

Tory Flory

From: Les Ruark <leswruark@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 15:08
To: usanz@ortelco.net; d420cop@gmail.com; dgreiner1979@hotmail.com; Kathy Johnson; Mary Reser; sgchdboard@gmail.com; sgilliamhealth@gmail.com
Subject: Following up.
Attachments: Les Ruark comment to SGCHD brd 1123.pdf; HB 2805 '23 ses.pdf

This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

21 November 2023

Cindy Hinton, Chairperson
Tory Flory, Vice-Chairperson
and Members
Board of Directors
South Gilliam County Health District
Condon, Oregon

Chair Hinton; vice-chair Flory; directors Greiner, Johnson and Reser:

Attached, albeit not quite as quickly as I'd hoped to have gotten it to you, is copy of the written public comment I submitted in-person last evening to the board. Plus copy of the most recent revisions to Oregon's public records and meetings statutes, as vice-chair Flory asked me to provide. I am taking liberty of sharing this send with others likely also interested in both of these subject matters.

I appreciated the board's welcome and accommodation of my presence last evening, and the subsequent discussion we had about the comment I presented. I look forward to receiving the answers to the questions I posed, which vice-chair Flory said are to be forthcoming. I also appreciated the learning had by having remained in attendance for the entire two hour meeting it was.

Again, let me repeat to and reassure each of you (as well as the newly named administrator), my appearance before the board last evening was not aimed at taking issue with the person herself who has been named the district's administrator. But rather, to genuinely (and obviously seriously) take issue with the lack of actual transparency involved with that decision-making. In essence, the lack of making for sound decision-making—which in turn, significantly lessens the chance of the board's decision-making being taken to task in the first place, whatever the matter involved.

Said again here, in a somewhat different way, the primary gist of what I was attempting to get across last evening was this:

The *district administrator's* role is *the* significant most important public face of the health district, second only (if that) to the PAs and clinic staff. The position is, by the very nature of its responsibilities, *the individual* responsible for the day to

day operations of the clinic and its district and the success of those operations (the board, of course, being responsible for the overall direction and sustained success of the clinic and its district).

Why would you *not* want to make as public as possible the selection process for naming an administrator as well as the subsequent detail arrived-at for compensating and bringing on board that individual? The board helms a 'public body' and is itself a 'governing body' as both are defined under state statutes.

Doesn't it—shouldn't it—have made more sense for the *full* board to have had opportunity to at least sign off on the selection of that individual if not in fact itself forged that selection, not to mention had some say in the construction and approval of the actual Letter of Employment arrived-at for that position—versus (and not all that particularly disclosed) handing over that collective responsibility as it did (least from all accounts I've been able to decipher), to a hiring committee purposefully comprised of less than a quorum of the board (plus other participants) for the obvious reason, it certainly appears, of then being able to largely *sidestep* having to adhere to or otherwise reflect the state's public meetings and records statutes (at least the spirit of, if not actually the intent of, those statutes)?

Wouldn't it have been much more straightforward, clearer, and have made for a cleaner process (at least outwardly) to have simply involved the full board in the selection and hiring process (including making proper use of executive session which that quite likely would have entailed)—if for no other reason than to exemplify the renewed effort to build (re-build) the trust and transparency in the board's work board members themselves have said they are committed to providing for?

Especially considering the person selected and named the district's new administrator is a recent former member of the board itself she is.

Sure seems to me it would have been, probably should have been. And, to a certain extent, still can be—depending upon just how transparent the board's answers are to the questions I've asked of it.

In closing here, I would certainly not attempt to speak for any particular member of the board. That said, however, I *am* aware of at least one newer director quite probably believing or feeling as I do—if, actually, there isn't also one, maybe even two other of the newer directors feeling the same or at least seriously leaning in that direction. If that "reading" of the board is of any help to the other two directors, moving forward :)

Whatever the ultimate outcome of the questions I've asked and the concern I've raised, again, thank you for taking into account the perspective I've offered up in this matter.

Have a decent and enjoyable Thanksgiving—genuinely.

Sincerely,

Les

LES RUARK

leswruark@gmail.com

(541) 454-2511

