

Meeting Date	Funding Sources	Pros	Cons	Notes
11/3	DAS Service Charge Fees	Stable funding, compensates for benefit to enterprise	The other agencies would need to find a way to fund the transfer with their GF or OF. Not sufficient to fund entire need, only connected to enterprise use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DAS Service Charge Fee List- <a href="https://pricelist.dasapp.oregon.gov/">https://pricelist.dasapp.oregon.gov/</a></li> <li>Amount of suggested charge: \$1,000,000 spread across the agencies pro-rata or \$50 per position.</li> </ul>
11/3	Prevailing Wage Fee Cap Increase	<p>Already infrastructure and policy</p> <p>Consistent increase approach</p> <p>Allows for prevailing wage staff to be covered by PWR fees as intended</p>	<p>Also public funds</p> <p>Can vary depending on amount of public infrastructure investment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ORS 279C.825 sets the prevailing wage fee paid for by public bodies at 0.01 percent of the contract price. However, in no event may a fee be charged and collected that is less than \$250 or more than \$7,500.</li> <li>The last time it was updated was in 2009, prior to that 2003. In 2009 the fee increased by 50%.</li> <li>If we increase the cap by the same 50% used in 2009 we'd have another <b>\$1,512,434.63, looking back.</b></li> </ul>
11/3	New Business Registry Fee	Relatively stable	Increased costs for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of suggested charge: \$50/ year</li> <li>Current Charge - \$100/year for instate business, \$275 for out of state</li> </ul>

Meeting Date	Funding Sources	Pros	Cons	Notes																														
		Registry will capture more businesses, including those wouldn't be captured by OED; existing fee structure could be easily tweaked, just need IAA for transfer	doing business in Oregon  Increase in administrative work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current number of Oregon business registries: <a href="https://sos.oregon.gov/business/Pages/oregon-business-statistics.aspx">https://sos.oregon.gov/business/Pages/oregon-business-statistics.aspx</a></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Active Business Filings</b></p> <table> <tr> <th>Business Type</th><th>Latest Month</th><th>Previous Month</th><th>12 Months Ago</th><th>Change Year Ago</th></tr> <tr> <td>Assumed Business Names</td><td>114,449</td><td>114,550</td><td>116,720</td><td>-1.9%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Limited Liability Companies</td><td>309,390</td><td>307,655</td><td>293,318</td><td>5.5%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Corporations</td><td>114,511</td><td>114,349</td><td>113,978</td><td>0.5%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Other</td><td>2,730</td><td>2,620</td><td>2,775</td><td>-1.6%</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Business Registry Total</b></td><td><b>541,080</b></td><td><b>539,174</b></td><td><b>526,791</b></td><td><b>2.7%</b></td></tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing ABNs that is about 425,000 registries</li> <li>Note it looks like approximately 180,000 actual have employees, maybe charge \$100 per year</li> <li>Could collect from SOS or collect a fee from OED when people file their first payroll report.</li> </ul>	Business Type	Latest Month	Previous Month	12 Months Ago	Change Year Ago	Assumed Business Names	114,449	114,550	116,720	-1.9%	Limited Liability Companies	309,390	307,655	293,318	5.5%	Corporations	114,511	114,349	113,978	0.5%	Other	2,730	2,620	2,775	-1.6%	<b>Business Registry Total</b>	<b>541,080</b>	<b>539,174</b>	<b>526,791</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
Business Type	Latest Month	Previous Month	12 Months Ago	Change Year Ago																														
Assumed Business Names	114,449	114,550	116,720	-1.9%																														
Limited Liability Companies	309,390	307,655	293,318	5.5%																														
Corporations	114,511	114,349	113,978	0.5%																														
Other	2,730	2,620	2,775	-1.6%																														
<b>Business Registry Total</b>	<b>541,080</b>	<b>539,174</b>	<b>526,791</b>	<b>2.7%</b>																														
11/14	Workers' Compensation Fund Transfer (Washington State model)	shared funding model, proven effective in funding similar	more cost to solely employers, Prevailing wage funding mechanism requires																															

Meeting Date	Funding Sources	Pros	Cons	Notes
		agency work at much larger scale, effective at preventing backlogs	prevailing wage policy change	
11/20	Wage Security Fund Increase (UI tax diversion)	Pros: Existing infrastructure and mechanism, stable funding mechanism	Narrow costs imposed upon employers only, statutory change required, impacts the UI trust fund balance depending upon how much would be diverted could have an impact on employer rates	<p><b><u>12.29 Information</u></b></p> <p>CFO Analysis suggests that current utilization can remain until will need to be increased to cover expenses as early as the 33-35 biennium to maintain reserves equal to 3 months and keep up with inflation, or as early as the 31-33 biennium to maintain reserves equal to 6 months and keep up with inflation. 6 months is the preferred amount.</p> <p>Approximately \$2.5 Million could be added to the WSF through 29-31, but it will need to be increased, to be effective in 2032.</p> <p>If pursued, will need to find out what the new rate will need to be.</p>
11/20	Worker Benefit Fund Increase	Costs shared between employers	expands existing purpose,	See DCBS Materials

Meeting Date	Funding Sources	Pros	Cons	Notes
		and employees, existing infrastructure and mechanism, stable funding mechanism	requires statutory change	
11/24	Increase to Corporate Income or Excise Tax (BOLI-specific allocation)			
	Cannabis Tax (BOLI-specific allocation)			
11/24 and 12/17	Increased Penalties on Non-Compliant Employers	Revenue coming from employers who have violated the law	Increased administrative burden, risk of perceived enforcement driven funding, potential incentivization for extending process and increasing penalty assessments,	

Meeting Date	Funding Sources	Pros	Cons	Notes
			<p>Additional capacity</p> <p>needed on the front end to be able to collect penalties, funding source unstable.</p>	