

## March 21, 2022, 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 Feb 22, 2022, Board of Library Trustees Meeting**

**Suggested corrections:** The passages shown in *italics* below are from the [draft minutes](#) with suggested corrections indicated in **strikeout underline** format.

**Page 1** (page 5 of agenda packet), Item V.A.1, first bullet: “*Handwritten Page 5, the last sentence should be revised to read “he read California **Appropriations** Code Section 54957b1.”*”

[comment: This correction was apparently made to the January 18, 2022, BLT minutes, however it was an odd change to make. To the best of my knowledge, there is no “California Appropriations Code.”<sup>1</sup> The reference seems clearly to have been to California **Government** Code [Section 54957\(b\)\(1\)](#), a provision of the Brown Act allowing legislative bodies to hold closed sessions “*to consider the appointment, employment, evaluation of performance, discipline, or dismissal of a public employee.*” As I attempted to point out on February 22, that provision seems intended to protect the privacy of the employee being discussed, and I did not think it was applicable to the closed session held on that day which appeared to be about the *process* of selecting a future employee, and not about any particular employee or potential employee whose privacy needed to be protected.]

**Page 3** (page 7 of agenda packet), paragraph 2: “*Jerry Kappel, NBPLF CEO, commented that on Page 33 under “Foundation Gifts” it says that donors who contribute to the Foundation shall be recognized in a manner that is **designed designated** by the Foundation.*”

**Page 11** (page 15 of agenda packet), full paragraph 4, sentence 2 from end: “*The program is exciting and will not add any new cities for at least a year in order to get the current **cities cities’** programs running.*”

**Page 12** (page 16 of agenda packet), Item VI.B.15.A, paragraph 1, sentence 2: “*Vice Chair Kost attended the last meeting and reported that the Foundation portfolio is **preforming performing** well against its benchmark, ...*”

**Page 14** (page 18 of agenda packet), line 1: “*The BLT is invited to the Buena Park Holiday **in Inn** on March 12, 2022, from 11:30 A.M. to 1:30 P.M. for the annual Writer to Writer Awards Luncheon.*”

---

<sup>1</sup> Google was unable to find anything referencing that exact phrase, but it did find a section of the Government Code [applicable to appropriations](#).

## **Item 2. Patron Comments**

**Comment 6** (agenda packet page 20): The patron inquired about access to [a book](#) they had seen was available from the University of California's Southern Regional Library Facility. They were told that after applying for and obtaining a card, the NBPL would be happy to assist them in obtaining their item at a non-refundable charge of \$5.00 per title requested. As I have repeatedly commented, Interlibrary Loan is available at no cost from the [Orange County Public Library](#), with pickup at any of their branches simply by calling them. It would seem helpful to let patrons know this no-cost option for the identical service is available to them. Indeed, it would seem helpful to mention this on the [NBPL Interlibrary Loan page](#). I believe the BLT has been told that OCPL passes through any charges imposed by the lending institution while NBPL covers them as part of its \$5.00 fee. However, I believe OCPL informs borrowers and gives them a chance to back out if there will be a pass-through charge, which there rarely is. In particular, I would not expect any charge for a book from the [SRLF](#).

## **Item 3. Library Activities**

Handwritten page 24 of the report mentions a recent "*study regarding the Library's portion of the [Schedule of Rents, Fines and Fees](#) (SRFF).*"

I don't believe the Library Board has yet reviewed the recommended changes, but as the report anticipates, the City's Finance Committee [did do so](#) at its [March 10, 2022, meeting](#).

Of particular interest to Council member and Finance Committee Chair Will O'Neill was the proposal to increase the passport photo fee from \$10 to \$15, and more generally, how much money the City was losing processing passport applications at the federally-set and non-negotiable fixed rate.

The full cost of NBPL providing the passport photos was estimated at \$25.17.

Mr. O'Neill seemed to think the Library should charge the full cost of \$25, but with an advice to patrons, similar to my comment about Interlibrary Loan, above, that the same service is available much more cheaply elsewhere, including, as he repeatedly said, FedEx stores where [their website](#) says "*At FedEx Office, just \$14.95 will get you two government-compliant, 2"x2" photos to submit with your passport application.*"

Ironically, the next evening I was reading County Supervisor Foley's [Friday Newsletter](#), and she called special attention to [Item 14](#) on the Board of Supervisor's [March 8 agenda](#), in which "*The Board reduced the Clerk-Recorder's Passport Photo Fee from \$10 to \$7. This cost decrease is a testament to Clerk-Recorder Hugh Nguyen's commitment to efficiency and innovation, which will save taxpayers money. This is government at its best!*"

It is not clear how County employees are able to do something for \$7.00 which NBPL employees take \$25 to do.

That said, for those interested in how the City of Newport Beach got into the passport business, the idea was initiated by the City Clerk in 2001. See the reasons in [Item 21](#) from the Council's November 13, 2001, meeting. The Clerk's Office eventually got tired of providing the service, and Library staff accepted it.

***Item 7. Balboa Branch Replacement Update***

I strongly suspect the 70 people who rated the “Interlibrary Loan service” at the Balboa Branch to be “Excellent” (handwritten page 37), and the 77 who said “Interlibrary Loan service” was “Very Important” to them (handwritten page 39), were thinking of the ability to request items from other NBPL branches and have them delivered to the Balboa Branch for pickup.

I would guess few, if any of them, were aware of or had paid the \$5 to attempt to borrow an item from a non-NBPL institution using the ILL service referred to in February Patron Comment 6 (see Item 2, above).