

MARINet Board Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021— Online Meeting

Meeting convened at 9:05 a.m.

Present: Linda Kenton (SAN), Abbot Chambers (SAU), Franklin Escobedo (LRK), Henry Bankhead (SRPL), Sara Jones and Chantel Walker (MCFL), Anji Brenner (MVY), Debbie Mazzolini (BET), Gary Gorka (DUC), Dan McMahon and Jessica Trenary (MARINet).

- I. No Public Comments (no member of public present)
- II. Guest: Bill Hale.
- III. Minutes of Dec. 21, 2020 approved
- IV. Old Business
 - a. Bookdrop Project: One bookdrop is ordered, nothing else has been done yet. Dan wants to get both proposed boxes going at the same time.
 - b. RFID: The first meeting with the project consultant Lori Ayre is tomorrow, Jan. 22. Our first task is deciding what kind of tags to order. MCFL is moving \$500k to MARINet to start this project, and that will pay for the first order of tags. Directors could use a timeline from the working group for this project.
 - c. Delivery: We can't find the hope-for study on delivery by Cheryl Gould or Califa. Dan is budgeting more for next year's city delivery, and Jessica is starting on an RFP to get new bids. The current driver of that route seems stressed by the amount of delivery, it's almost too many bins on both routes, seeming bigger than before March. For the RFP, would we want Sat. delivery on they city route? Maybe add as an optional bid price. Would floating among jurisdictions help reduce the delivery? Or reducing number of holds that patrons can place?
 - d. Collection Development Task Force (CDTF):

The CDTF will have their first meeting soon, in about a week. Sausalito Library is now a 2- or 3-to-1 net lender within MARINet. CDTF should take into account delivery issues. Would CDTF centralized purchasing increase or decrease the size of the delivery? We should clarify the charge to this task force. A. Financial and public service implications? B. Group ownership or just streamlining areas where we are all purchasing, like uploading records? C. Collective purchasing the top level, below that just coordinating purchasing? D. Are there ways to save money, and not hurt service to the public, by coordinating? E. Can we get discounts with larger group purchases? F. Can they touch on cataloging and pre-processing? Finally, MCFL can add Katrina Sadler to the group.
 - e. Reopening plans: SAN none. Full steam ahead with curbside. BET as well. SRPL notes that we've approached opening before so we have plans to follow, when current plateau subsides. The ICU vacancy rate is a factor as well as test rates. MCFL has DSW demands as well, being asked for more. (People who volunteer

to help with vaccinations are getting vaccinated.) DSW is a priority over library service for them. SRPL also having staff tapped for this kind of work.

- f. The FY2021-22 budget is not on the agenda. It is in the packet, and we should check the cost sharing formula for errors, then approve it next month. Budget approval is for March.

V. New Business: None.

VI. Standing items:

- a. Equity discussion: What structures would keep the equity discussion going inside of MARINet? What can each director do? Is it good to have different leaders take turns? Suggestion of books are one thing we can do. MCFL spends 45 min per meeting of leadership team, branch managers and other leaders. Don't make it the last topic on the agenda or it keeps getting pushed out.

While the Equity discussion may impact policy and practice, sometimes it's just an engaging conversation among staff, and that has value. How long should the discussion be each month? What kinds of things are discussed? (Sara and Chantel provided good examples. One example is the information that hold ratios were going up this summer for race/equity books, this led to action to purchase more copies. Other topics include issues, surprising ones such as film, and hair, these were good examples of discussion increasing comfort level.

45 minutes may be too long for this board every month. We are also a public board being recorded, so that may factor into the openness of discussion. Personal feelings and attitudes could be limited in this forum, making this kind of discussion hard.

- b. Systems admin report: no questions.

VII. Quest speaker: California State Librarian Greg Lucas joined us at 10 a.m.

The primary topic is universal borrowing, specifically for electronic resources. Mr. Lucas says thanks are due to California libraries for making the changes this last year, doing the work to keep people connected with libraries. We changed from in person and online services, to online only pretty much instantly. Service models will continue to change going forward even when we reopen doors. This also had huge financial considerations for public libraries. How do they keep online services and curbside delivery up when physical services also resume, due to limited staffing and money?

What if anything can be done to reduce the barriers we face with the electronic resource vendors? We have disparities within MARINet already. How do we equalize the distribution of stuff across the state? Mr. Lucas points out that the economy of scale that the state can achieve is big. ProQuest is providing K-12 products for free to public libraries. The NY Times for all libraries was half a million dollars, and to have Overdrive statewide would be much, much larger. For a resource like Kanopy, with per-use costs, the state would be reluctant to offer that.

Is there a willingness to restructure? Many laws and programs are decades old. Libraries do have the ability to shift services more quickly than any other public agency, as shown this year. They wouldn't want to break that responsiveness with changing the relationship between the state and public libraries. There was talk about a universal library card for the state, where did that go? The State Librarian said there was a bill last year, being reintroduced this year, saying every schoolkid should have a library card. Los Angeles County does this, and switched to a digital card last year. We need to solve the online card issue. Many decisions the vendors want to make should probably be our decisions instead, like about who to serve with our subscriptions.

Libraries have pivoted dramatically this year. Curbside service may continue after reopening due to popularity. Are other libraries moving forward with this hybrid model? Yes. It leapfrogged libraries to what the public expects, example is online storytimes. We had to deal with the copyright issues that prevented such programs in the past, but right now the publishers are being cool about it. Mr. Lucas points out the new products for after-hours access to library buildings with a library card. The public expectation is that we are becoming more digitally connected. But we also need to make better community rooms at libraries, for example by using bookshelves on wheels, so space can be opened up instantly.

For a real statewide library card, there is not yet a champion in Sacramento among legislators. ZIP Books are another example of a statewide program that CSL can help with. It's currently limited to physical items. Why? GL will find out. FE San Diego another example, all shared. SJ Without asking the state for money, we all are spending lots of money with Overdrive already. Law Libraries (BH) having a terrible time, Marin's considering closing. Can the state library help the law libraries. GL revenue stream from court filings. Additional funds as well. Revenue stream not adequate to cover expenses. Heightened use of law libs by public, non lawyers. AB State hasn't updated guidelines on web since June of last year. GL difficulty with agencies involved, but not much has changed, except physical items aren't much of a threat, quarantine times keep going down. Substance of guidelines isn't significantly different from what it was in June. (We are in retail category, 25% capacity.)

If questions, comments or suggestions on greg.lucas@library.ca.gov.

VIII. Resumption of business meeting: closing out topics

- a. Reopening: State Library now saying 24 hours is sufficient, the time period for quarantine can be shortened. Roll it back to 2 days? There would be pushback from staff. But why not 24 hours? We need documentation and/or approval of the County's Health Officer. Reminder that we are in retail category, and can have 25% occupancy.
- b. Universal Borrowing Agreement: Should UBA topic (internal and external) come back on the list? Maybe Feb agenda, suggestion of looking at JPA again and at online e-cards as they're connected.
- c. Equity discussion: Communities have different resources, those that need the most often have the least resources. Back to licensing and choice of resources. Are we going to recognize that and what can we do about it? Our financial fortunes have ebbed and flowed quite a bit over the years. MCFL example, had

no librarians at libraries in communities of color historically, this has been fixed. Who needs us the most?

- d. Meetings and Zoom records: If board members are aware of the recording, will they self-censor? Are the recordings posted? (Not currently per Dan.) Can we have difficult conversations in recordings? Chantel adds that “building the muscle” is important, getting used to having these conversations. The Executive Committee will flesh this out going forward.
- e. Board Agenda creation process. The board has been very open about adding topics, but sometimes topics come out of left field with no leadup. Henry’s suggestion is formalizing how topics are brought to the board. Our process is flexible but we then spend meetings explaining what the topic is. He shared an example form that San Rafael uses for this purpose. People are getting surprised by things brought to the board. We need more structure on what to expect. The public should get a summary of what the discussion items are. It does reach back to each agency ultimately. Led to discussion of new board members, better documentation of what we’ve discussed would be helpful. We do probably need better onboarding for directors, historical documents etc. of where we are. Send out draft minutes earlier? Next Executive Committee will discuss, then back to next mtg.
- f. Also on agendas, Bill Hale tells us that action and non-action items, as used on our agendas, are confusing and not compliant with the Brown Act.

IX. Non-Action Items: None.

- X. Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m. For lunch, some members stayed online, and shared a food that was special to them, and a book they’ve enjoyed this year. This is the last meeting for Sara Jones, as she’s off to Washington State to be their State Librarian, so to Sara, the Board says farewell and many thanks for all she’s done for us here.

Minutes taken by Dan McMahon, MARINet Systems Administrator