

Mr. Chairman and committee members, Thank you.

My name is Andy DuBose and I reside in Wilsonville.

I was in attendance on March 9th at 3:15 PM to publicly oppose this proposed legislation specific to wakeboard and wake surf watercraft.

I am personally not a wake sports boat owner nor do I wish to become one. I am a recreational fisherman and own a 19ft. center console boat and a home on the river. We purchased the home 6 years ago for that private access. I originally saw this to be a sound investment with a potentially high return on investment for that reason; river access. I consider these proposed bills that are targeting wake sport watercraft a threat to property values for those who own waterfront homes and docks. I would add that other reasons for my opposition have already been mentioned multiple times by many others and I strongly support their position.

My wife and I frequent sections of the Newberg Pool in our boat and disagree that these boats are the primary reason for bank erosion, dock damage, safety hazards, any more than any other watercraft. I think there is a segment of the boating population that forgets they will need to manage their balance when any boat comes by them, not just a wake-enhanced boat. I also feel there is a group targeting these boats wrongfully simply because the sport has grown in popularity and they are not a fan. I can appreciate the evidence that has been presented but I feel that any data specific to studies designed to target a single exposure does not uncover all of the related variables. It seemed unsubstantiated and biased. And, certainly does not warrant the proposed measures.

I am also in favor of protecting our river, the wildlife that calls it home, and the shorelines. But, I heard multiple people in the meeting yesterday hang their hats on the "width" of the river in the Newberg pool. That's your basis for thinking banning these boats is the right thing to do here? Simply put, there are multiple causes of the degradation and erosion of the Newberg Pool shorelines. Targeting boats over 4000lbs is a ridiculous step that would eliminate many types of boats that also produce wakes but are not wake enhancing. This bill and others on the topic are poised to single-handedly degrade property values of homes on the river and have a negative impact on several small businesses in the area.

Finally. I spent the entire time on the call and listened to all who had the opportunity to speak. The majority, in my opinion, was clearly opposed to this bill and the others targeting wake-enhancing boats. Mr. Witt, respectfully, it is clear what side of the table you are on as you time after time offered your rebuttal which seemed in an effort to discredit those opposed to these bills. I am also curious as to how it is okay to verbally release committee members from the meeting well before it ended. And, from a meeting at which they are present and tasked to hear and consider all input.

I thank you and all of the committee members for your time and the opportunity to share my position. I would urge all committee members to think twice about the "other side of the coin" related to these bills. The ramifications are real.

Best Regards ~  
Andy