

Submitter: Dave Leverich
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Joint Interim Committee On Transportation
Funding
Measure, Appointment or LC 2
Topic:

Chair, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

I urge you to vote no on this proposal. While it is presented as necessary to maintain Oregon's transportation system, the reality is that this bill raises taxes and fees sharply on drivers and working families without delivering anything beyond what ODOT is already obligated to provide.

Fuel Taxes: The bill raises the state fuel tax from 34 cents to 46 cents per gallon, a 35% increase. For working people who commute daily, that is not a small change - it's hundreds of dollars more each year just to drive to work.

Payroll Tax: It doubles the statewide transit payroll tax, moving from 0.1% to 0.2%. That may sound small, but it is taken directly from workers' paychecks. At a time when families are struggling with inflation, doubling a payroll tax is the wrong move.

Vehicle Registration and Title Fees: Passenger car registrations nearly double - from \$43 to \$85 per year - and title fees climb from \$77 to \$216. That is an increase of more than 180%. Again, this hits every working Oregonian who needs a car to get to work, school, or the grocery store.

Other Increases: The bill layers on more costs, from higher trailer and motorcycle registrations to new charges on high-MPG and electric vehicles.

In total, this package raises nearly \$6 billion over the next 10 years. Yet, there is no clear new benefit to the public. These revenues are aimed at maintaining a system that ODOT is already supposed to maintain under current funding. The bill does not solve the agency's accountability issues, nor does it ensure better efficiency or transparency in how dollars are spent.

Oregon families cannot continue to absorb higher costs at the pump, higher fees at the DMV, and higher payroll taxes, while being told this is the only way to maintain roads that should already be maintained. This proposal simply shifts the burden onto those who can least afford it - the working and middle class - while avoiding needed reforms in how the state manages existing resources.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask you to vote no on LC 2.

Thank you.
Dave Leverich.