First and foremost the idea that people and businesses cannot make decisions for themselves is a belief. We as humans are incredibly emotional beings and in the face of scientific evidence, we are likely to give up our rights and others feel that they are essential, but I don’t know where that other party is going to convince the other. I just wanted to briefly share my thoughts with you and the board. Obviously, some of us think masks are easy to go without, but others feel they are essential.

Government's 7/15/20 mask directive:

The latest COVID-19 case updates can be found on the DCHD Facebook page.

Deaths: 0
Hospitalizations: 1
Total cases: 30
Active cases in Davison County - 5
3450/209, 10/28/999/3898,
Active cases in the past 7 days (1,911 new, surrounding areas: ND 2,484/2096, SD 10,516/1198).

A motion was made by [Justice] to approve meeting minutes as published from 8/7/2020. Seconded by [Justice].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests: Hunter Herbaugh, Shanay Sagert, Jamie Mitchell
Timber Demandwol
Staff Present: Chad Hilt - Mental Health
Larisa Cross - Licensed Therapist
Stephan Strehlau - Grandview Schools
Denise Zander - Commissioner
Jerry Jimison - City of Grandview
Joe Lee - Medical Officer

III Donahue-GMC

Date: 8/7/20
From the mandate by Governor Bullock, we see that he says he wants to respect the decision-making of individual counties. But ultimately, he chose not to trust or respect the freedom of individuals and even the decision-making capabilities of local governments. From the discussion by the board of health, the impression given seems to be condescending. It’s either, we (the board) don’t think the business owners can keep up with the statistics that millions of Americans are staring at every day. Or, that the board just doesn’t trust businesses. Maybe there’s a third alternative I’m missing. Admittedly, I only know what the newspaper reported on the meeting, so context could be missing. Ultimately, I think our government has already overstepped its responsibility in attempting to mandate what is "safe". By all means, honor the governor’s mandate if you must, but I ask respectfully that you do not trample further on our freedoms. We the people are not your inferiors that are unable to make our own decisions about what is best for ourselves and our families. Our country was born out of a desire for individual rights and freedoms, and stripping us of the right to make our own decisions for our own safety is humiliating and demeaning.

Respectfully,
Shane Bishop

To Whom it May Concern:

As a resident of Dawson County, I am writing to voice concerns with the recent mask mandate that was passed at the last Board of Health meeting as reported by the Ranger Review. I understand that the Board of Health CAN create such mandates, but that alone does not mean you SHOULD.

It is my understanding that for a county Board of Health to implement mandates that are more restrictive than state mandates, as in this instance, there are several ‘checks’ that need to occur per Montana Code. Simplified, those things might include: meetings being publicly posted with the agenda, a ‘case’ or data (i.e. literature, peer reviewed studies) should be presented by the board justifying why the county needs more stringent restrictions (i.e. increased risk or threat to the residents residing here versus the rest of the state), and the opportunity for public comment. Despite my best effort to clarify if these things are indeed required or if they occurred, is blurry.

Whether or not the meeting and its agenda was posted is a bit of a moot point at this date. However, there have been convincing, reliable sources that corroborate that this did not occur.
Insulting.

We sadly live in a divided country. Please do not contribute to that division on the local level.

Injustice. The effect was sadly misplaced. This has been widely perceived as gross overreaches of power and fraud.

The opportunity for public comment seems to be coming "after the fact," but I have been assured that this process is not arterial. In which deep concern, these are my opinions. You will consider the ramifications of decisions in the best interest of the community.

How well do your empathy theses work?

I am concerned that there is no expectation of any nonunissuance statements were to prevent. Our primary concern that there is not an expectation to the anyone other than extreme situations were to encourage such ramifications. This shows a contradiction to me. Why create a mandate that could easily be lifted without any evidence that was taken out of context and never the intent of the board to implement.

How can this have been with public discussion about the possible penalty of not abiding by this mandate?

Improvements, as seen elsewhere, are discussed in a news article. The possible punishments could be $500 or a night in jail, if not.

并且/或瓣你并未足够，因此你对这些可能的惩罚应保持警惕。

There has been with public discussion about the possible penalty of not abiding by this mandate.

It has been with public discussion about the possible penalty of not abiding by this mandate.

The need for action is obvious. How can you be indifferent to the need to implement such punishments?

Regarding the new regulations, the need for action is obvious. How can you be indifferent to the need to implement such punishments?

And/or as per the powers, the second time you have been given would be eternal.
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How can this have been with public discussion about the possible penalty of not abiding by this mandate?
Respectfully,
Jamie McMillan

1. Going beyond the governors requirements in itself causes confusion. Now we have different requirements than other counties which causes confusion with other Montanans. Keep it simple and the same as all the other counties in Montana.

2. The problem of changing between 3 & 4 cases will always be a challenge that we have to communicate and lengthening the time until we stop requiring mask use will not stop that. The reality that this difficulty is caused by the governor, doesn’t mean we need to go beyond the governor’s mandate.

3. Our number of cases are low and doesn’t require more strict measures. And obviously if we have more cases the mask rule will be in effect.

4. Enforcement with fines and jail time wasn’t even part of the Governors order or communication and shouldn’t be part of the counties conversation either.

Respectfully,
David Wedel
126 Maple Ave
Glendive MT

We are not able to attend the meeting, but we would like to comment on the Dawson County order for face coverings. First of all, the way we read it, the board wants face coverings to be utilized for longer than the Governor’s mandate because of confusion as to whether we have 3 or 4 cases? So, the board is implying that the people of Dawson County are so stupid that we can’t figure out how many cases we have? The information is easy to find and someone posts daily what our numbers are. So, where is the confusion that the board is talking about? Seems to us that the only people that are confused are the members of the board if you think we can’t figure this out.

This pandemic is hard enough. Why add to the hell? All the board has managed to do with this proposed extension is to cause more anger and fighting among the people of this county who are just trying to get through this. Not to mention, the number of people who have stated that they will no longer shop here because of it. This will hurt us more than you can even imagine and you need to consider that.
I am writing this letter to voice my concerns pertaining to the mask mandate passed by the Dawson County Board of Health.

To Whom It May Concern:

Gentlemen

6 Executive Place
Ken & Lori Miller

Any given day or time. Thank you.

Our community is safe as possible and to lessen confusion about whether or not the mask mandate is in place on those of us that are trying to stay safe during this pandemic appreciate the efforts of the Board of Health to keep us comfortable and safer during.

I have seen an uptick in local businesses and now we can remember to the mandate we had avoided going into many or local businesses at all and now we can remember in our community and don't wish to see mask compliance fail again when we are in our community Full Florin Davis.

When the mask directive in place we have observed a marked increase in the amount of residents wearing masks.

The mask order would be extended indefinitely until such time as what Carbon County has done.

We are unable to attend the board of health meetings but Ken and I strongly support the board of health order to wear masks.

Ty. Vickie Luch

Following in their footsteps. Enough is enough.

The media has done nothing but impose fear in people about Covid-19 and you as the Board of Health are

Dawson County has had very few cases. This is something to consider as well. We must, as a whole, be doing

people with them on. We should have the right to choose what we are comfortable with.

people in Dawson County feel more comfortable not wearing them. We are saying this because we see very few people in Dawson County feeling comfortable not wearing them. We realize that the majority of the society's focus is on current information sharing the mask. Our work is not to be talked about the majority of the time.

Dawson County has had very few cases. This is something to consider as well. You as the Board of Health are

people with them on. We should have the right to choose what we are comfortable with.
Governor Bullock mandated state wide mask be used in counties with 4, or more COVID-19 cases in July. This directive does state that County Health Boards, and/or local health officials do have the power to implement stricter guidelines, if the Montana Code is followed. Such as peer reviewed data presented by the board justifying why Dawson County requires more restriction to keep our citizens safe. I have yet to find any information showing that this data was ever presented to the public.

Dawson County has had 30 confirmed cases of COVID-19, 1 hospitalization, and Thank God 0 deaths. From these 30 cases, how many have been asymptomatic, or very mild symptoms? How do we know that these tests were not false positive? How many tests have been performed in Dawson County? These are questions that need to be answered to show proof that Dawson County citizens are in imminent danger compared to other counties in Montana, and why the Dawson County Board of Health feels we need to continue wearing face masks for 3 weeks after reaching 0 cases.

This mandate is an overreach of our local government, and it is maddening to read in the Ranger Review that we citizens are to stupid “confused as the Board of Health would say” to know the difference between 3-4 cases, and therefore we will not know if the States Mask Mandate is in affect.

It seems that the Dawson County Board of Health is making these decisions based on their own fear, and want our citizens to be in fear of potential fines, and jail time. If we do not abide by wearing a mask for 3 weeks after the impossibility of reaching 0 cases anytime in the near future.

COVID-19 is real. We have all suffered in some way since March. Illness, loss of a job, missing school, lack of human contact, not being able to see our older loved ones, not being able to attend a, funeral, wedding, or graduation. I ask. Is this the best our elected officials can/will do?

Respectfully,
Billie Jo Stebbins.

Good morning, everyone. I will be listening in on this meeting, as I go about my work day, so I appreciate the opportunity to submit my comment this way. Thank you for taking the time to read it. With that, I have a few things to address.

My main concern, at this time, is fear based leadership. You, the members of this board, are charged with making decisions for our community based on fact. The fact is, Glendive is in great shape, at this time. Our positive case count is low. As I write to you, on August 20, 2020, we have a total of 8 active COVID cases. While I am deeply
cases, the face coverings would be required for the 3-week period after the Dawson County has zero active cases. Board of Health further restricted the Governor’s directive by requiring that even if Dawson County falls below 90 new COVID-19 cases in a week, the mask mandate remain in place.

During this time, in which there are zero or more active cases, you’re required to wear a mask when doing activities that involve the Dawson County directive applies to counties in which there are four or more confirmed and active COVID-19 cases, and only.


I would once again like to think you for taking the time to read my concerns. I wish you all the best in your

enough to do right by his citizens.

I encourage you all to rethink this decision to suppress our state mandate. I encourage you believe in the people,

how important it is for a community that is bustling as the seasons with fluctuate price,

them, I would hesitate to be so bold, I would hesitate to make a decision that destroys small business in Glendive.

employees will be you, the members of the board. Likewise, you will be willing to put yourself out there and do it for

anyone who is wearing a mask who will be expected to earn our trust and our business. Where you will be expected to show your

mandate. How will business owners and employees be expected to enforce it? Will they be expected to turn away

my third and final concern is for the wonderful and thriving small businesses in Glendive. If you finalize this mask

with an emergency that you have no intention of carrying out, once again, causing division in Glendive.

announcements cause unnecessary panic in our community. Well done, you’ve scared people into submission

neighbors’ and fellow citizens of Glendive were even topics for discussion. The lack of time and the time for

compromise. I’m wondering why our board of health would be concerned with toying or real change. I fear that extending our state mask mandate’s in place.

next, I would like to call attention to what I’m sure is the elephant in the room. ‘Discussion that took place

please be at the door. You are here to make informed decisions based on the current situation in our town.

we will all be detainees. We cannot hide and destroy our town because we are scared. Check your fears and your

realize that there is change. I fear that extending our state mask mandate’s in real time. This is a burden.

for those who are being impacted by this virus, our town and a whole, is not in a state of emergency. While I
In regard to complying with the Governor's Directive, it should be noted that the directive covering indoor spaces is specifically for "all businesses, government offices, and other persons responsible for indoor spaces open to the public." In regards to outdoor activities, the directive says that "sponsors shall require and take reasonable measures." The directive is NOT for the general population, but rather for those that are in control of public spaces and sponsors of events.

For argument sake, let's say that there are 200 businesses, government offices, etc. in Dawson County that have a fixed location and this location is open to the public. These locations are responsible for posting a sign that states, per the directive, "Mask or face covering use required for ages five and older." The Dawson County Board of Health feels that "there would be confusion" as to whether masks are required or not. The Board of Health is, therefore, implying that these 200 business owners and government officials aren't capable of checking the DPHHS website or the Dawson County Health Department Facebook page on a daily basis to see if there are 4 or more active cases.

As an individual in charge of the daily operations of a successful business in Dawson County, I can assure you that I am capable of checking a website or Facebook page daily. I am quite capable of counting to 4 and have been since before I started grade school. I can discern whether to put a sign on entry doors or not. If you want to eliminate confusion, the Board of Health should simply state which standard should be used as the DPHHS website and Dawson County Board of Health don't both always reflect the same information.

Lastly, placing the additional 3-week restriction on Dawson County is absolutely anti-business. The general population is already avoiding going into businesses in Dawson County because of the mask mandate. Business owners have said that people are turning around at their doors when they see the sign requiring the use of masks. Online shopping has increased due to the pandemic. While I, and most Dawson County residents, have no problem complying with the Governor's directive, I don't believe that it needs to be further restricted by the Dawson County Board of Health. Please don't further strangle the economy of our County by implementing restrictions in addition to the Governor's directive.

Mary Ann Phipps, EA
CHMS, P.C.
PO Box 561
113 W. Towne Street
Glendive, MT 59330
(406) 377-3361 (phone)
Preventative measures will move into our community. Mask use may not be the end all but the best. There is no mask protocol, nobody is being arrested or fined. We have a virus we can't control and it's not under control. If we don't take preventative measures we have seen any deaths. Unless we take measures we are going to see it go up.

There is no mask protocol, nobody is being arrested or fined. We have a virus we can't control and it's not under control. If we don't take preventative measures we have seen any deaths. Unless we take measures we are going to see it go up.

The reason you don't see any sick people is because they are in the county and we are seeing more here now. The reason you don't see any sick people is because they are in the county and we are seeing more here now. The reason you don't see any sick people is because they are in the county and we are seeing more here now.

Care Stephens

Health Department said to decide for the town of Glendale.

The government's orders overreach enough, our small town in eastern MT doesn't need stricter directives than Kaelin Circuit

There is no support for mask use.

mental health, leading them to live in fear. Believe mask use borders on child abuse. Believe mask use borders on child abuse. The statistics are skewed and

Amber Williams

To help people with their health.

morbidity and mortality in the county? glare, smoking, alcohol. Masks are way down on the list, this will do nothing.

Lynelle Chewy

communities are vulnerable, there are other aspects of health we should be concerned about the real causes for

public record.

Abigail Doolittle-Harris

Without ever changing.

In your opinion nowAlice mask is not good. Scolds have said they are wearing the same mask all day.

Jaimie Hashima

Public comment on the call. Below is a summation of those who spoke.
Luke Gambee
Wants to see real studies.

Jerry thanked everyone for taking the time to submit comments and be present for this call. In the documentation submitted by Ms. Harris there is a disclaimer stating this information should be used at your own risk, health decisions should be discussed with your healthcare provider. There hasn’t been any enforcement for those not wearing a mask. Mask are intended to protect others not the person wearing it.

Brett- Made a clarification about the directive and its intent. At no time during the discussion did anyone say enforcement of mask use should be the primary concern. A question was simply asked about what could be enforced.

Stephen- Agreed with the education piece on mask use; this is where our focus should be and to educate the public about where to find information on active cases in the county.

Brett- Agrees with Stephen . The public comments are well taken.

Justin- The basic premise is citizens are caring and compassionate. The order was not a power grab but rather a way to make sure people who are at risk are also being thought of.

Timber- Carbon County has a mask directive that states it will stay in effect until the number of positive cases drops below 4 for a sustained period of time. Currently they are at 12 active cases; 80 total cases.
  - Residents travel to identified hot spots as defined by the State of MT
  - Monitoring the capacity of the hospital, PPE and public health

Mineral and Beaverhead counties have the same concerns as Dawson County. Dawson County unified health team does monitor the capacity of the hospital, PPE and public health and active case trends it just hasn’t been publicized.

Brett motioned to withdraw the Board of Health order dated 8/7/2020. Seconded by Stephen.
All were in favor, no one opposed.

Event Requests:
Approved activities included:
Date: 11/13/2000

Notes by: Timber Dempewolf

Next meeting- 9-4-20 at 11:00

By Chair Signature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45-65 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Retreat - Eastern Montana Bible Camp Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10th with 100+ individuals in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer 5K Walk/Run</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>