

**Villages at Mt. Hood Board of Directors  
Updated Meeting Minutes for December 2011**

**George Wilson stated that he was disappointed that Clackamas County failed to acknowledge the “Villages at Mt. Hood Board”, while recognizing our local Chamber of Commerce during introductions at a County sponsored meeting held on November 19, 2011, to discuss future funding for repairing Lolo Pass Road in the event of another devastating flood, like the one in January 2011.**

**George said that after the meeting, he approached Commissioner Jamie Damon (whom he had met with a few months earlier), to point out yet another example of the lack of credibility toward the “Villages at Mt. Hood Board” by Clackamas County Commissioners, as credibility was a major talking point of our previous discussions.**

**When Commissioner Jamie Damon asked Laurel Butman, who did introductions, why the “Villages at Mt. Hood Board” had not been recognized, she stated, “the reason I didn’t acknowledge the Villages at Mt. Hood Board during introductions along with the Chamber, was because I was specifically asked by three (3) board members, including the board Chair, not to mention the Villages at Mt. Hood Board. He asked Laurel Butman for the names of the board members who made the decision to exclude the Villages at Mt. Hood Board, while stating he had not been informed of, nor advised of such a decision.**

**Laurel Butman then brought County liaison Christine Roth into the discussion, who verified there were Villages Board members who asked that the Villages at Mt. Hood Board not be recognized during the meeting. Christine Roth said that the meeting was organized on a very short timeline, and that individual members of the Board had asked not to be identified and thanked as individual members.**

**George replied, “The issue was never about any individual board members being acknowledged, recognized or thanked, but instead the issue was about the Villages Board being recognized as a whole.**

**George Wilson went on to state, “I am not only disappointed at the County’s lack of acknowledgement of the Villages at Mt. Hood Board, I am also offended that a decision was made without board approval. We have seven (7) board members for a reason, and any actions taken on behalf of the board must be approved by a quorum of the board. Every board member should and must have the opportunity to comment and/or vote on all business that pertains to the Villages at Mt. Hood Board. Any other action is a direct violation of our bylaws.**

**Our bylaws, as well as Oregon Public Meeting law must be followed at all times, and in every circumstance. If these rules are not followed, then the system fails and we are all cheated. Every board member should and will be accountable for their actions while performing the duties of a director for the Villages at Mt. Hood Board in accordance to our Villages bylaws”.**

**Bob Reeves stated that Clackamas County did not involve the Villages Board early on, and the Villages Board did not get a chance to decide on their involvement.**

Pat Sharp said that it was a Clackamas County meeting, not a Villages meeting and the Villages were not part of the meeting design. Pat Sharp added that the meeting was organized by the Transportation Department, and she did not know why the Villages Board had not been asked to be involved early on.

George asked, “Why should the Villages Board have to vote on whether or not to be acknowledged or recognized by the very governing body of which they represent and are a part of? All county business within the boundaries of our Mt. Hood territories is Villages Board business, and we do not (nor should we) have a choice in the matter. Furthermore, the issue was not about the Villages Board hosting the meeting, or recognizing individual board members. The issue(s) are:

1. Clackamas County’s lack of acknowledgement of the Villages Board during a meeting held by the County, within the boundaries of the Villages at Mt. Hood, which in George’s opinion continues to diminish, and in fact damage any future credibility for our Villages board.
2. The decision by three (3) Villages Board members to exclude the “Villages at Mt. Hood Board of Directors” from acknowledgement or recognition by the Board of County Commissioners during a County meeting held within the jurisdiction of the Villages Board”.

Shirley stated that although Laurel Butman indicated the board Chair as one who shared responsibility for making that decision, she, as Board Chair was not privy to, nor had any involvement in making that decision. She went on to say, “if the Board is not getting credit, then it should either get credit or at least ask”.

Coni Scott cited that although she felt the November 19 County meeting was an “excellent” meeting, she agreed with George in that the Villages Board should be waving its flag (so to speak) whenever the possibility arises, and that the Villages board needs to step up and thank people.

Bob Reeves said that the whole Board should have been involved from the beginning, and that the process was flawed.

In conclusion, George stated that he hoped this issue would not have to be brought forward and discussed in the future, and that it is vital that our bylaws be respected. He also continues to believe that better communications/relations are needed with the Board of County Commissioners.