

Co-chairs Beyer and McKeown,

There is a lot to like in this package on which you have worked so hard – most notably the historic state investment in transit operations. We also appreciate investment in active transportation and the badly needed funding for repair, maintenance and seismic upgrades of Oregon's roads and bridges. However, there is a major issue in the accountability section that you may want to fix:

The exemptions for the Cost Benefit Analysis (Section 13) would lead to it being used on so few projects that its utility in comparing the value of different investment choices are eliminated. In the most recent (2015-2018) STIP, in an earlier analysis I found only 3 projects over \$10 million. I don't know how many of those were over the \$15 million threshold. Since the bill also exempts from CBAs all earmarks (Section 71d) and all Congestion Relief Projects (indicates Section 12 which appears to be incorrect), it's unclear what projects CBAs would even apply to.

If you want CBAs to be used to help identify the best projects to prioritize, and not just as a checkbox, the \$15 million threshold will render the effort fruitless. We recommend that you:

**Remove the \$15 million threshold and allow the CBAs to apply to all projects that expand capacity.**

Tax-payers don't want another Pioneer Mountain / Eddyville boondoggle, but the policy as written would allow expensive projects of limited value to move forward without demonstrating a better cost-benefit ratio compared with smaller projects that are exempt from CBAs.

Thanks for all you do,  
-Chris Rall