

Submitter: Tammy Mittig

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Joint Committee On Transportation Reinvestment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2025

To: Joint Committee on Transportation Reinvestment

Date: [Insert Hearing Date]

Re: Opposition to HB 2025 — Transportation Revenue & Oversight Bill

1. Unfair and Overreaching Tax Burden

HB?2025 increases existing fees and taxes—covering gas, diesel, vehicle registration, and motor carriers—plus mandates a per-mile usage charge phase-in beginning July?1,?2026, disproportionately targeting electric and low-mileage drivers olis.oregonlegislature.gov.

Equity concern: Drivers with limited income or those in rural areas would bear a double burden—paying both gas taxes and the new per-mile fee or opting for an annual flat rate.

Regressive impact: Increases in diesel and weight-mile taxes transfer directly to consumers through higher transportation costs for goods and services.

2. Privacy, Complexity & Administrative Costs

The bill mandates the phase-in of a per-mile tracking system—yet offers little detail on data handling, privacy protections, or administrative transparency .

Privacy risk: Without a clear audit-resistant, opt-out structure, Oregon risks creating a vehicle surveillance scheme suffered by everyday drivers.

Administrative burden: The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and motor carrier businesses must build sophisticated systems to track miles, process billing, and manage exemptions—adding overhead and inefficiency.

3. Potential for Mission Creep and Cost Overruns

HB?2025 centralizes power by:

Mandating Public Utility-style audits of ODOT.

Granting the Governor appointment power over ODOT's director.

Expanding the Joint Committee on Transportation's oversight role
gov.oregonlive.comolis.oregonlegislature.gov.

This institutional realignment could politicize infrastructure decisions, reduce agency independence, and lead to mission creep or budget overruns.

4. No Clear Return on Investment

While the bill outlines new revenue streams, it lacks a compelling framework for ensuring funds are dedicated squarely to maintenance or proven congestion solutions.

No earmarks: There's no guaranteed allocation hierarchy ensuring roads/bridges get priority over other transportation initiatives.

Performance oversight concern: Although audits are required, there's no enforceable mechanism compelling corrective action on audit findings.

5. Timing & Transparency

With just months left in the session (sine die is June?29)
opb.org+3apnews.com+3axios.com+olis.oregonlegislature.govlegiscan.com+friends.org+6kgw.com+6, HB?2025 is moving at an accelerated pace.

Critical details on implementation and auditing remain murky.

Citizens and lawmakers alike deserve transparent cost-benefit analysis prior to imposing complex, long-term fees and surveillance models on Oregonians.

? Suggested Revisions & Alternatives

Delay the per-mile fee until a comprehensive pilot program proves its efficacy, privacy safeguards, and equitable billing.

Limit use of collected funds strictly to critical maintenance, congestion mitigation, and road safety—with clear earmarks.

Amend auditing provisions to include public-facing progress reports and enforceable improvement mandates.

Protect rural and low-income drivers with income-based exemptions or rebates—ensuring the tax structure remains fair and proportionate.

?? Conclusion

HB?2025, in its current form, places a heavy, inequitable burden on drivers—especially low-income, rural, or EV owners—without delivering solid transparency, privacy assurance, or accountability. I urge the committee to withhold support until the bill is refined to protect Oregonians' financial and personal freedoms while delivering tangible infrastructure benefits.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration.