

From: Les Ruark leswruark@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment by Les Ruark submitted to the SGCHD Board November 20, 2023.
Date: November 20, 2023 at 1:27 PM
To:



Questions and a definite concern,
presented as public comment to
the South Gilliam County Health District (SGCHD) Board,
by Les Ruark,
12888 Lower Rock Creek Lane, Arlington, Oregon,
a patron of the South Gilliam Health Center,
Monday, November 20, 2023.

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

I am here this evening to put forth to the board six questions and a definite concern. I intend to ask the questions collectively without expecting them to be answered—as I pose them—until after I've completed presenting my comment; recognizing, of course, that the board may, instead, choose to answer them at a later time and by a different means than verbally here this evening.

By either occurrence—this evening, or within a reasonable time after this evening—these are questions certainly deserving of being answered publicly, in as timely a manner as possible, and with the detail sought—and not so much chiefly with accompanying defensive personal reaction aimed at the person doing the asking :)

I will also submit these questions to the board electronically, immediately following the opportunity here to present them verbally.

Question 1.

At what meeting or meetings of the board did the board or any board-delegated hiring committee consider applicants and/or finalists for the position of district administrator or administrative assistant (whichever title is now being used for the position charged with overseeing the day-to-day operations of the SGCHD clinic and its district)—what were the times, dates and locations of these meetings?

Question 2.

At what meeting or meetings of the board did the full board itself, in open session—or did any board-delegated hiring committee, on its own initiative, and outside of a board meeting setting—proceed to select and determine to offer the position of district administrator (or administrative assistant) to the individual now holding that position—what was the date, time and location involved with this particularly important, the public deserving to see and hear, decision-making?

Question 3.

Did the selection and appointment of the newly hired administrator (or administrative assistant) occur with the consultation of legal counsel, or otherwise involve legal counsel's review, consent, or direction?

Question 4.

Is there a Letter of Employment (an "LOE"), a Personal or Professional Services Agreement (a "PSA"), or other such confirming, certifying, or agreed-to document now in place constituting or otherwise reflecting the actual detail of the aforementioned hiring—the title of the position hired; the responsibilities incurred, or scope of work and deliverables agreed to; the compensation (specific dollar amount) and benefits package (including health insurance and any PERS or other such retirement payments) arrived-at or agreed to; the vacation time allotted; and, the particular working arrangements set forth for the position (including identification of any assigned district-owned vehicle and individually assigned district-held credit card)—and, if there is this record, as there needs to be, why has it not been shared with the full board or even, perhaps, posted to the district's website?

Question 5.

Is an audio recording made of the board's meetings, one which staff or board members rely upon to create a written record of the board's meetings—or, which is used, in lieu of or in addition to written minutes, to also serve as a record of board meetings; and if not, why not?

Question 6.

Was there an audio recording made of, or any written record created covering, the 'meetups' of any board-delegated hiring committee utilized in the aforementioned hiring—the apparently or supposedly being no quorum of the board present at those meetups, notwithstanding?

A definite concern.

If there *has* been *no* on-the-record, occurring-in-open-session, decision-making by the full board itself to hire the South Gilliam County Health District's newly named administrator or administrative assistant (whichever the title is that is now being used for this position)—or, especially, if there's been a hiring of the administrator or administrative assistant on behalf of the board by a board-delegated hiring committee acting on its own initiative and outside of an open session board meeting setting—then please consider this public comment as respectfully, but nonetheless seriously, raising definite concern with the appropriateness and correctness of that situation.

It may well depict, if not actually exemplify, yet another instance, intended or not, of inappropriately deviating from the spirit of, if not in fact the intent of, Oregon's public records and open meetings statutes—for whatever legitimate (supposedly) or perhaps not so legitimate a purpose or need.

A bottomline situation which, if even halfway accurate, will quite likely not be left unchallenged, at whatever 'next step' venue for that there may need to be.

Least as one genuinely interested and concerned person in the board's important responsibilities is looking at it.

Thank you.

###