

1
2 **Approved November 05, 2021**
3 **California Library Services Board Meeting**
4 **April 6, 2021**
5 **Remote Meeting: Zoom**

6 **BOARD OPENING**

7 **Welcome and Introductions**

8 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to
9 order on April 6, 2021, at 9:38 am.

10 **Board Members Present:**

11 Anne Bernardo, Florante Ibanez, Sara Hernandez, Paymaneh Maghsoudi,
12 Maria Nieto Senour, Sandra Tauler, Elizabeth Murguia, and Connie Williams.

13 **California State Library Staff Present:**

14 State Librarian Greg Lucas, Natalie Cole, Meg DePriest, Chris Durr, Lynne Oliva,
15 Lena Pham, Beverly Schwartzberg, Shana Sojoyner, Reed Strege, Scott Taylor,
16 Jody Thomas, and Rebecca Wendt.

17 **Adoption of Agenda**

18 ***It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Ibanez) and carried***
19 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the***
20 ***agenda for the April 6, 2021 meeting.***

21 **Approval of September 2020 Meeting Minutes**

22 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried with***
23 ***seven ayes and one abstention (Tauler) that the California Library***
24 ***Services Board approves the draft minutes of the September 17,***
25 ***2020 California Library Services Board Meeting.***

26 **Meeting Date – Fall 2021 & 2022**

27 President Bernardo suggested that activities for the September 2021/2022
28 meeting would be the regular business Plans of Service and the LSTA State
29 Advisory Council Meeting and questioned whether the meeting should be held
30 remotely. Bernardo asked if meeting in late August would be too soon for reports
31 to be compiled and given to the Board. Natalie Cole stated that Monica Rivas'
32 input might have been needed on the time it takes for the systems' reports to be
33 compiled and suggested sticking with the usual timeframe. State Librarian Lucas
34 commented the Plans of Service were due at the end of June. Carol Frost, CEO
35 of the Pacific Library Partnership, said Plans of Service were due by law on June

1 3rd and to get approval from the Boards a two-week extension was needed. By
2 June 3rd plans were submitted without signatures for approval. She stated the
3 meeting was usually in August to early September so that the funds could be
4 approved and released to the libraries. Frost said it was taking about ten weeks
5 from when claim forms were submitted until checks were received so meeting
6 earlier was better. Cole said the meeting was held in September the last two
7 years and perhaps September was a good idea if not slightly before.

8 President Bernardo said the State Library would send out a doodle poll for
9 dates in early September and consider options for remote and in person. Member
10 Williams stated the Board usually did a February meeting in anticipation of
11 planning for legislative meetings in the spring. Bernardo said spring meetings,
12 legislative visits, budgets, other planning matters would be considered in the fall,
13 and it was tabled.

14 **Nominating Committee**

15 President Bernardo brought up the need for the Board to consider new board
16 members to serve as President and Vice-President for a two-year term in 2022 and
17 2023. She stated the Board would accept self-nominations for the Nominating
18 Committee and Bernardo along with Member Williams volunteered.

19 ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Maghsoudi) and carried***
20 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board appoint***
21 ***Anne Bernardo and Connie Williams to the Nominating***
22 ***Committee to select Board Officers for 2022-2023.***

23 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

24 **Board President's Report**

25 President Bernardo reported she had been monitoring listservs, and online
26 programs and meetings. She had been busy with People-of-Color and BIPOC
27 sessions, County Law Librarians, Northern California Association of Law Libraries
28 activities, legislative committee's calls to action, and attended the National
29 Library Conference. She noted lots of opportunities to participate online while
30 travel was still restricted and applauded the American Library Association's
31 putting forward concerns with libraries in the nation.

32 **Vice President's Report**

33 Vice President Ibanez reported he was asked to contribute to the Sage
34 Encyclopedia of Filipina /x/o American studies which would be coming out soon.
35 Ibanez continued to work part-time at the Pasadena City College History of Asian

1 Pacific Americans. Ibanez had been encouraging other librarians to apply for his
2 position on the Board because of his future retirement.

3 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

4 State Librarian Lucas reported the Governor Newsom issued a proclamation
5 for National Library Week which recognized how much libraries had done and
6 continued to do for all Californians. It stated "There are 1,128 libraries in California,
7 each one as unique and diverse as the community it served. They aren't just
8 buildings they are closers of the opportunity gap libraries are the hearts of our
9 communities and help Californians of all ages and backgrounds realize their fullest
10 potential." Lucas also detailed the services the proclamation touched on,
11 including providing books, research databases, wi-fi hot spots, job training, online
12 paths to high diplomas, early learning for infants and toddlers, virtual reality
13 stations, naturalization services, maker spaces, and biotech labs.

14 The proclamation also touched on how libraries were able to morph their
15 services and programs from in-person to virtual during the pandemic and they
16 value those virtual services provided to social distancing Californians.
17 Additionally, the proclamation talked about the pandemic related relief efforts
18 libraries provided such as providing health information, protective equipment,
19 and lunches. Lucas pointed out that the National Library Week proclamation was
20 different from the traditional and was nice to see.

21 State Librarian Lucas reported the board sent a letter to the Governor on
22 February 26, 2021, that requested the restoration of the \$1.75 million reduction in
23 the funds administered under the California Library Services Act. The letter also
24 sought to expedite \$800,000 for Lunch at the Library prior to the July 1 budget
25 deadline to get the money in time to feed kids that summer. Lunch at the Library
26 was a part of the package of budget-related issues that would be expedited
27 ahead of the Governor's May revision. Lucas applauded the board's efforts in
28 trying to make that happen.

29 State Librarian Lucas was impressed by the creativity and perseverance of
30 libraries during the pandemic. Lucas stated meetings were happening with
31 Library Directors every couple of weeks and the challenge reported was that
32 libraries had the same or less money because of pandemic budget cuts. For
33 about a year those funds were focused only on online services but libraries were
34 starting to have to split those finite funds between online and in-person services.

35 Around the state there were challenges with administering wi-fi hotspot and
36 Chromebook lending programs, specifically with helping people use the
37 technology. These services were a priority for the Newsom administration and
38 federal money was earmarked under the Cares Act. Chris Durr, a Library Programs

1 Consultant for the California State Library, had done some work with the
2 Community Navigator Model that was used for healthcare and immigrant
3 services, to help people understand the technology.

4 The State Library was also a new member of the State Broadband Council
5 and helped create an action plan in December. The Broadband Action Plan
6 mentioned libraries 34 times, the highest mention of libraries in a state document
7 in the past quarter century, and Lucas felt it was a recognition of the role libraries
8 played connecting communities and being a trusted place where people could
9 go.

10 State Librarian Lucas reported the broadband initiative was in the process of
11 working on a collaboration to coordinate the connection of libraries, schools, and
12 healthcare to leverage federal discounts. Laura Sasaki, the Broadband Program
13 Manager and State E-rate Coordinator at the State Library, was working with the
14 K-12 broadband team. Sasaki was working on bundling together projects so
15 bidders could receive one or two discounts. The state would put in a ten percent
16 (10%) matching fund for additional discounts. By bundling together projects we
17 were able to get successful bidders and in Southern Humboldt (Ferndale) and
18 Garberville were going to get connected, and Clarksburg would use the same
19 strategy connecting the library and high school. 900 of 1128 libraries had been
20 connected and what's left were primarily the harder more challenging ones to
21 connect.

22 Finally, State Librarian Lucas reported the State Library was a member of the
23 California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names and the Newsom
24 administration has put an emphasis on that entity. It was working in conjunction
25 with the U.S. Geological Survey, with the intent to take racist or inappropriate
26 place names and recommend changes. The State Library had been tasked with
27 doing some of the research. Lucas stated it was a privilege to be apart the
28 process.

29 President Bernardo stated we would probably be getting some American
30 Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) money through the Institute of Museum and Library
31 Science (IMLS). State Librarian Lucas stated there was \$179 million in ARPA funds
32 for libraries nationally and a little over \$10 million would come to California.
33 Bernardo asked if that amount was on top of what California normally got. Lucas
34 stated it was and explained the allocations to states were determined differently
35 because the funding was not a part of the regular budget process. The 50 states
36 received \$100 million and each received \$2 million by law. The remainder was
37 parceled out on a per capita basis, and we received \$2 million plus 11% of \$79
38 million, which came to \$10 million. If the funding had been on a per capita basis,
39 under the normal Federal Government rules it would have been closer to \$20

1 million. The American Rescue Plan and the CARES Act money had similar priorities
2 which are geared towards recovery and improving connectivity. We are also
3 looking for ways to partner with museums.

4 Member Murguia asked what programs might be funded with the new federal
5 funds. Lucas replied that the CARES money was spent. The \$10 million had not
6 arrived from the American Rescue Plan and would arrive around Tax Day. The
7 annual appropriation would not show up until July 1, 2021. Lucas stated that a
8 variety of proposals were being evaluated. The Federal Government had various
9 ways they wanted states to use COVID related money, which was not necessarily
10 restrictive, but it was narrower than the normal budget allocation.

11 **Zip Books Grant Program**

12 Deputy State Librarian Rebecca Wendt reported the Zip Books program
13 continued to function during the pandemic and had been welcomed by library
14 patrons. The money currently allocated to the program would be expended at
15 the end of the fiscal year. The program had been a lifeline for people during the
16 pandemic.

17 **Value of Libraries**

18 Natalie Cole reported the project was impacted by the pandemic and
19 therefore not fully completed. We had completed a set of information sheets
20 which were with the designer and the web pages had been prepared.
21 Everything drew on the refereed reported we published a few months ago and
22 was based on board-funded research. Cole acknowledged State Librarian Lucas
23 and Jamie Ramos for their collaborative effort to complete the webpages and
24 information sheets.

25 Cole reported that the training sessions had been completed online as
26 requested by the board and each participant received a two-part training
27 session, where they heard about how to demonstrate their library's value and how
28 to tell their stories. Great evaluations were received so they were hoping to do
29 more trainings in that area if they are able.

30 Member Williams asked if there was going to be a PR rollout across the state
31 with things like memes, social media, and bus signs. Cole answered that general
32 library promotion was not permitted under LSTA funding. Funds could be used to
33 raise awareness of individual projects but not to promote the value of libraries in
34 general. Cole stated they would work with the Communications team to promote
35 the information, but we had to ensure federal funding was not used.

36 President Bernardo asked if the training sessions were recorded, and if so,
37 would they be posted on the website. Cole said they were not because they

1 were interactive working trainings but that the State Library did have it California
2 Libraries Learn professional development academy managed by Bev
3 Schwartzberg, a Library Programs Consultant. Cole went on to say the State
4 Library had to be careful with the use of federal funds and advocacy but that
5 they did want to do more training in that area and put it online for as many people
6 as possible. Bernardo asked if there was a date that it would be released. Cole
7 stated there was not set date yet due to the multiple obstacles the project had
8 faced.

9 Member Williams asked if, once posted, the materials were available for library
10 systems, librarians, and others to take and use to promote or advocate. Cole said
11 yes, the information sheets could be accessed as standalone items or used as a
12 full report. Stakeholders could also quote or use pieces of information from the
13 materials and have references to cite. There were multiple ways libraries could
14 use the project. Cole gave credit to the State Data Coordinator, Meg DePriest,
15 who had been providing library data.

16 Member Williams asked if the information could be used as tool kit and Cole
17 responded yes. Bernardo asked if they were working with the State Library
18 statistics, and if the data would be kept current. Cole replied that Meg DePriest
19 collected public library survey data every year and libraries or anyone could
20 access data through the portal. The Value of Libraries pages included the high-
21 level numbers.

22 **Link +Grant Program**

23 State Librarian Lucas reported that the board had a detailed report on Link+
24 at the last meeting. NorthNet had provided an infographic (Exhibit A) that
25 showed the funding distribution, and the completion of the project was sufficient.
26 Member Williams commented that the Link+ program was fantastic.

27 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

28 **Library Services Act Preliminary Budget for FY 21021-2022**

29 President Bernardo stated the Board was considering the 2021/2022
30 preliminary budget and asked State Librarian Lucas was that correct. Lucas
31 stated we are looking at 2021/2022 and the confusion is that the content is rooted
32 in last year's budget language. It was reduced last year. The Board is acting on
33 the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 2021. Bernardo stated the funding
34 was the same as last year for the California Library Services Act, which was \$1.88
35 million. They had also included \$1 million ongoing for Zip Books which she thought
36 was new.

1 State Librarian Lucas confirmed the ongoing aspect of Zip Books, starting July
2 1, was new.

3 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried***
4 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts,***
5 ***contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2021-2022***
6 ***CLSA budget as directed in the proposed 2020-2021 budget, totaling***
7 ***\$1,880,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.***

8 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously***
9 ***that the California Library Services Board approves approve the \$1***
10 ***million allocated in the 2021-2022 budget to invest in the Zip Books***
11 ***program to ensure timely and cost-effective access to information in***
12 ***California's hard-to-reach and underserved communities.***

13 **Report Requirement Discussion**

14 President Bernardo asked if systems required an extension beyond the June 3,
15 2021 deadline for the Plans of Service submittal due to COVID-19. State Librarian
16 Lucas said there had been some concern expressed about the ability to pull
17 together the information needed for the Plans of Services because of delays
18 relating to the pandemic. Lucas said Carol Frost stated earlier the Plans of Service
19 were due on the 3rd and there was a two-week window needed to gather
20 signatures after the document was submitted. An extension would truncate the
21 State Library's review time if the next board meeting was scheduled at the end of
22 August or September but from a staff perspective offering systems more time was
23 not a big discombobulation. Several Board members asked for clarification on if
24 the systems needed more time and how much they might need.

25 Suzanne Olawski, Chair of the North Net Library System, stated they did not
26 need additional time to gathering the information. Diane Bednarski, Southern
27 California Library Cooperative (SCLC), stated SCLC would provide administrative
28 services for the cooperatives Santiago, 49-99, Serra, and Inland, and did not need
29 an extension to complete plans of service. Bednarski said she would like the state
30 library and staff to have the appropriate amount of time to review and come
31 back with questions. Brad McCulley, Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) President,
32 stated they appreciated the state library looking out for them, and PLP stood
33 ready to provide the statistics on time. Glynis Fitzgerald, Black Gold Cooperative
34 Library System, stated they were prepared to meet the deadline as well.

35 Several Members commented that it seemed like no extension was needed.
36 Vice President Ibanez stated if somebody needed a little more time that could
37 be considered as needed. President Bernardo suggested giving that to staff to
38 address we will get give that to staff to address and State Librarian Lucas stated
39 staff would be happy to do that.

1 **RESOURCE SHARING**

2 **California Library Services Act System Level Programs**

3 State Librarian stated the system's annual reports were detailed and shared
4 he was impressed, as always, by the way the different systems met the specific
5 needs of the areas they served. Each of the reports from the different systems
6 had similarities, but there were also different programs that catered to specific
7 needs of their membership. President Bernardo thanked the systems for the
8 annual reports.

9 **Consolidation and Affiliations**

10 State Librarian Lucas reported that the board received a letter from the
11 Redwood City Library Director Derek Wolfgram on February 25, 2021, regarding a
12 change in affiliation for the Fair Oaks Branch Library from Redwood City Library to
13 San Mateo County Libraries. No board action was required because the local
14 cooperative and regional system status was unaffected by the change in
15 operational responsibility. A subsequent letter from the Pacific Library Partnership
16 echoed the statements in Redwood's City letter.

17 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

18 State Librarian Lucas reported some of the legislative update items had
19 already been discussed. He stated that Natalie Cole could provide specifics on
20 the Cares Act funding. A large chunk was used to provide online summer reading
21 programs for all libraries and about a third was used to provide online job search
22 and job training. The bulk of the remainder went into a program for wi-fi hotspots
23 and Chromebook checkouts. California was getting another \$10 million from the
24 American Rescue Plan which had similar priorities in terms of one-time funding
25 geared towards aiding recovery from the pandemic. There were also specific
26 things outlined which repeat the broadband and community connectivity goals
27 that were in the Cares Act.

28 On the federal level there were two identical bills, one in the House and one
29 in the Senate, called the Build America's Library Act and each contained \$5
30 billion nationwide, and targeted marginalized communities and lesser resourced
31 communities. The program would pay for the renovation, rebuilding, and
32 rehabilitation of aging library faculties and the American Library Association
33 estimated California's share would be \$500 million. The estimated need for our
34 1128 libraries was \$5 billion and now was probably closer to \$6 billion because the
35 survey used was four years old and the need has likely increased.

36 Lucas stated it was a good start but was not enough to move the needle in
37 terms of need. To bring one bathroom up to ADA compliance in an urban or

1 suburban area in California could cost \$250,000. However, if those measures
2 passed, there was nothing preventing the state from augmenting the federal
3 money; so, if the federal government sent \$500 billion, could we add \$100 million
4 dollars in state money.

5 For the bills to pass they would have to become part of the President's
6 infrastructure package and that would have to pass all the Republican
7 opposition. From California's perspective \$10 billion nationwide would be better,
8 but it's \$5 billion and we would get \$500 million. Member Murguia asked is there
9 any serious effort to move it into infrastructure. Lucas stated its success was
10 dependent upon it being added to the infrastructure package, but he did not
11 know if that would happen. Murguia stated since the Governor mentioned
12 libraries 34 times for broadband that might pose a unique opportunity and she
13 wondered what the Board could do. Lucas stated that Speaker Pelosi was aware
14 of what would most benefit California and had played a big role in getting that.
15 Including the \$200 million in the American Rescue Plan that was not debated at
16 the end of the process; California owed her a great deal.

17 State Librarian Lucas reported the other issue pending was how much money
18 should the Institute for Museum and Library Services get for grants to states. So,
19 you need to increase it from \$180 million to at least \$206 million because if it
20 increased to \$206 million it raised the minimum level that every state got from
21 \$680,000 to \$1 million. At \$206 million the increase wouldn't come at our expense
22 and the expense of larger states like Texas and New York. The speaker's staff was
23 aware that appropriations stopped at \$ 206 million, and it doesn't hurt California,
24 but it doesn't help us. The state's lobby office in Washington D.C was also aware
25 of these things.

26 State Librarian Lucas pointed out today was the ALA Virtual Advocacy Day.
27 Member Murguia noted the ADA angle was interesting and seemed like an
28 opportunity to bring construction dollars back to California, since there was a big
29 push by President Biden to make states whole in terms of ADA compliance and
30 other programs with schools. Lucas stated there were other similar opportunities,
31 for example, to make California's libraries, half of which are 40 years of age or
32 older, energy efficient. He stated there were all kinds of priorities.

33 State Librarian Lucas reported the State Library was a sponsor and the
34 California Library Association supported a resolution by Assembly Member Evan
35 Low, which encouraged local libraries to stop charging late fees. This was an
36 equity issue. Fines were an easily removable barrier to the use of library materials.
37 Meg DePriest had done a lot of work around this in California and Colorado. He
38 stated that a lot of jurisdictions' experiences was that it could cost more to try and
39 get the money back and it seemed like jurisdictions were naturally moving award

1 from fines. The resolution encouraged cities and counties to think about the
2 factors differently and consider getting rid of the fees. It was the State Library's
3 intent to follow up with an information package for local decision makers that's
4 related to the resolution.

5 Lucas stated the main revision of the budget was coming out in the middle of
6 May and the State Library had various proposals at the Department of Finance.
7 Bernardo asked if the budget numbers for libraries might go up, since the state
8 had a lot of money. Lucas stated the state had double digit billions of dollars but
9 was uneasy about committing ongoing money, so the State Library had focused
10 its requests with that in mind.

11 **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS FY 2021-2022**

12 President Bernardo stated the Board had discussions on digitization and asked
13 if it was always on our plate or a new consideration for the State Library. State
14 Librarian Lucas said the State Library had made investments in digitization. Some
15 examples were California Revealed, which worked with local cultural heritage
16 institutions. The State Library funded the California Digital Newspaper Project
17 which digitized newspapers at the University of California at Riverside. We also
18 had a new program called digital concierge which worked with other state
19 agencies. Lucas reported the State Library was creating an oral history landing
20 page so that all the different entities that created oral histories could put samples
21 of their work on the page and help people find what they were looking for. Lucas
22 said Diane Bednarski could speak about the Digital Lab project that SCLC funded.

23 Lucas stated there was a tremendous digital need that we could not meet
24 due to the library's bandwidth. If we all made digital copies of our collections,
25 we could make one digital collection that contained the universe of our print
26 materials. There were all kinds of opportunities. For example, Cal Fire had satellite
27 information from the US Forestry Service satellite and you could create a wildfire
28 predictive based on historical records and what the weather says. There were all
29 kinds of opportunities, but also challenges. You could treat a book badly and it
30 would still survive, but if you mixed up the zeros and ones on a digital image it was
31 gone forever.

32 Lucas stated, in terms of the Board investing its money, or encouraging the
33 State to do more, there was plenty opportunity. Anne Neville who used to run the
34 California Research Bureau was now the top deputy at the Governor's Office of
35 Digital Innovation and the State Library looked forward to working with her and
36 that agency.

37 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

1 There was no public comment brought forward.

2 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

3 President Bernardo asked Member Maghsoudi if they had begun her library's
4 reconstruction project. Maghsoudi said yes, they were starting demolition next
5 week and the plan is to reopen in March 2022. Bernardo asked where they were
6 located during the process and Maghsoudi reported they were temporarily in City
7 Hall. Maghsoudi thanked the State, County Board of Supervisors, the City, and
8 Foundation and said it would be a wonderful project.

9 **OLD BUSINESS**

10 There was no old business brought forward.

11 **AGENDA BUILDING**

12 President Bernardo stated they should add considering whether the
13 distribution of funds to the systems should be one time, bi-annually or
14 semiannually.

15 Member Williams stated the Board could have a role in helping to promote
16 advocacy information, maybe in the form of letters for actions. Bernardo clarified
17 if she meant the Board as a group or individual board members and Williams said
18 as a Board. President Bernardo stated we would want it to be a board consensus
19 we would want to have that discussion and can only do that in a public forum,
20 unless it's something we've already discussed and have agreed to. President
21 Bernardo mentioned the bill that lowered the threshold for bonds and noted even
22 though the board may have taken action before, it might have a different
23 opinion at this time and the board would need to have consensus on these issues
24 to issue a letter. Lucas said he could check on the status of the bill and get back.
25 Member Williams said as specific items emerged, she imaged the board would
26 do what they had done in the past, bring specific items before the board at
27 meetings. Bernardo noted that as individuals, board members were welcome to
28 support matters specific to their jurisdiction or nationwide. Members Williams said
29 the board might think how it could leverage the Value of Libraries information in
30 any given situation.

31 Member Murguia stated that at the next meeting the Board would have room
32 to discuss the potential for the next state budget, advocating positions and
33 increasing funding, prior to the next budget coming out in January. Bernardo
34 agreed and stated the Board had been doing that over the last few years and it
35 that brought the Board to the Department of Finance in the Governor's office for
36 consideration.

1 President Bernardo congratulated Redwood City Public Library as a finalist in
2 the 2021 IMLS National Medal for Museum and Library Services and suggested
3 that board members follow the State Library on Facebook.

4 **ADJOURNMENT**

5 President Bernardo called for the adjournment of the California Library Services
6 Board meeting at 1:39 PM.

7

