

Submitter:

Darlene Chirman

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Joint Committee On Transportation Reinvestment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2025

To: Chairs and Members of the Joint Committee on Transportation Reinvestment
HB 2025, the Transportation Reinvestment bill has been released. I appreciate some components, but it does not provide enough for the one third of Oregonians who do not drive, due to youth (such as my 15-year old grandson), old age or disability, low income, or other reasons. I appreciate the inclusion of funding for Safe Routes to School and Great Streets. The increase in payroll tax for transit is an improvement but insufficient for the need—it should be phased in to one-half of 1% by 2032. Reading the proposed bill, it is unclear how much in total or additional funds are estimated to be raised with the new diversity of funding sources, which in general are needed as vehicles become more fuel efficient or electric, and gas taxes no longer meet the financial needs for transportation for Oregonians. It is also unclear what the financial impacts might be for a typical Oregon family—does this overburden our low-income residents? There has been some discussion of higher rates of the “privilege tax” on luxury vehicles, which could allow for lower fees in other areas.

I read that new fees will be instituted for the purchase of new and used cars, and fees for vehicle registration will be raised. A significant portion of these fees should provide for electrification of transportation—for incentives for low-income residents, and funding for school buses and transit buses. This is a public health concern, as diesel pollution worsens respiratory conditions such as childhood asthma. It is also an equity issue, as pollution is often higher in low-income neighborhoods due to commercial/industry/highway proximity. Electric vehicles are less expensive to fuel/maintain, once the initial investment is made. I appreciate that 50% of the privilege tax is planned for the Railroad Fund. Since I have found no estimate of the expected income from the privilege tax, it is hard to evaluate the likely money for Zero Emission Incentive Fund (the greater of \$12 million or 45%). Would this be funding the existing Oregon Clean Vehicle Rebate Program? It appears there was about \$20,000,000 in that program in 2024. So, if this funding source is only \$12 million, that is likely insufficient to the demand.

The proposed Bicycle tax would provide funding for a Multimodal Active Transportation Fund, providing grants for bicycle and pedestrian transportation projects. I support this, but would like to have some estimate of the amount expected to be raised for this purpose.

I watched the June 12th public testimony recording today, and heard over and over from county and city electeds and staff in support of the 50:30:20 division of funds among the state, counties and cities. While that ratio is listed in the bill, it appears to be applied a subset of the income, and after funds are set aside for the Anchor Projects. It appears not to meet the request of those testifying. How much funding is anticipated for the counties and city, in dollar amounts and relative to past

allocations?

Please continue to strengthen the environmental components of the transportation package, and pass the bill this session of the legislature.

Sincerely, Darlene Chirman

Portland, Senate District 23