

**Les Ruark**  
12888 Lower Rock Creek Lane  
Arlington, Oregon 97812  
(541) 454-2511  
leswruark@gmail.com

1 March 2021

Elizabeth Farrar-Campbell, Judge  
Sherrie Wilkins, Commissioner  
Pat Shannon, Commissioner  
Gilliam County Court  
Condon, Oregon

Judge Campbell; Commissioners Wilkins, Shannon:

I definitely wish to offer up an objection here to the county court, collectively, taking action Wednesday to oppose Senate Bill 554—not until there's been genuine advance opportunity for there to be a thorough discussion at the court's table of this legislation. To date, there's been none.

Certainly with due respect, quite sincerely, to commissioner Shannon, providing for simply five days posting (of which two of those days have been weekend days) of his (as I'm sure he'd be the first to admit) not-all-that-*unbiased* use of the court's briefing paper process to place this matter on Wednesday's agenda *is not*, in and of itself, the complete due-diligence this matter deserves—his preparing of the briefing paper and the court's first-time discussion of this matter does not make, alone, for the genuine and adequate effort needed by the court itself to fully examine and vet the issues this legislation brings to the forefront.

If an individual commissioner wants, in the next several days, to oppose or support this bill in Salem, given the bill's movement there this past week, that's certainly his or her prerogative. One, however, that obviously doesn't and need not require an accompanying resolution from the court to exercise. So long as it's made clear that that commissioner's individual position is just that and not (yet, and may well not ultimately be) the full court's position.

In the meantime, please, on Wednesday, *table* the request that's before you until a due-diligence review of it here can be and is made. One which easily could and should include putting on the table all sides of this issue versus offering up a collection of, essentially, but one perspective—in this instance, opposition to the bill.

By the way, if there was ever an example of the importance I've previously passed along to the court of it needing to determine *ahead* of a legislative session what its (the county's) set of legislative priorities and bills to track ought or ought not to be, this situation certainly serves to substantiate that need, for exercising some degree of assembly and consideration of forethought—least as best one *can* plan ahead for a legislative session these days; sure seems to me anyways. After all, SB 554 was pre-session filed; it isn't as if it completely came out of nowhere.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

**Les**

LES RUARK