

Francis Dupuis
Mars Hill
LD 276

I am writing Neither For Nor Against - LD 276. First of all, this was a very last minute change in the title and when searching or dealing with ATV issues, has not even been on the radar. I am against this bill because it goes against the 65" width MAX with adding a third category. There should be no machine allowed that is greater than 65", unless one of the nearly 400 grandfathered units. I am FOR this bill because it eliminates the weight restriction as written. Because accessories have become such a touchy and unregulatable topic, it should be higher than 2000lbs. I am and have always been a supporter of the 2400 or 2500 bills submitted in the past. The passage of LD 19 as written would have been adequate because 95% of all 2 and 3 Seat units would have been covered. A/C units with full cabs as well with the newer weights manufacturers are building. They are already cooking the books with the actual weight and listings in their websites and printed materials. LD 19 at 2500lbs could have been the answer. This one could be if it removed the third category and made the weight 2500lbs if you are going to continue using that way to register. The 65" part should not be touched at all. In closing, it was stated many times over the months and years of an increase that the real problem with trail abuse and landowner issues is reckless operations. Not the machine. THE OPERATOR. Using the excuses from 7 years ago that it was weight is just antiquated at this point, as the majority of the heavier machines are older people out with their kids or grandchildren. They can't ride the sport stuff anymore, so now they are punished because of the younger folks who still tear things up regardless. That's not a fair balance. Enforcement can fix that issue, not punish the older people. At least pass the handicapped card exception. Thank you for your time. - A Northern Maine rider and supporter of 2 and 3 seaters for an increase in weight only. -Francis Dupuis