

1 Approved April 6, 2021

2 **California Library Services Board Meeting**

3 **September 17, 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 September 17, 2020 at 9:38 am.

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

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

14 **Adoption of Agenda**

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

18 **Approval of June 2020 Meeting Minutes**

19 Florante Ibanez commented that in the Vice President's report on page 3,  
20 line 28 there had been a typo. He had referenced the Carlos Bulson Book club,  
21 not Wilson.

22 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez, Senour) and carried***  
23 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves,***  
24 ***as amended, the draft minutes of the June 25, 2020 California***  
25 ***Library Services Board Meeting.***

26 **Board Meeting for Fall 2021**

27 Annly Roman stated that the past year the board met in February to talk about  
28 legislative priorities and budgets. Additionally, the board usually meets in March  
29 or April in Sacramento, and in late August or early September for the Fall Meeting,  
30 which has been both in person and virtual. Roman said, based on the current  
31 COVID-19 situation and the travel restrictions it was hard to predict what would  
32 be happening the next time the Board met. She wanted to open the discussion  
33 of when the Board would want to meet, beginning of the year vs. mid-year, and  
34 if they wanted to try to meet in person.

1 Member Hernandez suggested that the Board should initially plan to meet  
2 virtually. All other Board members agreed. State Librarian Lucas asked if the Board  
3 wanted three meetings.

4 Annly Roman clarified that the meeting at the beginning of the 2020 was to  
5 plan for legislator meetings in spring. She asked if the Board was going to meet  
6 virtually in spring and if so, did they feel an earlier meeting was necessary.  
7 Member Maghsoudi asked if there was a budgetary reason to meet earlier in the  
8 year. State Librarian Lucas said he did not think there would be much in the  
9 budget and that the meeting in January or February might be unnecessary in the  
10 current circumstances in Sacramento.

11 President Bernardo said the Board could set forward their current budget  
12 priorities then follow up after the Governor's proposed budget introduction. The  
13 Board agreed to move forward with meetings in spring and fall.

#### 14 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

##### 15 **Board President's Report**

16 President Bernardo reported that her law library was continuing to work  
17 remotely. Staff continued with webinars, new trainings, and virtual conferences;  
18 they were also learning new online platforms. Although her library was still closed  
19 to the public, Bernardo reported the Board of Trustees asked for a reopening  
20 phased-in plan to be presented at their October meeting so she expected to be  
21 looking at limited in-person service sometime in October. Her library was ready  
22 with employee training requirements, P.P.E. and cleaning protocols.

23 President Bernardo attended the American Association of Law Libraries virtual  
24 conference as well as the Every Library advocacy and funding conference.  
25 Bernardo also reported that the legislature, in the 2021 state budget, included  
26 backfill funding for county law libraries, because of the filing fee revenue losses  
27 they had been experiencing.

##### 28 **Vice President's Report**

29 Vice President Ibanez reported that colleagues at Cal State Dominguez had  
30 requested an article for an online book they were preparing that, as he  
31 understood it, was partially funded through the board. The topic was Filipinos and  
32 advocacy in the arts and how that related to social justice. He was also involved  
33 in following up on how the process was going with the Filipino American Library  
34 that had been transferred over to USC's East Asia Library.

35 Vice President Ibanez continued to teach his History of Asian Pacific Americans  
36 class at Pasadena City College virtually. He had speakers come in who were part

1 of the group that authored “Hawaiians in Los Angeles” as part of the Arcadia  
2 books, “Images of America” series.

### 3 **Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

4 State Librarian Lucas reported that the State Library, like other places, was not  
5 open to the public. California received about \$3.5 million of Cares Act funding  
6 earmarked for libraries and some of that funding was being used to pay for online  
7 job training and skill training platforms created by Brainfuse.

8 Lucas stated that of the three online resources that the State of California  
9 provided for public school kids, Encyclopedia Britannica and TeachingBooks -  
10 made themselves accessible in libraries at no additional cost. ProQuest, for a  
11 slightly higher amount of money was also being made available in public libraries.

12 State Librarian Lucas reported that the State Library was supposed to reduce  
13 its budget by 5%, not hire new staff, and all the usual budget restrictions. The State  
14 Library had been using the time it had been closed to the public to work on  
15 making the digital front door more welcoming. We had also been working on  
16 ways to make our website easier to navigate and more up-to-date.

17 President Bernardo referenced the Governor's executive order about  
18 deploying affordable and reliable broadband networks and asked if the State  
19 Library has been participating in the Broadband Council that department of I.T.  
20 managed. State Librarian Lucas said that a bill passed adding a seat on the  
21 Broadband Council for the State Library and the Department of Food and  
22 Agriculture. Anne Neville-Bonilla, was the State Library’s representative on the  
23 Council.

24 Lucas stated they had a meeting about the Governor's Executive Order to try  
25 to get a sense of where the library fit because in the Executive Order it said that  
26 the State Library, working in concert with local libraries, was charged with  
27 promoting affordable broadband in homes and the communities they serve. In  
28 the conversation it was discussed that there were a number of different places  
29 where libraries intersect with the work others were doing. First, we were gathering  
30 information about libraries connectivity to put into a kind of broadband  
31 connectivity map that the state was creating. Lucas reported the State Library  
32 was incorporating information gathered in the Public Library Survey.

33 The State Library also identified ways to collaborate with the Department of  
34 Aging because one of their top priorities was finding ways to cope with the  
35 isolation that many older Californians felt. We were working on a one-pager  
36 advertising the role that libraries were playing in the area of digital literacy and  
37 broadband connectivity. Lucas stated that, in his experience, people often did

1 not think of libraries first or understand that they were a place that touched a  
2 broad cross section of California's senior population, at-risk families, and families  
3 with little kids. Therefore, they were trying to generate something to educate the  
4 other players, to make it easier for them to think of libraries.

5 President Bernardo stated that a couple of years ago she met the Director and  
6 the Deputy Director of the Department of Technology and they both said in terms  
7 of Cenic and broadband libraries were ahead. Lucas stated that it varied from  
8 library to library and jurisdiction to jurisdiction. However, we were in a significantly  
9 better place in terms of local connectivity than we were as recently as five years  
10 ago.

11 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

12 Deputy State Librarian Rebecca Wendt reported that the Zip Books program  
13 was an alternative model for Interlibrary Loan Services wherein libraries may  
14 purchase items not available in their collections and have them shipped directly  
15 to patrons. When the patrons returned the items to the library, the library had the  
16 option to add those materials to their collections. Zip Books remained popular, as  
17 it was one of the few tangible things that people could receive from their libraries.  
18 There were 74 libraries participating in the program and every cooperative system  
19 was represented.

20 Wendt said the program first launched as a pilot program with Library Services  
21 and Technology Act funds and the Board had invested several times. The current  
22 year was funded by a one-time \$1 million grant of Board funds and the funds were  
23 on track to be expended. Since July of 2019, there were nearly 57,000 items  
24 purchased and about half of those were added to library collections. In the  
25 second half of the last fiscal year, when the current health crisis had an impact,  
26 over 6,300 first-time users participated in the Zip Books program. Wendt stated that  
27 it was filling a desperate need for materials, particularly when people could not  
28 physically enter the libraries.

29 **Link+ Grant Program**

30 Suzanne Olawski, the NorthNet Library System Chair, stated that at the June  
31 meeting the Board provided NorthNet with direction on spending the remaining  
32 funds from that grant due to difficulties getting additional libraries connected to  
33 Link+ due to the pandemic and budget concerns.

34 Olawski reported that since June, the Coronado Library went live with Link+,  
35 bringing the total number of libraries that joined since the beginning of this project  
36 to five, with three more libraries in the implementation process. Glendale Library

1 hoped to go live by the end of the month, and Rancho Cucamonga and  
2 Alameda Free Library hoped to implement by October.

3 Based on the direction provided by the Board at the June meeting, NorthNet  
4 had allocated the remaining grant funds to NorthNet Library System and the 49-  
5 99 Co-Op library system. The intent of that was to support the sustainability of Link+,  
6 given the cuts to the CLSA budget allocation.

7 Olawski reported that due to the pandemic, Link+ suspended services in  
8 March, and resumed limited services in August. For months that members did not  
9 have access to Link+ materials or services, NorthNet received a credit, which  
10 could be used moving forward in the current fiscal year. Out of 67 Link+ clients, 47  
11 had resumed service and there were five additional libraries expecting to come  
12 back in October. Another five libraries planned to resume in January, and there  
13 were about 18 that did not know when they were going to reactivate. For those  
14 libraries that had resumed their Link+ services, patrons were appreciative.

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

16 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

17 **System Plans of Service and Budgets**

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

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

23 Monica Rivas reported that the final had not changed from the preliminary  
24 budget of \$1.88 million discussed at the spring meeting

25 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Murguia) and carried*  
26 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the*  
27 *final 2020/2021 California Library Services Act budget as directed*  
28 *in the Governor's 2020/2021 budget, totaling \$1,880,000, for*  
29 *allocation to the Cooperative Library Systems.*

30 Monica Rivas reported that system population and membership figures were  
31 used as part of the formula to determine allocations to the systems and were  
32 generated every year.

33 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried*  
34 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the*  
35 *System population and Membership figured for use in the allocation*

1 **of System funds for the fiscal year 2020/2021.**

2 Monica Rivas reported that all the Systems had submitted their Plans of Service  
3 for the year 2020-2021. Most were still using their funds for physical delivery either  
4 through contacted van, assistant van, UPS or through US Mail. Along with delivery  
5 systems also used funds for eResources and resource sharing services such as  
6 eMagazines, eBooks, audiobooks, RB Digital, Overdrive, Inky, Cloud Library, and  
7 Flipster. Some of the Systems were funding DigiLabs, Biblioteca, and Link+.

8 President Bernardo asked about the fact that in the Plans of Service it shows  
9 that Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) had leftover funds remaining in their budget.  
10 Brad McCulley, Burlington Public Library and Chair of PLP, stated that PLP normally  
11 had carryover funds every year and they did have three years to spend those  
12 funds. The reason those funds were higher than normal was because they had  
13 earmarked some money for SimplyE, the e-book platform, and Califa had  
14 covered the cost. PLP had also earmarked money for Analytics on Demand, and  
15 then issues within the consortium caused them to pull out of using that service.  
16 They had also has some pandemic related delivery cost savings. All of those gave  
17 PLP a large amount of overage this year. Additionally, PLP has always saved a  
18 little bit to provide the ability to pivot and provide services to our members.

19 PLP was such a big and disparate consortium with rural libraries and major  
20 cities like San Francisco, so it was not always easy to provide services for those  
21 kinds of libraries without keeping some funds at the ready. McCulley stated that  
22 they did notify the state of these funds and they were being spent.

23 Carol Frost, CEO of the Pacific Library Partnership, stated that when they  
24 realized that the pandemic was hitting, PLP immediately sent out a survey to all  
25 of its members and asked about budgets impacts. Fourteen of the smallest  
26 libraries were experiencing major budget cuts, including one library that was  
27 having 50% of their budget cut. Based on that, because there were these cost  
28 savings, we were able to buy a subscription to e-magazines for those. Frost said  
29 PLP was trying to pivot and make up for the 50% reduction in funding.

30 Frost stated that PLP had been in communication with the State Library and  
31 that was why they included that information in the Plan of Service. Frost stated  
32 she thought State Library staff has done a good job of trying to modify the reports  
33 that Systems submitted. There was an annual report that was modified for this year  
34 to show if previous year funds were being carried over and if so how they were  
35 going to be used. The same with the System expenditure reports, there was clearly  
36 a line item there for places to indicate where money was carried over. She  
37 thought Monica had done a super job of trying to give a clear understanding and

1 have it be transparent. Frost stated that she had spoken to State Library staff and  
2 offered suggestions of how to make it clearer when money was transferring from  
3 one year to another.

4 Monica Rivas stated that staff had a conversation with Carol Frost and now  
5 wanted to give the information back to the Board, just in case they wanted to  
6 see more. When we updated the forms staff was able to see more about how  
7 funding was used from previous years. Staff felt there was more we could do and  
8 wanted to ask the Board if they wanted more description of those funds,

9 President Bernardo stated that she appreciated the information because she  
10 was unaware that there had been some unspent funds at the end of each year.  
11 She asked if the other eight systems has carryover funds. Monica Rivas responded  
12 that all the other annual reports showed everything encumbered or expended.

13 Annly Roman said that one of the other reasons staff wanted to bring this to  
14 the Board's attention was to see if they wanted specific designation on the Plans  
15 of Service of which fiscal year funds were coming from. That might be a clear  
16 way for the Board to see how funds were transferring from year to year since there  
17 was that three-year window. Staff just wants to make sure we are clear about how  
18 we are capturing the movement of those funds since the Board is the deciding  
19 body. Rivas stated we wondered if the Board wanted to be part of the decision  
20 of what to do with those funds.

21 President Bernardo stated she felt the Board needed to be aware of the  
22 spending of any leftover funds within that three-year period, and that the funds  
23 were not reverting back. She stated that she wanted to see the detail on  
24 carryover funds and how they were used. She asked if that would be too  
25 burdensome for the systems. Annly Roman stated that the annual reports had  
26 already been changed and they had some other changes they could make to  
27 be sure staff was capturing all previous fiscal year funds and how they were being  
28 used.

29 Vice President Ibanez stated that he thought it was great information and  
30 since the Board was responsible for the money, he thought they should be  
31 appraised of any changes.

32 Suzanne Olawski from NorthNet stated that NorthNet also carried forward  
33 some funds this year to make sure they had funds to continue our modified  
34 services due to that 50% cut in the CSLA fund. So having three years to expend  
35 funds and modifying reports if necessary to clarify, that is acceptable.

36 Crystal Duran, County Librarian for Imperial County and Chair of the Serra  
37 System echoed what Suzanne Olawski. For this fiscal year when funds were cut,  
38 Serra relied heavily on unspent funds to help support them so they did not have a

1 huge disruption of service. All the systems, especially during the pandemic, relied  
2 on digital resources and Serra used a bulk of its funding on Overdrive, Flipster, and  
3 delivery. Being able to use those funds for three years was critical and necessary,  
4 especially with uncertainty about the status of budgets for libraries and the state  
5 as a whole. The three years gap and the ability to use those unspent funds is  
6 helpful to us as well. Robert Shupe, the director of the Palmdale City Library and  
7 Chair of the Southern California Library Cooperative echoed the previous  
8 comments.

9 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried***  
10 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the***  
11 ***California Library Services Act System Plans of Services and Budgets***  
12 ***for the nine Cooperative Library Systems, submitted for the fiscal***  
13 ***year 2020/2021.***

14 Annly Roman stated that the next item was a continuation of previous  
15 discussions regarding payments to the Systems. In the past, the Systems had  
16 received their annual allocation as two payments, one close to the beginning of  
17 the fiscal year, and then another midway through the year. At the last meeting,  
18 it was broached whether the Board would consider providing one payment since  
19 the meeting was later in the year and the budget funds had been cut.

20 Member Williams asked what the history was behind doing two payment.  
21 Monica Rivas stated that when she looked at the historical payment schedule, it  
22 varied. She was unsure if each year varies because circumstances were  
23 difference but some were done in two payments and some were done in just one.  
24 Williams said that if it was not the case of not having the funds because the  
25 legislature had not released them then she was fine with doing it all in one.

26 Annly Roman stated that differences might also have been related to state  
27 grant processes and policies with the State Library. There were different processed  
28 depending on the kind of grants and payments could vary from 40% up front to  
29 90%.

30 President Bernardo stated that since funds were cut in half she felt a single  
31 payment was reasonable. Member Maghsoudi agreed. Vice President Ibanez  
32 said he recalled the issue surrounding Systems having funds when they needed  
33 them most instead of having to wait for a lump sum. Member Williams stated it  
34 was also tied to when the Board met so that was a consideration in meeting  
35 dates.

36 State Librarian Lucas asked for clarification of what "up front" meant. Roman  
37 stated that it was a discussion of providing a lump sum of 100% of the funds to the



1 Systems versus two payments of 50% spread out over the course of the fiscal year.  
2 Monica Rivas stated that when the funds had been given in two payments the  
3 first was in September and the second in December, so there was not a huge gap  
4 of time between the two. Bernardo clarified that there were no reporting  
5 requirements between the two payments. Rivas confirmed that there were not.

6 Diane Bednarski, Executive Director for SCLC, commented on the impacts of  
7 when funds were received. She stated that in addition to overseeing the finances  
8 of SCLC, they oversaw administrative tasks for other Systems as well and they had  
9 been paying personnel salary, lease, and annual subscriptions in order to provide  
10 services. Therefore, SCLC was absorbing the burden of those costs for themselves  
11 and the other systems until checks were received. In a typical year, that would  
12 be an ongoing impact. Bednarski stated that this year had a greater impact  
13 because of the reduction in CLSA funding. For those Systems who made upfront  
14 payments for annual subscriptions to things like Flipster or Overdrive, those had  
15 been paid, but funds had not been received to offset that and with the reduction,  
16 those funds would not fully cover the costs. Bednarski asked for a single check  
17 earlier in the year.

18 Suzanne Olawski stated that she appreciated the Board's consideration of the  
19 immediate distribution of funds in a 100% lump sum. Crystal Duran and Robert  
20 Shupe echoed the comments made by Diane and Suzanne.

21 Member Williams stated that she agreed they should provide a 100% lump sum  
22 this year but thought the Board needed to look at the payment schedule in the  
23 next fiscal year. She thought they should look at scheduling meetings in a timely  
24 manner to give approval and take action more quickly and more prudently for  
25 the Systems. Vice-President Ibanez agreed.

26 ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Maghsoudi) and carried***  
27 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the***  
28 ***Cooperative Library Systems receiving their 2020/2021 fiscal year***  
29 ***allocation as a single payment of 100% of the amount.***

### 30 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

31 State Librarian Lucas stated that there was not much to update on at the  
32 federal level. It appeared unlikely that Congress would pass some kind of COVID-  
33 19 related relief package. There were two bills introduced that specifically  
34 targeted libraries and the American Library Association urged librarians to  
35 encourage their elected officials to advocate for them. The bills would have  
36 provided a \$2 billion package containing support both for operating costs and  
37 increasing the availability of digital services like hotspots, Chromebooks and

1 things of that sort, but neither bill seemed likely to pass. Lucas said that his  
2 conversations with people working at the Federal level were around the goal  
3 being to try to get some portion of those large library exclusive bills put into one  
4 of the omnibus relief package bills. That had not happened and did not seem like  
5 it would.

6 There had been some funds to California to help facilitate broadband  
7 connectivity in hard-to-connect places. Connection to broadband was  
8 expensive for a variety of reasons, but the federal government came up with a  
9 chunk of money. The beauty of those sorts of projects was you could use the  
10 library and connect other anchor institutions in the area. At the state level, the  
11 California Library Association supported AB 570, which had to do with broadband  
12 connectivity and touched on libraries. That stalled on the Senate floor at the tail  
13 end of the legislative session.

14 Lucas reported that the main legislative issue was the budget and what that  
15 would look like for the next fiscal year was anyone's guess. In the past, usually the  
16 impact of an economic downturn was felt in a more pronounced way in the  
17 subsequent year. That being said, the state's reports on revenue coming in had  
18 been higher than anticipated it was just a question if they would be high enough  
19 to cover the existing hole between money coming in and costs going up. State  
20 Agencies had been told by the Administration not to: spend money, fill  
21 vacancies, or ask for new funds.

22 Carol Frost, the Co-Chair of the CLA Legislative and Advocacy Committee,  
23 reported that CLA was in the process of developing their priorities for fiscal year  
24 2021. Priorities that had been discussed were funds for Zip Books, which would not  
25 continue without more funding, and restoration of the cut CLSA funds. CLA was  
26 also talking about prioritizing broadband connections, particularly in unserved  
27 communities. Frost stated that tied-in with, particularly during the pandemic,  
28 needing kids and families to have access to broadband to go to school or do  
29 their jobs. There were many libraries filling that void by extending their Wi-Fi out  
30 into their parking lots and some Community Colleges were doing drive-up Wi-Fi  
31 where a student can make an appointment to go use Wi-Fi in the parking lot. Frost  
32 stated she knew the State Library worked very hard to continue to have money  
33 for Cenic to get broadband to libraries that really did not have it but there was  
34 still a large gap.

35 President Bernardo brought up that the Board had sent a budget request letter  
36 to the Governor earlier in the year and asked if it would be worthwhile to send  
37 another asking for the restoration of the cut CLSA funds in 2021-2022. State  
38 Librarian Lucas stated that it would not hurt to ask.

1 Member Murguia said that she thought the Board should send another letter  
2 to the Governor mirroring the CLA priorities. Lucas stated that traditionally in  
3 Sacramento the more voices asking for the same thing, the more likely it was to  
4 have traction. So particularly in a tough budget year, it was better to have some  
5 agreement on what the most important issues were.

6 Lucas gave an example of one of the issues Department of Aging had been  
7 talking about was the isolation of older Californians. Deputy State Librarian Wendt  
8 could give examples of libraries using Zip Books as a mechanism to reach seniors  
9 who would previously have gotten a personal visit. So that was a COVID-19  
10 related reason for investment in Zip Books. Member Murguia said she thought it  
11 was an opportunity for us to tell the story, particularly in terms of broadband and  
12 accessibility, and to tell the story that libraries are helping with these things.  
13 Members Bernardo, Ibanez, and Williams agreed.

14 State Librarian Lucas stated that staff could draft a letter with a COVID-19  
15 impact focus. Vice President Ibanez suggested that Board members could use  
16 the new letter to push their individual local legislators as well.

17 **BAORD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2020-2021**

18 Vice President Ibanez gave a presentation on special libraries and examples  
19 of things that special librarians did in the workplace to inform the Board about the  
20 group he represented on the Board. Ibanez discussed his career, participation in  
21 various organizations, and special projects he was involved with.

22 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

23 There was not public comment brought forward.

24 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

25 President Bernardo thanked California State Library Staff for their efforts  
26 during the pandemic and for quickly getting the CARES money back into the  
27 community.

28 **OLD BUSINESS**

29 There was no old business brought forward.

30 **AGENDA BUILDING**

31 Member Williams brought forward adding a discussion items to address the  
32 payment schedule for the systems.

1 **ADJOURNMENT**

- 2 President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services  
3 Board meeting at 11:47 AM.