

## **HB 4117: Door-to-Door Delivery of Alcohol**

Chair Barker and members of the Business and Labor Committee,

Door-to-door delivery of alcohol isn't a tax issue. My name is Jody Wiser, and today I speak representing only myself, not Tax Fairness Oregon. But if you pass this bill, it will tax our citizens, raising the costs of family disfunction, addiction treatment, health care services and early deaths by suicide and auto accident.

In fact, this is one of three bills this year designed to increase consumption and support the alcohol industry while turning a blind eye to the likely social and financial costs.

One-hour door-to-door delivery of alcohol is a rapidly increasing program in other states. In 2016 there were eight states that allowed door-to-door delivery of beer and wine. All but two of those states also had above average consumption of beer and wine. Without door-to-door delivery, Oregon also has above average numbers – for both consumption and addiction.

Why are legislators proposing any bill in support of this industry and its products this year? This bill is no more logical than one-hour, door-to-door delivery of cigarettes and vaping products? Would you support that bill?

The Oregon Health Authority has pointed out that “Alcohol use is a cause of contributing factor in many health and social problems including child abuse, domestic violence, serious injuries, heart disease, liver disease, cancer and other diseases. Excessive alcohol use costs the Oregon economy over \$3.5 billion per year, or roughly \$2.08 per drink. This includes lost workplace productivity, health care expenses, criminal justice costs, and motor vehicle crashes related to excessive alcohol use. In Oregon, alcohol-related deaths have increased 38 percent since 2001, killing nearly 2000 people in 2016.” Meanwhile Josh Lehner of the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis finds that we've had more growth in alcohol- related jobs than in the high-tech industry over the last decade. He reports no similar growth in addiction treatment jobs, yet the need is there. Where are this committee's bills for that business sector?

The bill requires delivery drivers to be trained to check ID and to judge drunkenness on someone else's door step. But this judgement will be made, likely on a dark night, at a client's door, after the delivery person has made the drive and found the home or office, and can hope for a tip. That's a dramatically different situation than at a liquor store where the employee can observe the behavior of the customer as they enter and peruse the store or at a bar where the employee has ample time to watch behavior. And, In these situations there are often others in the room when the employee says “no” to the ID or the level of inebriation.

Finally, recovering alcoholics will tell you that going back to the liquor store for a second fifth in an evening is a deterrent. This bill removes that deterrent; one can order up a fifth and not face the same store clerk again.

The alcohol industry presents a policy area where I believe you must stop and consider your responsibility not to business owners and what they want, but to citizens and the community as a whole. With high rates of addiction, high rates of suicide, high medical costs caused by alcoholism, and ever-increasing numbers of auto accidents in which alcohol is a contributing factor, is making alcohol more easily available a good policy objective? Please consider the social costs of beer, wine and whiskey delivery by Grubhub, Instacart or some other service. And then, "Just say 'No'".