

Library District of Clackamas County Advisory Committee

Minutes - **UNAPPROVED**

March 22, 2021, 6:00pm

Meeting conducted via virtual meeting platform, Zoom

ATTENDANCE

Advisory Committee Voting Members

MEMBER	LIBRARY	ATTENDANCE	NOTES
Denise Fonseca	Canby Public Library	Present	
Grover Bornefeld	Clackamas County Library - Oak Lodge	Present	
Connie Redmond	Estacada Public Library	Absent	
Natalie Smith	Gladstone Public Library	Present	Vice Chair
Al Matecko	Happy Valley Public Library	Present	Chair
Jacquie Siewert-Schade	Lake Oswego Public Library	Present	Via phone
Robin Chedister	Ledding Library of Milwaukie	Present	
VACANT	Molalla Public Library		
Nick Dierckman	Oregon City Public Library	Present	
Kathleen Draine	Sandy / Hoodland Public Library	Present	
VACANT	West Linn Public Library		
Megan Chuinard	Wilsonville Public Library	Present	

Others Present

NAME	NOTES
Pat Duke	Director, Wilsonville Public Library
Doug Erickson	Director, West Linn Public Library
Desiree Fleck	Library Board Member, Estacada Public Library
Jack Frick	Resident of Sandy, OR
Doris Grolbert	Director, Happy Valley Public Library
Diana Hadley	Director, Molalla Public Library
Judi Jarosh	Alternative LDAC member, Canby Public Library
Melissa Kelly	Director, Lake Oswego Public Library
Kathryn Kohl	Manager, Clackamas County Library Network LDAC Liaison
Sarah McIntyre	Director, Sandy and Hoodland Public Libraries
Diana Morrow	Alternate LDAC member, Happy Valley Library
Katie Newell	Director, Ledding Library of Milwaukie
Mitzi Olson	Director, Oak Lodge Library Director, Gladstone Public Library
Paul Savas	Clackamas County Commissioner
Allegra Willhite	Deputy Director, Clack Co. Business & Community Services
Greg Williams	Director, Oregon City Public Library

Call to order, introductions, and roll call

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by Chair Al M. at 6:00 PM. During the introductions Judi Jarosh was welcomed as a new LDAC member.

Approval of minutes

The group reviewed the minutes from 1/5/2021. Natalie S. moved to approve the minutes as written. Nick D. seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Reports/Presentations:

Concord Property and Library Planning Task Force, and Gladstone Community Library Planning Task Force update:

Allegra W. updated the group on the status of the Concord and Gladstone task forces:

- The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners has approved the master plan documents for both projects.
- The work has passed another milestone: on March 9th the Board has declared their intent to move forward with the contract to take us into the next phase of the project which is schematic design. There will be formal approval at an upcoming business meeting.
- The next steps will be for the project team and consultants to refine the project ideas and meet with task force and subcommittees to turn the ideas into designs.
- The project is on schedule and updates will be posted on the County's website: <https://www.clackamas.us/communityproject>
- The next scheduled meetings for the task forces are 4/7/2021 for the Gladstone task force, and 4/8/2021 for the Concord/Oak Lodge task force, both starting at 5:30pm.

Grover added that the work is exciting, and we are down to the nuts and bolts of the design. Mitzi shared that in the work to create a combined library board they have conducted interviews and gone through the process of making appointment recommendations (five individuals have been selected for the recommendations). It will likely be another week or two before they are taken to the Board of County Commissioners for approval.

Results of the Survey to the Library District Task Force members:

Kathryn K. shared the results of the recent survey sent to the members of the Library District Task Force via slides (attached as part of these minutes). Highlights of the presentation:

- During the January LDAC meeting there was a discussion regarding how to address the task force meetings moving forward (i.e., would the meetings resume, or be postponed further).
- A short survey was sent out as a result of that discussion, asking members to give input on whether they wanted to meet virtually, or in person, depending on what was allowed regarding safe gatherings, and an open-ended question was included asking for feedback about the task force in general.
- The 57 voting members of the task force were surveyed, including City Managers and members of City administration, Library Directors, Library Board Members, and residents representing unincorporated Clackamas County. We had a response rate of 80%.
- The majority of the respondents were interested in meeting virtually, or a combination of virtual and in-person meetings, and half of the added comments (seven out of 14 total) expressed

interest in delaying or discontinuing the task force. Five of those seven comments were expressed by City Managers or members of City administration.

- Since the task force hasn't meet for over a year it would likely be a good time to give the Board of County Commissioners an update on the status of the group which they formed as a result of the settlement agreement with the City of Gladstone.
- The results from the survey give mixed information about how to proceed, and it would likely be helpful to have more feedback before giving an update to the Commissioners.
- Next Steps:
 - Kathryn and Allegra are planning to meet with three of the key stakeholder groups to gather more information in preparation for providing an update to the Board of County Commissioners:
 - City Managers (may be able to gather input at their May meeting)
 - Library Directors
 - LDAC (gathering your input today and perhaps at the next meeting)

Discussion following the slide presentation:

- Kathleen D. expressed that she believes the task force should proceed, perhaps as a smaller group to gather information related to funding needs to establish the need/priority to the City Managers by January 2022. Funding issues will become more and more critical as time goes by. Jack F. expressed agreement with Kathleen D.
- Grover B. remarked on the survey comment re: how the issues which LDAC has been discussing for years have not been resolved, and was curious what those issues are, and mentioned the letter which the Library Directors had written in the past (as part of the task force documentation) re: their need for additional funding. Grover expressed the need to review the annual reports from the libraries.
- Al M. expressed that City Managers have a lot on their minds during the pandemic (especially related to small businesses) and are trusting the Library Directors to focus on the library services.
- Commissioner Paul Savas shared that he has been speaking with Mayors and City Councilors in the County and these elected officials are busier than they have even been addressing the needs of their communities (related to the pandemic and other emergency situations of the past year) and how when budget time comes, and they see the financial pressures on libraries, they might see this work as a worthy pursuit.
- Jack F. expressed a concern about the use of Library District funds for capital expenses as related to the original ballot measure.
- Al M. shared his thoughts about the task force proceeding:
 - We could delay the task force.
 - Task force could convene via Zoom.
 - We could focus attention on the three different topics (library services, funding, and governance) covered by the task force in a different way. For example, we could have Library Board members discuss library services with the Library Directors, or we could have a sub-group of LDAC or a survey out to residents. We could do the same with the governance topic.
 - We could discuss this more at a future meeting.
- Denise F. shared how there is a new City Manager and a new Library Director in Canby who are working through a number of emergencies locally which may make it very challenging to take on additional topics right now. Balancing the needs of the libraries with the physical limitations for our leaders right now with all the current challenges may be the best approach.

- Megan C. expressed desire to be careful about timing of the process. She liked the idea of a survey, but we need to maintain this work as a public process, and work to get larger buy-in. Suggestion to consider a different breakdown of the task force, and perhaps combine it with a survey.
- Nick D. shared his opinion that if we wait too long to address these issues it may be too late for the libraries, but it may not be clear, for example, which library services will be needed/offered in the future. The City Managers are likely overwhelmed right now and this work is probably not a priority, but from his perspective the Oregon City Library Board is doing the best that they can at this time with the funds they receive, and if we can identify future services and a timeline it might help the work move forward.
- Natalie S. shared her experience on the Gladstone and Concord task forces – their work has been able to continue via Zoom meetings, and they have been able to stay on their timelines and accomplish their task. Her thought is to continue the work of the task force via Zoom, and perhaps include the City Managers on a quarterly basis.
- Greg W. shared his opinion that there is a lot on the plate of the cities right now. His concern is that knowing what library services are going to look like moving forward is challenging. The pandemic has changed a lot about how services are offered, and how he and others may need more time to see how things shake out. Additionally, any data gathered in the past year will be anomalous, further complicating our research/predictions for the future and analysis of the past.
- Sarah M. shared that she agreed with Greg W., and she wasn't sure what that work would look like but would like the group to make progress.
- Denise F. suggested that we focus on one of the objectives of the task force, perhaps the funding issue, since the services and governance issues could perhaps be addressed later. It may be that the task force is attempting to look at too big of a picture and should instead focus on one issue at a time.
- Doris G. expressed how the task force set up a structure to start with services topic (knowing what the communities want) to know more about what we want to offer but are currently unable to offer. Information about needed services would then feed into the next subcommittee looking at funding. We won't know how much money we need if we don't know what services the communities need, and related to that, what is the best way to govern the Library District and distribute the funds.
- Kathleen D. shared her understanding that the reason this work wasn't being done by LDAC relates to needing buy-in from other stakeholders, and wonders how the feedback from LDAC will impact the task force work, other than encouraging a start date for a resumption of the group.
- Al. M. shared how the task force was intentionally designed to include a variety of stakeholders including City Managers, Library Directors, Library Board members, etc. to have everyone at the table together to work through the issues. The original intent for the group was to cover the three topics sequentially, but the needs may have changed as a result of the pandemic. Al suggested that we can have a further discussion at the next LDAC meeting.
- General concern was expressed about LDAC's involvement (or lack of involvement) with any recommendations coming out of the task force, but comments were made about how LDAC would be involved in the process, reviewing the recommendations and being able to give feedback.
- Grover B. expressed the desire to have different stakeholders in the conversation, and to be transparent about the process (including getting the annual reports).
- Commissioner Savas expressed that the Board of County Commissioners is not applying any pressure to have an update related to the Library District Task Force at this time. Overall, we need overwhelming consent from all of the Cities to make any changes (like service areas), and a

collaboration of the stakeholders will likely be the best way to proceed. He also shared that it can be challenging (but not impossible) to engage the public in Zoom format meetings, based on his experience over the past year.

MOTION: Denise F. moved to have Al M. and Kathryn K. put together comments from this group to bring back to next meeting. Eight (8) members were in favor, and one was opposed.

Old Business:

- Annual Progress Reports: the group agreed to review the fiscal year 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 annual reports at the next meeting.

New Business: *there was no new business.*

Planning for next meeting:

- The group selected Monday, June 28th, at 6pm for the next LDAC meeting.
 - The 17/28 and 18/19 annual reports can be compiled that date, and Kathryn K. and Allegra W. may have information from other stakeholders re: the task force which they can share at the 6/28 meeting.

Adjournment

Al M. asked everyone to share one word about how they are feeling after the meeting. The words shared were as follows: optimistic, great, excited, opening, well, hopeful, creative, surviving, promising, adapting, energized, grateful, and thankful.

Denise F. moved to adjourn the meeting, Grover B. seconded, the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 PM.

-Minutes submitted by Kathryn Kohl