

1 Approved February 4, 2020

2 **California Library Services Board Meeting**
3 **September 17, 2019**

4 Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building
5 914 Capitol Mall, Room 218
6 Sacramento, CA 95814

7 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

8 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on
9 September 17, 2019 at 9:54 am.

10 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh
11 Maghsoudi, Adriana Martinez, Peter Mindnich, Sandra Tauler, and Connie Williams.

12 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Carolyn Brooks, Natalie
13 Cole, Janet Coles, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Annly Roman, Laura Sasaki, and Beverly
14 Schwartzberg.

15 **Adoption of Agenda**

16 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Williams) and carried unanimously*
17 *that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda for the*
18 *September 17, 2019 meeting*

19 **Approval of March 2019 Meeting Minutes**

20 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that*
21 *the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes, of the*
22 *March 28, 2019 California Library Services Board Meeting.*

23 **Election of Board Officers for 2020-2021**

24 Annly Roman reported that at the last Board meeting Connie Williams and Florante Ibanez
25 were elected as the nominating committee to nominate officers for a two year term. An email was
26 sent out to assess the interest of Board members to serve as officers and a limited response was
27 received. The Nominating Committee contacted Anne Bernardo and Gary Christmas to see if they
28 would be willing to run again. The Nominating Committee put forward nominations for Anne
29 Bernardo for President and Gary Christmas for Vice President.

30 President Bernardo called for nominations from the floor. There were none.

31 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the*

1 *California Library Services Board elects Anne Bernardo as the President of*
2 *the California Library Services Board for the years 2020-2021.*

3 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the*
4 *California Library Services Board elects Gary Christmas as Vice-President*
5 *of the California Library Services Board for the years 2020-2021.*

6 **Board Meeting Schedule for 2020**

7 Annly Roman stated that at the March 2019 meeting the Board indicated they wanted to have
8 a teleconference meeting in January to discuss potential budget requests. Roman stated that
9 because of the current meeting schedule the Board identified what they wanted to ask for in the
10 budget before the Governor's proposed budget was introduced and when everyone else was still
11 formulating requests. The board did not meet again until right before the May revise. Roman said
12 the Board had wanted to consider having a teleconference after the budget had been released to
13 discuss coordinating with CLA or interest in existing budget items.

14 Vice-President Christmas stated he felt it was a good idea to do a teleconference in January
15 after the Governor's budget was released and CLA had identified their priorities. President
16 Bernardo asked if the Board wanted to get ahead of the budget, like they did in 2019-2020 and let
17 the governor know their priorities before he introduced his budget in January. Vice-President
18 Christmas and other Board members stated they felt that was a good idea.

19 Annly Roman stated that meeting in January would not prevent the Board from notifying the
20 Governor of budget priorities earlier since the best place to be was in the Governor's proposed
21 budget. It had been suggested by Member Hernandez and seconded by others that the Board could
22 meet in between to clarify their requests in advance of the May revise .

23 Vice President Christmas asked, in terms of the Board's previous letter, if the Board identified
24 priorities or Greg drafted the letter. Roman said that the Board identified seven priorities at the
25 October 2018 meeting. A letter was sent to the new administration early on. President Bernardo
26 indicated she thought it was a good tactic to bring forward the wealth of library services. She stated
27 that at this point the Board knew Governor Newsom's particular interest and that his administration
28 was trying not to overlap services.

29 State Librarian Lucas said that the time table the administration set for state agencies to turn
30 in budget change proposals was Labor Day. However, they could add things into the January
31 budget prior to Thanksgiving. The State Library had requested the administration continue funding
32 Zip Books and Lunch at the Library. Lucas reported that the administration liked to demonstrate

1 fiscal responsibility through majority one-time funding. So instead of committing \$1 million
2 forever, the State Library had to submit a new request each year.

3 Lucas said the board had talked about getting more databases for K-12 students that would also
4 appear at the library where it would allow them to access additional knowledge. President
5 Bernardo also suggested that since they could see the demonstrated value of the completed one-
6 time funded programs some of those programs could be reintroduced.

7 Annly Roman stated that the interest in a January meeting had surrounded Board legislator
8 meetings in spring, and a wish to focus the Board's budget requests for those meetings. Vice
9 President Christmas asked if they could direct staff for Greg to draft a letter for them to send
10 detailing legislative priorities when they discussed legislative issues later in the meeting. Roman
11 confirmed they could.

12 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the***
13 ***California Library Services Board will hold a teleconference meeting in late***
14 ***January, early February, after the Governor's proposed budget is introduced***
15 ***and the California Library Association puts forward their priorities, to***
16 ***discuss Board budget requests.***

17 President Bernardo asked to talk about spring meeting dates and legislative visits. Annly
18 Roman stated that if the Board wanted to have legislative visits they should meet in advance of the
19 May revise. State Librarian Lucas stated that they should also meet prior to the Legislature's spring
20 break. Roman said that spring break would be in early April so the Board should aim for early to
21 late March.

22 Vice-President Christmas stated that the Board should have an in-person meeting in southern
23 California to give the southern California libraries an opportunity to participate face-to-face with
24 the State Librarian, library staff, and Board members. He suggested next fall would give plenty of
25 time to budget for the costs. President Bernardo asked if State Library staff thought that they
26 needed to re-think how they handled Board meetings due to cost. State Librarian Lucas stated that
27 the budget for 2016-2017 provided the Board with an additional \$3 million to use at their discretion
28 for various priorities. The Board met in person in the spring and fall and had a teleconference in
29 July. Those meetings were primarily to discuss budget options and finalize programs. The
30 consensus from the Board had been that they preferred in person meetings. The Board's activities
31 were fairly prescribed to making determinations about the appropriateness of the spending of the
32 nine systems and \$3.63 million. To have a meeting in Southern California costs about \$3000 which

1 comes directly out of the operating budget for the Library Development Services Bureau. So the
2 money that the State Library put into facilitating the in-person meeting came out of an operating
3 budget that supports more than \$20 million in other programming.

4 Member Ibanez asked if it was more cost effective to meet in Sacramento. State Librarian
5 Lucas stated that it was about a \$500 difference. It was about \$2400 to meet in Sacramento.
6 Christmas said that he thought \$500 was a nominal amount to spend to provide access to a physical
7 meeting for southern California library community members. Member Martinez agreed stating that
8 at each meeting she had been to at a Southern California Public Library there had been at least one
9 member of the public present.

10 Member Ibanez asked if the Board had considered piggybacking off the CLA annual meeting.
11 Member Maghsoudi stated that the 2020 CLA conference was going to be in Pasadena at the end
12 of October so they could coordinate their meeting with the conference.

13 Member Williams asked about putting the spring and fall meetings on hold until the winter
14 meeting. Member Ibanez said, and Vice President Christmas agreed the Board should discuss the
15 schedule further at the next meeting.

16 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

17 **Board President's Report**

18 President Bernardo reported that she had continued to be active with the Council of County
19 Law Librarians, primarily their legislative efforts. She continued to attend library webinars and
20 monitor calix and other listservs. She was able to attend the National Association of Law Libraries
21 meeting in Washington, DC and she spent most of that time attending sessions on collaboration
22 and networking.

23 Bernardo stated that, in the spring her library had begun their renovation to be able to provide
24 the lawyers in the library program.

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

26 Vice-President Christmas reported he attended the Association of Library Advocates' Serving
27 with a Purpose workshop in May at the Ontario Convention Center. He said it was very well
28 attended.

29 Christmas stated that the Riverside Public Library was continuing construction on the main
30 library. A lot of the framework was up and it would be completed sometime in late 2020. The

1 current main library would be turned into a center for Chicano art featuring a Cheech Marin
2 collection. That project received a \$10 million allocation from the State Legislature.

3 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

4 State Librarian Lucas stated that since March the budget had been approved. About 84% of the
5 new spending in the budget was one-time funding. Almost exclusively the money that appeared in
6 the library's budget was one time: \$1 million for lunch at the library, \$1 million for Zip Books, a
7 new \$5 million grant program helping libraries partner with community organizations to deliver
8 early learning and after school programs, and \$3 million for service to library patrons who cannot
9 come to the library.

10 Lucas stated there was also another \$9 million in legislative requests added to the State
11 Library's budget. One request was \$1 million in state money for California Humanities. Every
12 state had something like California Humanities, which was paid for through the National
13 Endowment for the Arts. It was traditionally a non-profit, so receiving state grant money was
14 abnormal.

15 There was also funding for some library facilities: \$4 million for one of the Whittier libraries,
16 \$2.5 million to bring a branch library in Fullerton back to life, \$280,000 for the Pomona Library,
17 and a smaller amount of money for the new library in Goleta to provide more library services in
18 Isla Vista. These kinds of allocations were new for the State Library so we had to create new ways
19 to put the money out responsibly.

20 Lucas reported that another legislative item was \$500,000 for LGBTQ archives. The legislature
21 identified three archives in their budget item. With a little investigation on the part of the State
22 Library and some of the smaller LGBTQ archives around the state, there were at least six or seven
23 others that had approached the State Library for funds. This item highlighted the need for different
24 kinds of support for the around 7,000 archives, libraries, museums, galleries, and historical
25 societies in California, particularly those for lesser represented communities. The State Library
26 was trying to convince the administration to spend money to protect broader at risk collections.

27 State Librarian Lucas reported that the budget also included funds for a census of statewide
28 cultural heritage entities. They hoped it could allowed the state to do a better job targeting the
29 money it had to support local cultural heritage entities. Finally, the budget had \$1 million for the
30 state library to offer digital concierge services to other state agencies. A lot of state agencies had
31 photographs and materials that helped to tell their story they wanted to put online rather than in

1 storage at the archives. The funding was designed to allow the State Library to help those agencies.
2 The State library had recently joined Google Arts and Culture, a forum for various digital
3 collections, and hoped the use the membership to showcase some of those collections and digital
4 images for other state agencies.

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

6 Laura Sasaki, the new Broadband Opportunities Program Manager and state E-rate coordinator
7 for the libraries, introduced herself and stated that she had worked in IT, broadband, and e-rate for
8 about 19 years. She stated she was very pleased to be a part of the State Library and the amazing
9 work it was doing.

10 Sasaki reported that the Libraries Illuminated program helped libraries explore uses of high
11 speed internet for programs and services or helped staff with training and internal processes to
12 make things more efficient and productive. 38 jurisdictions participated in the \$1 million program
13 and it wrapped up in June 2019.

14 The assessment surveys came back with overwhelmingly positive feedback from the libraries
15 that participated. They really felt that there was a positive impact on the communities and patrons,
16 so it was very successful. Beverly Schwartzberg stated that she felt the program really made it
17 possible for a lot of libraries to take advantage of their broadband connections.

18 President Bernardo asked if the general broadband program had continued. Laura Sasaki stated
19 that it was continuing. They had another two years to try to get the more difficult to connect
20 libraries up to speed as well as working with libraries that had signed on in the past to renew their
21 contacts with Califa.

22 **Value of Libraries: Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report**

23 Natalie Cole reported that the project was really continuing to gather speed because of the
24 groundwork they had laid out the first couple of years. They were working on formulating their
25 framework. They want people to know the value of libraries and what libraries do but grounded in
26 data. So as much as possible the data was being pulled together and no claims would be made that
27 were not represented in the data which was the strength of the project.

28 It was evident the value that libraries had at the individual, group, and community level.
29 Libraries provided opportunities and support for personal advancement which covers early
30 learning, reaching vulnerable populations, as well as community development which covers social

1 infrastructure and economic development. Through all those things libraries were continually
2 having a social and economic impact.

3 In terms of next steps, Cole thought that one really important thing was that there were
4 universal elements to what libraries were doing, the value they were delivering and the impact it
5 was having. What they were finding was it was individual transactional interactions that were very
6 specific. So since there were different kinds of value, if libraries were going to use the data to
7 promote themselves they had to think about what people wanted to hear. What aspect of the many
8 kinds of value that libraries were providing should be talked about at any given time. So some next
9 steps were talking with stakeholders to determine how to deliver the message. Each libraries story
10 was different but they were each part of a bigger framework of what libraries are doing.

11 Cole reported they were finalizing the data and putting it all together. Then they would be
12 preparing content for libraries and stakeholders to use to demonstrate the value of their libraries.
13 There would be the online clearinghouse, which was the original project goal. It was important for
14 the information in the clearinghouse to be thorough and grounded in the data. It also needed to be
15 easily accessible and useful, so they were working on making sure everything was accessible.

16 They were also creating supplementary materials and would be creating in-depth briefing
17 papers that could be used as needed. Cole also thought helping library staff tell their story was
18 going to be important. Anyone who used the data would need to be familiar with how to tell the
19 right story at the right time and putting all that data together. Additionally, they would be
20 identifying opportunities to use the data and get it out to other conferences beyond just California
21 Library Association and connect with other big initiatives.

22 Member Williams asked if, in trying to identify ways to use the data, there were ways to help
23 library staff across the state do that outreach so that they could imbed themselves in local
24 community activities. Cole stated that she thought the most useful way to do that was to train
25 people on how to imbed themselves and how to identify those opportunities. Cole said that if she
26 was thinking of funding people to do that they would need additional funding, but she did think it
27 was important to help people identify opportunities and take advantage of them. Williams stated
28 she was not really talking about staffing but using a CLA conference or other workshop arenas to
29 train library staff and stakeholders to know where to go to put themselves forward and be part of
30 those different community opportunities.

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

2 Lena Pham stated that the great thing about the SimplyE discovery app, was that it connected
3 different vendors' apps into one platform so patrons did not have to change apps to access all of
4 their library's eBooks. The app was originally developed by the New York Public Library with
5 Institute of Museum and Library Services funding. The California Library Services Board put
6 \$200,000 into it over the last three years. The program ended in June 2019.

7 27 library jurisdictions were live, or in process of being setup on SimplyE. That number
8 included the 6 grant pilot organizations (including 11 library jurisdictions) which were all live, and
9 9 more libraries were also live. There were over 100 libraries in 12 states participating in the use
10 of SimplyE, so it was gaining traction nationally.

11 Enki Library, California's first statewide eBook platform, was successfully integrated into the
12 SimplyE app. In terms of app development, it worked with: Overdrive, Bibliotheca's cloud
13 Library, Axis360, BiblioBoard, RBDigital, Open Access SimplyE collection, Enki Library, and the
14 Digital Public of America (DPLA) Exchange. Other app development include efforts toward
15 audiobook integration and Califa began talks with Midwest Tapes to integrate Hoopla into
16 SimplyE.

17 The app would be sustained through a new governance structure involving the DPLA, New
18 York Public Library, and the SimplyE Advisory Council. The council met monthly to advise on
19 new functionality and development, and to share the cost of maintaining and supporting SimplyE.

20 DPLA was supporting the eBook infrastructure through the DPLA Exchange. The exchange
21 was created in 2017 and was a library-led marketplace in which participating libraries could select
22 and purchase popular titles as well as free public domain works and openly licensed works. That
23 kind of marketplace helped libraries maximize access to eBooks.

24 Member Williams asked if larger systems across the state were investigating and if everyone
25 would be able to participate. Pham stated that Califa has set up a subscription so new libraries that
26 wanted to join could subscribe. Carol Frost stated that any library that was part of a cooperative
27 system would use CLSA funds to pay for SimplyE and PLP used their CLSA funds to pay for any
28 library that wanted to join. Frost felt like the product still needed a lot of investment to keep the
29 development going but it sounded like now that they were hooking into other big initiatives like
30 DPLA it would have future growth.

1 **Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

2 Lena Phan reported that the Innovation Station Project ended in March of 2019. The project
3 was funded with \$200,000 in one-time funds from the Board and created innovation labs through
4 partnerships with libraries, employers, and educators. It expanded on the concept of using
5 collaborations to help people connect to skills and encourage creative problem solving. 18 libraries
6 were awarded funds and over 60 unique programs were created. The types of innovation stations
7 created through this project were diverse and included makerspaces, makerboxes, labs, and library
8 services. 15 of the projects were at fixed location, 6 were mobile, and 1 was a lending service. The
9 18 libraries partnered with 29 organizations, 19 other libraries, 12 public entities, and 10 schools.
10 SCLC totaled the in-kind contributions toward to project at over \$360,000.

11 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

12 Carolyn Brooks reported that The Zip Books Project was an alternative model for interlibrary
13 loan that bridged the gaps between a library’s patron requests, a normal acquisitions process, and
14 an outreach/home delivery service.

15 Zip Books provided patrons with speedy access to materials they might not otherwise be able
16 to get through the library, without the long wait often associated with ILL requests. It had been
17 easy for library staff to administer and since Amazon shipped materials directly to the patron, it
18 saved the effort and cost of packaging and mailing materials, and saved patrons the effort of
19 picking up the materials. Zip Books added a patron-driven collection development approach to
20 participating libraries’ processes resulting in a collection more closely attuned to the needs of the
21 local community

22 Zip Books began as a service for rural libraries, and was expanded to include several pilot sites
23 in suburban and urban library systems. There were 70 approved library jurisdictions participating
24 in the program all over the state, and an additional three library jurisdictions were working to come
25 on board. The State Library anticipated a total of seven new library systems in 2019.

26 A Pilot Program was tested in May and June to look at alternate funding models and ensure
27 the availability of funds during the fiscal year transition. It highlighted difficulties navigating
28 Amazon’s fraud protocols and various internal procedures required in order for libraries to access
29 funds and process payments. Those findings would be used to determine best practices.

1 In a continued effort to lighten the workload for library staff, statistics reporting procedures
2 were updated and streamlined. Spanish marketing materials marketing materials had been added
3 and plans for developing a multi-lingual Zip Books poster were underway.

4 To reflect the diversity of the program, additional video testimonials were captured in Southern
5 California at Corona Public Library and Riverside Public Library. The 10 groups/15 individuals
6 who shared their experiences with the program were of varying ages and ethnicities. The footage
7 would be folded into the existing Zip Books promo video on the State Library website.

8 A Zip Books Advisory Committee was formed to provide feedback on existing policies and
9 procedures and new ideas that showcased the diversity of the program. The first in-person meeting
10 was planned for the CLA Conference in October.

11 Brooks stated that funds from the previous grant cycle had been expended and funds for the
12 new grant cycle had been rolled out. Those funds were on track to be fully expended within the
13 fiscal cycle year.

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

15 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

16 **System Plans of Service and Budgets**

17 Monica Rivas stated that the Board needed to consider the final CLSA budget for fiscal year
18 2019-2020. At the previous meeting they had approved a budget of \$3.63 million and that had not
19 changed. Rivas stated that the award letters for funding would go out after the budget was
20 approved. The State Library typically gave funds to the systems in two separate checks, one around
21 the fall board meeting and one toward the end of the year. Rivas said she was not sure if the systems
22 had a preference for one check. Since the Board was thinking of meeting in October in 2020, that
23 would effect when the checks went to the systems.

24 Carol Frost, PLP and NorthNet, stated that the systems normally got the first check in August
25 and it was September. They just did not want to wait any longer because they were covering the
26 cost of contracts until funds were disbursed. Rivas stated that the State Library had been waiting
27 for the final budget and the plans of service. Rivas stated that if the board was ok with it, the State
28 Library could send out the first award before the fall meeting, if it was later in the year, to get the
29 systems checks by August. Frost stated that there were enough checks and ballances that the second
30 claim check could always be modified in necessary.

1 Diane Satchwell stated that some systems without sufficient funds were struggling. So
2 whatever could be done to expedite payment would be great. Annly Roman informed the board
3 they would not need to take a motion but could give direction to staff.

4 Member Williams stated she thought the Board could discuss the next year's disbursement at
5 the next meeting. Member Tauler stated that she felt it was important to expedite the first check so
6 that the systems had their money. She was not sure how that would work but she favored the idea
7 of giving the systems money then evening it out at the end of the year. Member Ibanez asked if
8 they needed a motion and Annly Roman stated that Monica Rivas was just looking for direction.

9 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoodi) and carried unanimously that***
10 ***the California Library Services Board adopts the final 2019-2020 California***
11 ***Library Services Act budget as directed in the Governor's 2019-2020 budget,***
12 ***totaling \$3,630,000 for allocation to the Cooperative Library Systems.***

13 President Bernardo stated that as she heard it the Board was supportive of disbursing the funds.
14 Rivas stated that seemed correct and if they Board wanted to discuss other disbursement options
15 at their next meeting they could. For now, unless something changed in January, they would
16 process the payment before the board meeting and the second payment at the end of the year.

17 Monica Rivas stated that the Board had seen the 2019-2020 CLSA system membership figures.
18 Those were the figures used when disbursing funds to the systems.

19 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the***
20 ***California Library Services Board approves the System Population and***
21 ***Membership figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the 2019-***
22 ***2020 fiscal year.***

23 Monica Rivas reported that the \$3.63 million was disbursed between the systems and each
24 system had submitted their intended plan for the funding. Plans varied between system but the
25 most important things were physical delivery and e-resources. Systems were moving toward using
26 their funds for Enki, Link+, Overdrive, Zinio, SimplyE, there were several systems that used their
27 funds for eBooks or eMagazines, website updates, and digital collections.

28 Rivas stated that the Board needed to discuss a couple of items within the plans of service.
29 State Librarian Lucas stated that PLP and NorthNet had sent a letter regarding funds for audits,
30 which were required by state law for government entities and Federal law for those receiving funds.
31 In the plan of service, three of the systems, Santiago, Serra, and 49-99, included within their
32 baseline funding about \$4500 each for audits. The letter stated that plan of service instructions
33 previously said, "in your plan of service, under operations-complete this section using the

1 categories noted: for short term contracts, for consultant, for auditing staff, contact services may
2 be changed. If Indirect Costs/Fiscal Agent Fees are budgeted, you must describe exactly what
3 services are provided to the System. Such services generally include payroll, accounting, office
4 space, utilities, etc.” That statement had been modified to say “operations-complete this section
5 with the categories noted”. The systems’ letters stated that it was a long standing precedent for
6 some systems to use CLSA funds for costs related to audits and removing that language left the
7 section open to interpretation. PLP and NorthNet wanted to ask the board to clarify that the
8 precedent could continue using CLSA baseline funds for audits and that the former language be
9 included for clarity purposes.

10 Lucas stated that there was also a letter from the 49-99 cooperative which requested their audit
11 be paid for through baseline funding. So the options for the Board were to approve the plans of
12 service and allow, on a one-time basis, the audits for those three individual systems to be paid for
13 through baseline. The Board could do what the systems were requesting which was to restore the
14 old language and allow that the audits be paid for using baseline rather than administrative funds.
15 Monica Rivas stated that the main questions was if the audits were an administrative cost or a
16 baseline cost. President Bernardo asked if it had previously been clear that audits were an
17 administrative costs. Rivas stated that it was something that had come up lately. Annly Roman
18 stated that she had scanned the plans of service for the last ten years and paying for an audit had
19 only been included once, the year before.

20 Rivas stated that when she looked through previous verbiage it was seen as an administrative
21 cost and baseline costs were what it took to run the programs. The State Library was asking the
22 Board for direction. Vice-President Christmas stated that he was in favor of allowing the systems
23 to use baseline funds for audits.

24 Suzanne Olawski, Assistant Director of Solano County and Vice-Chair of PLP, stated that she
25 felt the clarifying language in the plan of service document should be reinstated. The language
26 provided guidance to those who were filling out the form and it gave direction on what funds could
27 be used for and what should be reported. She felt for accurate accounting and fiscal responsibility,
28 having that clarifying language would help the consortiums report more accurately. Diane
29 Satchwell stated that the three systems asking to fund the audit from baseline, received 95% of
30 their funding through the Board.

1 Monica Rivas brought up that the Inland Library System had asked for \$500 in baseline funds
2 to move some of their CLSA files since their office closed. Rivas stated that typically moving costs
3 would have been administrative cost. President Bernardo asked if that would be a one-time use of
4 funds. Annly Roman confirmed that it was a one-time cost staff wanted to bring to the Board's
5 attention because it was out of the ordinary.

6 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously*
7 *that the California Library Services Board approves the California Library*
8 *Services Act System Plans of Services and Budgets for the Nine Cooperative*
9 *Library Systems, submitted for the 2019-2020 fiscal year and include the*
10 *audits as an allowable cost within the baseline funding for the three systems*
11 *requesting it for 2019-2020 and for all systems in the future.*

12 President Bernardo brought up the question of pension liability. Annly Roman said that the
13 State Library had been asked to ask the systems for their pension liability as part of their plans of
14 service. The systems had submitted in a section of their letter that they felt that was extraneous
15 information. President Bernardo stated that she thought that was part of an earlier discussion they
16 had about pensions and systems' liability and asked if that information was addressed in the audits.
17 Roman stated that she was sure it was included in the audits. The State Library had received copies
18 of the audits but they were very extensive and detailed. Roman stated that as non-accountants State
19 Library staff had found them confusing and difficult to interpret. Rivas suggested that it would be
20 easier for staff to get a brief summary from the systems.

21 President Bernardo asked how Board members felt about receiving the audits and if they
22 should be able to see if the systems would be viable in the future. Diane Satchwell commented that
23 pension liability was quite large for some of the systems that they managed but that CLSA money
24 did not go toward the liability so they would need specific direction on what exactly the Board
25 was looking for, perhaps specific questions. Carol Frost agreed and stated she felt the question of
26 if the systems were able to pay their pension deficits was a different question than what was on the
27 plan of service She felt it opened up a bigger question with a lot of components; like the longevity
28 of the fiscal obligation, what were the plans and she was not sure where that discussion resided.

29 Member Williams felt the Board did not need that information. Vice-President Christmas
30 stated that if it lacked direction they could remove the request, but he thought the Board should
31 keep requesting the audits. He felt that would provide information on the financial viability of the
32 different systems. He suggested that the state library or systems could ask for some other measures
33 or specific questions surrounding that.

1 **Planning, Coordination, and Evaluation – Administrative vs. Baseline Funding**

2 State Librarian Lucas reported that when the California Library Services Act was passed in
3 1977, one of the programs included was planning, coordination, and evaluation. In 1987, the state
4 stopped putting specific funding into that section. According to past Board minutes it had been
5 precedent to treat those kind of expenses as administrative costs, which were capped at 20% of the
6 money under the Act. The request before the Board was to allow planning, coordination, and
7 evaluation activities to be paid for out of the baseline budget.

8 Lucas stated that one program example the State library had been given was for a system to
9 offer Analytics on Demand to their member libraries. The cost of that varied depending on how
10 many people would join, but in the example given to the State Library it was roughly \$150,000
11 per year. Some options before the Board were to continue to consider planning, coordination, and
12 evaluation costs an administrative expense; or keep it as an administrative expense but allow the
13 20% cap on administrative costs to rise to accommodate some of those expenses. The Board could
14 also designate planning, coordination, and evaluation as a baseline cost but cap the cost by limiting
15 how often the systems could fund those kind of projects. Finally, the Board could allow planning,
16 coordination and evaluation to be paid with baseline funds with no restrictions other than the
17 normal approval process that the Board has over the systems' budgets and plans of service.

18 Member Tauler stated that she believed in listening to the needs of the systems and thought
19 what they were trying to fund was going to be a service. She recommended that planning,
20 coordination and evaluation be part of the baseline. Member Williams agreed and stated that the
21 more they allowed flexibility in how systems spent money the better it was. Vice-President
22 Christmas stated that he agreed with member's Tauler and Williams. He asked for input from some
23 of the systems.

24 Suzanne Olawski, representing NorthNet, asked for the Board's support for the unrestricted
25 use of baseline funds for planning, coordination, and evaluation. She stated that NorthNet used the
26 full 20% of their administrative funds for staff so they would not be able to fund anything like
27 Analytics on Demand, or having a consultant like they used for their Link+ study. Jamie Turbak,
28 Director of the Oakland Public Library and a member of Pacific Library Partnership Executive
29 Committee, agreed.

30 Annly Roman read an email from Patty Wong, the Director of Library Services at Santa
31 Monica Public Library, supporting moving planning, coordination, and evaluation from system

1 administration to baseline. Wong stated that would provide the cooperative members with the
2 evaluation support they needed with the flexibility of using baseline allocations to appropriately
3 fund those programs.

4 Abbey Schellberg, Chair of the Inland Library System, said they supported and seconded all
5 the previous comments.

6 *It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Williams) and carried unanimously that the*
7 *California Library Services Board will allow Planning, Coordination, and*
8 *Evaluation costs to be paid with baseline funds.*

9 **NorthNet Link+ Execution Plan**

10 Suzanne Olawski, Vice Chair of NorthNet Library System, reported that at the March 2019
11 Board meeting NorthNet had received approval by the Board to move forward with the
12 implementation of the Link+ grant. She was providing the update that the Board had requested at
13 that meeting.

14 Olawski said that to recap, resource sharing could consist of physical, as well as digital
15 materials. It allowed the systems to leverage resources and finances through sharing models such
16 as the Zip Books model. For Link+, it was allowing them a greater sense of opportunity to get
17 resources into people's hands.

18 Link+ was a resource sharing platform. There were about 70 libraries that were participating
19 within the state making about 11 million titles accessible. When a patron was searching their home
20 library catalog for a title, if the patron could not find that particular title in their home library
21 system, they could click on the Link+ button, place a hold and within two to four days, have that
22 item available for pick-up. Part of the Link+ system was the delivery component that went with it.

23 NorthNet was in the process of onboarding four libraries. Sonoma County and El Dorado
24 County were already onboard and had implemented Link+. Woodland Library was also onboard
25 and Nevada County was in the process of switching their ILS provider. NorthNet was able to work
26 with a vendor master contract to save their Link+ participating members money.

27 Olawski reported that there was \$240,394 left in the grant to distribute to other libraries.
28 NorthNet was very confident that they would be able to distribute those funds, which she knew
29 was a concern expressed by some of the Board members from the March meeting.

30 NorthNet had created an ad hoc committee to work on the project and they were working
31 closely with Janet Coles, their State Library grant monitor. The next process was a three phase
32 approach. The first phase was to issue a call of interest, a survey to all libraries in California,

1 including academic libraries, to see if they would be interested in joining Link+. Having a quote
2 already from Link+ was not a requirement although some libraries had already taken that step. The
3 survey closed in August and they had received three viable responses. Two were individual
4 libraries and one was a library cooperative that was very similar to NorthNet.

5 Olawski reported that the committee was reviewing those applications and they would be
6 following up with those libraries. Two of the libraries already had a quote from Link+, the third
7 would need to do that and get a quote for the delivery portion.

8 They were reviewing the applications and needed to get more information from those
9 institutions in regards to the general quote plus the delivery costs. That would give a truer picture
10 of what the cost would be for each institution. They would then award the grants. Olawski stated
11 that NorthNet was confident that they would complete collecting the information in the next few
12 months and that they could award the funds to those institutions by December 2019. NorthNet
13 would have to implement all the funds by December 2020 and if they award the funds in December
14 2019 it would give those libraries a full year to implement. The average amount of time it took to
15 onboard to Link+ was three months. They were hopeful that by mid-2020 the entities would be
16 onboard and then they would have collected data from them as far as the usage of the program.

17 Vice-President Christmas asked about the indirect cost of \$45,000 in the plan of execution. He
18 wondered what those costs were and if there would be more as the other libraries came onboard.
19 Carol Frost stated that indirect costs covered overhead costs as well as administrative costs to do
20 reports or contracts on behalf of systems. The activities that had been done that could be related
21 back to those costs were; working with the ad hoc committee, developing the survey in Survey
22 Monkey, compiling the data, communicating with the Boards, developing an implementation plan,
23 and worked closely with their grant monitor. There was a lot of staff time that went into the
24 program and they would continue with those tasks as well as the fiscal monitoring of the program
25 to ensure that all funds were spent and reporting was done on time and accurately

26 Christmas stated that he was aware of the costs that could go into the indirect but he wasn't
27 sure how they determined the \$45,000 and wondered what they estimate it would be for the
28 additional libraries that they planned to bring on from outside NorthNet. Frost stated indirect was
29 typically taken as a percentage of the whole grant and there would be no other indirect taken on
30 behalf of the grant.

1 Member Williams ask, after the grant period was over, if the systems took all the costs on for
2 Link+. Suzanne Olawski stated that libraries would not come onboard unless they could commit
3 to being a Link+ member for a period of time. When they surveyed the other NorthNet libraries,
4 so many were rural and had delivery issues, or budgetary constraints and concerns and could not
5 make the commitment to Link+ for the longer term. That was part of the deciding factor in not
6 coming onboard with Link+. Carol Frost stated that Link+ was an allowable cost using CLSA
7 funds and any library that filled out the form to receive funds from the state grant, one of the
8 questions asked was about if they had funds available to support the program after the grant was
9 over because they wanted to make sure there was a long range plan.

10 Suzanne Olawski said that there was a 5-year master contract negotiated with Link+ by
11 NorthNet for all NorthNet Link+ member libraries. President Bernardo clarified that since the new
12 libraries were not part of NorthNet, they would be able to participate in this one-time funding for
13 start-up, but would not be able to participate in the NorthNet five year contract. Olawski stated
14 that was correct. NorthNet was clear that any other organization that accepted the funds would
15 have had to negotiate their own contract with Link+. Frost stated that NorthNet was one of the
16 nine cooperative systems and so, as a cooperative, they negotiated that contract for their members.
17 She did not think their Board would be interested in opening that up to others and figuring out how
18 to get funds from other libraries.

19 Yolande Wilburn, Nevada County Librarian, stated they were going to be migrating to their
20 new ILS the next week and she looked forward to coming onboard with Link+ quickly after that.
21 Their public, community, citizen's oversight committee, and Board of Supervisors were excited
22 about having that as a resource for their county. They were smaller libraries that did not have a lot
23 of shelf space so being able to reach out and get those items from other libraries was really
24 meaningful for their community. Jamie Trubeck, Oakland Public Library, said she thought it was
25 one of the most important services that the Board could support.

26 President Bernardo stated that the Board would want a final report once the program was
27 completed. Vice-President Christmas felt that in the future it would be good to have some
28 assurance that if a Library Cooperative System was running a program for the state that the same
29 deal that they arranged for themselves applied to other grant recipients. State Librarian Lucas
30 clarified that NorthNet could not guarantee the other libraries that participate the same rate they
31 got as a system over a five-year contract. They could ask for it but additional libraries that were

1 outside of NorthNet would not be subject to the same contract since contracts were dependent on
2 a lot of different things. Lucas stated that he heard what Vice-President Christmas was saying but
3 he didn't know how they could do it other than making an effort to negotiate larger contracts that
4 benefit more people.

5 Mark Fink, Yolo County Library and the Chair of the Link+ Committee that was overseeing
6 the operation, stated that there were a lot of factors that went into the pricing of the contracts such
7 as delivery, which had been a big part of the discussion surrounding costs. That would really vary
8 depending on where a library was located what their geographic restrictions were and if they were
9 close to another library that offered Link+ to act as a delivery hub. Fink thought that for future
10 contracts, III negotiated with libraries that were entering into Link+ and those same considerations
11 would be reviewed. He stated that he would be happy to take back the recommendation and
12 concern about pricing for the Link+ service for new libraries that came onboard.

13 **RESOURCE SHARING**

14 **Consolidation and Affiliation**

15 Annly Roman reported that the State Library received documentation from the Southern
16 California Library Cooperative seeking approval from the Board for the Simi Valley Library to
17 join their Cooperative. The Simi Valley Library separated from the Ventura County Library
18 System in January of 2012 and had not been part of a cooperative library system before. Simi
19 Valley Library had provide a resolution from their Board of Trustees requesting affiliation and the
20 Southern California Library Cooperative board had approved the request.

21 Roman clarified that because they were already three months into the fiscal year the affiliation
22 would be effective July 1, 2020.

23 *It was moved, seconded (Williams/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that*
24 *the California Library Services Board approves the affiliation of the Simi*
25 *Valley Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative Library*
26 *System effective July 1, 2020.*

27 **CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES ACT REPORTING**

28 Monica Rivas stated that on the annual report there was a category that tracked
29 communications activity; specifically telephone, fax, internet and other usage to count the number
30 of messages and the annual cost of those services. In the State Library's discussions with the
31 systems on the documentation and how to streamline it, the systems brought up that it was hard
32 for them to track the number of telephone and fax messages that they received. In looking

1 historically at that category Rivas said she found that a lot had to do with the previous reference
2 desk program.

3 Annly Roman stated that the systems had requested the removal of the section. Rivas stated
4 that in the plans of service there was a section that captured those kind of costs so they would still
5 provide the cost of their telecommunications. If the Board had no objection, state library staff
6 agreed that they could take that section on number of messages out of the form. Member Williams
7 stated that she thought it made sense to remove the section. President Bernardo agreed.

8 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

9 Annly Roman stated that the Board had taken a support position on ACA 1, the measure that
10 reduced the vote threshold to 55% for special taxes, which dealt with any number of things but
11 also specifically listed libraries as one of the concerns. The bill failed to pass in 2019. Roman
12 stated that she believed that Assemblymember Aguiar-Curry was going to try again in 2020 but
13 she was not positive. Roman stated that 2020 was an election year and there were a lot of legislators
14 in contested districts. Bills like ACA 1 were often seen as tax increases, so a lot of those members
15 were being very cautious.

16 State Librarian Lucas stated that the house approved a spending plan that increased the amount
17 of money for the Institute of Museum and Library Services by \$17 million. That would take the
18 \$184 million that was given to the 50 states in per capita grants up to a little over \$200 million.
19 The reason for the increase was that last year Congress approved language, without inputting more
20 money, raising the minimum amount the little states were guaranteed from \$680,000 to \$1 million.
21 There was some discussion by the larger states that they should be held harmless in that increase,
22 so Congress added language to do that. The \$17 million would allow the little states to get a
23 minimum of \$1 million without reducing the shares of the larger states. The House passed that and
24 it was in the Senate. The ALA lobbying office in Washington said that it was unlikely for the
25 Senate to approve it at that same level but anything could happen between now and the close of
26 the legislative session. Lucas said that from where we were in March with the President eliminating
27 Institute of Library and Museum funding entirely things were significantly better.

28 Annly Roman stated that last year the Board put forward 7 requests that had to do with Lunch
29 at the Library, Zip Books, online content, and online tutoring. State Librarian Lucas stated that
30 they also asked for \$500,000 to continue to make eBooks more affordable, \$1 million to continue
31 to build more partnerships between libraries, school and businesses through Innovation Stations to

1 teach STEAM and other necessary skills, and \$1.5 million to continue to boost the technology
2 library patrons had access to as a result of the greater broadband connectivity they were receiving.

3 President Bernardo asked if the Board wanted to ask for expansion of some of those programs.
4 She also stated that they has asked for some programs outside their purview and wondered it that
5 was something they wanted to continue to support

6 Member Christmas stated that the letter from last year was drafted by Greg and sent by Anne
7 and he felt that was an appropriate model for this year. He felt the priorities from the last year were
8 still valid.

9 State Librarian Lucas put forward that one recurring issue raised by library directors with State
10 Library staff was library facility needs throughout the state. There had not been a state bond
11 measure on the ballot for local library facility improvement since 2006 and the last successful
12 measure was in 2000. There was a lot need, if only to deal with American's with Disabilities Act
13 compliance. In a lot of areas in the state, just to bring one bathroom up to code was \$250,000 or
14 more. Library patrons also requested study rooms, and other things that older, mid-century modern
15 facilities didn't provide.

16 Vice-President Christmas asked if Lucas was suggesting a facilities bond or appropriated
17 money. Lucas stated he was telling the Board that the need for help to improve facilities was raised
18 with a growing sense of urgency by public library directors. Some jurisdictions handled it
19 themselves, some, like the cities of Riverside and Long Beach used creative lease/purchase
20 arrangements to get the facilities built sooner, then paid off over time.

21 State Librarian Lucas stated that the legislature just passed around \$20 billion worth of bonds
22 for K-12 and higher education, so those were first in line to be sold by the Treasurer. So there
23 would be lag time between any action the state took to authorize facilities bonds to help libraries
24 and when they would actually benefit local jurisdictions. Lucas said the State Library could type
25 up a greatest hits on library facilities, and bonds. Members Ibanez and Christmas stated that would
26 be helpful. Member Williams asked if the State library could provide information to consider
27 further funding for more state databases.

28 Yolande Willburn, Nevada County Library, echoed what State Librarian Lucas said regarding
29 facility issues. She had ADA and facilities assessments done on all of their buildings and there
30 was not one building where it would cost under \$150,000 just in ADA compliance issues which

1 did not include doing roofs, fixing leaks, plumbing and those types of things. So, that was a big
2 priority for them.

3 President Bernardo stated that a bond issue was a heavy lift and asked if the Board could work
4 with CLA on that issue. State Librarian Lucas stated that he could not really speak for CLA. In the
5 past CLA had echoed her thoughts that a bond was difficult. In the last 3-4 years the focus had
6 been on trying to reduce the approval threshold for local library facilities measures, both through
7 ACA 1 and SCA 3. The view had been that it was difficult to raise the amount of money to launch
8 and sustain a statewide bond campaign. A cheaper and potentially as effective tool was lowering
9 the local approval threshold.

10 State Librarian Lucas said that the State Library would send out information for the Board on
11 bond measures, Link+, K-12 databases, SimplyE, libraries Illuminated, and the other programs.
12 That way the Board would be working from a place of having lots of information to make
13 decisions.

14 Mark Fink, Yolo County Library, said that one of the grants that was really transformative for
15 their library was the MacGyver (Maximizing your learning spaces) grant. They were able to get
16 professional assistance from architects and designers to help them re-think their space and they
17 had used that synergy to get a significant contribution from their friends group to renovate their
18 Clarksburg Library which was owned by the friends of the library. Even though the grant amount
19 was only \$10,000 it really provided a great opportunity for conversation with their staff and got
20 their friends at the table. They were able to make some serious improvements to a facility that had
21 not had much work for over 50 years. Even though it was a small amount of money the design of
22 that grant and the pieces to it addresses some of those facilities issues on a more manageable level.

23 Lena Pham stated that it was an LSTA grant from 2018-19 and the State Library was going to
24 fund the project again for 2019-20.

25 **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2019/20**

26 Annly Roman stated that at the Board's strategic planning session they had discussed having
27 Board member reports, since each member represented a different group, to get an idea of who
28 was represented and why it was important. Member Buenafe had volunteered to go first but she
29 had been unable to attend the meetings. Roman asked if there were other Board members who
30 wanted to be on the list to do a small presentation on those that they represent.

1 Member Williams stated that she would be willing to present on School libraries. Member
2 Ibanez stated that he could be on the list after Member Williams.

3 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

4 There was no public comment brought forward.

5 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

6 There were not comments from Board members.

7 **OLD BUSINESS**

8 There was no old business brought forward.

9 **AGENDA BUILDING**

10 Annly Roman stated that for the next meeting's agenda she had fall meeting, and budget
11 considerations.

12 **ADJOURNMENT**

13 President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services Board meeting
14 at 2:36 PM.