

04 April 2021

To: Joint Committee on Transportation

Re: House Bill 2165

Dear Co-Chairs Senator Beyer and Representative McLain, Co-Vice Chairs Senator Boquist and Representative Noble, and members of the Committee:

To begin with, I am well aware that I am in a minority on my thinking on Oregon's *clean & green energy* endeavors and that my words will likely fall on deaf ears, but I feel compelled to add my two cents worth. In particular I am not in favor of being forced to support programs I currently view as counterproductive to society as a whole. As we like to say, timing is everything, and the timing for such grand schemes as electrifying the transportation industry in the state is not now, nor anytime in the immediate future. This bill, like others similar that are in the works, are jumping the gun.

In particular I don't like the part of HB 2165 that stipulates electric companies shall "... collect amount from all retail electricity consumers..." This is, at bottom, to promote the so-called *transportation electrification* of the state and in particular the subsidizing of electric vehicles and the infrastructure that would require.

Perhaps not now, but eventually, it will be seen that although this transportation electrification plan may appear (to some) as feasible, it will prove to have not been cost effective or reliable. The state's efforts to prop up mass motoring by switching everyone to electric vehicles is most likely not going to happen at the scale envisioned, unless the state also plans to buy electric cars and give them away to everyone. Which is not likely.

This grand plan is about mass motoring. That is what we're dealing with here. And that is dependent upon the financial model of "mobile America, so-to-speak, whether the cars are powered by gasoline or by electricity. Most of us are used to buying cars on installment loans. With incomes for many drying up, e.g., rental property owners forced to absorb the cost of providing free housing, there are ever-fewer credit-worthy borrowers for what loans might be available. Additionally, new vehicles are ever more expensive. So where is all that money to buy these new

electric vehicles supposed to come from? More "free" money? Raise the requirement for rebates to 500 percent of the federal poverty level? Six hundred percent?

Another consideration is whether Oregon's (and the nation's) electric grid can handle the charging needs of a fleet of the size envisioned. (From Oregon's DMV, in 2019 there were 3.7 million registered vehicles in Oregon.) How much will upgrading our grid cost?

On the fringes of the issue but still a valid concern is the amount of scarce rare earth mineral resources that are required for manufacturing car batteries. Those are not readily available in the continental United States. Most are controlled by foreign nations. And along those same lines, car manufacturing is dependent on wide-ranging (international) supply lines for parts and electronics.

Lastly, and by Oregon's own DEQ findings, if everyone in the state stopped driving internal combustion powered vehicles, the reduction in CO² emissions would be negligible. And isn't CO² still the bogey-man in this overall story?

I know my lone voice will not sway the Committee's actions. Nevertheless, for all the above reasons I am opposed to HB 2165 and suggest the Committee table it.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Richard Wisner". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Richard Wisner