

**Road Usage**

**Charge Final**

**Policy Framework**

**April 2014**



# Road Usage Charge Final Policy Framework

**April 2014**

Edited by James M. Whitty, Manager  
ODOT Office of Innovative Partnerships & Alternative Funding

Oregon Department of Transportation  
355 Capitol St. NE  
Salem, OR 97301-3871

(503) 986-4284

[jim.whitty@odot.state.or.us](mailto:jim.whitty@odot.state.or.us)



Original Report Prepared by D'Artagnan Consulting LLP





## Table of Contents

Definitions and Abbreviations	v
1 Introduction	1
2 Evolution of Mandatory Road Usage Charge Policy in the 2013 Legislature	5
Introduction of Mandatory Road Usage Charge Legislation	5
Transportation and Economic Development Committee	6
Revenue Committee	7
Joint Ways & Means Committee	8
3 Senate Bill 810: Voluntary Road Usage Charge Policy	11
Senate Committee on Business and Transportation	11
Joint Ways & Means Committee	11
Passage of SB 810	12
4 Competing Bills: HB 2453 and SB 810	13
Key Elements in Common	13
What Is Not in SB 810	14
Why SB 810 Passed	16
5 What SB 810 Does	17
Section-by-Section Analysis	17
Sections 1-5: Definitions, RUC and Revenue	17
Sections 6-8 and 10: Administration	18
Section 9: Protection of Personally Identifiable Information	19

Sections 11-19: Refunds	21
Sections 20-21: Penalties	23
Sections 22-28: Conforming Amendments and Technical Provisions	23
Sections 29-30: Multijurisdictional Agreements	24
Sections 31 and 33: Expenditure Limitation and Effective Date	24
Key Issues for Interpretation	24
ODOT Rulemaking Obligations and Opportunities	26
Policy Objectives of SB 810	28
Appendix A – Full Chronology of Events in 2013 Session	31

## Definitions and Abbreviations

In this document, the following definitions and abbreviations are employed:

Term / Abbreviation	Definition/Description	Remarks
<b>AAA</b>	American Automobile Association, formerly	
<b>ACEC</b>	American Council of Engineering Companies	
<b>ACLU</b>	American Civil Liberties Union	
<b>CSP</b>	Certified service provider	
<b>DMV</b>	Driver & Motor Vehicle Services Division of ODOT	
<b>EPA</b>	Environmental Protection Agency	
<b>EV</b>	Electric vehicle	
<b>GPS</b>	Global Positioning System	
<b>GVWR</b>	Gross Vehicle Weight Rating	
<b>HB</b>	House Bill	
<b>MPG or MPGe</b>	Miles per gallon or miles per gallon equivalent	MPGe is used in lieu of MPG for vehicles that derive some or all motive power from a fuel source other than gasoline or diesel, such as electricity.
<b>MRD</b>	Mileage reporting device	
<b>ODOT</b>	Oregon Department of Transportation	
<b>OIPP</b>	Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program	
<b>PHEV</b>	Plug-in hybrid electric vehicle	
<b>PPP</b>	Public-private partnership	
<b>RUC</b>	Road usage charge or road usage charging	
<b>RUFTF</b>	Road User Fee Task Force	
<b>RUCPP</b>	Road Usage Charge Pilot Project	
<b>SB</b>	Senate Bill	
<b>SEIU</b>	Service Employees International Union	
<b>VIN</b>	Vehicle Identification Number	



## Introduction

The purpose of this report is to document and explain the evolution of road usage charge policy in Oregon from the enactment of House Bill (HB) 2138 in 2011 to the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 810 in 2013. The objective of the report is to provide an analysis and understanding of both the “letter and the spirit” of current RUC policy in Oregon as well as policy gaps for future consideration by the Road User Fee Task Force (RUFTF) and Oregon Legislature.

Two prior documents summarize the evolution of RUC policy in Oregon prior to 2011. First, the *Final Report on Oregon’s Mileage Fee Concept and Road User Fee Pilot Program*, published November 2007, summarizes activities from the establishment of the RUFTF in 2001 through the completion and evaluation of a pay-at-the-pump pilot test in 2006-2007. Second, the *RUC Policy Framework*, dated August 2011, summarizes policy development from the reconstitution of the RUFTF in October 2010 through the conclusion of the 2011 Oregon Legislative session and the enactment of HB 2138.

Since the enactment of HB 2138, the RUFTF met four times to guide RUC research, a second pilot test, and new policy recommendations: October 2011, November 2011, May 2012, and September 2012. The bullets below summarize policy developments over the course of those meetings.

- In October 2011, the RUFTF endorsed several changes to RUC policy indicated by the evolution of HB 2328 during the 2011 Legislative session (which ultimately did not pass) and HB 2138 (which did). These changes are summarized below.
  - A per-mile charge of a rate to be determined would apply to electric vehicles (EVs) and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs) of 2016 model years and beyond beginning on July 1, 2015.
  - A flat annual tax (amount to be determined) would be offered as an alternative to paying based on reported miles driven during a transitional period from 2015-2018.
  - The mileage tax would apply to all EVs and PHEVs beginning on July 1, 2018 (regardless of model year), at which time there would be no longer be a flat annual fee alternative offered.
  - Removal of all penalties except those for tampering and false reporting.
  - Protection of personally identifiable information.
  - ODOT to set standards for compliance methods under an *open system* and work with other state agencies in doing so.
  - ODOT to develop reporting/billing period based on the circumstances of owners/lessees.

- The RUFTF endorsed ODOT's program of research, including a pilot program.
- In November 2011, the RUFTF endorsed the notion of a flat annual tax payment alternative set at a high amount to be determined.
- In May 2012, the RUFTF endorsed several policy elements to be incorporated into draft legislation for the 2013 Legislative session.
  - Elimination of the mandate for electronic reporting of mileage data.
  - Requirement for ODOT to provide motorists choices for reporting mileage driven.<sup>1</sup>
  - Requirement for ODOT to consult with the RUFTF on methods for mileage reporting and payment.
  - Allow motorists to consent to use of personally identifiable information.
  - Automobile registration is contingent on enrollment in the RUC system.
- In September 2012, the RUFTF made several additional policy recommendations.
  - Changed the definition of RUC applicable vehicles from EVs and PHEVs to vehicles with fuel economy rated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at or above 55 miles per gallon (MPG) or miles per gallon equivalent (MPGe), with model year 2015 and newer.
  - The per-mile rate was left for the legislature to determine.
- Finally, in December 2012, the RUFTF recommended draft legislation to the Oregon Legislature for the 2013 session regarding the establishment of a RUC program, later numbered HB 2453.

The remainder of this document summarizes the evolution of RUC policy during the 2013 Legislative session, which included competing bills HB 2453 and SB 810.

- Chapter 2 summarizes the introduction and evolution of HB 2453.
- Chapter 3 summarizes the evolution of road usage charge policy adoption in the 2013 legislature.

---

<sup>1</sup> The RUFTF endorsed the notion of requiring at least one choice without vehicle location capabilities prior to 2011.

- Chapter 4 compares and contrasts the contents of the competing bills HB 2453-Version C and SB 810, including a “gap analysis” of items not included in SB 810.
- Chapter 5 provides a narrative summary of what SB 810 does. In addition, there is a discussion of key issues from SB 810 open to interpretation and a summary list of ODOT rule-making opportunities and obligations stemming from SB 810.
- Appendix A is a full chronology of events from 2011-2013.

Records of all versions of draft and enacted legislation from both the 2011 and 2013 Legislative sessions can be viewed online at the Oregon Legislative Information System (OLIS) website: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us>. OLIS archives draft bills, amendments (including those not adopted), records and agendas of public hearings and work sessions at Legislative Committees and Subcommittees, written testimony by witnesses, and audio recordings of committee and chamber sessions. OLIS is an invaluable resource for research on legislative policy formulation and served as the primary repository for source documents used to prepare this report.



## Evolution of Road Usage Charge Policy in the 2013 Legislature

### Introduction of Road Usage Charge Program for Mandated Payers: House Bill 2453

The RUFTE endorsed policy elements of HB 2138 from the 2011 Oregon Legislative session and recommended additional policy elements based on 18 months of additional studies, analysis, and testing by ODOT, including the Road Usage Charge Pilot Project (RUCPP). These policy elements culminated in draft legislation developed by the RUFTE that became HB 2453.

HB 2453 reflects the RUFTE's recommendations over the course of its four meetings in 2011-2012. Key aspects of the introduced version of the bill include the following:

- ODOT would assess a per-mile charge (of an amount to be determined) on all vehicles with a fuel economy of 55 or above MPG or MPGe beginning July 1, 2015. ODOT shall determine the method for determining a vehicle's fuel economy rating.
- Motorists liable for RUC may opt to pay a flat annual tax equal to the per-mile rate (to be determined) multiplied by 35,000 miles. This option is not available to for-hire carriers (taxis).
- ODOT would provide multiple methods for identifying a subject vehicle, and for collecting and reporting mileage, at least one of which must not involve vehicle location capabilities.
- ODOT would implement automated methods of mileage reporting as an open system.
- Legally, the obligation for RUC rests with motorists, i.e., "a person shall notify [ODOT]... that the person is the registered owner or lessee of a subject vehicle." Such notification is also a condition of vehicle registration. In practical terms, ODOT would make every effort to ensure that motorists understand their obligations.
- Forbid disclosure of personally identifiable information beyond specifically enumerated categories of persons who must use such information for billing purposes.
- Vehicles that run on use fuel (e.g., diesel) would receive an emblem from ODOT indicating that they are exempt from use fuel taxes collected at retail by use fuel sellers.

- Defines “transportation project” for the public-private partnership (PPP) statutes to include collection of a per-mile road usage charge. Required ODOT to enter into PPP agreements to collect RUC. Moreover, ODOT would enter into PPP agreements for purposes of applying standards and certifying technologies for use in an open system to measure and collect RUC.
- ODOT would report progress toward implementation on April 1, 2014 and October 1, 2014.

## **Transportation and Economic Development Committee**

Following its introduction in January 2013, the House referred HB 2453 to the Transportation and Economic Development Committee. The Committee held a public hearing on February 25 and a work session on March 27. At the conclusion of the Work Session, the Committee voted 6-4 to move the bill with a “do pass as amended” recommendation.

ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission, bill supporters, and bill opponents testified at the February 25 Public Hearing.

- Representatives of ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission testified to provide information about the contents of the bill.
- The following organizations testified in support of the bill (written and/or spoken):
  - Association of Oregon Counties
  - League of Oregon Cities
  - AAA Oregon/Idaho
  - American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)
  - City of Portland
  - Metro Council
  - Legislators who participated in the Road Usage Charge Pilot Program
- The following organizations testified in opposition to the bill:
  - The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers expressed opposition owing to concerns that the bill would negatively impact sales of EVs and PHEVs. They characterized the bill as requiring \$2000+ in additional fees for prospective buyers of such vehicles. This claim assumed that a motorist choosing the flat annual fee would be required to pay for four years up front. Instead, the alliance supported a large-scale, multi-state pilot program for all types of vehicles.
  - The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) opposed the bill on the grounds that there were not sufficient privacy protections.
  - The Service Employees Union International (SEIU) opposed the bill based on concerns that a PPP would lead to outsourcing of agency employees,

possibly to an international company, citing the assertion that a Canadian vendor operated the Road Usage Charge Pilot Program.

Following the Public Hearing, ODOT met with representatives of the SEIU to clarify the purpose of a PPP for RUC. In addition, ODOT negotiated mutually satisfactory language for privacy protection with the ACLU over the course of several meetings. Both groups removed their opposition to the bill.

The March 27 Work Session saw one substantive amendment regarding further protections for personally identifiable information (PII) as negotiated with ACLU. The amendment added a requirement that ODOT and any certified service providers (CSPs) destroy records of location and daily metered use 30 days after use for processing a payment, dispute resolution, or a noncompliance investigation, whichever is later. CSPs may retain such data if a registered owner or lessee consents; however ODOT may not obtain or use records, even if consent is granted to a CSP. A key exception is that once PII are removed, ODOT and CSPs may both use aggregated data for purposes of traffic management and research. Following the adoption of the amended language, the bill passed 6-4 and was printed as HB 2453 Version A-Engrossed (2453-A).

## **Revenue Committee**

The House Revenue Committee held a Public Hearing (April 11-12) and two Work Sessions (May 1 and May 14) on HB 2453-A.

Public Hearing testimony was similar to that heard before the Transportation Committee, with the exception of the ACLU and SEIU, which were no longer opposed. A summary of those testifying (written and/or spoken) is listed below.

- Informational
  - ODOT
  - Oregon Transportation Commission
  
- Testimony by supporters:
  - League of Oregon Cities
  - Oregon Association of Counties
  - AAA Oregon/Idaho
  - American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)
  - City of Portland
  - Community Investment Initiative
  - Oregon Equity Alliance
  
- Testimony by opponents:
  - Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers

During the second Work Session on May 14, the Revenue Committee adopted numerous amendments, summarized as follows:

- ODOT may evaluate and facilitate local government pilot programs as part of its state RUC program.
- ODOT may enter multi-jurisdictional agreements with other states, provinces, and the Federal government for purposes of conducting joint research, furthering development and operation of multi-state RUC, sharing costs, and conducting stakeholder outreach and communications. Funds received from other jurisdictions are not limited.
- RUC applies to 55+ MPG or MPGe vehicles of model year 2015 or later only, and provisions relating to emblems for use fuel tax exemption are removed from the bill.
- In addition to mandatory RUC for vehicles with 55+ MPG or MPGe, the Committee added a voluntary RUC program for up to 5,000 vehicles. It also clarified that RUC does not apply to vehicles subject to Oregon's weight-mile tax.
- Per-mile RUC revenue may be pledged for bonding purposes.
- The per-mile RUC rate is set at 1.55 cents per mile.

By a 6-3 vote, the Committee recommended to "pass as amended." The bill was printed as HB 2453-B and referred to the Joint (House and Senate) Ways & Means Committee.

## **Joint Ways & Means Committee**

The Joint Ways & Means Committee referred HB 2453-B to its Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development, which held a Public Hearing (June 10) and Work Session (June 19).

Public Hearing Testimony once again followed a similar pattern as before, although new testimony in opposition was heard from an Oregon resident and EV owner.

- Informational:
  - ODOT
- Testimony by supporters:
  - League of Oregon Cities
  - Oregon Association of Counties
  - AAA
  - American Council of Engineering Companies Oregon (ACEC)

- City of Portland
- Community Investment Initiative
  
- Testimony by opponents:
  - Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
  - Salem Resident Jeffrey Allen

During the subsequent Work Session on June 19, the Subcommittee approved an amendment to increase ODOT's expenditure authority by \$3.1229 million but adopted no further changes.

On June 26, the Full Committee held a Work Session. HB 2453-B was recommended to "pass as amended" by a vote of 16-9-1. The Bill was printed as HB 2453-C and sent to the Speaker's Desk. HB 2453 was never considered by the full House but rather sent back to the Joint Ways & Means Committee where it remained at the close of the 2013 Legislative session.



## **Senate Bill 810: Voluntary Road Usage Charge Policy**

### **Senate Committee on Business and Transportation**

Legislation introduced in the Senate as SB 810, originally unrelated to RUC, was referred to the Senate Committee on Business and Transportation. At a Work Session on April 18, the Committee agreed to replace the contents of the bill with a RUC measure through an amendment, which included the following elements:

- The amendment text included almost all of HB 2453-A (HB 2453-Introduced plus the additional personally identifiable information restrictions regarding destruction of location and daily mileage data negotiated with the ACLU). A key distinction is that SB 810 would not require RUC for vehicles with 55+ MPG or MPGe, but instead allowed RUC only for up to 5,000 volunteers.
- In addition, the amendment allowed ODOT to conduct multi-jurisdictional research.
- The amendment included several minor adjustments including, most notably, the removal of interim reports and deadlines because SB 810 is not a mandated tax program.
- The per-mile RUC rate was set at 1.5 cents per mile.

The Committee voted 6-0 “do pass with amendments” and printed the bill as SB 810-A.

### **Joint Ways & Means Committee**

The Joint Ways & Means Committee referred SB 810-A to its Subcommittee on Capital Construction, which held a Public Hearing (June 18) and Work Session (July 3). The Subcommittee voted the bill back to the Full Committee, which held a final Work Session on July 3. During the Work Session, the Full Committee approved three amendments, one of which was unrelated to RUC. The two related amendments are summarized as follows:

- The 5,000 volunteer program has limits of up to 1,500 vehicles rated at less than 17 MPG, up to 1,500 vehicles rated at or above 17 but below 22 MPG, and the remainder rated 22 MPG or higher.
- ODOT’s expenditure limitation is increased by \$2.8 million to support 11 positions, including 8.75 full-time equivalents (FTEs), and contracted costs to implement the program.

The Joint Ways & Means Committee voted 22-4 “do pass with amendments” and printed the bill as SB 810-B.

## **Passage of SB 810**

On July 6, the Senate passed SB 810-B by a vote of 24-6, and on July 7 the House passed the bill by a vote of 47-13. The Governor signed the bill into law on August 14, 2013 and it became effective on October 7, 2013.

## Competing Bills: HB 2453 and SB 810

For several days during the 2013 Oregon Legislative session, HB 2453-C and SB 810 were both under consideration for passage. These two pieces of legislation had similar origins and shares much in common, but also have several important distinctions. This section explores what the two bills shared in common, what was “missing” from SB 810, and why SB 810 ultimately passed but HB 2453 did not.

### Key Elements in Common

Both bills contain the following provisions.

- Up to 5,000 volunteers may apply to pay a per-mile RUC beginning July 1, 2015.
- Revenues collected from RUC constitute State Highway Fund dollars available for pledging against bonds, to be distributed 50% to ODOT, 30% to counties, and 20% to cities.
- ODOT is to make multiple methods for mileage reporting available, with technology elements of reporting methods conforming to ODOT-adopted standards as an open system. At least one of the methods shall not contain vehicle location capabilities.
- ODOT and CSPs must protect personally identifiable information and must destroy location and daily metered use data 30 days after its use for transaction processing, dispute resolution, or noncompliance investigation (whichever is latest). CSPs (but not ODOT) may retain such data only with the consent of the motorist.
- Motorists are entitled to refunds for any payments made for miles driven out of state and for fuel taxes. Unless the motorist uses a location-based reporting method, which automatically excludes reporting of out-of-state miles, the motorist must apply for a refund in accordance with ODOT requirements. The motorist also has multiple options for claiming fuel tax refunds or offsets.
- ODOT may also provide refunds or credits for overpayments and off-road miles.
- Motorists may not tamper with the vehicle metering system; doing so is a Class A traffic violation.
- ODOT must enter public-private partnership with certified service providers (CSPs) for technology certification, collection of metered use data, RUC processing, and account management.
- ODOT may enter into multi-jurisdictional agreements with other state DOTs, the Federal government, and Canadian provinces to conduct joint research, develop

multi-state operational concepts, share costs, and conduct stakeholder outreach and communications.

- Expenditure limitations differ slightly between the two bills (\$3.1 million in HB 2453-C; \$2.8 million in SB 810).

## What is Not in SB 810

HB 2453-C contained numerous provisions that were not ultimately added to SB 810 as enacted. The list below summarizes the most important provisions not included in the bill.

- Under SB 810, RUC applies only to volunteers and is not required for any vehicles. Under HB 2453-C, RUC would also have applied to any vehicle of model year 2015 or later with a fuel economy rating of 55 MPG or MPGe or higher, as determined by ODOT. In future legislation, the precise parameters for inclusion of any mandatory vehicles must be specified, including potentially granting ODOT the authority to establish a method for determining vehicle fuel economy.
- HB 2453-C would have required ODOT to develop methods for “identifying a mandatory vehicle.” Interestingly, the bill would have required ODOT to develop *multiple* methods for identifying mandatory vehicles. No such requirement exists for SB 810 since the program is voluntary. In concert with defining mandatory vehicles, future legislation should provide ODOT the authority and parameters for identifying such vehicles.
- Under SB 810, heavy trucks subject to the Oregon weight-mile tax are indirectly excluded from RUC, since ODOT may only accept volunteer applications for vehicles under 10,000 pounds. Under HB 2453-C, Section 2 of the bill would have excluded “a motor vehicle subject to the weight-mile tax” from the definition of motor vehicle for purposes of RUC. This more clear distinction would need to be revisited and possibly placed in any future legislation to expand the RUC program beyond volunteers.
- The per-mile rate of RUC is set in SB 810 at 1.5 cents per mile, but in HB 2453-C the rate was 1.55 cents per mile. The per-mile RUC rate will likely be revisited in any future legislation. ODOT performs a cost allocation study every two years to inform the Legislature’s rate-setting decisions for fuel taxes, weight-mile taxes, and possibly in the future RUC rates.
- HB 2453-C would have allowed motorists subject to RUC to pay a “flat annual RUC” in lieu of a per-mile RUC equal to the per-mile rate times 35,000 miles. SB 810 contains no such provision. Some version of the concept may be revisited for future legislation.

- SB 810 provides that ODOT will issue emblems to volunteer RUC motorists whose vehicles are subject to taxes on use fuel such as diesel. These emblems exempt motorists from paying use fuel taxes (presently \$0.30 per gallon), which are collected by use fuel sellers at retail locations. HB 2453-C envisioned that the emblem program would not be necessary and that, instead, motorists subject to RUC whose vehicles consume use fuel would receive a rebate or offset using the same methods as motor vehicle fuel users. Given the experience of motorists with use fuel vehicles in the RUCPP (namely, retailers infrequently honored the tax-exempt emblems), this may be a preferable approach in future legislation.
- Because RUC applies only to volunteers under SB 810, there is no notification obligation on RUC payers. In HB 2453-C, in which RUC would have been mandatory for some vehicles, Section 10 places the obligation of the tax on the RUC payer, stating, “As soon as applicable, a person shall notify ODOT... that the person is the registered owner or lessee of a mandatory vehicle.” Although in practical terms ODOT will facilitate identification of mandatory RUC payers to make the process as straightforward as possible, the legal requirement for taxation must nonetheless place this obligation on the RUC payer. Such a clause should be included in future legislation that includes mandatory vehicles.
- SB 810 contains two provisions for refunds or credits for fuel consumed: one for use fuel and one for motor vehicle fuel. Under the use fuel provision (Section 18), subsection (5) does not explicitly allow the department to “provide by rule for refund thresholds that are met by aggregating refund amounts or by estimating use fuel tax refunds by vehicle type, at the option of the user applying for the refund.” However, this option is allowed under the refund provision for motor vehicle fuel (Section 19). HB 2453-C contained the full refund language for both use fuel and motor vehicle fuel (in Sections 16 and 17, respectively).
- SB 810 does not contain any provisions regarding eligibility of RUC-liable vehicles for Oregon vehicle registration. Specifically, Section 24, subsection (10) of HB 2453-C instructed ODOT not to issue registration to RUC-liable vehicles whose owners or lessees have failed to notify ODOT of their tax liability. Such a provision should be revisited for any future legislation expanding RUC to mandatory vehicles.
- HB 2453-C Section 26 explicitly allowed ODOT to “evaluate, and facilitate the development of, pilot programs... to be designed, implemented, and evaluated by local governments” as part of the statute that enabled the RUCPP. SB 810 does not contain a provision for local government pilot testing.
- Section 27 of HB 2453-C allowed RUC revenue to be used for the purchase of grant anticipation revenue bonds, while Section 28 allows RUC revenue to be pledged against any Highway User Tax Bonds issued by the State. SB 810 does not contain these provisions.
- SB 810 does not require ODOT to make any reports to the Legislature on the progress toward implementation, whereas HB 2453-C would have required two progress reports, not later than April 1 and October 1, 2014.

## **Why SB 810 Passed**

The chief distinction between SB 810 and HB 2453-C is one of voluntary versus mandatory road usage charges. Given the supermajority requirement (3/5) to pass new taxes or tax increases in the Oregon Legislature, the mandatory RUC embodied by HB 2453-C, albeit limited to 55+ MPG and MPGe vehicles, would have required 36 House votes and 18 Senate votes. On the other hand, the voluntary RUC program embodied by SB 810 is not considered tax legislation and so required only a simple majority to pass. Although SB 810 passed by wide margins in both houses of the Oregon Legislature (47-13 and 24-6), the voluntary nature of the program was more palatable from a policy standpoint than a mandatory program. Nevertheless, SB 810 enables ODOT to implement an operational Road Usage Charge Program for 5,000 volunteers, address lingering policy concerns together with the RUFTF, and use the voluntary RUC system as a foundation for possible future expansion at the direction of the Legislature.

## What SB 810 Does

### Section-by-section analysis

Having contrasted the two competing pieces of RUC legislation from the Legislative session, this section delves into the details of the bill that prevailed: SB 810. Below is a “section-by-section” analysis (in most cases several sections are taken together) of the contents of the bill. The purpose of this section of the report is to explain what the implications of SB 810 for RUC program implementation as interpreted and understood by legislators, the RUFTF, and ODOT leadership who crafted, debated, and negotiated the final passage of the bill into law.

### Definitions, RUC, and Revenue (Sections 1-5)

The bill obligates each registered owner or lessee of a “subject vehicle” to pay a per-mile road usage charge of 1.5 cents per mile for metered use of Oregon public roadways. [Section 3] A “subject vehicle” is a motor vehicle for which ODOT has approved an application for the volunteer RUC program. [Section 2(5)] The bill defines “motor vehicle” as a vehicle that is self-propelled or designed for self-propulsion with no fewer than four wheels in contact with the ground. [Section 2(3)] This includes all four-wheel passenger cars and light trucks, regardless of fuel source (e.g., gasoline, diesel, EV, PHEV). It also includes medium and heavy trucks, although vehicles over 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) are not eligible for the volunteer RUC program.

In order to qualify as a volunteer RUC payer, a person must submit an application to ODOT indicating that he or she is the owner or lessee of a motor vehicle of GVWR less than 10,000 pounds. According to the bill, a vehicle must be equipped with the ability to report mileage using an ODOT-approved method in order to be approved. In practical terms, volunteers will likely be “conditionally approved” to participate, but final approval may occur only after their vehicle has been successfully fitted with any approved mileage reporting equipment. [Section 4(1) and (2)]

The bill places a limit of 5,000 volunteers on the RUC program, broken down as follows:

- No more than 1,700 vehicles with an MPG rating less than 17 (MPG<17).
- No more than 1,700 vehicles with an MPG rating 17 or greater but less than 22 (17≤MPG<22).
- Up to 5,000 vehicles with MPG of 22 or higher (MPG≥22).

The bill authorizes ODOT to determine the method for measuring MPG of applicants’ vehicles.<sup>2</sup> [Section 4(2)(d)]

<sup>2</sup> Note that SB 810 makes no reference to MPGe.

In order to withdraw from the RUC program, a volunteer must notify ODOT and pay all RUC owed up until the notification. The volunteer must also return the use fuel emblem, if applicable. [Section 4(3) and (4)]

The bill directs ODOT to deposit all net revenue generated from the RUC program in the State Highway Fund. These moneys will be distributed 50 percent to the state, 30 percent to the counties, and 20 percent to the cities, which happen to be the same proportions for distribution of Oregon’s fuel tax. [Section 5]

## **Administration (Sections 6-8 and 10)**

The Legislature directed and authorized ODOT to administer the RUC program. In consultation with the RUFTF, ODOT must establish at least two methods of collecting, recording, and reporting miles traveled by a subject vehicle on Oregon public roadways, at least one of which must not contain vehicle location technology. ODOT must take into consideration the following when determining reporting methods:

- Accuracy of data collected.
- Privacy options for persons liable for RUC.
- Security of technology.
- Resistance of technology to tampering.
- Ability to audit compliance.
- Other relevant factors that ODOT deems important.

The bill requires ODOT to provide persons liable for the per-mile RUC the opportunity to select a method from among multiple options, meaning at least two, for collecting and reporting metered use of Oregon public roadways. [Section 6(3)]

In addition, ODOT must adopt standards for any technology used in mileage reporting methods as an “open system.” The bill defines “open system” as an integrated system, meaning the system establishes an available, common electronic messaging language whereby components performing the same function can be readily substituted or provided by multiple providers. In practical terms, this means that any in-vehicle devices, or mileage reporting devices (MRDs), certified as meeting ODOT’s standards, should be eligible for collecting, recording, and reporting miles traveled. In adopting standards, ODOT must collaborate with other agencies of the state of Oregon to integrate information systems currently in use or planned for the future. ODOT must publish—meaning making generally available—the specifics for operation of the road usage charge system including all standards ODOT adopts relating to operations of the methods for collecting, recording, and reporting miles traveled. [Sections 6(1) and (2)(d) and Section 25]

The bill authorizes ODOT to promulgate rules for the RUC program including penalties and interest imposed on delinquent charges. [Section 7]

The bill requires ODOT to establish reporting periods that may vary (e.g., monthly, quarterly, annually) depending on the individual circumstances of each “class” of registered owners, lessees, and subject vehicles. In establishing minimum reporting periods, ODOT must consider the following:

- The effort required by RUC payers to report metered use and pay RUC.
- The amount of RUC owed.
- The cost to RUC payers of reporting metered use and paying RUC.
- The administrative cost to ODOT.
- Other relevant factors that ODOT deems important.

[Section 8]

Once a reporting frequency is determined, the RUC payer must report mileage (rounded up to the nearest whole mile) and pay RUC. [Section 10(1)]

RUC payers are not required to report mileage driven outside of Oregon (e.g., a location-enabled reporting option would report only those miles driven within Oregon). The bill authorizes ODOT to assume that all metered use reported represents miles driven on Oregon public roadways unless the person obligated to pay RUC presents evidence in a manner approved by ODOT rule that the subject vehicle was driven outside Oregon. Since the bill does not prescribe when this evidence must be presented, ODOT may presume that the RUC payer may present this evidence prior to invoicing of the RUC for a given month or after invoicing but prior to payment. If the RUC payer presents this evidence after payment, section 11 provides the RUC payer an option to claim refunds for any reported mileage that was actually driven out of state. Reading sections 10 and 11 together, ODOT has rulemaking authority to determine the evidence required to make such a claim for out of state mileage refunds. [Sections 10(2) and 11]

## **Protection of Personally Identifiable Information (Section 9)**

The bill declares the confidentiality of *personally identifiable information* used for reporting metered use or for administrative services related to collection of the per-mile road usage charge and that such PII is a public record exempt from disclosure except for specific purposes and exceptions laid out in the section. [Section 9(2)]

The bill defines “personally identifiable information” (PII) as information that identifies or describes a person. This section then specifically describes the type of information that qualifies as PII, including a person’s travel pattern data, RUC account number, address, telephone number, email address, driver license or identification card number,

registration plate number, photograph, recorded images, bank account number, and credit card number. The section is clear that the information that consists of PII is not limited to this list. [Section 9(1)(b)]

While PII is necessary for proper processing of RUC, the bill imposes upon ODOT, certified service providers, and contractors for certified service providers the obligation not to disclose PII used or developed for reporting metered use by a subject vehicle or for administrative services related to the collection of per-mile road usage charges to any person except the following individuals or entities, and only the information necessary to respective recipient's functions for reporting metered use or for administrative functions related to collection of RUC:

- Registered owner or lessee of the subject vehicle.
- Any entity the registered owner or lessees the RUC payer “expressly approves” to receive the information.
- A financial institution, for purposes of collecting RUC owed.
- ODOT employees.
- A certified service provider.
- Contractors for a certified service provider, but only to the extent the contractor provides services directly related to the certified service provider's agreement with ODOT.
- A police officer pursuant to a valid court order based on probable cause and issued at the request of a federal, state, or local law enforcement agency in an authorized criminal investigation involving a person to whom the requested information pertains.

[Section 9(3)]

For purposes of protecting personally identifiable information, the bill defines “certified service provider” as an entity that has entered into an agreement with ODOT under the Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program for reporting metered use by a subject vehicle or for administrative services related to the collection of per-mile road usage charges and authorized employees of the entity. [Section 9 (1)(a)]

ODOT and certified service providers may use records of location and daily metered use of subject vehicles for traffic management and research after removing the PII. ODOT and certified service providers may also retain monthly summaries of metered use by subject vehicles (“VIN summary reports”), defined as monthly reports by ODOT or a certified service provider that include summaries of all vehicle identification numbers of subject vehicles and associated total metered use during the month but must not include location information. In addition, a certified service provider, but not ODOT, may retain the records of location and daily metered use of subject vehicles if a registered owner or lessee consents to the retention. [Sections 9(4)(b) and (1)(c)]

ODOT and certified service providers must destroy records of the location and daily metered use of subject vehicles that are not used for traffic management and research, nor retained by a CSP by consent of its customers, nor contained in a VIN summary report as described in the preceding paragraph not later than 30 days after payment processing, dispute resolution for a single reporting period, or a noncompliance investigation, whichever is latest. [Section 9(4)(a)]

## Refunds (Sections 11-19)

SB 810 makes allowances for several categories of refunds. Refunds are allowed for overpayments, off-road mileage, and fuel consumed. Each is discussed below.

- Refunds for overpayments. ODOT shall either refund overpayments or promulgate a rule to grant them as credits against future RUC. An overpayment could occur by inaccurate reporting of miles driven or by a RUC payer presenting evidence, in a manner approved by ODOT rule, that a subject vehicle was driven out of state. [Section 11 and Section 10(2)]
- Refunds for off-road mileage. RUC payers may apply to ODOT for a refund for metered use of a road, thoroughfare, or property in private ownership within 15 months after payment of the RUC for those miles. The application shall be in a form prescribed by ODOT rule and must include a signed statement by the RUC payer indicating the number of miles for which the refund is claimed and any other information ODOT considers necessary for processing the application. The bill authorizes ODOT to examine relevant records of the applicant in order to establish validity of the application, investigate any refund claims for fraud, and gather information ODOT considers necessary to protect the state and prevent fraudulent practices in connection to tax refunds and tax evasion. If the applicant does not permit ODOT to examine the relevant records, the applicant waives rights to the refund. These provisions imply that ODOT has the authority to refuse a refund application that is incomplete or otherwise does not comply with ODOT rules or is fraudulent. [Sections 12 and 13]]
- Fuel tax refunds.
  - Use fuel taxes. The bill has special provisions for vehicles that run on *use fuel* (e.g., diesel, propane, natural gas).
    - The bill directs ODOT to issue an emblem (also known as a cab card) to RUC payers that submit an application on an ODOT prescribed form. Emblems show that the use of fuel in a subject vehicle is exempt from use fuel taxation. An emblem must be displayed conspicuously on the subject vehicle and may not be transferred to other vehicles. [Section 15]

- RUC payers whose vehicles run on use fuel (e.g., diesel, propane, natural gas) are not required to obtain a Use Fuel User's License. [Section 16]
- Sellers of use fuel (e.g., diesel, propane, natural gas) shall not collect use fuel tax from vehicles subject to RUC. Presumably, motorists may use the emblem obtained in Section 15 to demonstrate their exemption from use fuel taxes when purchasing fuel. [Section 17]
- Notwithstanding the procedures outlined in sections 15-17, motorists may claim refunds for any use fuel taxes paid, provided invoices indicating purchase of the use fuel (e.g., diesel, propane, natural gas) or other approved information required by ORS 319.831 support the refund application. Pursuant to rule, ODOT may grant the refund or apply it as a credit toward future RUC incurred by the applicant. [Section 18]
- *Motor vehicle fuel taxes.* Motorists who pay RUC and use motor vehicle fuel (e.g., gasoline) in a subject vehicle may claim a refund for motor vehicle fuel taxes paid. Pursuant to rule, ODOT may grant the refund or apply it as credit toward future RUC incurred by the applicant. ODOT may provide refund thresholds that are met by aggregating refund amounts, provided the motorist presented original invoices or reasonable facsimiles showing the motor vehicle fuel purchase and meets the other requirements of ORS 319.280(5). Alternatively, the claimant has the option of estimating motor vehicle refund amounts by vehicle type, but the claimant need not present original invoices or facsimiles showing motor vehicle fuel purchases. [Section 19]
- Penalty for false statements. The bill provides penalties for false statements that are intentionally made in a mileage report, refund application, presentation of evidence for exclusion of out of state miles from RUC payment, or submission of other information required by ODOT related to a refund application for metered use on private property. Further, a person may not apply for, receive, or attempt to receive a refund for overpayment or driving on private property to which the person is not entitled. This penalty also applies to a person who assists or aids a person to violate this provision. Violation of this provision results in a class A violation. [Oregon Laws chapter 781, section 14]

In practical terms, these Sections collectively allow three avenues for fuel tax refunds or offsets.

- First, for customers with automated mileage and fuel consumption reporting capabilities, the fuel tax can be automatically deducted from RUC owed on each billing statement.

- Secondly, customers without automated fuel consumption reporting capabilities may opt to “estimate motor vehicle fuel tax refunds by vehicle type” (i.e., by using estimated EPA fuel economy for the vehicle make, model, and year), fuel taxes can be automatically deducted from RUC owed on each billing statement (note that this option is only available for motor vehicle fuel tax refunds but not for use fuel tax refunds).
- Finally, customers without automated fuel consumption reporting capabilities may opt to present invoices showing fuel taxes paid as the basis for a “manual” refund claim (note that this option is available for both motor vehicle fuel and use fuel tax refunds).

## **Penalties (Sections 20-21)**

The bill creates the offense of “tampering with a vehicle metering system,” classified as a Class A traffic violation.<sup>3</sup> A “vehicle metering system” is defined as the system used to record metered use by a motor vehicle for the purpose of complying with RUC reporting requirements.

A person tampers with a vehicle metering system if the person, with intent to defraud, operates a subject vehicle on a highway knowing that the vehicle metering system is disconnected or nonfunctional; or if the person replaces, disconnects, or resets the vehicle metering system of a subject vehicle with the intent of reducing the metered use it records. These offenses do not apply to a person servicing, repairing, or replacing the vehicle metering system. [Section 21]

## **Conforming Amendments and Technical Provisions (Sections 22-28)**

The bill determines that revenue derived from RUC belongs to the State Highway Fund. [Section 22]

The bill defines collection of the per-mile road usage charge as a “transportation project” eligible for innovative contracting and procurement under the Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program (OIPP). Under OIPP authority, ODOT shall enter into agreements to undertake transportation projects, the subjects of which include metered use data collection, tax processing, account management, and the application of technology standards to determine whether to certify technology. [Sections 23, 24 and 25]

The bill determines court jurisdiction over RUC, namely that the Oregon’s tax court is not the “sole, exclusive and final judicial authority for the hearing and determination of all questions of law and fact” arising from the RUC statutes. [Section 26]

The bill declares the operative date for sections 3-5, 10-19 and 21-22 is July 1, 2015 and grants ODOT the authority to take any action necessary to enable the department

---

<sup>3</sup> Although no explicitly stated in the bill, a Class A traffic violation presently carries a fine of up to \$2,000 for an individual and \$4,000 for a corporation.

to prepare to exercise all the duties, functions, and powers conferred upon ODOT for the RUC program prior to the operative date of July 1, 2015. [Sections 27]

Section 28 is a non-substantive provision of the bill.

### **Multijurisdictional Agreements (Sections 29-30)**

The legislature granted ODOT the authority to enter into agreements with other state departments of transportation, Canadian provinces, and the federal government for the following purposes:

- Conduct joint research relating to RUC and development of programs on a multi-state basis.
- Further the development and operations of single state or multi-state RUC pilot programs.
- Share costs for research.
- Develop a program for stakeholder outreach and communications.

[Section 29]

Any funds provided by other jurisdictions for these purpose are “not limited,” meaning they do not impact the expenditure limitations set forth for ODOT for the Road Usage Charge Program for the 2013-2015 biennium. [Section 30]

### **Expenditure Limitation and Effective Date (Sections 31 and 33)**

The bill expands ODOT’s expenditure limitation by \$2.828 million for purposes of implementing the RUC program during the present biennium (2013-2015). The bill took effect October 7, 2013. [Section 31 and 33]

### **Rail Proximate Real Property Transfers (Section 32)**

This section is entirely unrelated to the RUC program.

### **Key Issues for Interpretation**

While the language of SB 810 is clear in most instances, there are several areas that leave some room for interpretation. This section discusses seven such areas. For each area, we make an initial assessment, although these are not final or legal interpretations.

- Open systems. SB 810 defines an open system as an “integrated system based on common standards and an operating system that has been made public so *that components performing the same functions can be readily substituted or provided by multiple providers*” [emphasis added]. The bill further states that ODOT shall adopt standards for “open system technology” used in methods for mileage reporting. From these two statements, it is clear that any technology used in mileage reporting shall be based on open system standards. The question is whether ODOT shall require technology to be substitutable across all reporting providers for a given method. Clearly a basic MRD cannot be substituted for an advanced MRD, as these two methods are distinct. But can ODOT require one account provider’s basic MRD to be functional with a separate account provider’s system? As long as ODOT maintains open standards such that more than one provider has the opportunity to provide mileage reporting methods, the open systems requirements of SB 810 will be satisfied.
- Exceptions to PII protection and data destruction requirements. SB 810 allows motorists to share PII with any entity that they have “expressly approved” to receive the information. In addition, CSPs may retain daily metered use and location data if the motorist “consents to the retention.” The two phrases—expressly approve vs. consent—have different meanings, but due to the sensitivity over privacy provisions of RUC, implementing procedures for sharing data under each circumstance must carefully conform to the letter and spirit of SB 810. For the former (“expressly approve”), the motorist must actively provide an approval, either electronic or on paper, identifying the entity with which to share the data that is separate from a general approval of terms and conditions. For the latter (“consent”), the requirements are much less onerous in that consent requirements would be satisfied if a motorist provides consent as part of a general approval of terms and conditions. Nevertheless, as a matter of policy, ODOT could make the consent requirement more stringent by rulemaking or contractual provisions that require an electronic or written affirmative reply to a request to consent release of data that is separate from a general approval of terms and conditions. ODOT may also require by rule or by contractual provision that such consent may neither be nor be presented as a condition for a customer to establish a service contract with a CSP. ODOT should suggest or require language for consent requirements, to ensure that consent is clearly and fairly presented to motorists in accordance with the spirit of SB 810.
- Public-private partnerships. Sections 24 and 25 place RUC under the purview of OIPP’s contracting authority for PPPs. However, the question remains whether ODOT is required to develop RUC as a PPP or whether the options remain to run a partly or fully in-house RUC collection system. In other words, how much of the RUC program *must* be outsourced. While there is nothing in SB 810 requiring outsourcing of the entire Road Usage Charge Program, section 25 indicates that with regard to the collection of metered use data, tax processing, account management, and the application of technology standards to determine whether to certify technology, at least a portion of the program must be outsourced. As long as ODOT makes the opportunity available to private vendors to provide these services, the PPP requirements of the bill are satisfied.

- Emblems. SB 810 provides RUC volunteers whose vehicles run on use fuel the opportunity to apply for emblems indicating their exemption from the use fuel tax. However, there are also other methods for RUC volunteers to have use fuel tax offset or refunded, including automatically through the use of an MRD that accurately measures fuel consumption or by manual submission of fuel purchase invoices to ODOT. The bill makes no allowance for ODOT to estimate fuel consumption of use fuel vehicles for which MRDs cannot accurately measure fuel consumption by using the EPA's fuel economy ratings. Since emblems need only be provided upon application by a motorists, perhaps the best course of action is for ODOT to include it as the second among three alternatives for fuel tax offsets or refunds as follows: (1) automatically compute use fuel tax offsets, (2) use an emblem to indicate exemption from use fuel tax, or (3) claim use fuel tax refunds manually. Note that option (1) must be used alone, while options (2) and (3) can be used together.
- Definition of tampering and metered use. Section 21 of SB 810 defines the offense of tampering and creates a penalty for it. Tampering is fairly clearly defined, but the "vehicle metering system" (the object of tampering) is not. SB 810 says, "'vehicle metering system' means a system used to record the metered use by a motor vehicle for the purpose of complying with the reporting requirements under section 10." The question arises over the definition of metered use. By inference, it is clear that "metered use" as used throughout SB 810 refers to distance, or mileage, as measured (or "metered") by technology such as an MRD. However, the full "vehicle metering system" also includes recording for purposes of compliance, which means not only measuring mileage from the vehicle itself but also communicating the metered use to a back office. Therefore, tampering with the "vehicle metering system" can be taken to mean any effort to defraud or reduce mileage by tampering with the components of the vehicle itself that generate the ability to meter use (i.e., speedometer, odometer, and vehicle data port), the MRD, as well as any account management features that store the data once communicated from the MRD to the back office.
- Definition of a CSP. Section 9, relating to protection of PII, defines a CSP as "an entity that has entered into an agreement with ODOT under **ORS 367.806** for reporting metered used by a subject vehicle or for administrative services related to the collection or per-mile RUC and authorized employees of the entity" [emphasis added]. The question is whether any contractor that provides outsourced ODOT-branded RUC services (e.g., an "ODOT Account Manager" or OAM) constitutes a CSP for purposes of data retention and PII protection. Notwithstanding the interpretation of section 9 in this regard, as a matter of internal policy, ODOT could contractually require an entity entering into an agreement with ODOT for outsourced ODOT-branded services not to exercise the rights of CSPs for purposes of section 9 in order to keep the public trust that ODOT will not use contractual relationships with CSPs to circumvent the requirements of section 9(4)(b)(B) that prohibit ODOT from obtaining or using PII.
- Is VIN considered PII? Does PII include VIN? Although not explicitly listed as an example of PII, vehicle identification numbers clearly constitute PII since one of the other examples listed is the vehicle registration plane number.

## ODOT Rule-making Obligations and Opportunities

The list below comprehensively summarizes each opportunity and/or obligation for ODOT to make a rule of procedure in accordance with SB 810.

- Section 4(1). Volunteers must apply to volunteer to ODOT on a form prescribed by ODOT.
- Section 4(2)(d). ODOT must establish a method to determine the miles per gallon of vehicles associated with volunteer applications.
- Section 4(4). Volunteers may end their participation by notifying ODOT, which implies ODOT must create procedure for accepting such notifications and initiating the process of withdrawing a volunteer from the RUC system.
- Section 6(2)(a)-(c). ODOT in consultation with RUFTF shall establish methods for mileage recording and reporting, at least one of which must not use vehicle location technology.
- Section 6(2)(d). ODOT shall adopt standards for open system technology used in mileage recording and reporting methods. In adopting standards ODOT shall collaborate with other executive agencies to integrate information systems currently in use or planned for future use.
- Section 6(3). ODOT shall provide volunteers the opportunity to select from among multiple methods.
- Section (7). ODOT shall provide by rule for the collection of RUC including penalties and interest on delinquent charges.
- Section 8(1)-(3). ODOT shall establish reporting periods by rule, which may vary according to the facts and circumstances applicable to each class of vehicles.
- Section 9(5). ODOT shall provide for penalties for a CSP for violating PII and data retention statutes (Section 9) as part of any agreement with a CSP.
- Section 10(2). ODOT shall approve by rule a manner for motorists to provide evidence of mileage driven out of state when seeking a refund.
- Section 11(2). ODOT may provide by rule that refunds for overpayments be granted as a credit against future RUC.
- Section 12(1-4). ODOT must prescribe a form (and, inherently, process) for motorists to apply for off-road refunds, and the form must include a signed statement by the applicant indicating the number of miles for which the refund is claimed. Since ODOT may require information to process the application, the “process” may also specify information to be submitted.
- Section 13(1). ODOT may investigate refund applications, including examination of relevant records of an applicant.

- Section 15(1). ODOT must develop an application form for RUC volunteers with use fuel vehicles to apply for an emblem.
- Section 18(5). ODOT may provide by rule that a refund for use fuel tax paid can be applied as a credit toward future RUC.
- Section 19(4)(a). ODOT may provide by rule that a refund for motor vehicle fuel tax paid can be applied as a credit toward future RUC.
- Section 19(4)(b). ODOT may provide by rule for refund thresholds that are met by aggregating refund amounts or by estimating motor vehicle fuel tax refunds by vehicle type, at the option of the person claiming the refund.
- Section 24(3)(b). ODOT shall enter into agreements to undertake transportation projects (including RUC).
- Section 27(2). ODOT may take any action prior to the operative date of July 1, 2015 to enable the exercise of all the duties, functions, and powers conferred on it by SB 810.
- Section 29. ODOT may enter into multi-jurisdictional agreements.

## **Policy Objectives of SB 810**

This section summarizes the policy objectives derived from SB 810 that will guide ODOT's implementation of a road usage charge program.

1. Up to 5,000 registered owners or lessees of eligible motor vehicles may volunteer to pay a per-mile road usage charge. On or before July 1, 2015, ODOT shall at least provide the opportunity for volunteer RUC payers to begin reporting mileage under the Road Usage Charge Program.
2. ODOT will consult with the RUFTH to establish multiple methods for recording and reporting mileage. Methods established will:
  - a) Accurately collect mileage data;
  - b) Protect privacy of persons liable for the per-mile road usage charge;
  - c) Feature secure technologies;
  - d) Feature technologies that are resistant to tampering;
  - e) Be auditable; and
  - f) Feature other factors that ODOT deems important.
3. ODOT will enter into PPP agreements to (1) apply technology standards to determine whether to certify technology, (2) collect metered use data, (3) process RUC, and (4) manage accounts.

4. All volunteers will have multiple (at least two) options, approved by ODOT, for mileage reporting and account management, at least one of which will not feature vehicle location technology.
5. ODOT will adopt standards for open system technology and certify technologies that meet the standards for use in RUC reporting.
6. ODOT and any vendors will protect personally identifiable information from disclosure according to Section 9 of SB 810 except to an entity expressly approved to receive the information, including destruction of location and daily mileage data within 30 days of use for payment processing, dispute resolution, or noncompliance investigation (whichever is latest). The only exceptions are:
  - a) Data from which PII have been removed may be aggregated and used for traffic management and research purposes;
  - b) Certified service providers (also known as commercial account managers) may retain a customer's daily mileage and location data only with the customer's consent;
  - c) Monthly summaries of metered use by subject vehicles may be retained in VIN summary reports.
7. ODOT will develop and implement all the rules and regulations obliged by SB 810, including all of those listed in the previous section of this document (except for rules related to refunds as credits against future RUC and multi-jurisdictional agreements, which are optional).



## Appendix A – Full Chronology of Events in 2013 Session

Date	Bill	Location	Action
1/14/13	HB 2453	House	First reading. Referred to Speaker's desk
1/22/13	HB 2453	House	Referred to Transportation and Economic Development Committee
2/25/13	HB 2453	House Transportation & Economic Development Committee	Public Hearing
3/11/13	SB 810	Senate	First reading. Referred to President's desk
3/18/13	SB 810	Senate	Referred to Business and Transportation Committee
3/27/13	HB 2453	House Transportation & Economic Development Committee	Work Session
4/3/13	HB 2453-A	House Transportation & Economic Development Committee	Recommended "do pass with amendments" and referred to Revenue Committee
4/8/13	SB 810	Senate Business and Transportation Committee	Public Hearing
4/12/13	HB 2453-A	House Revenue Committee	Public Hearing
4/18/13	SB 810	Senate Business and Transportation Committee	Work Session
4/26/13	SB 810-A	Senate Business and Transportation Committee	Recommended "do pass with amendments" and referred to Ways & Means Committee
5/1/13	HB 2453-A	House Revenue Committee	Work Session
5/14/13	HB 2453-A	House Revenue Committee	Work Session
5/20/13	HB 2453-B	House Revenue Committee	Recommended "do pass with amendments" and referred to Ways & Means Committee
6/10/13	HB 2453-B	Joint Ways & Means Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development	Public Hearing
6/18/13	SB 810-A	Joint Ways & Means Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development	Public Hearing
6/19/13	HB 2453-B	Joint Ways & Means Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development	Work Session
6/26/13	HB 2453-B	Joint Ways & Means Committee	Work Session
7/2/13	HB 2453-C	Joint Ways & Means Committee	Recommended "do pass with amendments"

Date	Bill	Location	Action
7/2/13	HB 2453-C	House	Second reading.
7/3/13	SB 810-A	Joint Ways & Means Subcommittee on Capital Construction	Work Session
7/3/13	SB 810-A	Joint Ways & Means Committee	Work Session
7/5/13	SB 810-A	Ways & Means Committee	Recommended "do pass with amendments"
7/6/13	SB 810-B	Senate	Second reading.
7/6/13	SB 810-B	Senate	Third reading. Carried by Starr. Passes 24-6 [nays: Boquist, Close, Ferrioli, Knopp, Kruse, Whitsett]
7/6/13	SB 810-B	House	Referred to Ways & Means Committee
7/6/13	SB 810-B	Joint Ways & Means Committee	Recommended "do pass"
7/6/13	SB 810-B	House	Second reading.
7/7/13	SB 810-B	House	Third reading. Carried by Read. Passes 47-13 [nays: Barton, Fagan, Freeman, Gallegos, Gilliam, Gorsek, Hanna, Hicks, Sprenger, Thatcher, Unger, Weidner, Whitsett]
7/7/13	HB 2453-C	House	Referred to Revenue Committee
7/15/13	SB 810-B	Senate	President signed
7/15/13	SB 810-B	House	Speaker signed
8/14/13	SB 810-B	Senate	Governor signed
8/21/13	SB 810-Enrolled	Senate	Chapter 781, 2013 Laws, effective October 7, 2013

