

## September 21, 2020, BLT Agenda Comments

These comments on Newport Beach Board of Library Trustees (BLT) [agenda](#) items are submitted by: Jim Mosher ([jimmosher@yahoo.com](mailto:jimmosher@yahoo.com)), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

### **Item 1. Minutes of the August 17, 2020 Board of Library Trustees Meeting**

**Page 2** (6 of packet), Item 6, first sentence: “*Information Technology (IT) Applications Supervisor Avery Maglinti reported over the past year, IT staff has responded to 970 ~~daily~~ support tickets; ...*” [Perhaps I don’t understand the “daily support ticket” terminology, but I assume this meant 970 tickets, total, over the course of the year, rather than 970 tickets each day?]

**Page 2** (6 of packet), Item 6, paragraph 3: “*In reply to Secretary Kost’s question, IT Applications Supervisor Maglinti clarified that staff was sharing logins for the previous ILS because of the configuration of the ILS.*” [With no prior reference to login sharing in the minutes, it is difficult to guess what this sentence means: i.e., employees were sharing their passwords with people outside the library? Multiple employees were using the same login? Or ?]

**Page 3** (7 of packet), Item 7, paragraph 3: “*Chair Watkins noted the public can suggest additions to the Library using the Customer’s Request for Evaluation of Library Resources form.*” [The minutes correctly reflect what was said. However, [Request for Evaluation form](#) – formerly the only one attached to the [Collection Development Policy](#) -- is not the form used for requesting a book be [added](#) to the collection. It is, on the contrary, a “ban the book” form for use by patrons who want an item *removed* from the collection because they find it offensive.]

**Page 6** (10 of packet), Item 14, paragraph 3: “*In reply to Board Member Glabman’s questions, Library Services Director Hetherton indicated Storytimes are ~~virtual-only~~ ~~virtual-only~~ at this time.*” [A hyphen is necessary to distinguish the intended reading (“exclusively virtual”) from the alternative (that is, “virtual” is a format being used “only at this time”).]

**Page 7** (11 of packet), Item 17, paragraph 1, last sentence: “*July revenues were comprised of \$532 from Amazon sales, \$175 from membership dues, and \$1,190 from PBA auctions.*” [It would be helpful to spell out what “PBA” stands for. I, for one, don’t know.]

### **Item 2. Patron Comments**

1. With regard to **Comment 7** (page 14) from a patron asking “*how I can get a copy of a book that is no longer in print?*” and “*I do not see a copy in the catalog,*” a more helpful answer would have been to direct them to the Orange County Public Library which [charges nothing](#) for the same service (assuming it is not in their catalog, either). OCPL *does* pass along lending library charges, if any. I suspect NBPL adds them to the \$5 per volume service fee, although this is not clear from the [NBPL website](#) or our Circulation Policy [NBPL 12](#).

It would also have been helpful to inform the patron that many out-of-print books can be read online through the Internet Archive through its [Books to Borrow](#) and [Open Library](#).

Some can be borrowed for 14 days, others for as many 1 hour intervals as it takes to read them.

This can also be an option for [in-print](#) books. For example, if the patron wanted to read Wallace Stegner's [Angle of Repose](#) through [NBPL](#), they would have to wait through what is currently a 5-person hold queue. The same item could be read [online](#) without waiting, at least at the moment, through either of the Internet Archive services.

2. With regard to the "Patron Email Exchange" on page 17, it is not self-evident how the postings from Patrons 2, 3 and 4 fit into what appears to be a conversation between Patron 1 and a NBPL librarian.
3. As to the Director's extended reply to the email on page 18, it is interesting to note that "*over \$600,000 in programming a year*" is attributed to the Library Foundation, which is an outside private organization, although their programming is likely included in the attendance statistics reported on page 26 and used in our effort to qualify for a higher *Library Journal* star rating. I would be curious to know if other library systems distinguish programs occurring **at** their facilities from those produced **by** their employees, as well as what criteria NBPL uses for counting (or not counting) events held at its facilities by outside sponsors (for example, anything open to the public?).

### ***Item 3. Library Activities***

Regarding the Facilities report on page 20, the Fong Tse "from DMS Consultants" assisting with the library's Control/Security project is the same Fong Tse who was employed by our Public Works Department during construction of the new CdM Branch. As required by Section I on [page 8](#) of Council Policy F-14, his return as a private contractor within five years of being a City employee required Council approval of the contract under which he is working. That seems to have happened as part of [Item 11](#) on the Council's January 28, 2020, agenda.

Expanding on the previous sub-comment under the Board's current agenda Item 3: is there a standard definition for what constitutes a "program" as reported on page 26? A footnote to that page says "*Includes video views and programs conducted online.*" Does this include NBPLF online programs (such as the recent "Studio Chats" even when they do not occur at or involve attendance at NBPL facilities? Conversely, does programming produced by the Arts Commission or ProLiteracy count (or only when held on library property?)?

### ***Item 6. Expressive Use Areas Policy (NBPL 9) Review***

I agree with staff's suggestion for the location of the expressive use area at the CdM Branch. However, the interior layout of the branch shown in Attachment B appears show an earlier floor plan that does not match the actual layout as it is today.

It would seem less confusing to use a drawing with the correct current CdM floor plan as the basis for the illustration.

I also notice that at some point what were formerly called "*Expressive Activity Areas*" have been changed in the policy title and on the newer maps to "*Expressive Use Areas*": compare

the policy text and the labeling on maps in the existing Attachments B, C and D to the current policy title, the labeling on maps in the newer Attachments A and A2, and the titles recently superimposed above all the attachments.

I believe it would be less confusing to be consistent by choosing either “**Use**” or “**Activity**” throughout.

### ***Item 8. Lecture Hall Update***

Since it was sent to the Library’s mailing list, the Trustees have probably seen the [survey](#) being circulated by the City Arts Commission. Among other things, it asks the public if they see a need for a cultural arts center in Newport Beach, which could act as a venue for arts lectures, seminars and performances (and a majority of the Commissioners seem to be anticipating a positive response).

Although the Library Trustees say they have delegated responsibility for the Lecture Hall to the separate Council-appointed committee, they may still wish to try to ensure the product will be suitable to efficiently satisfy the City’s perceived cultural desires and not result in a future need to duplicate facilities.