

1 *Approved April 18, 2007*

2  
3 **Library of California Board Meeting**  
4 **September 14, 2006**

5  
6 **California State Library**  
7 **914 Capitol Mall, Room 500**  
8 **Sacramento, California**

9  
10  
11 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

12 President Paymaneh Maghsoudi convened the Library of California Board Meeting on  
13 September 14, 2006 at 8:36 a.m., by asking Member Kastanis to lead those in attendance in  
14 the Pledge of Allegiance. President Maghsoudi then welcomed Board Members, staff and  
15 audience members to Sacramento and called for introductions.

16 **Board Members Present:** President Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Anne Bernardo, Tyrone  
17 Cannon, Victoria Fong, Linda Jewett, Penny Kastanis, Jane Lowenthal, Susan Steinhauser,  
18 and Judy Zollman.

19 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Susan Hildreth, Tom  
20 Andersen, Chris Berger, Rushton Brandis, Ira Bray, Jacquie Brinkley, Suzanne Flint,  
21 Sandy Habbestad, Susan Hanks, Carla Lehn, Kathy Low, Cindy Mediavilla, Kevin  
22 Saunders, and Cindy Tackett.

23 **ELECTION OF BOARD VICE PRESIDENT FOR 2006**

24  
25 President Maghsoudi appointed Members Steinhauser and Fong to the Nominating  
26 Committee. Chairing the committee, Member Steinhauser stated that the position for  
27 Vice-President became vacant when Sarah Pritchard left the state to accept a position as  
28 University Librarian at Northwestern University.

1            *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Steinhauser) and carried*  
2            *unanimously that the Library of California Board elect Penny Kastanis as*  
3            *Vice-President of the Library of California Board to complete the 2006 term.*  
4

5            **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

6  
7            *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Cannon) and carried unanimously that the*  
8            *Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the September 14, 2006*  
9            *meeting as presented.*  
10

11           **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

12  
13           *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Jewett) and carried unanimously that the draft*  
14           *minutes of the October 20, 2005 Library of California Board meeting be*  
15           *approved as presented.*  
16

17           **RESOLUTIONS**

18  
19           Prior to the adoption of Board resolutions, several members read the resolutions  
20           prepared for former members as they leave their position on the Board.  
21

22           *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the*  
23           *Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution*  
24           *2006-1 for Sally Tuttle; Resolution 2006-2 for Sarah Pritchard; and*  
25           *Resolution 2006-3 for Lucy Lin. (See Attachment A)*  
26

27           **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

28  
29           **Board President's Report**

30  
31           President Maghsoudi reported that she continues to meet by conference call with staff  
32           at the State Library, as needed.

33           **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

34           Susan Hildreth remarked on the number of new staff at Library Development Services.  
35  
36           She noted that Gerry Maginnity, Assistant Bureau Chief in LDS, was in Denver, Colorado  
37           for a delivery colloquium entitled *Moving Mountains*. The State Library also supported  
38           the travel of representatives from some of the CLSA Systems to participate in this event.  
39           She hoped the Board would hear more about the colloquium at a future meeting.

1 Hildreth then invited the newly hired LDS Program Consultants Jacquie Brinkley,  
2 Suzanne Flint, Susan Hanks, and Cindy Mediavilla, to briefly talk about their past work  
3 experience and their current projects at the State Library. Hildreth continued her report  
4 by highlighting some of the activities throughout the year relating to Resource Sharing and  
5 the Library of California Board. She stated that Tom Andersen and herself participated in  
6 the CLSA Focus Groups throughout the state, facilitated by Maureen Sullivan. She  
7 reported that it was a worthwhile experience to travel throughout the state and see the  
8 unique and continuing role that CLSA Systems play. Hildreth stated that the LSTA process  
9 continues, as it is an ongoing process involving application review and monitoring of new  
10 projects for success, in which she involves herself, to some extent, in an advisory capacity.  
11 She reported that the Governor, in his May Revise, included an augmentation of \$7 million  
12 to the CLSA Transaction Based Reimbursements (TBR) Program, and another \$7 million  
13 to the Public Library Foundation (PLF) Program. She stated that in June, the library  
14 community was saddened by the new of Proposition 81 not being passed by the voters.  
15 Hildreth felt that this was due to a number of factors including low voter turnout and the  
16 concern regarding bonds, in general. She stated that the California library community and  
17 California Library Association are the driving force behind these issues, and they are  
18 looking to see how the November bond votes fair. Hildreth reported that there is a huge  
19 library construction need in the state of California and many projects are moving forward  
20 in various formats, in spite of the bond defeat.

21 Hildreth stated that although funding was no longer available to support the Library of  
22 California and Regional Library Networks, the Tierra del Sol Network submitted a 2006-  
23 07 Plan of Service, with a budget of \$7,300 in reserve funds. Since the Plan of Service was

1 unsolicited by the Board, no action was needed. Also, the members of the Arroyo Seco  
2 Library Network voted to dissolve as a non-profit public entity and distribute their  
3 remaining funds, which were about \$10,200, to the California State Library Foundation.  
4 Hildreth offered thanks to Arroyo Seco for the donation.

5 Hildreth concluded by saying that she is looking forward to working with Ruth Metz,  
6 an independent library consultant currently from Portland Oregon, who would be  
7 reviewing for the Board the scope of work on a study entitled, "Developing a New  
8 Reference Model."

9 **Election of Board Officers for 2007**

10 President Maghsoudi called upon Member Steinhauser to report on Board Officer  
11 nominations. Member Steinhauser stated that the committee, consisting of Members Fong  
12 and herself, was charged with not only finding a replacement for Sarah Pritchard to  
13 finishing out her term for 2006, but also for putting together a slate of officers for the 2007  
14 year. The committee recommended Member Maghsoudi and Member Kastanis as Board  
15 Officers for 2007.

16 *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Steinhauser) and carried*  
17 *unanimously that the Library of California Board elects Paymaneh*  
18 *Maghsoudi as President of the Library of California Board for the Year 2007.*

19  
20 *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Steinhauser) and carried*  
21 *unanimously that the Library of California Board elects Penny Kastanis as*  
22 *Vice-President of the Library of California Board for the 2007.*

23  
24 Member Steinhauser remarked that Penny Kastanis brings to her position over thirty  
25 years of librarianship, and that Paymaneh Maghsoudi brings twenty-five years of  
26 experience.

1    **Library of California Board meeting schedule and locations**

2       Sandy Habbestad reported that after surveying Board members regarding possible  
3    dates to schedule two Board meetings in 2007, February 28<sup>th</sup> and August 8<sup>th</sup> were  
4    proposed. The Board agreed upon those dates, and Habbestad informed the Board that  
5    everyone would be duly notified. Hildreth commented that by proposing a meeting in  
6    February, it was possible that development of a new Reference model would be far enough  
7    along in the planning stage for the Board to discuss. Also, if budget change proposals  
8    were to be considered for FY 2008/09, the Board would need to begin the discussion  
9    process before the August meeting. Having a meeting in August would allow time to  
10   further discuss, modify and submit a potential budget change proposal before the 2008/09  
11   deadline. The Board agreed that August 9, 2007, be held in reserve should a second day of  
12   business be required.

13    **Budget and Planning Report**

14       Habbestad reported that CLSA did not take any cuts this year, but received an  
15    additional \$7 million in TBR funding; bring the total CLSA baseline to \$21.3 million.

16        ***It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that***  
17        ***the Library of California Board adopts the 2006/07 CLSA budget as displayed***  
18        ***in the chart entitled “Summary-- 2006/07 CLSA Baseline Budget***  
19        ***Recommendation by Program” and that the aforementioned chart be***  
20        ***included in the minutes of this meeting. (See Attachment B)***  
21

22       Habbestad reported that the CLSA Plans of Service were received from all 15  
23    cooperative systems. She stated that staff had concerns about a few of the proposed  
24    activities in a couple of the Systems, but would be working with the Systems to resolve  
25    those concerns. Member Lowenthal asked what the concerns were regarding the Plans.  
26    Hildreth stated that Gerry Maginnity, along with Andersen and Habbestad, would be

1 looking at the Plans and identifying some areas that might need adjusting, and making sure  
2 that the expenditure was in line with the regulations.

3 ***It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Jewett) and carried unanimously that the***  
4 ***Library of California Board approves the CLSA Systems Plans of Service for***  
5 ***each of the 15 CLSA Cooperative Library Systems submitted for fiscal year***  
6 ***2006/07.***

7  
8 Hildreth noted that the Focus Group report from the work done with Maureen Sullivan  
9 was included in the packet. The report showed how varied and important the System  
10 services are and has helped the State Library to begin drafting an approach to re-looking at  
11 Cooperative Systems and their services. Member Steinhauser asked how the report would  
12 be used. Hildreth responded that one of the key issues is how we are providing reference  
13 services, either to our citizens or to our libraries through second-level reference from the  
14 Systems. She stated that although our first priority is on reference, we also want to look at  
15 the delivery component, since delivery is another key function that Systems provide  
16 throughout the state.

17 Hildreth reported that the Systems are beginning to look at how they can possibly  
18 consolidate, and they are also looking at how they can share resources for other kinds of  
19 services. Andersen reported that the participants in the focus groups were able to talk  
20 about the services and products they value as well as the ones that are not as important. He  
21 stated that this would help the State Library position itself for further strategic planning.  
22 Member Jewett stated that she would like to see school library districts become more  
23 involved in these service programs. Andersen stated that although the statute is directed  
24 toward the public libraries in terms of the financial assistance, each System can have

1 associate members from other types of libraries; however, CLSA monies can only be used  
2 for public libraries.

3 **Resource Sharing Report**

4 **CLSA Consolidations and Affiliations**

5 Andersen briefly reported on the steps that need to be taken in order for a new library  
6 jurisdiction to affiliate with an existing cooperative system. In regard to the City of  
7 Moorpark affiliation, he stated that the Board, in previous years, waived the contiguous  
8 boundaries requirement and approved two library jurisdictions—Thousand Oaks and  
9 Oxnard—located in Ventura County to join MCLS rather than Black Gold where the  
10 boundaries lay.

11 Patrick Hunter, Mayor of the City of Moorpark, provided reasons why the City of  
12 Moorpark Library withdrew from the Ventura County Library System to become an  
13 independent library jurisdiction. He also reported that the City of Moorpark requests to  
14 join the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System (MCLS) because many of the Moorpark  
15 residents work in the surrounding areas of MCLS libraries, rather than join the Black Gold  
16 System in which the boundaries are contiguous.

17 *It was moved, seconded (Jewett/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*  
18 *Library of California Board waives the contiguous boundary requirement of*  
19 *20190(a) of the Code of California Regulations to approves the affiliation of*  
20 *the Moorpark City Library with the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System*  
21 *(MCLS) effective July 1, 2007, contingent upon the receipt of all*  
22 *documentation required for this action.*

23  
24 In regard to the affiliation of Monterey Public Library, Andersen stated that over a  
25 decade ago the Monterey Public Library withdrew its membership in the Monterey Bay  
26 Area Cooperative Library System (MOBAC) in order to charge non-resident borrowers a

1 library card fee. In July 2006 Monterey eliminated the library card fee for all California  
2 residents and requested, once again, to become an official member of MOBAC.

3 ***It was moved, seconded (Cannon/Zollman) and carried unanimously that the***  
4 ***Library of California Board approves the affiliation of the Monterey Public***  
5 ***Library with the Monterey Bay Area Cooperative Library System effective***  
6 ***July 1, 2007.***

7  
8 Andersen stated that on July 1, 2006 the City of Victorville separated from the San  
9 Bernardino County Library system and established an independent municipal library  
10 jurisdiction. The city is currently in the process of transitioning from the county system to  
11 a community public library. He stated that Victorville is waiting for system membership  
12 approval from the Inland Library System Administrative Council.

13 ***It was moved, seconded (Steinhauser/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that***  
14 ***the Library of California Board approves the affiliation of Victorville Public***  
15 ***Library with the Inland Library System effective July 1, 2007, contingent***  
16 ***upon the approval of the Inland Administrative Council and supporting***  
17 ***documentation.***

18  
19 Andersen reported that Shasta County and the City of Redding are working together to  
20 construct a new library facility located in Redding. The City of Redding is in the process  
21 of separating from the County of Shasta and establishing an independent municipal library  
22 that will be operational in the new library facility. Andersen stated that the Redding  
23 Municipal Library is requesting Board approval to join the North State Cooperative  
24 Library System. Andersen stated that the State Library did not received notification of the  
25 request prior to the deadline required by law and asked that the Board waive the filing date  
26 requirement and approve the request contingent upon receipt of the required  
27 documentation from both the City of Redding and North State.

28 ***It was moved, seconded (Steinhauser/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that***  
29 ***the Library of California Board waives the filing date requirement of Section***

1            *20190(c) of the Code of California Regulations and approves the affiliation of*  
2            *the Redding Public Library with the North State Cooperative Library System*  
3            *effective July 1, 2007, contingent upon the receipt of all documentation*  
4            *required for this action.*

5  
6            **CLSA System Reference Program**

7            Habbestad reported that the motion for consideration is the annual approval of the  
8            System Population and Membership figures that are required in order to calculate the  
9            System Reference Program allocations. She stated that Exhibit A lists the public library  
10           members for each CLSA Systems and the population of the Systems as determined by the  
11           most recently published estimates from the Department of Finance. The population figures  
12           for 2006/07 included the affiliation of Fullerton Public Library with Santiago, and the  
13           Richmond Public Library’s change of System membership from North Bay to BALIS.

14           **It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Steinhauser) and carried unanimously**  
15           **that the Library of California Board approves the System Population and**  
16           **Membership figures for use in the allocation of the CLSA System**  
17           **Reference Program funds for the fiscal year 2006/07.**

18  
19           Member Lowenthal questioned the two jurisdictions—City of Industry and Lassen  
20           County—listed under the heading “Areas Without Service” on the last page of Exhibit A.  
21           Hildreth responded that Industry does not have its own public library, and therefore  
22           residents may use the libraries of the County of Los Angeles or direct service would be  
23           provided from the California State Library, if it does not have a share in the local  
24           jurisdiction. It was agreed that the language be changed to read “Jurisdictions that don’t  
25           provide service.” Habbestad stated that Exhibits B through G were excerpts from the  
26           2006/07 System Plans of Service. The plans indicate that all Systems will provide the level  
27           of service required by law for System Reference. Exhibits H through M are summaries of  
28           the achievements for System Reference Programs as reported in the 2004/05 annual

1 reports. She stated that System Annual Reports for 2005/06 were being received at the  
2 State Library and would be summarized for the Board's February meeting.

3 In response to a question about statewide reference by chat service, Hildreth replied  
4 that it refers to *AskNow*, the live chat, interactive, on-line reference service program,  
5 supported by the State Library through LSTA funding. Member Steinhauser asked if  
6 anything unusual was found in the Plans of Service. Hildreth responded by pointing out  
7 how the volume of reference questions had decreased at the System level in the last five to  
8 ten years. The questions are becoming more in-depth and specific at that level because  
9 people are satisfied with what they are finding on Google.com. Hildreth stated that  
10 reference dollars are now being used effectively for training and other kinds of  
11 enhancements for their local library and System Reference staffs. Member Lowenthal  
12 requested clarification as to whether Google and other Internet service providers have been  
13 empirically shown to decrease library reference questions. The response from staff was  
14 that there is considerable evidence to that effect. Member Kastanis added that in schools,  
15 students are Googling as an easy way to find information, rather than accessing designated  
16 databases. Member Cannon pointed out that another issue in the academic settings is  
17 whether students are searching effectively to find what they need, and whether they are  
18 accessing accurate, scholarly information, by using Google.com.

### 19 **Guest Speaker's Report on Developing a New Reference Model**

20 Hildreth introduced Ruth Metz, an independent library consultant who was asked by  
21 the State Library to identify a reference model or models, beyond the local level. Hildreth  
22 stated that the model would be based on the current System Reference Centers, but would  
23 involve a more direct approach.

1 Metz began her report by giving the Board a brief history of her work as a reference  
2 librarian in California. During most of the 1980's and part of 1990's she was the System  
3 Coordinator for BALIS. Prior to that she was the Director of Library Development at the  
4 Colorado State Library, working with the Colorado Regional Library Service System, a  
5 multi-type library structure. From 1976-1982, Metz was the Director of the Community  
6 College Learning Resources Center in Michigan. The strengths that Metz brings to the  
7 reference model project are her objectivity and experience working on a number of  
8 development projects, collaborating and facilitating the development of programs and  
9 services, and research and development programs to help promote library services. Metz  
10 stated that in her most recent position as Deputy Director of Libraries for the Multnomah  
11 County Library in Oregon, she championed the L-Net Program, Oregon's version of  
12 California's AskNow project. She stated that the current structure of reference, as it now  
13 exists in California, includes the local or first-level reference, the second-level reference,  
14 AskNow virtual reference service, and second-level databases, including First Source. The  
15 Nelson-Mayo focus groups that were conducted about a year ago resulted in three  
16 recommendations: 1) to merge the second-level question answering; 2) to improve the  
17 virtual model; and 3) to provide specialized databases and training.

18 Member Lowenthal asked for clarification on the terms *second-level reference* and  
19 *second-level databases*. Metz responded that consumer questions directed to local public  
20 libraries, which are known as first-level reference sources, may be referred to a CLSA  
21 System, if the local library is unable to answer the question. The CLSA System Reference  
22 Center library would be a second-level reference source. Hildreth commented that  
23 historically there were a number of different mechanisms for answering reference

1 questions in California. For a number of years there were two LSTA-funded third-level  
2 reference centers—the Bay Area Reference Center (BARC) located in San Francisco and  
3 the Southern California Answering Network (SCAN) located in Los Angeles. LSTA  
4 funding for BARC and SCAN was eliminated under State Librarian Gary Strong’s  
5 administration. At present, there exist a few other resources, in addition to the first and  
6 second level reference sources. Metz pointed out that there is a perceived need for a top-  
7 level reference source in California—a place of last resort. Along with that is a further  
8 question of where that reference source needs to be located. At present, the top CLSA  
9 reference level is being handled by the second-level reference source. AskNow, another  
10 reference service, has been added in recent years through the resources of the State Library  
11 and MCLS. AskNow is a live, on-line chat-room service, where the public, as well as  
12 library staff, can interact with a reference librarian to get help with question answering.  
13 AskNow is accessed from a public library’s website. The System Reference Centers use  
14 databases, such as the Los Angeles Public Library’s First Source databases, which contain  
15 some commercial, as well as specialized databases, so that reference staff can utilize them  
16 to handle second-level questions. Metz stated that she was asked to provide the Board with  
17 the scope of her work for the reference study, which is to create a new reference model. A  
18 very disciplined and defined approach has been taken in structuring this particular study,  
19 recognizing that it fits into a larger context of resource sharing, which the Board will be  
20 examining over the next few years. She stated that the intent is to have the central part of  
21 the study completed by June 2007, and be ready to ramp up to the operational part as early  
22 as March 2008.

1 Metz stated that the purpose of developing a new reference model is twofold: 1) to  
2 improve information access, and 2) to enhance, refine, and tune up what we are doing in  
3 California so that it is compatible with technology trends, and with the way that  
4 information consumers are now using—and could be using—information in the  
5 foreseeable future. She said that it is a given that reference technology is dynamic, and this  
6 model iteration is not carved in stone forever, because the technology is changing, and  
7 information consumers are using the information in different ways. Therefore, this new  
8 model needs to be structured so that it is contemporary, efficient, and workable for the  
9 public. But it must be fluid, and the Board will have to keep coming back and looking at it  
10 to make sure it keeps up with current trends. Metz reported that the scope of the work is to  
11 build on and tune up the reference referral protocol, the 24/7 direct public access, and to  
12 determine what specialized databases are needed to make this structure work. This project  
13 is not an attempt to turn everything upside down and start from scratch. Member  
14 Lowenthal asked if specific database needs had been identified. Metz replied that, in order  
15 to determine the need, she would find out what databases are presently being utilized, by  
16 consulting with stakeholders and the people using the databases.

17 In order to put the entire concept into context, Metz turned the Board’s attention to a  
18 graphic on page four of her written report entitled “Reference in Context of Resource  
19 Sharing Discussion.” Metz explained that she has put question handling at the center of  
20 the graphic, not because question handling is necessarily central to resource sharing, but  
21 because it is the center of her focus for the reference study. She stated that there are a  
22 number of issues that may be impacted; for example, if the reference protocol is changed,  
23 it will most likely have an impact on CLSA Systems and the delivery program. Metz

1 commented that the AskNow reference service is an important feature of the library virtual  
2 reference world, but as the consultant for this study, she would be looking into just how  
3 effective it is. She stated that it may or may not be a part of the new reference model. Metz  
4 explained that the AskNow service provides a mediated online 24/7 reference service,  
5 including document delivery. The Metropolitan Cooperative Library System (MCLS)  
6 administers AskNow through a three-year commitment of LSTA funds. Some research  
7 and development on the AskNow service is currently being conducted. The information  
8 gathered will be considered when developing a new reference model.

9 Hildreth clarified that no CLSA dollars have ever funded the AskNow reference  
10 service; its funding is in partnership with MCLS through LSTA funding.

11 Metz continued that the LSTA grant for 2006/07 is the last in a 3-year State Library  
12 commitment to transition from locally developed software to the OCLC Question Point  
13 service. OCLC will provide many of the tasks previously done by the MCLS coordinator,  
14 and will work with MCLS in marketing and training. OCLC's intent is to accomplish three  
15 objectives: 1) to continue 24/7 reference services for California residents; 2) to develop a  
16 pricing model for a sustainable future for AskNow services; and 3) to develop a procedure  
17 for transitioning to the new service model, including establishing an AskNow Advisory  
18 Board.

19 To clarify the role of OCLC with regard to AskNow, Metz stated that OCLC (Online  
20 Computer Library Center) is a networking organization, which has a huge global database,  
21 and which has developed the software that allows AskNow to function. AskNow is a  
22 network of reference specialists throughout California who volunteer their time and  
23 experience to respond to questions. MCLS coordinates the geographically dispersed

1 reference staff. OCLC has taken on the software, that MCLS developed in previous years,  
2 in order to manage the network of referral. OCLC is in the process of fine-tuning this  
3 software package, which Metz will be monitoring for progress.

4 Member Fong asked whether LSTA money had gone into funding any of the programs  
5 associated with OCLC, and whether OCLC is now making money off of the MCLS  
6 software. Andersen explained that MCLS is involved because LSTA originally supported  
7 the development of the MCLS 24/7 reference software. It was then decided that federal  
8 dollars could no longer be used to support software development. During this time OCLC  
9 was interested in acquiring the 24/7 software. An agreement was reached and the 24/7  
10 software was merged into the OCLC Question Point operating system. The State Library  
11 agreed to provide adequate LSTA financial assistance for three years, to enable all of the  
12 public library members of AskNow to have free access to the service. During this final  
13 year of LSTA funding, the grant only paid for access to Question Point. Hildreth added  
14 that during the three-year period, OCLC gave California public libraries very good rates  
15 for its service; however, it's not known what the rates will be in future years. In developing  
16 a new reference model now, it will help to determine what course to take in the future.  
17 Member Steinhauser sought further clarification as to the future of AskNow. Andersen  
18 responded that future-funding plans for LSTA had not yet been formulated.

19 Laurel Patric, Interim Executive Director for MCLS, Santiago and South State, stated  
20 that an advisory committee was being formed to work with OCLC on issues raised, such as  
21 the new pricing model. Patric called attention to the fact that the transition from the  
22 AskNow software to the new Question Point software proved to be rather difficult,  
23 primarily because not enough library staff being available for proper training. She also

1 pointed out that in addition to reference librarians in California, AskNow uses reference  
2 librarians world-wide in order to maintain 24/7 coverage.

3 Metz returned the Board attention to the graphic in her report and the contextual issues  
4 surrounding a new reference model. She pointed out that there may be legislative changes  
5 made in relation to the new model. Metz stated that, to a lesser extent, statewide delivery  
6 systems, multitype resource sharing, and the ILL and Direct Loan programs may be  
7 affected by the change, as well as LSTA funding.

8 In August 2006 CLSA Systems statewide got together to discuss System consolidation  
9 and a project that would test consolidation of systems and develop a process for moving  
10 toward a merger of the four Bay Area Systems. All these issues are on the radar screen in  
11 relation to the new reference model.

12 Specifications for a new reference model, which have been identified so far are:

- 13 1) A model that is efficient and cost effective
- 14 2) A statewide reference model which will serve all California residents
- 15 3) A flexible model, adaptable to changing technology, that is suited to the  
16 information consumer
- 17 4) Something the public sees as an extension of the local library
- 18 5) A model that pays attention to the delivery component.

19 A discussion ensued among members about reference service delivery and training the  
20 public about what services are available from the library. Metz responded to a question  
21 about current delivery service, stating that people now have several alternatives. They can  
22 go to their local library and get information in book or magazine form; or go online from  
23 home, office or school and search there local public library database and download

1 materials; or the local library may provide a fax copy. Member Steinhauser asked about  
2 answers being provided by text messaging or I-pod messaging.

3 Member Cannon raised an issue about less technologically savvy consumers who  
4 might not be aware of TM (text messaging) or IM (I-pod messaging). Are libraries looking  
5 at how they are going to train the user, and how they are going to market their services?  
6 Metz acknowledged that the new reference model had to take into account everyone's  
7 modality of accessing information. Member Kastanis cited the need to educate students,  
8 teachers, and the public on what libraries have available to offer already, as well as the  
9 newest technology advances. She has found that people are not aware of what kinds of  
10 resources are currently available to them at their libraries. Metz stated that the public  
11 information part of the new model is very important, and that her work plan, the *Ramp-up*  
12 *or Implementation Plan* of the project, would address this issue.

13 Metz moved on to the work plan, of which there were four parts:

- 14 1) Preparation and startup would begin in October 2006;
- 15 2) Fact-finding would be done between November 2006 and February 2007;
- 16 3) The design phase would be done between February and March 2007; and
- 17 4) The ramp-up to implementation would be completed by June 2007.

18 Metz said the approach taken would be pragmatic, not a reinvention of the wheel,  
19 recognizing there are some good things in place already. It will be direct, practical and  
20 focused.

21 Metz then directed the Board's attention to the Reference Model graphic on page 8 of  
22 her report. She said that she would be reporting to the State Library *Client Team*, a small  
23 group consisting of Susan Hildreth, Tom Andersen, and Gerry Maginnity, as well as some

1 other key CSL informants. Her fact-finding and design process would be in consultation  
2 with four teams, including the CSL *Client Team*. The *Consultant Cohorts* with whom she  
3 would be working can be found on *libraryconsultants.org*, a network of exceptional library  
4 consultants, and may include Sandra Nelson, Diane Mayo, and Maureen Sullivan, as well  
5 as others from around the state of California. She would be utilizing *Expert Informants*  
6 from California, as well as other states, on virtual reference and reference protocols. Also,  
7 she would be consulting with *Current Service Providers*, e.g., MCLS, and other reference  
8 service providers, such as OCLC and Los Angeles Public Library. In addition, *Alternative*  
9 *Service Providers* like tutor.com, may be consulted.

10 Member Steinhauser asked whether Metz would be consulting with the private sector,  
11 voicing concern that if only the public sector was used, the reference model may not bring  
12 forth the best of what is available. Metz acknowledge that her plan included the concept of  
13 utilizing the best assistance from the private sector. The *Client Team* would assist in  
14 determining which avenues to pursue, and with whom to consult.

15 Member Steinhauser voiced her concern about the absence of academic reference  
16 resources on the graphic. Metz explained that academic consulting was definitely included  
17 under the headings of *Expert Informants, Elsewhere; Current Service Providers; Other*  
18 *Service Providers* and *Alternative Service Providers*. Metz reminded the Board that she did  
19 not have a blank check to operate, that a disciplined approach to consultant resources must  
20 be taken, but it was doable with the assistance and direction of the *Client Team*.

21 Member Steinhauser expressed another concern about technology and how it becomes  
22 obsolete so quickly that the basis of this study could be obsolete by the time Metz gets

1 back to the Board six months from now. Metz responded that she would be attentive to  
2 that concern.

3 Member Fong asked whether other state library systems had been consulted from  
4 whom California might integrate reference model components. Hildreth responded that the  
5 California State Library keeps informed, so we have a pretty good feel for what is currently  
6 available in other state library agencies. She stated that many states use Question Point;  
7 there are two or three service providers, such as Tutor.com being used. Hildreth pointed  
8 out that no other state has California's unique set of problems and challenges and level of  
9 complexity. California's geographic size, population size and diversity, immigrant  
10 population, the variety of library systems, and different resource levels are some of the  
11 conditions making it challenging to establish a model for this state.

12 Member Cannon stated that one of the things the University of San Francisco Library  
13 is doing, which belongs to a national consortium of 28 Association of Jesuit Colleges and  
14 Universities, is to subscribe to tutor.com and 24/7 reference, by providing round-the-clock  
15 access to its students. They are also developing in-house systems using yahoo, since many  
16 of the students have yahoo accounts.

17 Member Steinhauser raised a point that it is important to identify who the user will be,  
18 and that perhaps yahoo.com represents an easy means for a user to tap into library services.  
19 Member Kastanis addressed Metz, saying that she had a daunting task, trying to hone  
20 down the volume of expert information available, looking at what is going to be most  
21 applicable to our communities, while working within the limited funding and time at her  
22 disposal. Metz agreed, stating that the goal is to have a good, efficient, and effective  
23 reference model for California now, and for the foreseeable future. While understanding

1 that technology changes, we are not aiming at state-of-the-art, but state-of-the-art will be  
2 looked at to see what this model will need to be. She stated that one of the things librarians  
3 around the country are questioning right now is the utility of virtual reference. Metz will be  
4 looking into what the various experts have to say about it, keeping an open mind without  
5 preconceived notions, and yet maintaining a disciplined approach. However, she does not  
6 believe that there is an expert on this particular area of virtual reference, henceforth the  
7 need to draw on the expertise of various people around the country, and to apply it to the  
8 question in a disciplined way.

9 Member Jewett asked what consideration is being given to all the different languages  
10 in California. Member Kastanis pointed out that there is new software that allows the  
11 English speaker's language to be translated into the French language. She believes that  
12 eventually it will be technologically feasible for library reference questions posed in one  
13 language to be responded to in that same language. Metz assured the members that  
14 language was under consideration as a part of this project.

15 Member Lowenthal asked how virtual reference could not be a component of any  
16 reference model? Hildreth responded that it's a question of modalities of delivery, not that  
17 of doing away with virtual reference altogether. Research and user surveys indicate that  
18 present modes of offering virtual reference are not effective in meeting user demands. She  
19 further clarified that users are not so much dissatisfied with the virtual content, as the mode  
20 in which that content is accessed and delivered. Member Cannon gave an example, citing  
21 tutor.com, who recently changed their software. Many librarians have complained that the  
22 new software is less user-friendly, that students prefer easier access.

1 Member Lowenthal then asked why was state-of-the-art technology not being  
2 considered for this study?. Metz restated that the goal of the project is not to do reference  
3 and delivery for everyone in the nation in order to achieve state-of-the-art technology;  
4 rather, the goal is to fine-tune the existing California reference model, to make it better,  
5 more efficient and more cost-effective. Hildreth added that California is spending both  
6 state and federal dollars in a number of different streams to support providing information  
7 and reference to our libraries and the public. She is concerned that those dollars are spent  
8 as strategically as possible. If additional funds are going to be requested for CLSA  
9 operations, whether for reference, delivery or whatever capacity, she wants to insure that  
10 the public library expenditures are justifiable, and funds are being spent as responsibly and  
11 effectively as possible. Hildreth does not feel that expenditures could be adequately  
12 justified and defended to the legislature until this study was completed. Andersen reminded  
13 Board members to keep in mind the context of the discussion, and that the reason the  
14 Board was hearing about the new Reference Model Project was that CLSA requires that,  
15 by law, public libraries and Systems provide reference service to the public. This project  
16 was formed to find the most efficient and economical means of providing reference  
17 service. At the end of the study, it will be the task of the Board and the State Library to  
18 find the funding to accomplish that.

19 Member Lowenthal asked if a public/private funding collaboration was considered to  
20 the legal question, or was it legally possible or probable. Andersen responded that he did  
21 not see any legal obstacles to public/private collaboration. There are, however, legal issues  
22 as to how public money is spent.

1 Member Lowenthal asked what is the overall goal of the project. Metz responded that  
2 the goal is to develop a new model for reference question handling in California that is  
3 efficient and effective.

4 Member Steinhauser noted that Maureen Sullivan's research seemed to indicate that  
5 the various Systems would prefer that second-level questions be answered by a third level  
6 of reference, or a statewide reference level. She also questioned whether one of the  
7 alternatives being looked at by Metz would possibility eliminate the second-level reference  
8 service in favor of statewide reference. Hildreth responded that she would not characterize  
9 the CLSA Systems as suggesting that the second-level Systems Reference be bumped up to  
10 a statewide reference level. Rather, the information gathered from the field by Nelson and  
11 Mayo suggested that perhaps the second level was not necessary. She went on to say that  
12 we are living in an age when the public wants immediate access to information, and we are  
13 looking to see whether libraries can provide the public with a very high level of question-  
14 answering service. Hildreth stated that she did not want to create the impression that  
15 statewide reference would necessarily be funded, or that the existing System Reference  
16 program would be replaced. A statewide reference system, which is a virtual reference  
17 service, is one of the things that should be considered, and eventually may be proposed,  
18 but we are not there yet. She stated that Metz will not be dealing with this issue, although  
19 her study should help the Board determine what is to be considered.

20 Member Steinhauser asked if there were fewer questions being asked of System  
21 Reference staff, even if those questions are more difficult to answer, why are we spending  
22 all this time and energy figuring out how to answer questions? Hildreth pointed out that  
23 every individual has the right to get his or her questions answered. She hopes that question

1 answering at the statewide or CLSA level could be provided using a cost-effective method,  
2 where individuals could get right to an expert to get their questions answered.

3 Member Lowenthal asked whether the third-level reference librarian, after exhausting  
4 library resources for an answer, would be able to go to the expense of sources external to  
5 the library to get the expert answers for the library user. Hildreth responded that she hoped  
6 a model would be created whereby the user could directly access an expert, or if not, be  
7 able to reach individuals who could directly access the relevant information. Andersen  
8 stated that as a former reference librarian, he called all over the United States, and  
9 sometimes outside of the States, to get answers for patrons. That is what reference  
10 librarians have always done. He also asked Board members to understand that it is not the  
11 number of questions that have gone down, but the number of questions directed to  
12 libraries. People are getting more of their questions answered on their own, especially on-  
13 line. Metz commented that second-level reference is already providing this high level of  
14 question answering, which can be rather expensive.

15 Member Bernardino asked how could multitype libraries be brought into the fold of the  
16 new reference model since it appears that this reference model would not represent the  
17 multitype libraries. Metz responded that the second-level reference systems are now the  
18 point of entry for the other types of libraries, and she does not see that changing. She  
19 agreed with Member Bernardino that these information resource-sharing arrangements  
20 were not necessarily formalized networks, and that these relationships varied from system  
21 to system.

22 President Maghsoudi opened up the meeting to questions from the audience.

1 Gail McPartland, from Peninsula, Silicon Valley, BALIS and MOBAC systems, stated  
2 that she was the instigator of the reference forums for the four Bay Area systems, and  
3 supervisor of second-level reference for the same systems. She offered many thanks to the  
4 State Library staff and the Board for carrying this conversation forward. She has about  
5 seventy librarians in the bay area who have been waiting for an answer to the reference  
6 dilemma. She asked if the recommendations were being accepted from the Nelson/Mayo  
7 report. Hildreth responded by saying that consultants Nelson and Mayo provided  
8 unsolicited recommendations; however, their recommendations would be considered in the  
9 larger scope. Andersen agreed, stated that the Nelson/Mayo report was under  
10 consideration, especially since it reflected what was heard in the focus groups.

11 McPartland voiced her concern that a “one size fits all” solution would work for  
12 California. She foresees an infrastructure that includes choice of alternative models that  
13 may work better for the various Systems, and System members. For about 18 months,  
14 Peninsula Library System has been experimenting with outsourcing reference questions to  
15 the North Bay Cooperative Library System. According to her reference staff, there has  
16 been no degradation of service observed. A few questions are still being answered locally,  
17 some going to local experts, some to the commercial sector and some to a few other  
18 entities. All available resources are being exhausted.

19 Greg Atkins, Chair of the North Bay Cooperative Library System, which also  
20 administers the North State and Mountain Valley Library Systems, voiced his concern on  
21 the work plan, which he feels does not leave time for the various individual libraries and  
22 systems to react to its proposed design, and to provide the input that would perfect the  
23 design. Atkins stated that the plan allows for a February/March *Design* window, and then

1 discusses *Ramp-up to Implementation* beginning in March. He believes that more time will  
2 be required for the CLSA Systems to react, to discuss the design proposals, and to provide  
3 input. Hildreth addressed his concern, remarking that the timeline was constrained by  
4 several factors: 1) Metz's time and scope of work needed to be limited; 2) the July 2007  
5 new Reference Model implementation date, which may not be realistic and thus may need  
6 to be adjusted; 3) the LSTA funding cycles; and, 4) the expiration date for the AskNow  
7 contract.

8 Hildreth expressed the intention to make sure that the *Implementation Phase* is part of  
9 the development of the implementation plan, and not the actual putting the model into  
10 effect. Member Kastanis added that a very important piece of this process is giving the  
11 CLSA Systems a chance to talk about it and contribute. Metz reiterated Hildreth's point  
12 that the presented plan is her own work plan, in order that the project moves with all  
13 deliberate speed to completion. She affirmed her intention to check in with the *Clint Team*  
14 to keep them informed.

15 Hildreth expressed her awareness that whatever is done, some objections will be raised.  
16 However, she does not want to railroad a design, but to make sure that some time is spent  
17 with the various entities that would be impacted by it. Being very mindful of the role of the  
18 Board, Hildreth stated that Metz was invited to make her kick-off presentation to the  
19 Board. Hildreth cited upcoming plans to provide information about what is taking place to  
20 the various stakeholders.

21 Member Steinhauser stated, as Chair of the Legislative Committee, she is concerned  
22 about how CLSA legislation might be impacted by any changes to the reference model.  
23 Because of the possible legal ramifications, she did not think that the *Ramp-up Phase* of a

1 new reference model would result in a too-hasty implementation. The Board does not want  
2 to jeopardize the eighteen million dollars the government allocates to these programs by  
3 ill-considered actions. Andersen agreed, affirming that looking into the legal aspects of the  
4 new Reference Model would be an important step to take after a new design is completed.

5 Metz elaborated on the *Ramp-up to Implementation* final phase of her work. She will  
6 be assisting the *Client Team* to think through and prepare for implementation. She will also  
7 be assisting the consultants with such matters as service providers, how to get service  
8 providers on board, what service specifications need to be met, the content of contractual  
9 agreements, and helping them with how to craft a communication plan for the library  
10 community.

11 Member Steinhauser asked for the cost and the funding source of this study. Andersen  
12 responded that LSTA was the funding source through a Networking grant to the Peninsula  
13 Library System, which looks at various resource-sharing activities that are done throughout  
14 the state. Metz said that the initial cost, up to the present, had been about \$15,000. The  
15 remainder of the study, from October 2006 to completion would be about \$50,000.  
16 President Maghsoudi thanked Ruth Metz for her presentation, and turned to other Board  
17 business.

18 **Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and Direct Loan Programs**

19 Habbestad reported that the annual cost studies that determine the proposed  
20 reimbursement rates for Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and Direct Loan programs were completed  
21 and the results sent to the Department of Finance as part of the ECP (Enrollment,  
22 Caseload, Population) process. She stated that this year's study showed an increase in the  
23 base rate for both ILL and Direct Loan programs. The total reimbursement rates, after

1 factoring in all the elements, were being proposed at \$5.22 per eligible ILL transaction;  
2 and \$.95 for each net imbalance Direct Loan transaction.

3 ***It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the***  
4 ***Library of California Board adopts, subject to the concurrence of the State***  
5 ***Department of Finance, reimbursement rates for the 2006/07 fiscal year as***  
6 ***follows: for CLSA interlibrary loans, a reimbursement rate of \$5.22 per***  
7 ***eligible transaction; for CLSA direct loans, a reimbursement rate of \$.95 per***  
8 ***eligible transaction; and that the Chief Executive Officer inform all***  
9 ***participants of the 2006/07 reimbursement rates as soon as Department of***  
10 ***Finance concurrence is obtained.***

11  
12 Habbestad next reported on the prorating requirement, stating that even with the \$7  
13 million augmentation in the 2006/07 budget, the TBR baseline would, most likely, fall  
14 short of reimbursing participants at 100%. The proposed percentage to be withheld from  
15 each reimbursement is based on three factors: 1) the reimbursement rate, adopted by the  
16 Board; 2) the projected transactions levels for the ILL and Direct Loan programs; and 3)  
17 the amount in the TBR appropriation.

18 Habbestad stated that staff is recommending that 35% be withheld from each quarterly  
19 payment, reimbursing participants at 65% of their total costs throughout the year, and that  
20 any remaining funds at the end of the fiscal year be calculated proportionately and  
21 provided to participants in a fifth payment. Habbestad reported that if projected transaction  
22 levels are realized, the 2006/07 CLSA ILL and Direct Loan program appropriation would  
23 fall short of being sufficient to pay the full reimbursable cost of the program by 24%.

24 Andersen stated that the Department of Finance continues to approve the increased rate  
25 of reimbursement, and that the \$7 million increase in the budget was a big help, although it  
26 will not allow the library to fully catch up to the 100% level where it needs to be.

27 ***It was moved, seconded (Kastanis/Steinhauser) and carried unanimously that***  
28 ***the Library of California Board directs its Chief Executive Officer to***

1            *withhold 35% from all CLSA ILL and Direct Loan Program reimbursement*  
2            *payments throughout the 2006/07 fiscal year and that, after determining the*  
3            *full State cost of the ILL and Direct Loan programs for 2006/07, directs the*  
4            *CEO to pay the full amount remaining due to each participating library if*  
5            *sufficient funds remain in the 2006/07 CLSA ILL and Direct Loan Program*  
6            *appropriation, or to prorate the final payment equitably if insufficient funds*  
7            *remain in the 2006/07 CLSA ILL and Direct Loan Program appropriation.*  
8

9            Member Lowenthal asked how many more millions of dollars would be required to  
10           achieve the full reimbursement rate. Andersen responded that it would take around three to  
11           four million dollars more to reimburse all participants at 100%.

### 12           **CLSA System Communications and Delivery Program**

13           Habbestad reported that this is an information item only. She stated that System Plans  
14           of Service for fiscal year 2006/07 indicated that all Systems would provide the level of  
15           service required by law. Exhibits A-D in the Board packet are excerpted from those plans.  
16           Exhibits E – H are summaries of the achievements for the System Communications and  
17           Delivery program as recorded in their 2004/05 annual reports.

### 18           **CLSA System Advisory Board (SAB) Program**

19           Habbestad stated that the motion for consideration is a standard motion, which the  
20           Board annually approves in order for one System Advisory Board (SAB) member from  
21           each System to attend the California Library Association (CLA) conference in November.

22           *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Jewett) and carried unanimously that the*  
23           *Library of California Board approves the use of 2006/07 allocated SAB*  
24           *Program funds, where available within each approved SAB budget, and*  
25           *where requested, to reimburse one SAB member from each System for*  
26           *expenses incurred in attending the November 2006 California Library*  
27           *Association conference to be held in Sacramento.*  
28

29           Habbestad presented an update on the CLSA System Plans of Service for 2006/07. She  
30           reported that the System Advisory Board workload estimates and mandated activities are

1 summarized in the packet as Exhibit A. All but one System intended to accomplish the  
2 duties specified by law. Some System members continue to have difficulty getting their  
3 governing bodies to appoint SAB members. Inland Library System currently has no  
4 members represented on its advisory board. Member Steinhauser asked if there was  
5 anything the Board could do to help Inland. Andersen responded that appointing an SAB  
6 member is up to the local jurisdiction. For several years, Kathy Aaron, System Coordinator  
7 for Inland, has had a problem getting the library directors to make appointments. Hildreth  
8 added that it has often proved very difficult to keep the SAB members involved, offering  
9 the explanation that most members of the public are primarily interested in the local home  
10 library issues.

11 Member Steinhauser suggested that due to the success of library service, it's possible  
12 that individuals are not aware of the importance of the SAB; or perhaps after the 30-year  
13 evolution of the legislation, a point has been reached where alterations to the legislation  
14 has become necessary. In response to a question from Member Steinhauser regarding  
15 making monies available for SAB attendance at the CLA conference, Habbestad stated that  
16 only a few members attend the conference. She referred the Board to the exhibit in the  
17 packet reporting this statistic. Andersen added that the purpose of this motion is to allow  
18 CLSA funding to be used to reimburse System Advisory Board members to attend the  
19 conference outside their service area.

## 20 **Unfunded components**

21 President Maghsoudi moved to the next item of business, the unfunded components of  
22 CLSA for which there were no reports to be made. Hildreth stated that although these  
23 programs are unfunded, it's possible they may come before the Board in the future.

1 Member Steinhauser reminded the Board that the good news about the Library of  
2 California is that the statute is still in place, which gives us a place holder for multi-type  
3 library systems.

4 **Legislative**

5 Member Steinhauser reported on legislation, referring to her memo on legislative  
6 activities during the past year. She stated that the highlights have already been mentioned,  
7 such as the funding increase for TBR and the Public Library Fund, and the defeat of  
8 Proposition 81. Member Steinhauser commented that the CLA conference is November  
9 10-13, 2006 in Sacramento. She urged Board members to attend the conference, although  
10 members would not be reimbursement by the state. She invited anyone interested in  
11 legislative information to e-mail her, or go to the CLA and ALAWAN websites for state  
12 and federal legislation.

13 Vera Skop, the new System Coordinator for Serra Cooperative Library System,  
14 brought forward a series of questions from Serra's Administrative Council regarding the  
15 effects from the defeat of Proposition 81. Hildreth responded that Proposition 81 was a  
16 CLA initiative, not an initiative of the Library of California Board, although the Board was  
17 firmly in support of that legislation. She said that CLA would be waiting until after  
18 November to begin formulating a new strategy, if there is any new strategy. It was  
19 recommended that Skop seek the assistance of the CLA Legislative Committee to answer  
20 questions posed by their administrative council.

21 Member Steinhauser thanked Skop for her support, and referred her to the information  
22 contained in the legislation section of the agenda packet. She stated that the LoC Board  
23 has a very limited jurisdiction regarding the legislation that it pursues. The Board does not

1 have jurisdiction over construction bonds, but because it had a related component about  
2 library facilities, that allowed us to take a support position. This Board primarily takes  
3 positions on bills relating to resource sharing and the federal Library Services and  
4 Technology Act.

5 Member Steinhauser suggested that the agenda item, "Legislative Strategies," be  
6 eliminated from future agendas.

7 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

8 No one from the audience rose to address the Board.

9 **BOARD COMMENTS**

10 Member Steinhauser thanked the staff for all their hard work in pulling together the  
11 materials for this meeting after nearly a year's hiatus. She also thanked Susan Hildreth and  
12 her staff for taking the initiative in putting together what could be the first steps in  
13 evolving our reference service, and in possibly taking another look after thirty years at the  
14 best way to offer cooperative library services.

15 Member Zollman thanked everyone for the warm welcome to her first meeting with the  
16 Board. She was looking forward to working together in the future.

17 Member Fong expressed her pleasure in seeing old faces and new. She thanked the  
18 staff for preparing the packet, and congratulated and encouraged Susan Hildreth for taking  
19 the leadership in looking at some major components of library service.

20 Member Cannon stated that it was a pleasure to finally meet Board members, after  
21 having been appointed by Governor Davis in 2003, but only just now being able to attend.  
22 He looks forward to working with the Board and Susan Hildreth.

1 Chief Executive Officer Hildreth thanked the staff for the hard work in preparation for  
2 the meeting.

3 Member Kastanis stated that she is amazed that there is still a feeling of excitement  
4 about what is happening in the state of California. She leaves the meeting with the sense  
5 that there is hope out there. She commends the leadership of Susan Hildreth and her staff,  
6 as well as the Board.

7 Member Lowenthal thanked the staff for the packet of helpful materials. She welcomed  
8 Member Cannon and the new staff in LDS, wishing them well in their new capacities.

9 Member Jewett thanked the staff, especially Sandy Habbestad and Tom Andersen, for  
10 their availability. She congratulated the President and Vice-President, and expressed how  
11 much she continued to enjoy working as a Board Member.

12 Member Bernardo thanked the staff for staying in contact with her. She congratulated  
13 Susan Hildreth for her leadership and courage in bringing library services forward. She  
14 said it was nice to know that special libraries are not out there by themselves, as they face  
15 the same challenges as public libraries. She expressed her pleasure in working with the  
16 Board to meet the challenges. She extended welcomes to the new members and  
17 congratulated Barbara Will on her new retirement status.

18 President Maghsoudi added her thanks to Susan Hildreth, Tom Andersen and Sandy  
19 Habbestad, for their help and leadership.

20 **AGENDA BUILDING**

21 Hildreth said that the Board should plan to meet in February to discuss the progress of  
22 Ruth Metz and the new reference model, as well as any budget issues that may arise.



***Library of California Board Resolution 2006-01***

***WHEREAS***, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Sally Tuttle for her distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her term of service as a Member of the Board; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to honor Sally for her outstanding public service representing the Public-at-Large since her appointment by the Senate Rules Committee on January 26, 1999 and her subsequent reappointment in May 2002; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to acknowledge Sally for her distinguished service as Vice President of the Board in 2004, and for her willingness to serve in the interim when there was a vacancy in the office of Board President; and

***WHEREAS***, Sally has advocated for libraries at the state level on behalf of the Board and the greater library community; and

***WHEREAS***, Sally served with distinction on various Library of California Board committees, including the Literacy Committee (1999-2003), Access Services Committee (2000-2003), Ad Hoc Public Awareness Committee (2001-2002), and the Resource Sharing Committee (2003), and as the Chair of the Literacy Committee (2002-2003); and

***WHEREAS***, Sally is currently a commissioner of the Calaveras County Library and member of the Friends of the Calaveras County Library, which in 1962, she organized and became its first President, and also served as its President in 1987, 1988 and again in 1993 and 1994, as well as serving as a CLSA System Advisory Board member for the 49/99 Cooperative Library System from 1997-1999; and

***WHEREAS***, it should be noted that Sally is very active promoting the Friends of the Mokelumne Hill Branch Library, where she diligently keeps the doors of the library open through her volunteer efforts; and

***WHEREAS***, during the time when Sally was Fund Raising Chair (1989-1991), nearly \$700,000 was raised to enable Calaveras County to provide matching funds to qualify for a grant through the 1988 California Library Renovation and Bond Act, which built the **Central Library in San Andreas**; also, on September 11, 2002, **The Garden of Friends** park was dedicated in honor of Sally Tuttle and the Friends of the Calaveras County Library for all they have done for the Library System; and

***WHEREAS***, Sally chaired the Membership and Volunteer Committee for the Friends of the Library, and was volunteer coordinator for the Calaveras County Friends of the Library Literacy program in which she helped the program to receive a literacy grant from the California State Library; and

***WHEREAS***, it should be noted that in 1999 Sally was awarded **Woman of the Year** by three organizations, Soroptimist International of Calaveras County, Mokelumne Hill Lions, and the Calaveras Prospect; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to recognize Sally's outstanding contributions to enable Californians to learn and to obtain information through our libraries.

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED***, that

*the Library of California Board  
extends its sincere appreciation and deep regard to*

***SALLY TUTTLE***

for her distinguished leadership and contributions  
to the libraries and people of the State of California  
on this day of 14 September 2006

***Library of California Board Resolution 2006-02***

***WHEREAS***, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Sarah M. Pritchard for her distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her term of service as a Member of the Board; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to honor Sarah for her outstanding public service representing Academic Libraries since her appointment by former California Governor Gray Davis on January 14, 2003; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to acknowledge Sarah for her distinguished service as its Vice President in 2005 and 2006, and for her leadership as Chair of the Budget and Planning Committee (2004-2006) and a member of the Resource Sharing Committee (2003-2004); and

***WHEREAS***, Sarah has advocated for libraries at the state level on behalf of the Board and the greater library community; and

***WHEREAS***, it should be noted that she brought to the Library of California Board her valuable experience as an academic librarian, most recently as Director of the Library at the University of California at Santa Barbara; and

***WHEREAS***, her service and experience extended as a member of the Gold Coast Library Network Board of Directors representing academic libraries as she tirelessly worked to promote the vision of the Library of California; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to recognize Sarah's outstanding contributions to enable Californians to learn and to obtain information through our libraries.

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED***, that

*the Library of California Board  
extends its sincere appreciation and deep regard to*

***SARAH M. PRITCHARD***

for her distinguished leadership and contributions  
to the libraries and people of the State of California  
on this day of 14 September 2006

***Library of California Board Resolution 2006-03***

***WHEREAS***, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Lucy H. Lin for her distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her term of service as a Member of the Board; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to honor Lucy for her outstanding public service representing School Libraries since her appointment by former California Governor Gray Davis on January 14, 2003; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to acknowledge Lucy for her distinguished service as a member of the Budget and Planning Committee (2003-2006); and

***WHEREAS***, Lucy has advocated for libraries at the state level on behalf of the Board and the greater library community; and

***WHEREAS***, it should be noted that she brought to the Library of California Board her valuable experience as a school librarian and teacher for the Long Beach Unified School District where she served the children at Bixby Elementary and Lowell Elementary Schools for 35 years; and

***WHEREAS***, the Board wishes to recognize Lucy's outstanding contributions to enable Californians to learn and to obtain information through our libraries.

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED***, that

*the Library of California Board  
extends its sincere appreciation and deep regard to*

***LUCY H. LIN***

*for her distinguished leadership and contributions  
to the libraries and people of the State of California  
on this day of 14 September 2006*

**SUMMARY – 2006/07 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET  
RECOMMENDATION BY PROGRAM**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>2005/06 BUDGET</b>	<b>2006/07 BASELINE</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED</b>
Transaction Based Reimbursements	\$ 11,616,000	\$ 18,616,000	-0-
Consolidations & Affiliations	-0-	-0-	-0-
Statewide Data Base	-0-	-0-	-0-
System Advisory Boards	27,260	27,260	-0-
System Reference	1,608,340	1,608,340	-0-
System Communications & Delivery	1,090,400	1,090,400	-0-
System Planning, Coordination, & Evaluation	-0-	-0-	-0-
Statewide Communications & Delivery	-0-	-0-	-0-
State Reference Centers	-0-	-0-	-0-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$14,342,000</b>	<b>\$21,342,000</b>	<b>-0-</b>