

1 **Approved September 3, 2015**

2  
3 California Library Services Board Meeting

4 April 28, 2015

5  
6 California State Library

7 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500

8 Sacramento, CA

9  
10 **Welcome and Introductions**

11 Vice President Murguia called the California Library Services Board (CLSB) meeting  
12 to order on April 28, 2015 at 9:36 a.m. She asked those attending to introduce  
13 themselves.

14  
15 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Aleita Huguenin, Florante Ibanez, Penny  
16 Kastanis, Gregory McGinity, Liz Murguia, Eric Schockman and Connie Williams.

17  
18 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State  
19 Librarian Gerry Maginnity, Janet Coles, Suzanne Flint, Darla Gunning, Sandy  
20 Habbestad, Susan Hanks, Wendy Hopkins, Carla Lehn, and Lena Pham.

21  
22 **Adoption of Agenda**

23 ***It was moved, seconded (Bernardo/Kastanis) and carried***  
24 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the***  
25 ***agenda of the April 28, 2015 meeting as presented.***  
26

27 **Approval of December 2014 Board Minutes**

28 Vice-President Murguia asked for a motion to approve the Board meeting minutes.  
29 Habbestad said she had a correction on page 9; line 15 – the Digital Library of America  
30 should be the Digital Public Library of America.

31

1           ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Bernardo) and carried unanimously***  
2           ***that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes***  
3           ***of the December 3, 2014 meeting as corrected.***  
4

5           **Board Meeting Date for Fall 2015**

6           Vice-President Murguia initiated discussion of fall meeting dates. Habbestad  
7           reminded members that at the December meeting they had expressed a preference for  
8           a fall teleconference, since the April meeting was in person. She communicated that the  
9           teleconference would take about two hours. Some members expressed a preference for  
10          a face-to-face meeting and Schockman asked whether it was possible to use Skype,  
11          GoToMeeting, or some other technology. Habbestad replied that it was difficult but  
12          possible and Lucas said he would get the Board a definitive answer.

13          Habbestad noted that the vote on all action items would be by roll call, and the call-in  
14          site of each Board member had to be listed on the formal agenda. Bernardo reminded  
15          members that because it was a public meeting, the sites would need to accommodate  
16          public attendees. Gunning said the California State Library (CSL) could reserve a  
17          meeting room on-site for those who were nearby. Confirming that September was best  
18          month for the meeting, Habbestad said she would provide a Doodle poll for the first  
19          couple weeks of September to see what dates worked and proceed from there.

20  
21          **Nomination of Board Officers**

22          Murguia said the Board needed two member volunteers to serve as the nomination  
23          committee for the 2016 Officers. Responding to Williams' question, Murguia, who was  
24          on the committee last year, said it was not too complicated, just talking to Board  
25          members about who might be interested in the officer positions. Schockman and  
26          Williams volunteered.

27  
28               ***It was moved, seconded (Kastanis/Huguenin) and carried***  
29               ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board appoints Eric***  
30               ***Schockman and Connie Williams to the nominating committee to***  
31               ***select Board Officers for 2016.***  
32

33          **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

1 **Board Vice-President’s Report**

2 Vice-President Murguia reported that her jurisdiction will be celebrating their “new” main  
3 branch library’s twentieth anniversary through November, and State Librarian Lucas  
4 would be their honored guest.  
5

6 **Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

7 Lucas reported that more work had been done on the broadband initiative since the  
8 last Board meeting. About 53 library jurisdictions were going to be connected in the first  
9 phase, which had started later in the year than expected. For the next phase they would  
10 begin earlier in the fiscal year getting the Letters of Agreement that libraries submit to  
11 Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC), which in turn are  
12 sent to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to determine the libraries’ e-  
13 rate discount. Lucas was surprised by the extent of some of the discounts. In a recent  
14 budget subcommittee hearing he told them about Buena Park Library who had been  
15 paying \$1200 dollars a month for 50 megabytes of bandwidth. Through the Broadband  
16 initiative, however, they would be paying \$145 a month for 1 gigabyte of bandwidth,  
17 partially as a result of the federal e-rate discount. Libraries could also apply to the state  
18 Teleconnect Fund program which would cover 50% of the amount not covered by e-  
19 rate. Hookups would begin at most of the 53 libraries on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Some were already in  
20 varying states of connectivity, in part because of a former pilot program, through the  
21 ARRA, involving libraries up and down the central valley.

22 To be a part of CENIC Broadband costed \$4.5 million a year. The way it is structured  
23 for libraries was: a) a general fund payment of \$2.25 million; and b) money from a  
24 portion of the Teleconnect Fund discounts. In the Governor’s budget last year there was  
25 a one-time amount of \$4 million. One million of those funds went to technology  
26 improvement grants that could be for anything; switches, routers, site improvements, or  
27 hiring someone to tell them what was needed. Libraries accepted for an e-rate discount  
28 would not receive a check for a year, which could discourage libraries from participating.  
29 The technology improvement grants helped to make it more attractive for libraries to  
30 wait it out. The one-time \$1 million was not included in the 2015-2016 budget proposed  
31 by the Governor, so CSL and California Library Association (CLA) asked that it be

1 restored and extended for five years. Although CENIC believed they could hook up all  
2 public libraries in three years, Lucas decided to ask for a five-year funding extension  
3 since it appeared that matters often did not progressed as quickly as anticipated. He  
4 feared that at the end of three years, those libraries with the greatest challenges to  
5 connecting would be left hanging without funding.

6 With respect to the current budget, Lucas reminded Board members that last year  
7 Assemblyman Gatto had a proposal to increase funding for public libraries by \$10  
8 million. That amount was whittled down to \$3 million in one-time money. \$2 million of  
9 that went to California Library Services Act (CLSA), half of which went to the  
10 aforementioned switches and routers to help libraries hook up to broadband. The  
11 Systems spent about 50% of the remaining \$1 million on one-time items also relating to  
12 hooking up broadband.

13 This year, Assemblyman Gatto had an \$11.8 million public library funding proposal. It  
14 contained; \$4 million for CLSA, a \$2 million augmentation for the Literacy program, \$4  
15 million for technology improvement grants, and funding for two smaller items. Of  
16 particular interest to Lucas was \$1 million earmarked for Career Online High School.  
17 This program, which costed \$1,000 per student, allowed students to attend from home  
18 and interact with librarians for assistance. At the end of the program, the student  
19 received a high school degree, not a GED.

20 Lucas mentioned that CSL had been spending federal money to help Sacramento  
21 and LA City run a similar program on a smaller scale. John Szabo, who ran the LA City  
22 Public Library System, was a huge advocate of the program. He came from Atlanta,  
23 Georgia where in one year they graduated 523 people from their Career Online High  
24 School program. It was not something they had traditionally done, but there was value  
25 in using new programs to demonstrate to lawmakers and taxpayers that there were  
26 many ways that libraries were changing lives. Their local lawmakers found so much  
27 value in the program that they seemed to feel that the program's achievement trumped  
28 everything else the libraries were doing. One of the advantages Lucas saw in the Online  
29 High School Program was that successful results could be measured in the number of  
30 graduates. It was not unlike the literacy program, in that the \$1,000 investment paid an  
31 incredible return by giving someone a high school degree.

1 Lucas was not sure how much money remained at the end of the budget discussion.  
2 Although the state expected more revenue, current formulas determined that extra  
3 money would go to public schools, leaving little latitude for spending money on libraries.  
4 Kastanis pointed out that the money for adult education classes leading to a GED was  
5 gone. Lucas responded that one of the largest discussions this budget year revolved  
6 around adult education. AB 86 directed community colleges and adult educators to work  
7 together to figure out a better delivery system for adult education and libraries were  
8 supposed to be a part of that. CLA was backing a bill in which libraries would be part of  
9 a consortium created to deliver adult education in different jurisdictions. According to  
10 Lehn, CSL's Programs Coordinator for Literacy, a report had just been submitted by the  
11 consortia. Currently they were in a holding pattern, waiting to see what happened, but  
12 she believed the agreement was that the same amount of funding as last year would be  
13 put in for adult education for community colleges, with K-12 built in. The problem was  
14 that adult education money for K-12 districts was gone. That impacted libraries because  
15 those who used to go to the K-12 schools for GED assistance were being referred to  
16 libraries. Libraries were trying to get their foot in the door, saying that they wanted to  
17 help those students unable to participate in classes due to their low reading levels.  
18 However, the adult education money that used to go to K-12 schools had never gone to  
19 libraries and she was doubtful that libraries would ever see any of that money.

20 Lucas pointed out that the larger discussion around adult education had shined a  
21 little more light on library volunteer literacy programs. Murguia asked if the Gatto  
22 legislation would address bringing libraries into the consortia and fund them for literacy  
23 education. Lehn understood that it would provide libraries additional funds to use for  
24 literacy programs. Lehn said that another issue was serving the same number of people  
25 with less and less money. The impact of people diverted from the closed adult  
26 education schools was one of the arguments why libraries needed money. Lucas stated  
27 that discussion over how community colleges would spend \$500 million for adult  
28 education had made people more aware of the library literacy programs, but he doubted  
29 libraries would see any of that money.

30 Williams saw opportunities and challenges. She did not know what the program  
31 model and requirements were for those who graduated from an adult literacy program,

1 as compared to those for a graduate from a conventional high school. There were a lot  
2 of questions to answer about the role of librarians, as well as content, delivery,  
3 instructors, and credentialing. Huguenin said that sometimes schools can be a little bit  
4 scary for people but libraries could be an alternative safe place for learning to happen.  
5 She encouraged any kind of relationship that could be built between education and  
6 libraries, including using Proposition 98 money. Williams added that it was very  
7 important that there were teacher librarians and library staff who were also seen as  
8 teachers. Huguenin said that there was tremendous potential for people to reach out to  
9 electronically and staying out in front of that would only enhance both education and  
10 libraries and make their partnership stronger. She advised educators and librarians to  
11 be aware of what has been happening in other states because she feels that electronic  
12 devices would help bring people into libraries in the future. Kastanis advised that  
13 teachers and teacher librarians not forget that the personal connections they can make  
14 with their public libraries are important for cooperation as well.

15 Murguia asked Lucas if he could give members something about the Career Online  
16 High School program model at the LA City Public Library System. Lucas responded that  
17 he had a memo from the person who was in charge of the program in Los Angeles, as  
18 well as material from the federal grants CSL had been administering.

19 Lucas said he wrote a piece for National Library Week that recommended that every  
20 child entering kindergarten get a library card, everyone was taught to read to at least the  
21 fifth grade reading level, and a card from any California library could be used to check  
22 out books anywhere in the state. The Governor put out a proclamation citing those  
23 goals. Perhaps the Legislature, in trying to get more money, could argue that it is for the  
24 furtherance of these goals. Lucas was told by CLA that the first two goals, making sure  
25 kids enter kindergarten with a library card and making sure people are reading at a fifth  
26 grade reading level, were not all that difficult. He and Tom Torlakson had been talking  
27 about the third library card goal.

28 Williams wanted to make sure when there were teacher librarians on school  
29 campuses, and that they were part of the collaboration. Lucas said he would not do it  
30 without them. Huguenin pointed out that many districts had eliminated school librarians.  
31 Those that remained were spread quite thin covering two or three different schools and

1 in some instances, teachers now had to do the job of a librarian. Some school libraries  
2 were sparsely used because of the lack of staff, or because a librarian covering two or  
3 three schools was only there on a particular school day. She felt it was important to  
4 encourage the use of school librarians again. Members wondered if inviting local  
5 officials to visit school libraries could help and Greg responded that they have done  
6 some events and usually got at least a representative from the legislators office. At the  
7 Annual Convention of School Libraries Association, Lucas was told there were 807  
8 teacher librarians in the state of California, for 6 million children, while in Texas, there  
9 were over 4000 for 5 million kids. Williams said far more school libraries were run by  
10 library technicians than by librarians. This program was an opportunity to bring forward  
11 the need for school librarians and for teacher librarians and public libraries to work  
12 together. Schockman asked Lucas if he thought the proposal would survive the May  
13 revise. Lucas said it would probably not be in the May revision, but it is something the  
14 Legislature might add to the budget the Governor releases around May 14<sup>th</sup>. As soon as  
15 CSL received it, the Board would get it, along with all the information Lucas could pull  
16 together on the Career Online program. Schockman asked Lucas whether the  
17 Department of Finance (DOF) had called to inquire about anything. Lucas replied that  
18 they had not called about broadband, but DOF and the Governor's office were aware  
19 that funding for CENIC, and for libraries to enable them to hook up to CENIC, went  
20 hand in hand. With respect to public libraries, this program was probably the most  
21 significant thing the State Library was doing right now and it would not work so well  
22 without funding both parts. It was CSL's job to keep these issues alive in the legislators'  
23 minds, while they were making the final budget deals.

24

## 25 **CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

### 26 **Budget and Planning**

#### 27 **CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2015/16**

28 Habbestad stated that on January 9<sup>th</sup>, the Governor released his 2015/16 proposed  
29 budget, providing \$1.88 million for CLSA Cooperative Systems. Exhibit A in the packet  
30 provided the preliminary allocation for each of the Systems. Included are the totals for  
31 the current year, with an additional \$1 million appropriated in one-time funds. CSL

1 would like to get a portion of this funding to Systems as soon as the state budget is  
2 signed. Staff recommended that the Board approve the preliminary budget for  
3 dispersing the funds to Systems; providing half of their budgets upon passage of the  
4 state budget act, and the remainder after Plans of Service have been approved and it  
5 has been determined that the funds for current fiscal year 2014/15 have been reported  
6 as expended or encumbered.

7 Murguia asked what would be done if there was additional funding in the final budget.  
8 Habbestad replied that any additional funding and how it was to be distributed would be  
9 presented to the Board for approval at the September meeting. Schockman asked for  
10 an explanation of the wide differences in allocation on the Exhibit A chart. Habbestad  
11 explained that the allocations were based on a formula which took into account 1) the  
12 population of the System, 2) the number of members, which varied from System to  
13 System, and 3) the distance for delivery between the members. Lucas gave the  
14 example of NorthNet, which might have lower per capita spending, but a larger number  
15 of members. McGinity asked whether the formula was a statutory or regulatory formula.  
16 Habbestad replied the formula had been adopted by the CLSA Board and was last  
17 revised in August, 2013.

18

19 ***It was moved, seconded (Schockman/McGinity) and carried***  
20 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts,***  
21 ***contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2015/16***  
22 ***CLSA budget as directed in the Governor's Proposed 2015/16***  
23 ***Budget, totaling \$1,880,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library***  
24 ***Systems.***

25

26 Habbestad added that the Plans of Service and budget documents had been  
27 forwarded to Systems to complete for fiscal year 2015/16. Those documents were due  
28 at the state library by June 1. The planning document was modified slightly to include  
29 more flexibility in how Systems could budget CLSA funds; such as for e-content,  
30 training, and broadband technology improvements. Also, as a follow up from a previous  
31 meeting, we had System audit reports for 49-99 and Serra Cooperative Systems that  
32 were currently done for the 2013/14 fiscal year. Copies would be forwarded for  
33 Habbestad's review, once they were approved by their administrative councils.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**RESOURCE SHARING**

**Consolidations and Affiliations**

Habbestad reported two motions before the Board for public library affiliation. Previously, both libraries had been members of cooperative Systems, but each had pulled out of their System in order to charge non-residents a library card fee. Santa Clara County pulled out in 2011-12 after Transaction Based Reimbursements (TBR) were zeroed out of the budget. Huntington Beach had pulled out about twenty years ago. CSL was pleased that the control agencies from both jurisdictions had agreed to eliminate the library card fee and become System members once again. Exhibit A-G in the packets, provided all the documentation required for the affiliation requests, and both the administrative councils (Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) for Santa Clara, and Santiago Library System for Huntington Beach) had approved the memberships. In addition, both libraries were requesting the Board to waive the September 1 filing deadline so that affiliations took place July 1.

McGinity asked why the libraries rejoined the Systems. Director Stephanie Beverage, of the Huntington Beach Library, stood and replied that Huntington Beach Library had pulled out of the Systems twenty years earlier to charge non-resident library card fees. However, with the Broadband and CENIC initiatives, they had recognized an opportunity for their community. To benefit from the initiatives they had to be a fully participating member of CLSA so she made a very strong case to the city council for rejoining the community of libraries and on February 2, the city council approved removal of the library card fee. That allowed them to rejoin and collaborate with Orange County libraries, and to participate in the CENIC program. As one of the first 53 jurisdictions to be connected, they were very excited to be part of it.

Hildreth, representing Santa Clara, said she thought they had left when the TBR was zeroed out of the budget. She was glad to have them back in PLP. McGinity asked if there was or could be something in the Broadband Initiative that would keep libraries in the Systems even after they were hooked up. Maginnity answered that it was in the agreement that should the connected library decide to no longer participate in CLSA, they would no longer have Broadband access and lose connection.

1  
2 ***It was moved, seconded (Bernardo/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***  
3 ***that the California Library Services Board approves the affiliation of***  
4 ***the Santa Clara County Library District with the Pacific Library***  
5 ***Partnership effective July 1, 2015, and waives the September 1, 2014***  
6 ***filing date for 2015/16 affiliations.***  
7

8 ***It was moved, seconded (Williams/Schockman) and carried***  
9 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the***  
10 ***affiliation of the Huntington Beach Public Library with the Santiago***  
11 ***Library System effective July 1, 2015, and waives the September 1,***  
12 ***2014 filing date for 2015/16 affiliations.***  
13

14 In addition to the foregoing agenda item, Habbestad pointed out two exhibits in the  
15 packet. Exhibit H provided a complete history to date of CLSA consolidations and  
16 affiliations, while Exhibit I showed a new, revised map for CLSA System boundaries.

17 Kastanis asked how many jurisdictions were not affiliated with the Systems and  
18 Habbestad answered either six or seven.

#### 19 20 **CLSA System-level Programs**

21 Referencing Document 5, Habbestad reported that the System Annual Reports were  
22 received from each of the nine Cooperative Library Systems. Exhibit A showed Systems  
23 continued to use most or all of their funds for the delivery of materials between member  
24 libraries. Exhibit B provided the actual workload for communications usage, and the  
25 various means of System delivery. Exhibit C and D gave a brief history of the  
26 communications and delivery workload, along with statistics on how they have fared  
27 over time. The communication statistics showed a drastic decline in the number of total  
28 messages between members and the System. Some Cooperatives were finding it  
29 difficult to provide this detail from their telecommunication systems. With respect to  
30 physical delivery, increased use of e-books had reduced the number of items being  
31 moved by van or courier systems. Exhibit E and F provided the expenditures for System  
32 administration and the communications and delivery program. Exhibit G provided the  
33 percentage of local funds that had been used to support the C&D program. Habbestad  
34 also provided an update on associate memberships. After polling System directors, it

1 appeared that six of the nine Systems provided some level of service for libraries  
2 outside their Cooperative Systems.

3 Schockman was struck by the great disparity of the percentage of local funding  
4 contributions and wondered if the Board could help persuade the local city and county  
5 government funders to become a greater part of this effort. Gunning, CSL liaison to the  
6 49-99 System, pointed out that some of the local governments were barely keeping their  
7 doors open, so doing a local share was almost impossible for them. Skop and Hildreth  
8 both said that because each System was unique, funds were allotted differently  
9 according to the System needs and priorities in their part of the state.

10

11 **Broadband update**

12 Maginnity reported that as of April 20<sup>th</sup>, 31 libraries had received award letters for  
13 technology improvement grants. It was significant that \$750,000 in grants had  
14 generated \$771,000 in local money. The library began last fall with the Letter of Agency  
15 program, to get the e-rate consortium going. Initially, 80-plus libraries were going  
16 forward with that program, and once the bid was returned, the library could elect to  
17 proceed or not proceed. At that point, 53 libraries chose to go forward but not all of  
18 those remained until the final stage. After guidelines for the grants were announced, 31  
19 applications were received and 7 more might be added. There were many reasons why  
20 all the libraries did not finish; there could have been a local issue or an affordability  
21 issue. Some libraries got bogged down with the final contract because they had to go  
22 back to their city council, some were unable to get the information they needed from  
23 their IT departments, or they were told to wait another year or so. Some were involved  
24 in long-term contracts with their current providers and would pay a penalty if they left. At  
25 the end of phase 1 on June 30<sup>th</sup>, it is hoped that there would be a total of 38 libraries  
26 receiving technology improvement grants. The initial projection indicated that these  
27 libraries would be provided with about a million dollars of state funds.

28 Phase 2 would begin in July or August, early in the fiscal year. Murguia asked  
29 Maginnity to explain why some of the local funding matches were much higher than the  
30 grant award amount. He replied that it showed their commitment to completing the  
31 project. In addition to the state money for which they were eligible, they were coming up

1 with money on their own. McGinity brought up that one of the matters discussed by the  
2 Board in December of 2014 was about establishing criteria for how the Board funding  
3 would be disbursed, but now that issue may be moot. It was thought that more libraries  
4 would have an interest in joining the broadband project than could be covered by the  
5 one million dollars, so some decisions would have to be made about how it was to be  
6 distributed. However, round 1 came in at less than a million dollars. Consequently,  
7 criteria were not needed because all the funding was distributed and they still had cash  
8 in the bank. Was that correct? Lucas responded that it was correct.

9 McGinity asked whether there would be another million dollars, should there be  
10 interest in round 2. Maginnity said there would be about \$800,000 available from the  
11 current year, and we would hope for additional money. McGinity asked whether they  
12 were going to need to identify disbursement criteria this time around. Lucas said it all  
13 depended on what happened after the Letters of Agreement went out. The concern  
14 expressed to the administration was that the larger library jurisdictions would join during  
15 the second and third phases. The larger group of applicants would necessitate the  
16 development of some criteria to help determine who would get more and who would get  
17 less assistance. McGinity wanted to make sure the Board had a hand in formulating  
18 criteria for how the funding would be distributed, should that become necessary. Lucas  
19 replied they would get that chance.

20 Murguia asked for an explanation of the funding allocations. Originally, there was  
21 about two million dollars of one-time money, but it would be about one million by the  
22 time they were done. Would these one million dollars be available for the next phase?  
23 Maginnity explained that part of the allocation went to pay the aggregator fee, lowering  
24 the total amount to about \$700,000-\$800,000. The library neglected to put the 10%  
25 aggregator fee into the budget this year, where schools and community colleges had it  
26 built into their budgets. Lucas said the \$2.25 million in the budget for the CENIC  
27 membership fee should have been \$2.5 to cover the aggregator fee. That was brought  
28 to the attention of Finance, so it could become part of the ongoing allocation. It would  
29 not affect this fiscal year, but prospectively Finance might modify it such that it would no  
30 longer come out of the operating budget or local assistance.

1 Schockman asked why libraries were always getting the crumbs in the budget cycle.  
2 Addressing Lucas, he pointed out that companies in California made a lot of money on  
3 their cellular carriers and consumers. Perhaps the State Librarian could say to AT&T,  
4 Verizon and other business carriers in California that it was time for them to step up to  
5 the plate and adopt a library or a Library System. Lucas responded that one of the  
6 advantages he saw with CENIC was that it had a long-standing relationship with AT&T,  
7 who represented about 50% of the market. For example, when a carrier like AT&T  
8 refused to go into a sketchier neighborhood to lay fiber needed to connect the local  
9 branch library, CENIC could tell that carrier they would guarantee a percentage of  
10 business over a certain period of time. The carrier could build the fiber line halfway,  
11 while CENIC could pick up the end of it, to make it more financially attractive to the  
12 carrier to participate. Lucas agreed that multi-billion dollar companies ought to step up  
13 to provide pennies on the dollar for the improvement of California, but was uncertain  
14 whether they would listen to an appeal from him. However, there were groups trying to  
15 do what Schockman was suggesting. For instance, the Teleconnect Fund went to  
16 Comcast and asked them to contribute money to make it easier for people to get  
17 internet access. In one of the earlier mergers, Comcast advertised something called 995  
18 online, an internet hookup geared for people who did not yet have internet. They have  
19 been pushed, both at the FCC level and here in California, to make it into a more real  
20 and robust program, as a condition of their purchase of Time-Warner.

21 Schockman asked if something about the service libraries provided and the good  
22 public relations involved in supporting them could possibly be included within the Gatto  
23 budget bill. He did not want it to take five more years to get everyone online. Lucas  
24 replied that what he would like to see, and what the administration advised, was for all  
25 parties to determine what they want, then to make a statement with one voice. As an  
26 appointee of the Governor, the first place for him to begin was with the administration.  
27 Schockman said it would be helpful to have a discussion with the governor and his staff.

28 Hildreth expressed her appreciation for accomplishing the broadband work. The  
29 library community had been working to get the high speed education network for fifteen  
30 years. The fact that there was money in the Governor's budget, CENIC was at the table  
31 and getting it done, and libraries had signed on and had access indicated that huge

1 strides had been made. When she was State Librarian, CENIC was not interested in  
2 providing assistance, but huge progress has been made and she was excited to be  
3 working on it.

4 Maginnity pointed out that CSL had two main partners: Califa, who dealt with CENIC  
5 issues; and Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC), who worked with the  
6 technology improvement grants. The program could not have been done without them,  
7 as there had been a tremendous amount of work to do. Libraries had responded well to  
8 the request to turn things around quickly and the Cooperative Library Systems had been  
9 really good at getting the word out. However, there had been many frustrations going on  
10 in the background. At one point, the Teleconnect Fund and the California Public Utilities  
11 Commission were going to declare a moratorium on new participants, which would have  
12 completely ended the project, as far as taking advantage of the Teleconnect Fund.  
13 Eventually, they dropped pursuit of a moratorium, but not before many phone calls,  
14 meetings, and significant input from libraries across the state declaring how much the  
15 Teleconnect Fund had meant to them.

16 Maginnity explained what A, B and C were on the spreadsheet he had passed  
17 around. They were the three categories eligible for funding: A was for hardware; B was  
18 “architectural” or “building changes” – something structural to the building; and C was  
19 consulting.

20

## 21 **BOARD FOCUS 2015/16**

### 22 **Brainstorm ideas for Board focus**

23 Murguia opened the discussion for Board focus for 2015-16. McGinity asked if there  
24 was anything new on digitization. Lucas replied that he had recently attended a Library  
25 Services and Technology Act (LSTA) sponsored event and was struck by how much  
26 broader the need was than had been discussed at recent Board meetings. There were  
27 universities that had digitization needs, the State Water Resources Board had maps  
28 and aerial photographs, Caltrans had a million aerial photographs, and the State Lands  
29 Commission had maps going back to the 1880s that were just sitting in map folders.  
30 There would be a report from the meeting, but in the meantime he thought there was  
31 value in the state pursuing the need. Digitization was a fairly simple process, and

1 students could be enlisted to accomplish it, but the equipment was expensive. With so  
2 much need, the primary question was priority. What should they do first? The state  
3 needed to set some sort of global policy, taking digitization out of the hands of each  
4 independent agency and having someone take charge of it.

5 When asked about the LSTA report coming out, Gunning responded that the meeting  
6 was specific to map digitization. Lucas added that that was what really surprised him;  
7 the meeting was about aerial photographs, just a subset of the digitization world, and  
8 they were talking about over 2 million items. Another thing he learned was that in  
9 several other institutions like the State Library, there was an average of 11.4 persons  
10 involved in digitization in some way. CSL was at 1.5 persons involved with digitization.

11 Schockman would nudge the Board toward a vision of becoming more  
12 entrepreneurial within their services. He expressed that the Board should try to think of  
13 ways, without destroying their mission, to make money to enhance the Board mission.  
14 He doesn't know what that means as far as how they get there, but he thinks they need  
15 to think more creatively. Schockman expressed that it might be time to allow the private  
16 sector to have a roll in their mission and how that could generate money, maybe even  
17 bringing in people from the private sector to talk to them. He clarified that his suggestion  
18 applies to CSL as someone should take the lead on this issue. He also questioned what  
19 other states are doing as he did not feel they were alone in their struggle to keep their  
20 mission alive. Lucas had a meeting the following week with other state librarians, and  
21 he indicated he would see what they have to say. Williams brought up potential  
22 partnerships to achieve digitization by working with private digitization companies.  
23 Libraries could look at what digitization companies do well, compare it to what libraries  
24 do well, and combine those in some way that will benefit both.

25 Lucas commented that the idea of looking at smarter ways to spend money is not  
26 exclusive to the private sector. He and Maginnity were looking at the CSL database  
27 subscriptions and figured there are other agencies subscribing to the same ones. If the  
28 state could coordinate subscriptions and got one shared license it would save money.  
29 There is coordination potential for libraries as well. There was a bill proposed ten years  
30 ago to benefit public schools where there would have been a statewide smorgasbord of  
31 databases, the state would get the license and public school libraries would be able to

1 choose which ones they wanted to subscribe to. Lucas feels there is the potential to do  
2 that for all public libraries. Williams said there are states that provide databases that  
3 anyone can access. Lucas said he hears anecdotally that, even with Systems, which  
4 helps, one library is doing the same thing as the library across town. He knows there  
5 have been efforts in the past to do kinds of regional administrative entities that did not  
6 work out very well. Schockman asked if Lucas was suggesting internal audits, or  
7 something like that, to find needs. Lucas said not necessarily. One of the advantages of  
8 the Systems is that they can get an economy of sale when purchasing. Maybe there are  
9 better ways to generate that same economy of scale through using one entity to handle  
10 cataloging for a group of libraries.

11 Gunning said one of their partnerships, the newspaper project, had set a goal of  
12 digitizing one major newspaper for every county in the next 3-5 years. Now, there are  
13 individual newspapers that are not included asking what it would take to be included.  
14 Since UC Riverside can only digitize so much, they are working with Ancestry.com, who  
15 will digitize the microfilm for free. There is an embargo for three years; the paper will be  
16 accessible at the physical local library location but they will be restricted from making it  
17 remotely accessible. After three years it will be on the California Digital Newspaper  
18 platform that is available worldwide. The embargo is not a problem because they would  
19 not get to those newspapers in the next three years anyways. There is a lot more  
20 interest in getting those newspapers digitized than there was three or four years ago,  
21 but it is impossible to fund UC Riverside for everything that is coming to them, so they  
22 have the agreement with Ancestry.com. Of course they are selling it commercially, but  
23 after three years it will be available long term, and the papers can be indexed better at  
24 that point through the California Digital Newspapers. Lucas said UC is negotiating a  
25 broader digitization contract and they are looking for a similar thing – private companies  
26 that will waive their fee for some sort of similar embargo.

27 Williams said since they're talking about brainstorming she would like to make sure  
28 they talk again about career online high school. Kastanis said she would like to know  
29 what is being done in other places, and get more information about it. Williams wants to  
30 explore the idea of collaboration with the adult education world, she thinks there are a  
31 lot of opportunities and they should spend some time looking at it.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Murguia said they put this on the agenda because some Board members had wanted to take the opportunity to meet legislators while they are here at the Capitol. She thought they could go around the room and have everyone report.

Kastanis said she is friends with Kevin McCarty and didn't think of contacting him before now. Lucas said the subcommittee held everything over until after the May revise so it wasn't too late.

Schockman volunteered to thank Mike Gatto on behalf of the Board. Secondly, he has known Marty Block a long time and one of Marty's major issues was and continues to be education. He would feel comfortable scheduling something with Marty to talk to him about their budgetary allocations. Thirdly, on the plane out this morning he ran into, Robert Hertzberg, an old friend who just got re-elected to the Senate. He told Robert what he was up here for and discussed the library budget stuff they are working on.

Bernardo was not able to attend yesterday's Leg Day, but she was here a month ago and visited with all her local legislators. They were all very supportive of libraries and she will look to their up vote when the time comes. She did write support letters in response to the CLA and a couple of the American Library Association (ALA) call to actions. Last week she had the opportunity to meet with the Governor and congratulated him on his proclamation for California libraries. He seemed to enjoy that recognition so hopefully when they talk about libraries in more detail to the Governor, he will be positive toward legislative action.

Ibanez made appointments with his local folks and they all seemed fairly unaware of what we do. He tried to inform them of the plight of libraries and showed them the sample letter from CLA that was in the packet. He commented that it was important to follow-up to keep people on track and informed.

Williams met with Senator Lois Wolk and thanked her. She spent some time chatting with them and introduced them to the materials.

Murguia was able to convey, in writing, her interest to both her local legislators and scheduled to meet with them in the district.

1 Lucas said they didn't talk earlier about a bond measure for libraries. The Governor  
2 vetoed a DeSaulnier bill last year which wanted them to do a library need assessment.  
3 The Governor's veto message said that the State Library's door was always open so  
4 needs could be brought to the CSL. CLA is beginning to put together a survey of its  
5 members on what capital needs are out there and Lois Wolk has a bill that could be a  
6 vehicle for that measure. The Governor has stated he does not want the state to take on  
7 more debt, so it is something would not appear until he is out of office in 2018. In his  
8 travels around the state Lucas has seen there is a need for, if not new libraries, then  
9 physical improvement of existing ones. A big issue is ADA. If they want to give one  
10 library branch a "facelift" they have to bring all the libraries in that jurisdiction up to code  
11 (\$200,000 a library), which turns a \$500,000 project into a \$3 million project. Lucas  
12 asked CLA to pull ADA issues and broadband related capital needs out of the survey  
13 results.

14 Murguia said when they did the first bond act the legislature asked the State Librarian  
15 about library needs. The librarian sent a letter out to libraries and came back with a  
16 billion dollar need and they ended up with \$75 million. She thinks it should not be that  
17 complicated to assess needs. Lucas said CLA had an interest in doing it, so they will  
18 see what CLA comes up with and take it from there. Barring anything, it could go on the  
19 ballot in 2016, which would have a good turnout since it's a presidential election year,  
20 but there could be competing bond initiatives which made some think they should wait.

21

## 22 **F. PUBLIC COMMENT**

23 Vice-President Murguia asked for public comments.

24 SCLC organized LA County and Ventura County libraries and made appointments  
25 with all the legislators in their districts. All 38 member libraries participated and they sent  
26 3-5 people to each appointment. They kept all the appointments and it went really well;  
27 they felt it was a great success.

28 Audience member thanked the Board and staff for helping to sustain the CLSA  
29 funding for broadband as it was going to make a huge difference in the lives of public  
30 libraries and the clientele they serve. She also thanked the staff for always being there  
31 to help.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**G. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

Maginnity said as a former employee, coordinator, and overseer of different Library Systems he would like to recognize Sandy Habbestad as it would likely be her last meeting. He wanted to mention in all those years he spent working with the Cooperative Library Systems and with the State Library, Sandy was always there. She is the memory – if they have a question, they can call her and she finds it. He wanted to acknowledge all her hard work and thank her.

Huguenin said CLSA funding really motivated SCLC, 49-99, and Serra to try to figure out how they could work together more collaboratively. SCLC developed a workshop program and now they have three reports that prioritized what they can do with CLSA funds and what they can do next year; how they are going to be budgeting and utilizing their funds and working on a more collaborative and resource sharing model. It is a really exciting time and she wanted to say thank you. It was the jumpstart to get the Systems back, excited, and working together again to be more effective.

Ibanez said Asian/Pacific American Librarian’s Association is celebrating their 35<sup>th</sup> Anniversary at ALA in San Francisco and, for anyone who would like to attend; they are having a symposium at the University of San Francisco. On Saturday at ALA they will be having their awards dinner at a Chinese restaurant and everyone is invited.

**H. AGENDA BUILDING**

Vice-President Murguia asked for agenda items for subsequent meetings.

Habbestad said budget discussions, and Plans of Services review and approval will be the basic focus of that meeting. Also the three issues identified under Board Focus. Williams asked if there was any preparation they would need to do for the Board focuses. Lucas said he can send out the materials he talked about and if there is something more that the Board wants to do prior to that phone call, they could do that. Williams said when she received the stuff from Lucas she would put up talking points or question points. Lucas said if the information is not enough, the Board can provide him direction and he will get them more. After he meets with the librarians in DC next week, he can get a better idea of what they’re doing in terms of private/public partnerships in

1 other states. ALA may also have information, and he could ask them as well. Ibanez  
2 suggested they look at a discussion with other directors about more cooperation  
3 between the different kinds of libraries; special, academic, and public, and how they can  
4 work together in these lean times. Lucas said there is an existing cooperative, MOBAC,  
5 a bay area system of libraries. They could not really quantify what they do but Lucas  
6 felt there was a benefit in just communicating. The public libraries would talk about what  
7 they were doing in literacy and the UC decided to participate and as a result of these  
8 communications they expanded their literacy efforts. Black Gold has a group that has  
9 been meeting for years, and like MOBAC, they are isolated, and want to work together.  
10 They recently had their annual meeting and over 50 people came to the luncheon.

11 Bernardo said the Heartland Regional Library Network is still operating. They offer  
12 services and research databases to their members. They found it helpful to coordinate  
13 efforts and know what others were doing. Law Librarians attended the recent Public  
14 Librarians forum and it was really good to have conversations between that special type  
15 of library and the public libraries. Including academic and school librarians in a lot of that  
16 discussion cannot hurt, maybe on a regional or statewide basis if that is doable.

17

## 18 **I. ADJOURNMENT**

19 Vice-President Murguia called for adjournment.