



HB 4111 I20

Testimony for House Transportation and Economic Development

Chuck Riley 2.5.2014

Chair Read, members of the committee, for the record my name is Chuck Riley and today I am representing Tax Fairness Oregon. As always, we want to protect the rights of Oregon's taxpayers.

We believe that HB 4111 is in concept a good idea, but we do have concerns including the following 5:

1. Section 1 talks about filling the multimillion \$ gap. This implies that our bonding capacity is not sufficient for upcoming projects, and exceeding that capacity is worrisome. The inclusion of the Treasurer offers some comfort, but it is still a concern. Are we putting too much debt on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren? Section 13 states clearly that the Infrastructure Innovation Oregon has the authority to borrow money.
2. Section 5 states that I2o shall carry out all powers, rights and privileges expressly conferred or implied by law. The word implied is open ended and is therefore troubling.
3. Section 5 also says that I2o shall be governmental agency, but not a state, local, or municipal agency under Oregon statutes or the Oregon constitution, and yet it's employees are state employees. We aren't sure what that implies. Is there some other agency like this with this much power and autonomy?
4. According to section 9, the budget of I2o which is to be passed with fewer than 30 days notice, is not subject to review or approval of the legislature, and fees are not review by the legislature.
5. Finally, The bill is for an emergency! What is the nature of the emergency?

Thank you for hearing our concerns, and I hope that they can be addressed prior to this bill moving forward.

We read the bills and follow the money