

Erlanger Legislation

SB0139/HB0107

Questions and Issues

Respectfully Submitted by Commissioner Tim Boyd

Ref: Executive Summary

- 1. Pg. 1/5 3rd Bullet** – Why does the Commission not have any say in the selection and appointment of the initial seven "community members" of the board?
- 2. Pg. 1/5 Last Sentence, Pg. 2/5 Section 3b** – Why is the Commission not allowed to confirm the nominations of the initial seven "community members" of the board?
- 3. Pg. 2/5 Section 1** – Why is the name not being changed to "Hamilton County Hospital Authority"?
- 4. Pg. 2/5 Section 3a** – Due to the fact that the County Commission is not being considered in the selection process of the "community members" of the board, by this document I am formally requesting the names and contact information for those being considered for the appointments of the "community members" before the County Commission is asked to vote on the approval of this legislation.
- 5. Pg. 2/5 Section 3b** – Why is the Legislative Delegation selecting the first board chair? This function is generally the first order of business of any board or legislative body. If the initial "community members" of the board are allowed to select the "academic board member" under this bill, why are they not allowed to select the initial board chair?
- 6. Pg. 3/5 Section 8** – Why is the City mention in this statement and any other section of the bill? Why is the City given any option on properties the authority may "...cease to use..."
- 7. Pg. 4/5 Section 12** – The county is mandated to provide funds to Erlanger, but has no say in the selection of the initial board members. This mandate is having the citizens of Hamilton County provide

\$50,000,000 – \$80,000,000 to Erlaner over the next 36 years, and yet their local elected representatives who are responsible for spending collected taxes have absolutely no say in how these funds might be used.

8. Pg. 4/5 Section 14 – This act should not be voted on by the Commission until such time as the names of the nominees for the initial "community members" of the board are made public.

9. Pg 5/5 Question #1 – The board selection process should be determined prior to the "...passage of the bill."

10. Pg. 5/5 Question #3 – This answer does not seem to support the actual selection process as defined within the bill.

11. Pg. 5/5 Question #4 – The discussion of the language of this bill may have been open and transparent, so why (as of this date) has the selection process for "community members" of the board not been as open and transparent? When will the nominees' names be made public?

