

Senate Committee on Health Care

Re: SB408 – Scope of Practice

Dear Chair Patterson, Vice-Chair Hayden, Members of the Committee on Health Care,

I **oppose** SB408, as, in my opinion, the intention of SB408 is not clear.

Why is it necessary to introduce an additional oversight to health care practices that are already regulated?

Each practice listed in Section 1 (2) is defined in ORS, and each has its own Regulatory Board and pertinent OAR chapter.

Further, for example, Section 4 (C) (b) says:

“In conducting the scope of practice review, a panel established under this subsection may consult with a *health professional regulatory board* [emphasis added] that regulates a health care profession described in subsection (2) of this section.”

This statement in its own points out the potential redundancy of the panel’s work.

The bill, as it is written, also has a potential to either restrict or limit the scope of practice of listed health care professions. Considering the shortage of health care practitioners, especially in rural areas, this would be detrimental to patients.

Interestingly, the nursing practice is omitted from the list in 1 (2). Was this intentional?

In my recent involvement with legislative efforts, I have witnessed flawed evidence, poorly drafted bills and, consequently, misunderstanding and confusion by both the legislators and the public.

I also perceived the mispurpose of some OHA advisory panels, and lackadaisical performance of others. We do not need another OHA panel. We need to start supporting Oregon population better through a patient-centered healthcare approach, patient rights protections, and allowing healthcare professionals autonomy and discretion of their decision-making. Overregulation and any additional steps involved in healthcare workflow do not benefit anyone.

Therefore, please vote no on SB408. Let us leave health care regulations to the Regulatory Boards that already exist and have all the necessary processes in place.

Respectfully,

Gordana Nichols