

Submitter: Raymond Smith
On Behalf Of: Myself and Family
Committee: Joint Interim Committee On Transportation
Funding
Measure, Appointment or Topic: LC 2

Dear Joint Interim Committee On Funding Transportation,

This testimony is in opposition of LC2.

I object to the enormous and egregious increases to fees for registration, titling, tax withholding, fuel, etc. within this measure. In fact I object to the increase of these already overpriced fees period.

I have lived in Oregon long enough to see Title Fees go from two dollars to what they are now. Yearly registration from ten dollars per year to what we pay now. A laundry list of new and ever growing fees that never existed before, and continually increasing fuel taxes that should make a greedy king remorseful. For those thinking that I am incredibly old and that is a long time ago, you are mistaken. Most of the larger increases started in the nineties, each time promising to rebuild all of our outdated and crumbling bridges. This massive rebuilding never happened. The common excuse now is, more fuel efficient vehicles, resulting in fewer fuel tax dollars and higher wages and material costs.

Although the latter excuses are true, they are not the true underlying reasons for the problems and want for more money.

More money will not and cannot fix the problems. These problems are a direct result of poor governing and mismanaged funds.

Here are some examples of how poor governing created these problems.

The constant government mandating of more fuel efficient standards for vehicles far outstripped customer demands.

Years of planned massive expansion and ongoing growth has the most crippling effect of all. When large or constant growth and expansion of a town or county happens the residents are strapped with the forced ever increasing costs to subsidize this growth.

When water treatment plants, water supply, police and fire services and yes, roads, intersections, sidewalks, etc. are overwhelmed by this growth, the burden of this cost is foisted upon the existing population. The impact of large growth and expansion has never paid for itself. While the developer of x number of subdivisions, strip malls, etc. may put in a few sidewalks or street lights, the major costs of accommodating this explosion of population is the existing population. This applies to the State of Oregon.

You need to stop raping the public to subsidize your planned growth which equals more population and more tax base. Figure out a way that the burden of impact is borne upon the growth alone.

With regards to road fees, taxes, etc.

I worked in Portland for a number of years. While I did not live in Portland, I lived in Oregon just as I do now. There are thousands of people commuting into the State of Oregon for work every day. These are not people here to visit Oregon, visit relatives or just passing through. These are people driving into the State daily, on the same roads, back and forth to their place of employment. Arguably, many of them are driving more miles in Oregon daily than in their own home state and more than some Oregon residents. If you want to make it fair by making sure each type of vehicle pays its share, you need to make sure all vehicles using Oregon roads to make their living are paying. The tax on income is a pittance compared to the aggregate of what Oregonians are required to pay.

I could go on, in more detail, however with time and space restrictions I believe this is sufficient testimony to justify my opposition to this measure.

I am asking this committee to reject this measure in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond Smith