

Submitter: John Herrmann

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Energy and Environment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB301

My wife grew up in Wilsonville on the river after having moved there in 1973. I have been with here since 1989 and regularly spent time there prior to my family moving there in 2012.

We began seeing damage from ballasted boats starting around 2015 (then rules prohibited them but they were unenforced).

We began seeing the impact of the wakes generated almost immediately. Hard data from a university study shows that large boats over 5500 lbs (combined weight) create wakes that are "orders of magnitude" great in volume and force than those from boats under. Some of the data was collected from our dock.

What we have see in the loss of 10-15 horizontal feet and up to 25 vertical feet of riverbank. We have seen 2nd growth fir trees fall like dominoes because of being undercut by these ocean-surf-like wakes.

We have a bank monitoring system installed and monitored by a geotech engineer in place because the bank eroded into the river leaving a 120' fir tree with half its roots exposed just 15 feet from our foundation.

In addition, the fishery has, from our experience been affected. My father in law took great pleasure in fishing for crawdads every summer. He used to catch a "mess" of them every week.

I have fished for crawfish successfully until the late 2000 teens, when the catch was just one or two at a time. I stopped fishing for them 3 years ago. The last time I didn't catch a single crawdad. Silting of the river bottom caused by turbidity, generated through massive wakes is why.

In summary, increase boat size or ballast requirements that would increase wakes has detrimental effects on property, kills keystone creatures that use the river and benefits a very few individuals ( last efforts had 50 of these boats within 50 miles of the river). It does benefit the boat selling business.

Using the average replacement rate for these kinds of boats and the average cost (\$150,000) with the annual maintenance cost \$5-\$7k/ per annum). We're talking about \$15,000,000 -\$20,000,000 over the (conservative) 10 year cycle of boat purchase and replacement.

There's your sign. It's a money deal. I love money deals but I only love sustainable, environmental neutral (or beneficial) money deals that doesn't damage either state or citizens real property because of the source of the money.

Ultimately, all power boating in this section of river will come under environment scrutiny. (I own a ski boat, I fish, I paddle (elsewhere; it's not safe when boats are out in the summer)

This bill is bad business.