

1 Approved September 17, 2020

2 California Library Services Board Meeting

3 June 25, 2020

4 Remote Meeting: Zoom

5 **BOARD OPENING**

6 **Welcome and Introductions**

7 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to
8 order on June 25, 2020 at 9:34 am.

9 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Florante Ibanez, Sarah Hernandez,
10 Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Elizabeth Murguia, Maria Senour, Sandra Tauler, and
11 Connie Williams.

12 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Natalie Cole,
13 Meg DePriest, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Annly Roman, Beverly Schwartzberg,
14 Jodie Thomas, and Rebecca Wendt.

15 **Adoption of Agenda**

16 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried*
17 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the*
18 *agenda for the June 25, 2020 meeting.*

19 **Approval of February 2020 Meeting Minutes**

20 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia, Ibanez) and carried*
21 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves*
22 *the draft minutes of the February 4, 2020 California Library Services*
23 *Board Meeting.*

24 **Board Resolutions**

25 President Bernardo stated that several members had left the board this year,
26 and resolutions were introduced in their honor.

27 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez, Tauler) and carried*
28 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts*
29 *California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-01 for Brandy*
30 *Rose Buenafe (Exhibit A).*

31 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi, Ibanez) and carried*
32 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts*

1 *California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-02 for Gary M.*
2 *Christmas (Exhibit B).*

3 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez, Williams) and carried*
4 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts*
5 *California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-03 for Adriana*
6 *Martinez (Exhibit C).*

7 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia, Williams) and carried*
8 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts*
9 *California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-04 for Peter A.*
10 *Mindnich (Exhibit D).*

11 **Board Meeting for Fall 2020**

12 Annly Roman reported that at the last board meeting, the board discussed
13 holding the fall meeting in late October in Los Angeles to coincide with the
14 California Library Association conference. That conference was postponed until
15 May, due to the Coronavirus situation. Roman asked if the Board wanted to meet
16 earlier in mid-September instead. She also advised that the Board plan on
17 meeting remotely in fall since it was unclear when the state would begin to open
18 up. At that point all state agencies were not allowed to do any unnecessary
19 travel.

20 Member Williams stated that she thought planning for a distance meeting
21 would be prudent. She asked if there was a time to meet when all the budget
22 facts and figures would be in hand. State Librarian Lucas stated that with the
23 traditional budget schedule there was not much information until the governor
24 introduced his budget on January 1. State agencies put forward what they would
25 like to see in the January budget by Labor Day but no decisions were really made
26 until November. That being said, earlier this year the legislature said they would
27 take a first cut of the budget, in June, which they did. Then the legislature was
28 going to take another look in August, largely because the state pushed the tax
29 deadline from April 15 to July 15. Depending on what happened there could
30 have been some activity on the budget in August.

31 Several Board members agreed that September would be a good time to
32 meet. Monica Rivas suggested meeting in late September because she had been
33 reassigned to the COVID-19 tracing team. Due to the Coronavirus situation the
34 State Library had given the systems an extension on the Plans of Service until the
35 end of July. Meeting later would give Annly Roman enough time to compile all
36 the information that was needed.

1 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

2 **Board President’s Report**

3 President Bernardo reported that she had worked to prepare letters of support
4 to the state as well as to her federal and state legislators for library and literacy
5 funding efforts. She also continued to attend trainings, webinars, and Zoom, GoTo,
6 and WebEx meetings.

7 Bernardo stated that, before the shelter in place order, she had testified before
8 the Assembly Budget Subcommittee five on Public Safety on how county law
9 libraries impact services for the unrepresented and self-represented litigants. She
10 expressed hope that her testimony would have an effect on county law libraries’
11 support and how access to justice issues would be supported in the coming
12 budget. County law libraries rely on court civil filing fees and with the court closure
13 and slow reopening county law libraries might not get any funding until the new
14 year. Hopefully some of the testimony provided in February, would stick with the
15 legislators and they would get something to backfill revenues.

16 President Bernardo reported her library had been closed to the public since
17 March 23rd, but staff were considered essential workers and continued to provide
18 email and phone reference. Staff rotated into the office to access print collection
19 to continue to serve patrons. Legal publishers had stepped up, offering free
20 services or access to their legal databases.

21 On a positive note, her library was selected to participate in this year’s
22 maximizing learning spaces grant, as a furnishings participant. The library was
23 working toward a Lawyers in the Library program. So for the past eight weeks, they
24 had been remodeling to maximizing learning spaces and address social
25 distancing with movable furnishings.

26 **Vice President’s Report**

27 Vice President Ibanez had retired. He was also a participant in library work with
28 the Carlos Bulosan book club based out of the Echo Park library. They would be
29 doing a webinar on the reading of “America in the Heart” and he would be one
30 of the two moderators.

31 **Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

32 State Librarian Lucas reported that due to the COVID-19 pandemic the State
33 was in a bad budget situation with something like a \$50 billion deficit. The
34 Governor and legislature were not planning on solving it in one year, instead they

1 were gambling a certain amount of economy recovery and more tax revenue to
2 prevent some of the deeper cuts.

3 Specific to libraries, increases proposed in the Governor's January budget
4 disappeared and several existing programs were eliminated. \$1 million dollars for
5 Lunch at the Library, which fed kids in the summertime when schools were closed,
6 and Zip Books, which was under the California Library Services Act budget were
7 both eliminated.

8 Since March the State Library had been conducting bi-weekly meetings with
9 library directors and the attendance was good. Lucas stated that the heartening
10 thing for him had been seeing how institutions that were premised on in-person
11 and online services pivoted so quickly to just online. On Instagram or Facebook
12 there were online storytimes and programming designed to reach out to people
13 from a digital distance. Lucas stated that he did not think there was any other
14 government or public institution that could adapt and change so fundamentally
15 in such a short period of time.

16 Lucas also stated that he was struck, in listening to the library directors, by how
17 individual and specific libraries were and the differences along the spectrums of
18 reopening. Some had been conducting what they called curbside delivery all
19 along, while others are just beginning that service. Some libraries were starting to
20 open their doors to patrons through appointments, while others had already
21 opened their computer and learning centers to help jumpstart job training or
22 workforce development.

23 State Librarian Lucas stated that it made him optimistic about the future to see
24 these community oriented entities respond to this unprecedented situation.

25 **Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report**

26 Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to create an impact study
27 and online clearinghouse cataloging the economic and social value of libraries.
28 It was due to end this year, but State Librarian Lucas granted an extension,
29 because some of the activities had to be postponed due to the pandemic. Cole
30 was excited to report the project had gained a lot of momentum. It was a very
31 slow moving project for a couple of years as they worked to gather the relevant
32 data and information. In the last few months the value statement, which was
33 grounded in evidence, had been completed, so libraries could make those
34 statements of value and know they were backed up with data.

35 Cole reported they had been working on finalizing the Clearinghouse that
36 would be available on the State Library's website. It would be comprised of a
37 landing page where the bulk of the information would sit, the value statement,

1 project reports, reports about the values that are held by Californians and how
2 they align with what libraries are doing, a note about the project's methodology,
3 and pathways to other pages. There would be a second page with 15 information
4 sheets on different topics that library staff and other stakeholders could use to
5 support whatever case or statements they want to make to support their libraries.
6 Cole stated there would also be a searchable database of resources that people
7 could draw on.

8 The website also had a photo gallery. They had hoped to take photos tailored
9 to the project to ensure full representation but that had to be postponed, but
10 there are a lot of nice photos on the site. Additionally, the State Data Coordinator,
11 Meg DePriest, would be providing a link to the library usage and collection
12 statistics to show library outputs. Cole stated there would be a whole set of
13 information to draw on to demonstrate the value and the impact of the public
14 library.

15 Natalie Cole reported that some of the other things to highlight were that a
16 second journal article was just accepted. It would be helpful because people
17 would be able to view the full academic arguments and all the citations, so it
18 would support the more accessible information sheets that would be online.

19 For next steps, Cole stated they had training planned in fall which would focus
20 on telling the right story to the right person at the right time. They would also be
21 using social media, presentations at conference, and articles in professional
22 journals to raise awareness about the project outputs and results. The results would
23 also be used internally to inform the work being done in the Library Development
24 Services Bureau.

25 Member Williams stated she thought what had been done so far was amazing
26 but she want to know if there were plans to find ways to not only educate library
27 people, but also educate legislators and nonprofit groups on how a library could
28 help their group and how they could help libraries. Natalie Cole stated that they
29 would raise as much awareness as possible.

30 Member Murguia asked if all the information would be available for anyone to
31 use. Cole confirmed that it would be freely available on the State Library's website
32 and that some of the data had already been posted.

33 President Bernardo asked if this was a point-in-tiem study or would additional
34 information be added moving forward. Cole stated that the goal was for it to be
35 a living set of information and a lot of the information would be long lasting.

1 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

2 Deputy State Librarian Rebecca Wendt reported that the Zip Books program
3 had been annually funded by the California Library Services board for several
4 years. It provided opportunities for people unable to come into the library to have
5 books delivered. The program began in the 2011-2012 fiscal year as a pilot
6 program. There was \$1 million from the 2019-2020 state budget that was awarded
7 to NorthNet in June of this year, which will allow the program to continue through
8 June of 2021.

9 At the beginning of the pandemic some libraries had to put a hold on their
10 iterations of Zip Books, but most had been able to resume. Wendt reported that
11 there were 74 libraries currently participating.

12 Wendt stated that over the past year, the Zip Books website, which was hosted
13 by NorthNet was updated with information on the program and videos. The
14 number of uses had continuously gone up. In the April 2020 information 45,610
15 items had been ordered through the Zip Books program, many of which were
16 added to library collections.

17 Vice President Ibanez asked if it would be possible to link their website on the
18 Board’s page as a success story or somehow demonstrate that the Board was
19 involved with the project. Annly Roman stated that she would work on getting
20 something added to the Board’s webpage.

21 **Link+ Grant Program**

22 Annly Roman stated that the Link+ program was funded through a one-time
23 funding allocation of \$450,000 for the California Library Services Board to
24 administrate. In Spring of 2019 the Board approved a motion to allocate “the
25 450,000 to NorthNet to pay the one time yearly cost for three libraries to join Link+,
26 and using the remainder to support the sustainability and growth of the Link+
27 regional resource sharing.”

28 Suzanne Olawski, Vice Chair of the NorthNet Library Cooperative System,
29 reported that the grant was awarded to NorthNet in March 2019. In September
30 2019 NorthNet provided an update on the status of the Link+ resource sharing
31 grant, and the board approved extending the grant opportunity beyond
32 NorthNet to all other California public and academic libraries. As a result of that
33 extension Coronado, Glendale, Rancho Cucamonga, and Alameda Free Library
34 were awarded grants to join Link+.

35 Olawski stated that the grants cover the first year subscription, first year of
36 delivery, and \$1,000 for supplies. NorthNet had been working with other libraries

1 throughout the state that had expressed interest in Link+, however since the
2 pandemic libraries are reluctant to commit to joining.

3 Suzanne Olawski reported that, due to the pandemic circumstances, NorthNet
4 had approximately \$85,000 (could vary slightly depending on courier fees, etc.)
5 in remaining funds that they did not believe they would be able to grant to any
6 additional new libraries. Olawski stated that NorthNet had been contacted by
7 the 49-99 consortium to inquire about receiving grant funds to help support their
8 Link+ costs due to the proposed 50% reduction in the CLSA funds in the 2020-2021
9 budget.

10 Olawski reported that NorthNet spoke with the State Library grant monitor for
11 the project, Lena Pham, and together they developed four options for expanding
12 the final funds for the board's consideration.

- 13 • Distribute the remaining grant funds to the NorthNet Library System to
14 support the master Link+ subscription renewal for fiscal year 2020-2021.
15 The cost would be divvied up proportionally between the 18 libraries
16 that would benefit.
- 17 • Divide the remaining grant funds proportionally between NorthNet and
18 49-99, with NorthNet receiving 70% of the remaining funds and 49-99
19 receiving the remaining 30%.
- 20 • Use the funds for courier costs. NorthNet anticipated a 5% increase in
21 the length plus courier contracts for fiscal year 2020-2021. NorthNet
22 could extend the funds to the 27 public libraries with Link+ courier
23 contracts that have not yet benefited from these grant funds to help
24 cover courier costs.
- 25 • Develop an equitable and competitive way for libraries to request the
26 remaining funds with 20% of the grant funds being reserved for NorthNet
27 Link+ subscription costs for fiscal year 2020-2021, and the other 80%
28 being awarded through a competitive process.

29 Olawski noted that the final two options would have required additional staff
30 time so NorthNet would needed additional administrative funds. NorthNet had an
31 ad hoc committee, working on the Link+ grant project so the four options being
32 presented for Board discussion and input were developed by that committee.

33 Laura Einstadter, County Librarian for Amador County and Chair of 49-99
34 Cooperative, stated that 49-99 requested consideration for additional funding for
35 the cooperative to cover Link+ costs that would not be covered due to the cuts
36 in CLSA funding. Einstadter stated 49-99 had been part of Link+ for a little over
37 three years. During that time, patrons had grown to rely on that service to provide
38 materials that their libraries would not able to provide. Most 49-99 libraries had

1 limited budgets, especially those like Amador that were rural. She stated that the
2 system did not have another means of getting funding to provide those resources
3 to members. For the month of January 2020, 49-99 community members had
4 requested 3,834 items and libraries loaned 3,263 items. Einstadter stated that the
5 service really had meant a lot to the communities in 49-99 and that was why they
6 were asking for consideration of some of the remaining funding.

7 Member Williams asked if the NorthNet Library System was asking for Board
8 input on how to use the funds. Suzanne replies that NorthNet was looking for any
9 questions, direction or opinions the Board might have had on how NorthNet
10 should expended the remaining funds. Carol Frost clarified that none of the
11 proposed options added any new libraries to Link+, itnwould just be determining
12 how far the funds could or should go to support already participating libraries.

13 Williams stated she supported whichever option allowed the most current
14 participants to stay in the system as long as possible.

15 President Bernardo stated she would not support an option with required
16 additional staff time and costs from NorthNet. She suggested the second options
17 mentioned which provided funds to both NorthNet and 49-99. Members Murguia,
18 Ibanez, and Hernandez agreed.

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

20 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

21 **SJVLS Amended Plan of Service**

22 Annly Roman reported that the San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS) had
23 requested an amendment to their 2019-2020 Plan of Service. SJVLS had originally
24 wanted to use funds to purchase the Omeka system. This would have provided a
25 digital archive and allowed member libraries to digitize, upload, and share local
26 collections. SJVLS had not been able make that program work so instead they
27 wanted to use those funds for e-resources and an e-card registration service for
28 member libraries to provide online registration for library cards.

29 President Bernardo clarified that it was \$25,970 that would have moved from
30 the original project to fund the new proposal. Member Williams asked what had
31 become of the Omeka project. Sally Gomez from SJVLS stated that they did have
32 the Omeka Project online, however, they did not have the participation from
33 libraries they had expected. In January they decided to put that project on hold
34 and move toward the e-card registration, which they had been wanting to
35 provide for some time. Due to the pandemic situation that project was even more
36 appropriate because so many people were using online services. So the e-card

1 registration system would make it easier for people to register online, and use
2 resources.

3 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia, Hernandez) and carried*
4 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves*
5 *San Joaquin Valley Library System's amended plan of service for*
6 *the fiscal year 2019-2020.*

7 **CLSA Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 2020-2021**

8 Monica Rivas reported that the next agenda item was the preliminary
9 California Library Services Act budget for fiscal year 2020-2021. Originally when
10 staff generated documentation for the budget, funding was proposed at \$3.63
11 million, but amendments to the budget had cut the proposed funded amount by
12 \$1.5 million to \$1.88 million.

13 Member Tauler asked if the Cooperative Library Systems would have to wait
14 to receive funds until after the Board met in late September. Rivas verified that
15 was correct because the plans of service would need to be approved before
16 funds were released. Annly Roman stated that the State Library would send out
17 awards as soon as possible.

18 *It was moved, seconded (Williams, Senour) and carried*
19 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts,*
20 *contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2020-*
21 *2021 California Library Services Act budget as directed in the*
22 *proposed 2020-2021 budget, totaling \$1,880,000 for allocation to*
23 *the Cooperative Library Systems.*

24 **Clarification of Use of CLSA Funds related to telecommunication equipment and** 25 **service fees**

26 Annly Roman reported that the California State Library had received a request
27 for clarification from the NorthNet Library System on whether certain
28 programs/items were considered an allowable use of funds under the California
29 Library Services Act. The items were things like paying for ongoing broadband
30 costs, system technology materials, network security software, and warranties. The
31 State Library responded that a case could be made that CENIC broadband bills
32 could be seen as service fees in support of communications, based on the
33 regulatory language in section 20236. The State Library did not feel that warranties
34 or security software would fall under that category. NorthNet Library Systems had
35 submitted a letter requesting official clarification by the Board.

1 Member Williams clarified that warranties were somewhat like insurance, and
2 would pay for any repairs. Annly Roman stated that it depended on what kind of
3 warranty as some companies will do repairs or replace items no matter what and
4 some warranties had conditions. Williams stated that she was curious because it
5 was a question of how much it would have cost to repair or replace something
6 and if you had the money.

7 Preside Bernardo stated that she agreed that the CENIC bills, could be
8 considered service fees. She thought what NorthNet was really asking was about
9 maintenance of technology. It seemed prudent to have a way to repair or
10 replace things that were purchased and if the funding for that did not come from
11 this pot she wondered how it would be funded.

12 State Librarian Lucas stated that, from the State Library's reading, the
13 regulations seems to indicate that warranties, maintenance, and things like that
14 are the costs of carrying out the various programs and fit under the administrative
15 umbrella.

16 President Bernardo asked if NorthNet was saying that covering those costs
17 under the administrative portion was insufficient so they wanted to be able to use
18 the bigger piece of the pie to fund those things. She wondered if they were asking
19 the Board if those items, like warranties, would fit under the baseline pot. Lucas
20 stated there were a variety of expenses that NorthNet wanted clarification on;
21 broadband, ongoing telecommunications costs from CENIC, warranties on the
22 data center network router, and network security software at the data center to
23 protect the network from hacks viruses and breaches. As he had said, the State
24 Library reading was that the administrative costs the systems received was
25 adequate to cover the expenses of conducting the programs of the Act. Member
26 Williams indicated that she felt they would not be asking if there was not a lack of
27 funding somewhere.

28 Todd Deck, Tehama County Library and Chair of the NorthNet Library
29 Consortium, stated that NorthNet was asking the Board to fully explore what
30 monthly service fees, as referenced in the regulations, meant. Deck stated that in
31 the memo provided to the Board there were two statements from rural libraries.
32 One from Jody Meza, Orland Public Library, talking about the challenges with
33 software renewal costs and another from Michael Perry about the challenges of
34 maintenance support. Deck stated that many local library budgets had not been
35 adjusted to fully support the additional costs of CENIC and they hoped that the
36 Board considering this could give libraries the additional support to keep that
37 program thriving. CENIC was becoming more important every day during the
38 pandemic.

1 Michael Perry, County Librarian for Siskiyou County, stated while they were
2 able to use Communication and Delivery funds to purchase hardware equipment
3 to support CENIC within the 12 branch system, one of the challenges his library
4 faced was that if any of the equipment failed they would have to repurchase.
5 Perry stated they could use the same funding source to do that but the timeline
6 on repurchasing was week, if not months.

7 Perry stated that his IT department said they were walking a tightrope without
8 a net because should any of the routers fail, especially the central branch router,
9 which was the hub of the system, everything was down until that piece of
10 equipment was replaced. He recalled when the equipment was purchased four
11 years ago it took about three to six months to get everything ordered, approved,
12 and delivered

13 Carol Frost clarified, as the fiscal agent for NorthNet, the way that NorthNet
14 distributed funds. There was the baseline funds, which was 80% and system
15 administration funds which was the 20%. The 20% went to support staff costs to run
16 the system. There was not one shared network in NorthNet so 80% of the funds
17 went back to libraries to support delivery and shared resources like overdrive.
18 NorthNet used a formula to distribute the funds back to libraries. Frost stated that
19 libraries had a menu that they could choose from that were allowable costs under
20 CLSA. Some examples were: local shared resources, or local shared delivery.

21 Frost stated that in the Plan of Service there was a section that talked about
22 use of CLSA funds to support telecommunications/broadband. A few years ago
23 they asked for clarification on what using CLSA funds for that purpose meant and
24 the response was that it supported hardware purchases. Frost stated that
25 NorthNet was asking for that definition to be expanded past hardware,
26 particularly for the rural libraries that really struggle to pay for those basic things to
27 support their network.

28 Frost explained as others have said a service warrantee made it so that if a
29 network border router broke down libraries would not have to come up with
30 \$20,000 to replace it. The money NorthNet allocated back to the libraries was not
31 very much, and they want to stretch the dollar as much as they could. Frost stated
32 that since the use of broadband or telecommunications funds were listed under
33 baseline it seemed like those other costs should be eligible as either administrative
34 or baseline costs.

35 Member Murguia stated that it sounded like NorthNet was asking for greater
36 flexibility on how funds could be used because they had limited resources.
37 Murguia and Williams wondered if the Board had authority to make that change

1 and if so, would that change be on an on-going basis for any system or a one-
2 time exception.

3 State Librarian Lucas stated that the regulations for the California Library
4 Services Act had language related to allowable expenses. NorthNet is asking if
5 the above mentioned expenses could be interpreted to fall under the umbrella
6 of those allowable costs. Lucas stated he thought NorthNet was requesting the
7 board say yes these expenses are allowable. Todd Deck confirmed that was
8 correct.

9 Member Tauler stated that she felt warranties fell under maintenance of
10 technology which was listed as an allowable costs and Member Ibanez agreed.

11 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez, Murguia) and carried with one***
12 ***no vote (Hernandez) and seven aye votes that the California***
13 ***Library Services Board accept the interpretation that the six items***
14 ***requested in the Summary of the NorthNet Library System's letter,***
15 ***Document 9 of the Board packet (See Exhibit E) are included in***
16 ***the regulatory language (Section 20236) as allowable baseline***
17 ***costs.***

18 **Fund Disbursement**

19 Annly Roman stated that this agenda item was a continuation of a discussion
20 the board had been having regarding fund disbursement. At the last meeting the
21 systems had expressed that they would like to get funds sooner, especially since
22 the Board was considering meeting at the end of October.

23 Member Tauler stated that she remembered the discussion had covered how
24 difficult it was for the systems to work through five or six months of their budget
25 without any money. It seemed to her that it would be best to give them part of
26 the funds since having to work through months of a fiscal year without any funding
27 was difficult, especially during the hard times everyone was having. Tauler said
28 she would suggest releasing 25% of their funding early and asked if that was
29 allowed.

30 State Librarian Lucas said that there was no money to provide 25% because
31 the budget had not been approved. So it was not legal for the Board to earmark
32 funds that did not exist. He understood that it made operations difficult, but was
33 not something anyone could do before the budget had passed. Tauler stated
34 that if it was not allowed of course they would not but urged for funds to be
35 released as soon as possible.

36 Monica Rivas stated that when the budget was finalized and the Board met
37 to approve the plans of service the State Library could do award packets as soon

1 after that as possible. Additionally they could consider the idea of giving the
2 systems all of the funding at once rather than in two payments.

3 **RESOURCE SHARING**

4 **CLSA System – Level programs**

5 Monica Rivas reported that this section was for the Board to look at the annual
6 reports. Rivas stated she compared the plans of service and the annual reports to
7 make sure they were consistent. The annual reports showed most of the systems
8 funding was still going toward delivery, whether by contracted van, UPS or a
9 postal service. The system were beginning to use more of the funding for e-
10 resources like ebooks, audiobooks, e-magazines, Enki, and Overdrive. There were
11 also some systems using their funding for Link+, and a couple used funds for
12 Digilabs this fiscal year.

13 **Consolidations and Affiliations**

14 Annly Roman reported that this agenda items was related to a section in the
15 regulations leftover from when there used to be funds available for consolidations
16 and affiliations. It required the board to approve consolidations of library
17 jurisdictions because it impacted the number of members within a cooperative
18 system. The Dixon Public Library affiliated with the Solano County Library System
19 effective July 1, 2020. This was coming before the Board as information and also
20 for approval with regards to the CLSA funding and the potential impacts on the
21 formula because of changes to the number of member libraries.

22 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi, Murguia) and carried*
23 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves*
24 *the affiliation of the Dixon Public Library with the Solano County*
25 *Library System effective July 1, 2020, and waives the September 1,*
26 *2019 notification dated for affiliations.*

27 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

28 Annly Roman stated that other than the state budget, which State Librarian
29 Lucas had already discussed, there was not any library related legislation moving
30 forward. Legislative leadership, for the purposes expediency and considering the
31 financial emergency situation, asked legislators to limit legislation to bills related
32 to COVID-19 or other emergency situations such as homelessness or fire
33 emergencies.

34 State Librarian Lucas reported that the federal government, as part of the
35 CARES Act, passed a \$50 million package for libraries and museums. The money

1 went to the Institute of Museum and Library Services and \$30 million of that was
2 given out on a per capita basis. \$3.5 million of that funding came to the State
3 Library. The language associated with the funding directed that the funds be
4 spent on closing the digital gap, and it specifically talked about laptops and
5 hotspots. The State Library's strategy on spending the money, within the
6 parameters, was to look at how to take this one time, money, and create the
7 most ongoing benefit.

8 Lucas reported that the State Library spent \$1 million buying a statewide
9 subscription to a service called Beanstack, which is basically, all though it does
10 do a lot more, an online reading program. Libraries have had to change their
11 summer reading programs because of the health pandemic which, in the past,
12 have been very in-person with events and things in the library. In surveying libraries
13 we discovered that more than 60% were using this service. By doing a statewide
14 subscription, we could touch the greatest number of libraries and reduce some
15 of their in-house costs

16 The bulk of the remaining funding was going to focus on job training workforce
17 development because what library directors were saying was, not unlike the
18 recession caused by the collapse of the housing industry in 2008, their expectation
19 was that, at a time when their budgets were shrinking, more people were going
20 to come to the library. More people are going to look for help, whether that's
21 employment or looking for social services, and what directors tell told us was that
22 it was more likely now that the first door that Californians knock on at the library
23 would be the digital one. So the State Library was looking at helping create kind
24 of a minimum level of service as it related to things like job training and workforce
25 development in as many libraries as possible.

26 Lucas stated that the House had passed a bill, called the HEROES Act that was
27 around \$1 trillion dollars or more. It contained \$5 million to support libraries
28 throughout the United States. That legislation was not going to go anywhere in
29 the Senate. There had been efforts by the American Library Association. A
30 majority of Senators had signed a letter circulated by ALA recommending
31 investing more money in libraries, something around \$1 billion dollars. It was
32 unclear what, if anything, would come from that.

33 Lucas stated that the Administration, through the Department of Finance, had
34 made it clear that they want the State Library to make it a priority to find as much
35 federal funding as possible that could go to local libraries. Lucas reported that
36 many of the spending reductions in the budget that the legislature and the
37 governor approved would not happen if \$14 billion in federal aid came to the

1 state of California. However, it seemed unlikely that there would be that level of
2 federal support

3 President Bernardo asked about the California Library Association's
4 information. State Librarian Lucas stated that the most recent update from CLA
5 related to the \$1.5 million reduction to the California Library Services Act. CLA is
6 concerned as to whether that reduction would be restored if federal money
7 came through. Lucas stated that his understanding was that the \$1.5 million
8 reduction was on the list of reductions to be restored if the federal money
9 materialized, but that was not clear from the budget document approved by the
10 legislature, and was not yet signed by the Governor. If the funds were not going
11 to be restored CLA stated they would work with lawmakers and the administration
12 in August, to get that issue clarified.

13 **BAORD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2020-2021**

14 Member Williams gave a presentation (Document 12 of the June 2020 CLSB
15 packet found [here](#)) on school libraries and librarians to inform the Board about
16 the group she represented on the Board and why representation was so
17 important. Among other things Williams explained that school librarians taught
18 students how to navigate and assess digital information. She also pointed out
19 how school libraries had pivoted to assist teachers and students with distance
20 learning due to the pandemic. She also brought up that although studies
21 showed that having a teacher librarian on staff improved education and
22 technology usage California had some of the lowest rates of teacher librarians
23 in schools in the nation.

24 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

25 Member Murguia issued a thank you on behalf her local public library, the
26 Humboldt County Public Library. The library, like all libraries across the state, had
27 really stepped up their game in terms of online resources. Murguia stated that she
28 knew they had received enormous support from the State Library and wanted to
29 let the Library State Library staff know that it had been helpful.

30 State Librarian Lucas stated that e-resources were a request made by
31 NorthNet. \With the stay at home order, the request for online resources were
32 significantly higher than before. The State Library had received some money back
33 from libraries that couldn't be used because the grant was premised on sort of
34 physical contact, so when the State Library got the request we were able to send
35 these grants to a number of jurisdictions to help them increase resources.

1 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

2 There were not comments from Board members.

3 **OLD BUSINESS**

4 There was no old business brought forward.

5 **AGENDA BUILDING**

6 There were no additional agenda items brought forward.

7 **ADJOURNMENT**

8 President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services
9 Board meeting at 2:10 PM. Adjournment was made in recognition of those who
10 we had lost recently to the corona virus pandemic, and to their families and
11 friends; of those we had lost in systemic and individual racism and social injustices
12 and their families and friends; and in recognition of the Porterville Public Library,
13 and Captain Raymond Figueroa and firefighter, Patrick Jones who died in the
14 fight to save the library.

15

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-01
In Honor of Brandy Rose Buenafe*

WHEREAS, The California Library Services Board desires to recognize Brandy Rose Buenafe for her contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her term of service as a member of the Board; and

WHEREAS, The Board wishes to honor Brandy Buenafe for her public service and expertise representing the institutionalized individuals since her appointment by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. on March 29, 2016; and

WHEREAS, It should be noted that Brandy Buenafe has served as the Library Services Administrator for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation since 2014; and

WHEREAS, Prior to her Administrator position she held several prison librarian positions with the Department including Senior librarian for the Pleasant Valley State Prison and Librarian at Corcoran State Prison; and

WHEREAS, Brandy Buenafe has also worked with the National Institute of Corrections on Evidence Based Correctional Librarianship and provided a library voice in evaluation literacy plans from organizations receiving Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Grants; and

WHEREAS, For the last several years Brandy Buenafe has served on the California Library Association’s Committee for the PRExcellence award; and

WHEREAS, Brandy Buenafe’s professional perspective, and enthusiasm have proven invaluable to the California Library Services Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

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

Brandy Rose Buenafe

*for her contributions and service
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of June 25, 2020*

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-02
In Honor of Gary M. Christmas*

WHEREAS, The California Library Services Board recognizes Gary M. Christmas for his distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of his term of service as a member of the board; and

WHEREAS, The Board wishes to honor Gary M. Christmas for his exceptional public service and engagement representing public library trustees or commissioners since his appointment by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. on June 20, 2014; and

WHEREAS, Prior to starting Gary Christmas Consulting in 2010, Gary Christmas dedicated over 30 years to the library community during his career at the Riverside County Library where he served in various executive officer positions from 2004 to 2010, was the County Librarian from 1997 until 2004, and held other positions such as branch manager and reference librarian from 1977; and

WHEREAS, Gary M. Christmas served as an enlisted member of the United States Coast Guard from 1973 until 1977; and

WHEREAS, Gary M. Christmas is an involved community member and has participated in many organizations including serving on the board of Library Trustees for the City of Riverside, participating in the Raincross Group, the Riverside East Rotary Club, the Unforgettable Foundation, as a Board member for the March Air Field Museum as well as a Board member of the California Riverside Ballet; and

WHEREAS, Gary M. Christmas’s experience, knowledge and insight have proven invaluable to California Library Services Board; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

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

Gary M. Christmas

*for his contributions and service
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of June 25, 2020*

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2020-03
In Honor of Adriana Martinez*

WHEREAS, The California Library Services Board recognizes Adriana Martinez for her contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her service as a member of the Board; and

WHEREAS, The Board wishes to honor Adriana Martinez for her public service representing the public-at-large since her appointment by the Assembly Speaker’s Office on October 25, 2017; and

WHEREAS, It should be recognized that Adriana Martinez was the Director of Outreach for the CA Complete Count Census 2020 from 2018 until 2019; and

WHEREAS, Prior to her time at the census Adriana Martinez was the Director of External Affairs and Statewide Relations for AT&T from 2011 until 2018; and

WHEREAS, Adriana Martinez launched her own consulting practice in 2007 providing government, community and public affairs services with a focus on economic development in under-resourced communities; and

WHEREAS, Before starting her practice Adriana Martinez served as the Associate Director of Economic Development for Mayor Antonio R. Villaraigosa, the Economic Policy Director for Mayor James K. Hahn, the Spokesperson for the CA Census Undercount Campaign under Governor Gray Davis, and a Policy Advisor to Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard in Washington, D.C.; and

WHEREAS, Adriana Martinez has received numerous awards for her civic work including the Community Champion Award from the YMCA, Mujeres Destacadas, and Alumna of the Year, UCLA Latino Business Association; and

WHEREAS, Adriana Martinez’s policy and civic experience and perspective have proven invaluable to the California Library Services Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

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

Adriana Martinez

*for her contributions and service
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of June 25, 2020*

