

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

Minutes – Approved January 23, 2023
 November 14, 2022, 7:00pm
 Meeting held at Clackamas County Red Soils Campus,
 Development Services Building, Room 119 and virtually on Zoom.

ATTENDANCE

Advisory Committee Voting Members

MEMBER	LIBRARY	ATTENDANCE	NOTES
Denise Fonseca	Canby Public Library	Absent	
Grover Bornefeld	Oak Lodge Library	Present	
Connie Redmond	Estacada Public Library	Absent	
Natalie Smith	Gladstone Public Library	Absent	
Al Matecko	Happy Valley Public Library	Present	Chair
Mark Pontarelli	Lake Oswego Public Library	Present	
VACANT	Ledding Library of Milwaukie	N/A	
VACANT	Molalla Public Library	N/A	
Nick Dierckman	Oregon City Public Library	Present	
Kathleen Draine	Sandy/Hoodland Public Library	Present	
Rachel Hyde	West Linn Public Library	Present	
Natalie McNown	Wilsonville Public Library	Present	

Others Present

NAME	NOTES
Diane Morrow	Happy Valley Public Library ALTERNATE
Danny Smith	Director, Canby Public Library
Michele Kinnamon	Director, Estacada Public Library
Mitzi Olson	Director, Oak Lodge Library & Gladstone Public Library
Doris Grolbert	Director, Happy Valley Public Library
Melissa Kelly	Director, Lake Oswego Public Library
Diana Hadley	Director, Molalla Public Library
Greg Williams	Director, Oregon City Public Library
Sarah McIntyre	Director, Sandy and Hoodland Public Libraries
Doug Erickson	Director, West Linn Public Library
Shasta Sasser	Director, Wilsonville Public Library
Rick Peterson	Manager, Library Network, LDAC Liaison
Desiree Dumitrescu	Estacada – guest
Bethany Schultz	Sandy/Hoodland – guest
Jack Fricke	Sandy/Hoodland – guest
Anatta Blackmarr	Oak Lodge - guest
KT Austin	Member Services Librarian, Library Network (minutes taker)

CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by Chair Al M. at 7:00pm. Mentioned that we are celebrating Greg Williams birthday today. Introduction of Danny Smith, Directors Group Chair 2021-2022, and Rick Peterson, Library Network Manager. Rick mentioned imminent budget challenges for the Library Network office and stressed that they would be doing everything they can to minimize the impact on libraries. The group also introduced themselves.

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The group reviewed minutes from 10/25/2021. Grover gave Kathryn kudos for her excellent minutes. Grover moved to approve the minutes as written. Nick seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

- **Concord Property & Library Planning Task Force, and Gladstone Community Library Planning Task Force update (Mitzi)**
 - These projects are currently on pause while they wait for updated cost projections which they're expecting in April of next year. At that point the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) will review the projections and decide how to proceed.
 - In October of this year the BCC approved ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) fund allocations totaling \$15 million for both projects- \$9 million for Oak Lodge and \$6 million for Gladstone.
 - The BCC also decided that if they end up with a revenue bond that requires annual support, that those funds will be paid out of the County general fund and not library district funds.

OLD BUSINESS

- **Annual Progress Reports for FY 2019/2020 and 2020/2021**
 - Rick noted that Kathleen noticed issues from Canby's reports on questions 2.7 and 2.20. Canby is investigating and Rick will send out a corrected version when available.
 - Grover reread a section of ballot measure 3-310 and gave kudos to libraries that have shifted their representation to reflect their city and their unincorporated area.
 - Al responded that COVID impacted libraries' ability to have as broad of representation as possible. But lots of folks worked hard for three years on the subcommittee to work on that.
- **Use of District Revenues for capital reserves, debt payment and allocated cost formulas**
 - Kathleen pointed to section 1.2 of the IGA and section 1 of article 2 of the bylaws, which require LDAC to evaluate the annual reports submitted by libraries. She argued that LDAC acts as auditors of the use of district revenue, and if any problems are identified, they must be referred to the Board of County Commissioners. Upon review of reports from the last several years, she asserted four issues stand out:
 - Extraordinary reserves held by three cities for what appear to be capital purposes.
 - The use of district revenue to cover mortgage cost/debt service
 - The possible misappropriation of district revenue to support general overhead or administrative cost
 - Question as to carryover or operating reserves that may end up delaying the entire expenditure of library revenue
 - She said this is thousands or even millions of dollars. Any dollars not spent on promised operations affect all libraries in the district.
 - She provided handouts establishing three motions she asked LDAC to vote on. In those motions she wants to ask the BCC for direction on the issues mentioned above, but the fourth one requires further investigation before it can be determined if it deserves referral to BCC.
 - First: capital reserves. These are set out in column 2.40 in the annual reports. Specifically, she named Happy Valley, Molalla, and Oregon City as having significant reserves not spent on operations or services, and said they appear to be for future capital improvements which would be inconsistent with permitted expenditures under our service. As previously explained by County Counsel at

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

LDAC's January 2018 meeting and further reinforced recently by the BCC at the May 11, 2022 business meeting. By fiscal year 2020, Happy Valley had set aside \$4.2 million, more than one year's worth of district revenue. Molalla had set aside \$1.8 million, almost two years of district revenue. Oregon City had set aside \$703,000. This shows more than \$7 million dollars in four fiscal years which have not been available for yearly operations and services. She maintained that the group should refer these reserves to the BCC.

- Second: mortgage debt service. These are identified in columns 2.23 and 2.42. All four years' reports identify debt service paid by Oregon City and Sandy. Oregon City paid ~\$265,000 from district revenue per year. Sandy's payments were fully offset by city funds and did not require use of district revenue. Kathleen proposed the group should refer Oregon City's spending to the BCC.
- Third: allocated costs for city overhead. These are identified in columns 2.21 and 2.43-2.52. Section 2.1 of the IGA specifies that district funds may not be used to support general overhead or administrative costs of the city except for administrative costs that are directly related to the provision of library services and/or the operation of a public library. The percentages range from 0 to 16%. She proposed the group should ask the BCC how to address these charges.
- Fourth: operating reserves and carryovers. These can be found in column 2.5 in annual reports. She indicates that some cities retain ample operating fund cushion which may delay the expenditure of district revenue. It varies from none to almost 200%. Some carry over may be appropriate, given the timeline for the receipt of the funds from a given year, but carryovers in excess of one year's district revenue should raise questions. She Proposed the group should refer Happy Valley's and Molalla's reserves to the BCC.
- Kathleen suggested the group needs the BCC to determine if any of this conduct can be deemed a breach of the terms of the IGA.
- Grover said we are representatives of the residents/taxpayers and that 3-310 and the IGA is the guidance under which LDAC works. He also referred to the last meeting when Commissioner Savas indicated that a majority of LDAC could send issues to the BCC, and that is where Oak Lodge and Gladstone situations were rectified.
- Al said Oak Lodge and Gladstone situations are different because of how they get County funds and the \$15 million of ARPA funds. Additionally, part of the issue we're facing is that there are a lot of ambiguous statements in the IGA and 3-310. For example, could "operation in the library" mean capital improvements because it doesn't specifically say no. It's very difficult when it is so vague, and different cities and different city managers view it differently.
- Kathleen said when Chris Storey, Asst. County Counsel, addressed this body in January 2018, he explained that when this district was formed it could not be a capital district by definition because of an existing capital district in Estacada at the time. That defined what this district could be, which was only a service district with funds not available for capital purposes. However, what is a capital expense vs. a repair is something we should have the County clarify.
- Doug said we have a lot of imbalance in this County. There are buildings that were paid for by the County and others that have mortgages. He also said that libraries are just trying to do what's best for their library tax district- including cities and unincorporated areas. Some financial decisions were made from people higher up than just library

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

directors, like at city councils, city managers, and communities. When we attack libraries, we're getting away from the point of this group.

- Kathleen said she knows these decisions are made higher up, which is one of the reasons she thinks we need to try to attack this issue and get it solved. We have a legal construct that we have to live under unless it gets redefined—but it hasn't been redefined yet. Ambiguity was convenient. If we want to go out for another levy later how do you convince taxpayers that we'll do what we say if we're not doing it now?
- Greg mentioned that while Kathleen had a lot of time to prepare this presentation, everyone else heard about it today.
- Kathleen indicated that she thought she wasn't allowed to share documents with the group.
- Greg said a vote on the motions would be very premature and libraries/representatives haven't had adequate time to prepare for it. He agreed that the purpose of the task force was to address these questions. But it is unfortunate that COVID happened when it did as it derailed some of the work of the taskforce. The library directors submitted a letter to LDAC in 2017 indicating that the discussions of inappropriate use of funds are symptoms of underfunding in libraries in Clackamas County. He said that he thinks this group would be better off to discuss providing sustainable, equitable library service throughout the County that addresses operational needs, capital needs, and centralized service needs. We need to do something different because the district is not sustainable as it is.
- Al said there is a motion on the floor and asked for a second.
- Grover seconded. He suggested on other boards, when a motion is introduced, a vote isn't taken until the next meeting.
- Al responded that this is old business and we have been talking about it for a long time. A vote can take place.
- Rick said he was not aware of any rules prohibiting the sharing of information or documents ahead of the meeting. He also clarified that Kathleen's motion had referred to the reports by the first year of each fiscal year rather than both (i.e. '2017' instead of 'FY 2017-2018').
- Desiree asked to clarify what capital purposes is defined as, because different libraries will consider different things. When this was brought up previously, Paul Savas said if there was any evidence of misplaced funds, he recommended that the group bring it to the BCC.
- Jack said the ballot measure said no money would be spent on capital improvements.
- Greg asked for guidance from the chair, as a director from a library specifically named in two of the motions, on how the vote should move forward, as there is clarifying information he would like to share but did not have an opportunity to prepare the data. Additionally, the Happy Valley director wasn't present and nobody from Molalla was present. They were also specifically named in these motions and aren't present to defend themselves or discuss. He also mentioned that library boards are the first line of defense when it comes to budgets and how funds are being spent, as libraries work very closely with their board, and their boards have not brought those concerns to LDAC.
- Nick agreed that the library board has been more involved in the budget process in the last few years, and everything has been discussed by the city commission and there's no

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

- hiding of anything in Oregon City. Additionally, he shared that he is visually impaired and needs information prior to the meeting so he can read it with necessary accommodations.
- Al said Happy Valley functions similarly. He asked the city manager why some of the allocated costs are so high. One example was that HR costs are higher because of the large number of employees. He agreed that it is the responsibility of each library board to look at their library's budgets.
 - Nick said it doesn't make sense that rent is considered an operating expense, but mortgage payments are not.
 - Melissa reiterated that the district was formed as a service-only district because of Estacada and we couldn't have overlapping districts. The Estacada district is not in existence and our libraries need funds for capital expenses to provide adequate services, we should be having conversations about how to address this going forward. Could we look at amending the IGA? Everyone wants to follow the rules but we also want to provide the best possible service to our patrons.
 - Jack said libraries can't change things retroactively and they have to do what you agreed to.
 - Greg clarified that what started a lot of this conversation in 2017 was that the BCC was looking at changing the master order which defines the purpose of the district. It would have been perfectly legal to change the master order but ultimately, they created the task force and asked the group to meet then return with recommendations.
 - Grover said that measure 3-310 was a promise. Even though it was written the way it was because of the Estacada district, it is still a promise.
 - Al clarified that the ballot measure actually *doesn't* mention capital improvements. It mentions services and building improvements.
 - Kathleen contended the group had to go back to what Chris Storey said in January 2018. We have a service district and we are stuck with it unless the BCC changes the master order or we create another library district. Going forward we do need a reconfiguration but we have to meet our obligations now, and these are not mutually exclusive endeavors.
 - Greg said that because there's a motion on the table, he wants to provide some context to certain expenditures. He said he believed capital reserves that Kathleen mentioned in her motion were from bond proceeds. He clarified that a lot of money spent recently was done so the building could reopen during COVID. For example, they had to reconfigure their computer lab (in consultation with their Library Board). They also bought new people counters because when they were under the Governor's orders to limit capacity. The accounting definition of capital expense that most cities use is anything with a lifespan of over one year and \$5000. Additionally, regarding debt service, before Oregon City decided to use district dollars, they went to voters and asked them if they approve using district dollars in this way and they said yes. The general fund contribution from the city has exceeded the amount of debt service that could be allocated to the unincorporated area. He stressed that there is a lot of nuance and context that is being lost by trying to make an urgent decision.
 - Doug argued that the group just spent over an hour on something that has already been discussed and not gone anywhere, while Library Network is facing budget cuts. He suggested the group should be addressing that.

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

- Mark pointed out that while this may be old business for many people, he is a new member. Additionally, LDAC's charge lays out that there should be a discussion of potential noncompliance in the group before raising it to the next level, and this motion seems to encourage the group to skip that. The way the motions were written is passing it along to commissioners without trying to come to agreement as a group
- Grover said that we didn't have the last four year's report data until this meeting and he agrees with what Greg said, so we should table the motion and have it on the next agenda.
- Kathleen said we had to wait 13 months to have this discussion. If the group agreed to meet again in January, she would table the motion and would also ask County Counsel if they would come to the meeting.
- Al said he would like to put forward a motion that the group asks County Counsel to meet with city attorneys for clarification on measure 3-310's success—since it does mention library improvements—and recraft the IGA and/or master order to allow for capital spending going forward.
- Greg worried that he would end up paying for meetings with attorneys. Not that it isn't a good idea, he just didn't know how productive it would be. Kathleen's idea to bring County Counsel in to answer questions is good, but he wasn't sure if they're going to want to speculate on what is or isn't appropriate.
- Mark said he didn't hear agreement in the room that everyone wants to "fix" the agreements to allow for capital spending. He agreed it would be good to get input from attorneys.
- Greg agreed that there is a lot of ambiguity and inconsistency between measure 3-310, the IGA, and the master order. An example of some of the nuance, in the IGA, attachment c says that all library service providers shall strive to meet OLA standards. Section G of those standards are for facilities. In the IGA there is no specific mention that says you can't use district dollars to achieve facility standards.
- Al rescinded his motion and that anyone can come to the next meeting—city attorneys, County Counsel, city managers, etc.
- Nick argued that the master order is what makes the ballot measure operational. The master order is the interpretation of the ballot measure.
- Rick shared that when Kathleen submitted the agenda item, he reached out to County Counsel to see if they could offer any clarity but was only referred to previous communication already mentioned in this meeting. He doubted that Counsel would be interested in making definitive statements.

NEW BUSINESS

- **LINCC Strategic Direction discussion**
 - Melissa shared that directors have worked together on a strategic direction document for many months. Even though LDAC as an advisory committee doesn't have a formal responsibility to inform this work, directors are excited to update the group on their strategic direction. The LDAC subgroup drafted a vision, mission, and values statement, which was a big inspiration for this. The directors are working on a tactical plan to go along with the document. The three main imperatives are:

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

- Listen to our communities. We want to understand their needs and find new ways to reach them.
- Adapt to community needs. We want to reduce barriers, widen access, and provide services to patrons of all ages. We're thinking about what's coming next, emerging patron needs. Want to continue supporting inclusivity for folks to come and sometimes have challenging conversations.
- Share our story - bringing folks back into the library, bringing new people in, and growing library usage.
- She also mentioned that from her understanding, the task force is not coming back in the way that it was proposed. The timing is not right now to work towards a funding measure, and we don't have support at the city or county level. At some point we may get there but not now. She invites all of you in your role as LDAC members to come to the library, share, tell your friends, and help us fulfill our imperatives.
- Nick asked what are the next steps for this work? Melissa said they're working with library committees on a tactical plan now to develop this. Each committee is currently looking at these goals through their lenses and helping to identify different tactics to implement over the next few years.
- Greg mentioned that cities spend a lot of time and energy doing surveys and community outreach and there is probably a lot of duplication. He suggested LINCC-wide surveying, which is part of why it is necessary to make sure the Network office is fully funded.

LDAC CHAIR / VICE CHAIR ELECTIONS

- Al volunteered to continue serving as Chair if everyone was interested. Nick nominated Al and Grover seconded. All voted in favor, with the exception of Al who abstained.
- Natalie was not present but Nick nominated her and Grover seconded. All voted in favor. Al will check with Natalie and make sure she knows that she could decline.

FUTURE PLANNING

- Al asks if January 23rd at 7 p.m. worked for everybody. Greg asked if others would be interested in starting at 6 p.m. Mark would have difficulty getting to Oregon City by 6 pm. because of a commute from work.
- Doug asked Rick to bring budgetary information to the next meeting if possible and get it on the agenda. Rick said he will share what he can.
- Nick asked if there was an opportunity for public comment regarding funding the construction of the courthouse and Greg said typically during the budget process they set aside time for public comment.
- Grover said that when the district was set up, the county committed to funding the Network office. He thought the courthouse was supposed to be a public/private partnership so they didn't have to front money for the construction. He would like clarification at the next meeting.
- Kathleen asked where the archives of the 2007/2008/2009 BCC hearings are stored. Greg suggested it would be with Records Management. Kathleen asked if they were readily available and Rick said he could check. Doug told Kathleen that there should be a reading room at Records Management, and that she should be able to walk in and have staff find what she's looking for.
- Al said something the group may consider is that LDAC could draft a statement to present to the BCC in support of the Network office and how their work is integral to the libraries.

ADJOURNMENT

- Al asked the group to give one word to describe how they're feeling. Terms included: overwhelmed, enlightening, tired, tired, 51 (Greg's birthday), comfortable, intrigued,

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

appreciative, optimistic, same, hopeful, glad, exhausted, fine, educated, vivacious, okay, okay, hungry, encouraged, meh.

- Nick moved to adjourn the meeting, Kathleen seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:03pm.

Minutes submitted by KT Austin.

Proposed motions for LDAC Nov. 14 2022 meeting

By: Kathleen Draine, Sandy & Hoodland Libraries LDAC representative

Based on the Annual Progress Reports submitted by the Library District's City Libraries to LDAC for the fiscal years 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, LDAC refers the following issues to the Board of County Commissioners, as the Board of the Library District of Clackamas County, for consideration:

Motion #1: [Capital Reserves]

Are the reserves listed (at Column 2.39 of those reports) by the Cities of Happy Valley, Molalla, and Oregon City, which appear to be created out of District Revenue (per transfers listed at Column 2.4) for capital purposes (see column 2.41), permitted , considering:

- (a) the Library District's legal structure as a Service District,
- (b) the promise in Ballot Measure 3-310 that 'All monies shall be spent on library operations and services", and
- (c) Section 2.1.[Use of Funds] of the Cooperative Intergovernmental Agreement between the District and the member Cities?

If not, what remedy is appropriate to return those funds to operations/services within the pertinent Service Area or the District?

Note: Lake Oswego's reserves appear to be funded out of Endowment and City Operational Support and thus not falling within this question.

Motion #2: [Debt Service]

Is Oregon City's use of some* District Revenue to pay debt service, as listed in column 2.23 in those annual reports, permitted. considering:

- (a) the Library District's legal structure as a Service District,
- (b) the promise in Ballot Measure 3-310 that 'All monies shall be spent on library operations and services", and
- (c) Section 2.1 [Use of Funds] of the Cooperative Intergovernmental Agreement between the District and the member Cities?

(*~ \$415,000/year less \$150,000 City Op Support)

If not, what remedy is appropriate for retroactively capturing those payments for use for Library operations/services within that Service Area?

Note: The City of Sandy has covered its debt payment out of its City Operational Support. It has also cured this matter, prospectively, by taking the debt payment out of the Sandy Library's Budget starting in FY2023.

Motion #3: [Appropriation of District Revenue for “Allocated” City general overhead]

Section 2.1 of the IGA provides that “District funds may not be used to support general overhead or administrative costs of Cities except to the extent such overhead or administrative services are *directly* related to the provision of library services and/or operation of a public library.” (emphasis added)

Column 2.21 of those annual reports sets forth the total general overhead allocated by each City (with details at columns 2.43 - 2.52). If not otherwise covered by City Support (column 2.7), what percentage** of District Revenue taken to cover City general overhead and administration exceeds an allocation that could fairly be said to reflect “direct costs”?

(* *percentages range from 0 to over 16% (see attached chart based on FYs 2019 & 2020))

Relevant provisions from the 2009 Cooperative Intergovernmental Agreement between The Library District of Clackamas County and Member Cities (“IGA”)

LDAC’s obligations:

1.2 District Advisory Committee. The District Board shall organize and appoint a District Advisory Committee consisting of one nominee from each Library City consistent with the policies and procedures of Clackamas County and/or the District for advisory committees. The District Board shall appoint the individual nominated by the Library City governing body to fill the service area’s representative seat. **The District Advisory Committee shall be responsible for meeting at least annually to consider: (i) the evaluation reports of participating libraries as submitted pursuant to Section 2.3, (ii) any proposed changes to this Agreement pursuant to the amendment process described in Section 3.3, and (iii) any impact of the annexation or withdrawal of territory from the District pursuant to Sections 3.4 and 3.5 hereof.**

4.14 Enforcement of Terms. The Parties hereto recognize that the District is relying on the good faith and commitments of the Library Cities to utilize the funding provided by the District in the promised manner. **The Parties expect that to the extent there is any noncompliance or breach of this Agreement, the Parties will discuss such noncompliance or breach in the District Advisory Committee and encourage an effort towards compliance.** If discussions and encouragement do not remedy the continued failure of a party to meet the Service Standards or other term of this Agreement, then the District Advisory Committee shall meet to consider an amendment to this Agreement to create incentives for compliance, including but not limited to withholding of District funds, reallocation of unincorporated residents to neighboring service areas, or other such actions as may be deemed appropriate. The Parties hereto agree that in an event of a material breach of this Agreement by one of the Parties, an amendment proposed to specifically address such breach shall require a two- thirds vote of the Library Cities, including but not limited to any amendment which would reduce the breaching City’s 100% return on assessments within such City’s boundaries, either via a Formula amendment or otherwise.

City Obligations:

2.1 Use of Funds. The Library Cities will use District revenue to provide public library service, and **shall expend the entire library revenue paid** under this Agreement in accordance with the purpose for which it was provided by implementing a plan **to achieve the Service Standards**. For the purposes of this Agreement, **“Service Standards” shall mean (i) the standards described on Attachment C, (ii) the provision of services to all District residents on the same terms, and (iii) the proper expenditure of funds as described in this Section 2.1. District funds may not be used to support general overhead or administrative costs of Cities except to the extent such overhead or administrative costs are *directly* related to the provision of library services and/or the operation of a public library.** It is the intention of the parties to work cooperatively in helping each city make progress in meeting the Service Standards.

Data from FY 2019/20 and FY 2020/21 LDAC Annual Progress Reports

ALLOCATED General City Hall Overhead

Library City		unincorp pop% Column 1.2	Lib Dist Rev (in K) Column 2.6	Lib Tot Rev (in K) Columns 2.2, 2.18	Tot Allocated Costs (in K) Columns 2.21 (2.43-.52) Method at Column 2.54	City Op Support (in K) Column 2.7 (net of debt serv@ 2.23 or cap exp @2.22)	Tot Allocated Costs - City Op Support / Lib Dist Rev	
Canby	FY 2019	32.5%	\$951.9	\$1,070.3	\$219.3	\$75.0	15.16%	
	FY 2020	32.7%	1012.4	\$1,168.4	\$76.5	\$142.7	-6.54%	
Estacada	FY 2019	80.7%	\$834.9	\$874.9	\$16.1	\$0.0	1.93%	
	FY 2020	82.0%	\$885.4	\$914.4	\$18.1	\$0.0	2.04%	
Gladstone	FY 2019	44.5%	~\$810.4	\$1,030.8	not complete	\$0.0		transfer to county mgmt mid yr
	FY 2020	44.6%	\$828.4	\$1,290.3	\$34.3	\$0.0	4.14%	
Happy Valley	FY 2019	64.2%	\$2,970.7	\$3,123.6	\$484.0	\$0.0	16.29%	
	FY 2020	65.0%	\$3,132.5	\$3,178.9	\$500.0	\$0.0	15.96%	
Lake Oswego	FY 2019	14.3%	\$3,129.5	\$4,836.5	\$632.0	\$1,611.0	-31.28%	
	FY 2020	14.6%	\$3,329.0	\$5,173.2	\$654.0	\$1,698.5	-31.38%	
Milwaukie	FY 2019	50.7%	\$1,793.9	\$2,799.8	\$1,012.0	\$819.2	10.75%	construction of lib
	FY 2020	50.7%	\$1,874.1	\$2,851.5	\$780.0	\$963.0	-9.76%	
Molalla	FY 2019	61.2%	\$955.9	\$980.2	\$70.5	\$0.0	7.38%	
	FY 2020	61.8%	\$1,003.2	\$1,009.0	\$94.3	\$0.0	9.40%	
Oak Lodge	FY 2019	100.0%	\$1,438.8	\$1,573.0	\$141.1	\$0.0	9.81%	
	FY 2020	100.0%	\$1,505.9	\$1,546.1	\$144.7	\$0.0	9.61%	key:
Oregon City	FY 2019	41.7%	\$2,393.0	\$2,761.1	\$45.7	\$0.0	1.91%	no burden
	FY 2020	42.2%	\$2,511.0	\$2,755.9	\$46.1	\$0.0	1.84%	nominal
Sandy & Hoodland	FY 2019	66.8%	\$1,353.7	\$1,712.2	\$170.7	\$123.6	3.48%	mid
	FY 2020	66.9%	\$1,426.1	\$1,620.1	\$170.7	\$123.6	3.31%	questionsble
West Linn	FY 2019	13.4%	\$1,706.6	\$2,780.7	\$854.0	\$1,032.1	-10.44%	
	FY 2020	13.4%	\$1,771.1	\$2,872.9	\$871.0	\$1,097.6	-12.79%	uncertain data
Wilsonville	FY 2019	17.0%	\$1,391.1	\$1,993.8	\$0.0	\$518.5	-37.27%	
	FY 2020	17.3%	\$1,465.7	\$2,027.4	\$0.0	\$540.1	-36.85%	

prepared by Kathleen Draine – Sandy & Hoodland Libraries LDAC rep
11/13/22