



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ROOM 606, COUNTY COURTHOUSE
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR • 248-3308
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 • 248-5220
GARY HANSEN • DISTRICT 2 • 248-5219
RICK BAUMAN • DISTRICT 3 • 248-5217
SHARRON KELLEY • DISTRICT 4 • 248-5213
CLERK'S OFFICE • 248-3277

AGENDA

MEETINGS OF THE MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

FOR THE WEEK OF

JANUARY 28 - FEBRUARY 1, 1991

- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 8:30 AM - Informal Briefing. . . Page 2
- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 9:00 AM - Agenda ReviewPage 2
- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Planning Items. . . .Page 2
- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Public Hearing. . . .Page 3
- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 12:00 PM - Joint Meeting. . . .Page 3
Multnomah County Sheriff's Auditorium
12240 NE Glisan
- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 2:00 PM - Joint Meeting. . . . Page 4
Multnomah County Sheriff's Conference Room 104
12240 NE Glisan
- Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 7:00 PM - Public Hearing. . . .Page 4
King Facility, Cafeteria
4815 NE 7th Avenue
- Wednesday, January 30, 1991 - 9:00 AM - Executive Session .Page 4
- Thursday, January 31, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Formal Meeting . . .Page 4
- Thursday, January 31, 1991 - 7:30 PM - Public Hearing . . .Page 6
Multnomah County Gresham Library
385 NW Miller

Thursday Meetings of the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners are recorded and can be seen at the following times:

- Thursday, 10:00 PM, Channel 11 for East and West side subscribers
- Friday, 6:00 PM, Channel 27 for Paragon Cable (Multnomah East) subscribers
- Saturday 12:00 PM, Channel 21 for East Portland and East County subscribers

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 8:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

INFORMAL BRIEFING

1. Overview on the Impact of Ballot Measure 5 on Assessment and Taxation, Including Related Budget Assumptions. Presented by Janice Druian
-

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 9:00 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

AGENDA REVIEW

2. Informal Review of Formal Agenda of January 31, 1991
-

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

PLANNING ITEMS

The Following January 7, 1991 Decisions of the Planning Commission are Reported to the Board for Acceptance and Implementation by Board Order:

3. PR 1-91 APPROVE amendment of the Powellhurst Community Land Use Map, changing the described property from high density residential to neighborhood commercial;
ZC 1-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, amendment of Sectional Zoning Map #406, changing the described property from HR1, high density residential district to NC, neighborhood commercial district;
REFUND APPROVE request for refund of filing fee for OP 1-90, an application filed in 1990, based upon written request dated November 26, 1990, all for property located at 12630 SE DIVISION STREET.
4. PR 2-91 APPROVE requested Comprehensive Plan Map change from multiple use agriculture to rural center;
ZC 2-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, amendment of Sectional Zoning Map #708, changing described property from MUA-20, multiple use agriculture to RC, rural center and from RC, rural center to MUA-20, multiple use agriculture;
CU 1-91 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, conditional use permit to allow for fleet vehicle parking for a waste disposal business, all for property located at 36132 SE DODGE PARK BOULEVARD.

The Following January 7, 1991 Decisions of the Planning Commission are Reported to the Board for Acknowledgement by the Presiding Officer:

5. CS 8-90 APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, expansion of the Community Service Designation onto the subject property to allow its development as a parking and training area;
SEC 20-90 APPROVE a Significant Environmental Concern permit for the project, all for property located at 36930 EAST CROWN POINT HIGHWAY.
6. CS 3-86a APPROVE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, change in zone designation from RR, rural residential to RR, C-S, community service to allow development of a three million gallon water reservoir, for property located at 4280 NW NORTH ROAD.
-

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing for the Purpose of Taking Testimony on Proposed Tourism Projects in Multnomah County. In Anticipation of 1991-93 Lottery Funds, Multnomah County is Generating a Preliminary List of Tourism Projects which would be Eligible for Lottery Funds.

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 12:00 PM

Multnomah County Sheriff's Auditorium
12240 NE Glisan
Portland, Oregon

MULTNOMAH COUNTY JOINT MEETING

Brown Bag Meeting of Elected Officials from Multnomah County Jurisdictions to Discuss Effects of Ballot Measure 5

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 2:00 PM

Multnomah County Sheriff's Conference Room 104
12240 NE Glisan
Portland, Oregon

JOINT MEETING

Meeting Between the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners and the Gresham City Council to Discuss Road Issues. (Immediately Following 12:00 PM Meeting.)

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 7:00 PM

King Facility, Cafeteria
4815 NE 7th Avenue
Portland, Oregon

PUBLIC HEARING

Update by Multnomah County Budget Staff Followed by Public Testimony and Input on Proposed Budget Reductions Associated with Ballot Measure 5

Wednesday, January 30, 1991 - 9:00 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners will meet in Executive Session for the Purpose of Labor Negotiator Consultation

Thursday, January 31, 1991 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

FORMAL MEETING

CONSENT CALENDAR
NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- C-1 In the Matter of Commissioner Committee Assignments for 1991
- C-2 In the Matter of the Appointment of Bernard A. Giusto to the Metropolitan Human Relations Commission. Term Expires 12/91

JUSTICE SERVICES
SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- C-3 Ratification of Intergovernmental Between the Oregon Traffic Safety Commission and Multnomah County to Provide Enhanced DUII/DWS Enforcement

LIBRARY SERVICES

- C-4 In the Matter of a Recommendation for Board Approval of the Art Collection Policy for the Multnomah County Library

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
AGING SERVICES AND JUVENILE JUSTICE DIVISIONS

- C-5 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Portland Public School District No. 1J and Multnomah County to Provide Services to High Risk Juvenile Offenders Placed at the Genesis School

REGULAR AGENDA
PUBLIC CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

(Recess as the Board of County Commissioners and convene as the Public Contract Review Board)

- R-1 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the State of Oregon for the Continued Use of State of Oregon Price Agreements to Purchase Goods and Services at Volume Discount

(Recess as the Public Contract Review Board and reconvene as the Board of County Commissioners)

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- R-2 RESOLUTION in the Matter of the Adoption of Rules of Procedure for the Conduct of Board Meetings and Repealing all Prior Rules

- R-3 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Portland to Fund the Urban Services Program for the Period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- R-4 PUBLIC HEARING in the Matter of a Request for Approval to Transfer Five Tax Foreclosed Properties to the Housing Authority of Portland Pursuant to the Provisions of ORS 456 and Multnomah County Ordinance No. 672

- R-5 RESOLUTION Adopting the Incident Command System Portion of the National Interagency Incident Management System for Development of Emergency Response Plans and an Emergency Management and Operations Plan for the County

- R-6 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Cooperative Assistance Agreement Between Multnomah County, the City of Gresham, the City of Portland, the City of Fairview, the City of Troutdale and the City of Wood Village to Provide Public Works Equipment Quickly to Mitigate an Emergency or Disaster Situation

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISIONS

- R-7 Budget Modification DHS #20 Requesting Authorization to Transfer \$32,977 in Salary and Program Savings to the Social Services Division to Fund Start Up Costs Incurred by the Mental Health Provider Community
-

Thursday, January 31, 1991 - 7:30 PM

Multnomah County Gresham Library
385 NW Miller
Gresham, Oregon

PUBLIC HEARING

Update by Multnomah County Budget Staff Followed by Public Testimony and Input on Proposed Budget Reductions Associated with Ballot Measure 5

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
REGARDING PROPOSED MULTNOMAH COUNTY
BUDGET REDUCTIONS

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners will hold a series of public meetings for the purpose of taking public testimony and input on proposed budget reductions associated with Ballot Measure 5.

The public hearings will begin with an update by the County's budget staff followed by public testimony on:

Tuesday, January 29, 1991 - 7:00 PM
King Facility, Cafeteria
4815 NE 7th Avenue
Portland, Oregon

Thursday, January 31, 1991 - 7:30 PM
Multnomah County Gresham Library
385 NW Miller
Gresham, Oregon

Tuesday, February 5, 1991 - 7:30 PM
Peninsula Neighbors Coalition
St. Johns Community Center, Auditorium
8427 N Central
Portland, Oregon

Wednesday, February 6, 1991 - 7:30 PM
East Portland District Coalition
Old Russellville School
220 SE 102nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon

All interested persons may attend the hearings and will be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard.

DATE SUBMITTED 1/9/91

(For Clerk's Use) JAN 30 1991

Meeting Date _____

Agenda No. 9:00 Am

REQUEST FOR PLACEMENT ON THE AGENDA

Subject: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Informal Only* 1/30/91
(Date)

Formal Only _____
(Date)

DEPARTMENT DGS DIVISION Labor Relations

CONTACT Ellen Ullrick TELEPHONE X2340

*NAME(s) OF PERSON MAKING PRESENTATION TO BOARD Kenneth Upton

BRIEF SUMMARY Should include other alternatives explored, if applicable, and clear statement of rationale for the action requested.

Request executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(D)(d) to discuss labor negotiations.

(IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE)

ACTION REQUESTED:

INFORMATION ONLY PRELIMINARY APPROVAL POLICY DIRECTION RATIFICATION

INDICATE THE ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON AGENDA 1 1/2 hours

IMPACT:

PERSONNEL

FISCAL/BUDGETARY

General Fund

Other _____

SIGNATURES: Kenneth Upton (ELU)

DEPARTMENT HEAD, ELECTED OFFICIAL, or COUNTY COMMISSIONER: A. Alexander ⁶²

BUDGET / PERSONNEL _____ / _____

COUNTY COUNSEL (Ordinances, Resolution, Agreements, Contracts) _____

OTHER _____

(Purchasing, Facilities Management, etc.)

NOTE: If requesting unanimous consent, state situation requiring emergency action on back.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON
1991 JAN - 9 PM 3:43

Confidential
Briefing Outline
Executive Session -
Collective Bargaining
Between Multnomah County
and Local 88, AFSCME
January 17, 1990

1. Duration.
2. Wage Increase FY 1991-92.
 - A. Costing Data.
 - B. Elements of Decision.
 - Budget - Sources of Personnel Savings.
 - CPI.
 - Salary survey.
 - Salary Increases elsewhere.
3. Wage Increases FY 1992-93 and 1993-94 (Assuming three year contract.)
4. Alternative Sources of Personnel Savings.
 - A. Furlough.
 - B. Freeze on amortized contribution to retiree health & welfare fund. (Article 11, p. 33).
5. Benefits. (January 30, Discussion).
 - A. The Problem of Cost.
 - Cost sharing alternatives.
 - Cost containment, e.g., managed care.
 - B. The Problem of Content.
 - Dual spouse coverage.
 - Domestic partners.
 - Preventative care.
 - Catastrophic:
 - Long Term Disability Income Protection.
 - Lack of Medical "cap".
 - C. Early Retirement.

6. Flexibility to Respond to Environment.

A. External.

- Contracting out - Article 19, p. 75.
- Intergovernmental Agreement, p. 76.
- Use of volunteers.

B. Internal.

- Temporary employees (Union Agenda). Article 3.1 a. p. 4
- Scheduling language (less than forty (40) hour a week, or irregularly scheduled, employees).
- Work Assignment. Article 22. 2. b., p. 94
- Meal Periods. Article 13.5, p. 45
- Voluntary Overtime. Article 14.6.e, p. 59

7. Embarrassment

- Holiday Pay - Article 7, Section 3, p. 17.
- Overtime
 - 2nd day - Article 14, Section 6.b., p. 59.
 - 2nd weekend - Article 14, Section 6.e., p. 59

8. "Minor" and/or Operational and Technical Issue.

(Examples only, excluding topics discussed above)

- Article 9 - Parental sick leave.
- Article 10 - Union Elected Officials.
- Article 14 - Possession of a phone as a condition of employment.
- Article 17 - Appealing an oral reprimand to the Employment Relations Board.
- Article 21 - Bumping of Union members by classified exempt employees.
- Article 24 - Local work rules.
- Addendum G - Auto allowance and compensation.

9. Library: Part 2.

- 7-1/2 hour versus 8 hour work day.
- Monday holidays in an organization largely closed on Monday.
- Flexible scheduling: split shifts, etc.

10. The Process.

- Time frame.
- Structure.

977LR

ATTACHMENTS

- ATTACHMENT 1: The \$4 Million Continuing Savings Approach
- ATTACHMENT 2: Chief Spokesperson Basic Approach
- ATTACHMENT 3: Domestic Partner Issues - Multnomah County, Oregon
- ATTACHMENT 4: Advantages and Disadvantages of Caps Placed on Employer Contributions - Multnomah County, Oregon
- ATTACHMENT 5: Ma/Pa Coverage Issues - Multnomah County, Oregon
- ATTACHMENT 6: Memorandum from Murray to Board re: Early Retirement Incentives
- ATTACHMENT 7: Memorandum from Ullrick to Upton re: Employee contributions to medical benefits in the private sector
- ATTACHMENT 8: Multnomah County Clerical Series: Comparison of FY 1989 Hourly Wages with General Wage Survey Data for the Local Area
- ATTACHMENT 9: Comparison of Rates of Advancement Through Wage Ranges Among Local Public Sector Employers for Classifications Comparable to Office Assistant 2
- ATTACHMENT 10: Per Cent Multnomah County Wages for Office Assistant 2 are Higher than Local Public Employer Wages for Comparable Classifications at Entry to Seven Years of Service

The \$4 Million Continuing
Savings Approach

<u>Option 1</u>	<u>Option 2</u>	<u>Option 3</u>
1st Year Freeze Wages (\$2,425,000)	1st Year Freeze Wage	1st Year Freeze Wage
1st Year Freeze Steps (\$582,000)	1st Year Freeze Steps	2nd Year 3.05% Deduction from CPI Formula)
1st Year Freeze H & W Contributions (\$895,000)	2nd Year 1.65 % Deduction from CPI Formula	
<hr/>		
Continuing Savings	Continuing Savings	Continuing Savings
1st Year <u>\$3,902,000</u>	1st Year <u>\$3,107,000</u>	1st Year <u>\$2,425,000</u>
No "One Time Only Savings Bridge" Necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge Savings \$795,000 - Required Furlough - Retiree Insurance Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge Savings 1,477,000 - Required Furlough - Retiree Insurance Fund

1021L/KU/ljd

Chief Spokesperson
Basic Approach

January 30, 1991

(Note:

- First Year
FY 91-92 Wage freeze only. Voluntary furlough if helpful.)
- Second Year
FY 92-93 (CPI Minus Increase in Health and Welfare which exceeds percentage which would result from CPI formula.
Min. 2 - Max. 5)
- Third Year
FY 93-94 (CPI Minus Increase in Health and Welfare which exceeds percentage which would result from CPI formula.
Min. 2 - Max. 5.5)

- Health and Welfare (Example only)

In the term of the first year of the contract, a mechanism would be implemented to involve the County and Union in further exploring possible amendments to address such possible new benefits as preventative care, better catastrophic coverage, and _____, as well as cost control mechanisms. The cost of any new benefit, which would be mutually agreed upon as reasonably determined by the County, would be further deducted from the second year wage increase.

- Flexibility, Clarification, Embarrassments, "Minor" Issues:

Goal of a significant gain in these dimensions:

- Initial Board direction on matters which it does not wish pursued or which it definitely does wish pursued.
- Later briefing on status of such issues once we are well engaged with the Union.

1022LR/KU/1b

Domestic Partner Issues — MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

Q What are the legal, fiscal and administrative ramifications of allowing employees to cover domestic partners on their employer provided health insurance?

Currently, there are only a handful of employers that offer health care benefits to unmarried partners. The Cities of Laguna Beach, Santa Cruz, Berkeley and Seattle are a few of the public employers that allow the coverage of domestic partners. As there are very few employers who allow this, and they have been doing it for a short time, there is no data available that provides meaningful information as to the financial impact of this policy.

It is safe to say, however, that anytime you allow more people to be covered under the plan there will be increased cost. In this instance, the magnitude of that cost is very difficult to measure.

Since this issue is understandably very important to lesbians and gay men, the AIDS issue cannot be ignored. At this time, however, there are still no facts as to whether employers are experiencing a higher incidence of AIDS claims as a result of the coverage of domestic partners.

There are administrative concerns that also need to be addressed when considering coverage for domestic partners. Some of the unanswered questions that come to mind when considering this issue are stated below:

- What defines a true domestic partner?
- When does a relationship become a true domestic partnership?
- When does the partnership end?
- How are dependents of domestic partners covered?
- How is COBRA applied?

The City of San Francisco is trying to address these issues by the introduction and passage of an ordinance that allows gays and lesbian couples to register domestic partners. The ordinance (Proposition K) actually was a watered down version of an earlier defeated measure that would have required the extension of employer provided insurance benefits to domestic partners.

The ordinance, which may, in fact, open the possibility for non-married partners to obtain benefits, does create a way to recognize intimate committed relationships, including those of lesbian and gay men who otherwise are denied the right to identify the partners with which they share their lives.

The initiative says that any unmarried couples, including heterosexuals, can submit a declaration of domestic partnership to the county clerk. By doing so, each partner would be responsible for the other's financial obligations. Dissolving the partnership requires a separate petition and individuals who do dissolve a relationship could not form another partnership for at least six months.

The City of Laguna Beach has addressed the administrative issue by requiring a couple to sign an affidavit stating that the partners have lived together for at least six months, intend to live together indefinitely, are not related by blood, are mentally competent and will notify the City if the circumstances of the relationship change.

Another area that needs to be considered is the tax consequence of such a policy. The Internal Revenue Service has issued a private letter ruling (PLR 9034048) which essentially states that whether a non-spouse cohabitant will satisfy IRC Section 152 definition of a dependent and qualify as a dependent for purposes of Section 105 and 106 income tax exclusions, depends on all facts and circumstances of each individual case, including not only the source of the cohabitant's support, but also the application of the laws of the state of residence governing the legality of interpersonal relationships.

Oregon law does not recognize common-law marriages, except for those where the relationship commenced in and was recognized by a state that considers common-law marriages legal.

In essence, this IRS ruling is stating that even though an employer in the state of Oregon allows coverage to be extended to domestic partners, it may, in fact, not be able to do so on a tax favored status. If this is the case, premiums paid for an employee's domestic partner may have to be included on the employee's W-2 form. If the County does elect to allow domestic partners and does not properly report income on the W-2 forms, the penalties for failure to properly disclose could be substantial. This also could create an array of problems for the employees as they may have to go back and file amended tax returns. Your entire plan could also be disqualified from exemption under Sections 105 and 106.

This tax issue, however, is very vague and since we are not attorneys and do not provide legal advice, we strongly urge the County to get a legal opinion regarding this issue before proceeding in this area.

As far as the insurance companies are concerned, we do not know of any that would allow coverage for domestic partners. We have asked the following carriers if they would allow coverage for partners and they all said no:

- Kaiser
- Good Health Plan
- Blue Cross/Blue Shield
- ODS Health Plans

Since the County's plan with ODS is self-insured, ODS would not really care if the County was to extend coverage since ODS is not assuming risk. They did, however, state that they would not extend coverage on an insured plan. This could create problems for the County should they wish to terminate the ASO plan.

The concept of granting unmarried couples spousal benefits continues to be a very controversial topic. Proponents of this type of policy state that the American family is changing and this type of policy recognizes that and treats all employees more fairly. They also state that the family unit includes lesbian and gay couples, unmarried heterosexuals and single parents and those policies should reflect the family unit as it is really structured in America.

Opponents of this policy say that it is an attack on marriage and the traditional family. They use terms such as a "financial time bomb", "legal quagmire" and "anti-family".

While we recognize the fact that the American family is changing and there are legitimate domestic relationships where coverage probably should be extended, we are, however, against the idea of extending coverage to domestic partners.

We hold this opinion primarily because of the administrative, tax, and fiscal impact that we believe it will have on an employer's program. We believe extending coverage to non-spouse cohabitants is, in fact, adding immeasurable risk exposure that would be very difficult to control administratively. We believe this process will open up the plan to an unlimited array of people and ultimately will be very costly. We also believe it is in the best interest to wait and see if the IRS comes out with clarification as to the tax status of such a policy.

Cities use self-insurance for domestic-partner coverage

By JOANNE WOJCIK

■ LOS ANGELES — Shunned by insurers fearing an onslaught of AIDS-related claims, city and county governments are turning to self-insurance to fund health coverage for the domestic partners of their employees.

Several West Coast public jurisdictions, including West Hollywood, Calif., Berkeley, Calif., Seattle and Santa Cruz County, Calif., have passed legislation extending health benefits to their employees' domestic partners. The city of San Francisco recently released a study of the cost of such benefits.

Medical insurers — which evidently assumed "domestic partnerships" is a subterfuge for homosex-

ual couples and could lead to costly claims related to acquired immune deficiency syndrome — refused to underwrite such policies.

"We were turned down by 18 companies," said Janet L. Murphy, executive assistant and personnel officer in the West Hollywood Department of Administrative Services.

When all efforts failed to find a commercial insurer, the brokers suggested the city contract with a health-maintenance organization, explained Kevin M. Fridlington, senior administrative analyst.

"But that option wasn't desirable because it would disrupt already established doctor-patient relationships," he said. In HMOs, enrollees are required to use physicians and hospitals who are members of the

network to receive coverage.

As a last resort, the city turned to self-insurance for its 133 employees.

Under the plan, the city pays 100% of employees' health-care expenditures up to \$20,000 per year. A stop-loss policy then kicks in to pay non-domestic partners' claims above that level.

However, because the city has a large number of homosexual employees, it could not find similar stop-loss coverage for domestic partners, and their coverage is capped at \$20,000, Ms. Murphy said.

What is ironic is that while the insurers assumed domestic partners involve homosexuals — a high-risk group — the majority of the city employees who have signed up for the coverage are heterosexual couples, Ms. Murphy observed.

Seattle and Santa Cruz County, Calif., also self-insure their domestic partner programs.

So far, 194 of the 318 eligible Seattle city employees have enrolled in the plan, underwritten by the city, said Benefits Manager Sally Fox.

The city of Berkeley, Calif., had no trouble adding domestic partners to its health-care plan, which is underwritten by two area HMOs, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan Inc. and HEALS, the Personal Care Physician Health Plan, said Ray Bolerjack, senior personnel analyst.

Santa Cruz County's employee health plan had been self-insured before the extension of benefits, so no change was necessary, said Pruitt Tully, employee relations manager.

Mr. Tully said the county is treating the benefits as taxable income to the employee — partners are not considered dependents by Internal Revenue Service — until it hears otherwise.

Benefit managers for the cities of Seattle, Berkeley and West Hollywood say they are treating the benefits as tax-deductible.

As if to avoid the question entirely, a report by San Francisco's Task Force on Family Policy recommends that employees pay the full cost of health-care coverage for their domestic partners.

For most of these jurisdictions,

the decision to extend the coverage was made in response to employee requests.

Some of these requests were matter-of-course, such as in the case of the city of West Hollywood, whose charter provides for equal treatment of homosexual couples.

Others, such as Seattle, tackled the issue only after a complaint was filed under the Fair Employment Practices Act.

There, the Human Rights Department last fall ruled that the city was violating its own anti-discrimination laws by not providing coverage to unmarried partners, Ms. Fox said.

While all the cities that offer domestic partner coverage require employees to file an affidavit before receiving coverage, the city of West Hollywood also requires employees to register their domestic partners in a manner similar to applying for a marriage license, explained Ms. Murphy.

In fact, the city offers domestic partner licenses to all of its residents.

In an effort to help other municipalities learn from its experience, the city of West Hollywood is developing a network of public entities offering coverage for domestic partnerships.

It is important that officials "know what they're doing before they do it," said Ms. Murphy.

The transition process, particularly negotiations with health insurance carriers, is time-consuming.

"Give it a year," she advised. "Don't try to do it in three months like we did."

She also advises that one government official be assigned exclusively to the task of setting up a self-insured domestic-partner plan.

"City & State"

July 30 - Aug 12, 1990

pays the lesser of the regular plan benefits or the total charges less the Medicare payment.

Design changes planned or being considered

During 1988 and 1989, 55% of the surveyed employers modified their retiree medical plans to affect the existing retiree group, while 70% implemented changes that were prospective only. Most prevalent changes were increasing the retiree out-of-pocket costs by raising deductibles or retiree contributions for the retirees and their dependents. One-fourth introduced utilization management for current retirees, future retirees, or future hires.

Of those considering changes within the next two years, 63% indicate that at least one change to be implemented will affect the existing retiree group. Anticipated changes will extend the recent plan design modifications; for example, 62% will increase the retiree payment for single or dependent coverage. More than 30% of the employers are considering tying the retiree contribution or the level of benefits to the length of service of the retiree.

Modifications that employers are definitely *not* considering include eliminating the plan (63%), having the retirees pay the entire cost (53%), and providing a flat dollar amount so retirees may pay for their own medical benefits (39%).

□ References: ¶ 10,140 and 53,110.

.05 *Survey of Retiree Medical Benefits*. For more information, contact Catherine Schmidt, Hewitt Associates, 100 Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL 60069, (708) 295-5000.

¶ 3170

Employers Must Decide If Domestic Partner Equals Spouse

Whether an employee's domestic partner is entitled to health and death benefits as the employee's "spouse" is a difficult issue employers will face with increasing frequency. Society has been expanding its definition of spouse, for example, through state and local housing laws that define "domestic partnership" to include a variety of living arrangements. Employers must know up front whether those arrangements qualify the partners for benefits.

Test case

A suit filed in New York federal court in August by the lesbian partner of a long-time AT&T employee who died of cancer illustrates the dilemma (.05). The lawsuit appears to be the first federal suit of its type filed anywhere in the country.

According to the complaint, the AT&T plan provided mandatory and discretionary death benefits to spouses. The employee, a Sales/Marketing Manager at the time of her death, had lived for 12 years with her partner and her partner's two children in New York. AT&T denied the benefits to the partner on the ground that New York does not recognize homosexual partners as spouses. Since

Employee Benefits Management

¶ 3170

state law does not recognize those unions, AT&T determined that it did not either.

The partner, on the other hand, has alleged that AT&T's denial of benefits discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation and that AT&T violated ERISA by contradicting the plan's own equal opportunity policy. The equal opportunity policy contained a provision that said AT&T would meet and carry out federal, state and local antidiscrimination laws. The law that AT&T allegedly failed to meet and carry out is a New York City Human Rights Law that makes it unlawful to discriminate against a person because of his or her sexual orientation.

Testing the waters

Employers are viewing this as a case that will "test the waters," said Maureen Lynch, an AT&T spokeswoman. However, unless state legislatures enact laws that recognize homosexual partners as spouses, employees and beneficiaries are not given much chance of success in these suits. John Hoos, the national practice leader for the legal group at Hewitt Associates, said that he would be "very surprised to see the [beneficiary] win under this theory" since ERISA looks to state law to define spouse. Currently, no state has a law that recognizes homosexual partners as spouses.

Hoos said that he wouldn't be surprised if the case were dismissed at an early stage on the ground that ERISA does not recognize the partner as a beneficiary. "I think the court may rule that she has no standing to sue," he said.

Uphill struggle

In areas of the country without a Human Rights Law and in plans without an equal opportunity policy, it may be even more difficult for the employee or the beneficiary to prevail. Even with the New York laws, the employee or the beneficiary faces an uphill battle. "They have a better argument with the New York laws," Hoos said, "but I think it will be difficult to prove discrimination because the company has defined spouse as the law defines it."

Legislative issues

The next move is apparently with the state legislatures. Nevertheless, employers can expect to see this issue arise more often. Stephanie Poe, a spokeswoman for the Employee Benefit Research Institute, said that she expects to see "more cases of [unmarried] employees wanting their partners covered" in the coming years. She noted that most cases so far have been in the public sector.

□ Reference: ¶ 79,270.

.05 *Rovira v. AT&T*, United States District Court, Southern District of New York, 90 Civ. 5486.

Advantages and Disadvantages Of Caps Placed On Employer Contributions — MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

As you requested, we have provided information on caps placed on employer contributions through the collective bargaining process. We will first point out the advantages and disadvantages of caps, and then provide a variety of options for setting caps and determining adjustment factors for them.

Caps are a good way to address the issue of health and welfare benefits in collective bargaining. The main advantage is that both management and the union are assuming some of the risk for increases in the cost of health and welfare benefits. In other words, a cap on benefits cost will create a partnership between management and the union in an effort to control those costs. If the cost exceeds the cap, it will trigger action by the union to help control cost.

Another advantage is the employee awareness that is generated as the efforts to control cost trickle down from the union representatives and business agents to the general membership. This increased employee awareness of benefits and understanding of the value of their benefit program is even further encouraged by the fact that the employee may have to make contributions toward the cost of those benefits.

Another advantage is the ease at which benefit caps are negotiated. Management and the union are no longer negotiating the bits and pieces of a benefit program; instead, they are negotiating dollar contribution levels which are clearly understandable to all parties.

There are no real disadvantages to caps. The disadvantages that do exist are actually created by the type of cap and the level at which the cap is established. If, for example, the cap is set too high and the actual cost of the plan is less than the cap, the union will try to get the excess paid to the employee.

It is our feeling that the most effective caps are those which result in the employee sharing in a portion of the cost. If, for example, the cap covers about 80% of the cost and the employee pays about 20%, the employee will have a much greater awareness and appreciation of the value of benefits. By establishing pre-tax premium conversion under the IRC Section 125 rules, the employee's portion of the premium cost will avoid federal, state and FICA withholding, thus increasing the employee's take home pay by 30% to 43% of the shared amount.

There are a variety of ways to determine the cap. Some of the more common methods are listed below:

- **Current Cost**

Freeze the employer contribution at the current level. In other words, freeze contributions at the current program price levels.

- **Current Contributions**

Freeze the current employer contribution at either the current dollar amount, or the current percentage of the actual cost, if cost sharing already took place.

- **Percent Based on Payroll**

Capping contributions as a percent of payroll will automatically incorporate an inflation adjustment factor based on any increases in salaries.

- **Cap Based on Preferred Plan Design**

With this method, a modern, cost-efficient plan is designed and priced, and that price becomes the cap. Employees choosing a more expensive plan will pay more.

- **Cap Based on Total Compensation**

With this method, the value of the total compensation package is calculated and then the amount to be contributed toward benefits is negotiated.

Another item to be considered with caps is whether or not to include an inflation adjustment factor or some type of escalator. If caps are set with an inflation adjustment factor, it is important that this factor not be set too high. By setting the adjustment factor too high, the County could lose the cost control initiative that it is trying to establish by implementing the cap in the first place.

Like the cap itself, there are many ways that they can be established. The most common are listed below:

- CPI;
- CPI plus some percentage;
- Medical CPI;
- Flat percentage; and
- A percentage equal to increases in salary.

In summary, caps are a very useful tool used in an employer's efforts to control cost through the collective bargaining process. To gain the most benefit, they must be designed and implemented properly.

Ma/Pa Coverage Issues —
MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

Q Can the County provide coverage once per family when husband and wife both work for Multnomah County, Oregon?

Subject to collective bargaining, the County could attempt it. This was done in a southern Oregon public sector group a few years ago. With this arrangement, coverage was available once per family. Each family could determine whether husband or wife would be designated as "head of household" to receive primary benefits, life insurance, etc.

This agreement, however, was later nullified because it was deemed to discriminate against certain employees who received lesser benefits based on where their spouse works. If a spouse did not work, or worked for another employer, the employee was entitled to full benefits. However, those employees whose spouse worked for the same employer were denied benefits. Also, it was decided all employees covered by a bargaining agreement should have equal benefits regardless of marital status or spouse's place of employment.

On the other hand, J.C. Penney Company, Inc. recently won a court case upholding its right to provide medical and dental benefits to dependents of married employees only when the highest-paid spouse is an employee of J.C. Penney. In other words, J.C. Penney will cover an employee's spouse only if the employee is the principal wage earner in the family. J.C. Penney has prevailed in several suits brought by employees charging sex discrimination.

A viable way of dealing with the dual employment situation is to utilize incentives and disincentives which allow the employee to make choices with the available employer contribution. While some employees may choose to continue to purchase double coverage, frequently couples will coordinate their selections to purchase the best overall package for the family's needs. In order to encourage coordination (rather than duplication), a variety of plans must be available with pricing modeled in such a way as to create incentives. Anytime a plan is designed to offer an employee a choice of non-taxable benefits (insurance) or taxable benefits (cash), a Section 125 Cafeteria Plan is created. A Section 125 Cafeteria Plan encourages value-oriented decision-making, especially when cash is one of the options. While a Section 125 Cafeteria Plan is an excellent way to offer benefits, it should be noted that there are additional administrative and regulatory concerns that must be addressed.

Whether or not a Cafeteria Benefit Plan is offered, two strategies which will discourage overutilization by dual-employed couples are premium cost sharing and a strong Coordination of Benefits (COB) provision. Premium cost sharing creates an awareness on the part of the employee as to the value of the coverage and discourages dual enrollment. Since the employee is now required to pay for benefits, he/she may, in fact, decline coverage to avoid duplication.

The COB provision protects the plans when dual enrollment is selected by assuring that no more than 100% of actual incurred medical bills are paid by the plan. This process is currently practiced by most claims administrators and HMOs.

**MULTNOMAH COUNTY CLERICAL SERIES:
COMPARISON OF FY 1989 HOURLY WAGES
WITH GENERAL WAGE SURVEY DATA FOR THE LOCAL AREA**

*by Ellen Ullrick
Labor Relations Specialist*

Office Assistant I

Actual Wages Received by Employees

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Average \$7.35	Average \$6.31	Average NA	Average NA

Classification Pay Ranges

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Entry \$6.95	Entry \$5.62	Entry NA	Entry NA
Top \$7.77	Top \$8.11	Top NA	

Office Assistant II

Actual Wages Received by Employees

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Average \$8.68	Average \$7.80	Average \$9.24	Average \$6.35

Classification Pay Ranges

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Entry \$7.95	Entry \$6.36	Entry \$8.25	Entry \$5.48
Top \$9.68	Top \$9.24	Top \$9.98	

Continued

Office Assistant III
Actual Wages Received by Employees

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Average \$10.01	Average \$8.38	Average \$10.32	Average NA

Classification Pay Ranges

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Entry \$9.42	Entry \$7.52	Entry \$8.98	Entry NA
Top \$10.83	Top \$10.88	Top \$11.02	

Word Processing Operator*Actual Wages Received by Employees*

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Average \$9.22	Average \$8.36	Average \$8.95	Average \$7.45

Classification Pay Ranges

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Entry \$8.25	Entry \$7.37	Entry \$8.25	Entry \$6.14
Top \$9.98	Top \$10.22	Top \$9.30	

NOTES**Data Sources**

Multnomah County wages come from the wage table in effect July 1, 1989. The wages shown under "Average" for each classification are estimates derived from the wage at each step in the 1989 wage table weighted by the number of employees at each step in January, 1991.

Continued

"Ptld. Area Survey" is the "Portland Area Cross-Industry Survey for January 1990." The survey is conducted annually by local personnel professionals under the auspices of Towers Perrin Forster & Crosby, Inc. Governments, including the City of Portland and Clackamas, are among the seventy participants. Also participating are prominent area employers such as Boise Cascade, First Interstate Bank, NIKE, PGE, Providence Medical Center, Standard Insurance, and Wacker Siltronic. Employers volunteer to provide data and pay a fee for the finished product. Consequently there is an emphasis on employers with sophisticated personnel management systems.

"Federal Survey" is the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Area Wage Survey for the Portland, Oregon Metropolitan Area, September 1989. This survey of establishments with over 50 employees is conducted biennially. Government employers are excluded, as are those in the construction and extractive industries. The BLS gets data from a representative sample of employers; the sample data is then weighted by the number of area employers in each category.

"Employment Div." is the Oregon Employment Division's publication, Oregon Wage Information 1990. It contains two sets of wage data. One is from wages offered on job orders at Employment Service offices throughout the state. The average wage offer is listed under "Entry" in the tables above. These are statewide figures with emphasis on smaller employers. The other data set is a compilation from a variety of sources statewide, including the job order data, BLS area surveys, and the Local Government Personnel Institute survey, which includes data from Multnomah County. The figures under for average wages come from this heterogeneous compilation.

Classifications

The classifications were matched as shown on the table below. Note that Multnomah County classification titles are the ones used previous to implementation of the classification and compensation study in July 1991. "Office Assistant III" is currently "Senior Office Assistant"; and Office Assistant II's receiving word processing premiums are currently "Word Processing Operators."

<u>Multnomah County</u>	<u>Ptld. Area Survey</u>	<u>Federal Survey</u>	<u>Employment Div.</u>
Office Assistant 1	General Clerk (Entry)	NA	NA
Office Assistant 2	General Clerk (Intermediate)	Secretary II	Clerk, General
Office Assistant 3	General Clerk (Senior)	Secretary III	NA
Office Assistant 2, WP premium	Word Processing Operator (Intermediate)	Word Processor II	Typist, Word Processing Equipment

The most problematic classification matches were between Multnomah County's Office Assistant series and BLS's Secretary series. Secretaries as described by BLS work for one executive and perhaps his or her staff, and the

secretary's level (I, II, or III) depends partly on the status of the executive in the organizational hierarchy. Office Assistants are classified by the complexity of their duties regardless of the status of their supervising managers. The Office Assistant classifications are also less specific than those in the Secretary series.

Actual Wages versus Wage Ranges

Wage ranges define the minimum and the maximum employers will pay for work in a particular classification. The average wages actually earned by employees lies somewhere between the minimum and maximum, depending on the amount of turnover and the amount of time it takes to advance within the range

The wages shown under "Entry" and "Top" for Multnomah County are the first and top step wages in the 1989 wage table. Those shown for the Portland area survey are the average entry and average top step wages among participating employers. (The Portland area survey includes wage figures for both entry and first step. If employers have a "sub-step" for new entrants, or if they tend to hire above the first step the two figures would be different. For clerical workers the average entry and first step figures are very nearly the same.) BLS only surveys wages actually paid. The wages listed under "Classification Pay Ranges" for the federal survey are actual wages paid at the 25th and 75th percentiles--that is, the range of rates actually paid excluding the extremes.

LR1010 ELU



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS	DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES	OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR	(503) 248-3303
GLADYS McCOY	PORTLAND BUILDING	EMPLOYEE SERVICES	(503) 248-5015
PAULINE ANDERSON	1120 SW FIFTH, 14TH FLOOR	FINANCE	(503) 248-3312
GRETCHEN KAFOURY	PORTLAND, OR 97204-1934	LABOR RELATIONS	(503) 248-5135
RICK BAUMAN		PLANNING & BUDGET	(503) 248-3883
SHARRON KELLEY			
	AT OTHER LOCATIONS:	ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	(503) 248-5111
		ASSESSMENT & TAXATION	(503) 248-3345
		ELECTIONS	(503) 248-3720
		INFORMATION SERVICES	(503) 248-3749

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Chair Gladys McCoy
 Commissioner Pauline Anderson
 Commissioner Rick Bauman
 Commissioner Gary Hansen
 Commissioner Sharron Kelley

FROM: Darrell Murray, Deputy Labor Relations Manager D

DATE: January 28, 1991

SUBJECT: Early Retirement Incentives

I. Introduction

I am advised that one or more members of the Board has expressed interest in exploring the possibility of offering financial incentives to induce early retirements and thereby reduce the number of employees actually laid off. There is need for further clarification of the Board's preferences and objectives, before additional work can proceed. This memorandum is designed to facilitate discussion with the objective of clarifying the Board's desires.

II. Preliminary Considerations

The following observations may assist the Board in its consideration of this matter, and staff's implementation of the Board's ultimate decisions:

1. Strict confidentiality is imperative until a decision is made and initial steps toward implementation are undertaken. Otherwise, the County may inadvertently delay the plans of those who already plan to retire this fiscal year.
2. Any financial incentive for early retirement is, with respect to employees represented by a union, a mandatory subject of bargaining and must be subject to good faith bargaining before implementation can occur. If the goal is to have this benefit in place by July 1, 1991, the only way to achieve this goal

is by mutual agreement of the unions. Whether the unions would cooperate is unknown, although there is no known reason why they would oppose such a benefit as adverse to their interests. It seems more likely they would attempt to hold out for a more lucrative option.

3. Targeting desired turnover may be difficult. Turnover in the road fund does the Board no good if what is really needed is turnover in the library and general fund. While it is, I am advised, legally possible to limit eligibility to employees of a particular department or work unit, the success of such an incentive will depend on the attractiveness of a particular benefit to the members of that unit. Our only experience in this regard is an early retirement option offered to library employees age 50 or older with over 10 years of service at the time of transition to the County. The benefit paid was \$400 to \$500 per month depending on service, payable from retirement to age 65. (Age 65 is the normal retirement age under the LAP retirement plan.) If the employee chose, he or she could take the combined present value of the monthly payments as a one-time-only lump sum up to a maximum of \$16,000. If the total present value of the benefits exceeded \$16,000 the employee could take the \$16,000 lump sum payment and receive the balance in a reduced monthly payment. This induced only two or three of the thirty-seven employees who were eligible for the benefits to elect early retirement.

4. Even if confined to a particular work unit, the benefit must be available to a qualifying class of individuals. The County may not, for example, limit the benefit to the first fifty takers. This makes prediction of cost somewhat difficult. An actuarial study would be prudent and necessary to project the range of possible costs associated with any particular package. Mark Johnson, an actuary with the firm Milliman and Robertson, estimates that a limited study would cost roughly \$3000 to \$4000 and would take 2 to 4 weeks to complete, depending on complexity.

5. If the County proposes an "early" retirement incentive of retiree insurance payments before age 55, there is a risk it may prompt a latent contract dispute concerning the extent of existing entitlements under the Local 88 contract.

6. An early retirement payment would be taxed as a retirement benefit. If paid out over a long period it would be taxed as received. If paid as a lump sum, it would be taxed immediately in entirety.

7. The benefit would not require establishment of any special administrative body (e.g. a trust or governing board), but I would strongly encourage prefunding any future costs out of savings flowing from the plan. An ordinance establishing a holding fund might be desirable for this purpose.

8. The County is not permitted by law to pay a lump sum payment to employees with the specific intention of increasing the employee's final average salary on which his or her PERS benefit would be based.

January 28, 1991
Memorandum To Board
Page Three of Three

Attached is an initial computer run listing all employees age 48 or older sorted in various ways. (Forty-eight was selected as the cut off because it is possible that an employee could hire on at age 18 and be eligible for normal PERS retirement after 30 years at age 48.) Once we know where in the organization the Board wishes to generate turnover we can use this run to commence consideration of what might be required to induce sufficient voluntary retirement. I hope this information is helpful. I will look forward to hearing Wednesday concerning your views of this matter. In the interim, please call if you have questions.

c: Curtis Smith
Merrie Ziady
Linda Alexander



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS	DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES	OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR	(503) 248-3303
GLADYS McCOY	PORTLAND BUILDING	EMPLOYEE SERVICES	(503) 248-5015
PAULINE ANDERSON	1120 SW FIFTH, 14TH FLOOR	FINANCE	(503) 248-3312
GRETCHEN KAFOURY	PORTLAND, OR 97204-1934	LABOR RELATIONS	(503) 248-5135
RICK BAUMAN		PLANNING & BUDGET	(503) 248-3883
SHARRON KELLEY			
	AT OTHER LOCATIONS:	ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	(503) 248-5111
		ASSESSMENT & TAXATION	(503) 248-3345
		ELECTIONS	(503) 248-3720
		INFORMATION SERVICES	(503) 248-3749

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Kenneth Upton
Labor Relations Manager

FROM: Ellen Ullrick *ELU*
Labor Relations Specialist

DATE: January 29, 1991

SUBJECT: Employee contributions to medical benefits in the private sector

At the executive session January 17 Commissioner Kelley asked for information comparing our medical benefits contributions with those in the private sector. I did not find data comparing actual medical benefits costs, but I did find two surveys which show percentages of premium contributed by the employee. As you know, full-time County employees receive full family coverage and make no contribution toward the premium.

The federal Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) puts out a biennial Area Wage Survey for the Portland Metropolitan Area based on a representative sample of employers with over 50 employees. The survey for September, 1989 indicates that 57% of office workers do not contribute to the premium for medical insurance which covers the employee only. The national Foster Higgins Health Care Benefits Survey, also produced biennially, emphasizes employers with over 500 employees. Their 1988 survey data for the Pacific region indicates that 70% of the employers responding required no employee contribution for employee-only coverage. The discrepancy between BLS and Foster Higgins may be due to variations within the Pacific region (which includes California) or to Foster Higgins' emphasis on large employers. Whatever the reason, Foster Higgins tends to show more generous benefits than BLS.

BLS does not provide data on dependent coverage. Foster Higgins shows that in the Pacific Region 34% of employers require no contribution for dependent coverage. Among plans requiring an employee contribution for dependents, the average contribution is 37% of the cost.

LR1013 ELU

**COMPARISON OF RATES OF ADVANCEMENT THROUGH WAGE RANGES
AMONG LOCAL PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYERS
FOR CLASSIFICATIONS COMPARABLE TO OFFICE ASSISTANT 2
JANUARY, 1991**

*By Ellen Ullrick
Labor Relations Specialist*

<u>Employer</u>	<u>Entry Rate/Hr.</u>	<u>Top Step Rate/Hr.</u>	<u>No. of Steps</u>	<u>Incre- ment</u>	<u>Years to Top</u>
Multnomah County	\$8.31	\$10.12	8	3%	7
City of Beaverton	\$8.50	\$11.96	8	5%	6
Clackamas County	\$7.39	\$9.25	6	4.5%	4.5
Clark County	\$8.29	\$10.59	6	5%	4.5
City of Gresham	\$7.32	\$9.15	6	4.5%	4.5
Lane County	\$8.98	\$12.04	7	5%	5.5
Marion County	\$7.86	\$10.25	7	4.5%	5.5
Metropolitan Service Dist.	\$7.98	\$11.24	8	5%	6.5
State of Oregon	\$7.51	\$9.73	7	4.5%	6
City of Portland	\$8.44	\$11.10	5	7%	3
Washington Co.	\$8.44	\$10.28	5	5%	4

Notes:

January Increases

On January 1 clerical employees at Clark County received a 2.5% wage increase, and at the State of Oregon a 4.5% wage increase. These increases are reflected in the figures above.

Increments

Increments between steps erode over time due to rounding error and other adjustments. The increments shown above are those which (to the nearest one-half per cent) best fit between the entry and top steps and yield the correct number of steps. The increments shown do not necessarily reflect the employer's compensation policy or increments for its other classifications.

**PER CENT MULTNOMAH COUNTY WAGES FOR OFFICE ASSISTANT 2
ARE HIGHER THAN LOCAL PUBLIC EMPLOYER WAGES
FOR COMPARABLE CLASSIFICATIONS
AT ENTRY TO SEVEN YEARS OF SERVICE**

*By Ellen Ullrick
Labor Relations Specialist*

Multnomah County					
	<u>Entry</u>	<u>1 Yr.</u>	<u>3 Yrs.</u>	<u>5 Yrs.</u>	<u>7 Yrs.</u>
Hourly Wages	\$8.31	\$8.58	\$9.05	\$9.56	\$10.12
% Mult. Co. Wages are Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Clackamas County					
	<u>Entry</u>	<u>1 Yr.</u>	<u>3 Yrs.</u>	<u>5 Yrs.</u>	<u>7 Yrs.</u>
Hourly Wages	\$7.39	\$7.74	\$8.46	\$9.25	\$9.25
% Mult. Co. Wages are Higher	11.1%	9.8%	6.5%	3.2%	8.6%
Metropolitan Service District					
	<u>Entry</u>	<u>1 Yr.</u>	<u>3 Yrs.</u>	<u>5 Yrs.</u>	<u>7 Yrs.</u>
Hourly Wages	\$7.98	\$8.38	\$9.24	\$10.19	\$11.24
% Mult. Co. Wages are Higher	4.0%	2.3%	-2.1%	-6.6%	-11.1%
City of Portland					
	<u>Entry</u>	<u>1 Yr.</u>	<u>3 Yrs.</u>	<u>5 Yrs.</u>	<u>7 Yrs.</u>
Hourly Wages	\$8.44	\$9.48	\$11.10	\$11.10	\$11.10
% Mult. Co. Wages are Higher	-1.6%	-10.5%	-22.7%	-16.1%	-9.7%
Washington County					
	<u>Entry</u>	<u>1 Yr.</u>	<u>3 Yrs.</u>	<u>5 Yrs.</u>	<u>7 Yrs.</u>
Hourly Wages	\$8.44	\$8.87	\$9.78	\$10.28	\$10.28
% Mult. Co. Wages are Higher	-1.6%	-3.4%	-8.1%	-7.5%	-1.6%

Notes:

Percentages

The percentages are the percentages by which Multnomah County wages would have to be lowered (positive percentage) or raised (negative percentage) to equal the other local employer's wage. Percentages are calculated as follows:
 $((\text{Local employer's wage} / \text{Multnomah County wage}) - 1) \times 100.$

LR1023 ELU