

House Committee on Transportation Policy
Representative Caddy McKeown, Chair

Hearing on House Bill 2320

Directs the State Marine Board to Create Nonmotorized Boating
Program

March 1, 2017

My name is Laurie Pavey and this is my first time testifying before the state legislature. I have been a paddler in Oregon for over 40 years. I do NOT support a Non-Motorized Boating Permit

I think it is time for the Marine Board to scale back their operations, tighten their belt and downsize their operation. Just because they are losing revenue from declining powerboat fees, they should not start a whole new program to tax an additional set of watercraft in an effort to increase their revenue. Canoes and kayaks have been freely floating on Oregon's waters since Lewis and Clark first paddled in Oregon. We should not have to pay a fee to merely dip our paddles in a river or lake. We should be free to paddle on the waters of Oregon, just as we are free to walk through our national forest lands.

The Marine Board states that many nonmotorized boaters demand more facilities and education. The user groups that I paddle with do not need or want any developed facilities. We shoulder our kayaks and walk down a trail to a river, no boat ramp is needed. We are safety conscious, teach others how to be safe on the water, and leave no litter. We need no help or services from the Marine Board. And yet under this bill we would need to pay yearly fees for services and facilities we do not need and will not use.

Under the proposed legislation a family of 4 (2 teenagers and 2 adults) would need to pay \$76 per year just to paddle their canoes several times a year on a lake in Oregon. (Paddler fee, agent fee, and Aquatic Invasive Species fee amount to \$19 per person per year.) These fees would be in ADDITION to any park entrance fees and/or any US Forest Service parking pass fees. Thus many families, especially those of lower income, may find it financially difficult to

access Oregon's waters. Everyone should have a right to enjoy our natural resources.

I am concerned with the practicality of enforcement of this law and I predict that any revenue generated would be quickly consumed by skyrocketing costs of enforcement. Sheriffs would be VERY busy trying to check everyone's permits. Our law enforcement officers need to be focused on enforcement of *real* crimes of violence and property, not using their hours citing canoers and kayakers for paddling without an OSMB permit. In Corvallis hundreds of college students float the slow current of the Willamette River in small 2-person rafts or double-float tubes in the summer. Those in the raft or double-tube would need a permit, while those floating in a tube alongside would not.

Traditionally 62% of the Marine Board's budget has been used for law enforcement and administration. Thus the amount remaining for facility maintenance and improvement is marginal.

More access (without developed facilities) in the form of land purchases would be the ONLY positive aspect of this bill I can see and this need is already currently addressed through grant programs administered by Oregon Parks and Recreation. Let's look at ways to further invest in these existing programs.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Laurie Pavey
Corvallis, Oregon

member of:
Willamette Kayak and Canoe Club
Lower Columbia Canoe Club
American Whitewater

editor of: *Soggy Sneakers: A Paddler's Guide to Oregon's Rivers*