

**From:** [Xess Dx](#)  
**To:** [LRO](#)  
**Subject:** HB 3023 - Testimony - OPPOSE  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 4, 2019 3:07:27 PM

---

My name is Matthew S. I reside in 97034. I am a registered voter, and a Democrat.

I strongly urge the committee to vote NO or simply kill this bill.

I am a full-time rideshare driver for both Uber and Lyft, with over 5,000 rides combined, and high customer satisfaction ratings on both platforms.

1. HB 3023 is terrible for drivers.

With the significant effort the rideshare companies spend on fighting to keep drivers classified as contractors instead of employees, and working hard to defeat any attempt for drivers to collectively bargain for better wages or terms, this bill, if passed, would kill any attempt for drivers to improve their conditions.

Both companies have been losing money, and both have gone public, indicating in public filings that they not only expect to continue to lose money over the short-term at the very least, but they expect to continue to reduce driver earnings (while maintaining or raising fares) to works towards profitability.

Drivers have no way to negotiate fares or earnings at any level, individually or collectively, yet if we were truly independent contractors, we would have the ability to do so.

The bill does not increase opportunity for drivers, as localities that want rideshare could negotiate to obtain rideshare. Frankly, the rideshare companies' argument that it is cost-prohibitive to expand territory without negotiating solely with the state is ludicrous. As publicly-traded companies, if the shareholders want expanded territory, these billion-dollar corporations would get them expanded territory.

2. HB3023 is bad for passengers and cities.

Local oversight allows for local handling of complaints and issues. Everything from pick-up zones to poor drivers to unsafe vehicles. A passenger has local recourse to have grievances addressed, beyond asking the for-profit rideshare companies to self-regulate.

Statewide management of rideshare could, or should mean that a driver who passes the vetting process can drive anywhere in the state. That precludes local requirements of knowledge of the local area (as in the Portland Metro area), and could cause dilution or lack of opportunity for local drivers to get on-platform.

From an electoral standpoint, if a voter feels a city is mishandling rideshare, they could vote out a city commissioner or mayor. If it transfers to ODOT, how much more difficult would it be to effectuate change?

3. HB3023 is bad for the State of Oregon and ODOT.

Even with the .10 per ride going to ODOT, this would increase the bureaucracy and oversight needed to manage the program. Who would adjudicate challenges to an erroneous background check? Who would investigate challenges to a driver being kicked off-platform for no cause? Would we burden the courts?

Nowhere does this bill indicate the state will regulate fares statewide, so unless the bill is amended to do that (increasing further the administrative burden and cost to the state), how will this bill and the state ensure the pay drivers receive is equitable from municipality to municipality, and the "cut" each city receives is equitable and fair as well. Who would ensure the rates charged to passengers are fair and reasonable and that rate increases have oversight as well?

Portland currently receives more than .10 per fare to run their PBOT monitoring program, would this discontinue or become another unfunded program?

#### 4. There is a hidden negative cost to HB3023

Uber and Lyft do not contribute to Oregon. They maintain skeleton staffs and fight to keep drivers as contractors and pay as little payroll and state taxes as possible. Most full-time drivers qualify for SNAP benefits and OHP despite driving 40-60 hours a week. None of their earnings go to social security.

#### Conclusion:

The reason Uber and Lyft are pushing this bill so hard is that they expect its passage to allow them to have less oversight, and less pressure to curtail their overall plans to lower driver pay and increase fares over time.

The Lyft CEO even said recently that they aren't a "transportation company." Uber has made similar claims over the years. Their goal is unilateral control of point-to-point transportation with as little oversight as possible and in Uber's case, to compete directly with public transportation.

Voting NO on this bill would send a loud and clear message that the State champions Workers and Consumers rights.

Thank you for your attention.

Note: Please use discretion with your personal information in written testimony (i.e., do not add personal information you do not want the public to see). All meeting materials, including your name and any personal information contained in the submitted documents, are posted to the Oregon Legislative Information System (OLIS) and are accessible to all major search engines, including Google, Bing, and Yahoo.