March 10, 2026

Minnesota Senate
c/o Beth Ethier
RE: SF 4169

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to oppose the tax increase in SF 4169 EXPANDING PUBLIC CHARGING TAX, while supporting adding back state funding to support NEVI. We should be not be selectively punishing owners and drivers of clean vehicles, while there are still government subsidies for the oil & gas industries. Yes roads and transportation needs to be funded, but adding to the existing burden EV owners pay is not the right way. Most economists would agree that air pollution and accelerating climate change are externalities that the free market does not address. This is exactly why we should have public policy to *ENCOURAGE* use of products that reduce the consumption of dirty fossil fuels. By increasing taxes to owners of these relatively new technologies such as EVs, it *DISCOURAGES* their wider adoption.

Also I want to point out this fee does not affect *MOST* EV owners because they charge at home. It instead puts even more concentrated burden on those who charge at public chargers, which could choke off that market share of businesses. That's like enforcing extra gas tax only when it's not the closest gas station from home. It's simply not a fair way to implement public policy and could lead to unintended consequences in the future.

If balancing the transportation budget is needed, we should be slightly increasing more the existing gas taxes. That has a bigger impact anyway, because it affects a larger volume of users, and also has a built-in long-term incentive to reduce the usage of such dirty fuel vehicles. We have one chance to get climate policies right on this planet, and we need to follow examples set by other high EV adoption countries. They have all given financial incentives to EV owners to get the public adoption rates higher, at least initially. The current U.S. market share of EVs is not high enough to abandon this strategy.

Thank you,

Jay Cai