California State Library
FOUNDED 1850
PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE, SHAPING OUR FUTURE

MEETING NOTICE

California Library Services Board
March 18, 2014
10:30am – 12:30pm

For further information contact:
Sandy Habbestad
California State Library
P.O. Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001
(916) 653-7532
shabbestad@library.ca.gov
http://www.library.ca.gov/loc/board/agendas/agendas.html

Meeting locations are as follows:

California State Library
900 "N" Street, Room 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Whittier Public Library
7344 S. Washington Ave.
Whittier, CA 90602

Humboldt County Office of Education
901 Myrtle Avenue
Eureka, CA 95501

El Segundo Public Library
111 W. Mariposa Ave.
El Segundo, CA 90245

Pacific Library Partnership
2471 Flores Street
San Mateo, CA 94403

Tulare County Public Law Library
221 S. Mooney Blvd., Rm. 1
County Courthouse
Visalia, CA 93291

Woodbury University
7500 N. Glenoaks Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91504

A. BOARD OPENING

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   Welcome and introductions of Board members, staff, and audience
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
   Consider agenda as presented or amended
3. **Approval of August 2013 Board Minutes** – ***Document 1***
   Consider minutes as presented or amended
4. **Board Resolutions** – ***Document 2***
   a. Consider resolution in memory of Liz Gibson
   b. Consider resolution for Judy Zollman
   c. Consider resolution for Dr. Conchita Battle
   d. Consider resolution for Jane Lowenthal
   e. Consider resolution for Rosario Garza
5. **Board meeting date for Fall 2014**
   Discuss the date for the meeting in Sacramento
6. **Nomination of Board Officers** – ***Document 3***
   a. Discuss the procedures for election of Board Officers
   b. Consider Nominating Committee for 2015 Board Officers

B. CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION

BUDGET AND PLANNING

1. **CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2014/15** – ***Document 4***
   Consider 2014/15 Preliminary Budget for CLSA

RESOURCE SHARING

1. **CLSA System-level programs** – ***Document 5***
   Review and discuss System Annual Reports, FY 2012/13
2. **Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs** – ***Document 6***
   Update on transaction levels for FY 2012/13

C. REPORTS TO THE BOARD

1. **Board President's Report**
   Report on activity since last Board meeting
2. **Board Vice-President's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting
3. **Chief Executive Officer's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting

D. BOARD FOCUS 2014/15

1. **Digitization**
   Update on the digitization projects at the State Library
2. **Taskforce on re-envisioning collaboration among California public libraries**
   Update on the Public Library Directors Forum
3. **Brainstorm ideas for Board focus**

E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Consider federal and state legislative issues - ***Document 6***

F. PUBLIC COMMENT
Public comment on any item or issue that is under the purview of the California Library Services Board and is not on the agenda

G. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS
Board member or officer comment on any item or issues that is under the purview of the California Library Services Board and is not on the agenda

H. AGENDA BUILDING
Input on agenda items for subsequent Board meetings

I. ADJOURNMENT
Adjourn the meeting

California Library Services Board Meeting
August 22, 2013

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

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

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

Not Present: Conchita Battle.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2014

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

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

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

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

BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2014

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

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President's Report

President Bernardo continued to serve as the Board's liaison to the California Library Association's (CLA) Legislative and Advocacy Committee. She attended most of the meetings by conference call and had been forwarding CLA messages to the Board. She encouraged members to participate in the library listserv CALIX. She explained it kept her in touch with the various issues facing public libraries. She also continued to serve as a member of the Legislative Committee for the California Council of County Law Librarians. Various matters were brought

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

Board Vice President's Report

Vice President Maghsoudi wished to remind the Board that the annual CLA Conference, this year entitled *Make Some Noise*, was in November in Long Beach. Many great programs were lined up and she hoped to see members there. Since the last time the Board met, she had opened Whittier Public Library's beautifully renovated and expanded branch library. Circulation had gone through the roof, with 5,000 registrations this year, between adults and children. The summer reading program concluded with a big party at a local park, with 2,400 people attending and 2,000 hot dogs served. Maghsoudi had just finished her term as Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC) Chair. She was now involved in the recruitment of a replacement for Rosario Garza, the SCLC executive director.

Chief Executive Officer's Report

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

State Library Organization

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

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

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

In April, Maginnity visited each of the five libraries serving Imperial County. They had been seriously impacted by the recession, with their area having one of the highest unemployment rates in California. But these libraries were absolutely incredible. Beginning in Calexico, Director Connie Barrington shuttled him around all of a long day, going to Imperial City, Brawley, Imperial County, and El Centro. The latter was closed two years ago due to earthquake damage, but they rented an old Montgomery Wards building. The Imperial County libraries

valued their membership, and working together cooperatively through the Serra Cooperative Library System. They were very appreciative of CSL's and this Board's efforts on their behalf.

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

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

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

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

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

router, for example, that would be an additional cost. Questions of savings were also being considered. Lowenthal asked if the Board could see an advance copy of the report to the Legislature. Maginnity replied that as part of the budget process, the report would remain confidential until he released it.

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

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

Lowenthal, referring to an earlier comment by Maginnity, asked whether the Braille and Talking Book Library budget was entirely funded by LSTA. He replied that it funded almost

one-hundred percent of the $2 to $2.5 million BTBL budget. President Bernardo thanked Maginnity for his report.

BUDGET AND PLANNING

System Plans of Service

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

Consider System Population and Membership Figures for 2013/14

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

It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) 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 2013/14.

Consider 2013/14 CLSA System Plans of Service

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

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

Consider New Formula for System Funding Allocation

Habbestad said that staff recommended the Board adopt a new formula for the distribution of CLSA funds that took into account the current formula factors, which were the number of members in each System, the populations served, and the round-trip miles to each public library headquarters in the System. Exhibit G displayed just three of the options calculated for this new formula. All others left very large increases or decreases in most of the Systems, and were not considered. The proposed formula basically combined all factors from the Reference and Communications and Delivery allocations formula. In formula option number one, each System would receive 30% of the total appropriation, or $37,500 equally, for each of the nine Systems, and 45% of the total would factor in the combined membership and population. Then, the remaining 25% of the total would factor in the combined membership and the round trip miles in the System's service area. It was recommended that the Board continue the "hold harmless" policy that had been adopted in 2008, which allowed two or more Systems to consolidate and retain the same level of base funding. It was also being recommended that the new formula be calculated beginning the fiscal year 2014/15, since Plans of Service for the current year had been

approved and budgets were already in place. President Bernardo asked for any comments or questions.

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

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

RESOURCE SHARING

Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs

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

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

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

Board Focus 2013/14

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

State Board Name

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

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

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

Cannon presumed the Legislature would be aware of a name change, so he did not understand why cache would be lost. Lowenthal replied that most people were too busy to notice a change. Maghsoudi asserted that the Board name did not matter. What mattered was the importance of the message. She and Bernardo each stated that they had never had a problem communicating with legislators, no matter what name they represented.

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

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

and that they should know who she was and what her interests were. They should be aware of the Board and that it had gone through a name change. And even if they did not know, they were obligated to read the legislation.

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

Bernardo asked whether the Board was satisfied and had come to agreement and consensus. Fong said the matter should remain open. There should be opportunity for a Board member to bring up this or any topic for a five-minute discussion in future, whether it was on the agenda or not. The consensus was that most of the Board was fine with the name change. For the record, Bernardo stated the topic would remain open for future discussion, but the name would remain. Murguia had a practical question – her business card said Library of California Board. But, with

the change of name, they would need new cards. Maginnity said that the change could be made. He would check into it.

Contiguous Borders Requirement

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

for discussion, two opposing sides emerged, so they put the issue on hold. The task force abandoned their recommendation and nothing was done.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discuss Board Planning Session

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

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

LEGISLATIVE

Consider Federal and State Legislative Issues

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

BOARD COMMENTS

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

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

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

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

AGENDA BUILDING

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-01

WHEREAS, *on October 14, 2013, the California Library Services Board, California State Library and the library community was saddened by the sudden loss of one of its dedicated colleagues, Liz Gibson; and*

WHEREAS, *the California Library Services Board wishes to express its heart-felt sympathy to her long-time companion, Sheila Thornton, and Liz's family; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board, staff, and library colleagues throughout California will always remember Liz as an intelligent and gracious professional who began her career at the State Library in 1971 as a Librarian, and worked her way up in the library profession to the role of Chief of Library Development Services in 1976 until her retirement from the State Library in 2003; and*

WHEREAS, *Liz was instrumental in the development of programs of the California Library Services Act as its first Program Manager during which time she helped to fine tune the legislation and worked with the library community to develop regulations as she gave leadership to shape resource sharing among California public libraries; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to recognize the many hats Liz wore in her career at the State Library, including LDS Bureau Chief, Assistant Bureau Chief, Planning Consultant, Automation Consultant, Data Coordinator, and Mentor Extraordinaire; and*

WHEREAS, *Liz was always willing to take on various projects beyond the scope of duties, including the State Library's first online monthly newsletter, CSL Connection; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to acknowledge Liz for her leadership to the first California Library Services Board as she became the voice of knowledge to help guide the CLSB, and later the Library of California Board, through changes in regional structure and unstable funding; and*

NOW, BE IT RESOLVED*, that*

the California Library Services Board
extends its sincere sympathy and deep regard
to the family of

Liz Gibson

for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 18 March, 2014

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-02

WHEREAS, *the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Judy Zollman 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 Judy for her outstanding public service representing the Public-at-Large since her appointment by the Senate Rules Committee on January 4, 2006 and her reappointment on March 10, 2010; and*

WHEREAS, *Judy demonstrated her passion for children and literacy as she advocated for school libraries and founded the Temple Sinai's People of the Book Literacy Project, where she coordinates reading tutors, library services and books to the school libraries, staff, and students in several Oakland schools; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to recognize Judy for her leadership at the Oakland Public Library Second Start Adult Literacy Program as its Families for Literacy Coordinator from 1989-1999, and for her work as Workshop Instructor at the San Francisco Public Library Project Read Adult Literacy Program from 2000-2002, and as a long-time volunteer tutor in adult literacy programs; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that Judy received the Jefferson Award for Public Service in 2008, a prestigious national recognition honoring community and public service in America, for her volunteer work building and maintaining libraries in four low-income Oakland schools, and for setting-up tutoring programs in three schools, as well as a teen/elementary after-school program; and providing children, teachers and schools with over 80,000 books, as well as art, music, storytelling programs, author visit, weekly food distributions, and adopt-a-family programs to needy families; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board would like to recognize that while Judy was a member of the CLSB, she maintained active membership in several community organizations, including the Social Action Committee – Temple Sinai, where she served as chair from 1999-2001, the Volunteer Action Center Advisory Board for the Jewish Community Federation of the Greater East Bay, and a member of the Jewish Coalition for Literacy; and*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, *that*

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

JUDY ZOLLMAN

for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 18 March, 2014

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-03

WHEREAS, *the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Dr. Conchita Battle 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 Conchita for her outstanding public service representing the Public-at-Large since her appointment by the Speaker of the Assembly on January 16, 2004 and her reappointment in December 2008; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that Conchita served with distinction as a member of the Board's Legislative Committee in 2005; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that Conchita is the director of the Advising Resource Center/EOP at California State University, Northridge, a position she has held since 2002; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that Conchita co-authored a book titled, Building Bridges for Women of Color in Higher Education, A Practical Guide to Success, which was designed to create a forum for synthesizing collective voices from women of color in academia; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that she is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Alpha Kappa Alpha, and the National Academic Advising Association; and*

WHEREAS, *Conchita's professional affiliations include the American Association for Higher Education, American Association for University Professors, American Council on Education, and the National Association for Women in Education; and*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, *that*

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

Dr. Conchita Battle

for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 18 March, 2014

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-04

WHEREAS, *the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Jane F. Lowenthal 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 Jane for her outstanding public service representing the Public-at-Large since her appointment by the Speaker of the Assembly on March 28, 2000 and her subsequent reappointments in December 2003 and December 2009; and*

WHEREAS, *Jane was instrumental in advocacy efforts for federal Library Services and Technology Act, making calls every year to Congress for reauthorization of LSTA and its annual funding, and;*

WHEREAS, *she gave generously of her time when in Sacramento to contact State Legislators on behalf of California's libraries, and advocated at State Legislative Committee Hearings and at Library Legislative Day visits to Washington D.C.; and*

WHEREAS, *Jane created a program to bring books to the libraries in child care centers within the city of Los Angeles, and was involved with the passage of Measure "L," creating extended hours for the branch libraries in Los Angeles; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that Jane served with distinction on many committees during her tenure on the Board, including the CLSA Transition Committee, LoC Support Services Committee, Legislative Committee, and chair of the Ad Hoc Public Awareness Committee; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that Jane has many roles in many organizations. She was the President of the League of Women Voters of the San Fernando Valley, Vice-President of the Los Angeles Women's Appointment Collaboration; and active with the Jewish Federation and Jewish Community Relations Council, International Visitors Council, and the National Kidney Foundation Board; and*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, *that*

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

Jane F. Lowenthal

for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 18 March, 2014

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-05

In Honor of Rosario Garza

WHEREAS, *the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Rosario Garza on the occasion of her retirement from the Southern California Library Cooperative on December 21, 2013; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to honor Rosario for her many accomplishments during her years in California, including fiscal responsibility for several statewide LSTA projects, such as the California Center for the Book, Out-of-School-Time Online Homework Help, California Summer Reading Program, and Transforming Life After 50, just to name a few; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that she began her career in the library profession with a Master of Library Science from North Texas State University, and a Master of Business Administration from Regis University in Denver, Colorado; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that among Rosario's outstanding accomplishments she represented Southern California public libraries at many state and national Legislative Day events; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to recognize Rosario's outstanding contribution to enable Californians to learn and to obtain information through our libraries; and*

BE IT RESOLVED, *that the members of the California Library Services Board do hereby congratulate and commend Rosario Garza for her achievements as Executive Director of the Southern California Library Cooperative since her appointment in November 2006 as Executive Director of the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System, and as Executive Director for the California Library Association since January 2013; and*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, that*

Rosario Garza

Shall be honored by the California Library Services Board for her distinguished leadership and contributions to the libraries and people of the State of California on this day of 18 March, 2014

Document 3

ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Nominating Committee for 2015 Board Officers

ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consider appointments to the Nominating Committee for 2015 Board Officers

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board appoint _____ and _____ to the nominating committee to select Board Officers for 2015.

BACKGROUND:

California Library Services Act regulations, Section 20116 (a), state that, "The state board shall annually elect a president and vice-president at the first regular meeting of each calendar year." It has been Board policy, to date, to elect Board officers at the last meeting of the calendar year so that the new officers may begin their term in the new calendar year. It has become common practice that the nominating committee be selected at the discretion of the Board President. However, after reviewing past practices, this has not always been the case. Up until 2003, the nominating committee was selection at a meeting of the full Board. After 2003, when meetings were decreased to one or two annually, a more informal approach occurred where the Board President selected two members to serve on the committee to put forth names for Board officers.

At this March meeting the Board will select two of its members to represent the Nominating Committee and report to the Board at its fall meeting the slate of Board Officer for 2015. In the absence of regulations prescribing the form and method for electing officers, according to Code of California Regulations Section 20127, the CLSB is guided by procedures set forth in Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, Chapter XIV, Nominations and Elections. Methods of nomination are: (a) by the chair, (b) from the floor (sometimes called open nominations), (c) by a committee, (d) by ballot, (e) by mail, and (f) by petition. See excerpts below for the nominating committee method of selecting Board Officers.

> *In the election of officers of an ordinary society,* nominations often are made by a nominating committee. Usually in such cases a nominating committee is chosen in advance to submit nominations for the various offices for which elections are to be held at the annual meeting.*
>
> *Designation of the Nominating Committee. The nominating committee should be elected by the organization wherever possible.*

**The ordinary people in a community, country, society, or organization rather than its leaders.*

Nominees. Although it is not common for the nominating committee to nominate more than one candidate for any office, the committee can do so. Members of the nominating committee are not barred from becoming nominees for office themselves. It is desirable policy for the nominating committee, before making its report, to contact each person whom it wishes to nominate, in order to obtain his/her acceptance of nomination—that is, his/her assurance that he/she will serve in the specified office if elected.

Report of the Nominating Committee. The time at which the nominating committee's report is made is a matter to be determined by rule or established custom of the particular organization – depending on its own conditions. In some societies this report is not formally presented to the voting body until the election is pending; but in any organization where advance interest in the election may develop, the nominations submitted by the committee should be made known to the membership earlier. These nominations can be sent to all members, for example, several days before the regular meeting – usually the election meeting itself – at which the chair calls for additional nominations from the floor (see below). The report should always be formally presented at a regular meeting, even if the names of the committee's nominees have been transmitted to the members of the society beforehand. Sometimes – in societies that hold frequent regular meetings – the nomination committee's report is presented at the regular meeting preceding the annual meeting at which the election is to take place. When the nomination committee is called upon for its report at a meeting, its chairman rises and presents the report as follows:

NOMINATING COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN: *Mr./Ms. President, the Nominating Committee submits the following nominations: For President, Mr. A [or "John A."]; for Vice President, Mr. B.*

A nominating committee is automatically discharged when its report is formally presented to the assembly; although if one of the nominees withdraws before the election, the committee is revived and should meet immediately to agree upon another nomination if there is time.

Call by the Chair for Further Nominations from the Floor. After the nominating committee has presented its report and before voting for the different offices takes place, the chair must call for further nominations from the floor. This is another stage of nomination and election procedure for which a number of details should be established by rule or custom of the particular organization. In many organizations, nominations from the floor are called for immediately after the presentation of the nominating committee's report – while the election is pending or earlier. If the nominating committee has for any reason failed to make its report at the appropriate time, this does not prevent the assembly from proceeding to nominations from the floor.

In some organizations all nominations from the floor are completed and nominations are closed for each office before voting for any office takes place. In other organizations, when nominations for one office have been completed, votes are cast for that office and the result is announced before the chair calls for nominations for the next office. A custom of the organization based on its own conditions should determine which of the two procedures is used. In either case, the different offices are taken in the order in which they are listed in the bylaws. The chair, as he/she calls for nominations, first repeats the name that was submitted by the nominating committee, thus:

CHAIR: *For President, Mr. A is nominated by the Nominating Committee. Are there any further nominations for President? [If a member nominates another person, the*

chair repeats the name of that nominee.] Mr. N is nominated. Are there any further nominations?

When it appears that no one else wishes to make a nomination, the chair should again ask if there are any further nominations; and if there is no response, he/she normally declares that nominations (for that office) are closed, without waiting for a motion to that effect, as follows:

CHAIR: Are there any further nominations for President? . . . [Pause.] If not . . . [pause], nominations are closed. [Or, "Without objection, . . .nominations are closed."] After nominations have been closed, a majority vote is required to reopen them. After nominations have been closed, voting for that office takes place, or nominations for the next office are called for by the chair, depending on the procedure being followed by the particular organization.

Document 4

ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA Budget for FY 2014/15

ISSUE TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consider the preliminary CLSA budget for FY 2014/15

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board adopt, contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2014/15 CLSA budget as directed in the Governor's Proposed 2014/15 Budget, totaling $1,880,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.

BACKGROUND:

The Governor's proposed budget, released in January for fiscal year 2014/15, provides the same funding level for CLSA System services as the previous year, a total of $1,880,000. No funding was provided for Transaction Based Reimbursements (TBR) for the fourth consecutive year.

Recommendation: Staff is recommending that the Board adopt the preliminary budget at this March meeting so that partial payments can be made to Cooperative Systems as soon as the State Budget Act of 2014 is signed. The remainder of the funds will be awarded when System Plans of Service are approved by the Board at its fall meeting.

RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE:
Review of System Plans of Service and Budget for FY 2014/15.

Staff Liaison: Sandy Habbestad

Document 5

INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA System Annual Report, FY 2012/13

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

CLSA funds continue to support programs at the cooperative system level. For FY 2012/13, the Communications and Delivery (C&D) Program funds supported all or a portion of each System's physical delivery of materials. Some Systems provided communications activity through virtual attendance at various meetings and use of their website and listservs for facilitating communications to member libraries. Exhibit A provides a summary of C&D activities and how communities benefited through state funding. Exhibit B displays a summary of the actual workload statistics for 2012/13.

The System Reference Program funds supported training, in-person and virtual, for local library staff in many of the regions, which enabled staff to keep their skills up to date and better serve the community. Exhibit C provides a summary of Reference activities and how communities benefited through state funding.

Expenditures: Exhibits D-F display CLSA and local funds expended in support of System-level programs in 2012/13. Overall, 55.5% of total program funding for C&D and Reference was expended from CLSA funds, and 44.5% was expended from local funds. See Exhibit G for a summary of local member contributions.

RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE: Consideration of 2014/15 System Plans of Service.

Staff Liaison: Sandy Habbestad

Exhibit A

California Library Services Act
System Program Annual Report
Communications and Delivery Program

System	Goals for Meeting the Needs of the Community	Were Goals Met – How did the Community Benefit?
Black Gold Cooperative Library System	The primary goal is to provide delivery of materials to patrons.	CLSA funds were used to partially cover the delivery contract. Black Gold members share an Integrated Library System (ILS). The community benefits because patrons are able to request items from libraries several hundred miles away and receive them very quickly, sometimes as soon as the next day.
49-99 Cooperative Library System	Increase frequency of delivery from one to two days per week, which will greatly improve the satisfaction level among the libraries' users.	CLSA funds help to provide needed materials throughout the System service area through the delivery system. Patrons are able to request materials owned by other libraries. The delivery system moves "Book Club in a Box" kits to libraries that have book clubs. This is an extremely popular program which is greatly facilitated by the delivery system.
Inland Library System	Delivery ranks high in priority for members. The physical vastness of the three counties served has made this an expensive proposition. Funding enables Inland to hire a courier service to delivery materials once a week among most of the member libraries. The goal for FY 2012/13 will be 95% of the items sent by the System delivery will be delivered with ten working days. Items sent via Riverside County van will be delivered with two days.	CLSA funds provided for the physical delivery of materials to 15 of item 19 members. Items were delivered with 10 working days for 95% of the time using a courier service, UPS, and the US Postal Service. Patrons in rural and geographically isolated areas benefited because of ILL services. The communities benefited by having access to the collection of all Inland member libraries, and receive materials from neighboring libraries in a timely manner. In times of smaller, sometimes non-existent, materials budgets this extremely important. Because of the vastness of Inland (over 25,000 sq. mi.) the goal of facilitating virtual attendance at Admin. Council, and all other meeting of member library staff, has been met with a subscription of GotoMeeting.

		The Inland website is continually updated to facilitate communication of System information. The community benefits by having libraries whose leaders and staff work effectively with each other on a regular basis.
NorthNet Library System	Delivery has been unanimously identified by member libraries as the highest priority. Funding will be divided in an equitable manner to subsidize the cost of physical delivery among members. A portion of CLSA funds will be used to develop and implement a shared software platform that can connect the System's different ILSs to create a scalable, virtual union catalog for the purpose of facilitating interlibrary loans. Due to the geographic size of the region, NorthNet libraries use a combination of delivery models, including the US Postal Service and other private delivery companies for remote locations with low volume, and contracting services to delivery companies for moving high-volume loads between libraries in more populated areas. These systems are regularly reviewed and have been found to be very efficient and cost-effective.	CLSA funds provided communications among and between the libraries through the NorthNet website and listervs for members. Delivery of materials was accomplished through contracts with two different vendors that provided deliveries to a number of the member libraries. These interlibrary deliveries made it possible for libraries to share resources through interlibrary loan on a much larger scale than would be possible otherwise. In addition, the piloting of an open source method of linking together the resources of member libraries that do not share in ILS allowed the members to evaluate the current and potential usefulness of the tool to facilitate interlibrary loans by readily identifying a library holding a requested item and sending a message asking that it be loaned. The community benefited because items requested were delivered in a reasonable amount of time at a reasonable per-item cost.
Pacific Library Partnership (PLP)	Member libraries agree that their first priority for System funds was delivery. Libraries throughout the region depend on resource sharing to enhance the breadth and depth of their individual collections. There are four separate delivery services in the region with each receiving a subsidy commensurate with their last CLSA allotment. The System's delivery frequency is between 2-5 days per week. Most of the libraries in POP have access to adequate local networks.	CLSA funding was primarily used in PLP libraries to move materials from library to library to support resource sharing. Each of the four geographic areas in the system receives a subsidy that reflects delivery needs for that region. All delivery services are stable: PLS has five-day-a –week delivery using three system vans and drivers; SVLS contracts with PLS for delivery twice a week; BALIS and MOBAC contract with courier services for two-three days a week, and there are two touch points one a week in Gilroy and San Mateo. The over 3 million items delivered cost 18 cents per item to move. Three libraries participated in a pilot project to test Fulfillment, a

		resource sharing tool that allows sharing between several current ILS' (Los Gatos, ILS Koha; Santa Cruz City-Co, ILS Evergreen; and San Mateo City, ILS III). Although some minor glitches were had in the beginning stages of testing, everything seems to be working as planned.
San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS)	Communications and delivery includes more than just physical delivery of library materials. Communications also entails the system0wide email services and the telecommunications network that connects the 113 locations to the data center and the ILS. CLSA funds will help subsidize physical delivery of materials, which has not declined. System-owned vehicles provide delivery service to all ten headquarters libraries three times per week.	CLSA funds helped to move materials between headquarters libraries through a contract service with the Fresno county Library and the County of Fresno (two different delivery systems). The materials were moved in a timely manner, with minimal delays around certain holiday weekends.
Serra Cooperative Library System	Physical delivery of materials between member libraries is a priority for the System members. Funding will pay for a more efficient (though still limited) delivery service, which will enhance the volunteer model of the previous year. The delivery frequency will continue with one day per week in both Imperial and San Diego counties, with San Diego County volunteer services supplemented with courier services.	CLSA funds were used to deliver materials throughout the System in a timely manner using a contract vendor and a hub/spoke model through the County of San Diego's delivery system. The benefit to the communities was the delivery of requested materials.
Southern California Library System (SCLC)	The administrative council has identified delivery as one of the top priorities for the SCLC members. The residents of the three counties (Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura) see the libraries as a seamless group, giving them the ability to pick up and drop off materials at any member library. A second priority in this area is finding an easier way to have staff attend meetings. Because of this need, work has been progressing on a videoconferencing system that will have at least four nodes where staff can go to interact with their colleagues from across the region. This year the System changed from previously owned equipment and staff who	CLSA funds kept materials flowing among SCLC members through the delivery system. In the greater Los Angeles/Orange/Ventura counties, residents expect library services to be seamless. That's the benefit of System delivery.

	handled the delivery, to contracting with a delivery company to provide two delivery vans and drives, each with two routes they alternate. Every library gets delivery every other day.	

Non-CLSA funded activities:

Black Gold: Local funds pay for:

- The network connections from 29 library buildings to the server in San Luis Obispo
- Access to Public Access Catalog
- A telephone service which wallows patrons to call in to renew items via an 800 number, and also calls patrons to let them know when a requested hold is available or when items are overdue.
- A separate public Internet connection for most of the libraries in order to provide fast connectivity where available

Inland: Riverside County Library System subsidized most of the cost of delivery to five Inland members who share a common ILS.

NorthNet: Libraries in Marin County funded and used a courier service and Link+ to share resources because they are all users of Innovative Interfaces, Inc. for their ILS. All member libraries provided Internet services that allowed them to communicate with and share resources with other members via listserv messages, interlibrary loan communications, and the Overdrive collection shared by the majority of the members.

PLP: Member libraries in PLS pay $274,711 in local funds so they can have 5-day-a-week delivery, since the shared ILS encourages robust system-wide delivery. Monterey Public and Pacific Grove Public libraries pay $2,000 for an extra day of delivery. This is to facilitate the traffic generated by a shared ILS.

SJVLS: A shared ILS is maintained, which allows all member libraries and their branches (113) equal access to shared collections.

49-99/Serra/SCLC: None reported

Exhibit B

System Communications & Delivery Program
2012/13 Service Methods and Workloads

	Actual Comm. Workload (Messages)	Telecommunications Systems Usage			Actual Delivery Workload (Items)	Delivery Systems Usage					Actual Miles Traveled By All Delivery
		Phone Fax	Internet E-mail	Other		System Van	Con-tracted Delivery	US Mail	UPS	Other	
BLACK GOLD	129,814	78%	22%	NA[a]	581,971	NU	97%	2%	0.5%	0.5%	57,919
49-99	565	NA	100%	NU	4,602	NU	100%	NU	NU	NU	71,000
INLAND	6,720	11%	89%	NA[b]	6,052	NU	89%	1%	10%	NU	12,396
NORTHNET	360	100%	NA	NU	3,683,700	NU	98.5%	1%	0.5%	NU	229,607
PLP	2,220	100%	NA	NU	3,152,760	NU	98%	1%	0.9%	0.1%	124,185
SJVLS	Unknown	NA	NA	NA	1,191,435	96%	2%	1%	1%	NU	87,600
SERRA	33,000	21%	79%	NU	37,583	NU	50%	2%	1%	47%[c]	48,000
SCLC	25,829	2%	98%	NU	69,303	NU	99%	1%	NU	NU	76,765
TOTALS	198,508	57%	43%	0%	8,727,406	13.1%	84.8%	1.1%	0.7%	0.3%	707,472

NA - Not Available; or unable to determine

NU - Not Used

[a]Telecom MPLS network

[b]Funds were expended for 'Go to Meeting,' but unable to determine number of message

[c]County of San Diego delivery system hub/spoke model

Exhibit C

California Library Services Act
System Program Annual Report
Reference Program

System	Goals for Meeting the Needs of the Community	Were Goals Met – How did the Community Benefit?
Black Gold Cooperative Library System	To meet the needs of the people asking for reader's advisory assistance, CLSA funds will go towards the NoveList databse that is a part of the Public Access Catalog (PAC). This product allows patrons to see reviews about titles in the catalog and makes recommendations on similar authors and titles the patron may enjoy reading. Two training events will be presented to staff at member libraries, with an estimate of 35 local staff members trained.	CLSA funds were used toward a NoveList subscription which is integrated into the PAC. Because NoveList is directly integrated into the PAC, usage of the project is greatly improved over a stand-alone version that patrons would have to leave the catalog to use. It also provides complete Series information for a title, which is frequently requested by patrons. The six member libraries responded to 336,364 reference questions in FY12/13. Libraries are still finding it difficult to send staff away for training for a day due to smaller staff counts; for this reason, no training events were held.
49-99 Cooperative Library System	The goal is to provide online training to the staff in member libraries to help them keep their skills up to date. Estimated number of training events: 5 Estimated number of local staff trained: 100	Library staff from throughout the region were encouraged to participate in online courses and webinars to help keep their skills up-to-date.
Inland Library System	Funds will provide training and professional development opportunities, both in-person and virtual. A portion of the group purchase of reference databases will be funded by CLSA. The administrative council will hold an all-day planning session in August to determine how best to meet the informational and education needs of the various library communities in a cooperative manner. Estimated number of training events: 6 Estimated number of local staff trained: 300	CLSA funds helped provide training for the Inland Leadership Program. The goal of the program was to help staff learn how to develop and fund a project by creating a proposal, applying for a small grant, running and reporting on the project. The program also encouraged staff to take an active part in professional development opportunities. Rural and geographically isolated populations benefited by a group purchase of Mango Languages, which included ESL instruction in fourteen native languages, including those languages of communities that member libraries serve. The Children's and Young Adult Committee combined their talents for a very successful and innovative "Library Tech Day, a day dedicated to

		all things technology." Sessions included Pinterest, Prezi, and how to use social media professionally. Individual projects funded included 1) e-Readers 101: a series of six workshops to teach patrons how to use electronic devices to download e-books; 2) Baby Activity Days: series of workshops for parents of children aged 0-2 to learn and teach pre-literacy skills to their children; and 3) Using Legos to teach leadership and teambuilding skills for elementary-age children. Total number of training events: 13 Total number of local staff trained: 401
NorthNet Library System	The goal is to improve the member libraries' ability to provide reference and information services by sharing resources in a cost-effective manner.	CLSA funds benefited the community through access to resource sharing to non-fiction ebooks that could be used by patrons and staff to provide reference and research information that would not otherwise be available to the individual member libraries. Underserved individuals and communities had access to information resources that would not have been available to them if not for the System resource sharing.
Pacific Library Partnership (PLP)	The Plan of Service stated that PLP would not be using funds to support reference services. However, during the last quarter of the fiscal year, with a sizeable balance left in the C&D budget, the System decided to use the remainder of the funds for an ebook platform for all the member libraries.	CLSA funds were used to purchase the Califa ebook platform, Enki, for all member libraries. PLP members will be able to offer the more than 10,000 and growing number of titles to their communities on a platform that is collectively owned, not leased.
San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS)	SJVLS did not request to use CLSA funds to support reference service in FY12/13.	
Serra Cooperative Library	Funds will be used for enhanced subscription-based services and e-content to provide communities with the information they request and require. Specific services to be offered will	CLSA funds provided materials and training to 30 member libraries that were able to better meet the needs of their communities. Trained staff were able to keep their skills up-to-date, benefiting the

System	be determined at the administrative council planning meeting in August 2012.	libraries and their users. Without System funding, it is unlikely that staff would have been able to attend training.
Southern California Library System (SCLC)	The Administrative Council identified the need for continuous training and networking opportunities for their reference staff. Low-cost training will be scheduled on a variety of topics; partnering with other organizations to offer training that will help library staff keep their skills up-to-date. Meet-ups, both fact-to-face and virtual, will be arranged to strengthen the connections between the reference saff across the region. Estimated number of training events: 15 Estimated number of local staff trained: 500	CLSA funds provided library staff skill enhancement opportunities, which better abled them to serve their communities. A variety of different training and information exchange opportunities were scheduled throughout the fiscal year. Topics offered including: • RFID • Book Vendor Machines • Collection development services • Using Pinterest • Califa's eBook Project • eBook summit (featuring presentations about a variety of vendors) • Stress management • Coaching/mentoring

Serra: In addition to Reference services, the Serra System Advisory Board held four meeting in FY12/13 funded by CLSA.

Non-CLSA funded activities:

Inland: As part of moving to a new service model, Ontario City Library volunteered to provide more complex research needs of library patrons by providing 2nd level reference on an in-kind basis. After a trial of almost four months, with very few questions referred to Ontario, the Administrative Council decided during their Planning Meeting in August of 2012 to drop 2nd level reference service.

Exhibit D

Summary of Communications and Delivery Expenditures for FY 2012/13

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	$ 47,690	$ 204,232	$ 251,922
49-99	55,391	609	56,000
INLAND	64,155	0	64,155
NORTHNET	300,808	0	300,808
PLP	180,495	2,000	182,495
SJVLS	100,624	835,211	935,835
SERRA	16,653	0	16,653
SCLC	294,763	45,334	340,097
TOTAL	$1,060,579	$1,087,386	$2,147,965

Exhibit E

Summary of System Reference Expenditures for FY 2012/13

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	$ 15,000	$ 71,470	$ 86,470
49-99	6,500	0	6,500
INLAND	96,705	0	96,705
NORTHNET	42,368	0	42,368
PLP	100,000	0	100,000
SJVLS	0	0	0
SERRA	95,190	0	95,190
SCLC	86,332	46,243	132,575
TOTAL	$ 442,095	$ 117,713	$ 559,808

Serra also expended $1,326 for System Advisory Boards in FY 2012/13.

Exhibit F

Summary of System Administration Expenditures for FY 2012/13

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	$ 15,673	$ 297,774	$ 313,447
49-99	15,474	251	15,725
INLAND	40,215	31,652	71,867
NORTHNET	85,794	212,153	297,947
PLP	70,123	190,286	260,409
SJVLS	25,156	233,357	258,513
SERRA	28,291	26,540	54,831
SCLC	95,274	257,990	353,264
TOTAL	$ 376,000	$1,250,003	$1,626,003

LSTA funds spent on System Administration	NorthNet	$4,591
	PLP	$146,701

Exhibit G

LOCAL MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAMS
FY 2012/13

	CLSA System Communications and Delivery			CLSA System Reference		
System	Percent of CLSA Expenditures for C&D	Percent of Local Funds for C&D	Total Expenditures for C&D	Percent of CLSA Expenditure for Reference	Percent of Local Funds for Reference	Total Expenditures for Reference
BLACK GOLD	19%	81%	$ 251,922	17%	83%	86,470
49-99	99%	1%	56,000	100%	0%	6,500
INLAND	100%	0%	64,155	100%	0%	96,705
NORTHNET	100%	0.0%	300,808	100%	0%	42,368
PLP	99%	1%	182,495	100%	0%	100,000
SJVLS	11%	89%	935,835	0%	0%	0
SERRA	100%	0%	16,653	100%	0%	95,190
SCLC	87%	13%	340,097	65%	35%	132,575
TOTAL PERCENT	49%	51%	100%	79%	21%	100%
TOTAL EXPEND.	$ 1,060,579	$ 1,087,386	$ 2,147,965	$ 442,095	$ 117,713	$ 559,809

2012/13 Expenditures:

	CLSA	Local	LSTA	Total
Administration	376,000 (21%)	1,250,003 (70%)	151,292 (9%)	1,777,295
Reference	442,095 (79%)	117,713 (21%)		559,808
Comm. & Delivery	1,060,579 (49%)	1,087,386 (51%)		2,147,965
Advisory Boards	1,326 (100%)	0		16,699
Total	1,880,000 (42%)	2,455,102 (55%)	151,292 (3%)	$4,501,767

Document 6

INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

From July 1, 1978 through June 30, 2011, CLSA has supported three programs specifically designed to encourage the sharing of publicly funded library materials throughout the state of California. The Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan (Equal Access & Universal Borrowing) programs provided partial reimbursement of the actual costs when local public and specified non-public libraries extend loan services beyond their normal clientele. These programs continue to greatly increase the individual public library user's access to library resources, even though the library is no longer reimbursed by the state.

The programs are in the third consecutive year without reimbursement from the state, and no funding is designated for the 2014/15 fiscal year in the Governor's Preliminary Budget. Through FY 2012/13, the State Library continued to collect quarterly data from participating libraries. However, in August 2013, the Board adopted a new reporting process that requires public libraries to submit transaction data on an annual basis. Data collection is important because the requirement of membership in a CLSA cooperative system is the sharing of resources with other jurisdictions in the same system.

Exhibit A provides the funding shortfall for the last 20 years. For this program to be fully funded as authorized in CLSA, over $40 million is needed annually.

RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE:

Updates on actual transactions levels for FY 2013/14.

Staff Liaison: Sandy Habbestad

Exhibit A

California Library Services Act
Transaction Based Reimbursement Shortfall
Based on Rates Adopted by the Board

Fiscal Year	TBR Budget Appropriation	Board Adopted Rates		Reimbursable Transactions		Proposed Cost on Board Adopted Rates			Percent of Total Reimburse-ment Due	Reimbursement Rate Libraries Actually Received	
		ILL	Direct Loan	ILL	Direct Loan	ILL	Direct Loan	Total		ILL	Direct Loan
93/94	6,537,000	$3.26	$0.62	598,148	9,430,933	$1,949,962	$5,847,178	$7,797,140	83.8%	$2.73	$0.52
94/95	6,537,000	$3.17	$0.65	651,979	9,572,561	$2,066,773	$6,222,165	$8,288,938	78.9%	$2.50	$0.51
95/96	6,537,000	$3.38	$0.66	834,395	10,075,442	$2,820,255	$6,649,792	$9,470,047	69.0%	$2.33	$0.46
96/97	6,537,000	$3.47	$0.69	996,825	10,471,870	$3,458,983	$7,225,590	$10,684,573	61.2%	$2.12	$0.42
97/98	7,919,000	$3.29	$0.75	1,165,557	10,491,145	$3,834,682	$7,868,359	$11,703,041	67.7%	$2.23	$0.51
98/99	8,600,000	$3.57	$0.71	1,223,800	11,056,055	$4,368,966	$7,849,799	$12,218,765	70.4%	$2.51	$0.50
99/00	9,092,000	$3.82	$0.73	1,187,182	10,424,950	$4,535,035	$7,610,214	$12,145,249	74.9%	$2.86	$0.55
00/01	10,894,000	$4.14	$0.77	1,128,006	10,296,586	$4,669,945	$7,928,371	$12,598,316	86.5%	$3.58	$0.67
01/02	12,145,000	$3.87	$0.73	1,409,560	10,897,596	$5,454,997	$7,955,245	$13,410,242	90.6%	$3.50	$0.66
02/03	11,848,000	$4.49	$0.78	1,549,221	11,363,394	$6,956,002	$8,863,447	$15,819,449	74.9%	$3.36	$0.58
03/04	12,145,000	$4.91	$0.84	1,610,606	12,444,532	$7,908,075	$10,453,407	$18,361,482	66.1%	$3.25	$0.56
04/05	12,145,000	$5.59	$0.87	2,112,814	11,209,197	$11,810,630	$9,752,001	$21,562,631	56.3%	$3.15	$0.49
05/06	11,616,000	$4.95	$0.89	2,228,249	10,652,295	$11,029,833	$9,480,543	$20,510,375	56.6%	$2.80	$0.50
06/07	18,616,000	$5.22	$0.95	2,398,198	11,194,524	$12,518,594	$10,634,798	$23,153,391	80.4%	$4.20	$0.76
07/08	11,616,000	$5.29	$0.97	2,829,113	11,940,218	$14,966,008	$11,582,011	$26,548,019	43.8%	$2.31	$0.42
08/09	10,182,000	$5.06	$0.89	3,240,228	12,127,303	$16,395,554	$10,793,300	$27,188,853	37.4%	$1.89	$0.33
09/10	10,182,000	$5.99	$1.20	3,514,901	14,354,372	$21,054,257	$17,225,246	$38,279,503	26.6%	$1.59	$0.32
10/11	10,182,000	$6.35	$1.17	3,650,793	14,748,409	$23,182,536	$17,255,639	$40,438,174	25.2%	$1.60	$0.29
11/12	0	$6.35	$1.17	3,451,599	12,662,283	$21,917,654	$14,814,871	$36,732,525	0%	$0.00	$0.00
12/13	0	$6.35	$1.17	3,101,388	12,678,459	$19,693,814	$14,833,797	$34,527,611	0%	$0.00	$0.00

DoF approved Board adopted reimbursement rates from FY01/02-FY10/11

R:/CLSA/TBR shortfall chart--1990-present

Summary of Board position on bills and other legislation:

Date Adopted by the Board	Homework Assistance
April 2007	Adopted a position of support for AB 1233, Homework Assistance.
	Legislation
February 1999	Adopted a position of support for full funding for the Public Library Foundation (PLF). Adopted a position of support for telecommunication services for California libraries at the most affordable costs.
April 1999	Adopted a position of support for SB 927, Newspaper Preservation.
April 2000	Adopted a position of support for AB 2757, relating to telephonic reading system.
June 2000	Adopted a position of support for SB 1774, Computer Access, *if* amended so that CSL administers the program for public libraries.
April 2001	Adopted a position to authorize the Board President and the Legislative Committee Chair to take appropriate action regarding a state budget augmentation for FY 2001/02 for county law libraries.
August 2001	Adopted a position of support in favor of the U.S. Senate revision of ESEA that identifies specifically support for school library services and that the Board President or his designee take appropriate action in support of the U.S. Senate version of ESEA, which includes support for school libraries. Adopted a position of support of the California Teleconnect Fund and that the Board President or his designee be authorized to communicate the Board's support for expanding the services provided under the California Teleconnect Fund on behalf of California libraries, and to communicate this support position to members of the California Public Utilities Commission.
February 2003	Adopted a position to endorse and support the California Library Association's campaign to retain CLSA funding for reimbursement for interlibrary loan, equal access and universal borrowing services; and, further, that the LoC Board will actively participate in this campaign. Adopted a position of support for a strong California State Library, continuing the one hundred fifty three year tradition of information sharing services to California state government and the people of California, and providing leadership to and fostering resource sharing among the 8000 libraries statewide.
October 2005	Adopted a position recommend and endorse all bills supporting librarians,

in addition to those that support the teachers, parity and equity in their practices.

August 2008 — Adopted a position of support for increased funding for the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

Library Construction/Facilities

February 1999 — Adopted a position of support for SB 3, public library construction and renovation bond act.

May 2002 — Adopted a position of support for SCA 10, the Senate Constitutional Amendment, which would amend the state constitution to allow the voters to approve a bond for public library facilities with a 55% majority, rather than a two-thirds majority, and would also allow ad valorem tax on real property to exceed the 1% limitation to pay for library facility bonds.

February 2003 — Adopted a position of support for SB 40 and AB 222, which propose a public library construction bond measure for 2004.

October 2005 — Adopted a position of support for SB 1161, the California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act, which is on the ballot for the June 2006 election.

April 2007 — Adopted a position of support for SB 156, the California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2008.

August 2008 — Adopted a position of support for SB 1516, the California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2010.

Library of California

February 1999 — Adopted a position of support for increased funding for the Library of California Act.

February 2001 — Adopted a position to undertake activities to support a legislative augmentation of the Library of California programs and services consistent with the Board's overall goals of full funding for the LoC; and that the Board President and the Legislative Committee Chair continue to monitor the status of LoC funding for 2001/02.

February 2003 — Adopted a position of support for continued authorization for operation of the Library of California and continued funding, at a minimum, at the 2002/03 level.

Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)

February 1999	Adopted a position of support for adequate funding for the Library Services and Technology Act and work towards the equitable distribution of those funds in accordance with the State based nature of the statute.
August 2001	Adopted a position to authorize the Board President or his designee to take appropriate action in support of increased funding for LSTA for fiscal year 2002/03 and for reauthorization of LSTA in 2003/04.
February 2003	Adopted a position of support for the 2003 reauthorization of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA).

Literacy

February 1999	Adopted a position of support for increased funding for the Families For Literacy Act and the California Library Literacy Service Act.
June 1999	Adopted a position of support for SB 571, Family Literacy.
April 2007	Adopted a position of support for AB 1030, Literacy and English Acquisition Services, young adult component.
February 2008	Support for CLLS and urge Governor to not eliminate it as introduced in Senate Republican's version of the proposed 2008-09 state budget.

Rulemaking procedure

February 1999	Moved to place the direct loan waiver provision on the table for discussion during the rulemaking procedure with the changes noted. Moved to place the net imbalance reimbursement formula on the table for discussion during the rulemaking procedure, and direct the CEO to have a study taken to look at alternative cost containment measures as well as full reimbursement costs. Moved to add a draft regulation comparable to Section 28 (d) (1) for academic, school, and special libraries that requires them to determine the eligibility of an individual as a member of their primary clientele before direct borrowing privileges are provided under the provisions of the Direct Loan program. Moved to retain the draft regulation for reciprocity in the electronic direct access program. Approved the proposed regulations for submittal to the Office of Administrative Law.

	Adopted the hearing process as presented to the Board on the document titled "Public Hearings on the Library of California Proposed Regulations."
August 1999	Moved to modify the proposed Library of California regulations and initiate a second public comment period.
November 1999	Moved to submit the proposed regulation to the Office of Administrative Law.
February 2000	Moved to make changes in the proposed regulations and notice them with cover letter summarizing the changes and indicating that they do not inhibit the authority of Regional Library Networks to develop protocols. If no public comment received, submit proposed regulations to the Office of Administrative Law.

School Libraries

April 1999	Adopted a position to accept testimony on AB 1289, California School Library Media Teacher Expansion Program.
April 2000	Adopted a position of support for AB 2311, School libraries: California School Library Media Teacher Expansion Program.
April 2001	Adopted a position of support for AB 336, School Library Pilot Program.
February 2002	Adopted a position of support that the LoC Board Legislative Committee support strong public school library services, including supporting the preservation of the California Public School Library Association (CPSLA) and the budgetary line item that supports it. *(This position was ratified by the full Board at its May 2002 meeting.)*
February 2003	Adopted a position of support for the California Public School Library Act and the continuation of the budget line item to fund library materials for school libraries.
April 2007	Adopted a position of support for AB 333, School libraries: online databases: subscriptions

Young Adult Services

February 1999	Adopted a position of support for the Board President, Access Services Committee Chair, and their delegates to make appropriate legislative contacts regarding development and implementation of the Statewide Young Adult Services Program; and reconfirm the Board's commitment to the Statewide Young Adult Services Program.