

Points on HB 4214 (H-1)

Sec. 13 (5) Page 13 Eliminate review team contracting the actual review.

Sec 14a (9) Page 18 Pretty big power shows the difficulty of changing direction.

Sec 15 (5)(c) Page 21 We don't like firms, but at least one person must head this project . Someone must be in charge and hold responsibility.

Sec. 15 (5)(d) Page 22 The EFM, since we are now moving into administering ordinances should not just have financial background but also management background.

Sec 19(1)(aa)(bb)(cc) Page 30 & 31 No problem with creating agreements for consolidated services with neighbors. Consolidation with neighbors is better in this sub because the procedures are left intact. It essentially allows the EFM to explore and recommend. Dissolve or disincorporate makes no sense. You lose all power to tax, cities and villages become townships or are added to existing townships which just spreads the troubles to a larger group, without their consent. There are no provisions in law for what exists when a township is disincorporated or dissolved.

Sec 19(1)(dd) Page 31 This is where a EFM needs local government management background.

Sec 22 Page 34 The check book of the local government should be posted to the website by an EFM. All contracts approved by the EFM should be posted and all expenditures related to the expense of the EFM including specialists brought in to assist should be separately identified showing cumulative totals.

Sec . 26(3) Page 40 These people could have been elected to solve the problem and are working collaboratively to solve the problem, such as occurred in testimony last week. This generalizes to the point of being wrong just as much as it is right.

The liability protection ignores the fact that an EFM can cause significant harm. Someone has to be accountable if real harm is done.