

Submitter: Tony Meacham

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Energy and Environment

Measure: SB1589

Oregon Legislature,

I strongly oppose this bill. Boating activities have been such a blessing to not only our family but also our friends. It brings a lot of joy to my family and we are able to share that with our friends, and our kid's friends. There's a sense of unity out on the water as well that strengthens our community.

When it comes to wake-surfing in particular with the bigger wakes we are very respectful of people's properties and do those activities along the stretches where there are no houses because we respect that some people don't like it for fear it ruins their banks of property.

However, we must look at the science and proof. The source of any land degradation doesn't come from boats, it comes from the winters with the rise and fall of the water level. Also, the lack of native vegetation and homeowner mismanagement of native trees has caused erosion as well.

Subjecting only towed water sports boaters to a weight limit is biased. A 5,000-pound fishing boat can produce a similar wake to the same size tow boat. Furthermore a 15,000 cabin cruiser that produces a wake far greater than any wake surfing boat can still operate freely under this legislation.

In addition, and most importantly, is our rights. All of us have a constitutional right to fun activities in our waters, and this includes towed water sports in the Newberg Pool. The right of the public to navigate the water is supreme and it includes the right of boating. *Witke v. State Conservation Com.*, 244 Iowa 261 (Iowa 1953). Boating for pleasure is considered navigation with full rights to use equal to boating for profit. That must be emphasized: navigability for pleasure is as sacred in the eye of the law as navigability for other purposes. *State v. Korrer*, 127 Minn. 60 (Minn. 1914).