

Roberta DiMezza

From: Larry Eidelman <larryeidelman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 12:26 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Opposition to House 5469

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to voice my opposition to House Bill 5469, especially as it is currently written. This bill clearly attempts to circumvent the Rhode Island Constitution with ambiguous language that will be impossible for anyone on either side to interpret. Language like "including, but not limited to"...what does that mean? Not limited to what? If you want to allow seaweed collection, swimming, fishing and right of passage, then just say that.

Also, 10 feet from the "most recent high tide" is an impossible doctrine to follow. You should all know this, we live in the Ocean State. The tides vary as much as 30 linear feet on our beaches. How about "10 feet from the current tide line" as that is all anyone would need to fish, swim, collect or pass easily.

If you're going to introduce a bill that will limit the recourse of a property owner to protect their property, at least have the decency to state the facts in plain language that all parties can interpret accurately should there be a discrepancy.

No one I know is trying to deny the rights of passage, just to protect our hard-earned and highly taxed properties.

Respectfully,
Larry Eidelman

- The bill attempts to circumvent the provisions of the Rhode Island Constitution
- The language of "10 feet from the most recent high tide line" is virtually unenforceable
- The language of "Protected conduct shall include, **but not be limited to**, fishing, gathering seaweed, swimming, and passage along the shore" - would indicate non-members can do basically anything on our property.
- The bill renders the Police Department helpless from protecting property owners from unwanted trespassing and vandalism.
- The language itself makes it impossible for a reasonable person to determine if a violation has occurred.
- The timing of the bill's introduction and a judiciary hearing clearly prohibits thousands of property owners from discussing a more sustainable course of action for shoreline access