



PROSECUTING ATTORNEY | ANTHONY F. GOLIK

RACHAEL ROGERS
Chief Deputy

ANNA KLEIN
Chief Criminal Deputy

LESLIE LOPEZ
Chief Civil Deputy

GAYLE HUTTON
Administrator

MEMORANDUM

DATE:	January 29, 2022
TO:	Council Chair Eileen Quiring O'Brien Councilors Julie Olson, Temple Lentz, Karen Bowerman and Gary Medvigy
CC:	County Manager Kathleen Otto
FROM:	Chief Civil Deputy Leslie Lopez
SUBJECT:	Mini-Initiative re Proposed Ordinance Prohibiting Mandates

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION

On November 30, 2021, the Auditor's office received a mini-initiative petition regarding:

AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING ALL MANDATES WITHIN CLARK COUNTY THAT DISCRIMINATES AGAINST A CITIZEN'S HEALTH STATUS AND/OR HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY.¹

Pursuant to Clark County Home Rule Charter (Charter), section 7.3, "The auditor shall have thirty (30) business days to validate signatures. If a sufficient number of signatures is verified, the auditor shall transmit the initiative petition to the county council." On December 20, 2021, the Auditor's office certified the petition as sufficient by its meeting the required 8,311 valid signatures of registered voters of Clark County. The auditor transmitted the petition to the County Council on December 30, 2021.

Pursuant to Charter section 7.3, "The council shall hold a public hearing on the proposed ordinance or amendment to an existing ordinance within sixty (60) days . . .". The Council set a public hearing on the proposed ordinance for February 1, 2022. According to the same Charter section, the Council shall enact, reject or modify the proposed ordinance within thirty (30) calendar days of the February 1, 2022 hearing.

You asked me to provide responses to the following questions regarding the legality of the proposed ordinance. This memo is intended to instruct you on the law, but ultimately it is the Council's decision to enact, reject or modify the proposed ordinance.

¹ See Mini-Initiative Petition.

1. What does the proposed ordinance seek?

The proposed ordinance seeks the following:

THEREFORE, WE CALL ON THE CLARK COUNTY COUNCIL TO IMMEDIATELY PASS AN ORDINANCE THAT PROHIBITS ANY AND ALL DISCRIMINATORY MANDATES, ORDERS OR COMPULSORY REQUIREMENTS WITHIN CLARK COUNTY BUILDINGS OR LAND USE THAT DISCRIMINATES AGAINST AN INDIVIDUAL BASED ON HIS OR HER CURRENT HEALTH STATUS, VIOLATES HEALTH PRIVACY OR DOES NOT HONOR HEALTH, RELIGIOUS OR MORAL OBJECTORS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER. No business, government agency, educational institution, public, health related, religious, corporate or private organization that operates on land within Clark County will be allowed to discriminate via employment practices or denial of services in relation to any other or future mandates or orders that discriminate in a like fashion (lockdowns, face coverings, etc.). Any violators will be subject to fines, risk permit denials, and risk land use permits.

See Mini-Initiative Petition - Complete Text of Ordinance.

2. Does the Clark County Council have the authority to enact the proposed ordinance?

The Council has the authority to enact proposed ordinances as permitted by state constitution and to the extent the proposed ordinance does not violate state or federal law.

The Washington State Constitution, Article XI, Section 11 provides broad authority to counties to act in the event of an emergency, stating:

Any county, city, town or township may make and enforce within its limits all such local police, sanitary and other regulations as are not in conflict with general laws.

This authority, however, is limited by state law. Local governments cannot have ordinances that conflict with state law.

Under Washington's State Constitution, "The supreme executive power of this state shall be vested in a governor". Article III Sec. 2. Pursuant to Chapter 43.06 RCW and Chapter 38.52 RCW, the legislature delegated significant police powers to the governor in times of emergency. The U.S. Supreme Court and Washington Supreme Court have both affirmed that the state, through the executive branch, enjoys "broad police power to protect public health and safety". *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, 518 U.S. 470, 475 (1996). A governor's proclamation has the force of state law. RCW 43.06.220. Additionally, if an arm of the state government has

regulations – these have the force of state law. *State Dept of Ecology v. Wahkiakum County*, 184 Wash.App. 372 (2014), *rev denied* 182 Wash.2d 1023.

Specifically, pursuant to RCW 43.06.010(12), the Governor may declare a state of emergency for the entire state or portions of the state. Once a state of emergency has been declared by the Governor, it does not cease until the governor enters a proclamation declaring its termination. RCW 43.06.210. Governor Inslee declared a state of emergency for the entire state and for every county. In addition, as explained below, Governor Inslee issued several proclamations regarding mask and vaccination mandates which are still in effect.

Local governments have no authority to override the state’s requirements for vaccinations for certain employees or for indoor mask requirements. While there is language in the various state proclamations and orders that allows local officials to implement *more* stringent requirements than the state, there is no language or statutory authority allowing local officials to circumvent the state requirements or introduce *less* stringent requirements.

Likewise, the Council’s authority is limited by federal law if a proposed local ordinance conflicts with federal law.²

Therefore, the Council does not have the authority to enact any ordinances that would be less restrictive than the current state and federal mask and vaccine mandates.

3. What is the current state law regarding masking and/or vaccination mandates?

A. Governor Inslee

Governor Inslee declared a state of emergency on February 29, 2020, using his broad emergency authority under chapter 43.06 RCW. More specifically, under RCW 43.06.220, after a state of emergency has been declared, the governor may prohibit any activity that they believe should be prohibited to help preserve and maintain life, health, property or the public peace.

Since then, Governor Inslee has issued several proclamations regarding mask and vaccination mandates.³ The most recent Proclamation 21-14.3 issued on November 24, 2021, requires all

² The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution provides that federal law “shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.” U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2. The basic principle is as follows: “If federal law imposes restrictions or confers rights on private actors and a state law confers rights or imposes restrictions that conflict with the federal law, the federal law takes precedence and the state law is preempted.” *Kansas v. Garcia*, — U.S. —, 140 S. Ct. 791, 801, 206 L.Ed.2d 146 (2020).

³ Proclamation 20-12.4 (issued July 12, 2021); Proclamation 20-9.4 (issued July 30, 2021); Proclamation 21-14 (issued August 9, 2021); Proclamation 21-14.1 (issued August 20, 2021); Proclamation 21-14.2 (issued September 27, 2021).

workers in state agencies, educational settings, and health care settings, to be fully vaccinated against COVID-19. These same workers, however, are not required to get vaccinated against COVID-19 under this Order if they are unable to do so because of a disability or if the requirement to do so conflicts with their sincerely held religious beliefs, practices or observance. *See* Proclamation 21-14.3, p. 5.

B. Washington State Secretary of Health

The Washington State Secretary of Health has issued various orders relating to face coverings since June 24, 2020.⁴ The current Secretary of Health Order 20-03.6 was issued September 24, 2021. It provides:

Every person in Washington State must wear a face covering that covers their nose and mouth when they are in a place where any person from outside their household is present or in a place that is generally accessible to any person from outside their household, subject to the exceptions and exemptions below.

See SOH Order 20-03.6, p. 3.

There are several exceptions to the general face covering requirement including, but not limited to, (1) when outdoors, except in a large outdoor setting of 500 or more people, (2) while working alone indoors, (3) at a small indoor gathering in a private residence, (4) while eating, drinking or sleeping, etc. *See* SOH Order 20-03.6, pp. 3-4.

The Order further states that people with a medical condition, mental health condition, developmental or cognitive condition, or a disability that prevents wearing a face covering are exempt from the requirement to wear a face mask. *See* SOH Order 20-03.6, p. 4.

In addition, the Order states that face covering requirements lawfully imposed by another public agency or official are to be followed if they are *more protective* than the requirements in this order. If they are *less protective*, then this order must be followed. *See* SOH Order 20-03.6, p. 5.

C. Washington State Department of Labor & Industries (L&I)

The Washington State Department of Labor & Industries (L&I) issued requirements and guidance for preventing COVID-19 on September 13, 2021. Specifically, L&I requires that businesses are to follow the face covering requirements issued by the Governor's Proclamations and the Secretary of Health's Orders. *See* L&I Requirements and Guidance for Preventing COVID-19, p. 1.

⁴ SOH Order 20-03 (issued June 24, 2020); SOH Order 20-03 (issued July 24, 2020); SOH Order 20-03.2 (issued May 17, 2021); SOH Order 20-03.3 (issued June 29, 2021); SOH Order 20-03.4 (issued August 19, 2021); SOH Order 20-03.5 (issued September 13, 2021).

L&I requires employers to maintain a safe, COVID-free work environment by “requiring face coverings or masks for customers and employees, in all industries, regardless of vaccination status, in indoor spaces accessible to the public and at outdoor events or gatherings attended by 500 or more people.” *See* L&I Requirements, p.1.

Employers must ensure workplaces remain safe and healthy for all, including employees with medical issues or disabilities pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Additionally, state law protects high-risk employees from being discharged, permanently replaced, or discriminated against in the workplace for seeking accommodation from exposure to an infectious or contagious disease during a public health emergency. *See* L&I Requirements, p. 2.

4. Have there been any legal challenges to the state law regarding masking and/or vaccination mandates? If so, what was the outcome?

Three separate challenges to the state’s COVID-19 mandates are listed below.⁵ As of January 29, 2022, there have not been any court rulings stating the current state mandates are unlawful.

A. *Slide Waters LLC v. Washington Dept of Labor & Industries*, 4 F.4th 747, 758 (2021 9th Cir.) (federal court).

Slide Waters LLC, (a waterpark) sought a temporary restraining order (TRO) to prevent L&I from enforcing the Governor’s emergency rule that “Employers must not allow employees to perform work where a business activity is prohibited by an emergency proclamation.” L&I had posted a notice on its website that stated, “If employers are found to be defying the Governor’s order, they’ll be informed and directed to close or adjust operations immediately. If they do not, they’ll face a workplace safety citation that could carry a fine of nearly \$10,000 or more.”

The Ninth Circuit court found Washington law allows a governor to proclaim a state of emergency “after finding that a public disorder, disaster, energy emergency, or riot exists within this state or any part thereof which affects life, health, property or the public peace.” RCW 43.06.010(12). The Court determined that the public interest in mitigating and combating the significant danger posed by COVID-19 outweighed the individual business interests in continued operations. The Court further found it was not the Court’s role to second guess the reasoned public health decision of other branches of government.

B. *Wise v. Inslee*, No. 2:21-CV-0288-TOR, 2021 WL 4951571 (E.D. Wash. 10/25/21) (federal court).

The plaintiffs, including individuals employed by multiple state agencies, a local government entity and a healthcare provider, filed a motion for a TRO to stop the Governor’s Proclamation

⁵ Challenges to state or federal action such as mask and vaccination mandates are handled in the courts.

21-14 regarding mandatory vaccination for educators, healthcare workers, and state employees and contractors. The Court determined the Proclamation is narrowly tailored because it applies to specific sectors whose employees are essential to combating COVID-19 and who come into regular contact with vulnerable segments of the public. Further, the Court found that the State has a legitimate government interest in preventing the spread of COVID-19, as endorsed by the Ninth Circuit. *Slide Waters v. Washington State Dept of Labor and Industries*, 4 F.4th 747, 758 (9th Cir. 2021).

C. *Bacon v. Woodward*, No. 2:21-CV-0296-TO, 2021 WL 5183059 (E.D. Wash. 11/08/21) (federal court).

The plaintiffs, a group of City of Spokane firefighters, challenged the City's vaccination requirement. The Court determined that the City has a legitimate government interest in preventing the spread of COVID-19 by adopting the vaccination requirements imposed by the Governor's proclamation. The Court denied the request for a temporary restraining order.

5. What is the current federal law regarding masking and/or vaccination mandates?

The United States Supreme Court recently recognized that healthcare workers are generally required to be vaccinated against transmissible disease, because such diseases are a workplace hazard that healthcare employers are obligated to address. *Biden v. Missouri*, 142 S.Ct. 647, (2022). The court found the Secretary of Health and Human Services did not exceed his statutory authority in issuing an interim rule imposing a COVID-19 vaccination mandate for all staff of healthcare facilities participating in Medicare and Medicaid. Therefore, vaccination mandates for healthcare workers of facilities that receive Medicare or Medicaid funding are lawful.

Conversely, on the same day, the United States Supreme Court evaluated OSHA's emergency temporary standard (ETS) mandating that employers with more than 100 employees require their employees to be fully vaccinated or take weekly COVID-19 tests at their own expense and wear a mask in the workplace. *National Federation of Independent Business v. Department of Labor, OSHA*, 142 S.Ct. 661 (2022). The Supreme Court determined the petitioners were likely to succeed on their claim that the ETS exceeded OSHA's statutory authority. The Court sent the matter back to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals to rule on the legal question of whether the Secretary of the Department of Labor, who oversees OSHA, had the authority to enact these rules.

6. The proposed ordinance seeks to ban mandates that discriminate against individuals based on a medical disability, however, the current mandates already provide for a medical disability exemption pursuant to the ADA and enforced by the EEOC.

The current mask and vaccination mandates already provide for an exemption due to a medical disability. *See* Proclamation 21-14.3, pp. 5-8; SOH Order 20-03.6. Specifically, state agencies, operators of educational settings, and operators of health care settings:

Must provide any disability-related reasonable accommodations and sincerely held-religious belief accommodations to the requirements of this Order that are required under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehabilitation Act), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 (Title VII), the Washington Law Against Discrimination (WLAD), and any other applicable law. As provided in the above-noted laws, State Agencies, operators of Educational Settings, and operators of Health Care Settings are not required to provide accommodations if they would cause undue hardship.

See Proclamation 21-14.3, p. 6.

The ADA defines “disability” as “(A) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual; (B) a record of such an impairment; or (C) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 42 U.S.C. § 12102(1). Therefore, to the extent an individual’s current health status or medical disability falls within the ADA’s definition of a disability, that individual would fall under the protection of the ADA.

On July 26, 2021, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) issued guidance on “Long COVID” as a disability under the ADA. On December 14, 2021, the EEOC updated its Technical Assistance Questions and Answers to include a section explaining when COVID-19 is an actual disability under the ADA:

**COVID-19 and the ADA
“Actual” Disability**

N.2. When is COVID-19 an actual disability under the ADA? (12/14/21)

Applying the ADA rules stated in N.1. and depending on the specific facts involved in an individual employee’s condition, a person with COVID-19 has an actual disability if the person’s medical condition or any of its symptoms is a “physical or mental” impairment that “substantially limits one or more major life activities.” An individualized assessment is necessary to determine whether the effects of a person’s COVID-19 substantially limit a major life activity. This will always be a case-by-case determination that applies existing legal standards to the facts of a particular individual’s circumstances. A person infected with the virus causing COVID-19 who is asymptomatic or a person whose COVID-19 results in mild symptoms similar to those of the common cold or flu that resolve in a matter of weeks—with no other consequences—will not have an actual disability within the meaning of the ADA. However, depending on the specific facts involved in a

particular employee's medical condition, an individual with COVID-19 might have an actual disability, as illustrated below.

See What You Should Know About COVID-19 and the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act, and Other EEO Laws at N.2, U.S. Equal Emp. Opportunity Comm'n (Oct. 25, 2021), <https://www.eeoc.gov/wysk/what-you-should-know-about-covid-19-and-ada-rehabilitation-act-and-other-eeo-laws#N>.

To the extent an individual seeks to remedy an issue with the medical disability exemption process, the individual can file a claim with the EEOC.

7. The proposed ordinance seeks to ban mandates that discriminate against individuals based on their religion, however, the current mandates already provide for a religious exemption pursuant to Title VII and enforced by the EEOC.

Similar to the medical disability exemption, the current mandates already provide for an exemption due to a religious belief, practice or observance. *See* Proclamation 21-14.3, pp. 5-8.

The EEOC enforces Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), which prohibits employment discrimination based on religion. This includes a right for job applicants and employees to request an exemption from an employer requirement that conflicts with their sincerely held religious beliefs, practices, or observances. If an employer shows that it cannot reasonable accommodate an employee's religious beliefs, practices, or observances without undue hardship on its operations, the employer is not required to grant the accommodation.

Under federal law, sincerely held religious beliefs "include moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views." Moreover, the term "religion" includes all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.

The EEOC has released guidance explaining that, although Title VII prohibits employment discrimination based on religion, an employee's request for an exemption from a COVID-19 vaccination mandate can be denied on the ground that the employee's belief is not truly religious in nature or is not sincerely held, or on the ground that such an exemption would pose an "undue hardship" by burdening "the conduct of the employer's business" through increasing "the risk of the spread of COVID-19 to other employees or to the public." *See What You Should Know About COVID-19 and the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act, and Other EEO Laws* at L.2 to L.3, U.S. Equal Emp. Opportunity Comm'n (Oct. 25, 2021), <https://www.eeoc.gov/wysk/what-you-should-know-about-covid-19-and-ada-rehabilitation-act-and-other-eeo-laws#L>.

To the extent an individual seeks to remedy an issue with the religious exemption process, the individual can file a claim with the EEOC.

8. Do the current mandates violate HIPAA?

No. In general, the HIPAA Rules do not apply to employers or employment records. HIPAA only applies to HIPAA covered entities – health care providers, health plans, and health care clearinghouses – and, to some extent, to their business associates. If an employer asks an employee to provide proof that they have been vaccinated, that is not a HIPAA violation. See <https://www.hipaajournal.com/is-it-a-hipaa-violation-to-ask-for-proof-of-vaccine-status/>

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services issued guidance on September 30, 2021, to help the public understand when the HIPAA Privacy Rule applies to disclosures and requests for information about whether a person has received a COVID-19 vaccine:

HIPAA, COVID-19 Vaccination, and the Workplace

1. Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule prohibit businesses or individuals from asking whether their customers or clients have received a COVID-19 vaccine?

No. The Privacy Rule does not prohibit **any person** (e.g., an individual or an entity such as a business), including HIPAA covered entities and business associates, from asking whether an individual has received a particular vaccine, including COVID-19 vaccines.

First, the Privacy Rule applies **only to covered entities** (health plans, health care clearinghouses, and health care providers that conduct standard electronic transactions) and, to some extent, their **business associates**.

Second, the Privacy Rule **does not regulate** the ability of covered entities and business associates to request information from patients or visitors. Rather, the Privacy Rule regulates how and when covered entities and business associates are permitted to use and disclose **protected health information (PHI)** (e.g., PHI about whether an individual has received a COVID-19 vaccine) that covered entities and business associates create, receive, maintain, or transmit. Thus, the Privacy Rule **does not prohibit** a covered entity (e.g., a covered doctor, hospital, or health plan) or business associate from asking whether an individual (e.g., a patient or visitor) has received a particular vaccine, including COVID-19 vaccines, although it does regulate how and when a covered entity or its business associate may use or disclose information about an individual's vaccination status.

Additional examples. The Privacy Rule **does not apply** when an individual:

- Is asked about their vaccination status by a school, employer, store, restaurant, entertainment venue, or another individual.
- Asks another individual, their doctor, or a service provider whether they are vaccinated.
- Asks a company, such as a home health agency, whether its workforce members are vaccinated.

See <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/privacy/guidance/hipaa-covid-19-vaccination-workplace/index.html>.

9. What are the consequences, if any, in enacting the proposed ordinance?

To the extent the Council enacted the proposed ordinance to ban existing state and/or local mask and vaccination mandates, the County, Board of Health, businesses/employers, and school districts could suffer consequences.

A. The County could lose state or federal funding/grants.

If the proposed ordinance is enacted, the County could lose state or federal funding/grants. Some examples are listed below.

1. Washington State Department of Commerce grants

The Clark County Department of Community Services (DCS) receives many grants from the Department of Commerce (Commerce). Language included in the Interagency Agreement related to federal funds as passed through Commerce to the County includes the following provision:

11. Recapture

In the event that the Grantee [County] fails to perform this Grant in accordance with state laws, federal laws, and/or the provisions of this Grant. COMMERCE reserves the right to recapture funds in an amount to compensate COMMERCE for the noncompliance in addition to any other remedies available at law or in equity.

Repayment by the Grantee [County] of funds under this recapture provision shall occur within the time period specified by COMMERCE. In the alternative, COMMERCE may recapture such funds from payment due under this Grant.

This means that if the County fails to follow state laws, federal laws or the provisions of the grants, Commerce reserves the right to recapture the funds from the County to compensate Commerce for the noncompliance.

A spreadsheet listing the current grants the County has with Commerce is attached. Currently, there are seventeen (17) grants totaling \$47,575,548.00.

2. American Rescue Plan (ARPA) grant

According to the Auditor's office, the County will receive \$95.7 million of the \$350 billion State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund committed to supporting for state, local and tribal governments under ARPA. The funds will be dispersed to the county in two equal distributions; \$47.35 million in 2021 and the balance in 2022.

Compliance with the United States Department of Treasury's Rules and Regulations is required in order to receive ARPA funds. Section 35.9 of the Treasury's Interim Final Rule related to ARPA funds requires the following:

§ 35.9 Compliance with applicable laws. A recipient must comply with all other applicable Federal statutes, regulations, and Executive orders, and a recipient shall provide for compliance with the American Rescue Plan Act, this subpart, and any interpretive guidance by other parties in any agreements it enters into with other parties relating to these funds.

See Federal Register, Vol. 86, No. 93, May 17, 2021, Rules and Regulations, § 35.9, p. 26823.

3. Grants from DSHS Contract #2163-23402

The County's contract with DSHS for its Developmental Disabilities Program has a strict COVID-19 vaccination requirement. The contract is worth over \$6 million for the 12-month period of 7/01/21 to 06/30/22. One of the conditions of the DSHS contract requires the County to:

- a. Certify that the County will comply with the COVID-19 Vaccination Requirement in the Governor's proclamations (re State employee/contractors).
- b. Provide copies of certifications from all fourteen of the County's contractors indicating the contractors will comply with the vaccination requirements.

B. The local health officer and/or a member of the local health board could suffer penalties.

If the proposed ordinance is enacted, and the Clark County local health officer complies with a ban on current mask and vaccination mandates, the local health officer may be removed as the local health officer. RCW 70.05.120(1).

Further, to the extent any member of the Clark County Board of Health violates the State's Board of Health Orders, the member is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not less than ten dollars not more than two hundred dollars. RCW 70.05.120(2).

C. Employer consequences

Although the County does not have authority to instruct private businesses, public schools, or other governmental entities to ignore current mask and/or vaccination mandates, if the County enacted the proposed ordinance as stated, a business that complied with the enacted ordinance could be subject to fines by L&I.

All employers, including the County, are subject to fines by L&I if found to be non-compliant with the current state mask mandate. RCW 49.17.060; WAC 296-800-11005. L&I has assessed fines against employers for both customers and employees failing to wear masks.

D. Schools may lose funding from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI).

Pursuant to RCW 28A.300.040, the state superintendent is in charge of dispersing state and federal funds and has “supervision over all matters pertaining to the public schools of the state.” According to RCW 28A.505.120, the state superintendent can withhold state funds in the case of district noncompliance, which is “any binding restrictions issued by the superintendent of public instruction.”

In August, 2021, Superintendent Chris Reykdal issued an emergency rule explaining the process by which OSPI will withhold money from districts that “willfully fail to comply” with COVID-19 mask or vaccination mandates. *See* WAC 392-117-070 to WAC 392-117-085.

Therefore, to the extent the proposed ordinance, if enacted, bans masks and vaccination mandates by Governor Inslee and the Secretary of Health, any school districts that comply with the enacted ban are subject to having state or federal funds withheld from their district.

This has happened to a school district in Oregon. In response to the state of Oregon’s mask mandate, the Alsea school board voted to put families and staff in charge of mask-wearing decisions. Consequently, the Oregon Department of Education informed the Alsea school board that the district will lose federal COVID-19 funding due to its mask policy since a condition of receiving the federal money is compliance with all state laws and regulations.

Status Contract	Contract Type	Value	Comments
Active DOC 20-4613C-105 ESG CV	Grant	\$ 4,916,760.00	Mod 2 (8/30/21) DOC UBM
Active DOC 20-6221C-148 CDBG CV2	Grant	\$ 426,157.00	Mod 1 (12/1/20) Extends 3 months and adds \$4,121,601
Active DOC 21-32606-058 LIHEAP	Grant	\$ 2,470,739.00	Amendment A (4/28/21) Adds \$340,239
Active DOC 21-32607-058 LIHWAP CAA	Grant	\$ 327,605.00	
Active DOC 21-3260A-058 LIHEAP ARP	Grant	\$ 3,521,071.00	
Active DOC 21-4610C-103 Shelter	Grant	\$ 2,589,311.00	Mod A (10/28/21) Updates scope of work
Active DOC 21-4618C-105 TRAP 2.0	Grant	\$ 18,758,380.00	
Active DOC 21-92401-406 MM	Grant	\$ 363,632.00	Amendment A (10/18/21) Adds \$130,208
Active DOC 22-46108-06 SDG (CHG-HEN)	Grant	\$ 10,511,708.00	Mod 1 (12/7/21) Adds \$2,977,495
Active DOC 23-32607-058 LIHWAP ARP	Grant	\$ 256,745.00	
			Amendment F (11/30/21) Adds \$169,675 and extends 12 months
			Amendment E (1/28/21) Adds \$351,929 for 2020-21
			Amendment D (11/20/20) Adds \$43,176
			Amendment C (7/30/20) Adds to Scope of Work and extends
			Amendment B (1/24/20) Increases award \$371,512
Active DOC F19-53101-406 LIHEAP WX WAP	Grant	\$ 1,372,646.00	Amendment A (10/30/19) Increases award \$326,590
Active DOC F20-3210C-006 CSBG CARES	Grant	\$ 543,260.00	
Active DOC F21-32101-006 CSBG	Grant	\$ 390,155.00	Mod A (4/20/21) Reduces grant \$1471
Active DOC F21-53103-406 DOE WX	Grant	\$ 297,344.00	Mod A (11/18/21) Adds \$78,782
Active DOC F21-53104-406 BPA	Grant	\$ 146,726.00	
Active DOC F21-5310C-406 ARPA WX LIHEAP	Grant	\$ 586,965.00	
Active DOC S22-32101-206 CSBG	Grant	\$ 96,344.00	
	TOTAL	\$47,575,548.00	