

Portland State University

PDXScholar

City Club of Portland

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

8-28-1986

Report on the Future of Multnomah County Library

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Report on the Future of Multnomah County Library" (1986). *City Club of Portland*. 410.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/410

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

REPORT
ON
THE FUTURE OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY LIBRARY

Published August 28, 1986

Vol. 67, No. 14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.	63
A. Charge to the Committee.	63
B. Scope of Work.	63
C. Procedure.	63
II. Background.	64
A. Libraries in Contemporary Society.	64
B. Library Services in the Portland Area.	64
1. Introduction	64
2. Multnomah County Library	65
3. Other Public Library Systems	65
a. Multi-Type Cooperatives	65
1. Washington County Cooperative Library Services	66
2. Cooperative Library Network of Clackamas County.	66
b. Fort Vancouver Regional Library	67
4. Other Types of Libraries (School, Academic, Special)	67
C. The Multnomah County Library System.	68
1. Origins/Evolution.	68
2. Funding Issues	69
3. Library Study Commission	70
4. Contract Renegotiation	71
D. Current Situation.	71
1. Search for New Director.	71
2. Open Meetings.	71
3. Internal Management.	72
4. Regional Cooperation	72
5. Long Range Planning.	73
III. Discussion and Conclusions	73
A. Service Goals.	73
B. Regional Library System.	74
C. Multnomah County Library Funding	77
1. Current Funding System	77
2. Appropriate Funding Level.	77
3. Funding Alternative: Independent Tax Base	78
4. Funding Alternative: County General Fund.	79
5. Funding Alternative: Special or Serial Levies	79
D. Governance of Multnomah County Library	79
IV. Recommendations	82
V. Appendices.	84
A. List of Area Public Libraries.	84
B. Bibliography	84
C. Persons Interviewed.	86

Report on
THE FUTURE OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY LIBRARY

To the Board of Governors,
City Club of Portland:

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Charge to the Committee

In June, 1985, the Research Board and Board of Governors of the City Club directed your Committee to study the future of the Multnomah County Library and of other public libraries in the Portland area. The Committee was asked to identify and recommend an array of library services appropriate to the Portland area, with attention to regional needs and opportunities. The Committee further was asked to focus on several specific issues, most prominently the appropriate system of governance for public library services and the amounts and types of funding needed to provide an adequate array of public library services.

The Committee was established in part because of growing interest in possible expansion or redefinition of public library functions. Another reason was the continued unsettled status of library services in the Portland area, especially in Multnomah County. Approximately one third of the Multnomah County Library budget is funded by a three-year serial levy running from July, 1984 to June, 1987. When the levy was passed, it was expected that the three-year period would allow formulation of long range goals for the Multnomah County library and definition of a plan for stabilization of funding. The report of your Committee is intended to make a contribution to that decision process.

B. Scope of Work

Your Committee determined that the Multnomah County Library is the keystone for any regional structure of library services in the Portland area, because it has the largest clientele and the most extensive collections. It has, however, the most troubled history. Successful regional cooperation or development of a regional library system will not be possible without a strong and securely funded Multnomah County Library as a participant. Your Committee, therefore, centered its analysis of short range issues (1986-1990) on the problems, needs, and possibilities of the Multnomah County Library. It considered the entire region in the development of recommendations relating to long-range (1990-2005) service needs and possibilities.

Your Committee focused its attention on issues of public policy, particularly: (a) finances; (b) forms of Multnomah County Library governance; and (c) regional cooperation and coordination. It dealt only indirectly with the specifics of service changes that properly are the responsibility of internal management and with technical questions that require trained professional judgments.

C. Procedure

Your Committee interviewed library professionals from inside and outside the Portland area. It reviewed previous and current studies of the

Multnomah County Library and of regional services. It reviewed data on public libraries in comparable metropolitan areas and gathered current information on several such systems. Because of high levels of community interest in library services, Committee members also were able to observe a variety of public meetings concerning aspects of County and regional library services.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Libraries in Contemporary Society

Modern public libraries can be viewed simultaneously as educational, cultural, recreational, and economic institutions.

As educational institutions, they encourage and facilitate reading and learning. They function as "people's universities," providing opportunities for self-education and self-realization to individuals of all income levels and educational backgrounds. They also are the schools of democracy. As repositories of freely accessible information, they make possible the informed citizenry upon whom our system of government depends. In an era in which most employment was in agriculture, Thomas Jefferson believed that democracy required individual ownership of productive land. In the information era of the late twentieth century, we might update Jefferson by arguing that democracy requires ready and independent access to reference books, clipping files, and computerized data bases.

As cultural institutions, public libraries help to preserve the record of human endeavor through collections of books, periodicals, sound recordings, films, videotapes and similar documents and materials. A public library also can take an active role in helping to articulate and preserve the particular cultural heritage of ethnic groups and others within our larger society through special collections and outreach programs.

The broadest base of support for public libraries comes from recreational users who rely on its collections for best-sellers, mysteries, and the masterworks of literature. For many, recreational browsing may be the first step toward the development of a serious educational interest.

Libraries also make a direct contribution to the economic well-being of our community. A trained and intellectually sophisticated labor force is an essential component of economic growth and development. Along with other educational and cultural institutions, a strong public library system contributes to the attractiveness of a community for business development or location. By maintaining and making available current technical and business information, public libraries can provide special support to new and/or small businesses that lack the resources or opportunity to develop full in-house information services.

B. Library Services in the Portland Area

1. Introduction

The Portland metropolitan area (including Clark County, Washington) supports four separate public library systems: (1) Multnomah County Library, (2) Washington County Cooperative Library services, (3) the Coop-

erative Library Network of Clackamas County, and (4) Fort Vancouver Regional Library. Each of the four functions independently, and each is different structurally, a consequence both of historical development and political priorities. Fort Vancouver Regional Library is included in this comparative analysis because of the extent to which it traditionally has cooperated with Oregon libraries.

The Multnomah County Library is an integrated library system, with a centralized system of governance, administration, circulation control, and cataloging. Fort Vancouver Regional Library, while different in governance and funding, has a similarly centralized structure.

Clackamas County and Washington County, on the other hand, each have a federated multi-type "network" of libraries; the public libraries in these two counties are independent community libraries that have agreed to cooperate in various ways. A web of library boards and advisory committees governs each network.

2. Multnomah County Library

The Multnomah County Library is Oregon's largest urban public library. The system includes the Central Library in downtown Portland, and fourteen branch libraries (eleven in the city of Portland, two in mid-County, and one in Gresham). In addition, the system provides bookmobile service in outlying areas, plus service to nursing and retirement homes and other institutions. The library's collection has over one million books, plus periodicals, newspapers, government documents, maps, prints, clippings, slides, and audio and video recordings. Special collections include a portfolio of original Audubon prints and a number of rare books on the subject of roses. Total circulation is over three million items per year. Multnomah County Library has been administered for roughly seventy five years by a private organization, the Library Association of Portland, under contract with Multnomah County; the library's funding, however, predominantly is provided by the County.

Multnomah County Library has the broadest and deepest public library resources in the Portland area. However, librarians and public officials alike have expressed concern in recent years that Multnomah County Library did not exercise leadership either in putting those resources before the public or in sharing them cooperatively with other libraries. The apparent reasons are funding constraints and past board/staff attitudes.

3. Other Public Library Systems

a. Multi-Type Cooperatives

Both Clackamas and Washington counties operate "multi-type library cooperatives," i.e., systems based on sharing resources and expertise among all types of autonomous libraries -- public, school, academic, and special. Unlike Multnomah County Library, those are highly de-centralized systems. They have the dual functions of (1) administering county-wide services and (2) coordinating activities among and on behalf of all existing libraries in the county. They have existed as cooperative systems for only about ten years, although individual city libraries existed before the formation of the network in each county. In each county, each city library functions with its own board. Funding is primarily from city and county funds.

The fact that both counties have cooperative systems rather than singular governance units is a reflection of how library service developed historically in each county. Both networks are substantially the result of grassroot efforts.

1) Washington County Cooperative Library Services

Before 1976, public library services in Washington County consisted of six small city libraries (Reaverton, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, Tigard, Cornelius, and Sherwood) that served the residents of their respective communities. The County's population grew, and by 1976, over 120,000 residents of unincorporated Washington County had no direct, free public library service at all.

A county serial levy in 1976 established the Washington County Cooperative Library Services (WCCLS), a multi-type library umbrella organization that funds four community libraries in unincorporated Washington County, provides funds to seven city libraries for service to county residents, operates a books-by-mail program in remote areas of the county, and administers a program of cooperative services among libraries of all types within the county. A Citizens Advisory Board, appointed by the Washington County commissioners, governs WCCLS.

A two-year serial levy passed in 1985 currently provides about \$2.5 million annually to fund WCCLS programs. The seven city libraries receive funding from their municipal governments, as well. In recent months, the County has reviewed several alternatives for future county-wide library service. The alternatives ranged from maintaining the status quo, whereby the eleven existing public libraries would continue operating separately, but with interlibrary cooperation and consolidated cataloging through WCCLS, to the formation of a special library service district embracing the entire County or a portion of it. If the later alternative is chosen, voters will have to approve the formation of such a district, which would have its own taxing authority and be governed by an elected board. The WCCLS Citizens Advisory Board favored the formation of such a district, but municipal governments within the County generally have opposed their cities' inclusion because of a concern about local control. In February, 1986, the Washington County commissioners indefinitely deferred action on the advisory board's recommendation.

Each library in Washington County currently has its own independent cataloging and circulation system. However, WCCLS is undertaking a \$1 million library automation project which, when operational early in 1987, will create a county-wide library catalog and circulation system. At that point, each of the four counties in the Portland area will have some degree of library automation. However, the systems will remain mutually incompatible.

2) Cooperative Library Network of Clackamas County

The Cooperative Library Network of Clackamas County is a multi-type library cooperative system, consisting of the County Library (which has two branches and a bookmobile), ten city public libraries, and various school, academic, and special libraries. Clackamas County has a county-wide automated library catalog, to which all the city libraries and the County Library contribute holdings. It is tied in with an automated circulation system and a county-wide borrower's card.

The County Commissioners recently called for a study of the feasibility of merging the County Library with the Oregon City Library, including construction of a combined library building. The County Library's main function is to serve rural and unincorporated areas of the county. It is a member of the library network, but does not govern it. Cooperative programs such as a county-wide automated catalog and circulation system are administered by a Citizens Policy Board and a Council of Librarians. Since 1977, county serial levies have funded the County Library and the county-wide cooperative services. In March, 1986, the voters approved a new 3-year \$5.7 million levy. The city libraries in the county are funded additionally to varying degrees by their own jurisdictions.

One difference between Washington and Clackamas county library services is that Clackamas County has (and has had for many years) a county library, with a staff, collection, buildings, and its own board of directors. Washington County, on the other hand, has no county library; its county-funded library agency manages funds, plans, and implements county-wide cooperative services -- such as library automation -- but has no library buildings or collections.

b. Fort Vancouver Regional Library

The Fort Vancouver Regional Library (FVRL), organized under a Washington State regional library law, is an integrated library system serving rural areas and nine cities in Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat counties. This area has a combined population about one-half that of Multnomah County. The district is a single taxing and service unit centrally administered from headquarters located in its main branch, the Vancouver Community Library. Under state statute, cities can annex themselves to the district or can contract with it for library services. Only three cities in the three counties are not served by the district: Camas (which has its own library), Bingen, and LaCenter.

The FVRL offers free library service to anyone who resides in a jurisdiction that has a public library. Under this liberal policy, it has served a number of Multnomah County and other Oregon residents over the years, even though Vancouver residents did not have reciprocal borrowing privileges at Multnomah County Library until 1986 (see Sect. II D.4). The FVRL expended approximately \$3.6 million in 1985, with 90% of its revenues coming from a \$.50 per \$1,000 assessed valuation maximum operating levy. The FVRL collection has about 370,000 volumes, consisting almost entirely of printed material. Annual circulation is 1,667,000 through 11 branches and three bookmobiles. FVRL makes extensive use of both the telephone and the mail to carry out library circulation and services.

4. Other Types of Libraries (School, Academic, Special)

In addition to the public libraries in the Portland area, several other types of libraries provide services to segments of the public. In each case, the libraries involved -- school, college, university, or special -- are products of the institutions that support them and serve quite specific constituencies, e.g., students, faculty, and organizational personnel.

None of the specialized libraries can meet, from its own collection, every request it receives. Most academic and special libraries, while serving a limited clientele, also have been serving a broader public by

sharing resources formally and informally with each other and with public libraries through cataloging networks and other cooperative and/or good will arrangements. Some academic and special libraries in the area allow on-site use of their resources by the public, but restrict direct borrowing by the public; some corporate libraries restrict the on-site use of their library facilities, but nearly all area libraries will make their resources available, to some extent, to other libraries through interlibrary loans.

Examples of specialized library resources available to the public include Portland State University Library's business collection, which is used heavily by Portland-area business people; the Oregon Historical Society library, which is charged by state law with preserving materials pertaining to state and regional history and making them available to the public; and the U.S. Bonneville Power Administration, whose extensive collection of energy-related materials is available to researchers throughout the region. Each of these libraries, and dozens of others, has rules that govern their use by the public, but collectively they represent an enormous cultural asset and a supplement to local public library service.

In Clackamas and Washington counties, the "multi-type network" library structure has provided visibility for non-public libraries and has facilitated the cooperative use of all types of libraries in each county. No comparable umbrella structure encompassing non-public libraries exists in Multnomah County.

C. The Multnomah County Library System

1. Origins/Evolution

The Multnomah County Library began as a small private library organized by a few interested citizens -- probably no more than a dozen -- in 1864. The first subscriber was William S. Ladd, president of Ladd & Tilton Bank, who attached to his contribution a condition that the library should forever be kept free of politics. Ladd became the first president of a small but ambitious group that called itself the Library Association of Portland.

Charter members of the Association paid a \$5 initiation fee and \$3 quarterly dues. However, within five years a building drive was financed in part by selling life memberships for \$200 and perpetual memberships, which could be bequeathed, for \$250. Those fees still apply.

The library remained a private subscription service with a limited membership for almost 40 years, until it was confronted with a critical choice in 1900. It was bequeathed an 8,000-volume private library, plus a cash endowment of \$2,500 in gold, from the estate of John Wilson, a wealthy merchant. A choice was forced because Wilson stipulated that his library was to be free for use by the public.

The Association could have added the Wilson collection to its own, bringing the total to 35,000 volumes, and opened everything to the public; it could have separated the Wilson collection from its own, which would

have remained private; or it could have forfeited the handsome Wilson gift to the tiny Portland public library, which had just opened a reading room on the top floor of City Hall. The Association accepted the Wilson library, absorbed the little City library in the process, and became a free public library on March 10, 1902.

The choice was made a bit easier due to the success of women's clubs in lobbying the 1901 Legislature for authorization of a city tax (up to 1/5 mill) to support public libraries. This funding proved insufficient, however, and in 1911 the legislature authorized counties to levy taxes for public library funding. In Multnomah County, such a tax then was used in preference to a city tax.

That legislation prompted agreement on a contract between Multnomah County and the Library Association of Portland that remained in effect with minor changes for 73 years. The County agreed to finance the Library and the Association to manage it. The County owned the Central Library building (opened in 1912) and the Association owned books and materials, existing branches, and new branches. In this ownership the Association served as trustee for the people.

The Library was governed by a 10-member board of governors chosen from an Association membership that ranged between 40 and 60 members. Three ex-officio board positions were held for county commissioners, though seldom used. The arrangement continued until 1984 when the latest of a series of financial crises drew new attention to the Library, its diminishing funds and services, unprecedented closures, and personnel dissatisfaction.

2. Funding Issues

In the early 1970s, the staff of the Multnomah County Library was cut by 30 positions (full time equivalent) as the County reacted to a sharp recession and cut budgets in all departments. This cut represented about 10 percent of total staff. Federal revenue sharing restored much of the damage, but not permanently.

Disastrous financial conditions persisted in Multnomah County government; devastating budget cuts became a grim routine at the Library. In 1982, two branches were eliminated, the Central Library was cut to 48 hours a week, bookmobile services were cut, and more positions were eliminated. In 1983, a year of three successive budget cuts, the Central Library was closed for nine days in March, hours at four branches were cut in half, the bindery was closed, and 19 positions (full-time equivalent) were eliminated.

Relief came with the passage in May, 1984, of a library levy to raise \$9 million over the next three years. Major cuts were restored, salaries were increased, materials were added, and the Central Library downtown was opened on Sundays for the first time in 21 years. But the three-year levy expires in June 1987, less than a year from now.

The income, expense, balance, and circulation figures for the Multnomah County Library in this decade (fiscal years) are as follows:

<u>Fiscal Year July 1-June 30</u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Operating Expense</u>	<u>Balance*</u>	<u>Circulation</u>
1979-1980	\$5,349,649	\$4,753,707	\$595,942	3,042,654
1980-1981	5,601,485	5,221,039	380,446	3,204,212
1981-1982	5,683,572	5,257,709	425,863	3,142,016
1982-1983	5,687,153	5,418,369	268,784	3,228,616
1983-1984	5,115,719	5,526,054	(410,335)	3,237,547
1984-1985	7,864,243	7,112,361	751,882	3,459,185

*The "balance" figure includes income from fines and interest which the library has accumulated as a capital improvements fund, used in recent years for building improvements and computerization of the circulation system. For 1984-85, the figure also includes carry over from the three-year serial levy to be spent in 1985-86 and 1986-87; such carry over is required by the manner in which serial levy revenues are collected.

3. Library Study Commission

In 1983 the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners agreed to investigate library conditions and to look for a lasting financial solution, if possible. This resulted in the appointment in June, 1983 of a Commission on Library Policy and Administration, a 15-member group headed by County Commissioner Arnold Biskar. The commission was charged specifically with determining whether the contract with the Library Association of Portland should be renegotiated. It also was to examine finances and assorted other issues pertaining to the library. The study commission consulted citizens and library experts in its deliberations and produced its findings and recommendations in December, 1983 in what is known as the "Barney Report," after the consultant who assisted the commission.

Two of the study commission's major recommendations promptly were placed on the May 1984, primary election ballot by the County Commissioners. One was the three-year, \$9 million serial levy to stop the Library's financial slide. The other was a proposed reorganization of library governance, which would replace directors of the Library Association of Portland with a nine-member board to be appointed by County officials.

Voters approved the money measure by a 56 percent majority. The governance measure was so close it qualified for an automatic recount, and lost by 206 votes from among more than 154,000 cast.

Examination of voting results reveals that support for both measures dwindled in a remarkably consistent pattern from west to east. Comparison of results by state representative districts (there are thirteen in the County) confirms the pattern. The \$9 million levy was supported by 69 percent of voters in the two districts west of the Willamette River. Results were exactly even (6,228 votes on each side) in District 16 in mid-County, but the levy was opposed by 54 percent of voters in the three eastern-most districts in the County. Voting on the companion governance measure reflected the same pattern; it won and lost in the same districts, but in each district there were fewer votes for it and more against it than on the levy measure.

4. Contract Renegotiation

The proposal to replace the County contract with the Library Association prompted renegotiation of the contract with the County in 1984. Principal changes in the renegotiated contract were:

- Effective October 1, 1985, the Library Board would consist of 13 members, five of them being County appointees and eight chosen by the Library Association. The Board previously consisted of ten members chosen by the Library Association.
- The Board would operate in partial compliance with Oregon's open meetings and open records laws.
- The Library Association would develop and adhere to a five-year library management plan.
- The Board would present to the county a long-term funding plan by June 30, 1986.

The contract confirmed that the Library Association holds title to the library collections and branch properties.

D. Current Situation

Since renegotiation of the contract between Multnomah County and the Library Association, a number of significant changes have occurred in the management of the Multnomah County Library. These have involved new professional leadership, changes in internal management, and steps toward regional cooperation.

1. Search for New Director

The first test of the reconstituted Multnomah County Library Board was to appoint a new head librarian. Earlier advertising efforts produced a pool of candidates and finalists unsatisfactory to members of the County Commission, who held a veto under the new contract provisions. Commissioners particularly were concerned about the ability of the finalists to build public confidence and expand the library's constituency and base of support.

A new search was conducted through a professional placement agency. The definition of "acceptable background" was broadened, opening the process to applications from librarians with experience in systems much smaller than Multnomah County. Sarah Long, head of the Harrisburg/Dauphin County, Pennsylvania library system, was chosen in 1985.

2. Open Meetings

The current contract places the operation of the Library Board partially under the terms of the Oregon Public Meetings Law:

"13. The Association agrees that, during the term of this agreement, all meetings of its Board of Directors at which decisions are made regarding the expenditure of

funds received from the County and administration of the library system shall be open to attendance by the public excepting only meetings, or the portions thereof, that deal with labor negotiations, personnel matters, property matters and such other matters that would be exempt from Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.610 et seq.) if meetings of the Association's Board of Directors were subject to such law."

As interpreted by the Board and its legal counsel, the provision applies only to full Board meetings dealing with financial and administrative issues. It excludes committee meetings and executive sessions. On one occasion, the Board excluded a newspaper reporter from an executive session, even though such sessions in other agencies directly subject to the open meetings law are accessible to the press for purposes of background.

3. Internal Management

The new head librarian, Sarah Long, used several approaches to examine conditions within the library system. She analyzed community needs and library services for each branch, established specific future goals and objectives, and engaged a professional consultant to study the system and identify needed changes. The consultant was Dr. Lowell Martin, a former faculty member at Columbia University and an acknowledged authority on large library systems. His report, issued April 8, 1986, suggested a wide range of internal management changes.

Long created a new management level within the library by designating a 10-member "cabinet" of department heads with major management discretion. The Central Library now has a single head of operations, just like each branch. Many staffers in the Central Library were reassigned so that each works in a single, specialized department rather than rotating among several departments. A number of support positions were reduced in grade to match work responsibilities. The latter change was unpopular and employees filed 17 grievances through the Multnomah County Library Union. Results of arbitration were not complete at the time this report was written.

4. Regional Cooperation

Public interest in some form of regional library cooperation is strong, as evidenced in recent reports by the Columbia-Willamette Futures Forum, the Metropolitan Citizens League, and the League of Women Voters. On May 1, 1986, representatives of three counties (Sarah Long from Multnomah, Donna Selle from Washington, and Richard Tuffli from Clackamas) presented a joint proposal for a single library district in the tri-county area. They said a unified district could provide a stable tax base, promote coordinated planning, and save money. They also suggested a potential action schedule: adoption of a regional library district by voters in November 1986, approval of a regional serial levy to pay for it in May 1987, and passage of a permanent regional library tax base in 1988.

For the past several years only residents of Multnomah County have enjoyed free borrowing privileges at the Multnomah County Library; non-residents (including commuters who work in Multnomah County) paid \$20 a year for a library card.

In January, 1986, the Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas library systems in Oregon and the Fort Vancouver Regional Library in Washington instituted "Access '86," a reciprocal borrowing arrangement on a one-year trial basis. A resident in any participating county can borrow materials without charge from any member library in the other counties simply by going to the library with proof of residence and obtaining a free library card. Because "Access '86" involved the Multnomah County Library extensively, it overcame a significant barrier to expanded regional library service in the future.

The "Access '86" experiment will be evaluated at the end of 1986. To date, Multnomah County has been a "net lender," supplying to outside borrowers twice the amount of material its patrons have borrowed from other counties. Greatest use of other libraries by Multnomah County residents appears to be at the Clackamas Town Center branch of the Clackamas County library. The benefits of increased access to library materials are clear, especially for suburbanites working in downtown Portland and for residents of neighborhoods near county boundaries. However, a possible cost is increased demand on a finite set of circulating materials. In addition, this experiment is expected to cost Multnomah County \$26,000 (the loss of annual card fees charged non-residents). If reciprocal borrowing is to be continued, some form of financial reciprocity must be developed.

5. Long-Range Planning

The renegotiated contract between Multnomah County and the Library Association mandates that the Library Board prepare a five-year management and service plan by June 30, 1986. Such a plan was prepared by a committee headed by John Howard, utilizing the services of consultant Lowell Martin. The report of the committee was adopted by the library Board in July, too late for full consideration by your Committee.

III. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

In its deliberations and discussions, your Committee has tried to move from the general to the specific. The following section begins with discussion and conclusions about general library service goals, proceeds to consideration of the possibilities in a regional library system, and ends with specific conclusions about the Multnomah County Library.

A. Service Goals

Your Committee was charged to recommend "an array of library services appropriate to the Portland area, with attention to regional needs and opportunities." In our deliberations, we agreed that the Multnomah County Library "is trying to do an overload of good things," to quote consultant Lowell Martin. Martin suggested defining six essential service areas:

1. Information services, including practical information, data for decision making, and multi-media resources;
2. Service to the business community;
3. User self-realization, educational self-improvement resources;

4. Recreational reading;
5. Services for children and young adults; and
6. Branch libraries as neighborhood centers.

Your Committee believes that this is a good summary of public library services, but has not tried directly to set priorities among the various items. Many of the choices among possible services require technical considerations and comparative cost analyses best done by library professionals. In addition, many choices are "political" in the sense they will require allocating resources among different segments of the community.

Based on its research and discussions, however, your Committee has identified several broad goals to guide public decisions on library services for the Portland area. The area's public libraries should consider these goals when defining their service priorities.

1. Public libraries should enhance opportunities for self-education by all citizens through free access to a wide range of information resources; they also should meet business information needs, fill recreational needs in a community, and serve as neighborhood centers.
2. Public libraries in the Portland area should take advantage of opportunities for greater efficiency and effectiveness through sharing of public library services and facilities, thereby meeting needs for improved accessibility and containment of costs.
3. Public libraries should provide better information services to business by a combination of free and fee-based services.
4. Public libraries should seek to serve the long run needs of all the citizens of the Portland region by providing free or low cost access to a wide range of newer data types and resources, thereby helping to prevent a split in the community between information-rich and information-poor citizens.

B. Regional Library System

Library services in a metropolitan area break logically into a two-tier delivery system. Like retail and service businesses, different library services can be supported by clienteles of different sizes. Some services that are in high demand can be supported by relatively small total populations. Other highly specialized services can be offered effectively only with a large population base from which to draw potential users and funding. When considering library services, recreational reading, children's programs, and community center functions fall in the category of high demand/high frequency services. The second category of lower demand services might include comprehensive reference services, business-oriented services (such as federal contract specifications), and other in-depth and specialized collections (such as information on grant-making organizations and their criteria).

The long-range health of Portland area public library services requires evolution toward a coordinated metropolitan system organized around the complementary goals of efficient coordination and widely convenient geographic accessibility. As computerized information systems permit broader access to information, development of alternative locations for computer-terminal type access must be considered, either within existing branches and separate libraries or in addition to these locations. At the least, users of branch and nearby community libraries should have immediate access to a portion of the resources at the Central Multnomah County Library.

Testimony by library experts and professional staff clearly indicates that it is possible to accomplish substantial steps toward a regional system through administrative cooperation, without governmental reorganization. The "Access '86" reciprocal borrowing program is a first step. Additional steps might include development of compatible computerized cataloging and circulation systems; agreement on areas of specialization for collection development; joint promotional efforts; and cooperative planning of capital investment in new or expanded branches. This administrative cooperation should involve university and specialized libraries, as well as general purpose public libraries.

As a step beyond such administrative cooperation, establishment of a tri-county library district under state enabling legislation has been proposed by the director of the Multnomah County Library and the directors of the Washington and Clackamas county library systems. Such a library district initially would include all of Multnomah County, the unincorporated portions of Clackamas and Washington counties, and any incorporated cities in the latter two counties that choose to be included at the start. This most likely would create a "swiss cheese" pattern that would omit those incorporated communities in Washington and Clackamas counties with their own libraries. However, those cities would be able to opt into the new district later. The proposed schedule to establish a tri-county library district is to: (1) elect a five-member district board in November, 1986; (2) propose a serial levy for interim funding in March or May 1987, and (3) convert the serial levy to a permanent tax base in 1988 (the first practical date) or at a later election.

Public discussion suggests several advantages of a regional library district. The first three points are of particular interest to residents of Multnomah County:

1. economies through consolidation of administration and support services;
2. the authority to acquire a tax base and thus to stabilize library funding;
3. an elected board which, with its clearly defined responsibility for libraries, would tend to become a strong institutional advocate for libraries; and
4. improved services in the outlying parts of Clackamas and Washington counties.

Disadvantages include:

1. political opposition from city libraries in Clackamas and Washington counties over issues of local control;
2. inadequate time available for implementation in a single step;
3. imposition of a new government entity, counter to the goal of simplifying government in the metropolitan area;
4. limited opportunities for economies of scale in a labor-intensive service field; and
5. weakening of county government by removing the responsibility for a politically popular service.

Your Committee is enthusiastic about the long-range possibilities of developing a cooperative regional library system in some form, but has concluded that it is premature to endorse a regional library district as the best avenue for achieving this goal. The concept has been seriously introduced to public discussion only since the spring of 1986. As discussed above, many questions of detail and of political feasibility remain in relation to a regional district. Moreover, several other ideas for regional governance have been suggested and deserve explicit consideration. These include: (1) establishment of a regional district as a taxing entity that contracts with existing libraries for service; (2) operation of library services by the Metropolitan Service District; (3) establishment of a regional district to provide separately supplemental services, while present libraries maintain their current funding arrangements; and (4) greater use of contracting authority by which smaller libraries in the metropolitan area could contract among themselves and with the Multnomah County Library to provide services on an appropriate cost sharing basis.

We also note that the City Club has adopted a position in favor of consolidation of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties into a single home rule county. Any regional library agency appropriately could be consolidated into such a "Willamette County" should it be created.

Recognizing both the public and professional interest in a cooperative regional system, your Committee concludes that there is a need for a detailed, systematic study of the best way or ways in which to move to such a regional system. Such a study could be comparable to that of the Multnomah County Library Study Commission (Barney Report) of 1983, but on a tri-county scale. Your Committee emphasizes, however, that this need for a detailed "best way to do it" study should not be a reason for postponing action on presently identified needs for greater regional coordination, standardization, and areawide access to collections and facilities. The user and staff experience and awareness gained from implementing such increased coordination should help build greater support for the more complete integration which ultimately may be required.

C. Multnomah County Library Funding

1. Current Funding System

Multnomah County in the early 1980's had a library system in crisis, as previously discussed. It now has a system with funding that allows delivery of basic services but is inadequate for major program development. The Multnomah County Library has taken on a large number of functions over the years, but currently lacks the ability to do any one of them as effectively as staff or citizens might hope. Its film and art print collections are examples.

For purposes of comparing libraries, budgets often are expressed in terms of per capita amounts. The special levy elevated the Multnomah County Library from the bottom of a group of comparable systems (at \$9.37 per capita per year) to the middle of the group (at \$14.00 per capita per year). This was, however, to be an interim measure only. The 1984 City Club report declared that its recommendation of a three-year serial levy "is a stop-gap solution at best; a permanent funding solution must be addressed."

The library presently is funded as follows:

	<u>1985-1986</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Money from general fund	\$4,650,000	93.6
Special serial levy	2,716,549	
State per capita support	44,429	0.6
Endowment support	184,387	2.4
Fees and fines	<u>268,868</u>	<u>3.4</u>
	\$7,864,233	100.0

2. Appropriate Funding Level

A funding solution for Multnomah County library services ideally should be able to offer a stable funding source at a higher level than now exists. Witnesses heard by your Committee, and the conclusions of consultant Lowell Martin, suggested that an adequate funding level would require an annual budget of approximately \$11,500,000.

Your Committee heard evidence that quality public library systems which serve urban areas comparable to Multnomah County require funding of \$20-22 per capita. These comparable cities include Salt Lake City (\$19.58 in 1984), San Francisco (\$20.47 in 1984), Spokane (\$20.49 in 1984), Denver (\$21.78 in 1984), and Seattle (\$22.84 in 1983). Funding for the highly regarded public library of Columbus-Franklin County, Ohio, serving an urban county very similar to Multnomah County, is roughly \$21.50 per capita for the current year. For Multnomah County, with a population of 562,000 in 1985, funding at \$20 per capita would provide a budget of \$11,240,000. Funding at \$21 per capita would produce \$11,802,000.

In many ways, the materials acquisitions budget for a public library is the essential measure of its long-term quality. The average materials expenditures of large public libraries, as indicated by data gathered by the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), amount to 15 percent of the total budget. The seemingly low percentage reflects the labor-intensive

character of library services. The Multnomah County Library materials budget for the current year is \$911,000, or 12 percent of the total. If 15 percent is applied to a recommended total of \$11,500,000, the resulting acquisitions budget would be \$1,725,000. That figure would nearly double current acquisitions capacity, allowing for aggressive development of non-book as well as book collections and innovative development of computer-based data sources.

An annual budget of \$11,500,000 would allow the Multnomah County Library to catch up in underfunded areas and to innovate in meeting new information needs. The "catch-up" category might include such items as bringing salaries in line with current standards, improving building maintenance, increasing hours, implementing a computerized catalog and an integrated acquisitions/circulation data system, training staff, and increasing acquisitions. The "innovation" category might include development of "super-branches" in east County (as recommended by Lowell Martin), improvement of business services, expansion of non-book resources, development of literacy programs, and improvement of the ability to access computerized data banks.

Your Committee acknowledges that major strides have been taken since 1980 in improvement of funding and services for the Multnomah County Library. However, more needs to be done if the Multnomah County Library is to meet adequately the needs of citizens in the 1990's and beyond. A high quality public library in Multnomah County requires funding in the \$11,500,000 range, a 46 percent increase in the library's annual budget. Voters may be reluctant to support such an increase. However, such funding would allow expanded services to residents in eastern parts of the County, improvement of business services, enlargement of the acquisitions budget, and improvement of internal management capabilities.

Major funding alternatives for library services are as follows: (1) A separate library services tax base, (2) the County General Fund, and (3) special or serial tax levies. Additional sources of income -- such as state and federal funding, library user fees and fines, endowment support and charitable contributions -- can and should be increased, but they are unlikely to become major sources of funding for the library. Each of the major funding alternatives is discussed in turn.

3. Funding Alternative: Independent Tax Base

County service districts and special library service districts may be funded by ad valorem property taxes in the form of an independent tax base for the district. Once a realistic initial level of funding is approved by the electors of the district, the tax base then may increase 6 percent each year without further vote by the electorate. The passage of an independent tax base offers the possibility of a stable source of funding at a higher rate than presently exists.

However, practical considerations preclude this as an option for the immediate future. Tax base elections can be held only at statewide primary or general elections, which occur only in May and November of even-numbered years. A library district would have to be in place by September to place a tax base measure on the November 1986 general election ballot. In turn,

creation of a library district would have required action by the Board of County Commissioners by the beginning of June, 1986. There is therefore no possibility of establishing a library tax base before 1988.

4. Funding Alternative: County General Fund

Money from the County General Fund is allocated on a year-by-year basis by the Board of County Commissioners as part of the annual budget process. The percentage of the County General Fund budgeted for library services fell from 7.19% in 1970-71 to 5.73% in 1983-84. The budget amounts have not kept pace with inflation, and the actual General Fund appropriation for 1983-84 dropped 10% from the previous year.

In the May, 1984 primary election in which voters approved a three-year serial levy for library services, they defeated a similar levy for justice services. In May, 1986, a statewide prison bond measure also was defeated. Multnomah County Commissioners are attempting to remedy a severe shortage of jail space at this time, among other financial problems. Those interested in library services cannot expect any funding increase from the County General Fund at any time in the next few years.

5. Funding Alternative: Special or Serial Levies

Oregon law provides authority to levy additional property taxes for library services on a one-time only or serial basis. By statute, serial levies for operating purposes may not exceed three years at a time.

Serial levies provide a higher level of funding but no long-term stability. The Lowell Martin study characterized the 1984 serial levy as "a temporary solution, a life-saver for the time being" (p. 52). Dr. Martin believed that the public expected "a permanent financial base would be found for the library." He also pointed out that:

"... those who have worked for the library levies will soon grow weary of coming back to the task every few years. And some time along the way the vote could be negative, leaving the library stranded" (p. 157).

Nonetheless, it is clear that another three-year levy is necessary to provide adequate library funding in the near future, given competing demands in the General Fund and the impossibility of holding a tax base election until 1988. Your Committee, therefore, has concluded that the Multnomah County Library requires a continued commitment of County General Funds and an expanded serial levy to meet the funding goal of \$11,500,000 per year.

D. Governance of Multnomah County Library

At present the Multnomah County Library is governed by the Library Association of Portland and its 13-member Board of Directors, that actually manages the Library. The Association is a private, non-profit charitable corporation. Until a 1984 renegotiation of the 1911 contract with Multnomah County (which added five public Directors as full voting members of the Board), there was little public involvement in decisions affecting the management of the Library. More than 90 percent of the Library's funding, however, comes directly from public taxes.

The majority of Library Association of Portland board members are uncomfortable making decisions in a public arena, a necessity that is taken for granted by elected boards, or boards appointed by and responsible to elected officials. Given an opportunity to go fully public by declaring itself subject to Oregon's Open Meetings and Open Records Acts during the 1984 contract renegotiation, the Board opted to retain as much privacy as it could.

Your Committee recognizes the Board's desire for retention of a more private, quiet, and relaxed arena for decision making. Many public officials probably have the same desire. However, this private style of operating was a product of circumstances in the middle nineteenth century and is incompatible with management of a public agency using public funds.

Many witnesses interviewed by this Committee, regardless of their personal positions on the issue, felt that the present arrangement was a source of tension that could not continue indefinitely. Library funding in the future will depend upon the good will of the electorate toward the institution itself. As Dr. Martin concluded in his discussion of library governance: "The question that has to be faced is whether the Association has become a political liability for the Library" (p. 166).

Association members themselves have declared, through their president, that they are willing to turn the administration of the Library over to a politically appointed or elected agency if public support for funding would require it. In such a case, the Library Association could continue to play a valuable role on behalf of the library. It could retain title to special collections it has built over the years. As an independent foundation it could attract long-term private funding for the library. The Free Library of Philadelphia is a model for such a relationship. In that system, two boards, one public and the other private, cooperate to ensure continued adequate funding of library services. In such a case, as Dr. Martin has commented, "the Association would cease control of the library with a record of a civic job well done. When and if that time comes, there should be widespread recognition of a legacy of the Association to its City and County."

The form of government your Committee recommends must be fully accountable to the public and also be able to command a tax base adequate to ensure the higher level of funding necessary for the Multnomah County Library.

One option for a publically accountable governing body was presented to the voters as a charter amendment at the May, 1984, primary election, and was narrowly defeated. It would have created a new county department administered by an independent, nine-member Multnomah County Library Commission appointed by the County Executive. This option, while providing public accountability of management, would have depended on the County General Fund for funding. Thus, both the stability and the amount of financial support would have continued to be unpredictable in the future, as noted in this report's section on funding.

A second option embraced by Lowell Martin and by the Multnomah County Commission on Library Policy and Administration is a service district, a statutory creation that allows the electors to establish a particular service, if they pay for it. Property taxes are one method that can be

used for funding. State law currently provides the framework that would allow such a service district to be regional (larger than one county in size), county-wide, or less than county-wide in size. If a county-wide government were chosen, it could be administered either by a specially elected board (a special library service district) or by the Board of County Commissioners (a county service district for library services). Any of the service districts would have the benefit both of public accountability and the possibility of establishing an independent tax base.

As described earlier in Sect. III, R, your Committee recognizes that there is enthusiasm among public library leaders for a tri-county district. The advantages of a smoothly operating regional library system are very attractive, particularly at this time when library services go well beyond stockpiling of books. However, your Committee has concluded that a citizen committee study and/or a consultant's report (such as the Barney Report) is needed to review the regional situation before such a large step should be attempted.

For Multnomah County alone, a county-wide service district could be established either in the form of a Library District (ORS Chapter 357) or a County Service District for library services (ORS Chapter 451). In many ways these two districts are similar. They both must be installed by the voters, both may establish tax bases by ballot, and both are public entities that would be fully accountable to the electorate. However, a Library District would be governed by a specially elected board, whereas a County Service District would be governed by the Board of County Commissioners.

The advantages and disadvantages of each are related mainly to this basic difference in their governing body.

One advantage of a Library District is that a strong elected board might serve as a powerful advocate for library services. In addition, Oregon law provides that district board members may be elected either at large or by zones. The possibility of electing board members from different geographical areas might be attractive to residents outside more heavily populated centers who often feel that library services do not adequately meet their needs. A major disadvantage of a directly elected board is that an election might attract single issue candidates. If such an issue were a demand for censorship of library materials, this would not be in the best interests of the library. Another disadvantage is the creation of an additional layer of government with its own elected board.

Because its governing body the (County Commission) already is in place, a County Service District for library services would be simpler to implement than a Library District. A County Service district would come close to the option that almost was approved by the voters in 1984, but would have the added capability of establishing a tax base. Finally, County Commissioners would have the opportunity to appoint a varied and highly professional advisory board to direct the management of the library. Such a board could be expected to attract highly qualified members. It can also be noted that the League of Women Voters of Portland and the League of Women Voters of East Multnomah County have recommended on the basis of a 1985-86 study that public library services should be provided by a library district with an appointed board.

Failing the adoption of a regional library district or a county-wide district, citizens of Multnomah County would face the possibility of a renegotiation of the contract between the County and the Library Association. There are two arguments against such a renegotiation. First, there is extremely little enthusiasm for a revised contract among many of the principals involved. Second, a new contract would do nothing to resolve the Library's perilous financial position.

However, there also are serious problems remaining under the current contractual arrangement. Some members of your Committee are uncomfortable with a situation in which tax money is used on a routine basis to purchase assets for a private organization, although expert witnesses have pointed out that the Library Association holds its assets as a trustee for the public. Both the past record of stewardship of the Library Association and its legal accountability indicate that ownership of library resources is not itself an issue. However, accountability still is lacking:

1. Meetings of the Board are not fully covered by the Oregon open meetings law; in particular, executive sessions and committee meetings are closed to the press and public.
2. "Public members" appointed by County Commissioners to represent the interests of all citizens are a permanent minority on the Board.
3. The management of the library never has been subject to a performance audit by the County.

Taken together, these problems are sufficient to compel changes in the governance of Multnomah County's public library system.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee submits the following recommendations to improve public library service in the Portland metropolitan area. In recognition of the central importance of a strong Multnomah County Library, the first three recommendations deal with funding for that system. The remaining recommendations deal with the broader issues of regional services and library governance.

Multnomah County Library Funding

1. The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners should place on the ballot a three-year serial levy for library services for the period starting July 1, 1987, to raise \$6,500,000 in each year, representing an increase of \$3,800,000 over the current serial levy.
2. The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners should extend until 1990 its current commitment to provide at least \$4,500,000 per year for library services from the County General Fund.
3. The Library Association of Portland and the professional staff of the Library should undertake vigorous efforts to expand the Multnomah County Library endowment, secure grants, and increase the level of state funding.

Regional Needs and Opportunities

4. The County Commissioners of Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties should jointly appoint and fund a citizen panel to study and recommend a long-range plan for a cooperative regional library system for the tri-county area. In coordination with City, County, and regional government agencies, the panel should examine (a) service needs; (b) the best balance of existing and new services among the Central Library, existing branches and suburban libraries, and possible new libraries; (c) associated capital and operating costs; and (d) alternative forms of governance and/or cooperation. One product should be a 15- to 20-year plan for coordinated service development. The second product should be a strategy for organizational and legislative changes needed to accomplish that plan. The study should be completed by the end of 1987.
5. Until a unified or cooperative regional library system is established, the Multnomah County Library, together with the other libraries and library systems in the region, should continue and expand mutually beneficial programs of cooperation.

Multnomah County Library Governance

6. By 1990 at the latest, governance of the Multnomah County Library should be transferred to an independent service district, which should endeavor to secure passage of a permanent tax base. This service district might be a tri-county library district. Should such a tri-county district prove infeasible, Multnomah County should establish a County Service District for library services, with an operating board appointed by and reporting to the County Commission.
7. If a separate library district covering Multnomah County is not established by 1990, Multnomah County should reopen the contract with the Library Association of Portland to (1) secure full compliance with the Oregon open meetings and open records laws, and (2) define a Board of fifteen members, a majority of whom are appointed by County elected officials.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Berry
George Dysart
Roger Leo
Julie Kawabata
Philip Spiers
Tom Stimmel
Nancy Tang
Paul Wright
Carl Abbott, Chair

Approved by the Research Board on July 10, 1986 for transmittal to the Board of Governors. Received by the Board of Governors on July 28, 1986 and ordered published and distributed to the membership for discussion and action on September 12, 1986.

Appendix A

AREA PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Multnomah County

Central Library

Branches:

Albina

Belmont

Capitol Hill

Gresham Heights

Gresham

Holgate

Hollywood

Midland

North Portland

Rockwood

St. Johns

Sellwood-Moreland

Southwest Hills

Woodstock

Clackamas County

Clackamas County Library

Branches:

Damascus

Clackamas Town Center

Canby Public Library

Estacada Public Library

Gladstone Public Library

Lake Oswego Public Library

Leding Library of Milwaukie

Molalla Public Library

Oregon City Public Library

Sandy Public Library

West Linn Public Library

Wilsonville Public Library

Washington County

Banks Community Library

Cedar Mill Community Library

Town Center Public Library

West Slope Community Library

Beaverton City Library

Cornelius Public Library

Forest Grove City Library

Hillsboro Public Library

Sherwood Public Library

Tigard Public Library

Tualatin Public Library

Appendix B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Katherine E., Historical Sketch of the Library Association of Portland 1864-1964. Portland, Library Association of Portland, 1964.

Don Barney and Associates. Executive Summary: Final Report of Multnomah County Commission on Library Policy and Administration. Portland, December 1983.

_____. Background Information: Multnomah County Commission on Library Policy and Administration.

City Club of Portland. Report on Multnomah County Library Three-Year Serial Tax Levy for Library Public Services (Multnomah County Measure No. 3) and Charter Amendment Establishing a Library Commission (Multnomah County Measure No. 4). City Club of Portland Bulletin, Vol. 64, No. 52, April 30, 1984.

_____. Report on Regional Government in the Portland Metropolitan Area. City Club of Portland Bulletin, Vol. 66, No. 42, March 13, 1986.

- _____. Report on Serial Tax Levy for Library (Multnomah County Measure No. 5). City Club of Portland Bulletin, Vol. 56, No. 55, May 14, 1976.
- Columbia Willamette Futures Forum. Summary Report: Critical Choices, '84.
- _____. Preliminary Report of the Critical Choices '84 Conference Follow-Up Committee on Libraries. Portland, July 24, 1985.
- _____. The Regional Library. Portland, Center for Urban Education, November 1985.
- Cooperative Library Network of Clackamas County. Directory 1985-86.
- Information Technology Institute, The Northwest Information Directory. Portland, 1986.
- Leagues of Women Voters of Portland and of East Multnomah County. Multnomah County Library System. Portland, April 1986.
- Library Association of Portland. Restated Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws, 1984.
- Martin, Lowell A. A Development Plan for the Multnomah County Library. Portland, April 1986.
- Multnomah County. Contract Between the County of Multnomah and the Library Association of Portland. Portland, October 21, 1911, with amendments, November 10, 1941.
- _____. Restatement and Amendment of Contract. Portland, August 8, 1984.
- Multnomah County Library. Annual Reports.
- _____. Communication Plan: Multnomah County Library. Portland, Whitman Advertising and Public Relations, October, 1985.
- _____. Goals and Objectives -- October 1985-June 1986. Portland, November 13, 1985.
- Oregon State Library, Library Development Division. Directory and Statistics of Oregon Libraries 1985. Salem, March 1986.
- _____. Establishing a Library District: Legal Issues and Answers.
- Sager, Donald J. The American Public Library. Dublin, OH: On-line Computer Library Center, 1982.
- Urban Library Council, Analysis of Annual Statistics. Chicago, 1984.

Appendix C

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County Commissioner
 Don Barney, Board Member, Library Association of Portland
 (County-appointed); Barney & Associates
 Bruce Bayley, Library Committee Chair, Columbia Willamette Futures Forum
 John Benford, Planning Director, Free Library of Philadelphia
 Arnold Biskar, former Multnomah County Commissioner
 Earl Blumenauer, former Multnomah County Commissioner
 Don Carlson, Associate Director, Metropolitan Service District
 Gordon Conable, Associate Director, Fort Vancouver Regional Library
 Wes Doak, Oregon State Librarian
 Anne Kelly Feeney, Multnomah County Auditor
 Lou Flannery, Librarian, Oregon Historical Society
 Dean Gisvold, Attorney for Multnomah County Library Board
 Pat Groseck, Public Information Officer, Public Library of Columbus and
 Franklin County, Ohio
 Azeril Kadril, Public Relations Director, Baltimore Public Library
 David Lansky, Director, Information Technology Institute
 Sarah Long, Head Librarian, Multnomah County Library
 Lowell Martin, Library Consultant
 Candace Morgan, Fort Vancouver Regional Library
 Jolinda Osborne, Board Member, Library Association of Portland
 (County-appointed) and former president, Friends of the Multnomah
 County Library
 Richard Palmer, Ohio State Library
 Tom Pfingsten, Director, Portland State University Library
 Michael Rollins, The Oregonian
 Randy Rosenthal, Administrative Assistant to Director, Free Library of
 Philadelphia
 John Schepke, Library Development Administrator, State of Oregon
 Maureen Seaman, Library Committee member, Columbia Willamette Futures Forum
 Donna Selle, Coordinator, Washington County Cooperative Library Services
 Lisa Shara, former aide, Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
 Mary Slaughter, Chairman, Citizens Policy Board, Cooperative Library
 Network of Clackamas County
 Cynthia Sturgess, President, Council of Librarians, Cooperative Library
 Network of Clackamas County
 Felicia Trader, Board Member, Library Association of Portland
 (County-appointed)
 Peter Voorhies, President, Library Association of Portland
 Lyndon A.S. "Tuck" Wilson, Jr., Attorney, Member of Multnomah County
 Library Study Commission

NOTES

NOTES