

The Non-Motorized Advisory Committee explored ideas for a user pay-user benefit structure to fund the Marine Board's services to non-motorized boating. As a non-motorized boater, and considering the benefits you may receive, what is a reasonable pay structure? Do you agree with the ideas proposed by the Advisory Committee? If not, do you have other suggestions?		
Disagrees with a Fee	Miscellaneous Comments	Questions Asked
In reality, the government can best serve our needs by leaving us alone. That is in all things.		
The final question on the back page of the survey suggests a Non Motorized Advisory Committee (Hand picked by the OMB), has made selective suggestions that purport users should provide a yearly fee to support the OMB to allow the OMB to provide the services the committee has "preapproved" and the OMB is now asking what the survey taker feels is a reasonable yearly set fee for those services. In other words how much are you willing to pay each year for the rest of your life to support the maintenance of the OMB as a viable agency? And so you can have a law enforcement agent periodically show up at access points to issue citations for having no proof the annual payment has been paid. (Last year 43% of the monies collected by the OMB went to law enforcement!!!!) IS this the kind of "safety" you would get for your money? The sell is the Committee is a committee of our peers. In reality, the non motorized advisory committee is a OMB hand picked select group of individuals, that attended each meeting led by an OMB staff member with a predetermined well prepared meeting outline and agenda. The committee was/is buttressed with law enforcement personnel, federal agency personnel, local and state agency personnel. The committee even contains one member of the Oregon Marine Board. In this milieu, is it any wonder the committee has come up with suggestions that would improve the non motorized boaters experience, for a reasonable yearly fee of course. On more than one occasion, by more than one OMB employee, I was informed of their intention to add members to the committee. Needless to say, given the direction the OMB had successfully managed to maneuver the committee into, and the OMB predetermined result the committee has presently come up with (and believes it is of their own making), why would the OMB add the potential for conflict and diversion? Needless to say, the committee member increase has not (and will not) occur. Tom Sawyer got his fence white washed. The Oregon Marine Board got the advisory committee..... In conclusion: The agency had in the past repeatedly referenced the declining revenue it is receiving from motorized boater and the increasing role non motorized boater are having on Oregon's water ways. That position has been further bolstered by the claim of Oregon statute obligation, whereas the OMB has to legal obligation to service all waterway users which includes non motorized boater, (whether they want to be "serviced" or not) Hummmmm??? Wonder where the revenue shortage can be replenished from? We can raise annual motorized fees, which we will, but if ever there was an untapped revenue source..... there is an untapped source out there waiting to be tapped..... all we have to do is create the illusion the public wants/needs us.....(at an annual registration fee of course!!!!) In summation: With few exceptions, since its inception, some fifty years ago, the Oregon Marine Board has been absent from the lives of non motorized boaters. I prefer it that way. Or as they in all too many countries, "Yankee Go Home."	I have never been inspected for invasive species.i feel the ramps are inadequate,but if you forget to post your sticker,the enforcement is always there with a ticket	Why have non-motorized pay when motorized does not?
Should never be a pay structure for non-motorized craft. Recreation like stand-up paddling is as fundamental as going for a walk. No fee.	I do not know the proposed structure but I am very curious to find out more about it.	How does AIS money get spent?
We already pay a use fee to park or launch so I don't see why we should pay anymore than we already do. I can't speak for my whole organization but I am the president of the Southern Oregon Fly Fishers and have personal know that many of us don't feel the justification for more fees. My non attendance at any of the meetings was not due to a lake of interest but more an issue of scheduling. I know that you can't meet everyone's schedule but I do appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion via this forum. John Storfold	I would be better prepared to answer this question if I was even aware of any public awareness campaigns on this issue. I was provided this link via Facebook and had no idea this was even going on.	Is there enforcement of AIS penalty?
There is no reasonable pay structure. The rivers are publicly owned to the high water mark. You charge us to park. You charge us yearly to boat. Enough already! There is no reasonable pay structure to pay more and no need to pay more. Several boating clubs exist that adhere to good kayaking safety standards where people can get that education and be safe and never pay any money to you. Please no new fees or restrictions; the rivers should be free and accessible to all.	Open to suggestions	Where will funds be allocated?
We already pay in Lane County to park at boat landings, and those with boats over 10 feet already pay for the invasive species tag. We don't pollute, rather as a group, we tend to clean up after fishermen and others who litter the river banks. I am opposed to user fees for non-motorized boats.	I did not know these hearings /sessions were being held. please add me to a mailing list. DOTIE KEMP (removed home address) EUGENE OR 97401 dottiekemp@gmail.com	Would funds go back to county of payee?
I don't want anything from you. So no pay structure is acceptable. Don't agree with ideas. Things are fine as they are. Leave things alone.	No suggestions at this point	Allocation of funds – where will they go?
I'm first curious about how the excise taxes break out; are there specific taxes on equipment that is used for non-motorized (paddles, oars, etc.) and are there taxes on equipment that is jointly used (pfd's, etc.)? And if so, what is the accounting to show the expenditures for the non-motorized component? Beyond that, I don't see a need for fees/benefits.	I do not think non-motorized boat should have to pay for Invasive Aquatic permits. The invasive species are coming in almost exclusively on motorized boats.	What are other states doing? Would there be reciprocity?
None. All I need are for sites to be off limits for motorized boats. I wouldn't pay anything. Why should I pay? The boats that create hazard should pay.	I pretty much like it as it is	What are other state doing?
A Non-Motorized user pay - user benefit structure is not needed or wanted. This is simply a way for the Marine Board to increase revenue. We don't need anything the Marine Board can provide so there is no need to pay for anything. Leave the non-motorized boaters alone, Look somewhere else for more money.	Not applicable, didn't attend	Would fee include giving \$ to BLM for access?
No I do not agree with the proposed structure. I boat all over the nation, including Idaho and Wyoming, where they have non-motorized permit systems. They claim the permits are for preventing the spread of zebra muscles, but that's not nearly as true as believed. Utah is an other state I frequently boat, with the Utah white water club, I bring this up because the uwcc uses club dues to support causes for the river. After digging deeper into Wyoming system, in particular the snake river access fund, it was discovered that all funds into the program did nothing more than pay for the enforcement of the permit system. None of the monies benefited the boaters, or prevent the spread of muscles. 15 dollars a year per boat when I personally have 10 boats, that's 150 dollars annually I pay for nothing more than the salary of a person that does nothing past ensuring I purchased my permit. I would rather that money be used for river education, or facility upkeep, and I would pledge that kind of donation to a program that really accomplishes benefit of the river. But as that is not the case, I instead move on to other states that truly support the river, and I have never found that in a state that charges for non-motorized boat permits. It all sounds good in theory but how will Oregon cover the enforcement costs of a permit system if not from the dues collected by the system? That's charging me to pay for the guy you assign to enforce me to buy the permits to begin with. That is the opposite of progress.	The most important issue facing the OSMB is invasive species protection! Oregon has too many aquatic treasures to risk destruction by invasive species. We need a stronger more comprehensive invasive species program! We have just been lucky so far! OSMB needs to develop better ways to help paddlers understand regulations and safety requirements. Available safety and rescue classes should be more accessible. Local paddle trail alliances are the best way to develop information on local put-ins, education and signage. OSMB should work with them to help with funding and collate this information on your website for public use.	How much are we talking? 1) Per biennium + admin. Costs = approx. \$25; 2) Potentially + \$10 fee for AIS... Approx. \$35/biennium; 3) Based #'s on existing AIS Permit holders ; 4) The cost is also based on the amount of money we spent in the past two biennium's; in order to sustain what was spent in the previous years with regards to brochures, AIS, hazard removal, legislation for Waldo Lake and Holgate Channel, facilities, etc.
Zero dollars. I would not benefit at all from the services. make people who are a danger to themselves pay. If you get caught without a lifejacket charge them 200 dollars. caught drinking? 600 dollars. Don't impose a fee across the board for all non motorized boaters. I know a lot of people that would be very upset with this idea.	I don't know enough about the Committee's actions to understand, I'll look into it further. Thank you.	User pay/user benefit – how to divide revenue to capital vs. operating (maintenance, LE)?
We already have so many licenses and fees that it cuts down on the amount of boating the general public can do. More government infrastructure Merli cost the taxpayer more money and eliminates those who are of lower income from being able to participate in these activities	Made extensive comments in the session.	Can you ask to ID watercraft to help in funding proportions?
I don't like paying fees to use a river. if you must collect money take it out of the NSA's budget.	Given that kayakers do not pollute (we don't use fossil fuels to propel our crafts).	What is the motor rate?...1) Motor fee is not transferrable with non-motorized; 2) Non-Motorized transfers to non-motorized only

Seems if we aren't given any services and need no infrastructure other than parking places (forest pass), then additional payment not justified	I'm not aware of structure.	Does it really need to be statewide? ...Some paddle year round in moderate areas
Don't agree with a user pay-user benefit structure. The is absurd!	I don't have an opinion on this.	Can landowners charge a fee?
No knew fees. Their are too many fees taxes already, just needs to stop. If that requires less facilities, ok, better than more fees and taxes.	Kid crafts have/collect stuff...shells, rocks, etc.	Will there be multiple fees?... i.e. parking, etc.
I don't recommend a Pay Structure: here's why. There is not enough kayakers/non-motorized users to fund this option. I certainly would not be happy about paying. And if payments were indeed imposed, I would just transfer my interests to Washington; since I already frequent many of their rivers and lakes.	Feel Ohio is bad and will impact view of fees	AIS – are we concerned with 'John' loaning permit to 'Jim' to avoid paying a fee?
I don't think that the Marine Board would provide services to me that would be worth paying for.	Issues seem localized	How did the OSMB divide the budget? 1) Would like five to cover his type of craft or go towards the river he rides...We allocate funds to where boaters are boating
I do not think non-motorized users should be charged a fee to access Waters of the State. This public resource should be available without a fee. I absolutely disagree with having facilities overbuilt and then ask non-motorized users to pay for them. Non-motorized users don't need most of the improvements that accompany development of access points. All we need is a dirt trail to the river and a reasonably safe place to leave a vehicle. If there ever is such a fee, it should be transferable from boat to boat and person to person the same way the invasive species permit is handled. As far as the invasive species permit is involved, it would be nice if law enforcement actually focused more on EDUCATION rather than just checking for whether or not a person has a piece of paper and issuing a citation if they don't. Even folks with permits might need reminders, and those without a permit certainly do.	Suggestions discussed including a fee instituted by the Gorge Commission, but that would probably take years and would be controversial.	
I disagree with a blanket non-motorized boater fee. My user group rarely uses boat ramps and restrooms, rarely interacts with motorized users and would not benefit from general safety advisories.	Problem with Marine Board AIS/Non-Motorized (NM) fee is that on the boundary water, local AIS/NM permit would be exempt for Washington residents. Trying to determine residency for people on the water would be difficult. If permit enforcement is not possible, then it is difficult to determine how much money should be directed back to local community.	
Reminds me of the Trailhead pass fees imposed on hikers to make use of their own backcountry but I still come across trails being closed/unopened due to lack of funding. I am reticent to back a motion for fees (on the spot or annual) that can forever increase as time goes by.	Shamu's needing to buy a \$10-\$20 permit...good luck	
You should not charge us for using non-motorized boats. If you do, people will just avoid it. It is outrageous for you to tax us when you provide virtually no facilities and so you can just pay salaries of folks who do not in any way benefit us. I won't pay, would rather go to jail. Its unfair and ridiculous to tax people who want to exercise in a kayak on the river, instead increase fees for motorized boats to provide incentives for people who do not pollute, do not cause noise, do not disturb wildlife and get exercise by paddling.	Multi-chambered considered boats under USCG that are floating in Bend	
Didn't hear the ideas proposed by the Advisory Committee. I would rather not pay anything to kayak rivers and maintain the status quo than my suggestions for improvement to access, safety, etc.	Like free Fishing day – Free Paddle day for NM?	
We already pay for the permits to access Oregon owned state river waters in Oregon. we never see compliance personnel any more on the rivers unless Kitzhaber is on the river or it is opening weekend fro training State Police on the river.	Interstate agreements	
Well, we knew this was coming. the only reason for you to do ANY of this is to find another way to make kayakers pay money for a sport that used to be free except for buying equipment. there is NOTHING we need from you and no amount we wish to pay. The rivers are public domain and we should be able to float them without paying you money. PERIOD.	AIS remove from kayaks	
The only reason you want to charge non motorized watercraft is because motorized boat usage has declined. Rather than charge a new class of boaters consider downsizing your department. Non motorized boaters use a fraction of the facilities that motorized craft use i.e. less parking, less trailers, less parking requirements, less garbage, less bank erosion, less crowds, less pollution, less water quality degradation, less law enforcement (not counting law asking for invasive species tags), less boatramps, less facilities, less alcohol related instances, less interactions with public officials/employees. Rather than starting a fee on a new class of watercraft it would be better for you to scale back your operations to focus on boater safety and downsize your department, adapt to the changing times like everyone else outside of the public sector has to do when revenue has declined. Charging for rafts, kayak, canoe and SUP usage begs the question will you be taxing bicycles and shoes next. A main concern is that the OSMB has already lost much credibility with the non motorized public over your decision to require the IS Tag on Paddleboards and Surfboards, clearly this is seen as a tax gouge for funding and not based on science or effectiveness. Without a bilge/motor/trailer as on motorized craft there is very little chance of spreading invasive species on a SUP, your wet sandals are more likely to cause spread. Thank you for listening, the meeting I attended felt more like you have already decided to start taxing non motorized users and are just looking for an easy way to do it. You even stated that a permit rather than licensing was your preferred method because administrating licensing would be more effective at education and outreach but not generate additional revenue. Non motorized users already pay entrance/parking/IS fees as well as state and property taxes. The answer is not to begin taxing them because motor boat usage is declining as the cost of gas rises. Feel free to call with any questions. Scott Keith (Removed number)	Compare to other states	
NO FUCKING PAY STRUCTURE. STOP FUCKING TRYING TO GET MONEY OUT OF US YOU FUCKING VULTURES!!!!!! Status quo is fine. We are not a viable income source for your silly business. Stay the hell away from nonmotorized boaters.	Flexibility with timing	
I don't see a need for additional services. The access sites are already in place, we already pay for parking, we already pay taxes, we don't need additional fees to simply float in our canoe.	It's a hurdle of AIS information to get to boaters	
Reasonable = none no Put fees on the offending motorized boaters. Don't blame invasives transport on us yakkers & then & penalize with registration & fees.	Rogue River permit different areas	
Sorry, I'm unaware of any benefits the Marine Board provides specially for non-motorized boaters. We are exceptionally low impact as compared to motorized craft. We don't require boat ramps and we don't pollute or leave our beer cans in the water because drinking is not allowed on LCCC trips. A side note: personally I'd love to see a complete ban on personal water craft, i.e. jet skis. If people drove their cars, they way they drive jet skis, the jails would be completely full with such drivers. Tax those guys to the max!	If there is a need in an area – have program. If no need, don't have a program	
Stay out of nonmotorized boater's business. We don't want any rules, regulations and fees enacted. In areas where there are a seasonal drownings and accidents, it looks like the locals have a handle on it. Just look at the Clackamas river, most specifically the class II section from McIver to Carver. Please no new fees or restrictions; the rivers should be free and accessible to all.	If the greater number of people pay – less of a fee cost	
Justification for fees always welcome, even of the fees aren't.	LE is not completely reliable for service on this fee (i.e. rescue)...It will not remove them from an area without the fee	
I kayak. It used to be free. Now we pay parking fees at put in and take out, plus yearly fees for our boats (invasive species permits), even if we never leave our community. The only impediment to my activity is governments constantly finding new ways to regulate and nickel and dime us, whereas the rivers should be free to float. The great fear is that your survey is prelude to new fees and restrictions.	No fee, no service option	
	Engineer Department – have one to help design non-motorized facilities	

Should never be a pay structure for non-motorized craft. Recreation like stand-up paddling is as fundamental as going for a walk. No Fee.	Go to legislature and ask for general funds	
Against any new fees... 2 motorized, 2 kayaks (AIS x2), 2 4-wheelers, snowmobile, SnoPark pass, sportsman's pack, deer/elk tag, camp trailer, boat license – Concern with motorized fee raising – concern with fee impact on young and new families	Someone needs to advocate for safety and kids	
For new kayakers, cost can be a determinant...1) Boat + PFD + paddle + AIS +++; 2) "Stop nickel and diming"	Want to exercise their right to use the water	
One person not for fees/permit		
One – No Way!		
Against fee – too many user fees – agencies charging too much but how can we do this for less \$\$?		
I really object to a non-motorized boater paying a fee in most areas. If you have a high use area then maybe this has to happen. Please don't penalize everyone at large. I enjoy good boat ramps and access points but how many more taxes do I have to pay. I'm an old retired senior who can't take much more taxation, before I just up and sell everything or just go to jail for failure to pay.		
I do not think that there is any benefit in a user-pay system for whitewater kayaking and rafting. Many rivers already have paid permits (e.g. Rogue, Deschutes) and facilities that are funded by those fees. On other rivers, existing facilities are adequate for our purposes. The biggest concern is access to the waterway, meaning having public land adjacent to rivers that boaters can use to get to the river, not facilities at the access point, and I do not believe that additional fees will improve access. I understand that other non-motorized users (e.g. row boats, SUPs, kite boards, canoes, etc.) have different needs, but my view is from a whitewater river standpoint.		
In my 11 years of paddling whitewater I have seen VERY minimal presence from the OSMB in my areas of use. Things have been just fine, I do not agree with a fee of any sort, as there is little to no benefit that I see from your presence in the whitewater non-motorized boating community.		
After meeting, realized that my community of boaters (avid class III-V) would get hit especially hard with fees despite having the least need for facilities and education. This calendar year, I have paddled in not only Oregon, but Washington, Idaho, California, Arizona, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia. If every state charged \$20, that would be \$160. And that doesn't include costs of all the rivers that required permits and the increased cost of gasoline and travel costs. Over a 50-year paddling career from age 20-70, that is an unfair burden to pay annually for safety/education aimed mostly at entry level boaters recreating in more populated locations. There would need to be reciprocity with all other states instituting a boater registration system. And the lifetime permit would help mitigate this. To the extent that the type of boating that my community engages in is more similar to hiking than to motor boating, and we use far fewer resources than cyclists (do not require pavement or developed trails for kayaking), it is really unfair to charge that much to our group.		
I don't currently receive any benefits from the Marine Board's services being a whitewater boater so do not want to see any pay structure established for whitewater boating until there is a defined need for Marine Board services.		
First off what are the Marine Board Services... I've been kayaking since 1994 and have not come across their services once. So first to discuss any notion of fees need to know what those services are. I think charging an annual fee to a white water kayak is a bit much, esp. if the one proposed is \$5 foot. Many kayakers have multiple boats, but don't use them that frequently - I have 3, but 2 I've not used in 2 yrs. Better to put the fee in when purchased. Again, if I knew more where the \$ would go - specifically to benefit WW kayakers and protect the environment - rather than the big pool of the Oregon Marine Board more open for discussion. We have a sail boat and pay fees for that - which are fine, but a different situation. Putting WW kayaks into the equation doesn't make a lot of sense - unless there is benefit to us or protection of the environment (e.g. invasive species on boats)		
I am vehemently opposed to any fees on non-motorized boats under 10 feet in length. These boats require very little in the way of access infrastructure, and we tend to be much more capable of handling ourselves, safety-wise, than the majority of boaters out there. We don't need OSMB creating regulations, bureaucracy, and fees around our sport/activity. The only argument that hold's water (no pun intended) with regard to justifying fees on 'small boats', in my opinion, is that of parking areas, which are sometimes needed. But as I said before, we don't need expensive boat launches or raft ramps, just a foot path to the water's edge. I have spent hours reading the meeting notes from those meetings that have occurred, and I agree with others who have said that the entire structure of these questions is false. The structure/questions begin with the premise that we should be paying, and then ask what we might like for our money. Only here at the very end does the conversation open up in any way to WHETHER OR NOT we should be paying. If fees for small boats do occur (and based on the line of questioning, I'm guessing that part has been decided), I think it is of paramount importance that the fee be small (\$10-15/year), since we are CLEARLY not requiring the expensive infrastructure that the motorized boats and rafts do; the fee should be proportional to the benefits/expenses. It is also extremely important that the fee be transferable from one boat to another. My wife and I own a half-dozen kayaks, and paying for each one would be ridiculous!!! My biggest concern is that the OSMB is putting one more obstacle in the way of getting new boaters on the water. Everyone should have the right to enjoy our natural resources, not just those who paddle regularly enough to make such fees worthwhile. We have enough rules and regulations in this world. Many of them are necessary in order to protect our wild places from our ever-growing population. This one seems to be all about making more money, based almost certainly on decreased income from the motorboat and yacht communities. We whitewater kayakers require VERY little from you, and often nothing at all, and thus we should be indebted to you VERY little, if at all. We really don't need what you're selling! Kevin Hill (Removed address) Silverton, OR		
Because I expect very little, if any, infrastructure and whitewater kayaking is fairly low-impact and already expensive enough, I am very opposed to any additional fees. WA has a pass required at many rivers now. NW Forest Pass for others. Invasive species permits for rafts... It gets to be too much.		
I think there are no services desired by the whitewater boating community to the extent that boaters would be receptive to user fees. This sentiment is exceedingly strong, and near universal. The Marine Board should go to all possible lengths to avoid imposing user fees on the nonmotorized community.		
I don't agree with having to pay to paddle my kayak down the river. I haven't seen any data to support Whitewater kayaking as costing the state a substantial amount of monies. I think this is another way of state government to collect yet again on residents		
I feel that since whitewater kayakers often don't use any infrastructure beyond roads, it would be difficult to implement and enforce a pay structure around the vast majority of our access points. It's also seems unnecessary since we pay for those roads through taxes already. Where users come to the rivers exclusively for beach going or river floating, they often use parks as their access points and usually pay a fee to access the river there.		
The AIS program is probably not seen by non-motorized boaters to apply to them and thus feel that the fee is unfair. The transport of AIS by kayak, canoe or sup is very unlikely. The costs to manage non-motorized boating is also very low. We also pay federal fees to access certain waterways such as the NW Forest Pass, parking fees, trip permits fees and lottery fees. Non-motorized whitewater boaters already pay huge fees. Maybe the federal government should grant some of that money back to the state for marine board operations?		
As a whitewater kayaker, I paddle in locations where there is seldom a conflict with motorized boats - we seldom see motorized boats. In addition, we require minimal improvements and facilities. I strongly believe that the whitewater paddling community is placing no demand on OSMB for assistance and OSMB is not providing services to the whitewater community. Therefore, I would suggest that no fees be charged to whitewater boaters or if any fees are required of whitewater boaters they be very small. In addition, whitewater boaters generally have multiple boats that are used depending on the type of run and the river level. For this reason, fees or licenses should be transferable from boat to boat. Finally fees are regressive - the less well off have to pay the same as the wealthy. Fees should be set up in a progressive manner so that the wealthy pay a proportionate share of their income.		

<p>We walk to the water. We do not need any infrastructure or facilities. We do not need any additional access points. There are no impediments to our use at current facilities. We do not need or want anything from the Marine Board, Especially not any taxes, fees or regulations. River runners want to be left alone to run wilderness rivers without expensive, unnecessary improvements that only serve to increase Marine Board revenue without any significant benefit to us.</p>		
<p>I use my boats almost exclusively in wilderness and would not appreciate having to pay for a boat license. Perhaps you could require fees in areas where OSMB is developing infrastructure. Those areas would allow users who benefit from that infrastructure to fund it.</p>		