



JAY BOZIEVICH

Lane County Commissioner
West Lane District
jay.bozievich@co.lane.or.us

DATE: March 9, 2015
TO: House Committee on Health Care
RE: HB 3100, relating to public health

Chair Greenlick and Members of the Committee:

The Lane County Board of Commissioners has not taken a formal position on HB 3100 and that is at least partially due to the understanding that the Committee would be developing a number of amendments to the measure based on the comments you'd receive during public testimony.

I have had a chance to examine this measure, and make the following initial observations based less on public health outcomes than from a fiscal responsibility focus:

- The introduced version of the bill repeals ORS 431.375. This statute contains a provision that county's may relinquish their public health authority. I strongly believe the option to relinquish must be contained within HB 3100 in order to protect both the county and the state. We are burying our head in the sand if we believe that simply removing relinquishment language will eliminate the reality that some counties may not survive the next decade without significant reform of either federal forest policy or of state tax policy. Lane County has been down this road before and introduced SB 831 during the 2009 session as a way to ensure that both the state and the county would have adequate tools in the event of either organization's resource constraints.
- I cannot support much of the language of section 30 of the bill regarding the funding of local public health authorities. Specifically, subsection 1 (b) suggests that the Oregon Health Authority should develop a rule that provides equitable distribution of funding that creates a baseline amount that local public health authorities must invest. When the legislature allows county officials to dictate to the amount of money that shall be legislatively appropriated biennially for these services, I suppose I could agree to the legislature telling us how much to appropriate locally. Lane County currently places in excess of \$2.5M general fund dollars towards the statutory requirements of the authority. That is done through a budget process that is inclusionary and transparent, and will continue to be. I will not support a mandate that removes local priority setting and decision making. Finally, I ask that you remove sub-section 4 of section 30 as it is inconsistent with subsection 1. While formulaic distributions are not necessarily perfect, they do provide for consistency. A competitive process involves too much human resource variability and only leads to local inefficiencies and degradation over time of our ability to recruit and retain excellent staff.

I am in support of the foundation capabilities structures outlined in Section 10, and the pathways to establishing those capabilities outlined in sections 11-16.

SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY