

On Thu, Sep 3, 2009 at 4:56 PM, Gary MacDonald <macdonaldsresort@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Keith,

Thank you for sending your email to our county commissioners. I enjoyed your letter and was especially satisfied to hear that even those outside of the "zone" appreciate its existence. We were extensively involved in the no wake zone's creation over twenty years ago. The absence of boat wakes is a side benefit to the real issue which is safety for everyone in the bay.

When I was a young kid I used to row around in the bay and my parents felt that I was relatively safe. With the proliferation of jet skis, drag boats, and larger and larger yachts, both sail and power, I feel very vindicated in pressing for the zone's creation many years ago. It is quite a sight to see boats of all sizes and styles using the bay and not having to worry too much about someone flying in here and running over someone. I see our no wake zone as quite an egalitarian use of the waterway. Everyone is treated the same when it comes to speed and wake. It is quite a sight to see canoes, kayaks, pedal boats, sailboats, drag boats, jet skis, yachts, etc. all going slow enough in this confined area to watch out for one another. Once they are out of the no wake zone there is more than enough room to do whatever they like.

When we submitted our proposal to the county commissioners in office at that time we had a public hearing and took testimony and comments regarding the no wake zone. There were several other proposals including a "freeway" down the center of the bay. However, the current boundaries and language were chosen because it protected everyone equally and was simple to enforce.

When one considers how little enforcement is involved in Bayview's no wake zone it makes it all the more remarkable that people generally comply with its restrictions.

I have a binder which contains most of the correspondence and information from those meetings long ago. Let me know if you want to look them over.

It has come to our attention that Bayview's no wake zone came up because other people have tried to get them instituted in various locations without success. It's almost like it is a "sour grapes" attitude that if they can't have a no wake zone then we shouldn't have one either. Ours works because of some specific circumstances which may not be existent elsewhere. I believe that if a "sour grapes" constituency exists they would be smarter to find out why ours works and then see how our success can be utilized in their situation.

I am adamant that the no wake zone is one of the best things that ever happened to Bayview. We have lots of people, tourists and North Idaho locals, who remark how quiet it is here versus the continuous racket involved on the other lakes. Even on a busy day, with lots of boats out, it is safe and quiet here. Based on your letter I am sure that you agree.

I have made an appointment with Mr. Jim Aucutt, chairman of the waterways commission, to talk to him about his views. He is the one who was on the local TV news supposedly made the remark that "he didn't know why a no wake zone was ever put in place in Bayview." I didn't see the program so I have to be a little circumspect in giving a synopsis of his remarks. However, no matter what he said I believe that someone in his position should have contacted those who have lived with the no wake zone so he wouldn't be clueless when it comes to the zone's importance and/or utility. The waterways commission is a volunteer organization. They report to the commissioners and can make recommendations but the final word comes from the commissioners.

Thank you for your support. If you have any questions or comments I will be happy to give you a quick reply.

Sincerely,

Gary MacDonald