

Notes for the file:

March 20, 2007

VH mentions "investigation" to DV. Says he does not think that DV will be involved. He and Susan F. and Viv K. are being interviewed by an independent attorney that the BOH has engaged.

March 21 (?) 2007

DV meets with Viv K. and asks her to let him know if there is anything in the interview that raises questions that DV needs to be aware of and/or may potentially involve him. VK agrees.

March 26, 2007

Vic H. meets with DV and asks him for two pieces of information that came up in the interview with the attorney:

1. What were the dates of DV's trip to India?
2. When did FCU direct DV to tell the India representatives to proceed with the purchase of Tamiflu?

Vic said that it was a grueling 5-hour interview with the attorney. Vic said he did not think that DV would be interviewed if he could supply the answers to the questions.

March 27, 2007

8:05 am - DV meets with VH. Reports:

- What were the dates of DV's trip to India?
  - "September 23 to October 11 2005"
- When did FCU direct DV to tell the India representatives to proceed with the purchase of Tamiflu?
  - "December 15, 2005, @ 10:00 am"

DV said that he has been keeping notes of the meetings and conversations in case he needed to report later. VH said that others have also been keeping notes.

DV asked what VH thought the outcome of the investigation might be? What are the implications for DV and other staff members? DV mentioned that VH, SF and VK had already announced their departure and that leaves only DV left and that he is worried about what may happen.

VH said that he is not sure but that it could lead nowhere or up to and including the dismissal of FCU. There could be far reaching implications. Meeting ended with VH @ approximately 8:13.

9:15 am - DV meets with Viv K. The meeting was not previously scheduled. DV saw VK in hallway and VK asked about the Sonitrol wiring in the Treatment Services area and the need to discuss this with the union. They went into VK's office. DV explained and said he would follow up.

DV asked how VK's interview with the attorney went. She responded that it was interesting and detailed. She went on to discuss her frustrations with FCU and how he has handled her resignation. She emphasized that she resigned before the new

TPCHD-SR 0417

management structure was developed and that her leaving had nothing to do with it. She is frustrated that the other managers do not know the real reason she is leaving, having to do with the way that FCU has handled the antiviral purchase process and how he has treated Susan F. ever since then. She also said that FCU has turned against her ever since the BOH completed his performance evaluation.

DV expressed his concern that he is the only one left of the 4 (DV, SF, VK, VH) who intervened to protect the department and put a halt to the purchase of the Tamiflu. DV & VK discussed how they had worked with VH in May/June of 2006 to concoct a plan to put an end to the purchase of antiviral drugs. DV told FCU that the India representatives had gotten others jobs (Microsoft) and that they were no longer available to help. FCU believed the story and the project came to an end.

DV said it feels a lot like the time when he worked for the department before and the director told him to do something that blew up politically and DV was the scapegoat and was forced to resign. DV said he is 58 years old, with generic management skills and would have a very difficult time trying to find comparable work if he is forced out of his position. He is worried that he may be a scapegoat again.

VK said that she has never experienced anything like this in her 46 years. DV agreed and expressed support and that although he is anxious he hopes that things will turn out for the best. The meeting ended at approximately 9:38.

Notes for file:

March 28, 2007 – 7:41 am

DV met with VH in his office. DV explained that he was concerned that if the investigation information (“the ruse” etc) gets back to FCU that it may jeopardize DV’s position with the agency. VH said he would ask Amy the attorney to send DV an email with assurances that anyone providing information for the investigation would be protected from retribution.

DV explained that between January and April 2006 that FCU had taken the lead on the activities around the project. IE, he had some contact with the Vancouver BC health department to see if they would import the Tamiflu for us. Apparently FCU discussed the Tamiflu acquisition at the April BOH meeting in executive session. DV was not present.

DV explained that on April 19, 2006 FCU told DV to “proceed with the business plan”. DV assumed that this meant to continue with the acquisition of the antiviral medicines. FCU said he would be approaching the BOH at the May 2006 meeting for formal approval. Also on April 19 FCU told DV that Susan Ferguson may request herself from involvement with the antiviral project. FCU said he would be seeking another attorney to advise the BOH

DV did not do anything, rather waited until after the May BOH meeting to see if there was any clarification and/or approval to proceed. After that DV, VH and VK met and discussed how to protect the department from liability. This culminated in DV telling FCU that the India contacts had taken other jobs and were no longer available to help us.

The meeting with VH ended at approximately 7:27 am.