

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?					
Suggestions - But Not Against a Fee	Need to See a Benefit	Similar to SNO Park Pass	Transferability	All Boats?	Where Should \$ Go
Remove the invasive species and combine with other fee structures -- add to boater license. No ideas on the ideas - need to look at proposals. Fees based on boat length works with a base fee.	I think you need to do a really good PR program before implementing permit program for non-motorized fee so people will see the benefits of the fee. Have a 1 day or 1 week low cost fee for those of us who have a one day party with several boats. Have a permit similar to state parks where it is hole punched for the month purchased instead of calendar year.	I was not able to get this link to work so do not have an informed opinion as to existing recommendations. Perhaps a program similar to the state's winter parking pass would work...payment on a per use basis or a larger fee for a season pass.	I am unsure of the proposed ideas. Boater fee could be ok, but should be transferable like the AIS permit. I have many boats, 3 for whitewater and 1 for flat water. I would not want to buy a permit for every boat.	Per boat on the water	Fees should be based on services used. For instance, an education program should be paid for be class fees; access facilities should be on a Sno-Park type program.
I would find either the present invasive species permit fee even if the fee was increased would be acceptable. Another option would be a license similar to a fishing license. Since these boats are smaller and less expensive than motorized boats people often have several. Also different types of boats are required for different types of rivers at different levels. I have been collecting boats since before 1974. Boats dating back to 1974 & 1976 do not get used very often but I could not afford to license them all. I recently loaned out Avon rafts built in 1974 & 1976 to friends to run Barton to Carver - better for the children than pool toys.	There will be a user pay structure, but I don't expect that there will be any actual benefit to non-motorized users. There were no improvements at the Tillamook County launches when they started charging. It's not practical to attempt to enforce parking for those who park in turnaround areas or trailer spaces, which is the single biggest problem at many launches. No way to prevent a motorized boat from parking at the first position beside a dock even though there's already a non-motorized boat in the second position while that person has gone to get the truck and trailer.	A system like the NW Forest Pass would be acceptable. Where there are improved facilities, require a River Access Pass for the vehicle. When there are no to minimal facilities, require no River Access Pass for the vehicle. Paddle and Oar boats require little infrastructure for river access so they should have minimal Pass prices.	Permit the person, not the boat...1) But then...does a tandem canoe need two permits? Dragon boats need several permits? Tandem kayak need two permits? 2) Leave it per boat and not person	Too confusing if not charging people who have a Boater's Pass on certain rivers -- it will confuse the people of where a permit is needed	Reasonable launch fees at developed facilities to help maintain them is one reasonable approach. An annual permit for non-motorized boaters, with a reasonable fee to support non-motorized programs, especially if they include a grants component to encouraged development of non-motorized access, would also be welcome. I have not seen the ideas proposed by the Advisory Committee.
Tillamook county has a per use type fee. Something to this would help, that way the money would stay where the use is taking place. Couple bucks per use or by a yearly pass per county maybe for the year with the option of being able to delegate where your yearly pass money is spent - Lincoln county, marion, tillamook, etc...	I think it makes sense to first know what the benefits the non-motorized boater may receive - before one could comment on a fee structure. It's like asking how much you want to pay for a fruit basket without knowing how big it is, the mix of fruit, etc.	SNO Park Pass across states	One fee for all -- transferrable -- no hassle	Permits should be required for all boats no matter what	I support an annual fee that could be attached to the invasive species licensing of the boats. I also think the boat size for the permits should be reduced down to the 8' length of boats. I have no problem with increasing the fees to cover safety and access issues.
I think keeping things as simple as the ATV program in Oregon is the only way to go. keep the cost low.	A model similar to a boat license would work; my question though is what we are getting for our fee. If I primarily use a kayak or a canoe on a river with no developed access - what am I paying for?	Be able to sell permit for convenience to users like SnoPark pass	In some states -- boat to boat -- not person to person...Simple -- boat has one no matter what age	10 ft. hard for LE -- have all boats	Pay structures inhibit use to resources that should have a low cost structure. They invite excessive expenses and ushering ask boaters to pay a disproportionate expense compared to non-boaters that use and take over the facilities. The fees target access to a public water resource with the idea that they will cover fancy put in and take out facilities that are not needed. And when we try to use the facilities, the parking is filled with non-payment users who are rightfully enjoying the same resources. Fees should focus on responsible pack it in pack it out enforcement for day use and fisherman and corresponding garbage collection points.
I think we need both improved and unimproved launch sites. The cost to young people getting started in life is high and with boating liscense and parking fee is a hardship on some. I have power boats as well as drift boats and enjoy running the rapids but I started in the 1965 when all you needed was air mattress. We learned from other boaters how to run the rivers if I was to start now I not sure I could afford all the nessary gear and fees. I am old now and can afford fee so charge my age group we use power boats up that lience fee and let my grand kids go cheap and have fun like I was able to.	I don't mind paying if your are providing some value added benefit. Right now there is nothing that is provided. Access to public spaces is free and should remain so. I would prefer a flat tax State wide if fees are required or pay at access sites. I can not stand tags or passes. They are difficult to acquire in rural locations and hard to keep track of both on and off the water. In addition, tags and passes are a deterrent to single use participants and hard to determine if you need one and where.	NW Boater Pass -- like forest pass	Support permit connected to boater for transferable	Length of boats -- should be all lengths	I'm happy to pay a small amount but I don't want the fees viewed as a funding source for access improvements that are not needed.

<p>While I passionately support river access and protection and am willing to pay for these benefits, it is frustrating to work weeks in a row and have a rare day off and drive hours to a river only to get there and see that one needs to pay a parking fee or some other fee and either not have cash or have to drive back to a nearby town trying to get a permit or whatever the issue may be. I am happy to pay the annual fee for a NW Park pass, but, beyond that, it becomes very onerous to buy separate permits for various rivers or regions. Similarly, I had an invasive species permit for my sea kayak in 2011 but have not taken my long boat out since then, and if I decide to go out once every few years, it is a slight hassle to figure out where/how to purchase a permit to paddle on the Bay which is just blocks from my house. As a predominant whitewater paddler, it is frustrating to get charged for things such as cemented boat ramps and such when we do not need such infrastructure and actually prefer not to have much man-made infrastructure.</p>	<p>* Before considering fee collection the OSMB needs to adopt a culture that is more supportive of non-motorized paddlers. * Take a positive and more active role in access projects. Where was OSMB during the planning process for new sites on Clackamas being constructed by PGE? Has OSMB engaged in Wild and Scenic River planning efforts or engaged in efforts to Protect and Enhance river values like recreation? * State is proposing to close Salmonberry access. Where is OSMB? They appear absent from discussions. * OSMB closures based on perceptions of safety (e.g. Willamette Falls) are an issue. A lack of advocacy for safe boat passage with rebuild of fish collection dam was a lost opportunity. * For users to trust an agency for fee collection, they need to see that the agency is advocating for their interests. The track record of OSMB has been poor in this regard. * Would funds generated have oversight from non-motorized boating communities or would it end up going to high-traffic sites dominated by motor boats? * Some states have found administrative cost of fee collection is greater than funds generated. * Multiple user fees are a hassle for users. They become a challenge for out-of-state visitors.</p>	<p>See value of SnoPark pass. If fee, need to see value – can we see examples of what could be done?</p>	<p>The best payment method would be modeled after the invasive species permit—a permit issued to the paddler rather than a license per boat. Moving water and whitewater paddlers of small craft often own multiple boats, but only paddle one at a time. My wife and I, for instance, own 14 whitewater canoes, but only paddle one at any given time. A boat license would penalize us for supporting the paddling industry (which puts money in the pockets of Oregon retailers). So, if you're thinking of assessing us a fee for supporting your work on access and other issues important to nonmotorized paddlers, make it a paddler fee, not a fee per boat.</p>	<p>AIS permits for all boats</p>	<p>I was shocked to see that half of the budget goes to police activities. No wonder we don't have sufficient revenue to build and maintain boating facilities and up to date web based information on navigable rivers in Oregon. I think that non-motorized boaters (including myself) should pay a fee that goes toward facilities and information regarding marine services. However, the "policing" of the rivers including policing for such things as alcohol and drug use, excessive noise, trespassing and vagrancy issues, etc, should not be draining our limited Marine Board's expenditures. 50% of the total budget for Police funding is way out of proportion to the Marine Board's overall budget and mission. Such policing activities on rivers that run through the state and various cities and counties should be shared across the board by all policing agencies. Dealing with drinking and drug use by Vagrants in Salem on the shores of the river should not be draining down our limited Marine Board resources.</p>
<p>Annual fee/tag for non-motorized boaters is the best option. marking the boat with a sticker is best for compliance checks. using a tag per household or person allows boaters to apply it to multiple boats in their family. typically multiple boats (canoe, kayak, driftboat, rowboat) are not used at same time.</p>	<p>If the money is spent directly on enhancing the non-motorized boating experience, then I am all for it. However, while pay-user fees have increased on the Deschutes and Rogue Rivers, the services provide have decreased.</p>	<p>Deschutes River needs a Boater's Pass for even tubes and Shamu's – anything that floats needs a Boater's Pass</p>	<p>Charge per boat not person</p>	<p>Concern with all lengths of a fee – they like the 10ft. cut off</p>	<p>Fees spent on the conflict areas to reduce conflict</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>I suggest having clarity on how the funds will be used.</p>	<p>Deschutes permit with a link to Boater's Pass for AIS</p>	<p>Confusing – doesn't understand the purpose of being flexible with transferable permits</p>		<p>\$ toward general public education re: risk, "know before you go"; environmental conditions; hazards including temperature concerns, strainers</p>
<p>They should chip in. Often times they are using the facilities that Motorized boater's pay for. If you are going to have a pay structure how would it be enforced? Good luck with the honesty policy.</p>	<p>If the marine board were to actually get us improved access to whitewater rivers I'm sure we'd be willing to pay a small fee to park and use the toilet. If all the marine board does is charge for parking/toilet without improving access, we might not like it.</p>	<p>Sno-Park pass - if density increase in areas add them to the program</p>			<p>Benefit – presence of Marine Patrol for safety – preventive and rescue</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>As a non motorized user, it is extremely difficult for me to recognize any benefit from the Marine Board. In my view, most everything this board does is for other (primarily motorized) water users. As a result I am very much against any such fee based system in general. In my opinion the board would need to provide evidence of support for our community first and THEN perhaps we could talk about this but at present there is no fee amount I would support.</p>	<p>Didn't attend the meeting.....a yearly pass seems ok and consistent with other things like park entry, clean boats, sno-park etc. I would rather that the general parks budget could make improvements within the park-entry permit collections. I would rather be in a culture of everyone sharing costs for everyone's good rather than each item being singled out.</p>			<p>Empathize on not wanting to pay fee, but willing to pay because \$ going back into facilities</p>
<p>I don't want to see non-motorized boats to pay any more than motorized boats. Non-motorized pollutes less (actually none at all), are not noisy, do not consume petroleum resources or produce potentially harmful wave action. I see no reason to charge non-motorized any more than presently charged for facility use.</p>	<p>Must see the value if I should pay – can't see benefit to whitewater directly - likes some things but benefit/value needs to be identified – already feel like there are several fees being paid – makes it harder to find value with other fees being paid... Applies to high-end/upper-end boaters – not just whitewater users (lived in Ohio and did not receive benefit for \$)</p>				<p>\$ to be used for enforcement of safety requirement, education and access</p>

<p>I watched the video. If user fees become a reality for non-motorized boater they should be based on use of a site, not based on a boat registration/licensing system. We already pay \$7 per year in fees (invasive species which partially funds the Marine Board. People (Marine Deputies) are expensive. I believe Marine Deputies are largely ineffective for enforcing laws and promoting safety for non-motorized boaters relative to the cost and should be a low priority.</p>	<p>The only thing that makes sense to me is a fee added to the invasive species permit. You are going to have a tough time convincing folks the money is being used in the right places. The money ought to be distributed for work by county based on how much was collected there. This would assure the money was spent where it was raised. Then you need to publish how much and where the funds were spent. You should have citizen boards (paddlers) in each county to establish priorities for the funding.</p>				<p>\$ to support safety services, access – non-motorized to help offset costs of facilities</p>
<p>They note that currently all NM users are told they need to buy the AIS permit and they were very surprised to find out it's not required on boundary water. Suggestion made that if a NM fee were established, they could encourage sale and monitor local sales so they could qualify for funds for local projects and enforcement.</p>	<p>First, I would want to see evidence that you are benefiting whitewater paddlers who currently see very little benefit from most of your traditional services to date. This means picking a few new projects every year that specifically target what whitewater paddlers want/need, and then demonstrate you are delivering on them. See American Whitewater's bimonthly journal for a good example of getting the word out about goals and accomplishments. Next, charge by the person, not number of paddle boats one owns. Do not charge canoes and IK's more because they are longer than kayaks -- one of your dumber credibility moves when implementing invasive species, in my opinion.</p>				<p>Facilities and programs advocacy vs. regulations</p>
<p>On surface, fee seems reasonable...1) Appreciate LE and regulation; 2) Cooperation with wildlife and other agencies; 3) Outreach by OSMB to low-income; permit/cost subsidy to low income</p>	<p>Presumably this question is about this document &lt;<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/OSMB/admin/docs/NMProposalOnLine.pdf">http://www.oregon.gov/OSMB/admin/docs/NMProposalOnLine.pdf</a>&gt;. For future surveys please provide a direct url to the "ideas proposed" because currently it's a treasure hunt through your website. The first thing the OSMB needs to define is what services will be provided. This is the fundamental question. The OSMB really needs to take a more active role in supporting the interests of the non-motorized boating community--the recent closure of the North Santiam associated with the reconstruction of the fish collection dam and the inability of the OSMB to advocate for the interest of rafters in advocating for safe passage is an example of the lost opportunities for the agency. We already have fees for USFS land and AIS fees. Many of us boat in Washington and Oregon which have different fee programs. It all gets overwhelming to the general public. If the fees are just used to support a program to improve a few launch sites in urban areas (e.g. Clackamas River) and hire staff to enforce fee collection, I don't believe it will be a success. If fees from non-motorized boaters go to a dedicated account that goes to a grant program to acquire new access points and develop facilities with a review committee that includes the non-motorized boating community then there may be opportunity for success.</p>				<p>Concern over multiple fees: AIS + NM tag + parking at site...Want to support local park/agency; spend \$ locally</p>
<p>Include with the invasive species permit.</p>	<p>Have user input/involvement with where \$ goes</p>				<p>Two ppl. fine with amounts as long as \$ comes back to non-motorized education, safety, and facilities</p>
<p>Fees tied to environmental stewardship. Low cost option for 1 or 2x boaters</p>	<p>User-Pay/User-Benefit – need to look at intangible benefits such as improved safety, reduced fatalities, etc.</p>				<p>Priorities for \$\$...1) Education; 2) Safety; 3) Environmental; 4) Access</p>
<p>Again, make people would aren't wearing life jackets or drinking on the river pay for the fees. NOT competent boaters. I can enjoy the rivers in a very safe way already.</p>	<p>People happy to pay, IF see a value</p>				<p>Parking – single car spots at a premium</p>

I think a boat title fee would be a reasonable way to make fees happen consistently	If this does happen – make sure that \$ is for NM only – transparent of where \$ goes				If fees – put towards brochure for vendors regarding education
Inconvenience of paying multiple fee – reduce hassle of multi-fees	Need to show results of \$				User Pay/User Benefit – education with program
Have fees for high issue rivers – fatality, conflict – focus fees in those areas – maybe phases	OK with fee to provide services to <u>all</u> non-motorized users – whitewater, flat, etc.				Use fees to remove hazards
Port of Hood River and instructors support a fee and can articulate how it would be used and why it is needed.	Use of funds need to be defined – however not a big chunk of \$ to back fill – have seen this happen with new revenue, but no new services happens – so \$ should go to facilities – capital improvements				However – Marine Patrol will rescue in areas where isolated paddlers go – shouldn't that resource be paid for?
I don't have any of this information available to me. I am here because a friend posted this link on Facebook and I wanted to take the time to weigh in on the topics that I could. I am currently living in Brazil where in my region anyway there is very few if any public access ways to rivers. We have to beg land owners for permission, pay them fees, jump off bridges(not the safest thing to do) or try to sneak around like criminals. It makes me appreciate and want to protect public river access in Oregon(always my home). If I have to pay a small fee to do that I would gladly.	I am unaware of any meetings that have been held and have no idea what has been proposed. In the case of the Ashland Rowing Club, we are an independent organization and to my knowledge are not beneficiaries of any particular marine board benefits. We license our boats and launch drivers and that is about it as far as I know. Reading the strategic plan summary does not enlighten me to any particular benefits being proposed.				Fees for services are needed
Additional discussion on other fees – user fees, parking fees, county issued fees, etc., either as a permanent option or temporary until state fees are implemented.	\$ directed to non-motorized program specifics				Need restrooms – need to contribute
OSMB staff indicated willingness to explore Columbia River specific fee options or scenarios for locally collected fees could benefit local community needs.	I carry my whitewater kayaks along trails and find a convenient entry point to mainly wilderness areas. My kayaks are in the 6-foot to 12-foot range. Infrastructure needs are minimal for my group, as we can hike trails into rivers as needed. For my private boating group, impediments would include costs in the form of fees for licensing boat, or access fees to rivers. I don't see how the Oregon State Marine Board can help provide additional access points for kayakers. If you think you can add value for kayakers, that needs to be clearly communicated to the community as I know many kayakers share my views.				I would pay a fee similar to my that assessed my motorboats to use my canoe in Lake Lytle. If I get a kayak or paddle board some day, which I hope to do, I would also pay a fee to use it in Lake Lytle if that would help keep the Lake free of speedboats; or restrict speedboats to 3mph trolling speed for fishing.
Limited income restrictions – affordability	Need to show where the \$\$ goes				
Fees – benefit users. If things improved at access, may see increased participation	Wants specific list of benefits				
Share burden with user	List where money goes/would go				
Keep AIS permit separate – make non-motorized separate – they should pay for their specific purpose	Year-end report – activities done				
Could permits be sold in booklets?...1) Price for 1 or 5?; 2) Sliding scale for volume – hate to remember to carry AIS – like sticker	Paddlers need to know the fee will take care of them and know where the money is going				
Could there be a universal fee for access, use, etc.?	Opposed at the proposal price...Might support with quality safety education (e.g. what OOPS or others teach)				
Voluntary fee donation box	Two ppl. don't understand it/need more info...How does capital, operating, LE etc. get distributed?				
Point of Sale – add on fee (surcharge) \$20 onto purchase price	Accountability is important...Group notification				
Could there be a box such as a tax donation check box?	Rules/fees need to be fair – transparent				
The more you can tie-in to AIS the easier	Spreadsheet – how \$\$ would be spent – how they are spent – how will it be spent				
Big issue would be for floaters in Bend – would affect them – not a safety issue	Need separate budgets for motorized vs. non-motorized – show where the money goes				
Call it a tax	Have funding go directly to non-motorized - designated funding to non-motorized				

To support a seat at the table non-motorized areas vs. motorized	Will there be a way to know how much each platform will pay?				
Make purchase system easier	Administration cost – Can you break down cost per density areas? If administration cost is less would there be a high or low cost or vice versa?				
Need to pay something – but want it to be equitable and don't want a "government cover"	I'm not quite sure what the benefits would be, and paying would be a large inconvenience. This doesn't mean that I'm completely opposed, but I don't know what the arguments are in favor. I travel a lot, and missed all the meetings because I live in Colorado but spent most of my summer in Canada. I enter and leave Oregon very randomly. I would really not want to have to stop by an office somewhere every time I decided to make a quick trip into Oregon to paddle, and would not want to pay a yearly fee in case it turned out that I only paddled in Oregon a few times. However, if there were some great benefits, such as free helicopter/wilderness rescues for registered users in Oregon, than I would be willing to go through the hassle. If all it gets us is stuff I wouldn't use (like boat ramps), then I would be extremely opposed.				
Tax for non-motorized boaters? Possible?	\$0 – like some ideas but feel disconnected to "benefits" described				
If OSMB has paid for a facility and asked for maintenance \$ it can only be a \$2 fee; no OSMB maintenance \$ - fee greater than \$2	The marine board has provided me no services as far as I've seen.				
Regional permit?	Not sure what the pay-user benefit structure proposed is and what services are proposed.				
Equipment excise tax on new equipment	Concern with where \$ goes – need to make sure it goes to NM				
One OK with fee concept, not actual \$	It's not at all clear to me what benefits I'm receiving, or about to receive...				
Work with Washington for reciprocity	Not really sure what benefits that the Marine Board provides. Before charging for these "benefits" can you please educate the public on what you are doing to help us?				
Number tag for replacement	I don't agree with a fee as I don't see any benefits. Pay should be in line with benefits and these should be communicated in a transparent way to fee payers				
What's reasonable?	Until the "services" are defined? I use ramps sometimes but prefer not to do so if hand carry locations are available.				
Impact – appropriate fee	Not about the money – but where is it going and what for rationale				
If required – at least boaters would be contacted –puts a name in front	What is the plan to spend the money – priorities?				
Combine both AIS and non-motorized	Clear link from \$ to program specifics vs. enforcement				
Have a pilot program – phases in different geographical areas	Why pay for something for no return on investment?				
A fee makes sense	Concern with generalized roll out and that majority of boaters will not see benefits				
Might need a tag for parking to make sure paddlers are using spaces					
Why should there be a difference in fees with regards to non-motorized and motorized?					
Cost??? – Make sure the NM fee is not as high as motorized					
General support for a combined permit (NM & AIS) Keep it simple					
Support permits but kayakers like primitive locations – white water					
Like services for free, but willing to pay					

Like fee = lunch					
I think a user fee for parking (per a vehicle) at the take-out for sections the Marine Board is currently (or plans to improve) access to is reasonable.					
I agree kayakers should support the Marine Board activities. I would like to see a tag like the Invasive Species tag that kayakers in Oregon should buy and demonstrate their support for all that the Marine Board does for our waterways.					
I'd be open to a reasonable fee, but I keep foremost in mind the VERY limited impact to environmental habitat, docks, structures, law enforcement, accidents, incidents, risk, etc that non-motorized boaters generate every year in contrast to motorized boats.					
I am not aware yet of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, but will look into them. A general fee similar to that required for the AIS permit would be appropriate. However, more significant fees should be reserved for use at those locations offering specific facilities. Bureaucracy, though it might be limited, should not be a deterrent to participation in non-motorized boating.					
As a kayaker in don't use many facilities like trailered vehicles. Any fee should be minimal and based on facility use. What would you charge a fisherman to use the banks of the river?					
I thought the ideas were constructive. I have no problem paying for services I use. I would, in return, expect to see non motorized boating receive more emphasis than it does now. The way it is now, I feel kind of like a second class user of facilities after power boaters.					
I am not familiar with the Advisory Committee's ideas, and am willing to pay an annual fee to help support the proposed Marine Board's non-motorized boater services.					
I find both user fees at access points and annual permits to be a nuisance. It is similar to the permits and fees and are required to access the national forest in places. Living in the Portland area, I boat in both Oregon and Washington, and it's a hassle to maintain the required permits for both states plus the invasive species permit. I don't mind paying taxes for public services, and I do pay taxes, but I dislike being hit up for some new fee all the time. It's annoying.					
Pay the same fees as a motorized vessel user. I register and pay the fees on a drift boat that never see's a motor. If I can do it. Everyone can do it.					