

3/3/2026



To whom it may concern,

I would like to express strong opposition to Sections 16-20 of the -3 amendment to SB1601 as it is currently moved to be adopted, on behalf of **LiveMove** at the University of Oregon. LiveMove stands in solidarity with other multi-modal transportation advocates in the state of Oregon and the City of Eugene.

Compensating for funding imbalances due to a need for State Highway Funding by removing huge sums of funds from Connect Oregon, Safe Routes to School (SRTS), Oregon Community Paths (OCP), and the Transportation Operating Fund (TOF) is not a viable solution and will have detrimental implications for the safety of non-drivers. It is a huge step backwards for Oregon in our progress towards creating a safer transit network for all users and promoting alternative transportation modes. It directly contradicts Goal 12 as per the statute language in OAR 660-015-0000(12), not to mention the local planning goals of cities statewide.

Specifically, **SB1601-3 goes against the following principles from Goal 12:**

"A transportation plan shall (1) **consider all modes of transportation including mass transit, air, water, pipeline, rail, highway, bicycle and pedestrian;** (2) be based upon an inventory of local, regional and state transportation needs; (3) consider the differences in social consequences that would result from utilizing differing combinations of transportation modes; (4) **avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation;** (5) **minimize adverse social, economic and environmental impacts** and costs; (6) conserve energy; (7) **meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged by improving transportation services"**

LiveMove also echoes the argument in opposition of this bill as put forth by Move Oregon Forward:

1. **"These cuts are a barrier to employment.** You cannot find or keep a job if you cannot safely get to it. By gutting these programs, the state is creating permanent barriers for low-income workers, disabled folks, and the elderly. In a shaky economy, we should be expanding ways for people to move safely and affordably, not balancing the budget at the expense of our most vulnerable neighbors.
2. **Why charge the 30% of Oregonians who cannot or will not drive with an expensive system they will never use?** Oregon's massive, expensive road system created this budget crisis, yet the state is raiding from the tiny sliver of funding dedicated to things like child safety, trains, and community paths. We are forcing the 30% of Oregonians who do not or cannot drive to pay for road debt they didn't create.
3. **Safety is not negotiable.** The state is taking \$17 million from Safe Routes to School and \$8 million from Oregon Community Paths. That is more than 60% of both programs' budgets. This funding builds the crossings, sidewalks, and paths that allow children to get to class without risking their lives.
4. **The proposed budget cuts are not a long-term, sustainable solution.** When budgets get tight, there is always pressure to raid smaller programs because they look like easy targets. But focusing on these line items is like stepping over dollars to pick up dimes. The immediate savings are tiny, but they create much higher costs later.

3/3/2026



5. **These programs were built with broad support because they work.** They reduce pollution, lower household costs, and keep rural communities connected to the rest of the state. The [Senate Democrats](#) and [House Democrats](#) both put out priorities that include lowering costs for Oregonians. Cutting programs that do that is not the answer.
6. **This plan goes against Governor Kotek’s climate orders.** This budget ignores the Governor’s recent Executive Order (25-29) which tells state agencies to speed up our transition to clean energy and reduce pollution. Yet this budget raids nearly \$50 million from safety, rail, transit, and EV charging, which will make it impossible for Oregon to meet its own pollution reduction goals.

Our coalition is done waiting. We’ve come to the table with no-cost and low-cost ideas based on successful models in other states, yet we face a complete lack of cooperation. Lawmakers have repeatedly promised to prioritize community needs. Yet, even with an alternative available that preserves both jobs and essential programs, they still choose these cuts. You cannot continue to siphon tax dollars from working Oregonians while cutting the very services those dollars are meant to fund. If these cuts move forward now, we expect our priorities to be first in line in the 2027 transportation package.”

We urge you to vote “NO” on SB1601-3 as it is currently amended.