

February 28, 2017

Rep. Caddy McKeown
Chair, House Committee on Transportation Policy
Oregon State Legislature
900 Court St. NE
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Testimony on House Bill 2320

Dear Chair McKeown,

As an avid kayaker and Oregon resident who enjoys boating across the state, I am writing to share my strong opposition to House Bill 2320, proposing to establish fees for boating on Oregon's public waters. This legislation essentially proposes to tax one of the most low-impact uses of our state's public lands and waters in order to fund an agency that provides essentially no services to the community which would bear the costs and which lacks the expertise or capacity to provide appropriate services were it so inclined. The legislation would erect senseless barriers for bringing more Oregonians outside to enjoy healthy outdoor recreation, activities that currently generate more than \$12.8 billion in annual consumer spending and \$955 million in state and local taxes and support more than 141,000 jobs in Oregon, according to the Outdoor Industry Association. The proposed bill is a solution in search of a problem, and should be rejected by the legislature.

As I understand it, the genesis of House Bill 2320 was a push by the Oregon Marine Board to find new sources of revenue and proposing to institute a fee for human powered recreation on our public rivers, streams, and lakes. As members of the non-motorized recreation community correctly pointed out that the Marine Board does nothing to benefit this community, the Marine Board responded by proposing to institute a "program."

This the epitome of regulation for the sake of regulation.

While it may be the case that certain high-traffic areas, particularly those which are seasonally popular with tubers and swimmers, may be in need of additional law enforcement and education efforts, those users would not be subject to fees, in contrast to the established, non-motorized boating community that would be expected to pay the costs. Addressing these localized areas of conflict or need would be better addressed through targeted enforcement of existing laws and educational efforts, and would more appropriately be funded through fees at particular, high-traffic points of access.

Best regards,

Louis Geltman
Hood River, OR