Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/27/2019 3:28:03 PM
First name: Anon
Last name: Jack
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Another Fee? Really?

I scanned the Trail Use article published on the Internet on 11/23 and was a bit confused. The premise of the article seemed to be that limiting access to certain mountain trails is necessary in order to limit damage to the trails and ecosystems. I can understand why this might be necessary. Less use equals less damage, hopefully. This limited access program is already set to go into effect next summer. So that part of the ecosystem protection program seems to be a done deal. But then, the article introduced a discussion of fees for use of certain trail systems. Fees are yet to be confirmed. So I'm wondering why fees weren't an integral part of the initial discussions regarding trail use, and if they were, why are they still, at this point being addressed as a separate issue? It would seem like the State is, once again, attempting to introduce additional fees on top of all the user fees currently paid by Citizens of this State. Do you not understand that Citizens are feeling the pinch of fees now more than ever in this State? Do you not understand that imposition of new fees, of any kind, will result in a percentage, however small, of Citizens no longer being able to take advantage of the environmental attributes offered by this State? Did any part of your initial trail/ecosystem preservation study consider areas where existing taxes could be cut in order to satisfy whatever funds you believe to be necessary in order to support this program? Did your study group simply assume that new fees should be assessed without consideration of other sources of funding? And since the Limited Access program is already set to be implemented next summer, why are you addressing new fees at all?

Jack McCaleb
Redmond, OR