Approved October 14, 2016

California Library Services Board Meeting

July 12, 2016

California State Library
900 N Street, Room 501
Sacramento, CA

Welcome and Introductions

President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board (CLSB) meeting to order on July 12, 2016 at 1:04 p.m. She asked those attending to introduce themselves.

Board Members Present: Anne Bernardo, Brandy Buenafe, Gary Christmas, Aleita Huguenin, Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Peter, Mindnich, Elizabeth Murguia, Eric Schockman, Sandra Tauler, and Connie Williams.

California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Gerry Maginnity, Lisa Dale, Susan Hanks, Wendy Hopkins, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, and Annly Roman.

Adoption of Agenda

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the July 12, 2016 meeting.

Approval of April 2016 Board Minutes

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Murguia) and carried by a vote of 11 ayes and 1 abstention (Tauler) that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the April 8, 2016 meeting.

Board Meeting Date for Fall 2016

Annly Roman reported that at the April meeting the Board discussed having an in-person meeting in early October to finalize the CLSA budget, discuss amending the CLSA regulations, and take care of the LSTA advisory portion of the Board's duties.

Member McGinity and State Librarian Lucas discussed if that time frame was workable for the State Library and an early in October was suggested. President Bernardo said that she felt an in-person meeting in late-September or early-October made sense to complete the Board's remaining work without getting to close to the holidays. Annly Roman said that she would send out a Doodle poll with date options from the end of September and beginning of October.

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President's Report

President Bernardo reported that she continued to monitor the listservs of the various library groups such as CALIX, AALL, ALA, and the Council for California County Law Librarians. She was on the Legislative Committee for the Council for California County Law Librarians and she had been very active in the struggles they had over the past few months.

Additionally, her library had celebrated its 125th Anniversary in May and had a nice open house. She also participated in this year's summer reading program.

Board Vice-President's Report

Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that she followed the California Library Association's legislative committee and tried to attend their meetings when possible.

Chief Executive Officer's Report

State Librarian Lucas reported that since the Board's last meeting in April the State Library had worked with the Systems to collect ideas for the use of the $3 million in one-time funding and the $1.75 million in on-going funding that were approved in the 2016/2017 Budget. All the proposals were available to the Board in the agenda packet.

Lucas felt that there had been increased attention given to libraries over the last few months. Several candidates for local office in San Diego pledged to increase investment

in public libraries. There was also a story in the New York Times which discussed a reporter's visit to a public library and all the amazing things happening in the New York, Queens, and Brooklyn libraries. Finally, the Folgers Shakespeare Museum had loaned one of their 83 copies of Shakespeare's First Folio to travel around the country and the San Diego Public Library in California library was a host. Lucas was impressed with the cross section of San Diegans who visited the library to see the Folio. The First Folio exhibit was also used to introduce San Diegans to events at the Old Globe Theater and Shakespeare in Balbo Park.

Broadband Update report

Gerry Maginnity reported that year 2 of state funding for technology improvement grants concluded on June 30, 2016. It was projected that by June 30, 2017, 128 public library jurisdictions would be connected to CalREN (California Research and Education Network). The 128 number referred to the main libraries for each jurisdiction. It was also projected that 400 branches will be connected by next year. Maginnity estimated that there would be $1M remaining for year 3 of the project. The priority would be to connect main libraries that had not been connected and then consider branches. No additional funding for these grants was included in the 2016/17 State Budget.

Member Huguenin asked how much money it would cost to finish the broadband project. Maginnity stated that it would probably cost around $8-$12 million to connect all libraries in California. President Bernardo asked if the cost was referring to hardware. Maginnity clarified the money could be spent in three areas, equipment, necessary site modifications, and consultant help, however, most requests were for equipment.

<u>CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION</u>

RESOURCE SHARING

Consolidations and Affiliation

Annly Roman reported that Santa Monica Public Library withdrew its membership from the Southern California Library Cooperative in 2013 to charge a non-district resident fee. The City Council recently passed a resolution showing support for the fee

elimination and the re-affiliation with SCLC. Santa Monica wanted to place the request for affiliation before the Board.

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the affiliation of the Santa Monica Public Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative effective July 1, 2016, and waives the September 1, 2015 filing date for 2016/17 affiliations.

BUDGET AND PLANNING

System Plans and Service and Budgets

Monica Rivas reported that population numbers had increased slightly from the year before. The population numbers included Santa Monica.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the System Population and Membership figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the fiscal year 2016/17.

Rivas reported that most of the CLSA funds were used for physical delivery but that systems had started to move toward doing things digitally. At the September 2015 Board meeting Member McGinity had asked for 10-year overview of how the Systems were using their Communication and Delivery funds. That information was also included in the agenda packets and showed that delivery methods had not changed much over time.

Member Maghsoudi asked what funding was being considered in the Plans of Service. Annly Roman said that at the April 2016 meeting the Board approved the standard $1.88 million allocation to the Systems, however, the Board held off on approving the additional $1.75 million in on-going funding and the $3 million in one-time funding that were in the 2016/2017 budget. The Plans of Service in front of the Board were on the previously approved $1.88 million. State Librarian Lucas stated that the Plans of Service would be amended to reflect any Board actions on the $1.75 million.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Plans of Service and Budgets for the nine Cooperative Library Systems, submitted for the fiscal year 2016/17.

CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2016/17

Annly Roman stated that the remaining $1.75 million in on-going funding was allocated under Communications and Delivery and the $3 million in one-time funding was left more open but was still confined of the Act. The $1.75 million would be allocated to the Systems based on the allocation formula but the Board could provide direction on the spending of those funds, which the State Library recommended.

Roman reported that there were two ways the $3 million in one-time funds could be allocated: 1) to the systems based on the allocation formula, or 2) as lump grants under the special library programs section of the California Library Services Act. The State Library recommended the special library program option because would be difficult to coordinate a state wide program with nine cooperative systems and determine who was going to be responsible for which portion of the program funding.

At the April 2016 meeting the Board expressed that the letters received from the Systems proposing uses for the $3 million in one-time funding had provided good ideas but that the short program descriptions did not provide enough information. Annly Roman reported that State Library staff put out a call to the Cooperative Systems and other public libraries for expanded proposals. The request emphasized the Board's preference for projects with a statewide impact, a priority of resource sharing, and sustainability. The State Library received 20 proposals which were reviewed by State Library staff with an eye toward the Board's preferences.

The California State Library staff recommended that decisions on $1.5 million of the $3 million in one-time funding be postponed so that some proposals could be investigated further. Member McGinity asked if the library had existing ideas they would focus on and if they would make recommendations for the Board to discuss at their next meeting. State Librarian Lucas directed Member McGinity to Document 5 (Exhibit A) in the Board agenda packet. Lucas said that there were a couple of intriguing proposals that require more investigation before the State Library would be confident recommending the Board invest. For example, one of the proposals would take the information that is captured inside a MARC record and link it so that a patron could find materials or events at their local library when performing a standard Google search. There was a for-profit company that would help libraries implement this program but the

on-going cost for their services was high. The software being used was developed by the Library of Congress and was in the public domain. A newer iteration of the software was currently being developed and there were already libraries around the state whose IT people were looking at this concept. While the idea could be really helpful to increase awareness and accessibility, there may be a more cost effective way of doing it.

State Librarian Lucas expressed that, in the intervening months, staff could have conversations with the Library of Congress on potential options, do more research on a few other proposals and offer a series of recommendations at the Board's next meeting. When going over the proposals submitted by the Systems, taking into account the concern with creating ongoing costs with one time funding, it seemed that there were some easier recommendation and some that needed more information to address concerns.

State Library staff had recommended that $1 million in one-time funding be allocated to the Zip Books program, currently being run as a pilot program with LSTA funds. Member Christmas said that he understand that Zip Books was used in some of the Inland areas and he wondered what the process would be to ensure that new funds would be implemented fairly and equitably across the state. State Librarian Lucas replied that staff was exploring how to do that.

Susan Hildreth commented that funds were allocated based on the rural nature of the system. That determination was based on rurality and the geographically isolated. State Librarian Lucas said the pilot program included 33 jurisdictions over 14 counties but there were some libraries that were participating out of their own pocket because it was a cheaper way to move materials. Members Christmas and Murguia wanted to confirm that both jurisdictions involved in the current pilot program and those not involved would be included in consideration for the new money. State Librarian Lucas said the intent was to expand the program statewide.

Member Christmas asked if the Board would be provided with more details on the Enki proposal discussed in Document 5 (Exhibit A) at the next meeting. State Librarian Lucas replied that the proposal was to connect library jurisdictions that aren't currently members of Enki and increase the available titles. A secondary piece to that proposal

was SimplyE, which offered someone the ability to access digital content and e-materials regardless of the platform(s) that the particular library was using.

Annly Roman commented that the enki proposal put forward by Library staff would be very similar to the originally provided proposal. However, library staff recommended funding app access items like the Adobe Vender ID and other set-up costs that would make it possible for libraries to connect to SimplyE without funding the individual library implementation portions of the proposal. President Bernardo expressed concern that the $200,000 allocated for SimplyE set-up might not be enough.

Member Williams noted that the eBook platform proposal said “unlimited” copies but she wanted to clarify if, for example, a classroom was reading a book, 30 copies could be checked out for simultaneous use. Member Williams said that she worked with students trying to access local library materials and they frequently ran into platform and licensing problems. She wanted to know if she wanted to download a book from her Petaluma library but they did not have it, could the enki platform allow her to use her library card to access a Southern California branch’s copy. Paula Mackinnon, with Califa, who operates the enki platform, replied that enki was an actual library developed eBook platform created using LSTA funds. It would allow multiple copies to be checked out but it would only provide access to what your library had purchased, it would not provide access to any other library’s content. The platform also does not take care of any licensing issues. If the Petaluma library purchased that item as one copy for one user that is how would remain. Additionally, each patron would need a library card. Mackinnon said that, as part of their purchasing process, enki library tried to obtain materials at unlimited usage, so any number of copies could be borrowed at the same time

Member Williams asked if providing funding for cross over titles would be a potential issue with funding both enki and SimplyE. Paula Mackinnon replied that the SimplyE app was the discovery tool for the patron. A patron with an IPad or a phone could log-in with their library card and used the app to discover eBooks on any of the subscription platforms that their library subscribed to without having to go to each platform individually. The app itself also provided for patron privacy because the patrons would not have to use a third party vendor app which stored and used their information.

SimplyE was a library developed application using IMLS funding and was currently only deployed by the developer, New York Public Library.

Member Buenafe asked if a library had to set up the app for it to be available to patrons. Mackinnon stated that Califa with Pacific Library Partnership would do the work so that a library could just subscribe. Member Buenafe asked if that was the Adobe License and other components mentioned in the proposal. Mackinnon said that the Adobe made it so the patron using the app wouldn't need to get their own Adobe ID, removing the requirement that the patron give a third party vendor access to their information.

Member Tauler commented how much her community was enjoying the Zip Books program as well as the potential benefits of enki and SimplyE platforms to smaller libraries with limited resources and staff.

President Bernardo brought up that State Library staff had recommended the Board direct the systems in the use of the $1.75 million in on-going funds. Staff provided four suggested areas of consideration including: development of e-content through digitization; improved access to e-books or other digital material; alternate delivery methods; or assistance with connecting to broadband. Annly Roman stated that the State Library put forward a draft motion saying that Systems would specifically address the promotion and enhancement of resource sharing using 21st century technologies in the Amended Plans of Service. The four suggestions were examples of programs or ideas that could address e-resource sharing but were not the only ideas that the Systems could consider.

Member Christmas felt the Board should state the Systems must address those four items in the motion. Annly Roman brought up that each of the four ideas had a cost and even though there was extra funding this year, once divided up among the Systems it would not be enough to address all of the examples. She pointed out that the Systems might be able to more effectively address one area or idea. Christmas agreed that the systems probably would not be able to address all four but felt they should prioritize those examples before looking at other programs.

Members Tauler and Maghsoudi felt the Board should give Systems the opportunity to come back with their own suggestions and decide what was going to best benefit

their member libraries. They felt that directing the Systems to promote and enhance resource sharing using 21st century technologies was sufficient guidance. President Bernardo worried that by not stating specific examples the preferred direction of the Board might get lost. State Librarian Lucas commented that ultimately that Board decided whether to accept the Amended Plans of Service provided by the Systems. If the Board felt that a system had not addressed the issue to their satisfaction, the Board could not approve.

Member Buenafe asked if there was a way to include the examples provided by the State Library as examples in the motion rather than requirements. Annly Roman said that the Board could include examples in the motion or the Board could direct staff to include those examples in the Amended Plan of Service instructions. There was a section in the Plan of Service documents where Library staff could add examples of programs promoting 21st century technologies. She said if the Board was comfortable they could direct staff to include that information. Members Christmas, Huguenin, Tauler, and Buenafe agreed with that direction.

Michelle Perera, Rancho Cucamonga Library, stated that she would like to support what Members Tauler and Maghsoudi mentioned regarding System choice. She said that the Inland Library System was unique and giving the System an opportunity to meet some of the needs for their individual communities through these funds could be locally impactful.

Yolande Wilburn, Nevada County Library, wanted to support e-resource sharing. She felt that Member Williams brought up great points with regard to schools. The local schools in their area send students to the public libraries and they do not have the resources to support what the students need. The libraries needed database access to pull articles applicable to student projects.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the 2016/17 CLSA budget totaling $1,750,000 for allocation to the Cooperative Library Systems and directs the Cooperative Library Systems to file an amended Plan of Service to address how these funds will be used specifically to promote and enhance resource sharing using 21st century technologies.

Member Ibanez asked if, since the Zip Books program was being conducted through Amazon, we were getting a price break. Susan Hildreth, representing Califa, the project

partner at this time, said that we were getting a small discount. She thought there was an opportunity to negotiate a higher discount because of the larger investment and to highlight the program as a partnership between Amazon and the California State Library. Member Ibanez said that he thought that was important in light of the Board's wish to increase partnerships between corporate and outside entities, and public libraries.

It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts $1 million of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to expand the Zip Books program statewide.

Member Schockman asked what exactly enki was. Paula MacKinnon explained that enki is an eBook platform that was developed with LSTA funds by Califa and that they negotiated directly with publishers for purchasing. Enki was launched in 2013 and was an eBooks only platform, not audio books.

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts $500,000 of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to connect the remaining, unconnected California libraries to enki, purchase new content for the enki system, and lay the groundwork for the deployment of the SimpleE eBook discovery app.

Member Murguia asked if there was a concrete plan for the remaining $1.5 million in one-time funds. The background information provided implied the State Library was looking to limit consideration to the items identified in Document 5 but it also mentioned challenge grants. State Librarian Lucas said that what was listed in the background information were some interesting proposals that staff felt needed more research.

Member Ibanez expressed interest in the proposal that allowed for searching for materials at public libraries using Google. He felt that having another way to universally search all libraries collections without going to their individual website would be an asset.

Member Williams suggested including community analytics in the considerations. The Board was spending money on some awesome things but there were still too many people that did not know what libraries do. She liked the idea of helping market library programs and resources to the patrons.

Member Buenafe asked if the areas that needed more research referred to the four areas described at the end of Document 5; lack of awareness, improved searchability,

organizing of information, and possibly challenge grants. Annly Roman confirmed and Buenafe said she agreed with those areas. State Librarian Lucas reported that the recurring difficulty in examining these ideas was that there were ongoing expenses. There is a finite list of things that you can do on an exclusively one time basis.

Member Murguia asked about challenge grants. State Librarian Lucas said that several people have suggested thinking about the one-time money as venture capital, so we could consider what we should invest in that would yield some greater benefit in the future. An example of a challenge grant could be addressing the statewide library card issue. Whatever mechanism we used to create a statewide library card had the strong potential to be obsolete within five years at the rate technology is moving. Maybe another way of addressing that desire is to look at the condition you want to create by having a statewide library card and set that as the challenge grant. How do you create a minimum level of service so that every Californian, wherever they are and at whatever time it is that they want it, can find the information that they need through their public libraries.

State Librarian Lucas pointed out that any challenge grant would have been limited by the restrictions on how California Library Services Act money could be spent. For example, how to end the drought in California or how do we reduce energy consumption by 33% by 2030 would not be viable options.

Tonya Kennon, Library Director for the City of Riverside and Chair of the Inland Library System, just wanted to reiterate the different needs of systems across California and the diversity of jurisdictions within those Systems. She felt that libraries need to address the needs of their communities and that by funding something like marketing we could missing an opportunity to address a real need. She said, if the Board decided to go with a challenge grant, the request for ideas should be broad to allow for more suggestions and innovation.

Gerry Maginnity commented that since we were talking about CLSA funds, it is already narrow in its scope in that the Act focuses on resource sharing. In 1977 the diversity of the state was acknowledged and the legislature agreed to fund resource sharing so that every Californian would have equal access to information. While staff

was looking at modernizing the Act to move forward with 21st century technologies, we do have to emphasize the resource sharing component of this.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board directs the California State Library staff to investigate further options for the remaining one-time funds that would improve access for all Californians to both materials and services offered by public libraries and present recommendations for consideration by the Board at its next meeting.

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

E. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Member Schockman commented that the election of the next Board President and Vice-President would be held at the fall meeting. He and Member Williams requested that the Board think about changing the regulations to allow for two year terms for President and Vice-President. There seemed to be a lack of interest in leadership and he felt a two year term would be easier for the Board to manage.

Annly Roman brought up that changing to two years terms would require a regulatory change. The Board would already be looking at the regulations at the next Board meeting because there was significant change to the CLSA statute. These regulatory issues were probably something that would carry over into another year.

Member Christmas suggested that for each agenda item it would be helpful for the State Library Staff person that is working on that issue to do a presentation on the item before the Board has their discussion.

Annly Roman brought up that Wendy Hopkins, the Bureau Chief for Library Development Services, had suggested, since there were several new members, a whole Board orientation to discuss their purview, processes, Robert's Rules of Order, Open meeting rules, and which agenda packet items are beneficial and what might be superfluous documentation. She wanted to see if that was something the Board would be interested in doing. Members Buenafe, Schockman, and Bernardo agreed it would be beneficial.

Member Ibanez asked if there would be the ability for Board members to get some kind of reimbursement for CLA Annual Meeting this year like last year. State Librarian Lucas said that we would take a look at the budget and let them know.

F. <u>OLD BUSINESS</u>

There was no old business brought forward.

G. <u>AGENDA BUILDING</u>

No additional items were brought forward for the next meeting's agenda.

H. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

President Bernardo called for adjournment on the California Library Services Board meeting at 2:50pm.

Document 5

ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2016/17

ISSUE TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consideration of the 2016/17 Ongoing $1.75 Million and the 2016/17 One-Time CLSA Augmentation of $3 Million.

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board adopt the 2016/17 CLSA budget totaling $1,750,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems and direct the Cooperative Systems to file an amended plan of service to address how these funds will be used specifically to promote and enhance resource sharing using 21st century technologies.

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board adopt $1 million of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to expand the Zip Books program statewide.

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board adopt $500,000 of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to connect the remaining, unconnected California libraries to enki, purchase new content for the enki system and lay the groundwork for the deployment of the SimpleE eBook discovery app.

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board directs the California State Library staff to investigate further options for the remaining one-time funds that would improve access for all Californians to both materials and services offered by public libraries and present recommendations for consideration by the Board at its next meeting.

BACKGROUND:

Approved in 1977, the California Library Services Act is aimed at providing access to information to all Californians, particularly underserved populations such as those who are economically disadvantaged and geographically isolated.

California's budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016 includes $4.75 million in new funding under the California Library Services Act. These funds are in addition to the $1.88 million that has been continuously appropriated under the act for the past several years.

Of the $4.75 million, $1.75 million is ongoing, allocated under the "Communications and Delivery" section of the act -- nearly doubling continued spending under the act to $3.63 million. The remaining $3 million is one-time funding, the use of which is left largely to the board's discretion.

At its previous meeting, the board adopted $1.88 million for allocation to the Cooperative Library

Systems, the total allocation for systems for the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2016.

Decisions on allocating the $1.75 million for the fiscal year that began July 1 were deferred to this meeting in order to weigh its allocation in conjunction with decisions on allocating the $3 million in one-time funds.

ALLOCATING THE $1.75 MILLION

In keeping with the direction provided by the board, the State Library recommends the Cooperative Systems be directed to use the ongoing $1.75 million to enhance cost-effective resource sharing among their library members.

The State Library recommends the board require the systems to indicate how they will advance cost-effective resource sharing by demonstrating in their amended plans of service that they are addressing issues such as:

- Development of e-content through digitization or other methods.
- Improved access to library e-books or other library digital materials.
- Alternate delivery methods such as the federally funded pilot project, Zip Books (See below)
- Assistance to member libraries in costs associated with connecting to the California Research and Education Network via the State Library Broadband Project.

ALLOCATING THE ONE-TIME $3 MILLION

The remaining $3 million in one-time money is appropriated by a budget trailer bill that also updates the act to make it more reflective of 21st Century technologies. The budget bill, SB 826, and the trailer bill, AB 1602, were signed by the governor on June 27, 2016.

The trailer bill also requires the library to submit a report to lawmakers and the Department of Finance by September 1, 2017 summarizing grants awarded, project descriptions and use of e-resources enabled by the funds as well as "the progress of grantees toward establishing regional or statewide e-resource platforms."

At its last meeting on April 8th, the board requested that the State Library and California's nine regional library systems offer proposals on how these funds should be used for consideration at the board's July 12 meeting.

The board stressed that priority for expenditure of these funds was to promote and enhance resource sharing among libraries on a statewide or regional level. Other considerations the board said it would weigh in evaluating spending proposals include:

- Sustainability,
- System-wide or statewide benefits,
- Opportunities for multi-agency partnerships, and
- Improved access to underserved individuals.

Funding Options:

The budget and the act give the board latitude in determining how the $3 million in new funds is allocated. Options for the board to consider:

1) Allocate the one-time funds as a lump-sum grant(s) for programs selected by the board

2) Allocate the one-time funds as grants to the systems using the existing allocation formula for ongoing funds with direction from the board on how the funds should be used. That direction would be addressed in an amendment to the systems plan of service.

3) A combination of Options 1 and 2

State Library Recommendations:

Allocate the $3 million in one-time funds as grants under the "Special Services Programs" section of the act. Doing so gives the board a better opportunity to develop a statewide approach and eliminate the complexities inherent in coordinating the funding and management of a single program through nine cooperative systems.

Included in the board member's agenda packets (Document 5, Exhibits B-U) are summaries of the spending proposals for the $3 million submitted by the cooperative systems and several independent public libraries. Also included are letters from a few cooperative systems (Document 5, Exhibits V-X) giving opinions on how the funds should be allocated.

Given the goal of the act, the board's emphasis on enhancing resource sharing among libraries on a statewide or regional level and the Legislature's emphasis on increased access to e-resources, the State Library recommends moving forward now with two proposals:

1) Allocate $1 million to expand Zip Books, (Exhibit G) currently a pilot program in rural counties, into a demonstration project for all California libraries to provide cheaper, more efficient delivery of requested items to library patrons. Under the Zip Book program, if a library doesn't have a book requested by the patron, the library buys a copy and has it delivered directly to the patron who returns it to the library when finished. The library can then add the book to its collection. This process is cheaper and more efficient then the normal delivery process. This grant would cap statewide spending at $1 million with priority given to public library jurisdictions with the lowest per capita spending.

2) Allocate $500,000 to boost statewide availability of e-materials by adding $200,000 in new content to enki, an online platform of 50,000 downloadable titles including classic literature in the public domain, encyclopedias, fiction, non-fiction, travel, cooking and crafts. An additional $100,000 would connect the state's libraries not yet using enki for three years. The remaining $200,000 would be used to facilitate the eventual statewide deployment of SimplyE, an open source app allowing for the discovery and reading of eBooks from multiple eBook platforms like Overdrive and 3M's Biblioteca (portions of Exhibits J and L).

3) The State Library recommends pursuing other investments that require more

investigation and is requesting the board approve continued investigation of the concepts outlined below, which seek to expand and improve access to existing information, postponing final decisions on the remaining $1.5 million in one-time funds until its fall meeting.

A key way to expand access to undeserved communities is making information easier to find. Several proposals put forward by systems and explored independently by the State Library could make it far easier for Californians to access both materials and services offered by public libraries but more investigation of costs and capacity is required. **Final action would need to be postponed until the board's fall meeting.**

Lack of Awareness

A recurring trend in Pew Center surveys about libraries and how their communities view them is lack of awareness of the programs and services libraries offer (http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/04/07/libraries-and-learning/). In an April 2016 survey, 22 percent of respondents said they didn't know if their library has an e-book lending program – even though an estimated 90 percent of libraries have such programs.

In a 2013 Pew survey, 46 percent of respondents said they feel they know "some" of what their library offers and 20 percent say they don't know "much."

Focus groups held in conjunction with Pew's surveys routinely say listing events and resources on a library's website isn't enough. Librarians in the focus groups say almost every day at least one patron tells them, "I didn't know that was available."

How in a state as economically and geographically diverse as California can a greater number of Californians learn how much is available to them at their local library?

A multiplicity of strategies might be needed. For some underserved communities the cost of transportation can be the principal barrier. But whether through phones, pads or laptops most Californians have access to the Internet.

Improved Searchability

One of the concepts the State Library thinks warrants further consideration is the Bibframe initiative by the Library of Congress. This new method of organization would make materials held by California's public libraries are made accessible by Google search rather than only through a library's website.

Potentially, through Google calendar, not only would a library's materials be findable without going to the library's webpage but so would programs and events like Storytime, adult literacy courses and job fairs.

The Library of Congress is refining its new Bibframe 2.0. However, several local public libraries including Napa and Sacramento are entering into contracts with a private company using open source software developed with the Library of Congress to begin

applying Bibframe to libraries. At least one other vendor appears to offer a similar product.

The vendor named in Exhibit K says it can offer this service to all of California's libraries for less expense than the proposal in Exhibit K but the company's proposal to do so lacks sufficient specificity and transparency to be considered at this time.

The State Library would like to spend the next six weeks working with the Library of Congress to determine how and when Bibframe can be deployed in California's libraries and the information held by libraries opened up to easier Internet access.

New Organization of Information

Another way to boost accessibility is to use search tools that connect related concepts rather than use a keyword – the direction in which the Web is moving.

The State Library has been in conversations with Yewno.com, which offers a new, more intuitive and more focused way of searching for information. Pioneered by Stanford University and others, the search tool would give public library patrons access to over 50 million pieces of information – and growing -- organized by relevance. The company went public in April and is preparing a proposal on how it could be used by public libraries.

Putting the Yewno discovery tool in public libraries would provide any Californian anywhere in the state with an easily searchable database – a key goal in being used in academic institutions like MIT and, soon, the University of California at Berkeley.

Like Bibframe, more exploration is needed to determine how Yewno could begin appearing in public libraries.

Challenge Grant

One way to jumpstart innovation is to through a challenge grant like those the Knight Foundation and others put forward. Perhaps innovators exist who can accomplish the goals of improved access for all Californians more efficiently, more globally or both.

A portion of these funds could be earmarked for a grant that would challenge the applicants with deploying the resources of California's 1,100 libraries – 64 million print, 14 million e-materials, more than 22,000 Internet stations – to address a key California "need."

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

CURRENT STATUS: At the Sacramento meeting in April 2016, the board adopted $1.88 million in on-going funding from the governor's preliminary budget, released in January 2016, in order to provide cooperative systems with a partial payment as soon as the budget act was signed. The board will be reviewing the Plans of Service for those funds at the July 2016 meeting.