

Regarding SB 1589:

Hello, My name is Joseph Sheets and ***I am in opposition of SB 1589***. My Wife and son and I live on the waterfront in Wilsonville on the North bank side, across from Charbonneau docks , 2 docks east of the I-5 bridge. I have lived at this address with a dock and many different Boats, PWC's, paddle boards, canoes, etc. for 22 years. I purchased this property in 1998 as a dream to be able to recreate on the river in towed watersports, fish and paddle with ease of access. I grew up waterskiing on the lower Willamette and upper since 1980. I feel I know every mile of river bank from the Newberg ramp to sauvies island. We currently have a wakeboard boat, PWC and paddle boards that are mowed at our private dock.

Most are unaware of the proposed restrictions- which I strongly believe is a big part of the problem and why these continued restrictions are snowballing. I also strongly believe these new restrictions will impact property values for waterfront landowners if the usability of the waterway is significantly restricted as proposed.

It is crucial we educate from the standpoint of there being no need for increased regulation. Instead, I believe the focus should be on enforcing the current rules versus creating new ones to create a balanced, safe and respectful river for recreation.

We are opposed to SB 1589. A major point I would like to make to the argument for environmental impact (bank erosion etc) - go and look at the riverbank now or better yet when the rains come back and look at how much high water impacts both the shoreline, channel and even docks for that matter?!! Everyone that has a dock knows that risk of damage and shore erosion is NOT from boat wakes, but more so from Winter High-water and flooding and debris. So why are these small group of landowners so up-in-arms on the impact a few boats cause during a few short months in the year??! See attached pictures. I have a lower lawn that our dock's bridge has been bearing on since 1975 when the original permit was submitted to drive pile. That bank and my lawn line have remained since then with the exceptions of 1996 flood and 2004 winter in which the lower lawn was under water again. I have been mowing that same grass line to the bank since 1998. The only erosion is due to high water in winter conditions. (see pictures). Our property would also be the worst bank area on the river due to where boats slow down to enter the bridge to bridge no wake zone, speed up after leaving the no wake zone and where they turn around causing large wakes and rollers. Yet my bank has still not eroded from wakes but only high water winters!!!. This is a fact

As someone that lives on and grew up enjoying the Willamette River, I perceive this as a direct attack on our way of life. I am angry and perplexed on how a vocal uneducated in science, minority is able to get away with this proposed overregulation of the public waterway.

Boats are not the factor for erosion as the winters are. It is a fact and is science proven, not subjective.

The Fish Runs that are still running are not running with the boats are recreating on the river. Sturgeon, salmon, trout, bass are all still prevalent and being caught on the Willamette for sport.

Wakeboarding, skiing, etc are on average only using the waterway for 26 days of the year. June thru end of August. The remaining 339 days of the year are for the most part inclimate weather that raises the river crest line and starts the erosion process! So we cannot let this House bill dictate our livelihood

and have inaccurate data submitted to a board for consideration. This is a public waterway with natural erosion.

We as a family enjoy boating the river, Wakeboarding on the river, recreating on our dock that we have paid a considerable amount of money and resources on. These House bills would decrease many riverbank home owners property values and strip them of their right to use a public waterway. The number of property owners that oppose this SB 1589 (88 on the current list), far more exceed the property owners that are for the house bills. If we must, we should further advertise this SB and any HB's and vote and let the people speak.

Please do not consider these house bills at all!

Respectfully,  
Joe Sheets