

My name is Lisa Ippolito. I have been a riverfront homeowner in Wilsonville since 2002 and I am in the middle of the Newberg Pool just west of the Boones Ferry Marina and I-5. I support Senate Bill 301.

Having lived on the river prior to there being any rules, the addition of surf zone rules and then the newest legislation, I have seen the impact of each of the changes. It has actually been very little. With the exception of the regulations that restricted and eventually banned surfing in the Newberg pool, the same boaters are still on the river. The difference is, many of those boaters on the river can no longer legally pull skiers, tubers, kneeboarders or wakeboarders because of ambiguous rules on determining when a boat can legally tow someone behind it under the current law and get an endorsement sticker.

Prior to the current legislation, when the Oregon State Marine board implemented the surf zone rules and required boaters that wanted to get a towed water sport endorsement to also take a test on the rules, I was able to take that test and get an endorsement for my boat. It was below the dry weight plus factory ballast limits. Then when the current law went into place, I was denied a towed water sports endorsement for my boat because the Marine Board said that my boat had the capability to add after-market ballast systems that would make my boat exceed the weight limit. I was told it doesn't matter how your boat was ordered and sold to you or the actual factory specs. The only thing that mattered was what manufacturer's websites listed as the maximum possible ballasted weight of the boat. So, even if someone is trying to follow the rules, they are still excluded from towing riders with their boat. This makes no sense whatsoever since any boat of any make or type can purchase after market ballast systems. I'm being penalized because a boat manufacturer's website talks about possibilities for my boat vs. being looked at based upon my actual boat. I know others have had this same issue. You can't even legally use ballast under the current law in place, so it shouldn't even be a part of the equation.

I'm not requesting we get rid of the current law, though I don't agree with it all, but what Senate Bill 301 will do, and I do agree with, is to get rid of the ballast reference in the current law since it cannot and is not being applied appropriately.

Thank you for your time and consideration to support SB 301.