I am *opposed* to HB4099 & HB4138.

My name is Hannah Caruso. I grew up living with a dock on the upper Willamette, located next to the I-5 bridge (between mile markers 30-50). Our dock is located right before the No Wake Zone under the two bridges. Due to this, boats frequently turn around in front of our dock to avoid the No Wake Zone. This also means that because of this, our dock receives double the amount of waves than the average riverfront owner's dock, located away from a No Wake Zone withstands. Despite this, my family has enjoyed living on our property with our dock for the last 15 years.

I, now 20 years old, am lucky to have grown up on a riverfront property and enjoyed wake sports with my family. We have a boat with a wake enhancing device, and enjoy using it during the warm summer months. My family maintains our dock and property to withstand the wakes of other boats.

I stand with the large group of people who strongly oppose the two bills, HB4099 & HB4138.
I believe that the bills are supported by a small group of riverfront home owners who are not willing to maintain their property. Some of my favorite memories with my family revolve around wake sports. Should these two bills pass my family, as well as many others, will not be able to enjoy wake sports that serve as a fun and bonding activity amongst families. Not only this, but the property value of the dozens of homes owned by families will drop significantly. I think these bills are extreme and rash, as they have significant effects on riverfront property owners.

There are other ways to reduce the wake effects on the shoreline and docks that should be further researched. For example, the technique used to turn around and pick up a fallen rider can be altered so the the large wake produced from turning around at a high speed is lessened.

It is obvious there is a controversy regarding the bills and that further research should be conducted on both sides.

I appreciate your time,

Hannah Caruso
31394 SW Olympic Dr.
Wilsonville, OR 97070