

To Members of the Joint Committee on Transportation;

The push for renewable energy is driving up the cost of living. This is especially true in California where the cost of electricity is nearly three times the average of other states. Forcing the electrification of transportation systems will do even more harm to the economy. Auto manufacturers are losing thousands of dollars on every EV they sell. There is more than a 100 day supply of unsold EVs on dealer lots all over the United States. Furthermore, EVs can become dead robots that can not be charged in freezing weather, have plummeting resale values, EV tires often wear out faster than on ICE cars, EVs can easily catch fire, finding an available working charging station can be an issue especially on a long trip, insurance costs are higher and if the batteries and/or the battery compartment is even slightly damaged such as a minor crash, the vehicle is often considered totaled and then must be scrapped. And then where do those damaged unusable batteries end up?

Additionally, electrifying the trucking industry will add another inflationary tier to the cost of living. Electrified freight trucks take longer to travel long distances due to the need to recharge the batteries and can not haul as much tonnage as diesel rigs, both adding to the costs of labor. Therefore, the transportation costs of food, goods and services will all be significantly increased.

Moreover, the California Resources Board approved a so-called in-use locomotive regulation for railroads that would ban any locomotive that is more than 23 years old from operating in California. This would mandate investments by the railroads to use locomotives that are not yet commercially available or even being built in the U.S. while limiting the life spans of more than 25,000 diesel-electric locomotives currently in use. Furthermore, the CARB regulation would put some shortline railroads out of business and both hurt and add inflationary costs to the supply chain nationwide. The cost of living in California is among the highest in that nation. Well-heeled taxpayers are exiting the state in droves. The cost of electricity in Oregon is already outpacing inflation. **OREGON MUST NOT FOLLOW THE SAME AGENDA AS CALIFORNIA BY FORCING ELECTRIFICATION OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS. THE PEOPLE OF OREGON SIMPLY CAN NOT AFFORD IT!**

What Oregon however does need to do is establish an equitable way to pay for alternative mode users to fund the transportation infrastructure they actually utilize. One two-axle transit bus does as much damage (wear and tear) to the roadways as 1200 cars.* As an example of the impact on a roadway; in 2018 TriMet made 223 trips a day on 82nd Avenue. It would have taken 267,600 cars in a 24 hour period traveling the entire length of the street to do the same amount of roadway wear and tear. Add the weight of batteries and electric buses will do even more damage. Yet today's TriMet fares only cover about 19% of the operating costs and none of the wear and tear costs buses do to the streets and roads.

Additionally, bicyclists pay nothing all while the extreme bicycle activists continually want more funding and take aways from motorists. PBOT has spent millions of dollars to add bicycle infrastructure on city streets taking away motor vehicle capacity and infrastructure which in turn adds to congestion thereby creating more fuel consumption, emissions and cut through traffic on residential streets. The Burnside Bridge for years had six full service travel lanes, three in each direction. When bicycle lanes were added, the number of lanes were reduced. The plan for a new Burnside Bridge is to have only three full service traffic lanes, a bus only lane and bike lanes with buffers. In spite of that, motor vehicle owners are the only group expected to provide local funding.

Instead of digging deeper into the pockets of motorists with highway tolling or another motor vehicle funding scheme, any additional funding source for roads and bridges MUST start with the users of alternative modes accepting some financial accountability by paying their own way. Transit users through an increased fare structure need to fully fund bus only lanes, including the maintenance, along with helping to pay for the maintenance on other streets and roads that are utilized by public transit buses. Bicyclists need to start directly paying for all the bicycle infrastructure they continually clamor for, possibly through registration and license fees. **If a new I-5 interstate bridge requires tolling, then ALL users of the bridge must help fund the project. To fund light rail, a surcharge MUST be required on transit fares. To fund the bicycle infrastructure, the purchase of a permit MUST be required to cross the bridge.**

In closing, it is time to end the era of transportation socialistic engineering by ensuring the costs of constructing and providing public facilities and services are equitably shared by those who benefit from the provision of those facilities and services. Continually attacking motor vehicles with new taxes or fees merely drives up the costs of living for everybody!

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Parker

Portland

* Per a Portland City Club Study and Report about a decade ago.