

MARINet Board Meeting – Minutes

May 5, 2022 Online meeting

Approved on June 2, 2022

Present: Henry Bankhead, Anji Brenner, Franklin Escobedo, Linda Kenton, Abbot Chambers, Sarah Frye, Lana Adlawan, Crystal Duran, Dan McMahon.

Absent: Gary Gorka.

Guests: None.

Meeting convened at 12:02 p.m.

Approval of minutes for April 7, 2022 meeting, approved unanimously after quorum.

No public comments, no public.

RFID update

We've spent \$514k in MARINet on RFID so far, for pads, tags, and tagging costs with Backstage LW. The sources have been the \$500k in county funds from 2019, and authorization to use \$249k of bottom line funds for the BSLW tagging. We have about \$220k in the MCFL funds left, and about \$500k in reserves, with \$80k more in July. Going forward, we could run out of money if the sorter ends up being 1 million or more for the sorter. What's the vision for the whole project? Why have we tagged everything if we're not going to sort? We should take advantage of the new technology. Alternatively, many libraries do have up to 10 years between tagging and sorters. There's no urgency, though tags in books do age and lose effectiveness slowly. SRPL is putting in an AMH. Do we retag in 10 years? Hopefully we replace them like failing barcodes, gradually, unless failure is epidemic. Books also get weeded, how many last 10 years? Site and cost issues at Tech Services need to be sorted out, as this is the biggest project we'll have done since CENIC, or bigger. It's worthy of serious discussion. We have to look at Lori's proposal next meeting for consulting on the AMH part of the project during this next year.

Lana points out, putting in a sorter will require staff be moved at Los Gamos, to expand the delivery space. We do need a site plan, pursuant to Lori visit to the site. Would the board be willing to share costs for that? Is there other space available in another building? The best space is likely at LG, given how our search went in 2014 for a new site, so we can see if staff can be moved to make the delivery space. Would SRPL be able to cost share their thing? It's a higher level of cooperation than we've seen in previous projects. The next step is with Lori, then to the architect, and then what additional steps?

Palaces Project:

It's really an aggregator for Overdrive and other e-book sites or collections, as much as a content source. They are hoping that Enki could be integrated. It is imilar to Simply-E, the same idea but different people. Will Enki go away? Don't think so. (Side issue: Enki records

should be updated in Sierra.) Palaces won't integrate Kindle. Many questions still. Kindle is currently 12k out of 53k checkouts on Overdrive. Libby is 12.4k. Great initiative, but wary of putting too many eggs in this basket. How do we nudge the user base onto another platform? But it would be nice to have everything on a platform we control.

Cost sharing working group met, report from Anji, and they have a survey ready to send out Monday. There will be 2 weeks to take the survey, then back to subcommittee. They will report back next meeting. It's a short survey, but it requires thinking about things.

Regionals working group, report from Linda. There is a report from 2013 when this was last looked at. The recommendation then was to join BAYLIS. Now, to join PLP, we'd need the approval of all the PLP libraries to approve as well as our own. Membership costs were then higher than what was being paid. Then the group decided not to pay more money so the idea expired. Now, direction on how we pursue this again? Likely that costs are higher now. PLP is a consortium of mega-consortiums. BAYLIS was east bay, part of PLP. We don't want to pay more, but do we get more back in benefits if we join? Would it serve our residents better? Linda has numbers from 2013. BALIS PLP and LinkPlus? What about being our own regional? We'd need to have staff. We are contiguous with SF and the East Bay. (It was their analysts that recommended BALIS.) General consensus to explore some more? Linda will continue investigating.

Future of board meetings zoom or hybrid. Should we meet only at Los Gatos or rotate libraries if meetings resume? Covid is still an issue. Remote meetings only are favored by many. Are we doing this right legally? What are the posting requirements? The state should be working on these issues we thought, though we've been doing this for 2 years. Should we get County Counsel to look into this? Would they be able to answer a question for a JPA? There are a lot of JPAs in Marin, should be able to get a reading from someone on this. Hybrid has its own questions.

B&T Diversity audit product. Presented by Peter DeVries, Jane Herb. Baker & Taylor is offering a new DEI tool, with 12 topics currently to evaluate. This is a shelf audit project, and it links through to the books for reference use. It applies to physical collections and digital, if it's Axis360, Cloud or Overdrive. It covers only "book" materials, as it's not set up for AV or library of things. Total % of items show in collection that meet at least one diversity measure/topic.

Subject headings feed into the evaluation. Collection "facets" are visible as percentages or as absolute numbers. It can export info into Excel, any top item or single area. Would the data show all the members or just be shared? It's included with Collection HQ? SRPL and MCFL have CHQ on their own, so they will have this. If the county would like DEI analysis, they could provide the DEI for whole consortium. There may be reasons why SRPL and MCFL would like to see the whole county's collection DEI info, they could see own info alone or everyone's info. Getting a lot of interest from academic market. Both academics would add \$4000 to quote. There is a perception that County and SRPL would be paying twice. The tool didn't increase the price of the CHQ subscription so it's not paying twice.

What's our timeline for decision? What are SRPL and MCFL using Collection HQ for? What is the visibility of each library to each other's collections in this tool? We could save the \$50k from Decision Center to provide Collection HQ for everyone? Then we'd all get the diversity tool? Dan will have an eval next month about DC vs CHQ. We need clarity on how this affects the existing CHQ customers. If everyone used CHQ it'd be a bigger picture to benefit the customer. If it was 60k it'd be in the ballpark. Henry and Lana will follow up with Baker & Taylor on their contracts and a consortia quote.

Aspen report. Each library could have their own version of the interface, a branded catalog. Some development time would be needed for that. Savings would be about \$40k per year including dropping Syndetics. E-book records can be imported via API daily like we do now. What should be the process going forward? The board should see a demo of this, in June, possibly as a stand-alone meeting.

MCFL Community Survey. MCFL received 5,000 responses, some involve other libraries so there's value to everyone in looking at it. Questions: High use of print materials is expressed, not really going away with lots of people. MCFL's goal is to keep digital resource use as high as it was during the pandemic, but people want the books, more popular materials, DVDs in physical formats as well.

Systems report

Peninsula Library System (PLS) and NorthNet (NLS) are both considering sharing their Overdrive backstock with us, and will formally decide during their June meetings.

As the budget year ends, we may need to move money quickly to cover the Backstage LW fees (all bottom line expenses, from prior year funds) so we may need a budget resolution in a hurry. Hopefully not though.

No equity discussion today. Next time is still Gary.

Topics for future, email Henry or Dan

Aspen

RFID

Update the doc on who was chair vice chair historically, Franklin will assume chair in July meeting. We'll need a new vice chair then.

Meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.