<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Reasons For</th>
<th>Reasons Against</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continue with scheduled in-person Board meetings, open to public | • Ensures decision making and oversight is carried out as required in a timely fashion  
• Meets requirements of PLA | • Not in line with pandemic recommendations  
• Not aligned with library operational response | Not supportable              |
| Move scheduled in-person meeting to teleconference | • Ensures decision making and oversight is carried out as required in a timely fashion | • Most collaboration platforms cannot accommodate public attendees and/or are cost prohibitive | Not supportable              |
| Move scheduled in-person meeting to livestream with public access | • Ensures decision making and oversight is carried out as required in a timely fashion | • Added complexity of technology to manage  
• Teleconferences can be difficult to manage/chair, may not be desirable to conduct publicly | Adoptable, given appropriate resources are available |
| Postpone any scheduled meetings until after April 5th | • Aligns with pandemic recommendations  
• Future meeting can be open to public | • Social distancing recommendations may be extended indefinitely  
• Any matters requiring timely decision-making may be affected | Adoptable, with ability to call special meeting via teleconference to discuss emergent issues |
| Cancel scheduled meeting | • Bill 132 has reduced required number of meetings to 7, Boards should be able to maintain compliance with requirements  
• Future meeting can be open to public | • Social distancing recommendations may be extended indefinitely  
• Any matters requiring timely decision-making may be affected | Adoptable, with ability to call special meeting via teleconference to discuss emergent issues |