

**From:** [Hall, John](#)  
**To:** [Exhibits HNR](#)  
**Subject:** Opposed to HB 2351 and opposed to HB 2352  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 6, 2019 12:58:20 PM

---

Greetings,

My name is John Hall, I am a resident and owner of a floating home at the “Macadam Bay Club” located at 7720 SW Macadam Ave, slip 24, Portland, OR 97219. I am writing to express my opposition to the bills, HB 2351 and HB 2352.

I have lived at Macadam Bay since 2010. I have 40 years of participating in many different water sports activities and I currently enjoy paddle boarding, kayaking, waterskiing, wakesurfing and, yes, swimming. I feel that the Oregon Marine Board is doing more than an adequate job of establishing rules for use of the public waters used by all types of water sports enthusiasts. Passing HB 2351 and 2352 would severely discriminate against one group of users in favor of others, essentially restricting access by a specific group.

2351 would set the stage to ban certain activities while having no empirical evidence that doing so would have the desired effect and would likely discriminate against one group of users.

2352 would put significant financial and other burdens on anyone doing boating activities where someone was being towed. This again discriminates against a single user group.

There are a few users who make a bad impression of the rest of the boating community. Boater safety is the responsibility of every user of the public waterway. I feel increased safety can be effectively achieved through better education, using funds derived from licensing, including those of non-powered water sports, i.e. paddle boarding, kayaking, canoeing and sailing. Rules governing the use of the waterway already exist and simply should be enforced, either through education, warning citations or civil citations resulting in fines.

Lastly, I am aware of a contingent of floating home owners in favor of the two bills to restrict boating activities on the Willamette. I do NOT share their view. Once again, there is no empirical evidence of their claims that increased wake energy is causing any more damage to their homes than other boat wakes. I certainly have not experienced any damage. In my opinion, much of the damage they claim is due to deferred maintenance and/or insufficient engineering to withstand wear and tear that goes along with putting a structure in the water. It simply requires more maintenance to live in the water.

Please reject HB 2351 and HB 2352.

**John Hall**

7720 SW Macadam Ave, #24

Portland, OR 97219

Cell: [253.365.1111](tel:253.365.1111)

[J1hall2@live.com](mailto:J1hall2@live.com)