

Testifying in Opposition of bill 2695. This is clearly an attempt to stack the board with more members representing the biased interests of special interest groups and continue the attack against motorized tow boats and water sport tow boats. The board in its current form needs to represent the interest of all river users as per its own public charter, including tow-sport boats, which at present it doesn't seem to be doing based on the perspective of tow-sport boaters. Adding more members focused on special interests will only make this worse. If there are issues with expertise and diversity of the existing board we should resolve this with the current size of the board and not increase it further. This would simply create more bureaucracy along with ownership and accountability issues. I'd also propose we review how the members of the board are appointed, oversight of, and tenure durations. Further the board itself is funded by boater registration and fuel taxes, yet there is this ongoing vilification of motor boats and tow boats in essence outlawing their use on the primary nearby water way. Now boaters will be further burdened to fund doubling the size of the board while also having to tow our boats perhaps a 30-100 miles for water access and no longer able to use the water in our back yard - all because some river front home owners want a more private river setting and paddlers worried about some splashes and getting wet while in the river. I appreciate the board has a tough job to represent all water users, but bending to the loud voices of special interest groups is unacceptable, and increasing the size of the board with more members biased to special interests is truly unacceptable. I fully agree with all the public testimony shared today by the 3 former OSMB members, including Paul Donheffner, who all testified in opposition of this bill.