



City Council Meeting
Public Comments
November 3, 2021

Item 9

You are listed as a member of SANDAG. I understand that SANDAG wishes to impose a mileage tax. I'm surprised that a group of people representing cities has this power. It's wrong that you do, and it's unjust that you would tax an already overburdened citizenry, especially for the purpose of mass transit projects that serve so few.

Greg Huskey

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/public-comment>

From IP Address: 68.111.173.149

Email christinenava858@gmail.com

Council Meeting Date November3rd

Agenda # #9

Subject SANDAG's proposed road user charge

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Chris Nava

Are you an Escondido Resident

Comments Dear Mayor and Council Members, There is no question that revenues for road maintenance of our roads are a necessity. However, the current system is patently unfair to the lower-income worker who cannot afford the more expensive EV's. To continue to rely on the current system as a funding source is simply inequitable. EV drivers contribute to the wear and tear of our freeways as much as the driver of older cars, and they contribute to congestion, not to mention pollution. A more equitable system would replace the current gas tax with an RUC. Road user charges are the best user-pay system that is long-term and sustainable. I urge you not to oppose the resolution against the consideration of RUC. Sincerely, Chris Nava

Would you like your comment read out loud? Yes

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=1d6199ae-e219-43c3-9019-db06afaa77f1>

Item 9

Dear Mr. Morasco,

Both my wife and I are vehemently opposed to the VMT concept. We are business owners here in Escondido and travel to see our clients. This would be a significant burden to us in the future.

Thanks you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kevin & Lynn Hall

From Url: <https://www.escondido.org/public-comment>

From IP Address: 72.197.179.104

Email noah@climateactioncampaign.org

Council Meeting Date 11/3/2021

Agenda # 9

Subject Climate Action Campaign Comments on Road Usage Charge

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Noah Harris

Are you an Escondido Resident No

Comments Good evening, Mayor and Councilmembers. This is Noah Harris, with Climate Action Campaign, urging you to oppose the adoption of a resolution opposing road usage charges. Transportation accounts for more greenhouse gas emissions than any other sector. If we are to achieve Zero Carbon as soon as possible, which the most up to date climate science says is necessary to stave off the worst impacts of the climate crisis, we have to shift people out of their fossil fuel cars and into more sustainable modes of travel. On the Road Usage Charge, we urge the Mayor and Council to consider the following points. First, the RUC would be meant to replace the gas tax, which will decline sharply with the transition to electric vehicles (EVs). This will be a crucial funding source for future transportation projects. Also, it would be deeply inequitable to continue relying on the gas tax with the transition to EVs. Working class communities tend to drive older, less fuel efficient cars, while EVs are expensive and inaccessible for many, especially transit-dependent riders. Meanwhile, EVs will not address congestion, and they still cause pollution and wear and tear on our roads, but they will not pay for their fair share of roadway maintenance under the current system. Please oppose today's resolution opposing road usage charges. Thank you.

Would you like your comment read out loud? Yes

A form has been submitted, click the link below to view the submission:

<https://www.escondido.org/FormWizard/ViewSubmission.aspx?mid=5168&pageid=3094&rid=f519b086-b7d3-42fd-b0a1-7a35b9a48eea>

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I am writing with some additional information and questions I hope you will consider before voting on the resolution to oppose the Road Usage Charges (RUC). I urge you to oppose the resolution as drafted.

First, it is important to acknowledge this, **We already have a per mile driving charge—the gas tax—and it is highly inequitable.**

People, like me, who drive an EV pay nothing even though we use the roads like everyone else. People who can buy new, more fuel-efficient vehicles, pay less than people who have older or used, less fuel efficient, cars...many times lower income people.

The current system is patently unfair and inequitable.

Please ask staff to report on these two questions.

1. How much money does Escondido get from the current gas tax?
2. What is the city's plan to replace that revenue as the gas tax continues to shrink?

Roads are expensive and must be maintained. In the coming years, the revenue stream from the gas tax will dwindle and will be far insufficient to meet the need.

A more equitable option is a Road Usage Charge which:

- charges EV users for their use,
- eliminates the need for the gas tax altogether, and
- can be adjusted to support low and very low-income people.

Further, California did a pilot program. Participants:

- Drove more than 37 million miles,
- 73 percent felt that road charging was more equitable than a gas tax,
- 87 percent of participants found the pilot to be easy,
- 85 percent were overall satisfied with the pilot, and,
- 91 percent expressed willingness to participate in another road charge pilot.

As cars and trucks become more fuel efficient and electrified, gas taxes are becoming unsustainable as a way to pay for America's surface transportation system.

An RUC system would solve that problem by collect adequate revenues from highly fuel-efficient vehicles and implement pricing based on actual costs imposed on the system. Increasingly, research points to RUC as a modern way of funding and maintaining our transportation system.

Plus, it is more equitable than the current system.

While there is not currently a proposal to replace the gas tax with a road use charge, many states, including California, are considering the possibility, and looking at potential ways to implement an

equitable revenue stream to replace the falling gas taxes. The federal government is also considering this.

I urge you to guard against complaints about specific issues with RUCs as they are unfounded because the details are as yet unknown.

Further, SANDAG could not implement a road use charge on their own. They may be able to add on to a state or federal charge, depending how the future laws are written. They are assuming that there will be a state fee, and that they will be able to add on to it, in 2030. Again, I urge the Council to wait for more specifics before opposing the concept wholesale.

For more detailed analysis, please see the Information and Technology Innovation Foundation's policy makers guide on this topic. <https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/22/policymakers-guide-road-user-charges>

It concludes with:

"Road user charges are the most viable and sustainable long-term "user pay" option for the federal government to both raise adequate and appropriate revenues and provide the federal share of funding for the nation's surface transportation system.

Both real-world examples and academic research demonstrate that an RUC system has the capacity not only to raise needed revenues but also to provide additional benefits, including more efficient use of transportation infrastructure, reduced environmental and social externalities, and ancillary benefits to users in the form of information for drivers.

Moreover, unlike other funding methods, an RUC system is the only option that, in addition to raising revenues, could actually reduce the amount of necessary additional capacity by improving the efficiency of current capacity use...."

I urge you not to adopt the proposed resolution against the consideration of RUCs.

Please contact me with further questions,

Laura Hunter

Additional information about Pilot is below.

California

The [California Road Charge Pilot Program's Final Report](#) has been submitted to the California Legislature. More than 37 million miles were driven as part of the pilot, and participant feedback found that 73 percent felt that road charging was more equitable than a gas tax. Further, 87 percent of participants found the pilot to be easy, 85 percent were overall satisfied with the pilot and 91 percent expressed willingness to participate in another road charge pilot.

The final report [recommends next steps](#), most notably exploring the feasibility of a pay-at-the-pump model for road charging, similar to the traditional gas tax collection model.

Launched on July 1, 2016, the [California Road Charge Pilot](#) was established by SB 1077 (2014). Conducted by the California State Transportation Agency, the nine-month pilot sought to be a proof-of-

concept by tracking and analyzing the driving of 5,000 volunteer drivers from across the state of California, including private citizens, fleet vehicles, commercial trucks and government vehicles.