



**Testimony Before the Joint Committee on Transportation  
Relating to HB 2019, HB 2530 and HB 3357**

**March 18, 2021**

**Submitted by Jim McCauley, Legislative Director - League of Oregon Cities**

Co-Chairs Senator Beyer and Representative McLain, Co-Vice Chairs Senator Boquist and Representative Noble. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the three public safety measures being heard today. I am offering the LOC's support for HB 2019, HB 2530 and HB 3337. We believe each of these measures add significant benefits to many communities across Oregon and while providing cities the individual choice of using the authority being provided.

I've had the benefit of watching the testimony provided in Committee earlier today. I appreciate the questions that's committee members offered during the hearing. I will address each of these bills in the following comments.

**HB 2019 – High Crash Corridor for City of Unity, LOC Supports**

LOC did not plan to provide comment on this piece of legislation because it was specific for a single community. We typically approach policy for any issue that has a more comprehensive impact allowing all cities to make their own decisions on how to apply state policy based on the priorities in their own communities. Representative Owens and Senator Findley provided compelling information as to why the citizens of City of Unity would benefit from locating a fixed photo radar site. The city has no local law enforcement and no real ability to regulate the public safety needs of their residents when traffic is effectively maintaining highway speeds associated with HWY 26 through the middle of town. It seems logical for authority provided currently to the City of Portland will undoubtedly have value for the city of Unity.

**HB 2530 – Extending Fixed Photo Radar, LOC Supports**

As many of you know LOC supported fixed photo radar bills in the past including HB 2621 in 2015, which set up Portland for fixed photo radar in high crash corridors. Our support in 2015 was provided, because we could see the long-term benefits of this authority in other communities, but it was clear the legislature needed details to better understand the benefits. Portland has now had nearly 4 years of data collection and its clear the placement of the fixed photo radar has a dramatic impact on drivers and subsequent safety improvements in neighborhoods where they are located. From the League's perspective we are grateful the city of Portland was willing to make the investment and collect the information necessary to justify expansion of authority. Now its time to expand this authority to other communities and allow those cities to also improve safety in their communities.

It is not possible for the LOC and our members in good conscience ignore the results of Portland's experience. They are real and they are saving lives. Those metrics include:

- **71 percent average reduction in people exceeding the speed limit.**
- **94 percent average reduction in people driving 10 miles per hour or more above speed limit.**
- **1/3 fewer injury crashes.**

- **75 percent of residents support the use of speed cameras on high-crash streets.**

I want to address the question of why not expand authority beyond the 50,000-population trigger. The feedback that I received in 2019 from committee members was that this needs to be a measured roll out in order to pass legislation. The population trigger was selected as a starting point. There are currently 12 cities that meet the 50,000-population trigger and include: Portland, Salem, Eugene, Hillsboro, Gresham, Bend, Beaverton, Medford, Springfield, Corvallis, Tigard, and Albany.

### **HB 2530, -2 amendment – Extending Authority to Cities Within an MPO, LOC Supports**

The -2 amendments provided today are a result of a broader conversation and the idea to have a geographic overlay that represents an urban area and does not arbitrarily exclude a city less than 50,000 even though the city is in an urban area and share high crash corridors with a city who meets the population test. LOC supports the -2 amendments for that reason.

The amendment specifically extends the authority to cities within an [Metropolitan Planning Organization](#) (MPO). According to ODOT there are 10 MPOs in the state. They include: [Metro, Longview – Kelso – Rainier](#), [Walla Walla Valley MPO](#), [Salem – Keizer](#), [Albany Area MPO](#), [Corvallis Area MPO](#), [Central Lane MPO](#), [Bend MPO](#), [Middle Rogue MPO](#), and the [Rogue Valley MPO](#).

By my count, this expands the authority to 30 additional cities that are connected by transportation corridors to cities with populations more than 50,000. The -2 amendment may represent an expansion level that the committee members can get behind, because it is a more cautious extension, and focuses on the safety challenges presented in more urban settings.

I want to make it clear that I cannot come up with a reason to exclude any city from this authority and would therefore support an expansion to include all cities. This is ultimately a policy choice for the Committee, and I understand concerns over the extension of authority to all 241 cities. This is exactly why the base bill had a 50,000-population trigger. I also believe there is a compelling reason to expand beyond the base bill so cities that are connected to larger urban settings within a transportation corridor represented by the established MPOs in Oregon.

Given the experience of Portland with fixed photo radar, the focus of fixed photo radar is a policy choice that is rooted in public safety to provide neighborhoods with additional measures of safety critical for their community's livability. It takes a significant investment in the equipment to establish a fixed photo radar site and operate and maintain the place, so not every city with the expanded authority will have the funds available to place a fixed, nor will they necessarily have a high crash corridor.

### **HB 3357, Use of Non-sworn Officers, LOC Supports**

We believe this is a good piece of legislation that makes sense. We see no reason why a training standard cannot be developed to allow for a non-sworn officer to review photos for issuing tickets. Given the limitations faced by local police agencies it only makes sense to provide this flexibility.