

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

Minutes - **APPROVED**

April 23, 2018

Clackamas County Development Services Building, Rm. 119/120

ATTENDANCE

Advisory Committee Voting Members

MEMBER	LIBRARY	ATTENDANCE	NOTES
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	Absent (excused)	
VACANT	Molalla Public Library		
Nick Dierckman	Oregon City Public Library	Present	
George Hoyt	Sandy Public Library	Present	
Pam North	West Linn Public Library	Present	Vice Chair
Megan Chrisman	Wilsonville Public Library	Present	

Others Present

NAME	NOTES
Greg Williams	Manager, Clackamas County Library Network LDAC Liaison
Irene Green	Director, Canby Public Library
Mitzi Olson	Manager, Oak Lodge Library
Michele Kinnamon	Director, Estacada Public Library
Lauren Gunderson	Interim Director, Gladstone Public Library
Doris Grolbert	Director, Happy Valley Public Library
Bill Baars	Director, Lake Oswego Public Library
Maureen Cole	Director, Oregon City Public Library

	Chair, LINCC Directors Group
Sarah McIntyre	Director, Sandy and Hoodland Public Libraries
Doug Erickson	Director, West Linn Public Library
Pat Duke	Director, Wilsonville Public Library
Laura Zentner	Interim Director, Clackamas County Business and Community Services
Paul Savas	Clackamas County Commissioner
Jack Frick	Citizen
Kathy Draine	Citizen
Jan Lindstrom	Oak Lodge Community Library Advocates

MINUTES

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

The meeting was called to order by Chair Al Matecko at: 7:00 PM.

Chair Al M. introduced two new LDAC members; Megan Chrisman representing Wilsonville, and Nick Dierckman representing Oregon City.

LINCC Directors Group Chair Mo Cole recognized Pat Duke (Wilsonville Library Director) for being named 2018 Oregon Librarian of the Year by the Oregon Library Association. Pat D. described his work over the last six years with the Dolly Parton Imagination Library (a program which promotes early literacy by mailing a book each month to participating children under the age of five).

It was observed that since 2015, Clackamas County has been recognized with two Librarian of the Year awards, one Library Employee of the Year award, and one Library Supporter of the Year award. Al M. expressed his appreciation for the good work being done in Clackamas County libraries.

In response to a question from Grover B., Greg W. indicated his goal when preparing minutes is to reflect what was said during a meeting, and not to make any sort of assessment on the accuracy of participants' statements.

Greg W. identified one spelling correction to be made in the 1/3/18 minutes. Grover B. moved to accept the minutes of the 1/3/18 meeting as amended. Natalie S. seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Nancy N. moved to accept the minutes of the 2/26/18 meeting. Kathleen M. seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Canby Library update

Canby Library Director Irene Green reported that the Canby Library Board recently made a presentation to the City Council, and as a result, Irene G. expects the Library will be receiving general fund support going forward, including \$50,000 this year (which will prevent cuts in staffing and operating hours). Previously, the Library had not received general fund support. Based on the presentation, the Council requested an additional 2-hour work session to better understand the library's situation. Irene G. indicated the Mayor and Councilors were very supportive of the library, and she is encouraged about moving forward. Kathleen M. agreed, saying that the Council's reaction to the presentation was very positive, and she encouraged other representatives to share information about their libraries with their City Councils. Irene G. mentioned that some areas of interest by the Council were the tax base of the Canby service area, the current district tax rate (compared with other districts in the state), and possibly reevaluating existing service area maps.

Task Force Updates

Greg W. gave an update on the status of the two task forces that had been approved by the Board. Greg W. reminded the group that two task forces were envisioned.

- The first (the Settlement Agreement Implementation Task Force) would be making recommendations on the minimum necessary changes to the Library District Master Order and/or Master IGA to implement the settlement agreement between the County and the City of Gladstone in order to proceed with constructing new facilities for both service areas. Greg W. relayed that the first meeting of that task force was scheduled for 4/30/18.
- The second task force (the Library District Task Force) was intended to be a larger group looking at more systemic issues facing the Library District.

Greg W. presented some preliminary ideas (based on feedback and input from different stakeholders, including LDAC) about the composition and working of the Library District Task Force. Greg W. indicated that nothing had been finalized, and that the purpose of this presentation was to solicit additional feedback and input from LDAC.

- Many of the questions and issues that have been brought up recently seem to revolve around three distinct areas: Library Services, Library Funding, and District Governance.
- In order to address these three areas, Greg W. outlined a potential structure in which a larger task force (consisting of 27 members) would be split into three distinct subcommittees (consisting of 9 members each).
 - Each subcommittee would focus on one of these specific areas. Members of specific subcommittees might have particular subject matter expertise.
 - The larger task force would meet less frequently (perhaps quarterly), while the smaller subcommittees would meet more frequently (perhaps monthly or bi-weekly).

- Membership would be drawn from every Library Service Provider, and from different stakeholder groups (Library Directors, City Managers, elected officials, LDAC/Board members, etc...).
- A “phased” approach could be adopted, in which one subcommittee would be active at a time. Each subcommittee would forward their conclusions and recommendations to the entire task force for discussion and approval; upon approval, those recommendations would then be transmitted to the next subcommittee to inform their work.
- Once all three subcommittees had completed their work, the full task force would synthesize subcommittee recommendations into a final report to be presented to the Board.
- Administrative support and facilitation services would be made available for the task force and subcommittees.
- A citizen survey could be conducted at the start of the process, to provide additional information to the Library Services subcommittee about County-wide patron needs and priorities.

Greg W. asked for feedback. From the audience, Kathy Draine asked how the task force related to LDAC. Greg W. responded that LDAC members would be one of the stakeholder groups with representation on the task force, and that he anticipated LDAC would be very aware of and involved with the task force’s work. Al M. suggested that before the task force’s recommendations went to the Board, they could be reviewed by LDAC. Grover B. indicated support for that idea as well. Kathy D. indicated she expected each subcommittee would present their recommendations to LDAC before being presented to the full task force. Nick D. and Kathleen M. indicated support for LDAC review of each subcommittee’s recommendations; Kathleen M. indicated she thought this would provide additional opportunity for public feedback.

George H. and Natalie S. indicated they would like LDAC to have an opportunity to review the final parameters and scope of the task force’s work before such work begins.

Megan C. wondered why the larger task force would need to approve the work of the smaller subcommittees (especially if the subcommittees were composed of subject matter experts). Greg W. indicated one of the purposes was to try and ensure the participation and consensus of diverse stakeholder groups (elected officials, city managers, library directors, etc...). Greg W. brought up the example of a City Manager and Library Director (potentially) having different views on questions related to Library Services; it is hoped that within the large task force, any such differences could be discussed and a consensus reached. Megan C. indicated that if LDAC were going to providing any sort of final approval, it made sense for LDAC to be involved in subcommittee recommendations throughout the process.

From the audience, Kathy D. asked why a separate Task Force was being created, and that she felt that LDAC could serve in that role. Greg W. indicated that, as a practical matter, consensus from many other stakeholder groups (not just LDAC) will be required to address many of these

issues; the goal of the task force is to bring those stakeholders (and not just LDAC) “to the table.” From the audience, Commissioner Savas observed that the task force proposal (as had been discussed and supported by LDAC) incorporated a variety of stakeholder groups and perspectives (not just LDAC), that it would be beneficial for this group to conduct their work, and that given LDAC representation (and the likely timeframe of the group’s work), LDAC would be very well informed about the task force’s work and progress.

George H. discussed the timeframe for the task force’s work, saying he felt one of the main goals would be to secure additional revenue for libraries. He felt that the best time for going out to voters would be November of 2020, and that the task force’s work would need to be wrapped up by the end of 2019.

From the audience, Jack Frick expressed a concern about “kicking the can down the road” on questions related to permissible usage of district funds (specifically for capital purposes and allocated costs), and did not want a task force’s work in this area to supplant LDAC’s work and responsibility. He also indicated he felt it was important to ensure the will of the voters who voted for the original ballot measure was being followed before presenting any new ballot measure. He also commended Irene G. for her presentation to the City Council.

Pam N. indicated she felt that LDAC members would be informed throughout the process and worried about adding too many additional steps to the process. Nick D. said he saw LDAC playing the role of “sponsoring group”, and that it would be important for LDAC to review final recommendations. He recognized the importance of having many stakeholder groups involved, and also indicated he thought that some of the subcommittees might get their work down more quickly than others. Grover B. liked the idea of the larger task force having a diversity of stakeholders, and expressed a desire for LDAC to be kept up-to-date on task force and subcommittee progress as work continued.

Greg W. indicated that there was an intent for LDAC’s feedback to be incorporated into the scope of work for each subcommittee.

Al M. thanked George H. for his comments regarding a potential November, 2020 ballot measure, but observed that a potential ballot measure could come later as well, and that he wouldn’t want the task force to “rush through” their work. Greg W. observed that, when talking about the timing of any potential ballot measure, it would be important to consider any other competing measures on the ballot at the same time. From the audience, Interim BCS Director Laura Zentner mentioned that new census data would be collected in 2020, and that it might be desirable to use that data in future discussions of service areas or other topics, and that census data was also a component of the current funding formula.

Al M. asked Library Directors for their feedback. Mo C. indicated she liked the phased approach, would advocate for more frequent (rather than less frequent) subcommittee meetings, and supported the idea of keeping everyone in the loop.

Greg W. asked to clarify the group's feedback on the degree of LDAC involvement in the task force. Al M. summarized what he had heard from the group, recommending that LDAC be involved in initially providing the task force with their "marching orders".

Greg W. also indicated that the process could include a citizen survey component, in order to better understand what services citizens wanted/needed from their libraries. Grover B. indicated that, if such a survey were conducted, he would want to review the data and any conclusions being drawn from it prior to publication. He cited his concern that, when Oak Lodge residents were recently surveyed about their needs, the conclusions drawn didn't match the data collected. Greg W. said he thought that the Library Services subcommittee would be the ones utilizing the data and incorporating it into any recommendations. In response to a question by Al M., Grover B. indicated he would like LDAC to be able to review any survey questions before a survey went out. Megan C. agreed. In response to a question from Mo C., Greg W. said that while Public and Government Affairs (PGA) might administer the survey, he had envisioned Library Directors being most involved in crafting the questions the survey would contain. Mo C. thought having the Directors, or a small group of Directors, assisting PGA with developing questions would be beneficial. Nick D. indicated it might be worth considering different surveys at different steps of the process, perhaps to get citizen feedback about funding or governance questions. Grover B. said he thought it was important that a survey also helped educate people about services available, and that he wouldn't want to get too specific about funding questions as part of an initial survey. He also indicated agreement with Jack F.'s earlier comment about delivering what was promised to voters. Nancy N. said she thought a survey should include information on what libraries provide, as well as what they might not be able to provide without sufficient funding. She felt it was important to remind citizens that original passage of the District preserved library service in the County. Al M. said he didn't feel a survey should be too long, and that respondents should be thanked for their participation. A small subcommittee of Library Directors (Mo C., Doris G., Sarah M., and Pat D.) was initially identified to work on survey questions. In response to a question from Al M., Laura Z. indicated surveys of this type were generally made available in both online and physical versions. Greg W. indicated he'd investigate what options were available for presenting a survey in different languages.

Greg W. shared some potential questions that each subcommittee might address as part of their work, namely:

Library Services

- "What services do citizens need, both now and in the future, from District libraries?"
- "What are the core services/service levels should all District residents receive?"
- "How do we measure service delivery?"
- "What services are best provided locally, and what services should be provided/supported centrally?"
- "What types of resources (human, financial, physical) are required to provide these services?"

Library Funding

- "How much will it cost to provide these services (both now, and in the future)?"
- "Are current funding sources/levels sufficient to support needed services?"
- "If current funding is not sufficient/sustainable, how do we best address the revenue shortfall?"

District Governance

- "Should Master Order, Master IGA, and/or Capital IGAs be amended?"
 - "What are permissible uses of District funds?"
 - "How do we ensure services are being provided and desired outcomes achieved?"
 - "How will we ensure that funds are utilized appropriately?"
 - "How are District-wide issues discussed and decisions made?"
 - "How do we address evolving centralized services/support needs?"
- "Are different changes needed under different future funding scenarios?"

Nick D. indicated he would like to see questions added about how libraries reach out to different populations. He also asked where questions regarding service area boundaries might be addressed. Greg W. initially thought it could be addressed by the Funding and/or Governance subcommittees (and would make a note that it was a topic to be addressed).

From the audience, Kathy D. suggested that the Governance subcommittee need not necessarily wait until the end of the process to meet, as there were current governance issues which could be discussed.

From the audience, Commissioner Savas stressed the importance of focusing on service and governance issues, not only funding. He addressed the concept of "taxpayer fatigue", noting that there was already significant concern over the potential number and size of competing regional funding ballot measures potentially on the horizon over the next couple of years. He said it was important to not lose sight of the work that LDAC does, nor to lose sight of LDAC's specific charge (which might be narrower than some of the night's discussions). He commended LDAC's recent work and progress, and echoed Grover B.'s sentiment that it was important to continue to work towards ensuring that the current District is functioning as voters intended before potentially going out to voters again.

Greg W. said he intended to take the feedback from the group (as well as feedback from other stakeholders), and would come back with a more refined proposal at a future meeting.

Annual Progress Reports

Greg showed the progress of a consolidated spreadsheet with each libraries' Annual Progress Report data. He indicated he still needed to validate some submissions with individual libraries before distributing it.

Bylaws

Greg W. reported that since a) County Counsel had approved a bylaws change proposed at the last meeting, and b) that he had distributed notice of the potential change to all LDAC members more than 10 days prior to tonight's meeting, the group could (if it so desired) vote to amend the bylaws. George H. moved to change the word "shall" to "may" in Article V, Section 2 of the LDAC bylaws. Kathleen M. seconded. Al M. abstained, but the motion otherwise passed unanimously.

Library Updates

- Lake Oswego – Just finished this year's Lake Oswego Reads program, which was terrific.
- Estacada – Parking lot construction is underway!
- Oak Lodge – The Friends are selling tickets for the 2nd annual Garden Tour.
- Oregon City – The Library is continuing with strategic planning; stakeholder meetings are coming up soon. The Library will be having a Star Wars program on May 4th ("May the Fourth be with you!")
- Wilsonville – Six weeks to go on library renovations.
- Gladstone – Looking forward to doing some long-term planning (one way or the other) after the May 15th election.
- Sandy/Hoodland – This Saturday is the library's Día de los Niños program.
- Canby – Also having a Día de los Niños program this Saturday, continuing to work on Teen Room renovations with the Rotary Club, and continuing to work on a Maker Space with the Foundation.
- Happy Valley – A draft strategic plan was presented to the City Council and was very well-received. Al mentioned that the library had a very strong response rate to the community survey that was conducted as part of the planning process, and commended Director Doris Grolbert on her efforts.

Next meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, May 29th @ 7:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at: 8:58 PM.

Minutes submitted by Greg Williams.