

Washington County, Oregon

Board of Commissioners

last update: January 6, 1999

MINUTES WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS DECEMBER 8, 1998

CONVENED:

10:03 a.m.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS:

Chair Linda Peters

Vice Chair Kathy Christy

Commissioner Kim Katsion

Commissioner Roy Rogers

Commissioner Andy Duyck

STAFF:

Charles D. Cameron, County Administrator

Dan Olsen, County Counsel

George McDowell, Assistant County Counsel

Alan Rappleyea, Assistant County Counsel

John Rosenberger, Director, LUT

Mark Brown, Land Development Division Manager, LUT

Bob Osip, Risk Manager, SS

Mike Conley, Chief Deputy, Sheriffs Office

Henry Alvarez, Housing & Tenant Services Manger, HA

Bill Gaffi, General Manager, USA

Terri Ewing, CPO Coordinator

Jeff Friend, Audio/Visual Specialist

Barbara Hejtmanek, Recording Secretary

PRESS:

Doug Browning, *Hillsboro Argus*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 24, 1998

1. CONSENT AGENDA

It was moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Motion - Rogers

2nd - Christy

Vote - 5-0

UNIFIED SEWERAGE AGENCY

1.a.

USA RO 98-66

Easements - Approval of Acquisition (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

1.b.

MO 98-518

Road Closure - NE Porter Road (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

1.c.

MO 98-519

Approve Funding Recommendations for Services to Children, Youth and Families (RFP 98-146P) and Award Contracts (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

SUPPORT SERVICES

1.d.

MO 98-520

Acceptance of Proposals/Authorization to Execute Agreements for Treatment Services for Sex Offenders #98121P, Hispanic Sex Offenders #98122P, Prison/Community Groups #98123P, Chronically Mentally Ill #98120P and Batterers #98119P - Department of Community Corrections (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

1.e.

MO 98-521

Acceptance of Proposal/Authorization to Execute Agreement for Emergency Medical Services Officer (98137P) (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

SERVICE DISTRICT FOR LIGHTING NO. 1-A COUNTY SERVICE DISTRICT

1.f.

SDL RO 98-40

Cornell Cove - Accept Petition, Form Service Area and Authorize Charges (Approved Under Consent Agenda)

2. ORAL COMMUNICATION (2 MINUTE OPPORTUNITY)

None.

3. PUBLIC HEARING - COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

3.a.

RO 98-221

Delegation of Certain Responsibilities to the County Administrator

Charles Cameron stated that over the past several months, there has been consideration to survey the existing practices and policies of the County with regard to responsibilities of the County Administrator and to determine what should be formally delegated to him. He noted this review has been completed, with the following recommended modifications:

- Temporary appointment of employees
- Suspension of employee with or without pay
- Employee leave of absence without pay
- Inclement weather policy
- Administration of employee and dependent benefits (including domestic partner insurance coverage)

Mr. Cameron referenced several exhibits which are contained in the agenda item and which support the Resolution and Order.

Chair Peters called attention to the fact that Section 1.6 in Exhibit A should be underlined because it is a new section. She added that Exhibits B and C are both entirely new sections.

Commissioner Christy wanted to know what opportunity employees would have to appeal a County Administrator decision they did not like.

Charles Cameron responded that employees represented by a bargaining unit may use the union to dispute the issue with the County and that non-represented employees may work through the Civil Service Commission or Article X of the Personnel Rules.

Chair Peters invited Mike Conley of the Sheriffs Office to come forward and read into the record a letter from the Sheriff.

Mike Conley extended the Sheriffs apologies to the Board for not being here today. He then read the letter, which encouraged the County Administrator to make the decision to provide equal benefits to domestic partners as Portland, Multnomah County, and Clackamas County have done. (Copy of Sheriffs letter may be found in the Meeting

File.)

Commissioner Duyck wondered if the Sheriff has considered the fiscal impact on his future budget of instituting this policy.

Mr. Conley replied that he did not think the Sheriff has given that a lot of thought and added that these numbers are not yet known.

Lois OBrien, 3785 N.W. 183, distributed a letter to the Board and read it into the record. (Letter may be found in the Meeting File.) She opposed any plan to offer Washington County benefits for domestic partners based upon her belief that the strength of any society is the value it places on God, country, and the traditional family. Ms. OBrien looked to examples in history to make the point that disregard of family values has always led to the fall of great nations. She felt that it was reprehensible that the Board is even contemplating encouraging negative behavior by taking much needed money from the paychecks of traditional families in the form of taxes and offering benefits to this special group.

Paul Vetterick, 5195 S.W. 152nd Court, Beaverton, Oregon, asked several questions: Is this initiative intended to solve a recruitment or retention problem in the workforce of the County? If so, is the number of eligible employees known? Is the cost to the taxpayer of Washington County assessed? He said that if the answer to the questions is no, then the question arises if Washington County is so flush with money that it is looking for new places to put it. Mr. Vetterick regarded this as an ill conceived proposal and questioned the definition of "domestic partner". He urged the Board to vote no against this delegation of authority.

Commissioner Duyck mentioned that there was extensive discussion of this topic at today's Worksession and that the County Administrator conveyed a definition of "domestic partner" to the Board.

Charles Cameron explained that the definition he read to the Board at Worksession is a composite based on a number of definitions used by other employers. He read this draft definition into the record:

"A domestic partnership is one consisting of two persons in which the members jointly share the same permanent residence for six months immediately preceding the date of an affidavit and intend to continue the relationship indefinitely; have a close personal relationship with one another; are not legally married to anyone; are 18 years of age or older; are not related to each other by blood in a degree of kinship closer than that would bar the marriage in the State of Oregon; were mentally competent to contract when the domestic partnership began; are each others sole domestic partner; and are jointly responsible for each others common welfare, including basic living expenses (for the purpose of the affidavit, basic living expenses mean the cost of basic food, shelter, and any other expenses of a member of the domestic partnership which are paid at least in part by a program or benefit for which the partner qualified because of domestic partnership). The individuals need not contribute equally or jointly to the cost of these expenses as long as they agree that both are responsible for the cost. The affidavit terminates upon death. The signing employee must notify the Employee Services Division within 30 days after such death or change by filing a statement of termination of

marriage or domestic partnership."

Jeff Grossman, 50 S.W. 224th, Hillsboro, Oregon, urged the Board to remove this particular provision from the agenda item being discussed and to consider it at a future date. He did not feel that the County has sufficiently publicized the hearing for this controversial matter. Mr. Grossman pointed out that no analysis has been done to provide the financial impact of the proposed action. He regarded giving benefits to domestic partners as poor public policy, partly because this policy would encourage cohabitation before marriage, which he believed would increase the divorce rate. Mr. Grossman believed that the Board is attempting to pass a controversial measure while two Commissioners terms are expiring at the end of the year. He urged the Board to let the newly-elected Commissioners address this issue in the new year.

Senator-Elect Charles Starr, 8330 S.W. River Road, Hillsboro, Oregon, said he accepted the responsibility in the last legislative session of leading the debate against homosexual rights legislation. He explained that getting domestic partner benefits is a small part of the homosexual agenda. Senator-Elect Starr believed this to be an attempt to cause society to accept homosexuality as a normative lifestyle. He could not find anything in the literature to show that sexual orientation is a condition with which one is inflicted but rather that it is a chosen lifestyle. Senator-Elect Starr stated that suffering, disease, and shortness of life are known conditions of this lifestyle. He felt it very unfortunate that the County would even consider adopting this item and thereby encouraging the homosexual lifestyle when the strength of the family is what has made the nation what it is. Senator-Elect Starr strongly urged the Board to remove this part of the agenda item.

State Senator Eileen Qutub, 11135 S.W. Partridge Loop, Beaverton, Oregon, told the Board that several bills were brought forward in the last legislative session dealing with domestic partners that were never heard due to lack of support by elected officials. In spite of that, she said, the Public Employee Benefit Board voted administratively to take this action. She speculated that the Board is moving this responsibility to the County Administrator, who cannot be voted out of office and who will take the brunt of this decision. Senator Qutub noted that two of the Commissioners are not returning to the Board in January and will not have to face the voters. She formed the opinion that the Board believes this action can therefore be taken without any repercussions. Senator Qutub regarded this as a sad commentary. She said that the County comes to the State for much funding support and reiterated a question by an earlier speaker: is the County so flush with money that it can extend benefits to domestic partners? Senator Qutub suspected that it will probably be stated that this will not cost anything but, based on past experience, she did not believe this at all.

Bill Witt, 13197 N.W. Hezen Lane, Portland, Oregon, urged the Board to vote against providing authority to the County Administrator to give taxpayer-paid benefits to domestic partners of County employees. He did not regard this as a proper use for taxpayer dollars, considering all of the unmet needs in the areas of education, senior care, energy assistance for the poor, etc. Mr. Witt observed that the Sheriffs representative today did not know how many dollars would be involved and he did not see how the Board could vote for something without knowing the fiscal impact of it. He told the Board that it should recognize and defend marriage and the family as the bedrock of the nation and culture. Mr. Witt felt that this proposal is not consistent with the values of the

citizens of this County and noted that many citizens have strong moral objections to sexual relationships outside of marriage and do not want to subsidize those relationships. He observed that this proposal has been made without prior opportunity for public discussion and debate. Mr. Witt stated that if this proposal passes, it will re-ignite the debate on the whole issue of homosexual rights, which will split Washington County apart. He urged the Board not to give this authority to the County Administrator today.

Dave Eischen, 38660 S.W. Eischen Drive, Cornelius, Oregon, requested the Board not to approve the domestic partner benefits portion of this agenda item. He believed that domestic partnerships often end up in broken relationships. On behalf of himself and his wife, Mr. Eischen read a prepared statement into the record: "We strongly feel that the County government should not put itself in the position of supporting, justifying or encouraging domestic living without the marriage commitment for the stability of the home and society itself. Tax dollars should not be used to further break down our society."

Ann Bliss, 6929 S.W. 167th Place, Beaverton, Oregon, testified for herself and her husband, Gary Bliss. (Copy of Mrs. Bliss testimony may be found in the Meeting File.) She told the Board that she and her husband have two grown sons (one of whom is gay) who are both employed in the State of Oregon. Mrs. Bliss pointed out that her gay son would not receive the same rights as his brother if he were employed by Washington County now. She argued for fairness in the workplace for all employees regardless of marital status, sexual orientation, or family unit. Mrs. Bliss stated her belief that Washington County has to offer domestic partner benefits in order to attract highly qualified employees in a competitive market. She said that most large companies in Washington County do offer domestic partner benefits.

Dean Kociemba, 1986 S.E. Hemlock Court, Hillsboro, Oregon, identified himself as the father of six children who is committed to the ideals of marriage. He regarded this as a dangerous precedent to set and warned the Board that public outcry to this action could lead to a ballot measure. Mr. Kociemba felt this proposal to be a very harsh attack on the family. He said that the Board's names would be remembered when the next election comes up.

Commissioner Katsion commented that she has been threatened before but it does not sway her opinion.

Webb Thomson, 19310 S.W. Oak Street, Aloha, Oregon, spoke against the domestic partnership addition to this agenda item. She said that her experience in the counseling field for five years has provided her with the opportunity to research this subject. Ms. Thomson reported that she has been swayed to a new position, i.e., that homosexuality is a childhood development stage that one is supposed to grow out of. She submitted a pamphlet entitled "The Other Way Out" which describes the experiences of a man and woman who walked away from the homosexual lifestyle. (Publication may be found in the Meeting File.)

George Knezevich, 18450 N.W. Heritage Parkway, Beaverton, Oregon, clarified that although an employee of Washington County, he is using his own time to testify today. He urged the Board not to promote abominable sin and to vote no on domestic partner benefits. Mr. Knezevich quoted scripture to show that homosexuality is an abomination

to God. He selected verses from Genesis and Leviticus to make his point. Mr. Knezevich referred to the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah due to their wickedness. He regarded homosexuality not as a lifestyle but rather as a deathstyle. He cautioned that we will all have a personal judgement by the Almighty and added that God belongs in government as well as all other aspects of our lives. Mr. Knezevich pleaded with the Board not to fund sin and to vote no on domestic partnerships.

The resulting audience applause was discouraged by Chair Peters.

Jean Harris, Executive Director, Basic Rights Oregon, 3203 N.E. Knott, Portland, Oregon, said her group has 85,000 donors, volunteers, and supporters in the State of Oregon. She revealed that Basic Rights Oregon has conducted an educational project that is called the Fair Workplace Projecta volunteer project of employers in the State of Oregon which is voluntarily adding sexual orientation protections to employee policies. Ms. Harris cited numerous companies which have already adopted domestic partner benefits. She said this is not a gay issue but rather an employee/employer issue. Ms. Harris wanted gay workers to have all of the rights provided to other employees. She did not regard this as an issue of morality and did not believe that money is an issue either.

Commissioner Duyck asked if Ms. Harris is referring only to gays and lesbians when she talks about domestic partners.

Ms. Harris replied that there are many types of domestic partner packages throughout the nation. She added that San Franciscos domestic partners benefit package includes heterosexuals also since it is illegal to discriminate against *any* group of people there.

Commissioner Duyck said he wished todays discussion was about covering anyone whether they are a blood relative or not because he felt this would be an easier and more honest discussion. He did not consider todays testimony as right-wing or hateful. Commissioner Duycks point was that the issue has not been thoroughly discussed. He disputed that it is a hate issue.

To the vocal chagrin of the audience, Ms. Harris told Commissioner Duyck to tell that to Matthew Shepard and his family.

Commissioner Duyck attempted to respond but Ms. Harris interrupted until Chair Peters called for an end to the debate.

Commissioner Duyck continued to want to know where the County is going with this and how far to expect the fiscal impact to go.

Pam Baker, 8705 S.W. Nimbus, Beaverton, Oregon, spoke in favor of extending benefits to domestic partners. She said that valued employees should have equal access to benefits.

Jerry Probst, 909 N.E. Lindon, Hillsboro, Oregon, stated that the policy set today does set a platform for legitimizing certain kinds of activity which are not regarded as acceptable to the general populace. He told the Board that he is a Pastor who has witnessed a deterioration over the past 30 years in the fabric of the family and the definition of what is a family. Pastor Probst did not want to see any policies that further encourage a lifestyle that causes degeneration of family relationships. He said he has witnessed families coming apart at the seams. Pastor Probst commented that it is poor

policy to do something just because everyone else is doing it. He urged the Board to instead do what is right. Pastor Probst asked the Board to examine the issue of whether double coverage would be provided to couples who are working two separate jobs and already are insured under some policy. He concluded that it is not meant as a threat to let the Board know that citizens take these decisions into consideration when voting.

Roy Barnhart (did not sign in) observed that Washington and Oregon seem to pride themselves on being liberal thinkers and wide open to new ideas. He felt that everyone deep down recognizes that homosexuality is a poor choice. Mr. Barnhart's opinion was that homosexuals should remain in the closet. He could not view this as a normal lifestyle. Mr. Barnhart asked the Board to please correct society rather than take a turn in the wrong direction.

Executive Director, Christian Coalition (no name given, did not sign in) said that his group has approximately 55 constituents in Washington County. He divulged that his homosexual cousin and his homosexual brother-in-law both died of AIDS. The Christian Coalition Director pointed out that the emotional trauma of these situations should make us encourage persons to do what is right. He asked the Board to do what is right to save our country.

John Leeper, 11160 S.W. Muirwood Drive, Portland, Oregon, encouraged the Board to pass this proposal at a future Board meeting. He recommended approving today the delegation of authority minus the portion dealing with the domestic partners benefits. Mr. Leeper said that certain issues (such as cost) could then be researched and better addressed at a later date. He voiced support for giving benefits to domestic partners.

This concluded citizen testimony.

Chair Peters asked the County Administrator to respond to issues raised during the public hearing.

Charles Cameron said that from staff's perspective, this *is* a recruitment/retention-based initiative. He said the County is responding to a number of employee requests to provide this coverage as well as responding to competitive employers. Regarding how many employees are expected to take advantage of the domestic partners benefits, Mr. Cameron said it is difficult to predict. He told the Board that Washington County now employs about 1,300 people and covers through spouse and dependent coverage approximately 3,500. Mr. Cameron speculated that perhaps a number in the 20s would apply for a program that would extend benefits to male or female spousal equivalents. He guessed that if the program was narrowed to persons of the same sex, the number would be greatly decreased. Mr. Cameron discussed the cost impact of this program. He explained that the insurance providers have insufficient data to justify any increase in the County's premiums. Mr. Cameron acknowledged that this does not mean there is no cost impact to this particular program. He explained that the cost impact will be based on the history of these 20 people; if all 20 contracted cancer, for example, it would be a very expensive proposition for the County. Mr. Cameron informed the Board that the three most costly areas of health coverage are: premature babies, cases of cancer, and heart conditions. He related that AIDS has not been a major factor in the cost estimation for the following reasons: 1) The number of people who may be gay or lesbian who would join the program would be limited which would consequently limit the exposure, and 2)

There are unfortunately not a lot of treatments for AIDS. Mr. Cameron reiterated that it is difficult to predict what cost would be associated with the proposal but it is expected to be small.

Charles Cameron said that if this delegation of authority is approved by the Board, the following issues will need to be examined:

- Definition of domestic partnerships
- Determination of whether or not dependents of domestic partners are eligible for benefits
- Proof of domestic partnerships
- Determination of what benefits would be included
- Taxation associated with receipt of benefits
- Implementation date
- Employee communication

Charles Cameron acknowledged that there is a bias to provide benefits to domestic partners if answers to the questions fall the right way. He stated that he would then initiate a pilot project, wherein coverage would be provided for a period of time. Mr. Cameron said that after a year or two, actual costs could be examined and a final determination made as to whether or not to continue the program.

Commissioner Duyck wondered what the chances would be of terminating benefits if there was an unfavorable review of the costs following the pilot project period.

Mr. Cameron recognized that there would have to be extraordinary reasons to terminate perpetual benefits. He said he did not know how many would apply for and take advantage of the benefit program. Mr. Cameron stated that there have been arguments that any information about a public employee is public information. He indicated that some employees might not take advantage of the program for fear that the County would be forced to reveal that information. Mr. Cameron told the Board that one of the elements of the Countys legislative agenda next year will be to provide more privacy protections for public employees, which may affect employee concerns. Regarding the double coverage issue, he explained that this is to the Countys advantage because the medical costs are divided between two employers.

Chair Peters thanked audience members for communicating from the heart about this issue. She noticed that a lot of people were speaking from their own faith. Chair Peters said that her vote for this proposal stems from her faith, which is different than that expressed by a lot of the persons who spoke today. She commented that our culture is not just multi-cultural, but also multi-belief. Chair Peters said that a lot of people find that ones belief in and understanding of God changes over a lifetime. She related that her personal guidance says that it is of primary importance that a public agency treat its employees and citizens fairly. Chair Peters said her head tells her that it is appropriate in an organization like Washington County for personnel decisions and benefit packages to be the responsibility of the County Administrator. She stated that it has been her effort for the years she has served on the Board to improve the level of fairness that is exhibited to all employees including offering the same sorts of benefit packages to employees without regard to gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or current living arrangements. Chair Peters was sorry it was not possible to vote on this issue years

ago; she would have been happy to do that. She recognized that people want to do what is right but have different definitions of what that is. Chair Peters assured the audience that the Board will use their hearts and heads to arrive at a considered decision of what is right for Washington County as an organization and a community.

Commissioner Duyck acknowledged that everyone does have different religious beliefs but noted that everyone shares the element of common sense. He objected to the domestic partner portion of this agenda item based on the common sense issue that you do not make a major policy decision without all the necessary information.

Commissioner Duyck wanted to know how far this policy would go and what it would cost. He pointed out that the definition of domestic partner is not even included in the agenda packet. Commissioner Duyck observed that there is nothing in the agenda item to limit the County Administrator to any semblance of order. He recognized that the County Administrator has done a very good job in the past with decisions and said he does have a lot of faith in him. However, Commissioner Duyck questioned if it is good policy to give an administrator an open-ended decision on employee benefits. He continued to request that the item be continued until all these questions are answered. Commissioner Duyck based his argument at this time on fiscal responsibility.

It was moved to approve the delegation of certain responsibilities to the County Administrator excluding the domestic partner provision and to have more information and public input before making the decision on the domestic partner provision.

Motion - Duyck

2nd - Rogers

Vote - 2-3

Nay - Peters, Katsion, Christy

The motion failed.

Commissioner Christy could not support the motion. She related that she has spoken to a variety of people about this issue, including a group of ministers. Commissioner Christy said that you find many different opinions when talking to ministers of different faiths. She did not regard what goes on in someones bedroom to be her business.

Commissioner Christy expressed a deep respect for County Administrator Charles Cameron and his decision-making ability. She commented that the financial implications of the inclement weather policy would be far greater than those associated with the provision of domestic partner benefits.

It was moved to provide the County Administrator with the authority for the following:

- Temporary appointment of employees
- Suspension of employee with or without pay
- Employee leave of absence without pay
- Inclement weather policy
- Administration of employee and dependent benefits (including domestic partner insurance coverage)

Motion - Katsion

2nd - Christy

Vote - 3-2

Nay - Duyck, Rogers

Dan Olsen clarified that the temporary appointment of employees was deleted and does not appear in the exhibits because there were some legal issues with that.

Commissioner Rogers thought the testimony regarding whether this is a recruiting or a retention issue raised a good point. He objected to the domestic partners benefits portion of the item because there is a much larger definition of domestic partner to consider. Commissioner Rogers called attention to this countrys history of taking care of the sick, disadvantaged, and the poor regardless of gender or religious preferences. He noted that preventive coverage (rather than catastrophic) is always better for the employer and added that it makes some sense to have insurance coverage that all Americans can afford. Commissioner Rogers said that since one has the option to choose a sexual preference, perhaps who pays for that insurance ought to be an option. He regarded insurance coverage as not only appropriate but necessary. Commissioner Rogers noted that he did not hear today the option of who should pay for this insurance, other than the County. He suggested that maybe the County ought to provide some opportunity not for the public to support others lifestyles but for those who choose alternate lifestyles to pay for it themselves. Commissioner Rogers hoped the County would look at who pays for the insurance coverage, how it might be implemented, and if there is a broader coverage for blood relatives that could be purchased by employees.

4. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

4.a.

MO 98-516

Board Interpretation of Land Use Ordinance

Mark Brown stated that this item represents a request on the part of the Director for the Board to subsequently render an interpretation on two issues: one having to do with when a permit expires and the other with what the Boards intent was when Ordinance 479 was adopted relative to taking the Board out of the land use hearings process. He asked the Board to direct staff to come back with an interpretation or several interpretations for consideration at a subsequent date. Mr. Brown believed that staff could have this item ready on December 22, 1998.

Commissioner Christy asked staff to come back also with an idea of how many cases would be involved, per todays Worksession discussion.

Alan Rappleyea cautioned that specific details about any one case should be avoided at todays meeting.

Chair Peters advised the audience that the decision being made today is only whether or not to schedule this on December 22nd for interpretation purposes.

Robert Palmer, 1300 S.W. Fifth, Portland, Oregon, said he would like to talk about the Boards interpretation of the statute. He saw a fundamental problem with the statute generically not with respect to any individual case or situation. Mr. Palmer stated that

the statute provides in a number of relevant parts that a permit expires two years from the date of issuance unless one of three conditions is met: 1) withdrawal, 2) application for extension, or 3) commencement of the development. He said that the statute also provides that in the event of an approval and a subsequent appeal, that timeframe continues to run during the course of the appeal. Mr. Palmer reported that the appellate court dockets are such that it can take five years for a "granted" and two years for a "denied". As an attorney, he believed that this amounts to an unconstitutional taking of the development right of the developer whose project is approved by operation of the law without any due compensation. Mr. Palmer added that this places a person in an untenable situation.

Chair Peters interpreted Mr. Palmers remarks to indicate that he supports the Board holding a hearing about this at a later date.

It was moved to schedule the interpretation as a future agenda item.

Motion - Rogers

2nd - Christy

Vote - 5-0

6. HOUSING AUTHORITY - A COUNTY SERVICE DISTRICT

6.a.

HA RO 98-12

Declaration of Necessity for Preservation of the Villager
Apartments

This item was taken out of order in order to allow Housing Authority staff to get back to their offices in a more timely manner.

There was a motion to approve the Resolution and Order authorizing the Authority to acquire the Villager, Vanrich, and Parkside apartments through condemnation procedures.

Motion - Rogers

2nd - Katsion

Vote - 5-0

5. BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

5.a.

MO 98-517

1998-99 County Regional Arts & Culture Council (RACC)
Funding Proposal

This proposal was brought to the Board by Chair Peters.

The Chair reviewed that the County has for some years participated as a member of the Regional Arts & Culture Council (RACC) and contributed money to it out of the General Fund or by other means. She recalled that the County last year rather than use General

Fund moneymade an arrangement with the Washington County Visitors Association but that this did not yield an amount that was sufficient to pay for RACCs operation of a grant program which gives money to arts organizations in Washington County for a number of the things that are important parts of our community. Chair Peters invited a brief presentation from three members in the audience.

Pam Baker, Washington County appointee to the Regional Arts & Culture Council, stated her belief that it is very important for Washington County to retain its minimal participation in RACC and, over time, to increase this support. She urged the Boards support for Chair Peters recommended contingency allocation for this year, with the hope that another approach can be found in ensuing years.

Janie Scott, Beaverton Arts Commission, thanked the Board for its past support. She said it is very important that the City of Beaverton sees Washington County as a partner in the arts as well as Metro and the Regional Arts and Culture Council. Ms. Scott explained that because of Board support, the Beaverton Arts Commission is able to get private dollars and City of Beaverton dollars in support of the arts. She invited the Board to a Holiday Open House at the City of Beaverton this evening from 5 to 8 p.m. Ms. Scott added that the citys first collection of Beaverton Visual Chronicles will be unveiled and on display tonight. She reported that this project was paid for with RACC grant through Washington County money. (Printed invitation may be found in the Meeting File.)

Alberto Raffles (name is misspelled; did not sign in) identified himself as the one at RACC who oversees the grant programs. In addition, he said that RACC has involvement with schools in Washington County through the Arts and Education Program. Mr. Raffles listed and discussed several grants which have been a success in the community. He told the Board that RACC has so far identified as many as 500 individual artists in Washington County and over 100 arts organization.

Commissioner Christy said she is willing to support funding for the arts but is concerned about where the money would come from, particularly since the recent ballot measure did not pass. She voiced support for Commissioner Rogers suggestion during Worksession that the Board fund RACC with \$25,000 now and then take a look at contingency when the County gets its mid-year report on finances. Commissioner Christy was very concerned about how much money is in the contingency now and what it will be used for.

Commissioner Rogers described himself as a supporter of arts programs and the legacy the arts leave. However, he did not favor the continuing funding of any organization and said he will move to amend the budgetary process this year so that no one is given ongoing support. Commissioner Rogers was willing to take applications for support and to provide continuing funding but not to assign a permanent status to these gifts.

It was moved to contribute \$25,000 to the Regional Arts & Culture Council out of the 1998-99 budget and to consider giving another \$25,000 depending upon the results of the mid-year budget review.

Motion - Rogers
2nd - Christy

Vote - 4-1
Nay - Duyck

OFF DOCKET - BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MO 98-522

Appointment to the Fair Board

It was moved to appoint Kathy Christy to fill the immediate vacancy on the Fair Board with appointment effective immediately through January 31, 1999. (On January 5, 1999, the Board will announce the appointments for District 1 and District 3.)

Motion - Rogers
2nd - Katsion
Vote - 5-0

Commissioner Rogers noted that this vacancy is due to the untimely death of John Thomas. He hopes to reconsider appointing Kathy Christy in January to the remainder of John Thomas term, which will run through December 31, 1999.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION (10 MINUTE OPPORTUNITY)

None.

8. BOARD ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Rogers reminded everyone that the December 15, 1998 Board Meeting will be an evening meeting, which is a departure from the usual Board schedule.

Commissioner Duyck pointed out an error on the Countys web page, which indicates that the December 15th meeting is canceled.

9. ADJOURNMENT: 12:02 p.m.

Motion - Katsion
2nd - Duyck
Vote - 5-0

MINUTES APPROVED THIS _____ DAY _____ 1998

RECORDING SECRETARY

CHAIR

For more information

or comment:

E-Mail: cao@co.washington.or.us

or **write to:** Washington County
Administrative Offices
155 N. First Avenue, Suite 300
Hillsboro, OR 97124

or **Telephone:** 503-648-8681

or **Facsimile:** 503-693-4545

or other phone numbers