

March 3rd, 2022

Timothy G. Sekerak Chief Clerk of the House State Capitol Building, H271 Salem, OR 97301

RE: Vote Explanation on Senate Bill 1589 (A-Engrossed)

Dear Chief Clerk Sekerak,

I am writing to explain my vote in opposition to Senate Bill 1589 (A-Engrossed).

I am fully in favor of increasing environmental protections and limiting the negative impacts of recreational activities on at-risk species, on natural habitats, and on homeowners' properties. We should be mindful of the cumulative impacts that recreation in public areas can have on wildlife, and on surrounding private properties.

However, this bill effectively represented the idea that the legislature should step in to do the job of an administrative agency when that agency has failed to do so itself. Certainly, the precedent for this "reverse delegation" of duties has already been set, but I do not think it is one we should follow when we have a meaningful choice.

Ideally, this problem should have been addressed when this body passed House Bill 2352 in 2019, which directed the Marine Board to determine a maximum loading weight for motorboats to be used for towed sports, like wakeboarding. Although the legislative intent in passing that bill was clearly to curtail the environmental and property damage being done by wakeboats, the Marine Board opted to choose a whopping 10,000 pounds as the maximum allowable weight.

This was an administrative act that was at odds with what the legislature was seeking. Perhaps it was due to a lack of specificity in the statutory language, but nonetheless it was an issue that should and could have been addressed if this body had exercised proper oversight.

Unfortunately, because legislators are compensated as though they only work a part-time job, we were not able to exercise proper oversight, and the Marine Board's rulemaking went unaddressed, and possibly even unnoticed, until it was too late.

Now, legislators from across the state have spent countless hours of their limited time mediating an argument between wealthy property owners in one small stretch of one river in one legislator's district, who have pitted themselves against wealthy boat manufacturers and wealthy boat owners. Meanwhile, as a result we have limited time to address far more relevant systemic issues involving people with far greater need, such as an unprecedented and still escalating housing crisis, a lack of services for an



increasingly poor working class, and any number of other state agencies that desperately need more oversight from their legislature.

We should have settled this matter the first time around. Therefore, I did not support this measure.

My Best,

Anna Williams