

April 8, 2013

Mr. Tobias Read, Chairman and Members of the House Transportation and Economic Committee,

In each state there is law to protect landowners from liability lawsuits when others are using their land for recreation. While these Recreational Use Statutes will not prevent lawsuits, the outcome is more likely to favor the landowner. These statutes were passed to help keep lands open for recreational purposes. In many states, aviation is now listed in the statute's definition of recreation. The recreational Use Statute is a landowner protection law to purposefully keep private lands open for recreational use.

O.R.S. 105.682, at the present time, does not list "non-commercial aviation" as a recreational purpose. HB-2016 would clarify this issue for the landowner when it comes to recreational uses.

Being the owner of a private airstrip, located one mile west of Monmouth, OR, depicted on the Seattle Sectional Aeronautical Chart as "MARR", I have been reluctant to let anyone other than myself use the strip because of liability issues. There are some "horror stories" out there about accidents and suits of which I do not want to be involved. If HB-2016 is passed, I will be more likely to let others land at my airstrip. With talk of more State of Oregon strips being closed, it makes sense to open up private airstrips to the public for recreational purposes.

I have been involved in aviation since 1963 when I first learned to fly and ended up making a 34 year career in the piloting of Airline Aircraft. I still fly light aircraft and am very interested in general aviation, especially in keeping airports open to the public for noncommercial and recreational purposes. I can only think of positive things concerning HB-2016 and its impact on aviation.

I urge your complete support for HB 2016!

Thank you for your indulgence in this matter,

Robert E. Marr

5350 Matney Rd

Monmouth, OR 97361

remarr@meritel.net