

1 *Approved March 18, 2014*

2
3
4 California Library Services Board Meeting
5 August 22, 2013

6
7 California State Library
8 900 N Street, Room 501
9 Sacramento, California

10
11
12 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

13 President Anne Bernardo convened the California Library Services Board meeting on August
14 22, 2013 at 9:30 a.m., and welcomed Board members, CSL staff and audience members to
15 Sacramento and called for introductions.

16 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Tyrone Cannon, Victoria Fong, Jane F.
17 Lowenthal, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Elizabeth Murguia, and Judy Zollman.

18 **Not Present:** Conchita Battle.

19 **California State Library Staff Present:** Acting State Librarian Gerry Maginnity, Sandy
20 Habbestad, Rush Brandis, Janet Coles, Suzanne Flint, Darla Gunning, Susan Hanks, Carla Lehn
21 and Lena Pham.

22
23 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

24 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the*
25 *California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the August 22, 2013*
26 *meeting as presented.*

27
28 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

29 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the*
30 *California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the March 1, 2013*
31 *meeting as presented.*

32
33 **ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2014**

34 President Bernardo called on Member Cannon to report the slate of Board officers for 2014.
35 After stating the nominees, he asked to discuss the election process after the vote. The following
36 actions were taken by the Board.

37 *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Cannon) and carried unanimously*
38 *that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as*
39 *President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2014.*

1 *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Cannon) and carried unanimously*
2 *that the California Library Services Board elects Elizabeth Murguia as Vice-*
3 *President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2014.*
4

5 Cannon wanted to adjust the current election process, so that the Vice President immediately
6 moved into the President's position once the latter's year of service expired. Then the Board only
7 would need to approve a new Vice President. In his experience, this was standard practice. The
8 current practice of selecting two new officers each year interrupted the continuity of the Board,
9 in his opinion. In response to Member Lowenthal's question, Cannon answered that he and
10 Maghsoudi were on it the committee. Lowenthal then asked why only two members. Habbestad
11 explained that if there were more than two on a committee, the discussion would have to be
12 opened up as a public meeting. President Bernardo stated that they would take Cannon's
13 recommendation under advisement. Lowenthal asked what the committee was looking for in a
14 candidate. Cannon replied that he was looking at the overall composition of the Board, who the
15 candidate was representing, and someone with Board experience. He pointed out that they had
16 not been a full Board for many years, and that his term had long since expired.

17
18 **BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2014**

19 President Bernardo asked if the teleconference scheduled for March 13th was acceptable to
20 members. Maghsoudi stated this date was in conflict with Public Library Association week.
21 Habbestad agreed to provide the Board with another Doodle survey for a date in February or
22 March. The August Board meeting date was still undecided because of insufficient responses.
23 Habbestad will provide the Board with another Doodle survey in January. Lowenthal pointed out
24 that the Legislature would be in recess during August. As August was not a good time for
25 Member Battle or Member Cannon, Habbestad would look at September dates and survey the
26 Board.

27
28 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

29 **Board President's Report**

30 President Bernardo continued to serve as the Board's liaison to the California Library
31 Association's (CLA) Legislative and Advocacy Committee. She attended most of the meetings
32 by conference call and had been forwarding CLA messages to the Board. She encouraged
33 members to participate in the library listserv CALIX. She explained it kept her in touch with the

1 various issues facing public libraries. She also continued to serve as a member of the Legislative
2 Committee for the California Council of County Law Librarians. Various matters were brought
3 up this year, with the Legislature and the Administrative Office of the courts having arrived at
4 agreement that county law libraries had reached a fiscal plateau. They were looking at setting up
5 a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing this fall to address those concerns, and bring testimony to
6 the Legislature. She also served this past year as the Council's Chairman of their Bylaws and
7 Governance Committee, and on the Bylaws Committee of the Heartland Regional Library
8 Network, the only network still active in what was formerly known as the Library of California.
9 She was excited to continue service to her region at the Heartland Network. She attended the
10 Northern California Association of Law Libraries' Spring Institute in Sacramento this year.
11 Unfortunately, she was unable to attend the National Association meeting, the Special Libraries
12 Association meeting, or CLA Conference in San Jose. However, she was able to attend several of
13 their activities and programs via live streaming. She accepted a recent appointment as Law
14 Library Liaison to the State Bar's Executive Committee of Law Practice Management and
15 Technology Committee. The Committee works to improve the quality of law practice through
16 effective management techniques and technology. She would assume the position when the State
17 Bar met in October. Her own law library was opening an e-branch in a new courthouse in
18 Porterville, about forty miles distant, sharing space with the court's self-help resource center.
19 The ribbon cutting would be on October 7th. She looked forward to what promised to be a good
20 partnership. As a personal note, her local Bar Association awarded her the 2013 Liberty Bell
21 Award, an honor designated for a non-attorney who had promoted better understanding of the
22 rule of law, stimulated a sense of civic responsibility or contributed to good government in the
23 community. Their theme this year was "Realizing the Dream: Equality for All."

24

25 **Board Vice President's Report**

26 Vice President Maghsoudi wished to remind the Board that the annual CLA Conference, this
27 year entitled *Make Some Noise*, was in November in Long Beach. Many great programs were
28 lined up and she hoped to see members there. Since the last time the Board met, she had opened
29 Whittier Public Library's beautifully renovated and expanded branch library. Circulation had
30 gone through the roof, with 5,000 registrations this year, between adults and children. The
31 summer reading program concluded with a big party at a local park, with 2,400 people attending
32 and 2,000 hot dogs served. Maghsoudi had just finished her term as Southern California Library

1 Cooperative (SCLC) Chair. She was now involved in the recruitment of a replacement for
2 Rosario Garza, the SCLC executive director.

3 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

4 Acting State Librarian of California, Gerald Maginnity, gave the following report:

5 **State Library Organization**

6 Maginnity began by saying that for the second consecutive year, the state had a budget on
7 time. The effects of the sequestration on what was basically a rollover budget was being watched
8 very carefully. As Washington was saying that sequestration would probably happen again, there
9 were big concerns about our Braille and Talking Book operation, which was entirely funded with
10 LSTA money. CSL was working with the Governor's office to keep them abreast of
11 developments.

12 On a more positive note, this year CSL was able to fill some vacancies to bolster Library
13 Development Services. It had been hit hard, with seven positions lost in recent years. The
14 remaining staff had really stepped up to keep LSTA funds moving and the CLSA program going
15 forward, but the arrival of new staff was most welcome.

16 The biggest project at CSL right now was the move back into the wonderfully restored
17 Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building. The Board would be given a tour today to see the
18 many improvements and to hear about the meticulous operation that accomplished them.
19 Nineteen-sixties air-duct installations and blockage were removed from the original light-wells,
20 beautifully restoring natural light to the interior of the building. The Third District Court of
21 Appeal had priority to return to the building and was now up and running. After numerous
22 delays, the Library was almost halfway through moving 4 million volumes from a temporary
23 warehouse in West Sacramento. The anticipated opening date was sometime in January. Cannon
24 expressed concern that the opening celebration would conflict with ALA Midwinter in mid-
25 January. Maginnity replied that the planning committee was aware of that and trying to avoid a
26 conflict. CSL was working with the California Library Foundation, who had graciously offered
27 to provide some funding for the event. The plan was for an opening ceremony, reintroducing the
28 building, followed by a week of events. The Board would be invited to the opening.

29 In April, Maginnity visited each of the five libraries serving Imperial County. They had been
30 seriously impacted by the recession, with their area having one of the highest unemployment
31 rates in California. But these libraries were absolutely incredible. Beginning in Calexico,
32 Director Connie Barrington shuttled him around all of a long day, going to Imperial City,

1 Brawley, Imperial County, and El Centro. The latter was closed two years ago due to earthquake
2 damage, but they rented an old Montgomery Wards building. The Imperial County libraries
3 valued their membership, and working together cooperatively through the Serra Cooperative
4 Library System. They were very appreciative of CSL's and this Board's efforts on their behalf.

5 The following day Maginnity visited San Diego, where he was given a tour of the soon-to-be
6 completed downtown library. They had received \$20 million in State Bond Act money to
7 complete their building project, which was expected to open in September. One floor would hold
8 a charter high school, which will be a unique experiment for a library. There would be some
9 interesting dynamics with the baseball stadium directly across the street.

10 The Public Library Directors Forum was held in March and worked with Michael Margolis
11 to continue the "Telling Your Library Story" project.

12 On May 7th and 8th, Maginnity attended ALA National Legislative Day in Washington D.C.,
13 where he visited several legislators. One of the key issues for Leg Day was LSTA, and although
14 he did not speak with Senator Nancy Pelosi, he did talk with one of her representatives about the
15 effects of sequestration. Also, he met Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez from Southern
16 California, and spoke with her about sequestration, as well. She told him that Congress needed to
17 hear their stories, as members were frustrated by the horrible sequestration process.

18 The National Medal for Museum and Library Service Award Ceremony was held at the
19 White House on May 8th, with First Lady Michelle Obama presenting. One of this year's ten
20 awards had gone to one of California's outstanding libraries, Rancho Cucamonga Public Library.
21 Another award went to a second California institution, the Discovery Science Center and
22 Museum in Santa Ana. Maginnity enjoyed being a part of this special event.

23 Maginnity reported on the Broadband Project. In a bill that was passed in the current budget,
24 the State Librarian was to write a report on current connectivity public libraries. He sent out an
25 announcement on July 30th that CSL was currently gathering data from all the public libraries in
26 the state. This massive project, fitting in with CSL's five-year plan for LSTA, was designed to
27 improve the broadband capacity of public libraries. The project was dominating most of his time;
28 the aim was to have the report to the Legislature by October 1st. Murguia asked whether the
29 report would include the cost amount. Maginnity replied that it would include some of the
30 current costs, and some estimates. The Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in
31 California (CENIC), CSL's broadband partner, would be looking at how libraries could be
32 connected and at some of the costs associated with that. Originally, \$5 million in state funding

1 would pay for all California public libraries to be connected by CENIC. Murguia asked for
2 clarification. Maginnity said the \$5 million would pay for access. But, if a library needed a new
3 router, for example, that would be an additional cost. Questions of savings were also being
4 considered. Lowenthal asked if the Board could see an advance copy of the report to the
5 Legislature. Maginnity replied that as part of the budget process, the report would remain
6 confidential until he released it.

7 Fong asked whether libraries would sign up with the California Research and Education
8 Network (CalREN). Maginnity replied that CENIC oversaw CalREN as part of their service. If
9 funding was in place, libraries capable of connecting could do so. Fong asked if most of the extra
10 cost would come from local funds. Maginnity replied that one plan would be to provide funding
11 to help libraries connect, with legislation going through the California Library Services Act. That
12 stage had not yet been reached, but one of CENIC's estimates was a \$2 million cost per year for
13 five years. There would be a beginning and an ending to the cycle, but each year payment for the
14 connections would still have to be made. Bernardo found one of the webinars very informative.
15 Impressed by the directors' survey, she appreciated all the wonderful collected data made
16 available. Maginnity pointed out that CSL had a resource page on its website, where all the
17 webinars were recorded. Lowenthal asked how many libraries had responded to the survey,
18 Maginnity replied that it was still out there, with the deadline of August 30th. One of the
19 strengths of the project was that help-desk assistance had been made available for questions and
20 problems. After the deadline, these consultants would be contacting the libraries that did not
21 respond, or those who submitted incomplete information. The goal was to conclude data-
22 collection by mid-September, then move on to create the report. President Bernardo thanked
23 CLA and the lobbyists, the Dillons, for spreading the word about the importance of connectivity
24 to libraries. Legislators had grasped the importance of this Broadband Project and had tried until
25 the last minute to pass an augmentation. Fong added that it had become a budget issue this year,
26 so the goal was to get it into the following year's budget. To that end, the survey would be a big
27 help.

28 Maginnity announced the July 1st return of the Santiago Library System, which members
29 decided to disaffiliate from the larger SCLC. He also wished to personally recognize Rosario
30 Garza, soon to retire, and to go on public record to say what an incredible job she had done with
31 the cooperative efforts, not only for Southern California, but for the entire state.

1 Lowenthal, referring to an earlier comment by Maginnity, asked whether the Braille and
2 Talking Book Library budget was entirely funded by LSTA. He replied that it funded almost
3 one-hundred percent of the \$2 to \$2.5 million BTBL budget. President Bernardo thanked
4 Maginnity for his report.

5

6 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

7 **System Plans of Service**

8 Bernardo said there were three issues to discuss. Habbestad and Maginnity would introduce
9 the preliminary information needed to have the discussion.

10 **Consider System Population and Membership Figures for 2013/14**

11 Habbestad said there were a few changes this year, including Santa Monica Public Library,
12 which was now listed under unaffiliated libraries. The city council adopted a budget that
13 included a nonresident fee of \$25 per year, effective July 1st, making Santa Monica ineligible for
14 CLSA System membership. Documentation for this was provided in Exhibit B in the Board
15 packet. The Simi Valley Library withdrew from the Ventura County Library System in
16 December 2011. The city wanted more control of local facilities, and until this year it had
17 contracted with Ventura County to temporarily run the library until a permanent administrator
18 could take over. The city did not request System affiliation for this year, so they would remain an
19 independent library jurisdiction until they chose to join a cooperative. They were included on the
20 list as an unaffiliated public library. In July the State Library was notified of the change of
21 boundaries for Lassen County. As background, Lassen County closed its libraries in 1994.
22 However, at the same time the Susanville District Library became an independent library
23 jurisdiction for its own residents. As for the residents of the unincorporated area in Lassen
24 County, the State Library became their home library. Then, in September 2006, Susanville
25 District Library annexed the unincorporated area of Lassen County and renamed the district the
26 Lassen Library District, with the intent of providing services to the entire county as a special
27 district, which they have done until now. In June 2013, in a local decision, the district boundaries
28 reverted to what they were prior to the 2006 action. The State Library was again the home library
29 of the residents of the unincorporated area of Lassen County. The population change, for
30 purposes of CLSA funding allocation to NorthNet, would go into effect in the 2014/15 fiscal
31 year, since the State Librarian had already certified 2013 population figures prior to this decision.

32 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
33 *California Library Services Board approves the System Population and*

1 *Membership figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the fiscal year*
2 *2013/14.*
3

4 **Consider 2013/14 CLSA System Plans of Service**

5 Habbestad said System Plans of Service were received from each of the nine cooperative
6 systems. She provided everyone with a replacement document for Exhibit D, which summarized
7 the total baseline budget for the Communications and Delivery Program and the goals for using
8 state funds in fiscal year 2013/14. It also provided how non-CLSA funds were being used to
9 support C&D. Exhibit E provided the estimated workloads for the delivery service, and the
10 vehicles used to transport materials to each member library; and then Exhibit F gave a summary
11 of the demographics of each System. She reminded the Board that they had approved the CLSA
12 budget allocation at the March 1st meeting, so that partial payments could be made to Systems
13 upon the passage of the state budget act. All nine Systems had submitted forms to claim the first
14 half of their total allocations. The remainder would be released in September after System
15 Annual Reports were received, showing how all the funds from the prior fiscal year 2012/13 had
16 been expended.

17 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the*
18 *California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Plans of Service for*
19 *the nine Cooperative Library Systems, submitted for fiscal year 2013/14.*
20

21 **Consider New Formula for System Funding Allocation**

22 Habbestad said that staff recommended the Board adopt a new formula for the distribution of
23 CLSA funds that took into account the current formula factors, which were the number of
24 members in each System, the populations served, and the round-trip miles to each public library
25 headquarters in the System. Exhibit G displayed just three of the options calculated for this new
26 formula. All others left very large increases or decreases in most of the Systems, and were not
27 considered. The proposed formula basically combined all factors from the Reference and
28 Communications and Delivery allocations formula. In formula option number one, each System
29 would receive 30% of the total appropriation, or \$37,500 equally, for each of the nine Systems,
30 and 45% of the total would factor in the combined membership and population. Then, the
31 remaining 25% of the total would factor in the combined membership and the round trip miles in
32 the System's service area. It was recommended that the Board continue the "hold harmless"
33 policy that had been adopted in 2008, which allowed two or more Systems to consolidate and
34 retain the same level of base funding. It was also being recommended that the new formula be

1 calculated beginning the fiscal year 2014/15, since Plans of Service for the current year had been
2 approved and budgets were already in place. President Bernardo asked for any comments or
3 questions.

4 Fong asked to clarify the difference between option one. Habbestad said that for option one,
5 although one System's budget will increase by \$3,985 and another System's budget will decrease
6 by \$4,792, the percentage difference for all Systems was an average of 0.15%. This was the best
7 option for all Systems. Fong then asked about the minus 3 in option one. Habbestad said the
8 minus 3 members was placed in the calculation and approved by the Board as a way to equitably
9 distribute funds so that a System with only three member libraries would not receive a base
10 allocation of the same amount as a System with 14 member libraries. For each System three
11 members were subtracted from their total membership. Maginnity said these formulas show the
12 State Library's dilemma: if population is emphasized, then funding shifts to Systems with the
13 highest population. If geography is emphasized, Systems like NorthNet were wide open, so they
14 got a lot of the funding. For some time, they had been struggling to create a balance that makes
15 sense, but does not harm any System to a significant degree. Bernardo asked if the System
16 coordinators had been told. Habbestad replied that they had and were on board with it.

17 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Maghsoudi) and carried that the California Library*
18 *Services Board approves a new formula allocation for CLSA Cooperative Library*
19 *Systems, beginning FY 2014/15, that distributes the total appropriation, as follows:*
20 *30% awarded on the basis of the first three members of each System, equally; 45%*
21 *for each System's combined portion of the total state population and System*
22 *membership, excluding the first three members per System; and 25% for each*
23 *System's combined portion of membership and round-trip mileage of the Systems*
24 *service area. It was further approved that the Board continue the "hold harmless"*
25 *policy which allows two or more cooperative Systems to consolidate and retain the*
26 *same level of base funding.*
27

28 **RESOURCE SHARING**

29 **Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs**

30 Habbestad would be covering two topics: 1) Update on transaction levels for FY 2012/13, and
31 2) consideration of a new reporting process. Habbestad began by saying that this was the third
32 year without state funding for the TBR program. However, CLSA interlibrary loan and direct
33 loan statistics had been collected on a quarterly basis through fiscal year 2012/13. CSL would
34 like to change this requirement by requesting that public libraries submit nonresident loan data
35 on an annual basis. Exhibit A was the new form being proposed, called a Nonresident Lending
36 Report, removing all reference to claim forms. We would continue to provide the Board with

1 annual statistics for interlibrary loans, but for the direct loan program we would only be able to
2 report on the total number of direct loans to nonresidents. Because the TBR database was
3 incompatible with our new Windows platform, we would not be able to report the net-imbalance
4 loans, just the total loans for each jurisdiction. Exhibit B was the complete history of the activity
5 to date. Lowenthal asked how it would impact staff time. Habbestad answered that with
6 Integrated Library Systems (ILS), public libraries should be able to pull out annual data just as
7 easily as quarterly data. CSL staff would benefit by completing the process once instead of four
8 times each year. Bernardo asked for comments, then put a motion on the floor.

9
10 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Cannon) and carried unanimously that the*
11 *California Library Services Board adopts an annual process for reporting*
12 *Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan transactions, beginning in FY 2013/14.*

13 14 **Board Focus 2013/14**

15 President Bernardo introduced several topics for discussion in an attempt to get ideas and
16 comments from Board members.

17 **State Board Name**

18 President Bernardo stated that Habbestad had provided a timeline for the discussion of the
19 Board name, which began in 1998, when funding for the LoC was first passed to its elimination
20 in 2003. Bernardo wished to begin with the year 2009, when State Librarian Stacey Aldrich
21 pointed out by email to Board members, a conflict in the law. The Legislative Council had been
22 reviewing the laws still in authority. At the same time, Aldrich notified the LoC Board that their
23 name would revert to *California Library Services Board*. The Board was also informed of the
24 name reversion at the August 2009 Board meeting, as corroborated in the meeting minutes. At
25 this point, Bernardo asked the Board for comments or discussion. However, Lowenthal requested
26 that another topic be discussed until Member McGinity could join the meeting, as it was a matter
27 of concern to him. Cannon then asked what purview the Board now had. Bernardo responded
28 that the former name was now the law. She asked whether any members were still interested in
29 going ahead with the name change. Murguia recalled that in the March meeting there had been
30 some suggestion that the Board itself would want to be known as the Library of California Board
31 again, with a recommendation to be brought forward from the Board requiring legislative action.
32 After having reviewed the materials, and reading the response from the library directors, she was
33 comfortable with the new CLSB name. Fong said she had been unaware of any Board member
34 being in on the discussions for all of the changes during 2011/12, as well as being unaware that

1 there had been any Board action designating Maghsoudi to represent the Board in those
2 discussions. Maghsoudi responded that there had not been any Board action. Fong said it would
3 have been nice to have a Board member as an official representative in the discussion. She asked
4 if CSL staff could inform the Board what actions would be required to effect a name change
5 back to LoC. In response, Maginnity said the law would have to be amended. There were two
6 options in doing so – either they could go through the Governor’s office to get an amendment, or
7 they could find a legislator that would sponsor the change. Cannon interjected that the Board
8 should be clear that they all agree. He did not have a problem with the *CLSB* name. If polled, he
9 did not think the entire Board felt a need to revisit the matter of the Board name. What was more
10 concerning to him than the Board’s name, was that the survey of library directors seemed to
11 indicate that they did not know what the Board does. Lowenthal asked about who responded to
12 the survey. Habbestad replied that 29 of the 184 public library directors responded, or about
13 16%. Lowenthal said there used to be a public relations committee, having once chaired it
14 herself. It seemed to her that people did not know what the Library of California was, what it did,
15 the value of what it did, the funding it needed and why it had never been fully funded. She
16 lamented that there were no longer a public relations committee, which could have helped people
17 to see the importance of LoC.

18 Lowenthal also wanted to address the issue of the Board name. She asked whether Bernardo
19 and Maghsoudi had attended the summit where the name had been discussed. Bernardo said she
20 had not been able to attend, but as part of the Legislative Advocacy Committee, had attended
21 discussions, and passed along information through emails. Lowenthal said that she had wanted to
22 take part in the discussions, but had been told that Bernardo and Maghsoudi would be the
23 Board’s representatives. Maginnity had told Lowenthal in an email that they would not be voting
24 on the name change. The problem she had with the name was the loss of cache and gravitas
25 when introducing herself to a legislator to lobby for more funds at the state capitol or in
26 Washington D.C. Her suggestion was a small name change, to something like CLSA Board, in
27 order to retain some of the gravitas of LoC Board. At this point in the discussion, Member
28 McGinity joined the meeting.

29 Cannon presumed the Legislature would be aware of a name change, so he did not understand
30 why cache would be lost. Lowenthal replied that most people were too busy to notice a change.
31 Maghsoudi asserted that the Board name did not matter. What mattered was the importance of

1 the message. She and Bernardo each stated that they had never had a problem communicating
2 with legislators, no matter what name they represented.

3 McGinity stated that earlier he may have misread how the name had been changed, and
4 although he did not think it should have been changed, the Board should not spend a lot of time
5 on it. If the Board preferred to leave it as it now was, he was fine with that. Fong agreed with
6 McGinity that LoC was a better name. She felt LoC covered more than CLSB, such as
7 electronics, e-libraries and “the cloud.” It was no longer just about physical libraries. LoC had
8 covered more than just public libraries and gave the Board a broader scope to be more visionary.
9 Maghsoudi said that she had been a part of a meeting with Aldrich in which revision of some of
10 the language of CLSA had been done. The changes resulted in SB1044. Murguia expressed her
11 understanding of SB1044, that the nine Board member appointments made by the Governor
12 reflected more than just public libraries. Fong said the original act provided for representation,
13 but not services. Soon, public libraries would not be the same and would have very different
14 needs. Even though the public would still be served, library services would be different. She felt
15 the old name gave them more flexibility, considering where libraries were headed. She went on
16 to speak about incorporating non-public libraries into the scope of what the Board did, not just
17 public libraries. Gunning added that the CLSA act itself did not provide services to academic or
18 other non-public libraries, only public libraries.

19 Maginnity interjected that the act before CLSA was called the Public Library Services Act, or
20 PLSA. It was renamed California Library Services Act, or CLSA, to allow the participation of
21 non-public libraries in the TBR program. That was an added concession. Now that TBR was no
22 longer available, there was no longer any benefit to the non-public libraries. LoC was to expand
23 CLSA even further. But that has now been repealed entirely. McGinity asked if it was possible to
24 add a request to the budget for a technical change to recover the LoC name. If so, he wanted to
25 make a motion to that effect. Maginnity repeated what McGinity had missed earlier in the
26 meeting, about going through the Governor’s office, or finding a legislator to sponsor a change
27 in the law. McGinity repeated that he would let the change go, if the Board did not wish to
28 pursue it. Lowenthal said she would agree to leave the name as it was, but would like to use a
29 slightly different name for Board members, when advocating for the library. Lowenthal then
30 asked how the Board would get the word out using CLSB, when they had been unable to do that
31 with the more effective LoC. Cannon said it was not up to the Board to articulate what that
32 meant. Maghsoudi said it was up to the Board members to explain their purpose and actions to

1 whomever they happened to be meeting. Cannon said he thought they were going in circles with
2 the discussion, and pointed out that Lowenthal had been working with the Legislature for years,
3 and that they should know who she was and what her interests were. They should be aware of the
4 Board and that it had gone through a name change. And even if they did not know, they were
5 obligated to read the legislation.

6 Bernardo asked whether there was any further discussion. Fong expressed that Library of
7 California had more cache when it had money. Although the LoC name would have provided
8 more room for creativity and future planning, now that their authority rested with the CLSA, she
9 had no problem emphasizing state library services. The Board should spend more time providing
10 better services and getting funding. Maginnity pointed out that when the Legislature was
11 addressed for funding, the California Library Services Act was referenced. That was how the
12 Legislature had known it. When going back and pulling funding codes, CLSA was what had
13 been found. When it got too amorphous, nobody understood what was being spoken about. The
14 term Library of California created a lot of confusion, with many identifying it with the State
15 Library. They would say the State Library's budget was okay, not understanding the difference
16 between CSL and LoC. The public libraries were focused on services they were getting, or not
17 getting. That was what they asked about. When library directors spoke with their legislators, they
18 talked about TBR, the cooperative library systems, and deliveries. They may not have known
19 what this Board does, but they were very aware of what they have received from the California
20 Library Services Act. They understood charging nonresidents for a library card, even though
21 they may not have known that the Board oversaw it. For Maginnity, the challenge was
22 determining what responsibility the state had for all the libraries in California. When two years
23 ago the budget was zero, a message was sent that the state had no responsibility. However,
24 despite this challenge, CSL had continued to work with public libraries in California. They asked
25 what resonated with the state. What would help all public libraries in California, and therefore
26 was the responsibility of the state? That was why the Broadband initiative was so critical, at
27 present. Fong said that the Library of California name was not working right now, and the Board
28 needed to be practical and responsible to move forward servicing the libraries in California.

29 Bernardo asked whether the Board was satisfied and had come to agreement and consensus.
30 Fong said the matter should remain open. There should be opportunity for a Board member to
31 bring up this or any topic for a five-minute discussion in future, whether it was on the agenda or
32 not. The consensus was that most of the Board was fine with the name change. For the record,

1 Bernardo stated the topic would remain open for future discussion, but the name would remain.
2 Murguia had a practical question – her business card said Library of California Board. But, with
3 the change of name, they would need new cards. Maginnity said that the change could be made.
4 He would check into it.

5 **Contiguous Borders Requirement**

6 Bernardo said that Habbestad had put together a document with a pros and cons discussion
7 resulting from responses obtained from a survey that was sent out to public library directors
8 earlier this summer. McGinity asserted that he had raised this issue. He knew what a limited
9 number of local library systems felt about this generally, and that they were strongly in favor of
10 making a change. He had heard a few pros and cons, but they did not seem to come from a deep
11 analysis. Clearly, there were some significant benefits, but maybe also some unknown
12 drawbacks. The Board might recognize some advantages to the Systems, but losing what they
13 already had might not be worth the cost. He was not yet prepared to put a motion out. He asked
14 what the State Library thought about the matter? Maginnity replied that the survey responses
15 showed both sides of the issue. It had been much discussed, but he did not know if there was an
16 easy solution. In the past the Board had waived the contiguous requirement when some libraries
17 had asked to change their System membership. With the way technology was going, contiguity
18 was no longer necessary. The geography-based type of system had revolved around having a
19 major resource library in that System, and delivery items. But that had been changing. On the
20 other hand, the concern from rural and isolated libraries that they would be abandoned, had also
21 been heard. McGinity asked what abandonment meant. Maginnity answered that thinking with
22 respect to the concept of the geography, it said that libraries in an area were together for a reason,
23 that they depended on the System's resources, or other member resources, and sharing resources.
24 Imagine a poor library and Systems that can only afford so much. Every System now had a
25 member share because CLSA was not enough. Or they paid for another service that was not
26 under CLSA. Many libraries felt they could not afford that, and so the libraries that could do that,
27 and buy into other Systems, would leave. A System would be left with very poor members who
28 could not do anything. The State Library needed to listen to their concerns and look for solutions.
29 He agreed that contiguous borders were no longer a real issue. McGinity added that in the 21st
30 century, that condition made no sense to him. If he remembered correctly, the matter came up
31 during Board approval of CLSA regulations. He had thought a motion to remove the contiguous
32 clause was in order. Maginnity said that removal of the contiguous borders requirement had been

1 the recommendation of the CLSA task force. When it went to the public library directors group
2 for discussion, two opposing sides emerged, so they put the issue on hold. The task force
3 abandoned their recommendation and nothing was done.

4 Gunning remembered that there had been discussion about alternatives. It was possible to
5 create affiliate memberships with almost all the Systems, where libraries could share resources
6 with a System other than its own. Bernardo asked if the public library directors wanted to
7 continue discussion. Rosario Garza, SCLC, answered that it depended on the System. For SCLC,
8 it was highly unlikely that any of them would be interested in joining another System. She gave
9 an example of Blythe, which was out on its own at the California/Arizona border. If it was
10 unable to meet the membership dues of the System it wanted to be a part of, it would be stuck on
11 its own, without resources. Garza cited an equal access clause in CLSA stating that any member
12 would lend another their resources. But, once they were outside the CLSA System membership
13 family, there was no requirement for them to participate in equal access borrowing. From a
14 membership group point of view, Garza thought the cons outweighed the pros. Lowenthal
15 inquired whether there was anything to motivate a library to share resources. Garza responded in
16 the negative, saying that with the loss of TBR there was no good reason. The discussion of why a
17 library should belong to a System, now that TBR was no longer available, was a very hot topic
18 being held at the local level. Linda Crowe, PLP, said there was not a big incentive to join now,
19 unless there was something to bind them together, like a shared Integrated Library System (ILS).
20 She remembered being on the task force, and when this topic was discussed at the forum, the
21 NorthNet libraries, in particular, did not want anything to do with changing the contiguous
22 borders clause. Garza said that was because they had established partnerships with the libraries,
23 and because of the diverse delivery option, and because of the difficulty getting deliveries to
24 remote areas. Crowe agreed. McGinity cited the survey in which those who answered said yes to
25 change in capital letters. He asked what the best guess for the percentage of libraries in
26 California that would end up without resources, if the law was changed. Gunning said at least
27 30%. McGinity pointed out that was not perhaps 30% of the population but 30% of the libraries
28 in a place where there might only be something like 10% of the population. Suzanne Flint, State
29 Library, remarked that a huge percentage of California's geography was actually considered
30 frontier. Gunning said the point about CLSA was creating more balance for those libraries that
31 did not have resources. One of the backbone fundamentals of CLSA was to help balance the
32 resources of more remote areas, or of extremely low population areas.

1 McGinity asked if there was any additional analyses that should be done. Or, had the
2 discussions already taken place? Had the time come for the Board to make a decision one way or
3 another? Even after what he had just heard, at this point he would put in a motion to take out
4 contiguous borders. But he did not want to proceed if Maginnity and CSL staff believed there
5 was some other way to look at this, or further conversation to be had, or something else that the
6 Board should read. Murguia brought up the option of an associate membership that attempts to
7 address concerns, where libraries could actually pay to join another System without jeopardizing
8 the one they were currently in. Maginnity brought up the formula mentioned earlier today, that
9 changed with membership. If people bounced around from System to System, the member
10 numbers would change every year, throwing the formula out of whack. McGinity did not doubt
11 that there would be initial disruption, since people would move, but he felt that after the first year
12 and a half, things would settle down again. To make sure there would be full public input, and
13 opportunity for any further analysis, he would wait until the next Board meeting to offer a
14 motion to do what he stated. Lowenthal asked him who he would be asking for input. McGinity
15 stated he would not be asking anyone. As part of a public body, the topic would be out there in
16 the public domain; his intention would be in the minutes. There were six months until the next
17 meeting, and he wanted to be really sure that the libraries had time for this conversation, that
18 they have arrived at the last stop, and that they were ready to go to one place or the other.
19 Murguia asked a question about the pros of doing away with contiguous borders. Would
20 someone explain what this really meant, with a concrete example of spurring an innovative
21 partnership with libraries that have similar goals? Maginnity provided an example, in which one
22 System in particular was doing a better job offering e-books, and a library wanted to join this
23 System, because their own was not moving in that direction. So, the library would buy into their
24 contract, and take full advantage of the service being offered. Would it be better to remain within
25 their own System, for whatever reasons, to stay within the formula, but become an associate
26 member of the other System, just for that particular service? Murguia asked if they already had
27 the authority to do that. Gunning said each of the Systems could make that decision, whether it
28 was in their by-laws or not. It was up to them. Murguia said that under CLSA, they must have
29 contiguous borders which determined what region the System was in. Crowe said she did not
30 believe that anyone would be unhappy with an associate membership. She did not think PLP
31 would be unhappy if someone came to them and said they wanted to join a PLP project. They did
32 not have to join the System, but they could certainly work on a single project, if they wanted to

1 pay the cost, and be a partner for that project. She was not aware of their ever having been a
2 problem doing this. Gunning stated that perhaps another alternative might include opening or
3 broadening the definition of resource sharing. That might open up the sharing of e-book
4 collections and other kinds of things, either regionally or cross-regionally. But the CLSA
5 language as it now stood was based on an old model; when it talked about delivery, it meant
6 sharing physical materials between one library and another within a System. That was where
7 there had been some push-back; although, economically it was not always the best way of
8 sharing materials anymore. Fong asked McGinity what he saw as the strongest reason for
9 removing the contiguous borders requirement. He asked why should they still be tying things to
10 geography in a 21st century world, where geographical borders no longer mattered? The principal
11 reason behind it had been the physical movement of information media. That was an old rule
12 from 19th century California, no longer applicable in the electronic age. In fifty years, perhaps
13 L.A. County Library would have a special relationship with a Tokyo library. According to the
14 survey, many respondents believed we needed to go in this direction. The original committee had
15 said the same, yet the larger library community balked. We should be thinking differently about
16 how libraries can work together more creatively, no matter where they were located in
17 California.

18 Fong remarked that McGinity made very valid points, but she was thinking on a more
19 practical level, about the formula numbers and how often they could change, and about where
20 loyalty of effort would lie? If libraries wished to belong to other groups, to work on mutually
21 advantageous projects, cherry picking them, so to speak, it could become very messy. She saw
22 both sides, and agreed with McGinity that they should leave it open and see how things
23 developed.

24 McGinity saw another trend developing with libraries like Santa Clara dropping out because
25 they had decided to charge a nonresident fee. He would not be surprised to see more libraries
26 following suit in the next two years.

27 Lowenthal commented that as she read through this topic initially, she began taking notes and
28 jotting down some of her thoughts. It was not her area of expertise and she had only spoken to a
29 few people, but she came to have a concern. Because she worked with many local districts, with
30 groups like community councils, she observed that they tended to have specific knowledge not
31 only of their local geography but of the problems inherent to their own area. She worried about
32 what would happen to this concrete understanding if libraries were no longer contiguous. And

1 what if people had to attend meetings two hundred miles away, or skip entire counties, some
2 would be unable to attend. Neither would there be the same level of feeling and personal
3 connections. People volunteered when they believed they were liked and that they mattered. Her
4 thinking was based in the present, while McGinity's vision was directed to the future. She
5 worried about how current problems would be accommodated.

6 Cannon tended to agree with McGinity, as they already had the Digital Public Library of
7 America beginning to emerge. With that type of an environment, did they need to be worried
8 about contiguous borders? What were the library directors expecting after responding to the
9 survey? Were they expecting the Board to discuss it and make a recommendation? Or, did the
10 Board have time to wait another six months and discuss it further? Bernardo responded that they
11 did have time. This was meant to be a discussion to flesh out the issues, to hear from the field
12 their concerns about contiguous versus non-contiguous borders, and to get a feeling from this
13 Board about what they were thinking, and where they were going with it. If the Board wished to
14 take it back to CSL staff and into the field for discussion, they could do that, and bring the topic
15 up again at another meeting. Because McGinity knew that LDS was short-staffed, he thought
16 more work on this should not be done unless it was necessary. His sense was that there was not
17 much more to be done. However, if more information came in from the field, because the topic
18 was on the Board agenda, that would be appreciated. Fong agreed with McGinity, that there
19 would be a trending if there were more people breaking away from the Systems, requesting of
20 CSL different guidelines to do various things. It would bubble up, resulting in more information
21 in a few months. Lowenthal pointed out that survey responses from the field had been 16%. Even
22 if they received five times that response, 80%, would they get 100% of the same 80% of
23 responses? Lowenthal questioned whether they would get the same response level and the same
24 issue results in a new survey that they got in the first. If CSL expected new answers, and it was
25 going to be helpful to the Board, then staff might want to remind people with two or three emails
26 to please send in their survey. Crowe suggested that they might want to hold open this topic for
27 next year. She believed that the Broadband and CENIC project was going to change the way
28 libraries did business throughout the entire state, so suspending a decision at this point would
29 make sense. McGinity agreed, but he asked for a motion in the agenda at the next Board meeting.
30 Murguia cautioned that March might be too early, since they would not know if CENIC would
31 be funded until May. Maginnity said the first clue would come when the Governor released his
32 budget in January. Otherwise, it would have to be a legislative effort. Bernardo concluded that

1 with additional time to receive library directors input, the Board would have a better handle for
2 an action at the next meeting.

3 **Discuss Board Planning Session**

4 President Bernardo said this topic had been brought up earlier in the summer, but the Board
5 pulled back on the idea. Was a planning session something this Board thought valuable? In the
6 packet, Habbestad included the last strategic plan that the Library of California Board had
7 adopted for 2000-2003. Also included was the Purpose of the California Library Services Act
8 document, and in the past there was the Comparison of the Purpose of the Library of California
9 Act, and its Mission and Vision Statements.

10 President Bernardo opened the topic for discussion. McGinity asked whether the Board had a
11 proposal they were considering. Bernardo replied that although they had a mission, they did not
12 have a strategic plan as the California Library Services Board. Fong stated that she had been in
13 charge of the Library of California strategic plan for 2001-2003. Some objectives had been
14 achieved, but the objectives needed to be updated. If the Board decided to go through another
15 strategic planning process, it would take time and money to get a good consultant, so the Board
16 should think about what it wanted. Lowenthal had also been a Board member when the last plan
17 was produced. She was frustrated because they had a much longer list then, with many things
18 that did not get done. At this time, she would not want to spend the time and money, or even put
19 things in black and white that someone could turn around and say “what happened to you guys?”
20 Fong said that they had very ambitious plans then, because they had expected to get a lot of
21 continuous funding for the Library of California. Cannon agreed with Lowenthal and expressed
22 that he would like the Board to find a way to become a full Board again. Lowenthal replied that
23 it was being looked into. Cannon responded that that was news to him. As a first step, they
24 needed to find a way to work with the Governor to say they have these positions available. Then,
25 further down the road, they could think about another strategic plan. He did not want to have a
26 planning session until they got more people on the Board. Lowenthal asked if the Board was
27 constrained by the new act to have a strategic plan. Bernardo was not aware of any constraint.
28 McGinity wanted to be clear that they were not going to do a planning session until the Governor
29 appoints four other people to the Board. Bernardo replied that there would be no major planning
30 session at this time.

31

32

1 **LEGISLATIVE**

2 **Consider Federal and State Legislative Issues**

3 President Bernardo said she had been serving as the Board liaison to the California Library
4 Association Legislative and Advocacy Committee, and had been forwarding to the Board any of
5 their messages and action alerts. Maginnity had attended many of the meetings in person as well,
6 so between the two of them they could update the Board on the state activities, and she would let
7 Maginnity update them on any federal actions that concerned the State Library at this time. SC 7,
8 Senator Wolk’s bill, had been forwarded to the Board. The status of that bill was still on hold
9 because constitutional amendments did not have the same legislative timeline as other bills. They
10 were looking at consolidating the voter threshold bills, combining those together. So, SC 7 was a
11 bill they were watching. SB 331, Senator Carol Liu’s bill, which was going hand in hand with
12 the \$5 million augmentation to the budget for CENIC, was placed in suspense, since SB 331
13 relied on the funding. Senator Wolk’s bill for California Library Week, SCR 14, passed. Library
14 Week was in May this year. And there were sundry other bills that attracted the attention of the
15 legislative committee. They had a watch on a number of these. There was AB 5, the
16 Homelessness Bill, and the Privacy Bill, which was going through right now. The Homelessness
17 Bill had been reworked several times, and it did not pass.

18 Bernardo asked Maginnity if there was anything on the federal side about which he wanted to
19 speak. Maginnity said if they went to the National Library Legislative Day link, there would be a
20 list of all the issues they were dealing with at the federal level. One he was watching very closely
21 was the work around e-books with publishers, and whether or not they were going to release e-
22 books to libraries, allow libraries to buy them, and related issues. There were other issues with
23 government printing, and the funding for that. It was just learned that they were thinking about
24 discontinuing microfiche and more, and reverting to paper documents. Since the State Library is
25 a federal government depository, that would send the Library into the stratosphere, with the need
26 for additional space. It meant the Library would begin receiving everything in paper again, when
27 it should be electronic. The reason why was cost-cutting. For CSL, it would become a space
28 issue. Microfiche took very little space compared to paper documents. The Library did not have
29 enough space. Murguia explained that the government was required to do the printing, and
30 microfiche was an added expense. Maginnity said they reduced their costs, and passed the cost
31 on to someone else.

32

1 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

2 President Bernardo asked if there were any public comments. There were no public
3 comments.

4
5 **BOARD COMMENTS**

6 President Bernardo went around the table for comments. Fong said she wanted to thank staff
7 for all their work, and Maginnity, who was doing a great job. She was very happy about the
8 CENIC project, and thought they should start looking at collaborative efforts to move the whole
9 library scene into what McGinity and she would like 30 years from now. The Board should make
10 time to discuss some future non-regulatory subject to have that vision. She would appreciate
11 some summary follow-ups on project progress. Congratulations to the new officers, and with
12 great gratitude for years of service, Anne Bernardo as president, as well as the vice president.
13 Murguia thanked the Board for her nomination. She appreciated all the work the staff was doing
14 in a time of very restricted resources. Maghsoudi said ditto to everything everyone had said. She
15 thanked staff for all the hard work they did, with the results seen in the field every day. Cannon
16 said ditto, as well. He thought Maginnity had done a terrific job as an interim. He thanked Anne
17 for being president this year, and Maghsoudi for agreeing to serve as incoming president. He
18 appreciated the discussion they had at the Board, and in spite of the fact that they did not see
19 each other often, he still felt they had some momentum in moving things forward. McGinity said
20 it would be great if the spelling of his name could be corrected in page one of the minutes.
21 Addressing Maginnity, he referenced a note in item number four about a hold harmless for post
22 consolidation. How long did that hold harmless stand, in terms of the money? Was it a year or
23 was it permanent? Maginnity said it was permanent. McGinity continued, stating even if they
24 were potentially losing, there was an incentive to consolidate to hold their money. If they lost
25 population, they lost money; but, if they consolidated, they would not. Habbestad responded that
26 it was not necessarily about the population, but rather more about the base funding. If you had 15
27 Systems, and they were each getting a certain base amount, if you consolidated those you would
28 still get just the one base amount. That was where we said hold harmless. For example, NorthNet
29 had three Systems that combined into one. They were still receiving the base money for those
30 three Systems. McGinity asked whether even if they had not they would have still lost the
31 money. Habbestad said they would not have consolidated because it would have shrunk their
32 budget. Maginnity said it was the loss of the additional base funding that was holding them up.

1 They felt there was a need to consolidate, but they would not do it, so staff developed, along with
2 the Board, the idea of hold harmless, so that no one got hurt.

3 McGinity next went to tab five, regarding the TBR reporting requirements, and asked if that
4 was state law or based on a regulation that the Board passed. Maginnity replied that it was
5 changed because there was money behind it. If the reports came in quarterly, based on those
6 numbers, they were issued a check. That was the reimbursement money, and that was why they
7 were doing it quarterly. After it was zero-funded, data was wanted to explain what had happened
8 to the Legislature. McGinity said he understood that, but he was trying to figure out if it was a
9 state law requiring them to provide information, or was it a regulation that the Board had
10 developed? Habbestad answered that it was a Board policy, and it was in the legislation that the
11 Board would set these types of reporting requirements. Lastly, McGinity said he would love to
12 have a conversation about the digitization work that the State Library was doing. From his
13 perspective, it was one of the most valuable things CSL could be doing, and he would rather
14 drive more resources towards it than some of the other library projects, or at least have a
15 discussion about it. In thirty years it would be content like CSL's amazing collection that would
16 be up on the web. He would like to cover that topic at the next Board meeting. Zollman
17 congratulated the newest vice president and president, and thanked Maginnity for taking over
18 Aldrich's job. It was a hard act to follow but he was doing a fantastic job and she really
19 appreciated it.

20 President Bernardo thanked the library staff and Maginnity for their hard work. She really
21 enjoyed trying to keep up with Maginnity and Habbestad, and the information that they had. And
22 libraries as a whole were in the news a lot, with very good stories, which she was very
23 impressed. NPR did the link to the stories from American public libraries. She was proud to be
24 part of a profession that provided such good service to so many people. Governing Magazine put
25 out the Once and Future Librarians list, with libraries a feel-good story, and she was very proud
26 to be part of it all. She thanked everyone who had put in their hard work, all the System
27 librarians who made the Board look good. She congratulated the incoming officers, Maghsoudi
28 and Murguia, and she expressed that she had enjoyed her term of service.

29

30 **AGENDA BUILDING**

31 President Bernardo asked if the Board wished to keep the three items of discussion, Board
32 name, contiguous borders and Board planning, open for the next Board meeting. Murguia had
33 thought they were done with the Board name. They were still looking for a date for the next

1 meeting. McGinity said he had thought the March date was settled. Habbestad replied that there
2 had turned out to be a conflict with a national conference. President Bernardo said another date
3 survey would be going out. She said if digitization and LSTA fell in together they would attempt
4 to fit that into the agenda. She asked if there was anything else they would need to visit at the
5 meeting. Murguia said they would want to follow up with CENIC. Habbestad said the state
6 budget would be out. Bernardo asked if there were any other items at this time.

7

8 **ADJOURNMENT**

9 With no further comments, Fong moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded, and with no
10 opposition, President Bernardo adjourned the meeting.