

1 **Approved July 12, 2016**

2  
3 California Library Services Board Meeting  
4 April 8, 2016

5  
6 Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building  
7 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500  
8 Sacramento, CA 95814  
9

10 **Welcome and Introductions**

11 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on April 8,  
12 2016 at 9:54 a.m.

13 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Brandy Buenafe, Gary Christmas, Aleita Huguenin,  
14 Florante Ibanez, Penny Kastanis, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Peter Mindnich,  
15 Elizabeth Murguia, Eric Schockman, and Connie Williams.

16 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Gerald  
17 Maginnity, Janet Coles, Lisa Dale, Susan Hanks, Wendy Hopkins, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Annly  
18 Roman, and Mark Webster.

19 **Adoption of Agenda**

20 President Bernardo requested that the agenda be amended to move item D, Legislative  
21 Update, to right after item B, Reports to the Board. Mike Dillon and Christina DiCaro, the  
22 lobbyists for the California Library Association, had an update on the budget, which she thought  
23 the Board should hear prior to discussing the budget portion of the agenda.

24 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the*  
25 *California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the April 8, 2016 meeting*  
26 *as amended.*

27 **Approval of Minutes**

28 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Huguenin) and carried unanimously that*  
29 *the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the*  
30 *September 3, 2015 meeting.*

31 **Board Meeting date for fall 2016**

1 Annly Roman reported that the discussion at the September 2015 Board meeting was to have  
2 a face-to-face meeting in the fall. Staff recommended the meeting be held in Sacramento in late  
3 August or early September. President Bernardo commented that late August would be her  
4 preference, especially since the Board would be dealing with budget issues. Annly Roman said  
5 that she would send out a Doodle poll to the Board for dates in early August and late September.  
6 She also stated that the Board would take care of the LSTA position of its duties at that meeting.

7 Annly Roman brought up that at the September 2015 meeting there had been some discussion  
8 on trying to meet with legislative offices in September 2016. She stated that most legislators  
9 would already be back in their districts but wanted to address the possibility to gauge the Board's  
10 interest. President Bernardo said that she thought they did not need scheduled visits.

11 **Nomination of Board Officers**

12 Annly Roman put forward that the Nominating Committee, once elected, could a)  
13 independently discuss and decide who to put forward for the nomination, or b) put out a poll to  
14 the Board to gain a sense of what other Board members wanted. However, no matter what  
15 method they choose, nominations would still be considered from the floor as required by law.

16 Member Schockman commented that, as a Committee member from 2015, he felt the polling  
17 system was judicious, timely, and allowed everyone to have a say in the nomination and that  
18 system should be continued. Member Williams agreed.

19 President Bernardo suggested that they should act as the Nominating Committee again and  
20 both Member Schockman and Williams stated that they would be willing.

21 ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that the***  
22 ***California Library Services Board appoints Eric Schockman and Connie Williams to***  
23 ***the Nominating Committee to select Board Officers for 2017.***

24 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

25 **Board President's Report**

26 President Bernardo reported that she had been monitoring the American Library Association's  
27 listserv notices and alerts to contact legislators. She participated in the American Association of  
28 Law Libraries Government Relations Office listserv and made attempts to stay on top of their

1 activities and alerts, and she also monitored the California Library Association's calix listserv and  
2 saw quite a bit of activity and discussion on what's going on with public libraries.

3 President Bernardo reported that she was able to attend the Special Libraries Association  
4 Sierra Nevada Chapter Workshop in Davis, CA. She attended, as the law library's liaison, the State  
5 Bar's law practice, management, and technologies meeting. She also attended the Council of  
6 County Law Librarians legislative day on March 1. They were preparing for their 125 anniversary  
7 this year with a reception with legislators later in the summer.

### 8 **Board Vice -President's Report**

9 Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that she participated on the California Library Association's  
10 (CLA) legislative meeting and sent out information or updates as necessary. She also participated  
11 in the CLA conference.

### 12 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

13 State Librarian Lucas reported that this year the state budget allocated more funding for the  
14 Literacy programs that the State Library conducted at about 800 libraries, which permitted the  
15 addition of new jurisdictions and the stabilization of programs. This stabilized funding allowed for  
16 the recruiting of more volunteer tutors, which lowered the backlog of learners.

17 Lucas also reported that, if the Federal Government passed the LSTA and IMLS portion of the  
18 budget as proposed, the funding to be given out on a per-capita basis would be reduced from  
19 previous years. California would still receive more funding due to a growth in its population,  
20 however, some of the smaller states were concerned that they would receive less. ALA brought  
21 that to the attention of congress but it was unclear what would happen.

22 The State Library was in the process of putting together the program for Federal money it  
23 would receive in October. State Librarian Lucas said that the State Library would be taking almost  
24 a third of the \$10 million it normally put into the field and concentrating \$1 million each on three  
25 programs. The first would help local libraries and cultural institutions work together to prioritize  
26 and digitize the most important parts of their collections. Another million would focus on  
27 immigrant integration. Many new Californians use the library to find out where to go for basic  
28 services. He stated that since libraries were already providing these services, the State Library was  
29 trying to focus more attention on those issues. Lucas had meetings with Social Services, who had

1 put about \$15 million toward helping immigrants complete the Deferred Action for Childhood  
2 Arrivals (DACA) documentation, which was geared toward young people and allowed them to get  
3 a two year work permit. The process was very complex and intimidating. Libraries in San Diego  
4 County had done a terrific job of assisting with the DACA process and the State Library was trying  
5 to connect libraries facing these immigration issues to help them get ideas for assistance  
6 programs.

7 The third category was mental health or public health issues. As with the immigration issue,  
8 many patrons seek answers to mental/public health questions at the library. Per the Department  
9 of Public Health (DPH), all of the federal funding for “safety net” programs was allocated to  
10 various state agencies; social services, CDFA, etc. DPH has struggled with how to ensure that  
11 eligible individuals do not have to go to four different agencies for assistance when many have  
12 trouble reaching a single agency. The State Library was looking into how these federal funds could  
13 be used to facilitate an easier process.

14 State Librarian Lucas commented that the reason the State Library is trying to concentrate  
15 funds on three areas was, in part, because of the Board’s discussion about public/private  
16 partnerships at the April 2015 meeting. The State Library had \$1 million and social services had  
17 invested \$15 million, maybe by working together the funds could go farther. Member Williams  
18 suggested working with the school libraries on the immigration initiative. The high schools in their  
19 county had been working with the local community colleges on DACA and would also like to work  
20 with public libraries.

21 Member Kastanis asked what had been happening with the Prisons systems. Brandy Buenafe,  
22 the Principal librarian from the California Corrections and Rehabilitation Department, commented  
23 that last year Senate Bill 343 codified that prison libraries provide literacy instruction. That  
24 allowed the Department of Corrections to access federal Workforce Investment Opportunity Act  
25 money to increase prison libraries’ physical collections. They were also working on developing  
26 partnerships with the community colleges that offer face-to-face instruction in the prisons to  
27 provide support to learners with an emphasis on earning a legitimate college degree that required  
28 academic research opportunities. The prisons were working on how to navigate having  
29 computerized databases in a non-network world.

1 Member McGinity brought up literacy programs and expressed concern over a perceived lack  
2 of sharing amongst libraries on what programs or methods worked best. He asked if the State  
3 Library studied whether there were library literacy programs that touched a larger number of  
4 people more quickly and less expensively than other programs. He wanted to know if there was  
5 an opportunity to study that question to determine if there was a set of successful libraries that  
6 should be helping libraries that are not as successful. He felt like it was incumbent upon them as  
7 a Board to make sure that literacy money was being spent in the best way possible.

8 Lisa Dale, the State Library Literacy Director, commented that the state did an annual report,  
9 collecting information on how libraries reach out to their community, engage tutors, engage  
10 learners, and serve families. That information was reviewed by State Library staff and agencies  
11 were contacted about any issues. Lisa stated that there were also tightknit, regional networks  
12 that met at least annually and had shared listservs. Additionally, there was a California Literacy  
13 Services listserv where best practices were shared, so library practices were reviewed by State  
14 Library staff and shared regularly.

15 Additionally, many of the literacy coordinators were operating on shoe string budgets. What  
16 the state provided kept their programs going but they were unable to serve or reach all relevant  
17 segments of the community. In an effort to reach more learners coordinators asked colleagues  
18 how they could improve and the State library helped them with program improvement  
19 suggestions and efficiency ideas. State Librarian Lucas added that we were in the first or second  
20 year of a large examination of adult education in community colleges and how those services  
21 were provided. There were consortiums established which could provide local libraries a seat at  
22 the table to discuss those kinds of issues with community colleges. The intent was to create a  
23 spectrum of service, so there was an examination going on at the state level on how that  
24 consortium is working.

25 Member McGinity requested that Library staff send him a copy of their best reports so that he  
26 can get a sense of the programs. Lisa Dale stated that it would not be a problem.

27 Member McGinity brought up that the prior meeting's minutes showed that the Board had  
28 requested a report to be brought to them in the fall showing a ten year span of the program

1 workload and the system demographics. Annly Roman commented that they would be provided  
2 that information with their fall meeting packets.

### 3 **Broadband Update Report**

4 Gerry Maginnity reported that it was the second year of Broadband Technology Improvement  
5 Grants. In year one of the state grants 42 libraries were enrolled, most of which should be  
6 connected by the end of the current fiscal year. Our partners; Cenic, Califa, and the Southern  
7 California Library Cooperative, did a thorough review with libraries this past summer and  
8 determined that 65 libraries would be eligible for the year two grants. 47 grants had been given  
9 out and three libraries were pending with either contract issues or waiting for bids. \$1.272 million  
10 had been awarded. The year two libraries would begin to connect July 1, 2016. There were 31  
11 libraries connected in an early pilot phase, aimed mostly at the central valley, which used local  
12 and federal Recovery Act funds, 42 in year one, and the potential for 47-50 in year two, so  
13 connections were approaching 130 public libraries connected out of 183 jurisdictions.

14 There was discussion of a potential need for network improvement in those pilot libraries  
15 because they were hooked up a while ago. A review would be conducted, with the potential of  
16 awarding around \$400,000. Maginnity indicated the review would include eligible branches and  
17 connected libraries or libraries in the process of being connected. That information would be  
18 provided to the field, hopefully in April 2016. Maginnity estimated that close to \$1 million would  
19 be awarded. Since the current budget did not provide more funding for broadband connections  
20 Maginnity commented that he estimated there would be potentially \$1 million left to award in  
21 year three. Member Williams asked if \$1 million would be enough to connect all the libraries  
22 including branches. Gerry Maginnity estimated it would take \$4 to \$5 million to finish.

23 Member McGinity asked why only 47-50 of the 65 eligible libraries were being connected and  
24 how eligibility was determined for the 65 libraries. Gerry Maginnity replied that libraries had  
25 dropped out for various reasons. He explained that libraries were contacted by the partners and a  
26 process outline provided. The beginning step was a letter of agency and once submitted each  
27 library looked at their resources to decide if they would go to the bid process. Some of them did  
28 not get that far, and some of them bid but could not do it this year.

1 Member Kastanis asked about responses from connected libraries, were people using and  
2 appreciating the connection. Gerry Maginnity commented that, based on responses he received;  
3 the connections were really making a difference. State Librarian Lucas commented that when he  
4 asked Library Directors if people were complimenting them on the faster speeds they say no, but  
5 they were getting fewer complaints. It showed that people using the library expected a fast  
6 connection and now expectations were being meeting. Gerry commented that these connections  
7 also lay the groundwork for additional projects not originally considered by the libraries such as  
8 digitization efforts which would benefit from a better broadband connection to improve delivery  
9 of the digital items. Additionally, some programs, such as Career Online High School, were all  
10 online and required a faster connection. These connections could help overcome reluctance to  
11 move into some of those areas. Lucas also pointed out that previously libraries were paying more  
12 for slower service. Connecting got libraries faster speeds, often at a significantly lower cost.

13 Member Huguenin asked if the State Library had partnered with any major internet providers  
14 since those businesses depended on people being able to read and download. She sat in on a  
15 meeting dealing with partnerships in other states and in Washington they were looking at  
16 providers paying for connections. She felt that since the industry was reliant on people  
17 connecting, maybe we could persuade those companies to fund a state network.

## 18 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

### 19 **CLA Legislative Advocate's Report**

20 Mike Dillon and Christina DiCaro, legislative advocates for the California Library Association  
21 (CLA), gave a report on the new California Library Services Act (CLSA) funds in the California State  
22 Budget. Mike Dillon gave a brief explanation of him and Christina's involvement in CLA as well as a  
23 report on the origin of and historical funding levels of CLSA. He also discussed the state's financial  
24 struggles over the last decade and the negative impact that had on public library and CLSA  
25 funding. This included a discussion of political changes, such as the decrease in the availability of  
26 funding and an increase in the number of people seeking funds, and the impact those changes  
27 had on him and Christina's ability to effectively lobby on behalf of library issues.

28 Christina DiCaro detailed some of their advocacy efforts and the development of relationships  
29 with and the involvement of the Department of Finance (DOF) in these efforts. She described the

1 support and assistance they have received from the director of the DOF, Michael Cohen, and the  
2 budget analyst on library issues, Jack Zwald, as well as the DOF's efforts to understand the  
3 systems and the library field in general.

4 She expressed that, during a meeting with DOF staff in October, in which the cooperative  
5 systems' coordination was discussed, there was the impression of potential opportunities for  
6 additional CLSA funds. The CLA legislative committee provided ideas to the DOF, including  
7 digitization, platforms for the sharing of materials, universal library cards, library card programs  
8 for school children, as well as the critical need for reimbursement for the movement of eBook  
9 related materials. Additionally, she and Mike Dillon helped facilitate visits, by DOF staff, to  
10 libraries around the state, including an opportunity for all the NorthNet library directors to  
11 provide direct feedback and ideas, organized by Melanie Lightbody.

12 Christina reported the when Governor released his proposed 2016/2017 budget it provided,  
13 under the California Library Services Act, the \$1.88 million systems have been getting for  
14 communications and delivery for the past 3 or 4 years, an additional \$1.75 million in ongoing  
15 funding for communications and delivery, and \$3 million in one-time funds.

16 After the budget release, Christina and Mike met with DOF staff to gain a sense of how they  
17 envisioned the funds being used. The staff indicated that they did not want to put many  
18 restrictions on the \$3 million in one-time funding because they wanted to give the authority to  
19 the California Library Services Board (Board) to make some of those decisions. DOF staff indicated  
20 that the ongoing funding were necessary because the Systems needed boots on the ground to  
21 implement anything they would do with the one-time funding.

22 The \$3 million in one-time funding was allocated in a budget trailer bill which also made  
23 modernizing changes to the California Library Services Act. Christina reported that the lack of bill  
24 language directing the spending of the one-time funding did generate some questions and  
25 concerns in the Senate Budget Subcommittee on exactly how the funds would be used. Both State  
26 Librarian Greg Lucas and Mike Dillon assured the members of the Subcommittee that the Board  
27 would be meeting to determine a framework for how the funds would be used. Christina  
28 expressed that they were cautiously optimistic that the CLSA money would be included in the  
29 final budget.



1 One change in the CLSA budget trailer bill was the permanent elimination of the language  
2 related to the Transfer Based Reimbursement (TBR) program, a way of reimbursing libraries for  
3 the movement and lending of materials. Christina DiCaro stated that, due to the decreased  
4 funding for CLSA there had not been money to fund the TBR program. The Department of Finance  
5 argued that the TBR system was probably not the best way to reimburse for the movement of  
6 materials and, by removing the language completely; they hoped to generate a conversation to  
7 find a better system.

8 Member Murguia asked for clarification on TBR because she represented a very rural area and  
9 she wasn't sure how they might be impacted by removal of the TBR program. It was then asked if  
10 the State Library of California Library Association had a plan for TBR or a program in place of TBR.  
11 Both State Librarian Lucas and the Dillons indicated that they did not. Murguia asked if the Board  
12 was supposed to use the new funding to create a replacement program.

13 State Librarian Lucas indicated that the existing language allowed for reimbursement; I send  
14 you a book, I send you a bill, you send me a check, but funding had not been available for five  
15 years and there was no intent to provide any in the future. There were more cost effective ways  
16 of moving materials back and forth, such as moving them digitally. The new \$3 million and \$1.75  
17 were to augment the Systems, not to create a replacement for TBR. On the administrative side,  
18 the \$1.75 was to make the Systems more financially robust so that they could make regional  
19 decisions and the \$3 million was to invest in some kind of future improvement in what the  
20 libraries do. Lucas said to run the TBR program in a realistic way would be about \$50 million and  
21 questioned if it would be the best system to promote in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There were new  
22 programs like Zip Books, a pilot project in rural California, which were cheaper and more efficient.  
23 Under the Zip Books program libraries purchase requested materials they do not own and ship  
24 those materials directly to the patron's home. Once the patron is finished with the material they  
25 bring it to the library and it becomes part of the collection.

26 Member Kastanis said that she was curious how much change there had been to lobbying on  
27 issues now versus the past. Mike Dillon responded that every year it was just an ongoing effort  
28 and that they tried to encourage field participation by requesting letters from the entire CLA

1 membership to the Budget subcommittees, however, it had been very tight. He indicated that  
2 there was more competition for limited resources.

3 Susan Hildreth, from Pacific Library Partnership, NorthNet Library System, and Califa, stated  
4 that they were very excited about the potential for the additional funds. Of the \$1.75 million,  
5 which the systems hoped the Board would allocate as on-going funding, only 25% could be spent  
6 on administration, so the idea that it would bulk up boots on the ground was not realistic. The  
7 other real challenge at the System level was a conflict between their want to support digital  
8 sharing and the limited definition of what could be shared in the Communication and Delivery  
9 section of CLSA. The systems wanted to see that broadened so they could more effectively use  
10 the \$1.75 million.

11 President Bernardo thanked Mike Dillon and Christina DiCaro for their presentation.

### 12 **Consider federal and state legislative issues**

13 Annly Roman informed the Board that the Department of Finance's proposed language for the  
14 California Library Services Act bill was included in their agenda packet. Annly explained that the  
15 bill would give the Board an idea of the changes the Department was proposing.

16 A letter from CLA to the Budget subcommittee with their comments on the bill was also  
17 included and President Bernardo pointed out that the CLA letter contained additional requests for  
18 funding in other library related areas such as \$4 million for broadband grants.

### 19 **Board reports on Legislative Visits**

20 Member Ibanez reported that he attended four legislator meetings, one with a legislator and  
21 the rest with staff. All of them were receptive; however there were questions about how the \$3  
22 million would be spent. His last meeting was with Senator Liu's chief of staff, who expressed that  
23 she felt there was a need within the state for digitalization. Member Ibanez said that his general  
24 impression was that legislators and staff were supportive.

25 Member Christmas stated that he met with four staff members from different offices and  
26 spoke to them about CLSA and broadband funding. All the offices seemed supportive, however all  
27 asked about how the \$3 million in one-time funding would be used and two offices asked about  
28 broadband funding specifics.

1 Member Murguia reported that she spoke with Senator McGuire about the current CLSA  
2 budget proposal and the additional request from CLA for an additional \$4 million for broadband  
3 and he was interested in both. She missed Assemblymember Wood but did meet with his staff  
4 and they were very supportive. He was on the special subcommittee on the digital divide so he  
5 was very interested in Broadband and would be a natural in terms of support for the additional  
6 funds.

7 President Bernardo reported that on March 1 she joined the Law librarians on their legislative  
8 day and included her bid for additional support for CLSA funding while she was at those meetings.  
9 They were all very supportive so she was very hopeful that the funds will remain in the budget  
10 through the May revise.

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

12 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

13 **CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2016/17**

14 A draft motion was presented to the Board which stated that the Board adopted, contingent  
15 on the passage of the state budget, the 2016/17 CLSA budget totaling \$3,360,000 for allocation to  
16 the systems. Member McGinity stated that his inclination was to change the approval amount of  
17 \$3.63 million to \$1.88 million. He suggested making a decision on the other \$1.75 million in  
18 ongoing funding in concert with the Boards decisions on the \$3 million in one-time funding  
19 because he wanted the Board to make a comprehensive, strategic decision around the use of the  
20 new funds as a whole.

21 It was clarified that the \$1.75 million and \$3 million were allocated separately, with the \$1.75  
22 million allocated in the main budget document and the \$3 million allocated in a separate budget  
23 trailer bill. State Librarian Lucas said he did not think anything would restrict the Board's ability to  
24 do what McGinity proposed but that staff would get clarification during the meeting for the \$1.75  
25 million in ongoing funding since it was allocated with the \$1.88 million in ongoing funding for  
26 communication and delivery.

27 Annly Roman commented that she was unsure of impact on the systems' plans of service if the  
28 Board waited to allocate the \$1.75 million at the next Board meeting because, normally, the

1 Board would be approving those plans. She wanted the Board to be aware that it would require  
2 an addendum to the cooperative system's plans of service to be approved at a later date.

3 Member McGinity said that the funds were proposed so amendments could be required  
4 anyway if the budget changed. Approving the motion with the \$1.88 million gave the systems  
5 their normally budget, which they should already have planned for. Since their budgets would be  
6 effectively doubled with the \$1.75 million, he thought approving it later would not interrupt their  
7 planning as the systems had probably not determined exactly what to do with the funds. McGinity  
8 proposed that, if needed, a phone meeting could be held at the beginning of the fiscal year to  
9 address extra funding issues so libraries would have the ability to use the funds thoughtfully over  
10 the fiscal year.

11 McGinity stated that, based on the testimony from the Dillons and the systems, the Board  
12 should try to be strategic about the use of the new funds. There was a reason that the  
13 administration proposed the \$1.75 million increase concurrently with \$3 million in one-time  
14 funding and he wanted the Board to be thoughtful in their approach. Member Murguia suggested  
15 hearing from the systems on what the extra \$1.75 million would mean.

16 Diane Satchwell, executive director of Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC), Serra,  
17 and 49-99, said that several cooperatives held a workshop to discuss potential initiatives.  
18 Cooperative system funding ideas were provided to the Board in the agenda packet, however, as  
19 indicated by Susan Hildreth earlier, many ideas do not meet the restrictive regulatory  
20 requirements and definitions for communications and delivery.

21 Member McGinity wondered if it would be helpful to have the California Library Association  
22 (CLA) propose a trailer bill to tweak the California Library Services Act (CLSA) communication and  
23 delivery language to allow for more innovative programs. Susan Hildreth, who was on the CLA  
24 legislative committee, said that they had talked about modifying the language in the regulations  
25 to broaden some of the eligible e-resource activities. For example, current CLSA regulatory  
26 requirements only allow eBook platforms if they are shared by three or more member libraries, so  
27 they can only use CLSA funds for Overdrive, Zinio, or online magazines if they have three or more  
28 members participating. They cannot use CLSA funds for streaming audio or video.

1 Jack Zwald, Department of Finance, stated that the budget trailer bill addressing CLSA did  
2 expand the communication and delivery language surrounding digital materials but most of the  
3 restrictions on fund usage were regulatory issues. State Librarian Lucas stated that the regulations  
4 that implemented the original California Library Services Act contained language that defined,  
5 more specifically, what communications and delivery involved. The Board had adopted  
6 regulations to implement the Act in the past but it had been quite some time since changes were  
7 made. He stated that State Library staff read through the regulations at the end of 2015 with an  
8 eye toward possible changes, however, the regulatory process was complex and the scope of  
9 changes that could be initiated by the State Library, independent of the Board, were too modest  
10 to move forward.

11 President Bernardo asked if conforming regulatory changes would be necessary if the new  
12 CLSA language passed. State Librarian Lucas agreed that changes would need to be made. Annly  
13 Roman stated that state agencies must give the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) advanced  
14 notice of intent to add or amend regulations so that those potential changes can be noticed in the  
15 yearly regulatory calendar. The State Library put in a request to be on the 2016 calendar for the  
16 CLSA regulations but the action dates were left as "to be determined" and would probably extend  
17 into 2017 because of the waiting periods built into the regulatory process. Any regulatory change  
18 decisions should be made after the trailer bill's passage so that language could be properly  
19 incorporated and all changes would have to go before the Board for approval. Annly stated that  
20 she would add the CLSA regulations to the fall meeting agenda per the Board's direction.

21 President Bernardo adjourned for lunch at 11:45 AM and stated that the Board would  
22 reconvene at 12:45 PM.

23 President Bernardo reconvened the session of the California Library Services Board at 12:55  
24 PM. Discussion returned to the previous proposal of allocating only the ongoing \$1.88 million at  
25 the April meeting and waiting to make decisions on and allocate the new funding. Member  
26 McGinity clarified that his proposal did not changing the method or formula for allocation of the  
27 \$1.75 million, just the timing. He also emphasized the importance of allocating the \$1.88 million  
28 in a timely manner so the standard funds are not disrupted while the Board is considering and

1 dealing with the new on-going and one-time funds. President Bernardo called for comments from  
2 the systems on the proposal to allocate only the \$1.88 million at this time.

3 Susan Hildreth stated that it would give the systems a base budget for a few months for which  
4 they could do a plan of service. If the Board was able to identify a few priorities, she felt that it  
5 was reasonable to ask the systems to report back on plans for the \$1.75 million and ways in which  
6 they could use those funds to leverage the \$3 million. Susan expressed that the systems wanted  
7 the \$3 million to be allocated to the systems based on the existing allocation formula.

8 Mary George, Placer County Library Director of Library Services and member of the NorthNet  
9 consortium, said they were encouraged by the trailer bill. They have been using Zip Books and  
10 have seen some of the richest impact stories from the field, so they would like to encourage  
11 moving that program forward. A lot of their colleagues have also said they were interested  
12 because they saw the benefit. They would really like to recommend that the new \$1.75 million sit  
13 under communications and delivery for those kinds of programs. She also advocated for the  
14 Board to allocate at least some of the \$3 million in one-time funding for Broadband as the  
15 program was essential for the NorthNet libraries which were in some of the more rural areas of  
16 California. Her comments were seconded by Rita Lovell, Alpine County Library.

17 Stephanie Beverage, Huntington Beach Public Library, speaking for the Santiago Library  
18 System, stated that they agreed about broadband. They would also want to use some of the \$3  
19 million to continue their special literacy and Career Online High School programs.

20 Vice-President Maghsoudi asked if the Board had to have a decision in place with regards to  
21 the spending of the \$3 million prior to the Governor's May revise. State Librarian Lucas responded  
22 that they were not required to have anything in place, but it would be helpful to have some  
23 general ideas or guidelines in place for strategic uses of the money.

24 ***It was moved, seconded (McGinity/Christmas) and carried unanimously***  
25 ***that the California Library Services Board adopts, contingent upon the***  
26 ***passage of the State Budget Act, the 2016/17 CLSA budget as directed in the***  
27 ***Governor's Proposed 2016/17 Budget, totaling \$1,880,000 for allocation to***  
28 ***Cooperative Library Systems***

29 A second draft motion was placed before the Board which authorized California State Library  
30 staff to collect and summarize input on spending option for the \$3 million in one-time funding for

1 presentation to the Board at the next meeting. Member McGinity proposed including the new  
2 \$1.75 million in on-going funding within that motion and several Board members agreed.

3 Significant additional discussion, initiated by Member Murguia, was had by the Board on  
4 whether the Board should include their priorities for spending the \$3 million in one-time funds  
5 within that motion or if a third motion should be made containing their priorities and any  
6 direction they wished to provide to the Cooperative Systems. There was general consensus from  
7 Members Christmas, Ibanez, and Murguia that, based on comments they heard from legislators  
8 and legislative staff during their meetings the day before, the Board needed to identify and  
9 communicate to the legislature and cooperative systems priorities or direction for the  
10 expenditure of the \$3 million in one-time funding. It was determined that the motion directing  
11 the State Library to collect and summarize information should be kept broad and if they wanted  
12 to specify priorities that could be done in another motion.

13 There was also discussion on whether the Board felt that they needed the library to gather  
14 more information or if they had all the information they needed, from the letters provided by the  
15 cooperative systems in the agenda packets, to decide on a program and instead wanted to direct  
16 State library staff to draft specific proposals with clear budget numbers and outlines on how the  
17 funds would be spent in the designated areas. Vice-President Maghsoudi felt that the Board had  
18 the information they needed but Member McGinity, with the agreement of Members Huguenin  
19 and Christmas, stated that he felt the paragraphs provided by the systems on their project ideas  
20 did not provide enough information. He was uncertain what those ideas actually meant for  
21 libraries, which ideas were feasible within the \$3 million, and what the costs would look like. He  
22 recommended that the Board seek additional information to help make a better, more informed  
23 decision.

24 Annly Roman reminded the Board that part of their decision was how to allocate the funds.  
25 Funds could be allocated either through the allocation formula to the systems, as grants under a  
26 section in the Act dealing with special services programs, or a combination of the two. The  
27 decision directly related to the kinds of proposals the Board would be discussing.

28 ***It was moved, seconded (McGinity/Christmas) and carried unanimously that***  
29 ***the California Library Services Board directs the California State Library staff to***

1 ***gather and summarize input from libraries across the state for usage of the***  
2 ***proposed \$3 million in one-time and for the \$1.75 in ongoing CLSA funds in the***  
3 ***Governor's Proposed 2016/17 Budget for consideration by the Board at the Fall***  
4 ***2016 Meeting.***

5 McGinity recommended that the Board determine some core principles, based on the letters  
6 already received from the field, and direct State Library staff to draft a letter to the Chairs of the  
7 Subcommittees letting them know the priorities that would be the Board's focus for the \$3  
8 million. He felt they could leave content to the discretion of the Board Chair.

9 President Bernardo initiated the discussion of the Board's intentions for the \$3 million in one-  
10 time funds. She stated that she tallied the suggestions from the systems by subject and there were  
11 18 different main ideas which ranged anywhere from early literacy to STEM labs. Statewide e-  
12 resources had the most number of votes with seven systems agreeing, statewide virtual card was  
13 number two, and a student library card was number three.

14 Member Williams put forward communications and delivery, broadband, digitization, and e-  
15 content as the main priorities based on her interpretation of the information in the agenda packet  
16 and the earlier testimony. Member Buenafe spoke of breaking down barriers as a common theme  
17 and suggested that statewide library cards or databases would be important for the less affluent  
18 counties.

19 President Bernardo brought up that in their discussions, the Board should consider the  
20 sustainability of each project. She, and Members Williams and Christmas agreed that the Board  
21 should not spend one-time money on something that would either be lost, or that would need  
22 funds allocated again and again. Member Williams suggested using on-going funding to purchase  
23 items and one-time funding to build knowledge (training, publicizing, etc.) around those items.

24 Christmas stated that he liked the suggestion from Pacific Library Partnership to use some of the  
25 money to plan, coordinate and evaluate system resources to be better prepared to go forward in  
26 the future. He also brought up some of the other suggestions such as the mental health initiative  
27 proposed by SCLC or the statewide library card, although he expressed concern that some  
28 projects, like the statewide library card, would have ongoing costs that it would be difficult to  
29 account for. He felt investing in planning and perhaps some coordination among the systems  
30 would be the most appropriate uses.



1 Member Kastanis asked State Librarian Lucas what he thought about the statewide library card  
2 and the processes that might be associated with making it work. Lucas stated that there would be  
3 different ways of getting it done. One way to do a statewide card would be to do Link+ for every  
4 library in the state. The libraries in the bay area were connected by Link+, which allowed patrons  
5 to use their card anywhere in the larger bay area through the Link+ program. Santa Barbara and  
6 the central coast do a similar thing and Sacramento is also part of the Link+ system. That system  
7 would cost more money than is being spent now, but potentially some of that cost could be offset  
8 by eliminating the processes these library systems or geographic areas are currently using.

9 Member McGinity asked if other states had a statewide card. Annly Roman stated that there  
10 were not many states that have full participation but there are states that have the majority of  
11 their libraries participating in a shared card system but they tend to be the smaller states. Member  
12 Huguenin suggested that maybe the Board should try to track what was going on in other states.  
13 She thought that maybe states with more rural populations such as Wyoming might have thought  
14 of something California had not.

15 Member McGinity suggested that digitizing local libraries' collections and sharing those  
16 documents through the State Library would be beneficial to libraries in the state. He asked if the  
17 State Library knew what should be a priority. State Librarian Lucas said that the Library did have  
18 some information from past programs the state has done but it was not enough to give a  
19 comprehensive overview. For the digitization grant he mentioned earlier, the first phase would be  
20 for local jurisdictions to coordinate with local cultural heritage groups to get some idea of the  
21 collections. Step two would be to prioritize the collections. McGinity suggested including  
22 University Libraries' collections as well, although Members Kastanis and Murguia expressed the  
23 difficulty of getting libraries to coordinate. Lucas said the hope was for everyone to begin working  
24 together because there is not enough money for everyone to do what they want on their own

25 President Bernardo asked if, even though Gerry Maginnity estimated \$4 million more was  
26 needed, it made any sense to use some of the \$3 million for Cenic. Member Murguia thought  
27 some of the funds should be used for Broadband. She represented a rural area and it was essential  
28 for them to be able to connect.

1 State Librarian Lucas clarified that, while the administration had not put additional funds into  
2 connection grants, the budget did have funds for the annual dues to Cenic and there was a  
3 separate pot of money for connection assistance. Even if the state put forward no more money for  
4 these onsite improvements, Cenic would still be available because the state was paying the annual  
5 dues. The local libraries would just have to come up with the full price to connect. At the same  
6 time, because the state is a member of Cenic, Cenic can offer equipment and routers to libraries at  
7 a significant (65%) discount. There were also other programs with the federal government where  
8 potentially libraries could get a deeper discount. Whether the Board put funds into Cenic or not,  
9 the ability for libraries to connect to Cenic will still be available, the \$3 million would just make it  
10 easier. The first year of the program the Board took money out of CLSA and put it into the  
11 broadband grants, so the Board could do that again.

12 Member Williams suggested that the Board should look for more new, innovative programs  
13 then Broadband and Member Christmas brought up that CLA had asked the legislature for an  
14 additional \$4 million in broadband funding and that proposal could be funded making the use of  
15 the \$3 million unnecessary. Member McGinity agreed with Members Christmas and Williams. He  
16 felt the Governor had been setting funds aside for that specific purpose and if he had wanted the  
17 \$3 million used for broadband he could have made that allocation.

18 Member Christmas stated that he would like to see the \$3 million used for innovative,  
19 collaborative projects mostly coordinated by the Cooperative Systems with guidelines from the  
20 Board on spending. His preference would be for collaborations between systems. Member  
21 Williams agreed stating that resource sharing, planning, statewide content, statewide library card,  
22 or breaking down barriers were her preferred statewide priorities.

23 McGinity disagreed that the main decisions on funding should be coordinated through the  
24 Cooperative Systems. Rather, he felt that direction should be given from the state level on a state  
25 level issue. He was not sure what direction would be the best, but thought the Board should pick  
26 one or two ideas as innovative statewide initiatives. He just wanted to make sure that resources  
27 are shared between systems, not just within a system. Christmas said that he agreed that the  
28 State Library and the Board should set the direction they want the systems to go, and have the

1 systems come back to with more details on their suggested programs. He asked to hear from the  
2 systems.

3 Member Schockman brought up item E on the agenda, becoming entrepreneurial/public  
4 private partnerships, because none of the proposals from the systems addressed how they might  
5 move toward being more entrepreneurial and it had not come up in the discussion so far.

6 Ryan Baker, Vice-Chair of Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC), said, based on all the  
7 letters, there was a general need for resources sharing. He also wanted to emphasize that any  
8 project the Board decided on should be shared amongst either the cooperative systems or  
9 statewide. For the Board's benefit he provided specific descriptions of the programs SCLC  
10 suggested in their letter. Ideas they were considering included: using funds to coordinate mental  
11 health services and provide a link between the community and the mental health agencies, legal  
12 services, medical services, and other services people might need but have trouble accessing;  
13 statewide resource sharing using makerspace and digitization vans to reach underserved  
14 communities; statewide library card or collection sharing though Link+ or a similar program; and  
15 an immigration mentoring program, providing guidance on how to access services, connect with  
16 others, and specific guidance on the citizenship process.

17 Susan Hildreth, representing Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) and NorthNet, asked clarifying  
18 questions regarding the special library programs section of the Act. Gerry Maginnity stated that  
19 although the section did not fall under the communication and delivery requirements, all ideas  
20 would still need to comply with the intent, goals and requirements of the Act.

21 Proposals from PLP and NorthNet tried to focus on resource sharing. Susan discussed some  
22 potential projects such as; a statewide virtual library card pilot program, e-resources funded in  
23 collaboration with the Department of Education or the Community Colleges, and student success  
24 cards, a program giving students direct access to library resources using their student ID to login.  
25 Additionally, NorthNet was interested in broadband. She recommended resource sharing as the  
26 priority the Board should identify.

27 Diane Satchwell agreed that resource sharing was a priority. She also brought up that the Board  
28 should consider, in terms of sustainability, that some systems may not have funding for programs  
29 with ongoing costs. Susan Hildreth reported that most of the systems do not have a lot of staff

1 capacity. In order to manage the new funds and make any program successful the systems would  
2 need to be able to use some of the funds for administration. President Bernardo clarified that the  
3 systems could take up to 25% for administration. Member McGinity ask if the systems were  
4 suggested that the Board should set aside funds for administration and Diane responded that they  
5 were.

6 Members Christmas, McGinity, and Williams touched on Susan Hildreth's comments regarding  
7 partnerships with the Department of Education for shared databases as a possible way to expand  
8 the reach of the \$3 million for a greater statewide impact and asked if that would be easier since  
9 CLSA had funds to leverage. State Librarian Lucas responded that there was interest. About 10  
10 years ago the Department of Education sought statewide database that public schools could use  
11 to create a minimum level of service throughout the state and there was a bill about 7 years ago  
12 under the Schwarzenegger administration that dealt with creating or studying a statewide  
13 database system. There are potential issues with vendors because the vendors wanted each entity  
14 to pay for a separate license as well as the difficulty of getting different groups to collaborate and  
15 agree.

16 Member Christmas thought the Board could set resource sharing as their main priority with  
17 some specifics underneath it but leave it open for other things that might come up from the  
18 systems, such as collaborative projects like Azusa's mental health initiative. Member Williams  
19 agreed that resource sharing should be the main focus. She and Member Kastanis expressed  
20 concern that the money given by the administration was really a small amount in terms of possible  
21 projects. They felt the Board needed to be cautious and not direct the funds toward unattainable  
22 projects or projects that were expensive to maintain long term. Additionally, they emphasized that  
23 the Board should look at resource sharing in terms of sharing materials, people, and ideas as well  
24 as working toward collaborations to get more bang for their buck. Members Williams and  
25 Christmas agreed that projects should leave openings for partnerships with vendors, local  
26 community groups such as Rotary Clubs, all kinds of schools, and other kinds of libraries.  
27 President Bernardo suggested the Board could give direction that the cooperative systems include  
28 potential partnerships in any proposal information they provided. Christmas said that if resource  
29 sharing was the only priority, the Board should provide examples of what that means and

1 emphasized that he felt the systems should be implementing any programs with their local  
2 libraries.

3 State Librarian Lucas brought up that one of its purposes of the California Library Services Act  
4 (CLSA) was to provide better service for underserved communities, which is any population whose  
5 needs are not adequately met by traditional library service patterns including those who are  
6 geographically isolated, economically disadvantaged, functionally illiterate, non or limited English  
7 speaking, homebound or institutionalized, or disabled. Members Williams and Huguenin brought  
8 up examples of students who are underserved but might not be on the underserved radar, either  
9 from lacking access to a school library and librarian or access to necessary resources such as  
10 computer and printers. Some, like a student in Salinas who created a computer lab for students in  
11 his area to use by soliciting donations, are working on solutions to their lack of access, but maybe  
12 programs created by the new CLSA funds could make it easier.

13 President Bernardo said that it sounded like the Board had reached consensus that resource  
14 sharing would be the focus. Rita Lovell commented that in order for a lot the concepts the Board  
15 discussed to work, libraries needed a robust infrastructure. \$3 million was not a lot of money in  
16 terms of creating infrastructure but she wanted to urge the Board to keep that in mind as they  
17 made decisions.

18 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried by a vote of 11 ayes***  
19 ***and 1 abstention (Schockman) that the California Library Services Board directs***  
20 ***the California State Librarian to draft and distribute a letter to the Systems and***  
21 ***legislators stating that the California Library Services Board intends to use the***  
22 ***\$3 million in one-time funds to emphasize resource sharing within the***  
23 ***Cooperative library systems around the state and that would include such***  
24 ***projects as e-library card, e-resource collaborations, collaborations with other***  
25 ***libraries and local organizations.***

26 There was additional discussion, initiated by Member Murguia on how many public libraries  
27 were not members of a cooperative system. State Librarian Lucas said that it was only a few.  
28 Diane Satchwell stated that, because of broadband and the new funds, Santa Monica Public  
29 Library had successfully requested to affiliate with SCLC and that request would come before the  
30 Board in the fall.

31 Vice-President Maghsoudi had to leave the meeting.

1 **RESOURCE SHARING**

2 **CLSA System-level programs**

3 Monica Rivas reported that CLSA funds continued to support communications and delivery at  
4 the cooperative system level. Included in the agenda packets were attachments that had data on  
5 their annual programs and use and spending statistics. She also thanked all the systems for the  
6 due diligence of completing and submitting their reports on time.

7 **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2016/17**

8 **Becoming Entrepreneurial and public/private partnerships**

9 President Bernardo said that the Board had discussed becoming entrepreneurial and  
10 public/private partnerships in reference to the new \$3 million and asked if anyone else had  
11 further discussion on the issue. State Librarian Lucas brought up Member Kastanis' and Williams'  
12 concern about how feasible a large scale project would be with only \$3 million and provided  
13 examples of various projects where partnerships have expanded programs or allowed groups to  
14 implement changes or programs they could not afford on their own. These examples included:  
15 libraries in Queens, New York and Brooklyn working together to get facility upgrade funds that led  
16 to longer term partnerships; Career Online High School scholarship awards from the state  
17 requiring matching scholarships from the community; and Riverside libraries getting used  
18 computers from law firms in their area. Member Christmas also brought up the potential for  
19 facilities partnerships such as buildings or parking covers with solar panels to generate electricity  
20 and often, additional funding for the county. Member Huguenin agreed that finding opportunities  
21 for partnerships and investment was important and stated that libraries were essential and  
22 valued in America so if they kept asking for investment and partnerships something would  
23 appear.

24 State Librarian Lucas said the Board and the State Library could examine any proposed ideas  
25 for the \$3 million in funding with an eye toward how the programs could be structured to foster  
26 partnerships. Several Board members indicated their agreement.

27 Member Williams asked, after the letter had gone out to the Legislators and systems, would  
28 the Board discuss more about what an initiative actually looked like and make final decisions  
29 when they then met in fall. Several members suggested that the Board meet earlier and President

1 Bernard said that there could be a special meeting held by teleconference if an earlier decision  
2 was needed. Member Murguia stated that the Board should do what is necessary to move the  
3 process forward. Member Christmas suggested that since the one-time funding would have to be  
4 encumbered in fiscal year 16/17 it would be better to encourage the systems to provide plans for  
5 the one-time funding, if passed by the legislature that could be presented to the Board. Williams  
6 agreed with member Murguia and Christmas' comments.

7 Christmas asked if, since the cooperative systems would be completing plans for service for the  
8 next board meeting, could the systems address the priorities and extra funds in those plans of  
9 service? Annly Roman said that since the Board had only approved \$1.88 million to be allocated  
10 to the systems and the plans of service would be based on that amount. If the budget passed the  
11 systems would update those plans depending on how the Board allocated the funds.

12 State Librarian Lucas said that it sounded like the Board members were asking for a subsequent  
13 meeting after the budget passed but before the fall meeting. Williams said that the Board needed  
14 more information and in order to determine the direction for the funds, she felt they should meet  
15 before fall. Lucas said that as part of the priorities letter the Library was sending they could ask  
16 for options to present to the Board.

17 Member McGinity said that he agreed the Board needed an earlier meeting to discuss options.  
18 He suggested that the State Library present the Board, in July or August, with five options from  
19 the field, each worth around \$3 million, for the Board to discuss. He thought that would give them  
20 a good framework for a conversation. Then the Board could make a decision on one, or a  
21 combination of the options.

22 Member Christmas asked how that would work with the plans of service. Annly Roman stated  
23 that it depends on how the Board allocated the money. The funds could be allocated through the  
24 special services programs section of the CLSA or the Board could allocate the money to the  
25 systems based on the existing allocation formula. The Board could also allocate the funds using a  
26 combination of those two options. Annly clarified that the plans of service deal with the funds  
27 given to the systems based on the allocation formula. Monica Rivas clarified that right now, the  
28 only thing that would be included in their plan of service would be the \$1.88 million and that if  
29 the Board had already approved those plans the systems could do an amendment. Annly stated

1 that if the Board came back in July or August and passed a motion to give the \$1.75 by allocation  
2 to the systems, the systems would have to amend their plans of service and the Board would have  
3 to meet again to approve those amendments. It was the Board's responsibility to approve the  
4 plans of service. Christmas verified that the one-time money could go out as a lump sum for a  
5 project or could be allocated to the systems and would then have to be included in their plans of  
6 service and Annly Roman confirmed. He asked that the systems be given an opportunity to submit  
7 ideas for the \$3 million in one-time funds.

8 Member Williams brought up that the Board had already discussed not using the funds for  
9 programs with ongoing costs. She would recommend the \$3 million be used for administration,  
10 planning, and support activities. Christmas said that they wanted to make sure that the request  
11 for information to systems should emphasize that the programs be completed or otherwise  
12 sustainable.

13 Member McGinity said that he felt a meeting after the passage of the budget was needed. He  
14 was also concerned with how long it would take state library staff to gather options for the Board  
15 and how long it would take the systems to create a plan of service. State Librarian Lucas said that  
16 the process of collecting options could begin right away. His intent would be to have something  
17 ready for the Board shortly after the budget passed. Diane Satchwell stated that the systems  
18 typically get from March until June to create a plan of service. She said how long they needed  
19 would depend on the program being addressed. If they were identifying partners or coordinating  
20 with vendors for pricing it would take longer because of all the moving parts. President Bernardo  
21 suggested eight weeks as enough time. McGinity then suggested that, if they held an earlier  
22 meeting, the Board approve the plans of service for the \$1.88 million and deal with an  
23 amendment for the \$1.75 million later. That way there would be no interruption in the spending  
24 of the \$1.88 million for programs that were already in place. He suggested that the Board have a  
25 phone meeting to discuss options for the new funding sometime between the middle of June and  
26 July, and give the systems until early September to update.

27 Diane Satchwell stated the number of coordinators could be a problem, for example, she had  
28 three systems and each one needed to meet to discuss and approve program suggestions. They  
29 would need to calendar special meetings for early August or September to make sure they got



1 everything approved. McGinity asked if the Board would be asking the impossible. Diane said that  
2 it would be very difficult. President Bernardo asked if it would be more feasible if they were given  
3 until the beginning of October and if so would they have time to implement before the end of the  
4 fiscal year. Gerry Maginnity stated, for the benefit of the systems' people attending the meeting  
5 that once awarded the funds they have two years to spend it. Diane said that would be possible.

6 Member McGinity, after additional feedback from Gerry Maginnity and Diane Satchwell on  
7 how long the processes of generating and assessing options would take, said that he would  
8 suggest that the Board have a phone meeting about two weeks after the budget passes, so early  
9 to mid-July, to discuss options. Once a decision is made, they would give the systems, assuming  
10 the funds go out through the systems which they could not, until October to amend and deal with  
11 those amendments at the fall meeting.

12 Annly Roman clarified that the July meeting would be a phone meeting at which the Board  
13 would consider the ideas and options for how to send the new funds and adopt the plans of  
14 service on the \$1.88 million. The October meeting would be in person to discuss the amended  
15 plans of service and any other budget related decisions. She said that she would send out a  
16 doodle poll for a teleconference meeting in July contingent on the new funding in the budget  
17 being approved.

18 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

19 There was no additional public comment.

20 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

21 Member Buenafe thanked the Board for making her feel so welcome and expressed that she  
22 was excited about the opportunity.

23 Member Huguenin said that she thought that this was an exciting time for the Board.

24 Member McGinity stated that ever since he joined the Board every meeting they had discussed  
25 how there was not much to do because there was not any money. He was excited that the  
26 Governor and Legislature put money into libraries. While it was complicated he felt that it was a  
27 great problem to have.

28 Member Williams thanked everyone for the great discussion. The California School Library  
29 Association had its 100 year celebration at the conference and they had a history book made that

1 went through an incredible amount of primary source information about the history of school  
2 libraries in California. She presented two copies to the State Library.

3 Member Mindnich stated that the meeting was a good learning experience for a new member.

4 President Bernardo said that she would like to thank California State Library staff for all the  
5 effort and work they put into getting the meeting ready. She also congratulated Brandy on joining  
6 the Board and congratulated the re-appointees.

#### 7 **OLD BUSINESS**

8 Annly Roman stated that the concept of having someone come in to help the Board with  
9 Strategic Planning to determine what the Board's direction should be and what issues should be  
10 their focus was still on the table. It has been discussed but kept being put off as something to do  
11 when there was a fully appointment Board and probably when there was more money to actually  
12 put toward a goal. It had been brought up at the September 2015 meeting and the Board decided  
13 they wanted to move it to the April agenda to have that discussion when they met in person.  
14 Members Christmas and Huguenin thought it was a good idea but suggested waiting to address it  
15 until the Board was done handling the budget issue.

16 Annly stated that they could move it to the next Board meeting. She stated that she thought  
17 the session would take a large portion of time so the Board should probably address it at a  
18 meeting where they could focus most of the discussion on the Strategic Plan. Member McGinity  
19 said that based on how often they met and what they have to discuss he did not feel it was a  
20 priority. He felt that the decisions that needed to be made surrounding the budget should be the  
21 priority and he though the Board should focus on that. President Bernardo and Member  
22 Christmas agreed.

23 Bernardo suggested, and McGinity and Christmas agreed, that it should be kept on the Agenda  
24 as a reminder in case the Board had funding and time to address it at a later date.

#### 25 **AGENDA BUILDING**

26 There were no additional agenda items.

#### 27 **ADJOURNMENT**

28 President Bernardo adjourned the meeting at 3:37 p.m.