

NLS Executive Committee Meeting

Friday, August 17, 2018

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon

Yolo County Library
Mary L. Stephens Davis Branch- Small Conference Room
315 E. 14th Street
Davis, CA 95616

- | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Roll Call | Deck, Chair | |
| 2. Public Invited to Comment | Deck | |
| 3. Adoption of Agenda (Action Item) | Deck | |
| 4. Approve Minutes of May 24, 2018 (Action Item) | Brinkley | Attachment 1, pg. 3 |
| 5. Old Business | | |
| A. Review and Approve Allocation Not to Exceed \$3,000 for Additional CalPERS work (Action Item) | Brinkley | Attachment 2, pg. 9 |
| B. Review LINK+ Update | Brinkley | Attachment 3, pg. 10 |
| C. Approve LINK+ Revised Quote (Action Item)
(To be Distributed Separately) | Brinkley | |
| 6. New Business | | |
| A. Review and Approve Allocation of NLS CLSA Funds (Action Item) | Brinkley | Attachment 4, pg. 15 |
| B. Approve Allocation of NLS Funds for Staff Development (Action Item) | Brinkley | Attachment 5, pg. 16 |
| 7. System Chair Report | Deck | |
| 8. Executive Committee FY 2018/19 Meeting Schedule | | |
| • Friday, November 30, 2018 – Virtual Meeting | | |
| • Friday, May 17, 2019 – Location TBD | | |
| 9. Select dates for 2019 Mid-Year Administrative Council Meeting (Jan/Feb) and Annual Meeting (June) | | |
| 10. Adjournment | | |

Brown Act: The legislative body of a local agency may use teleconferencing in connection with any meeting or proceeding authorized by law. Cal. Gov't Code § 54953(b)(1). A "teleconference" is "a meeting of a legislative body, the members of which are in different locations, connected by electronic means, through either audio or video, or both." Cal. Gov't Code § 54953(b)(4). A local agency may provide the public with additional teleconference locations. Cal. Gov't Code § 54953(b)(4).

The teleconferenced meeting must meet the following requirements:

- (1) it must comply with all of the Act's requirements applicable to other meetings;
- (2) all votes must be taken by roll call;
- (3) agendas must be posted at all teleconference locations and the meeting must be conducted in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of the parties or public appearing before the body;
- (4) each teleconference location must be identified in the notice and agenda and each location must be accessible to the public;
- (5) during the teleconferenced meeting, at least a quorum of the members of the legislative body must participate from locations within the boundaries of the body's jurisdiction; and
- (6) the agenda must provide the public with an opportunity to address the legislative body at each teleconference location. Cal. Gov't Code § 54953(b).

Meeting Locations

NLS Admin office, 2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
Benicia Public Library, 150 East L Street, Benicia, CA 94510
Butte County Library, 110 Oak Grove Parkway, Oroville, CA 95966
Lincoln Public Library, 485 Twelve Bridges Drive, Lincoln, CA 95648
Nevada County Library, 980 Helling Way, Nevada City, CA 95959
Solano County Library, 1150 Kentucky Street, Fairfield, CA 94533
Sutter County Library, 750 Forbes Avenue, Yuba City, CA 95991
Tehama County Library, 545 Diamond Avenue, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Willows/Orland Public Library, 201 N. Lassen Street, Willow, CA 95988/333 Mill Street, Orland, CA 95963
Yolo County Library, 226 Buckeye, Woodland, CA 95695

Conference Information

Phone Number: 1-877-216-1555

Passcode: 907394



2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
650-349-5538 Fax: 650-349-5089

www.northnetlibs.org

DRAFT MINUTES

NLS Executive Committee Meeting

May 24, 2018

1. **Welcome and Roll Call** –Chair, Mel Lightbody, Butte County, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Also present were NLS Executive Committee members Todd Deck, Tehama County, Suzanne Olawski, Solano County Library, James Ochsner, Sutter County Library, Kathryn Hunt, Lincoln Public Library, Ana Danielson, Mono County, Stacey Costello, Colusa County, David Dodd, Benicia Public Library. Also attending, Michael Perry, Siskiyou County Library, Carol Frost, Pacific Library Partnership, Andrew Yon, Pacific Library Partnership, Susan Hanks, California State Library, and Jacquie Brinkley, NorthNet Library System Coordinator.
2. **Public Invited to Comment** – None
3. **Motion to adopt Agenda.** Brinkley noted that Agenda Item D should be corrected to Review only, no Action required. With correction to Agenda, Olawski moved; Danielson seconded. Motion carried.
4. **Motion to Approve Minutes of 2/26/2018 Executive Committee Meeting.** Hunt moved; Dodd seconded. Motion carried.
5. **Old Business**
 - A. Frost provided update on the NLS LINK+ Study, including the delivery component still in process through consultant Galecia Group. Frost recently attended the LINK+ annual meeting on behalf of NLS. The contract for Tricor as the main delivery service for current LINK+ clients will expire next year, and so the pricing NLS received from Tricor reflects what the new model will be. The NLS pricing includes weight, and we are determining if the Tricor quote truly reflects the actual weight the libraries have today, and the correct anticipated weights for any new libraries. Any new delivery contracts made will reflect new and anticipated increase in costs. Innovative Interfaces, Inc (III) is in the process of negotiations with other couriers, but no agreement has been made as of this date. Galecia Group is still working to gather data from NLS members to create delivery model options to maximize efficiency while controlling costs for new and existing LINK+ clients. Consultant is waiting on response from a few NLS current LINK+ libraries to finalize proposed delivery models. Consultant has also sent out for quote tentative delivery schedules to two current NLS couriers – Sprint, AmTran, and one other, ExPak. The last piece of Galecia Group's work will be to create and distribute to NLS a complete listing of costs and best choice for delivery model. Possible next steps are for Galecia Group to report at NLS Administrative Council meeting on June 15, if full pricing details are available before that date.

Frost reviewed NLS funds available: \$328,093 of CLSA funds were set aside for the LINK+ Study, of which \$128,093 needs to be expended by June 30, 2019.

Frost also reported that in the FY 2018/19 Governor's proposed budget, \$450,000 is included for shared resources, including NLS and LNK+, although she is not sure what portion of those funds is for NLS, or how the funds might be distributed.

Other next steps may include drafting an implementation plan by June 15 and, by recommendation from NLS members, creating a "LINK+ Mentor" list to match new LINK+ libraries with existing libraries. In addition, NLS will need to determine if libraries can sustain past the one-year funding.

Lightbody asked if from Phase I of NLS LINK+ Study or Galecia Group's delivery research, if there is a sense of how many libraries would participate.

Frost reported that while the earlier study results were shared with NLS Directors at the January 2018 Admin Council meeting, delivery cost data was not part of that original scope of study, therefore no delivery costs were available. NLS might assume a phased approach of joining LINK+, but at this time there is no idea of how many libraries might join.

Dodd asked if Galecia Group returned to TriCore with new NLS data to get a revised quote. Frost reported that we were directed to work through Innovative Interfaces, Inc (III) for delivery quotes.

- B. Hunt presented a proposed revision of NLS Bylaws upon review by Committee and as requested by the NLS Administrative Council that included the following considerations: Establishing a means of joining NLS directly; Making provision to leave NLS; Creating a process to re-enter NLS as a member library; Status of non-public libraries as Associate Members; Defining member and "constituent" libraries; and establishing language that allows only full members to vote on CLSA issues (versus "Associate" members voting). The Bylaws review also included revisions to Terms of Service for Chair and Vice Chair – from one-year term to 2-year term for both (Article IV, Section 3, a. and b.). Also reviewed and revised was that NLS annual membership fees will be tied to the annual Consumer Price Index of December of previous year (Article III, Section 2, a.) Hunt pointed out that an amendment will be made to the revised Bylaws presented at this meeting to change current language of "Constituent and member libraries" to "All" in following Sections: Article III, Section 2. a., b., and c. Also, Article IV, Section 1, Section 6, and Section 7.

Lightbody thanked Bylaws Review Committee, Hunt and Dodd, for their work on this project.

Frost commented that, as an example, the Loomis Library seeking membership with NLS will still require the California Library Services Board (CLSB) to recognize and certify new public libraries before NLS would consider their membership request. Hanks reported that there is a formal process for which libraries must apply for CLSB certification and she offered to research that documentation.

Frost commented that NLS would need clarification if a library leaving NLS or legacy system would lose or jeopardize their CLSA funding should the timing of CLSB approval be delayed. NLS Bylaws do not direct if a library is eligible. The CLSB has that authority.

Motion to recommend adoption of revised NLS Bylaws by the NLS Administrative Council at the June 15, 2018 annual meeting.

Hunt moved, Ochsner seconded. Motion carried.

- C. Brinkley presented draft agenda for June 15 Administrative Council meeting. Discussion re: items to add to agenda and request to have State Library liaison attend and provide CSL report. Hanks agreed to attend and provide report.
- 6. A. Frost reviewed how CLSA are distributed by the State Library to NLS and how by formula, funds are then allocated to NLS members annually. Once annual CLSA allocations are determined, individual NLS libraries are invoiced for their share of delivery costs and/or shared resources paid by NLS (i.e. OverDrive, Zinio, enki). If annual CLSA allocation exceeds what is paid by NLS for these shared costs, the library receives the balance of their CLSA funds by check.

Perry, Siskiyou County, shared his concern that by having only the balance of CLSA funds come to his library via NLS rather than having the full amount paid to the library and he pay the bills directly, his library is missing out on showing those funds as revenue on their books. Without the funds running through their accounting system, there is no way to capture the revenue generated and value added with CLSA funds. Perry is asking the Executive Committee to consider having all CLSA funds distributed by NLS to individual libraries and each library then billed for their shared expenses, with NLS to collect from all libraries. Perry acknowledged the extra expense and time this might cause, but asked the Executive Committee to explore CLSA distribution possibilities so that libraries could show the revenue on their own books. Perry cited E-Rate practices as an example of how this process might work.

Frost remarked that distributing all CLSA funds and billing back to libraries would leave NLS in a cash deficit while waiting for all libraries to pay on invoices.

Lightbody commented that all revenue and costs do appear on the books for Butte County and matched against CLSA funds. She acknowledged that administrative servicing of such a practice (distributing all CLSA and billing back) would be impacted and likely increase costs of administering these shared contracts.

Ochsner recalled the year when this billing practice changed – formerly received all CLSA funds and then billed back. The transition year was difficult to explain the change, but now full costs of revenue and expenses are included on books.

Danielson commented that it was more effective for NLS/PLP to administer these shared contracts in the current way.

Lightbody commented that “revenue” can be vulnerable if seen as “received.”

Perry suggested that a survey of directors be sent out to determine how they show CLSA funds and expenses in their accounting and how to best capture that value of “revenue” when it doesn’t come as income to the library. Perry expressed similar concern with the State Library’s state-funded Zip Books program.

Danielson suggested using In-kind to show contribution from other sources, such as the State budget. Danielson will share a copy of Mono County Office of Education budget as example of how In-kind is recorded.

Frost suggested that upon results from directors’ survey, NLS staff will create a Best Practice document that could be included on the NLS Annual Budget and also included in the NLS Guidebook annual updates. She also expressed that she was reluctant to distribute all funds to libraries and getting payments returned in a timely manner.

- B. Ochsner presented memo from Nominating Committee for recommendation of slate of nominees for FY 2018/19 NLS Executive Committee.

Dodd commented that it was challenging to recruit from NBCLS, citing that these libraries appear to not value NLS or System membership.

Motion to approve slate of nominees and to recommend adoption by NLS Administrative Council Adoption at annual meeting of June 15, 2018.

Dodd moved; Deck seconded. Motion Carried.

Acknowledgement was made to outgoing Executive Committee members, Costello and Danielson.

- C. Deck and Brinkley presented the FY 2018/19 LSTA Pitch An Idea proposal submitted to the State Library for Career Visioning project to bring workforce resources to new adults in rural communities of NLS, PLP and Black Gold library systems. The State Library offered a new LSTA opportunity for regional and statewide proposals. NLS, in collaboration with PLP and Black Gold submitted a proposal and was invited to apply for funding. Hanks commented that the same consultant worked on other workforce projects in Southern CA and had excellent evaluations from participants. The LSTA application will be developed and submitted to the State Library by June 6. Approval and award would be made on or near July 1. Funding was recommended at \$110,000.
- D. Brinkley presented draft FY 2018/19 NLS Plan of Service. Frost mentioned that new questions had been added to the form and form was distributed late from the State Library so staff is still gathering data to complete this document. Brinkley asked Executive Committee for any suggestions to “Future Plans” section. Dodd suggested language be broad and describe more general concepts such as “Resource Sharing” versus specific products/programs such as OverDrive and Zip Books.

Brinkley reported that a more complete draft of the Plan of Service will be distributed to Executive Committee for review prior to the June 15 Annual Meeting.

Frost commented that the System's Plans of Service can be revised at later date, should the need arise.

- E. Frost presented the Califa membership renewal and usage chart for discussion. She explained that "Activities" included the purchase of goods or services through Califa.

Perry noted that while Siskiyou showed no activity on the chart provided, they did take advantage of a discount coupon offered by Califa with an approximate \$200 value.

Ochsner and Hunt both remarked that from year to year their Califa activity may change, but overall, they felt the savings offered were significant and membership was a value to each library.

Hunt suggested polling NLS members as to barriers of using Califa membership and suggested considering paying membership fees for only those who want to participate in FY 2019/20. If this is not a significant budget impact, she suggested renewing for all at this time.

Frost responded that the Califa membership had a minimal impact on the NLS budget.

Motion to renew Califa membership for all NLS member libraries, FY 2018/19.

Ochsner moved; Olawski seconded. Motion Carried.

- F. Frost presented an amended NLS contract with PLP for administrative services. Frost reminded Executive Committee members that the original contract was approved as a Baseline with an agreement to negotiate additional fees above and beyond Baseline contract that may come up due to new or on-going projects requiring additional time for CEO and/or System Coordinator. Frost added that the current NLS System Administration budget is under budget and with this amendment, will continue to be under CLSA requirement of 20% to System Administrative costs.

Dodd asked about State or LSTA projects that now required additional contract fees to NLS and advised that any proposed projects that have a fiscal impact to NLS (i.e. additional administrative costs) be discussed in advance with the NLS Executive Committee.

Deck agreed that better communication will be made with Executive Committee members with regard to projects that may have a fiscal impact on NLS.

Motion to approve amendment to NLS/PLP FY 2018/19 Contract to reflect additional work.

Deck moved; Costello seconded.

Hunt asked if the LSTA grant was not approved, would the PLP contract amendment be necessary or would it be reduced?

Frost responded that if contract works shifts or is reduced, the Executive Committee can review the contract again at later date. The contracting model used this year (baseline and amending as needed) was developed at the recommendation of former NLS Chair. Also, the LSTA grant had

minimal financial impact to NLS – 84% of the administrative costs on the grant would be funded with LSTA.

Motion carried, with request to improve communications.

- G. Yon presented the NLS FY 2018/19 Draft Budget. Corrections on budget forms were noted for the Executive Committee.

With corrections, Motion to approve DRAFT Budget and recommend adoption to the NLS Administrative Council on June 15, 2018.

Hunt moved; Danielson seconded. Motion carried.

- H. Yon presented the NLS FY 2016/17 Financial Audit and recommended approval as submitted, stating the records are sound. He also noted that the Financial Highlights, page 46, noted a significant increase in net position and pointed out that this was due to NLS receiving CLSA funds to administer the statewide Zip Books program through June 30, 2019.

Motion to approve NLS 2016/17 Financial Audit. Danielson moved; Hunt seconded. Motion carried.

7. System Chair Report – None
8. Deck and Brinkley to schedule FY 2018/19 meeting calendar and share with Executive Committee.
9. Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.



2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
650-349-5538 Fax: 650-349-5089

www.northnetlibs.org

To: NLS Executive Committee
From: Jacquie Brinkley, NLS System Coordinator
Subject: Review and Approve Allocation Not to Exceed \$3,000 for Additional CalPERS Work
Date: August 17, 2018

At the June 2018 NLS Annual Committee meeting, Isabel Safie from Best, Best and Krieger, Attorneys at Law, presented the final installment of research and opinions on several CalPERS questions related to the obligations of the legacy systems. At that time, Ms. Safie mentioned she has been monitoring AB 1912, introduced by Assembly Member Rodriguez. This bill applies retroactive as well as prospective joint and several liabilities for all retirement related obligations to any current or former member of a JPA throughout its existence.

There was expressed interest on behalf of several NLS Directors that NLS retain Ms. Safie for monitoring this bill on NLS's behalf and provide updates as they come available.

Ms. Safie's current contract has been fulfilled and there are no unspent funds in the contract. She has indicated that the cost for monitoring would be approximately \$1,500 - \$2,500, depending on how much activity there is around AB 1912. Ms. Safie will provide written review and analysis as the bill is amended. A final memo to NLS would provide a summary of AB 1912 as signed into law and include a section that discusses how her prior analysis to NLS is impacted by AB 1912.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the NLS Executive Committee consider allocating up to \$3,000 for an amendment to the current contract with Best, Best and Krieger to provide monitoring for AB 1912 for NLS and to provide written updates as they become available.



2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
650-349-5538 Fax: 650-349-5089

www.northnetlibs.org

To: NLS Executive Committee
From: Jacquie Brinkley, NLS System Coordinator
Subject: Review Link+ Update
Date: August 17, 2018

BACKGROUND

At the June 2018 NLS Annual Committee meeting, libraries were presented with proposed costs for Link+, and were asked to identify their interest in participating either this fiscal year or next. Below is a chart which represents the interest:

Yes - New

Lincoln Public Library
 Plumas County Library
 Roseville Public Library
 Sonoma County Library
 Sutter County Library
 Woodland Public Library

Current

Belvedere-Tiburon Library
 Benicia Public Library
 Dixon Public Library
 Larkspur Public Library
 Marin County Free Library
 Mill Valley Public Library
 Napa County Library
 Sacramento Public Library
 San Anselmo Public Library
 San Rafael Public Library
 Sausalito Public Library
 Solano County Library
 St. Helena Public Library
 Yolo County Library

Maybe

Alpine County Library
 Butte County Library
 Colusa County Library
 Del Norte County Library
 El Dorado County Library
 Folsom Public Library
 Humboldt County Library
 Shasta Public Libraries
 Siskiyou County Library

No

Lake County Library
 Mono County Library
 Nevada County
 Orland Free Library
 Placer County Library
 Tehama County Library
 Willows Public Library

No Response

Lassen Library District
 Mendocino County Library
 Modoc County Library
 Trinity County Library
 Yuba County Library

No academic libraries expressed interest. This list has been shared with Innovative for an updated quote. They were concerned that only 6 new libraries confirmed (since their first quote was based on all of the libraries joining). We indicated that the libraries listed under 'maybe' included those with an interest to defer to FY 2019/20 for implementation, or else are waiting for final costs in order to make a determination. At the writing of this memo, Innovative expressed a possible tiered pricing structure where the costs would include the existing libraries and the 'yes' libraries, and cost would go down for as the 'maybe' libraries commit.

We were also notified that Innovative was working with Tricor, who indicated they would not be able to deliver to Plumas (which is a 'yes' library) and Alpine, Del Norte and Siskiyou libraries, which were all 'maybe' libraries.

The revised quote including 'maybe' libraries will be distributed at the August 17, 2018 Executive Committee meeting.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION IN WORKING WITH THE LINK+ BOARD

Lori Ayre from the Galecia Group is continuing her work on finding delivery solutions for NLS. She provided this update, which was shared with Innovative:

Alpine, Del Norte, Plumas, and Siskiyou (Lassen, Modoc, Mono were "No's" for LINK+ at this time)

For libraries to join Link+, they have to meet the current terms of Link+ which currently calls for 5-day per week delivery service. This could be accomplished by contracting with Tricor for all delivery. However, Tricor has stated that they will not service Modoc County, Mono County, Plumas County, or Siskiyou County. All of these libraries currently use USPS or UPS for much of their delivery needs (or rely on staff travel between branches). None of them have a regional courier service handling transfers between library systems. Let's call them "off-route" libraries.

What we need for these libraries: In order for Alpine, Del Norte, Plumas, and Siskiyou to participate, we would need a waiver from Link+ which allows them to send and receive Link+ material using USPS or UPS. The advantage to using these services is that material can be sent directly to the requesting library so it should be possible to get material to the destination library within five days. The disadvantage to using USPS/UPS is that when these libraries request Link+ material, it will need to be prepared for USPS/UPS at some point. If Link+ agrees to the waiver for libraries to use this service, I would recommend we set up a centralized service

where all such requested material would be received and then shipped so that sending libraries wouldn't have to deal with special packaging so their workflow wouldn't be affected. In other words, NorthNet would take on the actual shipping to these "off-route" libraries. I would recommend that the "off-route" libraries ship returns (and requested Link+ items) directly to their destination using USPS/UPS (which is also their normal workflow) as this would be faster and less labor intensive all around.

Sonoma (Sprint) and MVLS (Am-Tran) (Sonoma was a "No" at this time. Mendocino did not respond; MVLS: Nevada & Placer counties – No at this time)

For all other libraries, one option is to say they must use Tricor (or whomever the Innovative courier is). However, many of the other libraries do receive delivery already from another courier. In the case of MVLS, many libraries receive delivery from Am-Tran but none are 5-days per week. Many are only 1-day per week. In the case of Lake, Sonoma and Mendocino counties, they receive five-day per week service from Sprint.

What we need for these libraries: *Can we get permission to use existing delivery providers and have them intersect with Link+ at one central location? This is basically how Marin County does it now. All Link+ material goes to MCFL and then that consortium handles delivery from there. We would need to do that for Lake/Sonoma/Mendocino (one stop to connect to Sprint). Additionally for MVLS, we would need to know whether the internal courier could be utilized even if delivery is so much less frequent than currently required of Link+.*

Humboldt, Shasta, Tehama (Orland & Willows "No" at this time; Trinity – no response)

For libraries that are far away, have no internal courier in place, but which Tricor has agreed to service, the cost is prohibitive for many of them, so it would be useful to USPS/UPS an option for these locations.

What we need for these libraries: *Can we designate some of the very remote libraries which Tricor says they will service as "off-route" too. And if so, what criteria can we use to designate a library "off-route?"*

Recommendations to Innovative for Modifying INN-Reach Configuration to Support Above Requests

The above allowances need not negatively impact Link+ turnaround times. The way to accomplish that is to utilize two mechanisms within INN-Reach that can control how often a library is selected to fill a request. One tool is Primary Lending Groups and the other is the Request Balancing Table.

My recommendation is that Innovative establish the "off-route" libraries as their own Primary Lending Group so that they are more likely to request material from each other. Only when the request cannot be filled by someone in the same Lending Group will it go to the rest of the Link+ members.

Since all the off-route libraries would be using USPS/UPS for sending and receiving, keeping them in the same Lending Group would allow them to send and receive to each other using the same workflows which would make it quicker and it would also diminish the reliance on a central (NorthNet provided) transfer/shipping service as described above.

If the Primary Lending Group is not an option, the other way to achieve a similar goal is to use the Request Balancing Table. In this scenario, all off-route libraries would be given an extremely low number which would result in them not receiving requests from other libraries very often. While this may strike some as "unfair" the benefit of keeping requests infrequent to these libraries is that it would keep the overall costs down and turnaround times high (so ultimately better for patrons for sure). The Request Balancing Table could be used to lower the number of requests to the MVLS libraries as well - making their infrequent delivery schedules less problematic to the overall turnaround times. This should be done for MVLS even if the off-route libraries become their own Primary Lending Group.

Summary of What We Need from Link+ Board:

1. *Need permission to designate some libraries "off-route" because there is no service available or Tricor service is overkill. These libraries would be permitted use USPS/UPS for sending returns and requested Link+ items to other Link+ members*

Note: The LINK+ Board has already given permission to allow alternate couriers to assist

2. *NorthNet needs to commit to centrally receive Link+ material requested from off-route libraries and ship via USPS/UPS to destination*
3. *Need permission to transfer all Lake/Sonoma/Mendo materials via Sprint courier who delivers 5x per week at all locations. Transfer point to be determined.*

Note: The LINK+ Board agreed in principle to allow less than 5-day a week delivery in certain circumstances. They did not define what those circumstances would be – e.g. case-by-case basis, library size, etc.

4. *Need permission to transfer all MVLS materials via AmTran courier who delivers 1x-4x per week to MVLS locations. If yes, can we leave current delivery schedule alone or do we need to set a minimum number of delivery days per week (e.g. 3x per week delivery required if you are going to join Link+)*

5. *Permission to ask Innovative to put all off-route libraries into a Primary Lending Group and to reduce the priority of requests to MVLS libraries using the INN-Reach Request Balancing Table.*

Recommendation

NLS Executive Committee to create an Advisory Group to parse out LINK+ implementation and contract details and to make recommendations for moving forward, including identification of “mentor” LINK+ libraries to pair with new LINK+ libraries. Advisory Group to consider how LINK+ billing would work for NLS members (individual contracts, or NLS to carry group contract); how to bring current LINK+ libraries into the NLS group, etc. The Advisory Group may also work with the California State Library in determining how new state funds designated in FY 2018/19 budget for resource sharing will be fairly allocated among other CLSA systems interested in LINK+ or other resource sharing opportunities.

NLS staff will work with the Advisory Group to move this project forward and recommendations will be presented by Advisory Group representative at next NLS Executive Committee meeting of November 30, 2018.



2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
650-349-5538 Fax: 650-349-5089

www.northnetlibs.org

To: NLS Executive Committee
From: Carol Frost, CEO, PLP
Subject: Review and Approve Allocation of NLS California Library Services Act (CLSA) Funds for FY 2018/19
Date: August 17, 2018

The FY 2018/19 CLSA allocations for the NorthNet Library System (NLS) will be \$816,895. Once system administration costs are accounted for, there will be \$648,016 unallocated.

NorthNet generally allocates the entire amount of funds which are not allocated to System Administration back to the libraries which can choose to apply their funds towards costs related to delivery, Zinio and OverDrive.

NorthNet also has some one-time funds which remain from previous fiscal years (funds must be spent within three years of receipt).

\$10,000 FY 2016/17 funds to Zinio

\$95,970 FY 2016/17 funds to Overdrive

\$328,093 to Link+ (FY 2016/17 \$128,093 and \$200,000 FY 2017/18)

Michael Perry, the Overdrive and Zinio coordinator, has notified us that of the \$10,000 allocated for Zinio, \$3,943 will be unspent. This will need to be reallocated.

Recommendation

The NLS Executive Committee has several options for allocating the \$648,016 and the \$3,943. California Law outlines acceptable use of expenditures of CLSA funds, including: staff training as it relates to services provided using CLSA funds (staff training for other purposes can be funded from System Administration); and shared e-Resources between 3 or more libraries.

Option one: allocate the \$648,016 to the public libraries per the formula for Zinio, Overdrive and delivery costs

Option two: in consideration of the Link+ study, the Executive Committee may choose to hold back additional funds to cover the installation costs for a possible Link+ implementation (none are anticipated at this time)

Option three: The NLS Executive Committee may choose to allocate the \$3,943 of anticipated unspent Zinio funds toward Overdrive.



2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
650-349-5538 Fax: 650-349-5089

www.northnetlibs.org

To: NLS Executive Committee
From: Jacquie Brinkley, Project Coordinator
RE: Staff Development Funds for NLS members
Date: August 17, 2018

For the past several years, \$50,000 from the NLS budget has been designed for staff development for NLS member libraries at \$1,000 per library, funded from the NLS Contractual Services line item, using membership dues. These funds are particularly beneficial to NLS small and/or rural member libraries who have little to no staff development in their local budgets. Since these funds are not subject to the same limitations as CLSA funds, this is one of the few benefits available to all NLS members.

In the FY 2018/19 budget, \$83,128 is unallocated for Contractual Services. It is recommended that NorthNet continue to fund staff training at \$1,000 per member, and allocate up to \$50,000 for this purpose.

This will allow libraries the flexibility to decide locally the best training for their staff, including attendance at conference and other opportunities in FY 2018/19.