



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Stanley Drtikol

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:32 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

stanapdx@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Good morning Ms. Kesh,

I am writing to

oppose the following changes proposed for **Rooster Rock State Park – Nudity.**

CHANGES TO RULE: As proposed Currently: 736-010-0065

(1) A person ~~of post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~ is prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060, ~~in any part of the park property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River~~ in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website.

(2) Section (1) applies only where the person engaging in nudity is in public view. Section (1) does not apply to nudity in a public bathhouse, lavatory, or within tents, campers or other enclosures which are screened so that the nudity cannot be viewed by the public.

The above language appears to give park managers the unilateral ability to change the current boundaries for nude use without full public process or engagement of user groups. If that is not the intent, recommend Section 736-010-0065 (affecting Rooster Rock) be deleted from the overall proposal, or the following language instead be adopted which would reinstate the boundary definition and provide for posting and mapping while giving users assurance that this rule change isn't a prelude to shrinking or eliminating the nude use area without a full, transparent process.

Please consider the following language: 736-010-0065 Rooster Rock State Park - Nudity

(1) A person ~~of post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~ is prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060, in any part of the park property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River in Rooster Rock State Park in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Mark Stinnette

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:38 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

markstinnette@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Someone posted a copy of an email response from you (on the RR Instagram) following public comment. I appreciated hearing from you that the state has no intention to alter the CO boundaries.

However, more importantly, I wanted to commend you on the quality and transparency of your response. It is refreshing to read such a genuine response as opposed to simply 'messaging' or, worse yet, waffling.

Please keep up the good work & have a great week!

Regards,

Mark



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Hana Drtikol

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:39 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

idrtikol@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Good morning Ms. Kesh,

I am writing to

oppose the following changes proposed for **Rooster Rock State Park – Nudity.**

CHANGES TO RULE: As proposed Currently: 736-010-0065

(1) A person
~~of post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~
is prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS
167.060,
~~in any~~
~~part of the park property west of the established boundary running~~
~~north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access~~
~~stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia~~

~~River~~

in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website.

(2) Section (1) applies only where the person engaging in nudity is in public view. Section (1) does not apply to nudity in a public bathhouse, lavatory, or within tents, campers or other enclosures which are screened so that the nudity cannot be viewed by the public.

The above language appears to give park managers the unilateral ability to change the current boundaries for nude use without full public process or engagement of user groups. If that is not the intent, recommend Section 736-010-0065 (affecting Rooster Rock) be deleted from the overall proposal, or the following language instead be adopted which would reinstate the boundary definition and provide for posting and mapping while giving users assurance that this rule change isn't a prelude to shrinking or eliminating the nude use area without a full, transparent process.

Please consider the following language: 736-010-0065 Rooster Rock State Park - Nudity

(1) A person ~~of post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~ is prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060, in any part of the park property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River in Rooster Rock State Park in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website

With regards,



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Liz Nase

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:40 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

lizn1824@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Good afternoon Ms. Kesch,

I am writing to oppose the following changes proposed for Rooster Rock State Park – Nudity.

CHANGES TO RULE:

As proposed Currently: 736-010-0065

Rooster Rock State Park – Nudity.

(1) A person
~~of post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~
is prohibited from engaging
in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060,
~~in any~~
~~part of the park property west of the established~~
~~boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the~~
~~easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high~~
~~water mark of the Columbia River~~

in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website.

(2) Section (1) applies only where the person engaging in nudity is in public view. Section (1) does not apply to nudity in a public bathhouse, lavatory, or within tents, campers or other enclosures which are screened so that the nudity cannot be viewed by the public.

The above language appears to give park managers the unilateral ability to change the current boundaries for nude use without full public process or engagement of user groups. If that is not the intent, recommend Section 736-010-0065 (affecting Rooster Rock) be deleted from the overall proposal, or the following language instead be adopted which would reinstate the boundary definition and provide for posting and mapping while giving users assurance that this rule change isn't a prelude to shrinking or eliminating the nude use area without a full, transparent process.

Please consider the following language: 736-010-0065 Rooster Rock State Park - Nudity

(1) A person ~~of post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~ is prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060, in any part of the park property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River in Rooster Rock State Park in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website.

Thanks for your attention,



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Rylla Riverman

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:41 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

rylla.riverman@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Hello Ms. Kesch,

Please note my response to this rule change.

Thank you.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Rand Thornsley

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:42 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

randthornsley@aol.com

Location (if provided): , WA

Public comment:

Dear M. Kesch,

I
have been informed that the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department is considering changes to OAR 736-010-0065 which specifies fixed geographical boundaries for the clothing-optional section of Rooster Rock State Park.

Why would the State of Oregon want to do this? There seems to be no relevant reason.

- a) The clothing-optional section of the park has been well-marked, well-understood, and well-disciplined. Allowing changes to the section would disrupt all of these current conditions.

- b) This seems like a waste of our taxpayer dollars both in terms of time spent by state employees managing this change as well as physical costs of changing signage, instructions, and other assets to manage section.

This

proposed change negatively effects current users both local and those who travel from out of town to this special area for naturist outings.

- a) Who (specifically names and/or organizations) initiated the need to for a change to the way the boundaries are determined?

- b) What is the cost benefit analysis?

- c) If the change were to be made today, specifically how would the clothing optional section of the park be different?

- d) Why is there a need to be able to change the boundaries without public comment/input.

Can you direct me to where I can find the original deed that turned this area over to the state many years ago?

While

I reside in Washington state, just across the river from Rooster Rock, I spend many wonderful hours at this beautiful park in the summer months. I also buy the annual park pass to financially support Oregon Parks. It is one of the few places in this area where naturalists can relax and enjoy nature as they wish. It is secluded from other park visitors for anyone who does not enjoy nature in our natural state.

Making

this change seems to be ill-advised when there are many other efforts that the State of Oregon could make better use of the funding that would have to go into this and I strongly oppose any changes to the current boundaries of the clothing-optional area of Rooster Rock State Park.

Sincerely,



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

David Bates

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:44 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

dgbates503@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Dear Helena -

I see in public forums that the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department is considering changes to OAR 736-010-0065 which specifies fixed geographical boundaries for the clothing-optional section of Rooster Rock State Park.

This raises concerns to me on several levels.

a)

The clothing-optional section of the park has been well-marked, well-understood, and well-disciplined. Allowing changes to the section would disrupt all of these current conditions.

b)

This seems like a waste of our taxpayer dollars both in terms of time spent by state employees managing this change as well as physical costs of changing signage, instructions, and other assets to manage section.

What is the impetus for this change?

a)

Who (specifically names and/or organizations) initiated the need to try to change the way the boundaries are determined?

b)

What is the cost benefit analysis?

c)

If the change were to be made today, specifically how would the clothing optional section of the park be different?

d)

Why is there a need to be able to change the boundaries without public comment/input.

Can you direct me to where I can find the original deed that turned this area over to the state many years ago?

As a 5
th

generation Oregonian, I enjoy this treasure on the Columbia River. It is one of the few places in the our state where naturalists can relax and enjoy nature as they wish. It is secluded from other park visitors for anyone who does not enjoy nature in our natural state.

I see no need for this change and strongly oppose it.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Amanda Boekelheide

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 09:45 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

amanda.boekelheide@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Dear Helena Kesch,

I'm writing in favor of keeping the current version of the rule that defines clothing optional areas of Rooster Rock by reference to landmarks, rather than the online map.

As a recent article that outlines some of the history of Rooster Rock states, '
in
the 1960s and 1970s, the secluded eastern portion of the park became popular among naturists for nude recreation. By the 1980s, in an effort to formalize and manage its use, OPRD designated the area as clothing-optional, cementing Rooster Rock's reputation as a haven for body freedom. Today, it remains one of two officially recognized clothing-optional beaches in Oregon, alongside Collins Beach on Sauvie Island.

Please keep this important and unique haven free from last minute arbitrary changes by retaining the formal public rulemaking process.

Again, I urge you to keep to OAR 736-010-0065 as is.

Appreciated,



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Jeremy Fendley

Date comment received:

January 13, 2025 10:30 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

jfendley23@hotmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Hello.

I've read and heard about proposed regulation changes to Rooster Rock State park. What concerns me and others like me is the proposed changes that might give future park managers significant leeway to reduce or eliminate the clothing optional beach. I generally believe in freedom of expression and maintaining historical culture (as long as it's not harmful to others). I believe non-sexual nudity in appropriate places harms no one and in fact Oregon state law considers such to be legal.

Furthermore, I know many users of the clothing optional section have volunteered to maintain and clean up the park in the past. I have made visits to Rooster Rock since 2019 to check out the rock feature and historical information signs, watch birds, walk/hike, picnic, enjoy the beach, and use the well maintained facilities during travel. I've thus used all parts of the park including the clothing optional beach. I've had interactions with wonderful OR parks staff and conversations with visitors. I think the issue that's causing concern is the phrasing. I've heard others say a better way to phrase it would be something like this :. “

A person of ~~post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~
is

prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060, in any part of the park property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River in Rooster Rock State Park in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website”

As

it stands, the proposal to cross out the location specifics could allow a future manager to shrink or remove the clothing optional beach section. I believe this would be unfortunate, unnecessary, and potentially decrease park revenue. Such potential future decisions should not be made without input from park users and interest groups. The proposed wording could give park managers unilateral authority to make changes without dialogue with stakeholders. These are just my personal opinions as a citizen. Thank you for your time.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Jayne Cravens

Date comment received:

January 14, 2025 06:14 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

jcravens42@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): Forest Grove, OR

Public comment:

The proposed update defines the stay limit as no more than 14 consecutive days in a 30-day period to match most national parks. I agree with this proposed update.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Francis S

Date comment received:

January 14, 2025 06:52 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

yohohogonzo@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): Portland, OR

Public comment:

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in regards to proposed and or possibility of proposed rule change that would alter the current boundary of the clothing optional portion of Rooster Rock or allow the boundary to be changed without public comment or process in the future.

While I realize the intent may only have been to clarify the current boundary in term of mapping or wording for the OPRD website I do have concerns that I was only made aware of this proposal by means of social media. One one hand I would say that I should be a more informed citizen and take the time to read the Park rules proposals every year or whenever they may be posted, one the other hand I would say that a citizen should not need to keep a vigilant eye about changes proposed to their favorite Oregon State Park and one of their most cherished places in the world.

I consider Rooster Rock to be one of the most beautiful parks we have in this state. It is also what I would call my happy place. We all need one. For some it may be their book club, local roller skating rink, corner bar, or preferred restaurant. For me, its looking eastward as I float upon the Columbia River as the sun begins to set and the sky turns cotton candy pink. I often cant help but stand in the clear, knee high water with my toes in the wet sand while a gentle breeze caresses my tanned balls and wonder what was it like to be the first group of indigenous people to set foot at this place and make camp for the summer. If there's one thing that I do know in life it's this; anytime someone sees someone else having a good time, inevitably they will take it away. Just as the White man took from the Tribes of the Columbia, fundamentalists inevitably will try to take away a place they deem too revealing, scandalous, salacious and hedonistic, or as some call it fun. It will happen under the guise of decency, appropriateness and moral certitude.

I would propose that a rule be made and added that states; Any proposal now or in the future that would affect the current boundaries of the clothing optional portion of Roster Rock would need to be proposed prior to May 1st and that written notification of such proposal would need to be posted for the public to view at the current notification and rules board at the parking lot and restroom, being

visible from June 1

st to September 1st and that no decision-making-body can execute any change without a public meeting that can happen no sooner than September 30th of that same year. The notice posted to give date and time of scheduled meeting and changes to be discussed.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Theodore Cooper

Date comment received:

January 14, 2025 09:07 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

TedCisFree@protonmail.com

Location (if provided): Seaside, OR

Public comment:

Rooster Rock should not reduce the area currently set aside for "clothing optional" use. It has been over 40 years since I first visited and enjoyed using this "clothing optional" area. Also, it is about 1/4-mile walk to the "clothing optional" area so most people don't want to walk that far, especially when the water is high and covering the walk to that area. There is no good reason for changing this area's "clothing optional" rules or boundaries because nudity is allowed by Oregon State Law and it doesn't cause problems. Only law-breaking people cause problems and they all wear clothes. Nudists just want to get a tan, feel the sun's warmth and get their necessary dose of vitamin D. Most people don't get enough vitamin D.

Sincerely,
Ted Cooper



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Audra Horridge

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:03 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

audra.horridge@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Hello Helena,

I am writing you today to speak of the proposed change to the Rooster Rock clothing optional area. Limiting this area would do the community a great disservice. Rooster rock is one of the only areas I feel safe being fully nude. The mental health benefits of being in your natural state in nature, free from judgement are so incredible, and the nude beaches are one of the greatest parts of living in Portland for me.

There is already limited beach space, especially when the water levels are high. Please reconsider keeping the beach and trail as-is so we can continue to respectfully visit and soak in the healing energy from being able to be our natural self in nature.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Jessica Georgette

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:05 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

jessicageorgette@icloud.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Howdy Helena,

I'm reaching out with deep concern and a heavy heart about the proposed changes to the clothing-optional area at Rooster Rock. This space is so much more than just a beach—it's a sanctuary, a lifeline, and a place of healing for so many of us. Taking it away or restricting access would be devastating.

Rooster Rock is one of the only places where I feel truly safe and free to be myself. The mental health benefits of being fully nude in nature, surrounded by acceptance and peace, are beyond words. For me, and for countless others, this place is an irreplaceable part of living and visiting Portland.

This sacred space is already scarce, particularly during periods of high tide.

Shrinking

it further would strip away a refuge that we hold so dear. For many of us, it's the one place we can reconnect with ourselves, with nature, and with a sense of freedom that is so rare in today's world.

Please, I beg you to reconsider the proposed changes. Let Rooster Rock remain a space where we can come as we are, without fear or judgment, to find the healing and connection we so desperately need.

Thank you for hearing me out. Your understanding could make all the difference.

Please Don't Take Away Rooster Rock's Clothing-Optional Area.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

David Rogers

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:06 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

david.kevin.rogers@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

I am 70, I am very healthy & active. I enjoy nude hiking and relaxing during many seasons at Rooster Rock. I am very concerned that there could be boundary adjustments made to further restrict "clothing optional" areas. It is already getting more and more crowded with the increased populations coming to the Portland-Vancouver area. Please DO NOT allow this law change! We already have a well defined area, and I've always seen visitors respect and are well aware of those boundaries, clearly with geographic landmarks. It's important to have large areas allowing interaction with nature, as a naturalist. It's healthy, stress free and helps many also dealing with depression and other challenges. Please do not allow the possibility of boundary changes & restrictions. Please add my email address to your distribution list to keep me informed. Thank you.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Steve Chittock

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:07 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

stevechittock@hotmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes to the rules at Rooster Rock state park and want my voice to be heard.

Thank you.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Russell Brummer

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:08 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

russbrum@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

I strongly oppose government interference in Rooster Rock! It's a beautiful space of freedom in a country already upset with an incoming president who's a felon. I fear that truth, justice, and democracy will soon disappear in this xenophobic republic now run by literal fascists.

Government should be a respectful debate between socialists and libertarians. We need socialized education for equal opportunity to earn privilege. And we need citizens who hold those with privilege accountable. Some self righteous bureaucrat drawing lines that disrespect both tradition and public opinion would cause an uproar that I would be part of.

The trademark of terrorism is the death penalty. Some people deserve life in prison; no government deserves the right to kill. And right after that, sure signs of terrorism are correctional facilities that offer no opportunity for correction - just paranoid conservatives making scapegoats of those they catch and hateful terrorists who think crime is only ever a moral failing and never a trauma response to poverty caused by a hateful society.

Jails and prisons need open surveillance: cameras everywhere where anyone can watch online. It's needed for safety and compliance: to keep inmates safe and guards honest. Not done in a hateful way, it could be an environment of constant surveillance with just as many, if not more, rewards as punishments. We need to end prison slavery and make it a place where inmates can earn good money for good work to make a plan for release. It could be a place of free education, therapy, and assisted living for anyone willing to trade freedom and privacy for those things. It could be a place with compassionate opportunity to change; without malice for those who don't want to change. When it's no longer a terrorist hell hole, then criminalize camping in public areas and clear the streets of tents.

Loss of freedom and privacy is punishment enough, beyond that, inmates should have every opportunity to leave better off than when they went in.

People who litter and camp in public space should be sent to a jail that's not hateful. AND the government should not be so hateful to assume people are guilty until proven innocent and take away from us one of the best places near the city that allows for naked picnics with the privilege of privacy that is a right for peaceful, law abiding, tax payers.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Charmange Cummings

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:11 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

charmagnec1@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

I'm am deeply concerned over loosing access to a nudist section of rooster rock. We love AANR Northwest and have done many clean ups in that park as a nudist. My husband and I love this place to hang with like minded people who believe in the nudist lifestyle.

Besides clubs there are only a couple places that are nudist friendly. Please fight along side AANR for our rights as a nudist in Oregon.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

David Brownlow

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:12 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

davidmbrownlow@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Ms. Kesch,

It is my understanding that there is a proposed change to the wording of OR 5285 2024 that could change the rules for nudity at Rooster Rock. Please do not mess with this local icon that so many have enjoyed over the years.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Bruce Deloria

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:14 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

bruce@deloria.us

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Good afternoon Ms. Kesch,

I am writing to oppose the following changes proposed for Rooster Rock State Park – Nudity.

CHANGES TO RULE:

As proposed Currently: 736-010-0065

Rooster Rock State Park – Nudity.

(1) A person of ~~post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~ is prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060,
~~in any part of the park property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River~~
in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park property
as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website.

(2)
Section (1) applies only where the person engaging in nudity is in public view. Section (1) does not apply to nudity in a public bathhouse, lavatory, or within tents, campers or other enclosures which are screened so that the nudity cannot be viewed by the public.

The
above language appears to give park managers the unilateral ability to change the current boundaries for nude use without full public process or engagement of user groups. If that is not the intent, recommend Section 736-010-0065 (affecting Rooster Rock) be deleted from the overall proposal, or the following language instead be adopted which would reinstate the boundary definition and provide for posting and mapping while giving users assurance that this rule change isn't a prelude to shrinking or eliminating the nude use area without a full, transparent process.

Please consider the following language: 736-010-0065
Rooster
Rock State Park - Nudity

(1) A person of ~~post-pubescent age or over 12 years of age~~
is
prohibited from engaging in nudity, as defined in ORS 167.060, in any

part of the park

property west of the established boundary running north and south 100 yards east of the easternmost beach access stairway and east above the approximate high water mark of the Columbia River in Rooster Rock State Park in areas of the Rooster Rock State Park

property as posted and indicated on park maps available on the State Park website



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Eric Koszyk

Date comment received:

January 16, 2025 08:15 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

e_koszyk@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Ms. Kesch,

Hello. We strongly oppose any reduction in the clothing optional area for Rooster Rock. We strongly oppose any proposed changes to OAR 736-010-0065. If anything, we would like the clothing optional part of Rooster Rock to be increased.

There are plenty of places within the Portland metropolitan area for those who prefer to wear swimsuits. There are few places for those of us who prefer to sun bathe and swim in the rivers as nature made us. There needs to be more places that are clothing optional quite frankly.

We go to Rooster Rock often and go there more than a dozen times every summer. We always buy the two year pass. We also have participated in beach clean up days. We take our two young daughters (ages 7 and 10) to Rooster Rock often. We love that there is a place where we can all go naked in a non-sexualized environment. This is good for our daughters, regarding body positivity and being able to experience nature naturally.

The two of us also love to hike naked. The only place to do this around Portland is Rooster Rock.

We are both military veterans and one of us owns a small business. We do a great deal for our society. Please INCREASE the area where nudity is allowed and not decrease it.

Please take our comments into consideration. We appreciate the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and we love Rooster Rock!

Thank you.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Nick Gorman

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 06:03 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

acadng50@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): , OK

Public comment:

As an out of state visitor I have always loved to spend periods of the summer in Oregon because I greatly enjoy the beauty of the land and its parks. As we all know each park has its own beauty in its own right and each of us enjoy one or two more. I will say compared to other state parks I have visited, the Oregon State Park system and its care is the best in the USA. I definitely appreciate the care the state park staff and volunteers do for them. We now live approximately 1,700 miles away. Therefore, I plan our family time so as to spend as much of it as possible enjoying Oregon before returning home. The original "stay rule" has been very clear and accommodative to allow my family to enjoy our time a little longer at one of the parks that we have for several decades returned to every year.

With the reservation system now in place it has been a challenge to set up our reservations six months in advance within the existing stay framework, but it has been doable. The proposed length of stay framework will surely impact our ability to visit longer at a park that we enjoy the most within our limited timeframe. In effect, it would cause us to make long reservations at other locations before returning back to our favorite park. Additionally, in my personal opinion, making the change to follow other "stay rule(s)" may not be in the best interest for Oregon residents and out of state visitors.

I am opposed to the proposed length of stay (14 consecutive within 30 days period) framework from its current format.

Thank you for allowing me to share my comments.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Alty Behe

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 08:33 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

altybear@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Hello,

I hope this letter finds you well. I was hoping to voice my opinion regarding this proposed downsizing of the Nude area of Rooster Rock Park.

Simply put, I disapprove. The unique qualities of that portion of the area are important to many members of my spiritual community. There is only one other nude approved waterfront area in the area and for half the season it is besieged by mosquitos and inaccessible due to water levels washing out the majority of the beach.

Whilst Portland does have its freedom of expression expectations. I personally have no desire to be skyclad in an environment which even 'may' have children. I am confident many share in my feelings regarding this matter. Compressing the space, and removing the many wooded trails I am fond of meditating on, feels like a disrespectful folly.

With appreciation for the work you do and the time you contribute,



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Alan Nolasco

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 08:34 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

alannolasco53@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Regarding OAR 736-010-0065. I am opposed to any changes in the rule affecting the current fixed geographic boundaries for the clothing-optional section of the park. No to boundaries determined by maps published by the OPRD website. No to future adjustments to be made without requiring a public hearing or formal process.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Bobby Thornhill

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 08:35 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

bobbythornhill2@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

I am opposed to any changes in the rule affecting the current fixed geographic boundaries for the clothing optional section of the park. No to boundaries determined by maps published by the OPRD website. No to future adjustments to be made without requiring a public hearing or formal process.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Todd Palmer

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 08:36 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

todd_palmer@hotmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Dear Ms. Kesch And The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department,

I am writing to oppose the proposed amendment to OAR 736-010-0065, which would allow changes to the clothing-optional boundaries at Rooster Rock State Park without public input.

Rooster Rock holds historical and cultural importance as the nation's first officially designated clothing-optional beach, providing a safe and inclusive space for naturists. The current process, tying boundaries to fixed landmarks and requiring public involvement, ensures transparency and community trust.

The naturist community has been a dedicated steward of Rooster Rock, contributing through clean-ups, trail maintenance, and tree-planting events. Removing public input risks undermining this collaboration and the park's positive legacy.

I urge OPRD to preserve the current process, ensuring public hearings remain integral to any changes. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Jay Keening

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 08:37 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

jaykeening@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Rooster rock is one of the few pieces of magic and area's we have left to be safe.

No! Please do not allow it to be threatened



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Ron Buss

Date comment received:

January 17, 2025 08:38 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

rabsheesh8@gmail.com

Location (if provided): , OR

Public comment:

Dear Helena,

I attended your public meeting last Wednesday 1/15/25, but made no comment because I thought making it n writing would be more official & documented.

Thank you for letting the clothing optional boundaries at Rooster Rock State Park remain status quo as it's been since 1990.

This portion of the beach has been close to my heart since my first visit in 1979. I've never missed a summer. All of my regular patron friends feel the same.

I/we bring many positive things to this state park such as picking up garbage other leave behind, guarding the safety & well being of all who come plus answer any questions newcomers might have to make them feel welcome. I can even count more than a dozen times when we've saved drowning victims who unsuccessfully tried swimming to sand island.

Also important, these clothing optional patrons bring millions of dollars annually in parking revenue. In the peak of weather, the parking lot is at full capacity. Imagine that huge parking lot full at \$5/space.

I speak from experience. In 1990 the nude boundaries became highly restricted. Most if not all discouraged patrons (including myself) went to Sauvie Island which isn't a state park, thus loosing all that

parking revenue. For 4 summers I checked back at Rooster Rock to see the attendance. Each time there were only 20-30 cars on a weekend. There were many complaints. By 1995 much of that restriction was lifted. A compromise was initiated. Instead of banning areas 20 feet from the waterline, all land beyond the bottom of the east ramp & lowest base of the deer trail was fair game.

So I hope you can understand that if the clothing optional boundaries at Rooster Rock were further restricted, it would be a financial blow to that park's annual revenue.

Thank you for keeping things status quo. Feel free to contact me regarding this topic anytime.

Yours truly,