



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
2051 KAEN ROAD | OREGON CITY, OR 97045

**LIBRARY DISTRICT TASK FORCE
MEETING #5**

Date: October 6, 2025

Time: 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Location: Development Services Building Auditorium

Agenda

Meeting 5 Purpose:

- Review Charge and True North
- Task Force Reports on Recommendations
- Fine-tune slate of recommendations for the Library District Board

9:00 a.m. Agenda and Meeting Schedule Review

9:05 a.m. Opening Comments, Facilitator & County Counsel

9:15 a.m. Discovery Summary, Staff

9:25 a.m. Discovery Individual Reports, Task Force

10:00 a.m. Break

10:10 a.m. Discovery Discussion

10:30 a.m. Fine-Tune Recommendations based on Discoveries (Input)

10:40 a.m. Next Steps

Attachments:
Presentation

Library District Task Force

Meeting #5

October 6, 2025



Meeting 5 Purpose

1

Review Charge and
True North

2

Reporting on
recommendations

3

Fine-tune slate of
recommendations

Our Charge and True North

- Our charge from the Library District Board of Directors: “The Library Task Force will make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners on several longstanding library issues.”
- Using equity as a lens, what actions should the Task Force be recommending to the District Board that could help enhance the long-term health and vitality of the Library District for all?

Recommendations

- Recommendation A: Direct staff to propose an amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement to clarify the use of district funds for capital expenses and allocated costs.
- Recommendation B: Direct staff to conduct analysis of the library district and make recommendations for core levels of service.

Recommendations

- Recommendation C: Direct staff to conduct analysis of the funding formula and service boundaries, incorporated and unincorporated, and propose recommendations for changes to address funding disparities amongst the service areas.
- Recommendation D: Direct staff to initiate the creation of a strategic plan for the district that would prepare the district for its 20th year of service and beyond.

Discovery Summary

- Recommendation A – Capital Expenses & Allocated Costs
 - Average 2.5 (58 responses; 1 = 9, 2 = 11, 3 = 38)
 - 3s generally supported the idea of ending debate, mostly no comment
 - Adopt previously drafted IGA amendments
 - Codify the legal opinion received
 - No clear unifier on 1 and 2 ratings
 - Existing documents have the necessary language
 - Clarity can be provided in other ways
 - Opposition in anticipation of what the amendment would say

Discovery Summary

- Recommendation B – Levels of Service
 - Average 2.3 (56 responses; 1 = 8, 2 = 24, 3 = 24)
 - 3s generally didn't comment
 - Support was mostly for doing the work to figure out what the community wants
 - Some unity on 1s and 2s, but for different reasons
 - Opposition because this is city-level discussion
 - Opposition unless the work is part of future funding measure
 - Opposition because there are already Oregon Library Association standards
 - Opposition because they feel the member cities will not support any changes
 - Opposition because the district should just adopt the current Oregon Library Association standards by reference and not a particular set of standards

Discovery Summary

- Recommendation C – Funding and Boundaries
 - Average 2.1 (56 responses; 1 = 20, 2 = 12, 3 = 24)
 - Raters who scored a 3 generally didn't comment
 - Ground truthing of service areas and funding
 - Support for specific fixes (not district level analysis)
 - Support for “equitable funding” (100% per capita, unincorporated redistribution, etc)
 - Support for specific outcomes (“I only support this if the thing I want happens”)
 - Some unity on 1s and 2s, but for different reasons
 - Opposition unless the work is part of future funding measure
 - Opposition because they feel the member cities will not support any changes
 - Opposition because the only question was capital expenses and allocated costs

Discovery Summary

- Recommendation D – District Strategic Plan
 - Average 2.3 (55 responses; 1 = 8, 2 = 20, 3 = 27)
 - Feedback generally centered on whether this recommendation was focused on planning for the current district or moving toward a new district and/or levy
 - Some comments reflective of concern whether this work would be duplicative of work that library directors and city staff are doing for their individual libraries
 - Various commentors indicated that this recommendation should really be focused on a framework for a future funding measure

Reports from Individual Task Force Members

- 3-5 minutes from each Task Force Member
- What do you want your colleagues to know about the feedback received so we can move this work forward in a thoughtful and productive way?

Break

Please be back in 10 minutes

Discussion

- Themes and lessons learned
- Clarification from fellow Task Force Members
- Clarification from counsel and staff on process and procedure

What does the future hold?

- Referral to voters for new permanent rate through a new district
 - County would form new district; Library District would begin dissolution process
 - Both acts referred to voters and drafted that both must pass for either to be effective
- Referral of a levy to voters
 - How the levy is structured would need to be explored
- Maintain status quo/tweaks to existing structure
 - Could be adjustments to current operating agreements, but no levy or permanent rate adjustment

Facilitator's Proposal

- Honoring the feedback received
- Moving the work of the district forward
- Reducing fatigue from recommendations and studies

Fine-Tuning Recommendations

- Recommendation A: Direct staff to propose an amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement to clarify the use of district funds for capital expenses and allocated costs.
 - Consideration: Work within the existing library district governance structure as outlined in the Intergovernmental Agreement and incorporate external stakeholders as appropriate.
 - Consideration: Retain the Library District Task Force as a steering committee to advise on the work undertaken to implement this recommendation.

Fine-Tuning Recommendations

- Recommendation B: Direct staff to conduct analysis of the library district and make recommendations for core levels of service.
 - Consideration: Hire a consultant to assist with analysis.
 - Consideration: Work within the existing library district governance structure as outlined in the Intergovernmental Agreement and incorporate external stakeholders as appropriate.
 - Consideration: Retain the Library District Task Force as a steering committee to advise on the work undertaken to implement this recommendation.

Fine-Tuning Recommendations

- Recommendation C: Direct staff to conduct analysis of the funding formula and service boundaries, incorporated and unincorporated, and propose recommendations for changes to address funding disparities amongst the service areas.
 - Consideration: Hire a consultant to assist with analysis.
 - Consideration: Work within the existing library district governance structure as outlined in the Intergovernmental Agreement and incorporate external stakeholders as appropriate.
 - Consideration: Retain the Library District Task Force as a steering committee to advise on the work undertaken to implement this recommendation.

Fine-Tuning Recommendations

- Recommendation D: Direct staff to initiate the creation of a strategic plan for the district that would prepare the district for its 20th year of service and beyond.
 - Consideration: Hire a consultant to work on drafting the plan, incorporating the efforts of the library directors, cities, and unincorporated areas to plan for their library service areas.
 - Consideration: Work within the existing library district governance structure as outlined in the Intergovernmental Agreement and incorporate external stakeholders as appropriate.
 - Consideration: Retain the Library District Task Force as a steering committee to advise on the work undertaken to implement this recommendation.

Next Steps

- Are we ready to move forward with drafting a report to the Library District Board of Directors?