

Dear Chair Nathanson, Vice Chairs Walters and Reschke, and members of the House Revenue Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony. My name is Spencer Trumm and I live in East Portland. As a community organizer, my work has introduced me to people across Oregon who seek better lives for themselves and their communities. I'm writing to you in opposition to HB 2089. This bill, which threatens to divert a massive portion of the funds designated by Measure 110 for addiction treatment, recovery care, and wraparound services, flagrantly contravenes the voters' wishes and imperils some of the most vulnerable Oregonians.

Lest anyone forget, Measure 110 passed by a 16.92% margin of the vote in 2020. The voters' message was clear. They wanted simple possession of small quantities of drugs to be treated as a medical matter, not a criminal one. And they wanted a major increase in funding for addiction treatment and recovery services to make these lifesaving programs better and more accessible statewide.

In 2021, Oregonians came together once again to demand that Measure 110's funding for treatment be implemented without delay by passing SB 755. In my organizing "beat" alone, I worked with people in recovery, psychiatrists, rehab professionals, attorneys, small business owners, nurses, activists, and the family members of people whose lives had been destroyed by addiction. Their stories of pain and hope had many permutations, but one theme ran through all of them: **every barrier to care is a barrier to recovery.**

For example, volunteers from Central Oregon described how they had to drive for hours every morning on icy backroads to get themselves or loved ones to the nearest clinic that provided the treatment that worked for them. LGBTQ+ volunteers spoke of how hard it was to find providers who would respect their dignity and not try to force them to join a church.

Other people I spoke with told me success stories that illustrated the same point. Volunteers living in remote parts of Wallowa County told me about the difference one clinic made by expanding telemedicine infrastructure there. One counselor who works with clients from tribal nations located in Jefferson County praised the work done by culturally-specific recovery programs. Both emphasized the difference increased accessibility made and agreed that more funding would help effective programs expand their reach.

Some of these people—and many other Oregonians like them—testified and spoke out in favor of SB 755 because they knew what was at stake. They had seen the difference between accessible and inaccessible care programs in people's lives. They were

grateful and hopeful when the legislature made the right choice and voted to pass SB 755 with resounding margins (39 ayes to 15 nays in the House, 19 ayes to 7 nays in the Senate). And they did not think the State would break its word.

For the State to slash funding for addiction treatment and recovery services by tens of millions of dollars—just two years after allocating those funds—would be more than just an insult to the voters. It would disrupt the rollout of recovery programs designed for Oregonians who have had the hardest time accessing care in the past.

Among the 60,000 people served by Measure 110 funds since the Measure's implementation are rural Oregonians, Oregonians of color, and LGBTQ+ Oregonians. For a long time, discrimination, geography, and funding shortages made it harder for people from these communities to access care that met their needs. This disparity in care access deepened inequities across Oregon. Measure 110 funds are changing this by paying for care across the state that is evidence-based, trauma-informed, culturally specific, linguistically accessible, and patient-centered. So if the State enacts HB 2089 and strips away these funds, Oregonians from historically underserved communities will suffer the most.

Oregon has committed to righting historical inequities and helping its people tackle the scourge of addiction. But if the State passes HB 2089, it will renege on both of these commitments.

I urge you to vote NO on HB 2089.

Sincerely,
Spencer Trumm
Portland, OR