



Dear Chair Lively, Vice-Chair Gamba, Vice-Chair B. Levy, and Members of the House Committee on Climate, Energy, and Environment,

I am writing on behalf of Climate Reality Project (CRP) Portland Chapter to oppose HB 3119, which would mandate a two year delay of the Advanced Clean Trucks rule. The Advance Clean Trucks rule is vitally important to public health and already carefully crafted to avoid disruption and undue burden to the trucking industry and those who rely on it. It is important to note that the rule does not apply to any vehicles currently owned in Oregon, only to an incrementally rising percentage of new sales.

As an organization which advocates for a Just Transition to clean energy, zero carbon transportation, climate justice and public health, CRP Portland Chapter knows the transition to clean energy must be just and equitable. We know that in Oregon, diesel pollution from medium and heavy duty vehicles not only accounts for 15% of greenhouse gas emissions in Oregon¹, but also results in 176 early deaths and nearly 2 billion dollars in health costs² per year. The majority of those costs fall disproportionately on low income communities and communities of color living and working near trucking corridors. That is not acceptable or just, and shows the imperative of a successful transition to zero emissions vehicles.

At the same time we hear that agricultural communities are concerned about the rule's impact on their ability to transport food to markets— that would also be unjust and detrimental to public health. That concern might be alleviated because no changes are required for vehicles currently on the road, and electric medium and heavy duty trucks are rapidly becoming more available and so much more efficient than internal combustion engine vehicles. To the extent that affordable access to advanced clean trucks becomes an issue, we urge Oregon to provide assistance to alleviate the burden on farmers or other providers of essential goods. One potential funding stream to assist with this transition is money currently credited to biofuels, which are neither sustainable nor environmentally sound at scale.³

We also encourage you to review the very detailed testimony by VERDE⁴ and Union of Concerned Scientists.⁵

Thank you for your service and for the opportunity to comment,
Helena Birecki
Interim Chair, Climate Reality Project Portland Chapter

¹ Transportation accounts for 35% of Oregon's sector-based emissions (<https://www.oregon.gov/deq/ghgp/pages/ghg-inventory.aspx>) of which 42% comes from medium and heavy duty vehicles (https://static1.squarespace.com/static/613127fc91a6b76873be6446/t/61561514cf312212c5dceee6/1633031446406/MJ+Bradley_MHD+Clean+Trucks+Report_Oregon+2021.pdf)

² <https://cleanairhealthycommunities.org/>

³ <https://www.wri.org/insights/california-oil-refineries-biofuels-problematic> ;

<https://assessments.epa.gov/biofuels/document/&deid%3D363940> accessed 1/31/25

⁴ <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2025R1/Downloads/PublicTestimonyDocument/118743>

⁵ <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2025R1/Downloads/PublicTestimonyDocument/117491>