

Submitter: Adam Harclerod

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Environment and Natural Resources

Measure: SB1589

Its not very often, especially during this time of year being a CPA, and being exceptionally short on time, that I take my attention away from my clients, however this issue warrants my attention. I have been following this legislation throughout the most recent legislative session and frankly I am shocked that this bill is taking up valuable resources that could be allocated elsewhere. On Monday I signed up to testify in opposition of this bill and after being on the call for two hours, I noted that the majority of the time was given to those in favor, with little time given to the opposition. It appears that the majority of the individuals involved have already made up their minds and the process is more of a formality than fact based. Its disheartening to say the least. As at least 75% of the time was allocated to those in favor, it was in fact and in appearance a one sided affair. I am hopeful that I will have an opportunity to oppose this legislation today but incase I don't have time I would like to reiterate the following reasons as to why I stand opposed to this bill.

1. Restricting towed water sports to boats weighing less than 5,000 lbs while still allowing those same boats to drive up and down the river makes no logical sense unless the purpose is to merely cancel towed water sports. This would be like telling a snow skier they can ride the chair lift but can't ski down.
2. I heard various facts on Monday comparing the total number of towed watersports endorsement to total boat registration saying it's a minimal amount of users. While that is true if you use state wide registration numbers, its inaccurate if you look at the users of the waterway. if I lived in Eugene, what reason would I have for the endorsement. Short answer, no reason.
3. The irreparable damage to local businesses is a complete after thought and warrants discussion.
4. The Newberg pool is already the most heavily regulated water way in Oregon and the Oregon State Marine Board has already spent years studying impacts from usage which lead to the current regulations.
5. From my experience in this section of water, we should focus on education and enforcement of the already extensive regulations rather than segregating a subset of users.
6. The amount of inflammatory, baseless information stated as fact by multiple senators (specifically Kennemer) was tough to listen to as he kept stating misinformation when in fact he was providing misinformation.

In closing, my family and I recreate on this section of river and have for over ten years, the memories we have made are memories that will last a lifetime, with this restriction we will no longer be able to make those memories as our current boat,

even our prior 2014 model year boat, would not make the weight restrictions. I appreciate your time and truly hope everyone will oppose this unnecessary bill.