a much larger scale. Libraries that were not served by contract delivery vendors, primarily in the North State region, used the US mail service and/or UPS and were reimbursed for all their costs. CLSA-allocated funds were also used to partially offset the communication costs for resource sharing for the Overdrive collection. The community benefited because items requested were delivered at an affordable cost in a timely manner.

NorthNet Library System Continued	**Use of One-Time State funding:** The one-time state funding was placed in an equipment reserve to support NLS libraries participation in the statewide broadband initiative. The needs and requirements for NLS libraries to participate in CalREN are currently being identified. Specific plans for the use of these funds will be determined in FY 2015/16 and may be deployed in FY 2015/16 or FY 2016/17. Any expenses will be aligned with C&D requirements and priorities.
Pacific Library Partnership (PLP)	Delivery continues to be the first priority of our member libraries. Libraries throughout the region depend on resource sharing to enhance the breadth and depth of their individual collections and delivery is the critical component that makes this possible. There are four separate services areas within the region with each service area receiving a CLSA subsidy for delivery.	CLSA funding was primarily used in PLP libraries to move materials from library to library to support resource sharing. The current delivery model has a 5 day a week delivery in San Mateo County, and the Peninsula Library System employs 3 drivers and owns 3 delivery vans; libraries in the East Bay and San Francisco have 2 or 3 day courier service; libraries in the South Bay have a contract with PLS for delivery using their van 2 days per week; and libraries in the Monterey region have a courier delivery service 2 or 3 days with 2 libraries paying extra for 5 days of service. The delivery service has 2 touch points once a week in San Mateo and Gilroy. There was also a special arrangement between Santa Clara County Library and San Jose Public Library for material transferred and returned. **Use of One-Time State funding:** The funds were distributed to the libraries, using a 40% base formula based on their membership participation fee and a 60% population allocation. Given the statewide impetus and direction with broadband, staff recommended that each library use their allocation for the purchase of hardware and software in support of broadband, specifically and for communication in general. This included equipment such as routers and switches, as well as software.

| Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) Continued | For the libraries in San Mateo County (PLS), the funds were aggregated and held to purchase switches and routers that were urgently needed to mitigate the 400% increase in usage that occurred since the broadband implementation upgrade to 1GB for all sites.

Recognizing that some libraries participate in Linked+ for expanded interlibrary loan, funds were also used to support this valued service, as well as other delivery and ILL options. | |
| San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS) | CLSA funds helped to move materials between headquarters libraries through a contract service with the Fresno County Library and the County of Fresno (two different delivery systems). The materials were moved in a timely manner, with minimal delays around certain holiday weekends.

Use of One-Time State funding:

The San Joaquin Valley Library System's (SJVLS) share of the one-time funding was $67,503. Of those additional funds, $13,411 were designated for System Administration, leaving $53,642 for Communications and Delivery. SJVLS remains in critical need of expanded bandwidth and network capacity. The Administrative Council elected to apply the one time funds to help augment telecommunications costs.

During the fiscal year, SJVLS was in the process of converting our network from frame relay technology to MPLS. This was an expensive and time consuming process. The one-time funds provided SJVLS with improved flexibility in providing connectivity to many of our more rural and isolated branches. | Communications and delivery includes more than just physical delivery of library materials. Communications also entails the system-wide email services and the telecommunications network that connects the 113 locations to the data center and the ILS. |

Santiago Library System	Delivery is a top priority for System members. Meeting the delivery expectation and customer demand is a goal of the delivery service especially the demand for e-books. SLS delivered over 20,000 e-books titles through Enki.	The SLS website was updated and maintained. An Online Resource Directory was regularly updated by staff and fostered better communications between members by making information about local resources available electronically throughout the county's libraries. The community benefited by having up to date information about neighboring libraries and their services available electronically. **Use of One-Time State funding:** The one-time funding in Orange County was used to ensure that residents had access to enhanced countywide e-book collections. SLS used the funding for collaborative e-resource building. Each member library was able to purchase extra e-book titles from one-time funds that were distributed according to a formula based on population.
Serra Cooperative Library System	Physical delivery of materials between member libraries is a priority for the System members.	CLSA funds were used to deliver materials throughout the System in a timely manner using a contract vendor and a hub/spoke model through the County of San Diego's delivery system. The benefit to the communities was the delivery of requested materials. Work on the website continues and the "go live" date is October 9, 2015. This will provide member libraries with a variety of tools to enhance communication and provide support to the member libraries. **Use of One-Time State funding:** The one-time funding provided an opportunity to add Zinio and OverDrive to all libraries. Zinio is working well at the rural libraries. OverDrive continues to cause some challenges, but with the additional funds, Serra has been able to do testing to make this a reality. Broadband was discussed, but Escondido was the only library able to participate in year one.

| Southern California Library System (SCLC) | The administrative council has identified delivery as one of the top priorities for the SCLC members. An assessment of the delivery model to cut costs was performed and SCLC changed its provider to achieve a lower cost. SCLC continues to consider alternative delivery models to reduce cost. | CLSA funds kept materials flowing among SCLC members through the delivery system. The website is being completely revamped to enhance communication between member libraries. Information will be posted to assist the libraries with details in areas of job descriptions, request for proposals, fines and fees charts, and much more.

Use of One-Time State funding:

SCLC did a pilot project with 8 member libraries to file e-rate in anticipation of connecting to the Broadband (CENIC). The libraries worked with a consultant to set up e-rate for their libraries (all of them filter and comply with CIPA). The savings for each library was substantial and created a mechanism to move forward with broadband clue to the savings to their organizations. |

Non-CLSA funded activities:

Black Gold: Local funds paid for:

- The network connections from 29 library buildings to the server in San Luis Obispo
- Access to Public Access Catalog
- A telephone service which allows patrons to call in to renew items via an 800 number, and also calls patrons to let them know when a requested hold is available or when items are overdue.
- A separate public Internet connection for all the libraries in order to provide connectivity where available, and Wi-Fi.
- A shared OverDrive subscription for downloadable eBooks and audiobooks.

49-99: A workshop was attended by all six systems to discuss priorities. Most of the topics were outside CLSA funding, but are much needed projects to strengthen 49-99 libraries.

Inland: Riverside County Library System subsidized the major portion of the cost of delivery to five Inland members who share a common ILS. Riverside County paid for much of the delivery staff, delivery vehicle maintenance, and overhead costs.

NorthNet: NLS is a 41-member cooperative system and covers a vast amount of geography. NLS provides support for staff development ($1,000) for each member library. Many of the member libraries participate in "Library to Go", a group Overdrive eBook collection. They are constantly working on leveraging their buying power as an entire system or groups of systems members for shared resources, including purchasing online magazines subscriptions (Zinio and Flipster) and data analysis resources, i.e., Analytics on Demand.

PLP: Member libraries in PLS paid $368,608 in local funds so they can have 5-day-a-week delivery. Two MOBAC libraries (Monterey and Pacific Grove) also used local funding ($2,000) to supplement additional deliveries.

Inter-Library Loan Services: Libraries fund inter-library loan services locally, including OCLC World Share and Linked+.

Libraries are also using local funds to invest in their connectivity via broadband to the CalREN network.

PLP provides a shared eBook collection for its member libraries. ALL PLP libraries participate in the Enki eBook platform as well.

SJVLS: A shared ILS is maintained, which allows all member libraries and their branches (113) equal access to shared collections.

Santiago: The SLS in-kind delivery system, which ensures that Orange County residents are able to drop off public library materials at any Orange County library. Member libraries paid for staff that prepared and received their library's deliveries as well as for overhead costs: telecommunications cost, office space, and equipment.

Staff time to maintain effective communication between all SLS libraries was provided by non-CLSA funds. The SLS Executive Committee continued to reestablish the cooperative, met bimonthly, worked on setting a strategic direction to better serve Orange County's over 3 million residents.

Serra: Serra Directors participated in a workshop to discuss possible projects and programs to be completed as a cooperative.

SCLC: Day in the District project that most libraries participated, were each library signed up with SCLC to attend a meeting with their legislator and CoLA staff.

System Communications & Delivery Program
2014/15 Service Methods and Workloads

System	Actual Comm. Workload (Messages)	Telecommunications Systems Usage			Actual Delivery Workload (Items)	Physical Delivery Systems Usage					Actual Miles Traveled By All Delivery Vechicles
		Phone Fax	Internet E-mail	Other		System Van	Con-tracted Delivery	US Mail	UPS	Other	
BLACK GOLD	679,340	16%	84%	NA[a]	544,017	NU	97%	2%	0.5%	0.5%	57,919
49-99	203	36%	64%	NU	3,283	NU	99%	1%	NU	NU	71,000
INLAND	10,340	39%	60%	1%[b]	143,923	NU	1%	0.5%	0.5%	98%[c]	47,004
NORTHNET	128	100%	NA	NU	1,781,559	NU	80.0%	5.0%	15.0%	NU	234,109
PLP	2,625	100%	NA	NU	3,091,894	70%	28.9%	1%	0.0%	0.1%	126,620
SJVLS	Unknown[d]	NA	NA	NA	1,025,000	97%	3%	0%	0%	NU	87,600
SANTIAGO	2,250	33%	67%	NU	4,036	NU	0%	5%	5%	90%[e]	11,232
SERRA	900	37%	63%	NU	11,700	NU	50%	2%	1%	47%[f]	48,000
SCLC	20,344	7%	93%	NU	20,430	NU	99%	1%	NU	NU	76,567
TOTALS	716,130	16%	84%	0.0%	6,625,841	40.0%	49.0%	2.0%	5.1%	3.9%	760,051

NA - Not Available; or unable to determine

NU - Not Used

[a] Unable to determine the number of message going though the Telecom MPLS network

[b] Go to Meeting

[c] Riverside County Library system delivery van

[d] Two years ago Fresno County transitioned SJVLS to a VOIP system making the detail on number of phone messages unavailable. SJVLS transitioned to a Microsoft cloud service for Interview email and no longer has the ability to generate any counties from the server.

[e] Delivery vans from member libraries

[f] County of San Diego delivery system hub/spoke model

System C&D workload activity FY14-15

Exhibit C

SYSTEM COMMUNICATION WORKLOAD HISTORY*

Actual Messages

SYSTEM	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
BALIS	3,668	3,620	2,200	2,000	**					
BLACK GOLD	476,198	383,851	643,364	837,576	667,564	623,021		129,814	141,174	679,340
49-99	5,170	20,900	3,970	3,970	3,970	325		565	NA	203
INLAND	4,647	NA	2,573	1787	4,151	5,200		6,720	9,300	10,340
MCLS	310,061	468,115	200,675	200,675	**					
MOBAC	1,310	2,250	1,600	1,200	**					
MVLS	16,000	30,000	17,700	17,500	**					
NORTH BAY	48,452	49,200	59,520	61,500	**					
NORTH STATE	34,729	17,495	38,654	43,979	**					
NORTHNET					59,274	53,436		360	252	128
PLP					343,656	144,532		2,220	2,308	2,625
PLS	281,238	284,075	306,250	356,300	**					
SJVLS	478,256	436,550	702,800	647,065	850,598	859,135		NA	NA	NA
SANTIAGO	100,500	121,457	4,786	5,145	**				2,350	2,250
SERRA	14,506	24,950	19,300	22,100	20,650	21,575		33,000	33,000	900
SVLS	7,975	20,000	6,200	5,450	**					
SOUTH STATE	3,700	4,400	4,291	4,612	**					
SCLC					640,753	207,310		25,829	NA	20,344
TOTAL	1,786,410	1,866,863	2,013,883	2,210,859	2,590,616	1,914,534	No Funding	198,508	188,384	716,130

*10 year history

**2009/10 Communication & Delivery workload reflected under new System name as a result of System consolidations approved by the Board in August 2008.

NA - Not Available

SJVLS: In 2012 Fresno County transitioned SJVLS to a VOIP system making the detail on number of phone messages unavailable.
SJVLS transitioned to a Microsoft cloud service for interview email and no longer have the ability to generate any counts from the server.

SYSTEM DELIVERY WORKLOAD HISTORY*

SYSTEM	Actual Items Physically Delivered									
	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
BALIS	33,638	33,425	33,940	32,660	**					
BLACK GOLD	896,090	1,038,322	1,196,129	1,734,395	1,636,374	1,521,707		581,971	428,643	544,017
49-99	410,200	425,875	425,875	425,875	364,600	333,835		4,602	7,332	3,283
INLAND	134,607	152,571	238,291	286,257	1,179,395	278,645		6,052	250,269	143,923
MCLS	67,323	63,787	80,919	64,437	**					
MOBAC	114,098	112,680	113,500	113,625	**					
MVLS	276,000	782,262	1,048,300	1,086,757	**					
NORTH BAY	4,144,896	3,913,206	4,544,462	4,734,728	**					
NORTH STATE	485,407	543,159	550,727	1,149,265	**					
NORTHNET					6,970,454	6,347,286		3,683,700	3,683,940	1,781,559
PLP					3,084,658	3,083,588		3,152,760	3,801,934	3,091,894
PLS	2,261,544	2,286,800	2,603,528	2,808,008	**					
SJVLS	488,120	511,777	784,857	766,044	1,161,606	1,156,870		1,191,435	1,155,544	1,025,000
SANTIAGO	13,000	13,000	1,400	9,984	**				4,427	4,036
SERRA	141,718	131,466	135,252	158,652	153,685	150,567		37,583	8,275	11,700
SVLS	31,275	31,000	27,250	26,230	**					
SOUTH STATE	1,255	1,255	1,255	8,018	**					
SCLC					84,421	127,145		69,303	23,465	20,430
TOTAL	9,499,171	10,040,585	11,785,685	13,404,935	14,635,193	12,999,643	No Funding	8,727,406	9,363,829	6,625,842

*10 year history

**2009/10 Communication & Delivery workload reflected under new System names as a result of System consolidation approved on August 7, 2008.

Summary of System Administration Expenditures for FY 2014/15

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	$ 15,700	$ 341,142	$ 356,842
49-99	24,064	2,363	26,427
INLAND	61,428	0	61,428
NORTHNET	107,692	53,388	161,080
PLP	109,750	278,730	388,480
SJVLS	38,593	159,479	198,072
SANTIAGO	31,615	0	31,615
SERRA	43,406	475	43,881
SCLC	113,202	318,666	431,868
TOTAL	$ 545,450	$1,154,243	$1,699,693

LSTA funds spent on System Administration   PLP $75,099
LSTA funds spent on System Administration NORTHNET $5,238

Summary of Communications and Delivery Expenditures for FY 2014/15

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	$ 104,552	$ 144,536	$ 249,088
49-99	96,255	0	96,255
INLAND	245,714	0	245,714
NORTHNET	541,770	143,615	685,385
PLP	438,998	2,904	441,902
SJVLS	154,369	762,361	916,730
SANTIAGO	126,462	0	126,462
SERRA	173,622	0	173,622
SCLC	452,808	0	452,808
TOTAL	$2,334,550	$1,053,416	$3,387,966

LOCAL MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLSA SYSTEM SERVICES
FY 2014/15

System	CLSA System Communications and Delivery		
	Percent of CLSA Expenditures for C&D	Percent of Local Funds for C&D	Total Expenditures for C&D
BLACK GOLD	42%	58%	$ 249,088
49-99	100%	0%	96,255
INLAND	100%	0%	245,714
NORTHNET	79%	21.0%	685,385
PLP	99%	1%	441,902
SJVLS	17%	83%	916,730
SANTIAGO	100%	0%	126,462
SERRA	100%	0%	173,622
SCLC	100%	0%	452,808
TOTAL PERCENT	69%	31%	100%
TOTAL EXPEND.	$ 2,334,550	$ 1,053,416	$ 3,387,966

2014/15 Expenditures:

	CLSA	Local	LSTA	Total
Administration	545,450 (30%)	1,154,243 (65%)	80,337 (5%)	1,780,030
Comm. & Delivery	2,334,550(69%)	1,053,416 (31%)		3,387,966
Total	2,880,000 (51%)	2,207,659 (46%)	80337 (3%)	$5,167,996

System Program Local Member Contributions 14-15

An act to amend Sections 18701, 18703, 18710, 18724, 18731, 18743, and 18745 of, and to repeal Sections 18732, 18744, 18751, and 18765 of, the Education Code, relating to libraries, and making an appropriation therefor, to take effect immediately, bill related to the budget.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.   Section 18701 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18701.   The Legislature finds and declares that it is in the interest of the people of the state to insure ensure that all people have free and convenient access to all library resources and services that might enrich their lives, regardless of where they live or of the tax base of their local government.

This government. This finding is based on the recognition that:

(a) The public library is a primary source of information, recreation, and education to persons of all ages, any location, or any economic circumstance.

(b) The expansion of knowledge and the increasing complexity of our society create needs creates a need for materials and information that go goes beyond the ability of any one library to provide.

(c) The public libraries of California are supported primarily by local taxes. The ability of local governments to provide adequate service is dependent on the taxable wealth of each local jurisdiction and varies widely throughout the state.

(d) Public libraries are unable to bear the greater costs of meeting the exceptional needs of many residents, including people with disabilities, non-English-speaking and limited-English-speaking persons, those who are confined to home or in an institution, and those who are economically disadvantaged.

(e) The effective sharing of resources and services among the libraries of California requires an ongoing commitment by the state to compensate libraries for services beyond their clientele. promote access to information in both print and digital format.

(f) The sharing of services and resources is most efficient when a common database is available to provide information on where materials can be found.

SEC. 2. Section 18703 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18703. In adopting this chapter, the Legislature declares that its policy shall be: be as follows:

(a) To reaffirm the principle of local control of the government and administration of public libraries, and to affirm that the provisions of this chapter apply only to libraries authorized by their jurisdictions to apply to participate in the programs authorized by this act.

(b) To require no library, as a condition for receiving funds or services under this chapter, to acquire or exclude any specific book, periodical, film, recording, picture, or other material, or any specific equipment, or to acquire or exclude any classification of books or other material by author, subject matter, or type.

(c) To encourage the adequate financing of libraries from local sources, with state aid to be furnished to supplement, not supplant, local funds.

(d) To encourage service to the underserved of all ages.

(e) To encourage and enable the sharing of resources between libraries.

(f) To reimburse equitably any participating library for services it provides beyond its jurisdiction if a public library, or, if not a public library, beyond its normal clientele.

(g)

(f) To ensure public participation in carrying out the intent of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 18710 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18710. As used in this chapter, the following terms have the following meanings, unless the context otherwise indicates or unless specific exception is made:

(a) "Academic library" means a library established and maintained by a college or university to meet the needs of its students and faculty, and others by agreement.

(b) "Act" means the California Library Services Act.

(c) "Cooperative library system" means a public library system that consists of two or more jurisdictions entering into a written agreement to implement a regional program in accordance with this chapter, and which, that, as of the effective date of this chapter, was designated a library system under the Public Library Services Act of 1963 or was a successor to such a that library system.

(d) "Direct loan" means the lending of a book or other item directly to a borrower.

(e) "Equal access" means the right of the residents of jurisdictions that are members of a cooperative library system to use on an equal basis with one another the services and loan privileges of any and all other members of the same system.

(f) "Independent public library" means a public library that is not a member of a system.

(g) "Interlibrary loan" means the lending of a book or other item from one library to another as the result of a user request for the item.

(h) "Interlibrary reference" means the providing of information by one library or reference center to another library or reference center as the result of a user request for the information.

(i)

(h) "Jurisdiction" means a county, city and county, city, or any district that is authorized by law to provide public library services and that operates a public library.

(i)

(i) "Libraries for institutionalized persons" means libraries maintained by institutions for the purpose of serving their resident populations.

(k) "Net imbalance" means the disproportionate cost incurred under universal borrowing or equal access when a library directly lends a greater number of items to users from outside its jurisdiction than its residents directly borrow from libraries of other jurisdictions.

(l)

(j) "Public library" means a library, or two or more libraries, that is operated by a single public jurisdiction and that serves its residents free of charge.

(m)

(k) "School library" means an organized collection of printed and audiovisual materials that satisfies all of the following criteria:

(1) Is administered as a unit.

(2) Is located in a designated place.

(3) Makes printed, audiovisual, and other materials as well as necessary equipment and services of a staff accessible to elementary and secondary school pupils and teachers.

(n)

(l) "Special library" means one maintained by an association, government service, research institution, learned society, professional association, museum, business firm,

industrial enterprise, chamber of commerce, or other organized ~~group,~~ group and the

greater part of their collections being in a specific field or subject, ~~e.g.,~~ such as natural

sciences, economics, engineering, law, and history.

~~(o)~~

(m) "Special Services Programs" means a project establishing or improving

service to the underserved of all ages.

~~(p)~~

(n) "State board" means the California Library Services Board.

~~(q)~~

(o) "System" means a cooperative library system.

~~(r)~~

(p) "Underserved" means any population segment with exceptional service needs

not adequately met by traditional library service ~~patterns;~~ patterns, including, but not

limited to, those persons who are geographically isolated, economically disadvantaged,

functionally illiterate, of non-English-speaking or limited-English-speaking ability,

~~shut-in,~~ homebound, or institutionalized, or who are persons with disabilities.

~~(s)~~

(q) "Universal borrowing" means the extension by a public library of its direct

loan privileges to the eligible borrowers of all other public libraries.

SEC. 4. Section 18724 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18724. The duties of the state board shall be to adopt rules, regulations, and

general policies for the implementation of this chapter. In addition, the state board,

consistent with the terms and provisions of this chapter, shall have the following powers
and duties:

(a) To direct the State Librarian in the administration of this chapter.

(b) To review for its approval all annual proposals submitted under this chapter.

(c) To annually submit budget proposals as part of the annual budget of the
Department of Education.

(d)

(c) To expend the funds appropriated for the purpose of implementing the
provisions of this chapter.

(e)

(d) To require participating libraries and systems to prepare and submit any
reports and information which that are necessary to carry out the provisions of this
chapter, and to prescribe the form and manner for providing such those reports and
information.

(f) To develop formulas for the equitable allocation of reimbursements under
Sections 18731, 18743, 18744, and 18765. Such formulas shall be submitted to the
Department of Finance for approval.

(g)

(e) To require that any public library participating in programs authorized by
this chapter provide access to its bibliographic records and materials location
information consistent with the legislative policy of encouraging the sharing of resources
between libraries.

SEC. 5.   Section 18731 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18731. ~~Any~~ A California public library may participate in universal borrowing. ~~Public libraries~~ A public library participating in universal borrowing ~~may~~ shall not exclude the residents of any jurisdiction maintaining a public library. ~~Public libraries that incur a net imbalance shall be reimbursed for the handling costs of the net loans according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724. Reimbursement shall be incurred only for imbalances between:~~

~~(a) System-member libraries and independent public libraries.~~

~~(b) Independent public libraries with each other.~~

~~(c) Member libraries of one system with member libraries of other systems.~~

SEC. 6. Section 18732 of the Education Code is repealed.

~~18732. If two or more public library jurisdictions wish to consolidate their libraries into a single library agency, an establishment grant in the annual maximum amount of twenty thousand dollars ($20,000) shall be made to the newly consolidated library jurisdiction for each of two years, provided that notice of such consolidation is filed with the State Librarian within one year after the consolidation.~~

SEC. 7. Section 18743 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18743. Each member library of a system shall provide equal access to all residents of the area served by the system. ~~Member libraries that incur a net imbalance shall be reimbursed through the system for the handling costs of the net loans according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724.~~

SEC. 8. Section 18744 of the Education Code is repealed.

~~18744. Each member library of a system shall be reimbursed through the system to cover handling costs, excluding communication and delivery costs, of each~~

interlibrary loan between member libraries of the system according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724.

SEC. 9.   Section 18745 of the Education Code is amended to read:

18745.   Each system shall annually apply to the state board for funds for intrasystem communications and delivery. Proposals shall be based upon the most cost-effective methods of exchanging print and digital materials and information among the member libraries.

SEC. 10.   Section 18751 of the Education Code is repealed.

18751.   When any system or systems consolidate, a grant of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) for each of the two years following the consolidation shall be made to the newly consolidated system.

SEC. 11.   Section 18765 of the Education Code is repealed.

18765.   Each California library eligible to be reimbursed under this section for participation in the statewide interlibrary loan program shall be reimbursed according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724 to cover the handling costs of each interlibrary loan whenever the borrowing library is a public library, except for the interlibrary loans made between members of a cooperative library system as provided in Section 18744. Libraries eligible for interlibrary loan reimbursement under this section shall include public libraries, libraries operated by public schools or school districts, libraries operated by public colleges or universities, libraries operated by public agencies for institutionalized persons, and libraries operated by nonprofit private educational or research institutions. Loans to eligible libraries by

~~public libraries shall also be reimbursed according to the allocation formula developed~~
~~pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724.~~

SEC. 12.   The sum of three million dollars ($3,000,000) is hereby appropriated from the General Fund to the California State Library for allocation pursuant to the California Library Services Act (Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 18700) of Part 11 of Division 1 of Title 1 of the Education Code).

SEC. 13.   This act is a bill providing for appropriations related to the Budget Bill within the meaning of subdivision (e) of Section 12 of Article IV of the California Constitution, has been identified as related to the budget in the Budget Bill, and shall take effect immediately.

- 0 -

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

Bill No.

as introduced, _____.

General Subject: California Library Services Act.

The California Library Services Act establishes the California Library Services Board and provides that its duties include, among other things, adopting rules, regulations, and general policies relating to the implementation of the act.

This bill would revise and recast the act, including, among other things, removing from the board the powers to annually submit budget proposals as part of the annual budget of the Department of Education and to develop formulas for the equitable allocation of reimbursements to public libraries, as defined, for providing specified library services.

This bill would appropriate $3,000,000 from the General Fund to the California State Library for allocation pursuant to the act.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as a bill providing for appropriations related to the Budget Bill.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: yes. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

**MICHAEL F. DILLON
& ASSOCIATES INC.**

March 7, 2016

The Honorable Marty Block, Chair
Senate Budget Subcommittee Number 1 on Education Finance
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA. 95814

**RE: STATE LIBRARY BUDGET: Item 6120-211-0001 and 6120-215-0001
California Library Services Act – Support Governor's Budget**
Hearing date: Thursday, March 17, 2016

Dear Senator Block,

The California Library Association (CLA), representing the state's librarians, library employees, library students, friends group members and trustees, is in support of the proposed funding in Governor Brown's January Budget, pertaining to the California Library Services Act. Consideration of this funding will be before you during your hearing on Thursday, March 17, 2016.

The Governor's January Budget proposes for the California Library Services Act (CLSA):

- **Adding $1.8 million in ongoing funding to the current $1.8 million baseline.**
- **Adding $3 million in one-time funding for the purpose of allowing the systems to explore more creative and effective ways to loan and share materials between libraries (e.g. "digital delivery").**

CLA is grateful to you and your Senate Budget Subcommittee colleagues for your leadership in approving a major library funding package last year, which included $4 million in ongoing funding for the California Library Services Act. While this augmentation moved forward to the Budget Conference Committee, the $4 million for the CLSA ultimately was eliminated by the Governor during negotiations with the Leadership. During the Fall, CLA has had very productive conversations with the Department of Finance, and the DOF has spent a considerable amount of time touring libraries in California and speaking to many library directors. As a result of those discussions, we are pleased to see the January Budget reflects a funding commitment to the California Library Services Act – both in the form of one-time and ongoing dollars.

You may recall that the CLSA was created in the 1970's and it contained an important function known as "Transaction Based Reimbursement," wherein participating public libraries, in eight regional systems, agree to share their books and materials. The benefits of this seamless exchange were many: the law's intent was to encourage a cooperative loaning and lending model, wherein a patron could, for example, check out a book in a county in which they work and return it in a neighboring county where they live. A van/truck would return the book to the original loaning library. This sharing model saved libraries from having to purchase identical collections, and instead they could focus on collections that fit the needs of their particular community. Most importantly, when there is sufficient funding in the baseline for this program, it incentivizes libraries to continue this agreement to loan and lend. Without this funding in place - e.g. several

years ago when the Budget "trigger" wiped out $12.9 million in this fund - a few libraries left the systems and one began charging as much as $80 per person to non-residents for library cards. Such charges go against the very essence of the CLSA's and the public library's mission, which is to serve as the "great equalizer" for all California residents.

The $1.8 million in ongoing funding that the Governor proposes in his Budget will restore a portion of the CLSA general operations for the systems. Additionally, the $3 million in one-time funding that the Governor proposes for the CLSA, will promote greater "digital delivery" options for public libraries, such as moving more eBooks between libraries, digitizing important or historical documents that can be shared among jurisdictions, and various other new innovations that the libraries are exploring.

On a related note, the California Library Association would like to continue the current momentum that is underway for the Governor's library broadband project. As you will recall, the Governor and this subcommittee have been very supportive of funding that will attempt to connect most of the public libraries in the state to a high-speed, broadband "backbone" operated by the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California. With last year's $4 million in one-time money that was provided for connection grants, 39 jurisdictions will be eligible for funds to connect their central/main branches, and a portion of their branches. The same robust interest is expected in 2016-17, which would warrant another $4 million in one-time funds in order to move forward with Phase 3. As such, CLA respectfully requests your consideration of an augmentation of $4 million in one-time dollars, should there be money available at May Revision time. Clearly, there is need to have high-functioning broadband connections and access at public libraries so that patrons can take advantage of the "digital delivery" referenced above, as well as apply for jobs on the computers, compile a resume, research the Affordable Care Act or other health-related issues, or use online homework tutoring.

Lastly, the library community would like to continue to seek your support of additional funding for the California Library Literacy Program. This very successful program is available at public libraries for adults who have never learned to read for various reasons. Last year during the discussions surrounding the AB 86 adult education consortiums, it became clear that the public libraries are serving a tremendous number of "pre-5th grade level" adult students. (The schools and community colleges will accept adult education students only if they are Grade 5 ready.) In light of this workload issue, CLA requests some modest additional funding ($1-2 million) to continue to bolster this baseline, which currently stands at $4.8 million. One literacy director at the Santa Barbara library recently said, "The increased CLLS funding, along with other local funds, is helping to make possible the staffing of our first-ever physical location, an Adult Literacy Center in our Central Library, along with computers in that space, additional books, and increased tutor training." The Placentia library said, "We are purchasing more literacy workbooks so they can be issued to the [learner], rather than copying pages every week."

Thank you for your continued support and leadership on behalf of the public libraries of California. We appreciate your consideration of CLA's 2016-17 Budget request.

Sincerely,

Michael F. Dillon
CLA Lobbyist

Christina Dillon DiCaro
CLA Lobbyist

cc: Senate Budget Subcommittee No. 1 on Education Finance Members
Senator Mark Leno, Senate Budget Chair
Senator Jim Nielsen, Senate Budget Vice Chair
Greg Lucas, California State Librarian
Anita Lee, Senate Budget Committee
Cheryl Black, Senate Republican Caucus
Christian Osmena and Jack Zwald, Department of Finance
Jason Constantouros, Legislative Analyst's Office