

March 1st 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,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HB2320, which proposes to establish fees for non-motorized boating on Oregon's public waterways. I do not believe this fee will alleviate congestion at high traffic access points where there has been conflict between motorized and non-motorized users, especially since the users which are most at risk for conflict and harm, tubers or floaters, are exempt from this fee. These users traditionally do not wear PFDs or helmets and are often intoxicated while on the river and are a danger to themselves and others.

Instead, your fee targets the kayaking community to pay for law enforcement and access construction and maintenance. This community consists of some of the most low impact users of the resource with broad knowledge of safety and respect for the resource. Personally, I rarely use developed access points, and those that I do use are on federal public lands.

I sit on the Yamhill County Parks Board, and while the county could benefit from a grant program to improve access to waterways, I do not believe this program would provide adequate funds to make any meaningful improvements for those paying the fees. \$1.6 million per biennium in funds for grants across the state will likely be focused in metropolitan areas with rural users not seeing the benefit.

Lastly, I want to comment on the idea of a state wide fee and how it would restrict access for those of us in the non-motorized community that want to take family and friends on the river. If I wanted to take a group of friends rafting on the Santiam river for example, we would have to pay the county park fee at Packsaddle for vehicles left there. We would need a Northwest forest pass for vehicles the Fisherman's bend recreation site. If using a boat longer than 10 feet we need an aquatic invasive species permit (\$7/craft) and now the state is proposing a per/user fee of \$12? How is this promoting healthy recreation and enjoyment of our beautiful resources in Oregon?

I strongly oppose this bill and hope the committee reconsider its concept to focus fees on high traffic areas and high risk users such as tubers.

Thank you for your consideration.
Marie Vicksta
Resident of McMinnville OR

