

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

Dear chairs and members of the JCTF,

I'm writing to voice my concerns with the stopgap measure to fund ODOT. I'm hoping that future legislation will rectify the issues and gaps below:

- Root cause of the funding gap:

Could we get a clear explanation of why our mega-projects always seem to incur substantial cost overruns, seemingly without any accountability? Never mind the increased future maintenance costs for road expansions while complaining at the same time that we're unable to fund even the current maintenance costs?

- Fair share for EV drivers:

This bill charges EV drivers the same road use fees as a 20mpg ICE vehicle (equivalent to a 10mpg ICE vehicle if it's an electric delivery vehicle); many motorhomes will pay less for road maintenance per mile than a small EV delivering pizza or medical samples.

EV drivers have been paying increased registration fees and title fees for years; this bill raises them further (even though the per-mile fees already more than make up the purported reason for the registration fee discrepancy).

If you want a fair share for road maintenance, implement a weight-mile tax for all vehicles. Then look at the next paragraph for a fair share contribution to healthcare and climate change mitigation costs.

- Forcing the state to move backwards on health and climate change in order to fund road maintenance:

This bill will lead to lower EV registrations than we could achieve without the excessive changes to fees for EV drivers. Another win for the fossil fuel industry, instead of looking at what a "fair share" would mean if looked at comprehensively for the state.

How much lower would our future healthcare costs be for every 1000 EVs replacing ICE vehicles on our roads?

How much lower would our climate change mitigation costs be for every 1000 EVs replacing ICE vehicles on our roads? Please note that we are already paying some of those through higher electricity rates. Absurdly enough, EV drivers are shouldering more of these increased costs through our "fuel" than ICE drivers that contribute disproportionately to the problem.

All of this would be addressed with a combination of the two solutions below:

Weight-mile tax for road maintenance; road damage is from heavy vehicles (aside from studded tires; a separate solution is needed for those);

Carbon tax that comprehends the non-road impacts of driving; ICE drivers can pay at the pump, EV drivers pay at the plug (as they already do);

The state is trying to move us in what is unquestionably the right direction for health and climate, and we cannot allow a narrow-minded transportation bill to kneecap those efforts.

Sincerely,

Peter Hoeckel
Portland, OR