

## Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

Minutes - **UNAPPROVED**

February 26, 2018

Clackamas County Development Services Building, Rm. 119/120

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### *Advisory Committee Voting Members*

<b>MEMBER</b>	<b>LIBRARY</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Kathleen Myron	Canby Public Library	Present	
Grover Bornefeld	Clackamas County Library - Oak Lodge	Present	
Connie Redmond	Estacada Public Library	Absent (excused)	
Natalie Smith	Gladstone Public Library	Present	
Al Matecko	Happy Valley Public Library	Present	Chair
Nancy Niland	Lake Oswego Public Library	Absent (excused)	
Karol Miller	Ledding Library of Milwaukie	Present	
<b>VACANT</b>	Molalla Public Library		
Don Wright	Oregon City Public Library	Present	
George Hoyt	Sandy Public Library	Present	
Pam North	West Linn Public Library	Present	Vice Chair
Caroline Berry	Wilsonville Public Library	Absent (excused)	

#### *Others Present*

<b>NAME</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Greg Williams	Manager, Clackamas County Library Network LDAC Liaison
Laura Zentner	Interim Director, Clackamas County Business and Community Services
Bill Baars	Director, Lake Oswego Public Library

Maureen Cole	Director, Oregon City Public Library Chair, LINCC Directors Group
Pat Duke	Director, Wilsonville Public Library
Michele Kinnamon	Director, Estacada Public Library
Mitzi Olson	Manager, Oak Lodge Library
Irene Green	Director, Canby Public Library
Lauren Gunderson	Interim Director, Gladstone Public Library
Sarah McIntyre	Director, Sandy and Hoodland Public Libraries
Doris Grolbert	Director, Happy Valley Public Library
Katie Newell	Director, Ledding Library of Milwaukie
Paul Savas	Clackamas County Commissioner
Christine Simpson	Citizen
Kathy Draine	Citizen
Kevin Johnson	Citizen
Nick Dierckmann	Citizen

## **MINUTES**

### *Call to order, roll call, and approval of minutes from previous meeting*

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by Chair Al M. at 7:00 PM.

Roll call was taken.

Greg W. identified some typos that had been corrected in the January 22, 2018 minutes. Kathleen M. moved to approve the minutes of the January 22, 2018 as amended. Don W. seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### *Task Force Updates*

Greg W. shared a draft “two task force” proposal that Business and Community Services staff had developed, based on 1) the BCC’s prior direction to form a Task Force to make recommendations on possible Library District Master Order and Master IGA amendments, and 2) the feedback that had been provided in previous LDAC meetings. In examining the issues and discussing the matters with other stakeholders, Greg W. said there appeared to be two separate but distinct issues, namely:

- 1) In the short-term, what changes to the Master Order and Master IGA might be needed to facilitate the construction of new library facilities for the Oak Lodge and Gladstone service areas?
- 2) In the longer term, how can some of the more systemic issues facing the Library District (including sufficiency of revenue) be addressed?

Since there appeared to be two separate issues to discuss, BCS staff envisioned establishing two separate task forces.

- Task force #1 would be charged with determining 1) whether or not the Master Order needs to be changed to implement the Settlement Agreement between the County and the City of Gladstone, and (if so), 2) what are the minimum changes to the Master Order and/or Master IGA necessary to allow construction of new Oak Lodge and Gladstone facilities to proceed. This task force would be a smaller, more technically-focused task force, and would complete their work in a relatively short timeframe.
- Task force #2 would be a larger group which would focus on some of the larger issues faced by the District that have been brought up by LDAC members, Directors, and other stakeholders. These issues could include the sufficiency and sustainability of District funding, governance, appropriate use of District funds, service standards, etc.... That group would draw membership from a broad range of stakeholders and conduct its work over a longer period of time.

Al M. asked if there were specific timelines for each task force. Laura Z. indicated that the work of task force #1 would need to be completed by the end of June, 2018 (in order to comply with the terms of the settlement agreement), and that the timeframe for the work of task force #2 would be 12-24 months.

Grover B. liked the idea of keeping discussions on each topic separate, and was in favor of the approach. He noted that a smaller task force worked very well for LDAC when making revisions to the Annual Progress Report form.

In response to a question from Al M., Comm. Savas agreed that proceeding with the minimal amount of changes to the Master Order would be simplest, and agreed with the timeframes for the work of task force #1. He wanted to hear feedback from other LDAC members.

Natalie S. asked about the composition of each task force. Greg W. answered that the current proposal (subject to change based on LDAC member feedback) was that task force #1 would consist of technical and subject matter experts from the County and the City of Gladstone. For task force #2, the hope is for the group to be small enough to be nimble, but large enough to include representation from different stakeholder groups (such as LDAC members, City Managers, Library Directors, elected officials, board members, and citizens), drawn from all district service providers (library cities and the County). In order to keep the size of the task force manageable, it might not be possible (for example) to have every City Manager or every Library Director on the Task Force, but the expectation was that representatives from each group on the task force would solicit and bring feedback from their peers/colleagues; for example, the two or three Directors on the Task Force would work closely with the full LINCC Directors Group to solicit feedback/input and keep the larger group up-to-date. Greg W. reiterated that LDAC feedback would be most helpful in further refining the proposal.

Kathleen M. asked what the criteria for participation on task force #2 might be. Greg W. answered that no specific criteria currently existed, and that LDAC's feedback on those sorts of details would be helpful.

In response to a question from Al M., Greg W. indicated that the current proposal was for task force #1 to consist of representatives from the County and the City of Gladstone. Greg W. said that if task force #1 did identify necessary Master Order changes, those changes would be brought back to LDAC for review and discussion.

Al M. asked for feedback from the group.

- Doris G. supported the two task force approach. She observed that the question of needing to change the Master Order to implement the settlement agreement was primarily a legal one, and as such, it made sense for a small, technical group to address the issue. If changes were deemed necessary, that question could then be addressed subsequently. She agreed that the scope of task force #2's work was much bigger, and would require time and coordination.
- Sarah M. agreed with Doris. She observed that determining the composition of task force #2 would be a tough job!
- George H. suggested task force #2 be broken down into smaller groups tackling specific issues, so that the larger group didn't get bogged down. Subject matter experts should be included in the appropriate groups working on specific issues/questions.
- Natalie S. said it would be important for there to be clear goals, objectives, and leadership.
- Kathleen M. liked George H.'s idea of breaking down the larger groups into smaller groups. She suggested that each smaller group also have diverse compositions (e.g., City Managers, Library Directors, LDAC Member, etc...).
- Irene G. said the two task force approach made sense, and agreed that it would be important for subject matter experts to be involved in discussions within their field(s) of expertise.
- Michele K. was in favor of the two task force approach.
- Mitzi O. supported the idea. She expressed her concern that these two distinct issues had become convoluted, and without separating the issues, she didn't see any other way of moving forward.
- Grover B. expressed support for the possibility of not changing the Master Order. He also agreed that a larger committee would function better by being broken up into smaller subcommittees to focus on specific issues, and reporting back to the bigger group.
- Pat D. said the proposal makes sense, and appreciated that the outcome would be a discussion on the broader issues facing the District.
- Pam N. liked the the two task force approach, and agreed with the suggestion for smaller subcommittees within the larger task force.

- Mo C. supported the approach, saying it helped to sort out and approach the various issues that need to be addressed. She also supported the idea of separating the larger group's work into smaller components.
- Don W. asked whether the County would provide the support needed, especially when it came to addressing financial, technical, and legal questions. Greg W. indicated such support would definitely be provided.
- Karol M. saw both "pluses and minuses" to the approach. She expressed a concern that task force #1 might be hampered in finding creative solutions. In response to a clarifying question from Al M., Karol said she didn't necessarily see the two issues as separable, and foresaw there might need to be some interaction between the two groups. Greg W. said that if task force #1 came to an impasse or a decision point requiring more input, it would be brought back to LDAC. Karol M. indicated a concern about having only Oak Lodge and Gladstone discussing an issue with potential wider impact.
- Bill B. liked the idea of separating the issues. He expressed particular support for discussions on how to ensure the long-term sustainability of District libraries. He also expressed support for splitting up the larger task force into smaller groups.
- Al M. said he felt it was important that task force #1 had some additional participants, other than Oak Lodge and Gladstone staff. For task force #2, Al M. suggested a composition of 24 members, broken into three groups with eight members each. He advocated for the smaller groups to work on specific issues, then come back to the larger group to report and discuss.

From the audience, Kevin Johnson asked if changing the Master Order would result in District funds being permissible to use for capital projects. Al M. replied that could be a possible change to the Master Order. Kevin Johnson then pointed out that changing the Master Order to allow use of District funds for capital purposes wouldn't change what voters approved when they passed Measure 3-310. Kevin Johnson observed that Gladstone would now be the only City required to use general fund money for library support. He also observed that while Measure 3-310 indicated the County would be exiting the retail library business, the County would now be operating two libraries. He doesn't feel that changing the Master Order changes the intent of Measure 3-310, and feels that a new measure should be presented to voters.

Comm. Savas observed that, to the best of his recollection, there was nothing in Measure 3-310 that indicated passage would result in the closure of specific libraries; rather, the measure indicated that passage would sustain library operations, including those libraries operated at the time by the County. While there may have been side discussions and literature circulated about the County exiting the retail library business, Measure 3-310 as presented by the County to voters did not address any closure of County libraries. Comm. Savas indicated that part of him agreed that there should be an element of voter input regarding substantial changes to the Master Order, however, if there is a path forward where the settlement agreement can be implemented without changing the Master Order, Comm. Savas would be supportive.

Al M. pointed out that while LDAC is an advisory committee, and that the Board does have decision-making authority, he truly believes the BCC listens to LDAC feedback, as evidenced by

the attendance of Comm. Savas (and other Commissioners) at LDAC meetings, as well as the BCC's willingness to hear feedback at Board sessions.

George H. observed that changing the master to allow use of District funds for capital purposes does not answer the question of how you sustain operations when a portion of District funds are used for capital purposes.

Kathleen M., citing the Estacada example, asked whether or not Gladstone could go out for a library capital bond. Comm. Savas answered that the Estacada model is something that could be done now, without changing the Master Order. George H. indicated one of the ideas he'd been looking at was a capital bonding district that included the entire library service area, not just the City portion of the service area. From the audience, Kathy Draine indicated she was working on trying to determine the assessed value of all properties (within City limits and in unincorporated areas) within each library service area. She indicated she was working with Greg W. to try and get this data, in the hopes that it could inform future discussions.

Going back to the idea of task force #2 consisting of three groups of eight members each, Greg W. asked if there was any concern that within these smaller groups of eight, all cities/service providers might not be represented. Grover B. observed that while the smaller groups might not have representation from all cities/service providers, the larger group would. He felt this was acceptable, and there was no opposition from any other LDAC members.

Greg W. then asked if having the LDAC Chair participate on the small task force would address some of the concerns he'd heard about only having Gladstone and Oak Lodge representation. Al M. indicated he'd be willing, but suggested it could also be another LDAC member, not necessarily the Chair. Al M. asked to whom the task force would ultimately report. Greg W. indicated that while the task force would ultimately provide recommendations to the BCC, he anticipated those recommendations would first be reviewed and discussed by LDAC.

From the audience, Kathy Draine asked, if task force #1 determined that Master Order changes were not necessary, could that shorten the task force's work? Laura Z. observed that even if Master Order changes were not necessary, Master IGA changes likely would be, and the task force's input and recommendations on those changes would be needed. Comm. Savas suggested a third goal of the small task force might be recommendations on how capital improvements are to be funded going forward.

In response to a question from Al M. on timeframes, Laura Z. indicated that the goal is to get moving as soon as possible. Time has been scheduled at the BCC's March 6<sup>th</sup> Policy Session to present a task force update/proposal. Doris G. asked if there was any groundwork that the group could do to facilitate moving forward. Natalie S. suggested LDAC could review and provide a recommendation for the composition of the task force #1. Laura Z. shared a draft composition of task force #1. The initial, draft composition of the group included:

- Don Krupp, County Administrator

- Paul Savas, Clackamas County Commissioner
- Laura Zentner, Interim Director of Business and Community Services
- Representative from Clackamas County Counsel
- Representative from Clackamas County Public and Government Affairs
- Jacque Betz, Gladstone City Manager
- Gladstone Legal Counsel
- Mitzi Olson, Oak Lodge Library Manager
- Oak Lodge Library Board Chair
- Lauren Gunderson, Interim Gladstone Library Director
- Gladstone Library Board Chair

Natalie S. suggested that Gladstone and Oak Lodge LDAC members should also be included. George H. suggested that Kathy Draine be included as an independent, citizen-at-large representative. After some discussion, it was determined that it made more sense for Oak Lodge and Gladstone LDAC representatives (rather than library board chairs) to participate as 1) they are well-versed in the issues that will be discussed, and 2) they are also members of their respective library boards. The task force meeting would be a public meeting.

George H. made a motion to recommend the composition of task force #1 as

- Don Krupp, County Administrator
- Paul Savas, Clackamas County Commissioner
- Laura Zentner, Interim Director of Business and Community Services
- Representative from Clackamas County Counsel
- Representative from Clackamas County Public and Government Affairs
- Jacque Betz, Gladstone City Manager
- Gladstone Legal Counsel
- Mitzi Olson, Oak Lodge Library Manager
- Grover Bornefeld, Oak Lodge LDAC Representative
- Lauren Gunderson, Interim Gladstone Library Director
- Natalie Smith, Gladstone LDAC Representative
- Kathy Draine, Citizen-at-large

Kathleen M. seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Natalie S. made a motion to accept the proposal of having two task forces, with the recommendation of task force #2 being “split” into three groups of eight members. Kathleen M. seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Canby Public Library

Kathleen M. distributed charts illustrating the allocated costs charged to the Canby library by the City. In total, 19% of Canby's District revenue goes to paying allocated costs. Kathleen M. said the Canby library board will be giving a presentation to the Canby city council in March.

Irene G. reminded members that, at the last meeting, she had expressed serious concerns about deficits and potentially needing to cut hours and lay off staff. Irene G. reported that, after sharing this data with Canby city administration, the City will for the first time be providing money from the general fund, and the deficit will be covered. Irene G. shared some details of how the library's allocated costs are calculated. She felt that this data had helped tell the library's story to City administration, and helped when evaluating whether allocated costs paid with District funds were related to library services and operations.

Mitzi O. pointed out that, on the consolidated spreadsheet Irene G. shared (which contained revenue and allocated cost data for other libraries), the Oak Lodge allocated cost percentage was inflated due to the fact that the total revenues used in the calculation (which were pulled from the State Library of Oregon) likely didn't reflect District funds transferred to reserves. Mitzi O. estimated the percentage of allocated costs compared to revenue for Oak Lodge was around 10-11%. Sarah M. indicated that the population served numbers for Sandy/Hoodland from the State Library report were not totaled correctly.

George H. said that when an LDAC subcommittee had done a study of allocated costs a few years ago, the allocated costs across libraries averaged 23%.

Kathleen M. said she felt that LDAC bylaws suggested that LDAC and the Library District Board should do a periodic review and update of the Master IGA and service area boundaries.

Al M. asked Kathleen M. and Irene G. what significant problems were illustrated by the data. Irene G. said she felt what qualified as an allocated cost directly related to library operations needed to be more clearly defined. Doris G. said allowed usage of District funds would be a good issue for task force #2 to address. George H. agreed, and also thought the possibility of going out to voters for an increased rate should be considered. Al M. agreed, observing that absent a large influx of new residents, future revenues would likely remain relatively flat. Grover B. suggested that if the IGA were followed and fewer allocated costs were paid from District funds, there would be more money available for operations. Grover B. acknowledged that you could go out for more money, but thought it was important to first ensure that money already being collected is spent the way it should be.

Irene G. said it was useful for LDAC to be requesting allocated cost breakdown, and that having the breakdown made it easier to illustrate the library's situation. Kathleen M. reported that some in the city were surprised.

From the audience, Christine Simpson , a 30-year resident of the unincorporated area 4 miles from Canby, related that she recently found out that her District funds might be going to Oregon City, and not to Canby as she had assumed. She asked how decisions about distribution of unincorporated residents' tax dollars had been made.

Greg W., Pat D., and Doris G. gave some information about how service area boundaries had originally been established (which is a topic that LDAC has discussed in previous meetings). Service areas were originally determined prior to District formation, in order to be able to provide service populations to the State Library. Some of the factors in determining those boundaries included self-reported patron usage patterns, census information, and natural/logical boundaries like highways and rivers. When the District was formed, some adjustments to those service areas were made (and agreed to by all Cities) to try and ensure that each District library would have sufficient revenue to sustain a library that could meet threshold standards in the Master IGA, and offer a consistent baseline level of service throughout the County. Pat D. gave an example of one such adjustment, where Wilsonville “gave up” a portion of its service area to Canby to try and ensure that Canby received sufficient revenue.

From the audience, Nick Dierckmann observed that with all the different variables and circumstances between libraries, it is difficult to do an “apples to apples” comparison of their operations. He said it is helpful to hear LDAC discussions and to better understand the terminology used when discussing libraries and the District.

From the audience, Kathy Draine suggested that it could be beneficial to let City Council members know exactly what the Master IGA says.

From the audience, Nick Dierckmann observed that there was nothing in the Master IGA that prevented a City from using a rented/leased space as a library. Doris G. confirmed that several District libraries had leased, or currently are leasing, space. Hoodland and Town Center/Happy Valley had leased space in the past, and Oak Lodge was currently in a leased facility. Doris G. observed that sometimes, however, leased spaces aren't particularly well-suited to the needs of a public library.

#### Revised Annual Progress Report Form

Greg W. reported that he had made the updates and modifications to the Annual Progress Report form suggested by LDAC. He was still in the process of transferring data from the old version to the new version, and sending it back out to library directors for updates and review. He anticipated having that done by the next LDAC meeting. Greg W. thanked the library directors for their assistance and support with testing the revised forms and collecting the requested data.

#### New business

Kathleen M. asked what the process for revising bylaws was. Greg W. said that, per recent guidance from the County's Public and Government Affairs office, prospective bylaws changes were first to be reviewed by County Counsel. If Counsel approves the changes, the proposed change would be presented and voted upon per the process in Article IX of the bylaws. Greg W. suggested that if a revision to the bylaws were desired, the best process would be for LDAC to pass a motion directing him to submit the requested change to County Counsel and, if approved, to proceed with notifying members (per Article IX) of the proposed change so that it could be voted upon at the next regular meeting.

Kathleen M. made a motion to submit the following bylaws change to County Counsel for approval and (if approved) written notice of the proposed change be provided to LDAC members at least 10 days prior to the next scheduled meeting so that the motion can be voted on:

Change Article V, Section 2 from "The officer of Chair shall rotate among the representatives from the Library Service Providers." to "The officer of Chair **may** rotate among the representatives from the Library Service Providers."

Don W. seconded.

During discussion of the motion, Kathleen M. observed that with the big issues the group is working with, and with how well the group is operating under the leadership of the current Chair, this change would give the group the flexibility to re-elect Al M. as Chair. A question was asked whether the Chair's term was limited to one year. Greg W. confirmed that Article V, Section 1 required an election of officers at the "annual" meeting, which (when the group meets more than once a year) has been designated as the first meeting after July 1.

The motion passed unanimously, with Al M. abstaining.

### Library news and updates

- Milwaukie – The City held a 3<sup>rd</sup> community meeting on the new library, and even with snowy weather, the meeting was very well attended.
- Oregon City – The library is in the midst of their strategic planning process and dreaming of the future.
- West Linn – the new children's programming space had its soft opening, and the feedback by staff and patrons has been very positive. A formal opening is planned for March 21<sup>st</sup> from 12:30 – 3:30. The relocated Book Nook, now operated by the Library Foundation, is thriving.
- Wilsonville – even though the carpet is late, the renovation continues!
- Oak Lodge – A visioning process to determine the library's future needs is underway.

- Canby – Based on feedback from teen patrons, the teen room is going to be re-done, with Rotary supporting the renovations. 350 people have signed up for the Winter Reading Program. Program attendance is strong.
- Gladstone – A group of Gladstone citizens have formed a PAC to support the May ballot measure.
- Sandy/Hoodland – The library continues to offer lots of programs. Participation (by both tutors and tutees) in the English language tutoring program continues to increase on a weekly basis.
- Happy Valley – Doris G. reflected on just how much programming had increased since the days of being located in the leased, space-constrained Town Center space. Back then, programming was nearly non-existent. Now, adult programming is going strong, and today's two storytimes (for example) attracted 90 and 115 people respectively! Having programming space makes a huge difference.

Al M. asked LDAC members for any feedback on tonight's meeting.

- Karol M. was exhausted!
- Don W. feels the group has a new sense of purpose, and feels that the group is communicating well.
- Pam N. appreciates that the group is looking towards the future.
- Grover B. is thrilled to have the chance to discuss and be responsible for the District they represent.
- Kathleen M. is grateful for the group's support and ideas. She feels that people are engaged, working on challenges, and moving forward.
- Natalie S. feels the group is growing and evolving into a cohesive team, and that there's nothing the group can't accomplish.
- George H. echoed Natalie's comments!

Al M. expressed his appreciation for everyone's participation and feedback.

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, April 23<sup>rd</sup> at 7:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Al M. at 8:53 PM.

*Submitted by Greg Williams*

