

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

I am a retired law-enforcement officer who spent a career working with courts, contracts, budgets, and accountability. I am not telling anyone how to vote but encouraging voters to consider financial judgment and risk when evaluating candidates for the Curry County Board of Commissioners.

Public court records show that commissioner candidate Jeremy Dumire has been the subject of multiple civil judgments related to unpaid debts, which were resolved only after court action. These were civil matters, not criminal cases. That distinction matters and should be acknowledged.

At the same time, repeated judgments and wage-garnishment proceedings are not irrelevant when the office sought carries fiduciary responsibility. County commissioners oversee multi-million-dollar budgets, approve contracts, and are entrusted with safeguarding taxpayer resources. In my professional experience, financial decision-making under pressure is a legitimate indicator of risk—not as a moral judgment, but as a practical governance concern.

In law enforcement, we assessed risk by looking at patterns, not isolated incidents. We ask whether past behavior could reasonably affect future responsibilities. That same lens is appropriate here. Voters are entitled to ask whether a candidate's documented financial history aligns with the demands of overseeing county finances, and whether it could undermine public confidence or distract from effective governance.

This record does not disqualify anyone from holding office under Oregon law. But it is relevant to public trust. Voters should review the public record, listen carefully to the candidate's explanation, and decide for themselves whether the level of risk is acceptable for this position.

David L. Gardiner
Retired Detective
Brookings, Curry County, Oregon.