

1 **Approved September 17, 2019**

2 California Library Services Board Meeting

3 March 28, 2019

4 State Library Building

5 900 N Street, Room 501

6 Sacramento, CA 95814

7
8
9 **A. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

10 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on March
11 28, 2019 at 9:31 a.m.

12 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Sara Hernandez, Florante Ibanez,
13 Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Adriana Martinez, Peter Mindnich, Elizabeth Murguia, Maria Senour,
14 Sandra Tauler, and Connie Williams.

15 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian
16 Narinder Sufi, Carolyn Brooks, Natalie Cole, Janet Coles, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Annly
17 Roman, and Beverly Schwartzberg.

18 **Adoption of Agenda**

19 President Anne Bernardo indicated that Member Buenafe was unable to attend so her
20 presentation on correctional libraries would be removed from the agenda.

21 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously*
22 *that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda, as amended,*
23 *of the March 28, 2019 meeting.*

24 **Approval of October 2018 Board Minutes**

25 Annly Roman stated that the date at the top of the minutes needed to be changed from
26 October 2017 to October 2018.

27 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously*
28 *that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes, as*
29 *amended, of the October 4, 2018 California Library Services Board meeting.*

30 **CLA Legislative Advocates**

1 President Bernardo introduced Mike Dillon and Christina DiCaro, California Library
2 Association's (CLA) Legislative Advocates from KP Public Affairs, to report on the issues that
3 the California Library Association had been pursuing and the lobbying process.

4 Christina DiCaro stated that Mike Dillon had been working for the Association since 1978.
5 She joined the firm in 1994. Over the last few decades they had successfully secured passage of
6 library construction bonds, fought for millions in library funding in state budgets, worked with
7 stakeholders to ensure that all public libraries were connected to the high speed broadband network
8 run by CENIC, and been involved in passing and defeating legislation.

9 One of the recent success stories, which was a result of the joint effort between CLA, the
10 State Library, and the Corporation for Information Network Initiatives in California (CENIC), had
11 been to secure state funding to connect all public libraries to a high speed broadband backbone.
12 DiCaro reported that they still had a lot of work to do as there were about 400 branches left to
13 connect.

14 In November, 2017, based on a request from the Director of the Department of Finance to
15 collaborate CENIC, CLA and State Librarian Lucas developed a \$9.5 million compromise budget
16 request that was incorporated into the January Budget for last year: \$2 million in one-time funding
17 for broadband equipment grants to continue to connect the public libraries to CENIC; \$3 million
18 in broadband capacity grants to increase connection speed for public libraries that were already
19 connected; \$1.5 million in one-time funding to the California Library Services Board for online
20 service systems (Zip Books and Link+); \$2.5 million in on-going funding for library literacy
21 services to help bolster family centered literacy programs; and \$350,000 for CENIC tax payments
22 to the Public Utilities Commission and an e-rate coordinator at the State Library.

23 DiCaro reported that also, during the 2018-19 budget process, the Senate Budget Chair, Holly
24 Mitchell, based on a conversation with the State Librarian, requested \$1 million to fund the lunch
25 at the library program. This program fed youth during the summer months when there was no
26 access to a free school lunch. All those requests were included in the final 18-19 budget.

27 The new Governor had been active on the issue of early childhood education including
28 pushing for more preschool slots for children, better daycare options, and day long kindergarten.
29 In December the CLA Legislative Committee started talking about how to appeal to the new
30 administration for early childhood development funding. The State Librarian had also petitioned
31 the administration and Department of Finance on similar issues.

1 DiCaro said that in meetings with the Governor’s staff and the staff for the Assembly Budget
2 Subcommittee on Education Finance on February 20th they had received feedback that libraries
3 were perceived as doing good work but were considered supplemental to the bigger programs like
4 more pre-school slots. The Governor’s staff particularly wanted to understand what the overlap
5 was with libraries and other providers of early education services because they did not want to
6 fund overlapping services. The administration instead wanted to know how they could effect and
7 serve the most vulnerable children and placed an emphasis on bilingual components

8 DiCaro stated that, the Governor would release his May revision on or around May 15th and
9 they wanted to get something into the May revise because it was next to impossible to get
10 something in later.

11 DiCaro said that another challenge was that the state was overdue for another major
12 recession. Because of this Governor Newsom committed to a lot of one-time funding rather than
13 on-going programs. So whatever CLA and the State Library could imagine in the next few weeks
14 needed to be mindful that what they requested might have needed to include one-time funding
15 components.

16 Finally, DiCaro reported that CLA was supporting ACA 1 by Assemblymember Aguiar-
17 Curry, which would lower the 2/3 vote threshold that currently existed for local construction bonds
18 and special taxes down to 55%. The bill pertained to all kinds of city, county, and special district
19 projects but public libraries and broadband were prominently featured. The bill had passed the
20 Assembly Local Government Committee and had opposition from the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers
21 Association and some business groups. ACA 1 had support from some housing groups, water
22 agencies, CLA, labor unions, transportation groups, and the cities, counties, and special districts.

23 Member Williams asked what CLA was doing with stakeholders in regards to determining
24 the overlap for programming. DiCaro stated that was a daunting task and she thought it was more
25 realistic that they would be able to get one county’s information to provide a snapshot. She gave
26 the “hub” model in El Dorado County as an example of the end goal, where they had created a sort
27 of one-stop-shop for libraries/social services. Kids could get lunch, parents were connected to
28 information about WICK, CalFresh and other services, and kids could take home a STEM kit,
29 DiCaro thought that bilingual components could be added as well. The model was libraries
30 providing wrap around services.

1 Member Christmas stated the Board members did not have information on the Hub with wrap
2 around services at their legislator meetings but that program had come up in some of the
3 conversations. He thought that program was something that would make it better for libraries in
4 terms of financing and he thought it was a good suggestion.

5 Member Murguia asked State Librarian Lucas if he could continue to work with the CLA
6 Lobbyists on something that the Board could support. Member Murguia asked if the Board wanted
7 to reflect on a unified ask and update their priorities. Lucas stated that the Board had identified a
8 series of priorities in a letter to the administration when it first started. Some of those things, Zip
9 Books and Lunch at the Library, were already in the budget. He thought, since getting a request to
10 the budget committees was time sensitive, the Board should reiterate their original position and
11 react to what happened in the May revise.

12 Member Ibanez asked how the El Dorado hub worked. State Librarian Lucas stated that some
13 library locations were using a variety of delivery systems to provide family strengthening services.
14 In LA County they were trying to route those wrap around services through LA Cares, the health
15 insurance outfit for lower income Los Angelinos. What El Dorado did was a partnership between
16 the library and, primarily, First 5 and the County Office of Education. Funding from various
17 sources was used to provide a public health nurse in the five El Dorado County branches, a
18 community navigator to help connect people to services, and a family literacy specialist. Lucas
19 said that libraries were good locations for this kind of programing because they were safe,
20 accessible, did not have attached stigma, and had other programing that could
21 compliment/supplement the services.

22 Lucas stated that the administration had allocated about \$10 million to come up with a
23 strategy for early learning and they were just beginning that. He was unsure how quickly they
24 would be ready to consider programs like that with their agenda.

25 **Board Resolution**

26 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the*
27 *California Library Services Board adopts California Library Services Board*
28 *Resolution 2019-01 for Aleita Huguenin. (See Exhibit A)*

29 **Board Meeting Date for Fall 2019/Spring 2020**

30 Annly Roman reported that the Board had talked about having the Fall Board meeting in late
31 August, early September but the Board had been unsure where they wanted to meet. Roman

1 reported that she had done a cost comparison of how much it would cost to meeting in northern
2 vs. southern California. Both sets of travel costs had been done with as few people
3 traveling/staying overnight as possible as well as working out which airport/mileage combinations
4 would be the cheapest for each traveling board member.

5 Members Christmas, Maghsoudi, and Ibanez thought the Board should meet in Southern
6 California since they had not been there in a while. Members Maghsoudi and Mindnich both
7 offered to host.

8 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the*
9 *California Library Services Board will meet in Southern California for their*
10 *fall meeting at a locations to be determined by California State Library staff.*

11 **Nomination of Board Officers**

12 Annly Roman stated that the update regulations were finalized and the Board had set elections
13 for every other odd year. The Board would elect new officers this year to serve until 2021.

14 Roman explained the nominating process. Member Williams and Member Ibanez stated that
15 they would be willing to continue on the Committee.

16 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Christmas) and carried unanimously that*
17 *the California Library Services Board appoints Florante Ibanez and Connie*
18 *Williams to the Nominating Committee to select board officers for 2020-2021.*

19 **B. REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

20 **Board President's Report**

21 President Bernardo reported that she had been active with the Council of California County
22 Law Librarians. She had been attending Infopeople webinars and trainings because it was hard to
23 get away from her library and encouraged her staff to do the same. Bernardo had been active in
24 advocacy with local legislators and participated in the ALA asks to Congress and Representatives
25 on library issues.

26 She reported she had participated in the Asian Pacific Leadership Foundation's Leadership
27 Retreat where a number of appointed and elected officials were attending and was able to speak
28 with them one-on-one.

29 **Board Vice-President's Report**

30 Vice-President Christmas reported that there was an organizations for library trustees and
31 advocates called California Public Library Advocates. They had an annual conference in Ontario
32 and the next conference would be on May 23rd at the convention center in Ontario. He had been

1 many times and thought it was a great opportunity to learn ways that trustees, library foundation
2 members, and other library supporters can help library efforts throughout California.

3 He had attended the City of Riverside library ground-breaking on March 18th. State Librarian
4 Lucas was one of the speakers and it was a nice event. They intended to have the new library done
5 by next summer. The old library would be turned into the Cheech-Marin Center for Art,
6 Technology and focus on Chicano art. The legislature, with State Librarian Lucas' help
7 appropriated about \$10 million for the center.

8 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

9 State Librarian Lucas reported that the most significant change since last October was the new
10 administration in Sacramento.

11 Lucas stated that the Dillons had mentioned there had been \$5 million in one-time money to
12 help facilitate library connections to high speed broadband. They had spent a lot of time mapping
13 out the most strategic way to connect. One decision that came out of those discussions was to
14 marry the grant cycle with the federal timeline for e-rate. Lucas stated that one of the advantages
15 of joining CENIC was help filling out paperwork for the federal e-rate programs, which took about
16 two years to go into effect. The marrying of the timelines was a way to make it easier, not just for
17 the State Library, but also for participating libraries.

18 State librarian Lucas stated that under a piece of legislation from last year, the State Library
19 was responsible for creating a website where people could find every grant offered by the state of
20 California. The project had been an eye opener for the State Library on some of the grant programs
21 structures that exist within other state agencies. Lucas said it was outside our comfort space as an
22 agency, but positive things would come from the project, both from how State agencies look at
23 each other and at the State Library. Hopefully it would create a better customer service experience
24 for people trying to connect with state grant funds.

25 State Librarian Lucas shared that on the negative side, for the third year in a row the President
26 of the United States of American had eliminated, in his budget, the \$200 million for public
27 libraries, which was about .000045% of the entire federal budget. In the past Congress had put the
28 money back in but always at the same level from previous years.

29 Lucas stated that finally, Senator Richard Pan had introduced a bill to create the Children's
30 Cabinet of California. It was modeled after the Homelessness Council that Senator Mitchell
31 created two years ago which required all agencies that touch on homelessness to coordinate and

1 collaborate. In his bill Senator Pan identified the Department of Education, Department of Social
2 Services, but not the State Library as related agencies. The State Library had put out about \$10
3 million annually in local grant programs, many of which were related to children and education.
4 Lucas stated that Senator Pan had agreed to add the State Library to the bill.

5 **Lighting up Libraries: Broadband Update report**

6 Beverly Schwartzberg reported that for the last four years the California State Library had been
7 engaged in the state-funded High-Speed Broadband in California Libraries project. The project
8 goal was to bring high-speed broadband of at least 1 Gigabit per second to all California public
9 libraries by connecting them to the California Research and Education Network (CalREN), which
10 is managed by the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

11 Since the October 2018 meeting, the project team had been focused on Year 5 connections,
12 and planning and implementing changes to the grant program. As part of the strategic planning
13 process for the project, the State Library had looked at next steps. These efforts included issuing
14 an RFA for the Aggregator and Program Manager roles, revising and creating a more efficient
15 grant program application process, and adding new grant program options to support expansion of
16 capacity.

17 149 jurisdictions, out of a total of 185, had joined the project and of those jurisdictions, 144
18 were connected or in the process of connecting to CalREN. There were five Year 5 jurisdictions
19 that had signed contracts with Califa and another two were working on completing contracts
20 with Califa.

21 Of the 1,125 public library outlets, 53 percent were connected, 17 percent were in the process
22 of connecting, and approximately 30 percent were either not yet connected, chose not to
23 participate, or were not eligible. Of the 30 percent ‘not participating,’ approximately half were not
24 CSLA eligible locations.

25 Schwartzberg reported that after a jurisdiction had been connected for a year, its director was
26 surveyed about the value and challenges of connecting to broadband. The feedback received to
27 date continued to be positive and constructive. Challenges included getting funding situated in
28 order to join, overcoming geographical issues that stymied vendor interest in bidding,
29 infrastructure build delays, and access to a reliable IT professional to assist with daily technical
30 issues.

1 For Year 4 connections were being implemented for County of Los Angeles Public Library,
2 San Diego County Library, Roseville Public Library, and City of Santa Clarita Public Library. An
3 additional 17 jurisdictions applied for grants.

4 Schwartzberg said that the library locations that remained to be connected were the most
5 challenging to connect, mostly because they lacked adequate broadband infrastructure. In an effort
6 to address those challenges, the State Library was making grant funds available specifically to
7 address infrastructure issues.

8 For unconnected jurisdictions or branches still in need of broadband, the State Library planned
9 to utilize new funds to expand the current program to address a broader range of connectivity
10 challenges. This included funds for upgraded wiring, construction for infrastructure needs, and
11 training for staff.

12 Member Murguia asked if the State Library thought the last round of funding would be
13 adequate to connect all libraries. Schwartzberg stated that was unknown. The goal was to get as
14 many connected as possible and the new funding help.

15 **Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Program Grant Program** 16 **Report**

17 Beverly Schwartzberg reported that the Libraries Illuminated Initiative was designed to help
18 libraries explore the uses of high-speed internet, through programs and services or improved staff
19 efficiencies and internal processes. Thirty-eight jurisdictions received funding totaling \$1,000,000.

20 Libraries purchased technology to take advantage of broadband or other connections.
21 Participants forged creative partnerships with businesses, volunteers and education.

22 Since the October 2018 meeting, the advisory board allocated the remaining \$38,000 to
23 participating libraries. Ten participating libraries were able to identify needs that had developed as
24 a result of initial funding or new needs that became apparent and received small additional grants
25 of \$1500 to \$6400.

26 Schwartzberg reported that libraries used the Libraries Illuminated funds to: purchase
27 computers, tablets, routers, and laptop kiosks; fill makerspaces and libraries with everything from
28 bots to sewing machines and equipment for STEAM programming for children, teens, and adults.
29 In addition to the individual grants, the State Library provided 35 libraries with virtual reality
30 equipment. The initial \$1,000,000 in state funding was matched by \$1,053,000 in cash or local
31 funds and \$630,000 of in-kind matches.

1 Hundreds of programs were supported by the funds, and libraries were asked to use the Public
2 Library Association's Project Outcome tools to evaluate the impact of their grant program. As of
3 mid-March, there were 1581 survey responses about 243 programs, demonstrating that the
4 Libraries Illuminated programs had a positive impact.

5 Schwartzberg, in response to a question on how much unmet need could be addressed by
6 continuing the program, responded that, the speed of technological change made programs like
7 Libraries Illuminated imperative. The project's emphasis on community partnerships helped
8 libraries look to their communities and leverage skilled volunteers and local resources.
9 Additionally, each year, more libraries connected to higher-speed connections, and user demands
10 grew and change. The challenge was to reach underserved audiences, stay on pace with
11 technology, and showcase libraries as accessible technology leaders.

12 If the program continued libraries could continue to do outreach to small, underserved
13 communities, including rural libraries, and provide specific examples of targeted projects to certain
14 needs and circumstances.

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

16 Natalie Cole reported that they had two recent papers be accepted for presentation/publication;
17 one at the 10th International Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Conference, taking
18 place in Glasgow and one in the peer-reviewed journal *Library Management*. They had been
19 getting preliminary results from the academic literature review and getting those results out there
20 to receive feedback and input.

21 Cole reported that to supplement the review of academic publications, they were in the process
22 of reviewing approximately 240 articles published in professional journals. Cole was also looking
23 at the topics of presentations being given at professional conferences to really get the full scope of
24 what libraries were doing.

25 The results of the annual Public Libraries Survey provided quantitative data to contribute to
26 the full picture of the value of California's public libraries. The survey showed the breadth of
27 library services and their impacts. Some questions had been inserted that were specific to the
28 project, so they were able to tailor questions to get specific data

29 They had just announced a mini-grant program to 30 libraries to support programming that
30 represented different aspects of the value framework. Those programs included financial literacy
31 workshops; a therapeutic gardening workshop for veterans; literacy programs presented in

1 collaboration with barbershops; and a community support center for at-risk individuals. There had
2 been a whole range of proposals which demonstrated the many different facets of value public
3 libraries provide. Those projects would be providing data to show the impact on the communities.

4 Cole stated that the 59 local, regional, and copycat LSTA grants that would be funded this year
5 were all being evaluated using the same survey used in the mini-grants so there would be data on
6 those programs as well.

7 They had worked with Sacramento State University's Institute for Social Research to conduct
8 a survey which explored Californians' values and perspectives on the role and value of public
9 libraries. The results showed that people believed libraries were essential to their communities and
10 their families. Even if they did not personally benefit from services, they felt libraries were a
11 valuable institution for the contributions they made to the community as a whole. Californian's
12 also highly value the kinds of community services that libraries provided but did not necessarily
13 connect those services to libraries.

14 Cole stated that they had also conducted conversations with library leaders in the field. Those
15 discussions produced examples of the role libraries played in terms of wellness in the community,
16 things that the public did not associate with libraries like trauma care, clinics, and vaccinations.

17 A prominent part of the conversations was the role libraries played with families and young
18 children. Cole thought it was very interesting that people in the field talked a lot about the
19 community services libraries provided to vulnerable populations. While that might have been a
20 huge part of what libraries were doing, it was not how libraries were perceived. The general public
21 perceived libraries in terms of books and information and Cole thought addressing that disconnect
22 was something for libraries to work on.

23 The next steps for the project were to integrate results from reports issued by agencies and
24 organizations such as Institute for Museum and Library Services, American Library Association,
25 Public Library Association, Aspen Institute, and others; look at what those reports were saying,
26 and integrate that information with the other findings. They were also going to look at key
27 publications on the value and benefit of having libraries in the community and collect data from
28 the LSTA and State-funded projects to finalize the value framework being created. They would
29 use the data sets to create materials that libraries could use to demonstrate their value built on solid
30 data. There would be an advisory group to make sure this was done in the most effective way.

1 Member Williams stated that the most important part of the project would be convening an
2 advisory group to provide input on the optimum way to present the information. She wanted to
3 make sure this information went somewhere. Natalie Cole stated that was why they spent time
4 going through the approach of gathering all the academic information, professional literature, and
5 collect the grant program data from our own libraries. To give the advisory council something to
6 work with.

7 **California eBook Platform with Library Owned Content Program Report**

8 Lena Pham reported that the Enki library was a shared eBook platform with library owned
9 content. All of the grant funds had been expended, with the last portion being for e-content. During
10 the course of the grant program over 7,500 new eBook titles were purchased from multiple
11 publishers based on the initial collection development survey. Many titles were licensed for
12 simultaneous unlimited use. The purchases included a collection of always available fiction and
13 non-fiction, non-fiction from UC Press, story sharers (young adult fiction for struggling readers),
14 children's fiction, graphic novels, young adult and adult fiction, travel collection, business and
15 technology collection, and study guides.

16 Additionally, 29 new library jurisdictions were connected to the eBook platform, bringing the
17 total number 101. The Enki eBook collection was also integrated into SimplyE, so Enki titles could
18 be searched and read in the SimplyE app.

19 Pham reported that in 2015 Enki had over 84,000 checkouts. Since then annual eBook
20 circulation has increased to about 100,000 items each year. Moving forward Califa would continue
21 to manage the open source platform.

22 **Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader Program Report**

23 Lena Pham reported that SimplyE allowed patrons to access to all their library's eBooks from
24 various vendors in a single application. Through the board's support and additional LSTA funds,
25 27 California library jurisdictions were either currently live or in process of being setup on
26 SimplyE. That included the original 11 pilot jurisdictions. An additional five libraries were live on
27 SimplyE and 11 more library jurisdictions had signed on to subscribe.

28 Each library had a range of eBook platforms that were integrated into the app and libraries that
29 subscribed to Novelist Select were getting that book recommendation service integrated into their
30 app. Audiobook integration had also begun and audiobooks purchased on Bibliotheca Cloud

1 Library, Axis360 and RBdigital were discoverable. Overdrive audiobook integration was
2 underway. They were also exploring PDF functionality and expected that would be available in 6-
3 8 months.

4 The initial set up of the app was complete and Califa would continue to maintain the SimplyE
5 servers. Further outreach would be conducted in the next few months to assist libraries in
6 promoting SimplyE to their patrons. The project had grown in scale, and the Digital Public Library
7 of America (DPLA) had taken the lead on setting up a national governance model to ensure
8 sustainability and development going forward.

9 **Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

10 Lena Phan reported that the Innovation Station Project created innovation labs through
11 partnerships between libraries, employers, and educators. Funds for the project had been awarded
12 to 18 libraries so that they could create their own Innovation Stations.

13 In December a follow up survey was sent to participating libraries to gather information on
14 project impacts. A few of the projects included: 29 Innovation Station Project funded programs
15 in Monrovia; five programs where people tried out Makerboxes in Butte County Library, 141
16 Library on the Go outreach programs in Santa Barbara Public Library with a total of 4,948
17 participants, and three training sessions and four instructional guides were created in Alhambra
18 Civic Center Library. San Luis Obispo Public Library created nine different Mobile MakerKits,
19 and circulated the kits through their catalog on three-week loans.

20 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

21 Carolyn Brooks reported that the Zip Books program was a unique model set-up by the Butte,
22 Humboldt, and Shasta County Libraries as an LSTA project in 2011-2012. It allowed patrons to
23 order a book that their library did not own from amazon, shipped the resource to the patron's home
24 and when the patron was done they returned it to the library. The library would then have the
25 option of adding that resource to their collection. The program allowed for patron driven collection
26 development so that patrons helped to create the collection within their library.

27 Brooks reported that there were 69 libraries participating. They had piloted it in different areas
28 and explored the functionality in rural, urban and suburban areas.

29 The past year they had been able to get all participating libraries onto the same funding calendar
30 cycle. That allowed the State library to streamline processes related to the project and reduced the

1 costs associated with trying to track different cycles. The State Library had also gotten each library
2 set-up on its own Amazon account with its own payment processes, which helped alleviate fraud
3 alerts from amazon related to multiple locations ordering on one account

4 The State Library had been gathering library and patron feedback to assess the difficulties and
5 successes of the program. They were looking at creating a toolkit that anyone could use. Based
6 on the conversations with the libraries they had updated the messaging to make the program clearer
7 to patrons.

8 There was a new project Coordinator and she had been mentoring new libraries coming on
9 board. She had also been facilitating and encouraging the connections between the established
10 libraries and the new libraries that had questions. There was a listserv in place for questions.

11 Member Murguia asked if the reimbursement covered the entire cost or if there was a local
12 share. Brooks stated that the program covered the cost of the material which averaged about \$15.
13 Libraries submitted their charges and those charges were paid through the fiscal agent.

14 President Bernardo stated that one of the consultants she had met with the previous day was
15 asking about Zip Books and if there was a report of the titles being purchased. Brooks stated that
16 Amazon provided lists of that information. Member Williams said one aide asked if there were
17 issues getting the books back. Brooks said that some libraries did have issues determining how to
18 get the books back so they created new messaging of “Read, Return, Repeat”. Some the libraries
19 made a simple record in their catalogue so there was a reminder process in place and other libraries
20 made calls. Yolande Willburn, Nevada County library, stated her library had not had trouble
21 getting the books returned because patrons could not get another Zip Book until they return the
22 one they had.

23 **C. CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

24 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

25 **Reconsider \$450,000 2018/19 Fiscal Year Funds**

26 State Librarian Lucas reported that in the 2018-19 budget t \$1.45 million was allocated to the
27 California Library Services Act for the Board to distribute; \$1 million for Zip Books and \$450,000
28 for the one-time connection costs of digitally linking the catalogs of all libraries north of San
29 Francisco. The Board approved those allocations at its October 4th meeting. The mechanism that
30 was commonly used to digitally connect library catalogs was a product called Link+, which

1 allowed users to access all the books of all of the libraries that were connected to Link+ in their
2 area. Users could make a selection, hit a button, and that book would be delivered to their library.

3 After the October meeting there were some discussions between Greg and NorthNet, the
4 library consortium that has all the libraries north of Sacramento, and they reported that, at that
5 time, only three libraries could participate. The issue with participation centered on the ongoing
6 expenses associated with Link+. The initial connection cost was much smaller than the annual
7 subscription costs and delivery fee, which was \$12,000. Lucas stated that the Board needed to
8 make a decision on what to do with the \$450,000 in one-time money, which had to be encumbered
9 before the end of the fiscal year.

10 Lucas reported there was a letter submitted by NorthNet that requested the Board give the
11 \$450,000 to NorthNet to pay all the first year costs of Link+ membership for the three libraries
12 that wished to participate and the remaining \$312,000 would be used for the sustainability and
13 growth of the Link+ regional resource sharing. That would include covering start-up costs for new
14 libraries to joint Link+ under the NorthNet master contact and support ongoing costs throughout
15 the grant period.

16 State Librarian Lucas stated that there were three options provided to the Board. One was to
17 comply with NorthNet's request to leave the \$450,000 with them. The other two options were to
18 provide the one-time connection cost to the three libraries that had elected to participate, about
19 \$50,000, or approve the full one year's worth of cost for the three libraries that wished to
20 participate, which was about \$137,000, and both would keep the balance for some other purpose.

21 Member Murguia asked if the project had always involved paying the full first year
22 subscription. Annly Roman reported that the Board's exact motion for the initial approval of the
23 project was "...the California Library Services Board approves the \$450,000 allocated in the 2018-
24 2019 budget to pay the one-time connection cost of digitally connecting the catalogs of 26 county
25 library systems, 15 city library systems, and 13 academic libraries in the northern third of the state."
26 Member Murguia stated that their initial motion to expend the funds did not include the one year
27 subscription. Roman stated that the Board could make another motion that did include all the first
28 year costs.

29 Member Hernandez said that as she looked at NorthNet's letter it stated that budgetary and
30 delivery concerns were what prohibited membership and she wondered what the delivery concerns
31 were. Lucas responded that it was the delivery subscription cost discussed previously.

1 Todd Deck, representing Tehama County Library and NorthNet, stated that Link+ currently
2 had 14 NorthNet libraries and was incredibly popular with patrons. Some of the benefits were cost
3 savings, connectivity, and access to the 11 million titles of books available. When NorthNet began
4 the process of exploring the connected catalog it really became a multi-year process because
5 NorthNet was a big geographic area. The challenges identified were start-up costs, ongoing
6 delivery, locating carriers for the most rural areas, and the time for implementation. Also during
7 this time talk of the recession began so taking on that type of commitment became harder for a
8 small rural library like his. With that in mind, they had learned so much during the process. Link+
9 was a really ambitious program and they did need some time to fulfill the program's potential.

10 He encouraged that Link+ really captured the core values of the California Library Services
11 Board which were literacy, cooperation, diversity, serving the underserved, and access for all. He
12 urged the Board to consider allocating all the money to NorthNet because each library that joined
13 pushed small libraries closer to being able to join as well.

14 Brad McCulley, Pacific Library Partnership Executive Chair, stated from the perspective of
15 his library consortium, when something new came along it took a lot of hand holding to get
16 everybody on board because there were questions, technical difficulties, and budget issues. It
17 usually took about a year or two to get the momentum to push all of that forward and he thought
18 that was a lot of what was happening with the Link+ program and NorthNet. He thought that by
19 pulling the money away to soon they would be doing themselves a disservice. NorthNet was a
20 large, very rural area, and they really need the service.

21 Yolande Wilburn, Nevada County, stated they would have loved to join but there were some
22 things they needed to work out before committing. Nevada County was rural and delivery was an
23 issue. They, as a group, had been having conversations about if Sacramento Public would serve as
24 the hub for their Link+ delivery and then got shipped to Nevada County from there. Nevada County
25 had a delivery driver that went to their branches each day, so getting it to Nevada was the main
26 concern. The biggest hesitancy in joining were questions surrounding what that would look like
27 and how to do delivery in a way that was quick.

28 Wilburn stated that they were a small library so they did not have the space to hold huge
29 collections. Link+ would really expand the number of items available to their patrons who would
30 otherwise have to ask for interlibrary loans, which cost patrons \$3 per loan.

1 Mark Fink, Yolo County Library, explained the Link+ model. If a patron was looking for an
2 item their library did not own, if the library had Link+ the patron would have the option of
3 searching for the item in another catalog, placing a hold on that item and having it delivered to the
4 patron's library. In addition to patrons being able to borrow items from other libraries, each
5 library's collection would become part of the larger Link+ collection.

6 Fink reported that Yolo County Library offered ILL, Zip Books and Link+. In the last fiscal
7 year, they had 500 Zip Book requests but their patrons request almost 12,000 items from Link+
8 and they sent out about 8,000 items to other libraries. Each one of the transactions were material
9 that they did not have to buy. Additionally, the material that might not have circulated well in their
10 library system was available to other libraries. It was also a way for Yolo County patrons to get
11 materials in other languages which they could not support at the level they needed.

12 NorthNet had negotiated a five year contract for the Link+ service, so libraries that were joining
13 would know their expenses four years into the future. There were logistical issues that had to be
14 worked out and it took time to resolve some of the complexity associated with participating in
15 Link+. Fink thought that NorthNet's had taken a very thoughtful approach to how they wanted to
16 move forward, so he would encourage the Board to maintain that funding and let them add more
17 rural libraries.

18 Susan Hildreth, Sonoma County, said they were the only new county library that was joining
19 Link+ as a part of the grant. Hildreth wanted the Board to be aware that the three libraries joining
20 had already signed contracts with innovative and anticipated being able to manage the future cost.
21 She thought the Board should give NorthNet more time, given its diverse geographic area and
22 members.

23 Member Christmas stated that he would favor only providing funding for one-time costs, not
24 the whole first year, for the three joining libraries and reallocating the remainder of the funds to a
25 different California Library Services Act grant program. He thought there had been adequate time
26 for libraries to decide if they could afford it and a better use of the money would be to put it into
27 Libraries Illuminated and other programs.

28 Member Tauler questions that if they had only gotten three libraries in six months, how
29 NorthNet would be able to spend the money. She wondered if a smaller amount would be more
30 appropriate. Tauler suggested paying for the connection for the three committed libraries but
31 allocating half the \$450,000 for Link+. That would allow them to grow but would also allow part

1 of the money to be used for a program that was ready. Member Christmas stated he supported that
2 proposal.

3 Member Maghsoudi stated that her understanding was that the money needed to be
4 encumbered in the current fiscal year and couldn't be changed. Annly Roman stated that once the
5 money was encumbered at the end of the fiscal year the Board could not use it for another purpose.

6 Nancy Giddens, 49-99 Library Cooperative and Calaveras County and the library directors
7 from Tuolumne County and Amador County, stated that they were all very rural library systems
8 and it look their libraries a lot longer than six months even though they were committed because
9 of the delivery and connectivity logistics.

10 Member Williams stated that she felt giving NorthNet the full \$450,000 to keep working on
11 the program, made a lot of sense given that the Board was supposed to be providing access.
12 Members Murguia and Ibanez supported that position and thought they should give the proposal a
13 chance to succeed.

14 Member Hernandez asked if there was an urgent need for Zip Books or Libraries Illuminated
15 since those had been mentioned. State Librarian Lucas stated that there were more applications for
16 Libraries Illuminated than the state library had been able to fund totaling about \$132,339.

17 Member Tauler stated that she supported giving the full \$450,000 to the NorthNet system for
18 the Link+ program but suggested a lower amount because she was worried about their ability to
19 spend all the money based on participation so far. She said she did see the value in the program
20 and in connecting libraries. Member Maghsoudi asked if NorthNet had any additional
21 commitments.

22 Yolande Wilburn stated that she though Link+ was a great idea. However, the ILS system they
23 used was not compatible so they had to wait for their contact to expire. Now she was in negotiations
24 to have Polaris as the ILS, which was completely compatible, but it was with county council so it
25 would not go live until the end of the year. So she needed to one, be able to have that piece in
26 place, and two, determine how to do delivery. Wilburn stated that she was committed because she
27 thought that it was a good deal for their patrons and, in the long run, it would have provided savings
28 in the collection budget because they would not have to buy things that were available elsewhere.
29 As a rural system it was taking some time because of the hurdles.

30 Carol Frost, NorthNet administrator, said that they knew that the one-time costs for year one
31 for the three libraries would be \$137,295. Adding the three other interested libraries (Nevada

1 County, Del Norte, and Siskiyou) would come to about \$110,000. The wild card on those libraries
2 was the delivery issue because it meant inventing a new delivery model. NorthNet had hired a
3 consultant and done some preliminary routes on how that could happen, but a lot of couriers did
4 not want to drive to those remote areas. Frost stated they were trying to create a hub-and-spoke,
5 based on where couriers would go and then develop that last hundred miles connection. Frost stated
6 that allocating the funds to support the sustainability and growth of Link+ would offer flexibility.

7 She stated this was supposed to be a demonstration project of how it could be done. If there
8 was a concern that NorthNet might not be able to spend all the money, maybe in that last year, if
9 it looked like there would be money left over, other libraries would be given an opportunity to
10 join. Frost stated that she believed NorthNet had the ability to succeed but she thought that might
11 be an option to address Board concerns.

12 State Librarian Lucas stated that he had just heard testimony that there was a lot that needed to
13 be done to make the program work. He stated he was trying to understand why it would be good
14 to send the money without answering those questions first. It was the Board's decision but he
15 wondered why they would allocate funds without seeing a more robust plan with specifics.

16 Member Murguia stated that not allocating the funds to NorthNet seemed like abandoning the
17 effort to expand Link+ in very rural areas. Member Christmas stated that he did not agree that
18 allocating half the money to NorthNet and reallocating the rest was abandoning the project. He
19 thought that it would be better to give \$225,000 that the Board knew they could spend and use the
20 rest of the money around the state for other libraries and get results rather than spend money to see
21 what could happen with Link+.

22 Member Murguia asked where the proposal for the \$450,000 originated. State Librarian Lucas
23 stated that it was represented by NorthNet that if the State of California provided \$450,000 it would
24 have covered the one-time connection costs of the libraries listed as NorthNet members. Lucas
25 stated that NorthNet did come to the State Library shortly after the Board approved the money to
26 say that was not possible.

27 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and failed with a vote of five ayes***
28 ***and five nays (Hernandez, Ibanez, Maghsoudi, Murguia, Williams) that the***
29 ***California Library Services Board approves allocating \$225,000 to the NorthNet***
30 ***Library System to use for Link+ within their library system, allocating \$132,339***
31 ***to the Libraries Illuminated program, and leaving the remaining \$92,661 with***
32 ***the Board for other programs.***

1 Various members spoke in support of giving the full \$450,000 to NorthNet to continue trying
2 to connect to Link+. Member Maghsoudi stated that she thought the Board should add a caveat
3 that if they were unable to spend the money within NorthNet they would open it up to other
4 libraries around the state. Member Williams stated that she thought allocating all the funds to
5 NorthNet but requiring a plan be provided to the Board at the next meeting was the best idea.
6 Member Senour asked what would happen if they could not spend all the money. Williams stated
7 they would open the program for other libraries to join outside of NorthNet.

8 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Murguia) and carried with a vote of eight ayes*
9 *and two nays (Christmas, Bernardo) that the California Library Services Board*
10 *approves allocating \$450,000 to the NorthNet Library System to pay for the one-*
11 *year costs for three libraries to join Link+ and use the remainder to “support*
12 *the sustainability and growth of Link+ regional resource sharing” consistent*
13 *with the digital connection of catalogs mandated in the Governor’s budget.*
14 *NorthNet Library System will develop a plan of execution which will be*
15 *submitted to the Board at their fall, 2019 meeting.*

16 **CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2019/20**

17 Monica Rivas stated that the budget was for the preliminary \$3.63 million which would be
18 divided up based on the formula.

19 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously that*
20 *the California Library Services Board adopts, contingent upon the passage of*
21 *the State Budget Act, the 2019/2020 California Library Services Act budget as*
22 *directed in the Governor’s proposed 2018/2019 budget, totaling \$3,630,000 for*
23 *allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.*

24 Monica Rivas reported that there had been a proposed \$1 million in one-time funding for Zip
25 Books.

26 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the*
27 *California Library Services Board approves, contingent upon the passage of the*
28 *State Budget Act, the \$1 million allocated in the 2019-2020 budget to invest in*
29 *the Zip Books program to ensure timely and cost-effective access to information*
30 *in California’s hard-to-reach and underserved communities.*

31 **RESOURCE SHARING**

32 **CLSA System-Level programs**

33 Monica Rivas reported that this section dealt with the Annual Reports from 2017-2018. She
34 had gone through the Plans of Service for 2017-18 and made sure that the proposals matched the
35 Annual Reports. Systems continued using their funding for delivery services like Link+ and Zip

1 Books. They were also moving toward e-resources like Zinio, Hoopla, Overdrive, RB Digital and
2 other eBooks.

3 **CLSA REPORTING**

4 Monica Rivas reported that at the last two Board meetings they had discussed updating some
5 of the Systems' reporting forms. State Library staff had meetings with the Systems to ask for their
6 input on changes. Library staff also determined what changes they thought would be necessary.
7 Rivas stated that she had looked at the historical plans of service and a lot of the verbiage on the
8 forms related to programs that no longer existed. All the language that did not fit communication
9 and delivery was removed, and definitions were added based on suggestions from the systems.

10 Additionally, in the updated regulations, systems were allowed to use funds for planning,
11 coordination, and evaluation so a section was created for that on the budget request form. Rivas
12 stated that she had also added examples to the budget request form to give the systems an idea of
13 what should be under each item.

14 Rivas had updated the expenditure reports in an effort to make it easier for State Library staff
15 to understand. When systems filled out their Plans of Service they specified what programs they
16 would be funding. At the end of the report Rivas added a section to detail how much each program
17 cost. Instead of systems only reporting spending a certain amount on e-resources they would also
18 show how much was on each resource (Zinio, Overdrive, etc.) individually.

19 Rivas also added a section where the systems could report CLSA funds from prior year. The
20 board can then see what had been encumbered, and what had been spent. Member Tauler said she
21 thought the systems would have spent all the money each year. Annly Roman stated that sometimes
22 there were programs that were too expensive to fund in one year so they would save some of the
23 funding until they got the next years allocation to fully fund the program. Roman stated that the
24 funding cycle was the same of the Link+ funding so they had the first fiscal year, then the two
25 years after to spend the money.

26 Rivas stated that the forms were still a work in progress. She had spoken to a couple of the
27 system coordinators and requested a phone call to go over the proposed changes.

28 **D. CLSA REGULATIONS**

29 Annly Roman reported that the California Library Services Act regulatory process had been
30 completed. The regulations were effective as of January 1, 2019.

1 **E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

2 Member Hernandez stated that she was new so legislator meetings were educational. She was
3 curious to know how priorities were formed and how the Board collaborated and coordinated with
4 the CLA lobbyists. In legislator meetings there were hurried meetings with staffers getting requests
5 from everyone so how could they clarify their ask so it was as digestible as possible.

6 Member Christmas stated that he agreed that the Board needed to fine-tune their message. At
7 legislator meetings the day before he waited with people from all different organizations so they
8 needed to make their message stand out.

9 Member Murguia stated that she attended four legislator meetings and met with her own
10 Assemblymember and Senator as well as the staff for the Senate Budget Chair. She had promised
11 a letter from the Board that would summarize and prioritized the budget items they had asked for.
12 She thought it would be useful and should go out at least to the Budget Chairs and other usual
13 suspects.

14 President Bernardo said that she had joined fellow board members on their legislative visits
15 the day before. The previous day she was with the County Law Librarians on their Legislative
16 Day. She was able to visit her five local legislators and she included the California Library Services
17 Board's positions in her conversations.

18 Member Murguia asked if there was a legislator they should be targeting as a champion. Annly
19 Roman stated that she did not think that there was a legislator who would spearhead all seven
20 requests that the Board had made. Member Hernandez asked what the realistic odds were of getting
21 the items they discussed with legislators the previous day into the May revise. She was wondering
22 how next time they could be more effective, determine the amount of priorities that could be easily
23 digestible, and be aligned with whoever was following up. State Librarian Lucas said that the best
24 place to be in the budget process was in the Governor's proposed budget. To do that, they were
25 making decisions shortly after the Board's fall meeting. The second best place was in the May
26 revision. Then there was a month of opportunity between May 14th and June 15th where smaller
27 ticket items could be added.

28 Member Hernandez stated that she thought the Board should take a critical look at what was
29 in the draft budget and then prioritize what they wanted to push for in the May revise. Annly
30 Roman stated that would be difficult because of when the Board met, fall and spring. The proposed
31 budget did not come out until after the fall meeting and their spring meeting was right in the middle

1 of when the legislature was already working on the May revise. Roman stated that the Board could
2 have a teleconference meeting after the budget came out at the beginning of the year to discuss the
3 budget.

4 Annly Roman said that she wanted to bring ACA 1 to the Board's attention. It would lower
5 the vote threshold for local measures to 55%. ACA 1 was similar in nature to SCA 3 from last
6 session, which the Board supported. The difference was that the SCA 3 was targeted to libraries,
7 whereas ACA 1 was broader. Roman reported that CLA was in support.

8 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the*
9 *California Library Services Board supports ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry).*

10 **F. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2018/19**

11 There was no additional Board discussion brought forward.

12 **G. PUBLIC COMMENT**

13 There was no public comment brought forward.

14 **H. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

15 Members made comments about past and upcoming events and thanked staff for their work.

16 **I. OLD BUSINESS**

17 There was no old business brought forward.

18 **J. AGENDA BUILDING**

19 There was no additional agenda items brought forward.

20 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

21 President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services Board meeting
22 at 3:07PM.

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2019-01
In Honor of Aleita Huguenin*

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Aleita Huguenin for her distinguished 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 Aleita Huguenin for her exceptional public service and engagement representing the “Public-at-Large” since her appointment by the Assembly Speaker on February 19, 2014; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that Aleita Huguenin has served as the Chair of the Democratic National Committee – Western States Region since 2005; and

WHEREAS, In 2007 Aleita Huguenin became President of Aleita & Partners, a firm that works on Democratic races in the 13 western states; and

WHEREAS, with a background in education from teaching elementary and junior high school from 1969 to 1987, Aleita Huguenin was the Bay Area Political Manager for the California Teachers Association from 1987 to 1996 and the Statewide Government Relations Manager for the Association from 1995 to 2007; and

WHEREAS, Aleita Huguenin’s education background, public policy knowledge, and insight 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*

Aleita Huguenin

*for her contributions and service
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 28 March, 2019*