

RE: Comments for HB 2267 Hearing, Monday the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Good afternoon, Patrick –

I and others from Lake County will not be able to attend in person to comment on HB 2267 during Monday's hearing.

As a facet of promoting Lake County economy by drawing ATV users from afar, as well as enhancing recreational opportunities for our citizenry, Lake County has embarked on allowing ATV use on designated county roads connecting key landmarks and recreational areas.

Of course, many of those county roads necessitate crossing of state highways.

Also, additional county roads could be included for ATV use if segments of state highways are opened for ATV use.

On HB 2267, I wish to submit my comments herein.

- I personally applaud the forward-thinking of HB 2267 proponents.  
To my thoughts as a motorcyclists, for all concerned an ATV is actually as safe or safer than a bicycle, a moped, or a small motorcycle that are currently allowed on roadways.  
Of course, there will be a brief time period for all conventional auto drivers and ATV riders to get accustomed.
- HB 2267 as reads in SECTION 4, (1) (f):
  - *The crossing of a highway must be made at a place that is more than 100 feet from any highway intersection.*
  - My opinion: This prohibition needs to be removed.
    - Town of Lakeview ordinance allows ATV use on certain streets.
      - Hwy 395 transcends the Town north to south.
      - To adhere to this 100-ft prohibition, an ATV users is forced to cross Hwy 395 within the Town from an ally way to opposing ally way, because street intersections with Hwy 395 is prohibited.
      - Crossing Hwy 395 within town limits from one ally to an opposing ally is actually more dangerous than crossing the Hwy at a street intersection where motorists expect a vehicle to cross.
    - Lake County roads commonly cross a state highway.
      - Currently, to adhere to this 100-ft prohibition an ATV rider must negotiate a highway ditch for 100 feet, then cross, and negotiate the opposing ditch line back to the county road.
      - Rather absurd.
- Concerning requirements of additional fixtures (turn signals, registration plate lights, horn, etc.).
  - Some of these stipulations are reasonable; others are in excess compared to:

- Some motorcycles, mopeds, etc. that are already allowed on highways.
- Other states' requirements.
- I do suggest that consideration in some form be given to effects these extra stipulations might have on ATV riders from surrounding states and other regions of the country.
  - Example; Individuals touring from an eastern state with destination being Oregon's coast and their state requirements for highway ATVs differs notably from Oregon's requirements.
    - We should wish not to discourage or penalize visitors to Oregon because their home state requirements notably differs from Oregon's requirement.
- One large aspect of Lake County's interest in promoting ATV use is to draw and facilitate ATV use from surrounding states and other regions of the US.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on HB 2267.

Ken Kestner  
Lake County Commissioner

**KEN KESTNER**  
*Lake County Commissioner*  
*513 Center Street*  
*Lakeview, OR 97630*  
*Office: 541 – 947 – 6004*  
*Mobile: 541 – 219 – 0053*  
*E-Mail: [kkestner@co.lake.or.us](mailto:kkestner@co.lake.or.us)*