

Oregon Legislature:

I am more neutral than opposed, opposition is based more on enacting bills which provide no additional benefit. Current bill SB 850 has essentially three parts:

1. Pay prevailing wage for federally funded ARPA money over \$750,000. All public works projects over \$50,000, and building projects over \$250,000 already require prevailing wage if federally, state, or locally funded. What is the point of enacting special legislation for ARPA funds?
2. Use apprentices to perform at least 15% of the work. This may have some validity to bring new tradesman in, but it could stand on its own.
3. Establish a plan for outreach, recruitment and retention of women, minorities and veterans. I believe this is already required for federal funds, including targets for subcontractors related to minority, women owned and veteran owned business. Again what is the point of enacting additional legislation for what already exists?

Opposition is related to going through the motions to adopt rules related to specific funds, of which half will likely be gone by the time the legislation passes, and will all be gone likely in the next 3 years – without any real change in existing regulations.

Sincerely;

Ralph Dunham

2340 Waite St.

North Bend, OR.