



Testimony to House Business and Labor Committee on House Bill 3023-A

May 13, 2019

**Chris Hagerbaumer, Deputy Director
Oregon Environmental Council**

Founded in 1968, the Oregon Environmental Council (OEC) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, membership-based organization. We advance innovative, collaborative and equitable solutions to Oregon's environmental challenges for today and future generations.

Oregon Environmental Council opposes HB 3023-A.

Transportation network companies (TNCs) can support a more sustainable transportation system, especially when they provide "last mile" service to neighborhoods not served by transit and service during non-peak hours when there is less transit service. Over the long run, if families are well served by safe sidewalks and bikeways, have excellent transit service, can participate in carsharing or hop on an e-scooter, and have the ability to take a TNC or taxi when needed, we will see more folks give up their cars.

But real-world experience across the nation shows that TNCs are currently generating more trips, more miles and more greenhouse gases. TNCs are actually adding to congestion; replacing trips that would have been made by transit, walking, or biking; and not providing transportation planners with sufficient data to ensure that they do operate in a positive way in the community.ⁱ

Cities therefore need to retain the ability to regulate TNCs, especially given how rapidly the transportation world is evolving. Unfortunately, Section 2 of HB 3023-A preempts cities from regulating TNCs for the public benefit, even overriding existing city regulations in Oregon.

We appreciate that HB 3023 was amended to ensure wheelchair accessibility and that it would charge a small fee per ride to help fund EV charging infrastructure around the state. We appreciate the nod toward shared data for planning purposes, but the word "may" on page 3 line 10 of the -14 amendments to HB 3023-A means that TNCs could easily stonewall local governments with regard to data. And even if a city were able to convince a TNC to enter into an agreement, the data they are allowed to ask for in the proposed amendment is very limited and would not be sufficient to, for example, determine whether TNC trips are cannibalizing or adding to transit ridership in the city. In instances where TNCs *are* pulling trips away from transit (and thereby reducing revenues and public support for transit), a city might want to charge TNCs a small amount to replace lost revenues, especially cities committed to transportation equity. Reliable, affordable and efficient transportation is [one of the most significant barriers to](#)

[people who are trying to escape poverty](#), and transit is critical for many low-income residents who can't afford to own car or to take a TNC.

Cities also need the tools to regulate TNCs with regard to congestion. Just last Wednesday, a report came out saying [that Uber and Lyft are the biggest contributors to San Francisco's congestion](#), accounting for more than half of the growth of traffic in that city. Local governments need permission to regulate where TNC loading and unloading can occur to manage traffic flow and protect people, and cities may need to apply other tools to reduce TNC's contribution to urban congestion.

Statewide regulations on TNCs make sense, but they should be the floor, not the ceiling. None of the amendments to the bill so far satisfactorily address the issue that local governments need to have the ability to manage the public right of way for the public good. We urge you to not pass HB 3023-A.

ⁱ A few recent studies include: [The New Automobility: Lyft, Uber and the Future of American Cities](#), Schaller Consulting, 2018; [Understanding the Recent Transit Ridership Decline in Major US Cities: Service Cuts or 2 Emerging Modes?](#), University of Kentucky, 2018; [Disruptive Transportation: The Adoption, Utilization and Impacts of Ride-Hailing in the United States](#), UC Davis Institute of Transportation Studies, 2017.