



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Vickie Whiteaker

Date comment received:

December 30, 2025 05:45 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

vwhiteak@msn.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Please don't remove veterans use of State Parks.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Scott Whiteaker

Date comment received:

December 30, 2025 05:46 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

scotywhiteaker@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Laila Lienesch

Date comment received:

December 30, 2025 05:53 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

gobeavs62@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

When we retired, we bought a Class C motorhome so we could spend time camping in our beloved Oregon State Park campgrounds. Being on a fixed income, far flung trips and all the expenses that go with that were (and still are) not in our budget. This past weekend I went on the Reserve America website to make our reservations for our Spring / early summer trips and what I found both angered and saddened me. We've been priced out of camping at Oregon State Parks. Rates have jumped an astonishing 60 - 159%!

Please explain how you can justify increasing the cost by 67% to camp at a park with only water and electric, no sewer and no dump station (Beachside State Rec area). Or at William Tugman where there is no sewer but does have a dump station by 62%! So I looked at LaPine State Park, and to travel there after the risk of poor road conditions over the Passes (as we live outside of Corvallis), the nightly cost jumps from \$22/night in April to \$57/night in May, that's a 159% increase!!

I feel for the families that now cannot afford to camp in our State Parks because they have no choice but to go during the summer months. We as retirees have more flexibility in our schedule, but not in our wallet. Thankfully, US Forest Service campgrounds are still affordable otherwise we may not be camping at all in 2026.

I fully comprehend budget shortfalls, but to put the burden on Oregonians is unfair and unwise. There has to be another way to fund State Parks. If the legislature will not agree to a line item in the budget then perhaps issuing a tax on recreational equipment (e.g. binoculars, backpacks, tents, etc) might be part of the solution? Please look elsewhere to fund State Parks so that every Oregonian can enjoy them.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Scott Whiteaker

Date comment received:

December 30, 2025 06:14 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

scotywhiteaker@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I'm a 100 percent Vietnam veteran. I strongly disagree with your plan to limit veterans and foster families to 10 free days per year. These two groups do the jobs that most people can't and won't do. Limiting men and woman who sacrificed so much for our country is downright ugly. There are other ways to recoup shortfalls than on the backs of servants who do the hard work that the majority won't do. Make up your funds on the majority ,not the few who serve .

Sincerely Scott Whiteaker



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Christine Leis

Date comment received:

December 30, 2025 06:45 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

tina_leis@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Limited 10 days for disabled veterans puts them at a disadvantage given limited income and access to facilities



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Chase Newman

Date comment received:

December 30, 2025 07:20 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

chasenewman@me.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Dear Oregon Parks and
Recreation Commission,

I am writing to oppose the proposed change that restricts Special Access Pass benefits exclusively to Oregon residents. This policy would create unnecessary barriers for disabled veterans and foster/adoptive families from outside Oregon who have historically relied on these benefits to enjoy public lands.

Military service is a commitment to our nation as a whole—not to individual states. Veterans who served our country did so for all Americans, and their sacrifices should be honored equally, regardless of where they reside. Limiting access based on residency undermines that principle and sends a message that some veterans are less deserving of recognition and support.

Furthermore, equity and access are core values of Oregon public recreation. Oregon's parks are a shared national treasure, and restricting benefits to residents disproportionately

impacts those who may travel to Oregon for healing, family bonding, or outdoor recreation. These experiences are vital for well-being and should not be limited by state borders.

I urge the Commission to maintain inclusive eligibility for the Special Access Pass and uphold the spirit of equity, access, and national service that these programs represent.

I support your proposed modifications reducing the free camping to 10 total days per year. I also support no-show reservations as counting against those 10 days. Neither of those proposals are exclusionary or restrictive for the disabled veteran class and they contribute to an overall better reservation experience for everyone. Should you wish to continue to erode veteran benefits, I'd ask that you first consider increasing the disability percentage required to obtain a Special Access Pass before you eliminate the program for non-residents entirely.

Thank you for your consideration.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Joanna Low

Date comment received:

December 31, 2025 04:06 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

joannamlow1@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Dear Oregon State Parks Leadership,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the Disabled Veterans Special Access Pass (SAP). As the spouse of a service-connected disabled veteran and as part of a community that relies on Oregon's state parks, I am deeply concerned about the significant and harmful impact these changes would have on disabled veterans and their families.

Oregon's free camping program for disabled veterans was created as a meaningful gesture of gratitude, one that acknowledges both service and sacrifice while providing a tangible benefit that supports healing, stress reduction, and family connection. Access to nature is widely recognized as an important component of emotional and psychological well-being, and for many disabled veterans, these trips are one of the few accessible ways to reconnect with family and community while managing long-term service-connected limitations.

Reducing the camping benefit from 10 free nights every 30 days to just 10 free nights per year is not a modest adjustment. Many disabled veterans face physical limitations, financial strain, and health-related barriers that make other forms of recreation, travel, or lodging unrealistic. State parks offer an environment that is relatively accessible and adaptable to a wide range of abilities.

It is also important to recognize that many disabled veterans do not receive sufficient or consistent compensation, despite living with service-connected injuries that affect their daily lives. Long-term medical needs, reduced earning capacity, and ongoing emotional challenges already place significant strain on these families. Restricting access to low-cost outdoor recreation creates yet another barrier for individuals who have already sacrificed greatly in service to our country.

I understand the need to address budget constraints and improve system efficiency. I support stronger cancellation policies to prevent individuals from reserving multiple sites and leaving campsites unused, and I agree these policies should apply equally to pass holders, with cancellations counting toward usage limits. I also support higher fees for out-of-state visitors; while tourism is valuable, Oregon's state parks should remain accessible to Oregon residents, particularly given how difficult it already is to secure reservations.

However, the current proposal combines these reasonable reforms with a severe reduction in disabled veteran benefits, elimination of free day-use parking, and tighter reservation limits all at once. Oregon's

campgrounds routinely fill within minutes of reservations opening, often requiring residents to be online exactly six months in advance, demonstrating that demand remains extremely high. This raises serious questions about whether internal operational efficiencies or alternative cost-saving measures have been fully explored before targeting programs designed specifically to support disabled veterans and foster families. Implementing multiple major changes simultaneously, without first evaluating the impact of each adjustment, places a disproportionate burden on these groups while dismantling one of the few practical, meaningful benefits available to them in Oregon.

There are more balanced approaches that would preserve meaningful access for disabled veterans while still addressing fiscal concerns. Any changes should be proportional, data-driven, and carefully evaluated for their impact on those the program was created to support. A reduction of this magnitude, from ongoing monthly access to a strict annual cap, goes far beyond what is necessary and fundamentally alters the intent of the program. Adjustments that maintain regular, predictable access while improving system efficiency would better align with both budget realities and Oregon's commitment to disabled veterans.

This program does not serve all veterans, it serves those who continue to live with lasting physical, emotional, and financial impacts from their service. A reduction of this magnitude sends a discouraging message to individuals for whom access is already limited.

I respectfully urge Oregon State Parks to reconsider the severity and cumulative impact of these proposed changes and to adopt a more balanced, phased approach, one that reflects both fiscal responsibility and Oregon's commitment to honoring and supporting disabled veterans.

Thank you for considering public input. I hope your final decision preserves meaningful access for all disabled veterans this program was created to serve.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Grace Phillips

Date comment received:

December 31, 2025 04:10 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

gracelikesscience@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

The dynamic pricing is also disproportionately going to impact lower income visitors like myself who only get specific days off each year. The dynamic pricing is extremely disappointing and I fear it will price us out of utilizing our parks. There needs to be a lower income waiver option if this is to move forward--perhaps proof of SNAP, Medicaid, TANF, etc



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Wendy Giordano

Date comment received:

December 31, 2025 09:49 PM

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Both my husband and my father are service connected disabled veterans and avid outdoorsmen. The SAP camping benefit has made outdoor recreation affordable and accessible for our family. Time in Oregon's parks is not a luxury for them—it is a meaningful way to stay active, connected, and well after having given their health in service to our country. Reducing this benefit so drastically places a disproportionate burden on disabled veterans who rely on it.

I understand the need to balance budgets and manage increasing costs, but I urge the department to consider a middle-ground solution rather than such a steep cut. For example, allowing up to 50 free camping days per year, with a maximum of 10 days per month within that annual cap, would continue to honor veterans' service while still setting reasonable limits.

I would also like to comment on parking payment options. QR codes should not be the only method readily available. Not all visitors have smartphones, reliable service, or the ability to navigate digital-only systems. Please continue to offer alternative payment methods. Additionally, when a QR code is scanned, the initial screen should include a clear option to purchase an annual pass, which would improve usability and likely increase pass sales.

Finally, thank you to the Oregon State Parks staff, rangers, and volunteer hosts who make our parks such incredible places. Their work does not go unnoticed and is deeply appreciated.

Thank you for considering these comments.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Melissa Boomer

Date comment received:

December 31, 2025 10:21 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

melissadboomer@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Please do not consider dynamic pricing as it creates too much of a financial barrier for all Oregonians to access our beautiful parks.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 12:42 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

robertkolker.crso@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

As a disabled veteran, I am very disappointed with OPRD and it's decision to limit the number of days I can camp within the state park system. I was proud of the fact that my state representatives would honor my sacrifices with such a benefit that I utilize monthly when I am not volunteering as a State Park Volunteer Host.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Charlie Douglas

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 05:34 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

cldgls@icloud.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Hello

What prompted me to give feedback was my recent experience making a Washington State Park Reservation. I didn't make the reservation because it was too expensive. They have priced me out.

Dynamic Pricing - Please don't do this. Camping on a nice weekend in the summer should be a possibility for every family. It's hard for working families to get weekdays off. Don't penalize us by charging more to go on the weekend when that's the only time we can go. I wasn't able to make the reservation mentioned above. \$94 for 2 nights at a tent site was too much for me to pay.

Cancellation Changes - I do not like empty camp sites. This rule should be changed but I do not like the Washington State Park reservation model. The refund rate should be based on how time there is until the reservation date. For example, if it's 2 months or more before the reservation date then refund 100%. If the time period is less then refund less money. With that being said, there should be exceptions for extenuating circumstances.

Special Passes - I don't have an option on this topic.

Thank you for listening.

Charlie Douglas
Albany, OR



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Kristi Yee

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 06:49 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

Gradee2003@comcast.net

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I don't understand why a tent can camp in a RV site, BUT a RV can't park in a tent site.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Cornelius Dunbar

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 03:22 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

nealdunbar@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

We enjoy our parks and are happy to pay our share!



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Lisa Anacker

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 06:08 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

lisak80@hotmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I was disappointed to read that you are considering instituting dynamic pricing at the state parks. This seems to be the opposite of what state parks stand for-equitable access for everyone. I hope you reconsider.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Alicia Ryerson

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 07:55 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

goaskalice71@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I support the cancellation policies, which I think will help free up camping space for others.

With the day use fees, it would be nice if the fees were seasonally adjusted. For example, places that tend to be emptier in the winter months could have reduced fees, or vice versa with summer months.

I live in Redmond, OR and enjoy hiking at Smith Rock. But as a local, we tend to try to find periods when it's less crowded with tourists, such as the winter. If we had reduced fees for local and frequent visitors during off-seasons, that would be great.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Leo Durand

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 08:21 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

joethetourist@live.ca

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Having spent an accumulation of years in your parks in the last three decades, I think the changes are well overdue. Have never understood why the no vacancy signs are always up and sites remain empty. Booking in Jan & Feb for the summer has always been an issue when RV sites get booked for 1&2 by secondary resellers. You should even consider offering the 6 month in advance booking for 14 day stay only, 5 month advance booking 7-14 nights and 4 months for any length up to 14 nights. Imposing more penalties for 7 - 30 day cancellations, non refundable at 48 hours with late arrival options to hold reservation. Just a few thoughts from a loyal supporter of Oregon Parks.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Alison Funk

Date comment received:

January 1, 2026 10:21 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

alison4226@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Camping at OSPs has been my family's way of affordable vacation for the past 5 years. We have made so many memories renting the cabins and appreciate that our children will grow up with these experiences. Seeing the recent change to fees is disheartening. Rather than deeply assessing operational costs and being better stewards with resources, fees are planned to not just increase, but at a rate that is outrageous. I can now reserve an Airbnb with a bathroom, wash machine, etc. for nearly the same price as a small, rustic cabin at Silver Falls. There are no new benefits or amenities to justify the cost, just a higher fee. I recall the video shown at Silver Creek where families from the 50s and 60s were camping at Silver Creek and I think about how far a reality that is now. To spend hundreds of dollars for what used to be an assessable option for weekend fun, is now out of reach for many of us. I also am disappointed that the fees are seasonal. The cabins always fill up, always. So now, to make it more expensive during summer, just because you can, is disappointing.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

BRITTANY HIGUERA

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 04:48 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

mccolmbrittany@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Hello,

Personally I understand not giving refunds for no shows and same day cancellations (!-(!:s acceptable. I disagree strongly with changing & adjusting the prices due to holidays, popular dates. That is NOT okay by any means & price gauging considering that it's already more expensive to camp than ever before. It's camping, not an AirBNB. Please take into consideration of what can happen if you push out people who actively camp with pricing to "once in awhile" people. If it becomes unaffordable, these parks will suffer in the long run because no one will be able to afford it except the 1%.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Becky Chase

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 05:36 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

ricandbec@live.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

First, thank you for all the beautiful state parks we have in Oregon! We are avid campers and day users. Have been residents all our lives and as we've traveled to several states the past

1 1/2 years, tell many people they must visit Oregon!

We realize costs of everything has and will continue to rise. One huge possible change we saw listed was changing the Foster and Adoption Families and, Oregon Veterans Pass from 10 days free camping to just 10 days per year. Yes, 10 days a month is a lot. But so is your possible cut to just 10 days per year. Our Foster/Adoption families and Veterans have done a lot for many kids and Veterans for not just our country but also our state. To get time in the great outdoors with family and friends, sitting around campfires and visiting rather than being on cell phones and computers playing games, is a powerful emotional and mental tool.

Please consider not cutting these down so dramatically per year. Or offer half price camping like other government agencies do for up to a specified amount of nights per month.

Even 2 - 3 free nights per month would help both the state with operating costs but still allow Foster/Adoption and Veteran families to still be able to enjoy our parks.

Increase costs even higher for out of state residents.

With so many state parks using volunteers that have free camping in exchange for working, that has helped with maintenance fees.

Please consider not such drastic cut backs on the Foster/Adoption and Veterans families.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Ernest Drake

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 04:36 PM

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

The proposed reduction to the SAP waived fee days from 120 to 10 days a year is over correction. While my family has not ever used the entire 120 days, we have appreciated the opportunity to do so and feel the proposed change is an arbitrary.

I do support the restriction of SAP to Oregon residents. In fact, I didn't realize that was not already the case.

Also, dynamic pricing is so unfair to the park user. Operating costs do not change on a daily basis, there is no reason other than maximizing profit at the expense of the user to use dynamic pricing. If the point of the parks is to allow Oregonians to experience our natural beauty, don't change the rules to punish Oregonians.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Natalie Bennon

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 04:41 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

nataliepdx@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I would like to also see a Special Access discount for Oregon public school teachers and employees.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Robert Ridder

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 07:41 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

robertmrider@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I am writing in support of these proposed rule changes, specifically reducing refunds on cancelled reservations. There's an obvious problem of many people overbooking with no concrete intentions of using the actual reservation. For the past 3 years I have used a third party service that would notify me of last minute cancellations. I would consistently be able to get a reservation somewhere on the dates I wanted. Even then, a very high percentage of camp sites would be reserved and remain empty. I've spoken to campers who make two week reservations, with the intention of only intending to use one weekend within those dates. They cancel the other reservations because it costs little to nothing to do this. I also support reducing the special access pass benefits, only because the resource offered, site reservations, is such a finite resource. Hopefully, these rule changes will increase actual use, boost revenue for our state parks, and allow more casual users the ability to enjoy our state parks.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Nina Baurer

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 10:50 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

ninabaurer@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Oregon State Parks need to be accessible to Oregonians. The proposed fee hikes and diminished refunds will price many families out of being able to use Oregon State Parks. I can support the portion about not refunding any fees for people who do not cancel prior to the date of arrival.

I cannot support such wide fee ranges that would allow additional fee increases without oversight.

I propose dramatically increasing fees on out of state visitors. Camping fees for out of state guests are currently only slightly higher than residents. This could change. Other states charge a much higher rate for out of state campers.

This non resident fee increase could also apply to day use parking. Any vehicle with an out of state license plate could be charged a higher day use fee. A higher priced year long pass could also be available to those who will visit our parks multiple days.

The bottom line is that we need to keep Oregon State Parks available for Oregonians.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Mike Atkinson

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 11:46 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

mokiea.ma@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

The proposed decrease in disabled veteran no charge camping days is too excessive. Disabled Vets should be recognized for their sacrifice. Reducing so severely is wrong . A more modest reduction should be considered.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Bob VanDerhoff

Date comment received:

January 2, 2026 11:52 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

bob@vanderhoff.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I recognize that Oregon is the only state to offer camping benefits to out of state disabled veterans. I have had my pass for 5 years and have not used it in the past 4. It's not so much about the money, but I was so proud of Oregon for respecting all disabled vets. When I was discharged in 1973, Vietnam era veterans were not appreciated and often treated poorly. So thank you for your respect for those of us who served and are permanently disabled as a result. Please consider keeping the existing policy or, at least, honor existing passes until they expire.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Gordon Treber

Date comment received:

January 3, 2026 05:01 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

gordontreber@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

As an Oregon disabled Vet, I oppose the rule change of 10 days a month to 10 days a year. Perhaps go with 7 days a month.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Nicole Smith

Date comment received:

January 4, 2026 10:17 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

travelingketocat@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I understand the business needs and constraints given the current financial climate, for the parks compared to cost of operations. Out of all the proposed fee changes, the refund and cancellation changes feel fair and in line with other lodging policies, which is okay.

However, the dynamic pricing feels more predatory and restrictive to all family financial backgrounds. Pricing sites higher for the most in-demand days of the week or for more in demand parks puts families who otherwise could afford these trips, at a disadvantage from when it was all equal.

I encourage you to explore other options and not move forward with dynamic pricing.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Jenny Lupton

Date comment received:

January 4, 2026 03:59 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

jenberst@hotmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

The vendor fees are already too much, I will not vote for this administration if these changes go into affect.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Doyle Crampton

Date comment received:

January 4, 2026 06:16 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

doyle.crampton@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Oregon State Leadership,

In regards

To the proposed rule changes to access and fees to state parks I have a couple of concerns. First as a fourth generation Oregonian I believe Oregon State Parks should be accessible to all Oregonians. Implementing a variable price schedule that increases fees due to demand and time of year will make staying at Oregon State Park only available to those with more financial means. This seems not only wrong but not a very Oregon thing to do.

Second, as a service connected Veteran, reducing Veterans access by over 90 percent gives our sacrifice the middle finger.

Oregon has over 250 sites taking reservations year around seven days a week. I do not see Oregons disabled Veterans population stopping Oregonians from being able to stay at an Oregon State Park.

Keep Oregon parks Oregon parks and respect those that served and sacrificed. Fail to do so will be an epic failure of Oregons leadership.

Sincerely,

Doyle E. Crampton



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

TK Smith

Date comment received:

January 4, 2026 06:44 PM

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

We choose parks in Oregon because they are better than any other state I've visited. The campgrounds that OR State Parks provide offer better services, better facilities and better access to the beautiful natural resources of public lands. The reservation system is better than all other surrounding states (WA, ID and CA all have serious problems), and the current refund policy allows working people with demanding jobs flexibility when emergencies come up. A 3-7 day cancellation policy is more than fair, and falls in line with all other travel/lodging industries. There is absolutely a problem with no shows and people not respecting the cancellation policy in place. And those who choose not to follow the rules should be charged, but let's not punish the people who are playing by the rules. Getting reservations is incredibly hard. Planning my summer 6 months out is necessary to get the spaces desired and changes are sometimes needed. This new cancellation policy does nothing to address the demand for campsites or people misusing the facilities, it only generates income. I always pay the user fees when I make reservations, I never call the phone center asking for an exception to the rules. Let's enforce the current system and make changes where there are cracks before we punish everyone. Things that are regularly abused, no shows or last minute/day of cancellations, should have charges for the entire reservation. Also park staff/volunteers need to do a better job of opening up those sites for new arrivals. Many times sites sit unfilled with reserved tags on them because no one showed up.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Date comment received:

January 4, 2026 08:29 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

rodgers_chrystal@hotmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Dear ORPD,

As the wife of a Disabled Oregon Veteran, I am opposed to the reduction of benefits to the Special Access Pass. This will be very detrimental to our family, as our number one hobby is camping! We enjoy camping in Oregon State Parks year-round! The parks provide a healthy way to help my husband and family balance mental, emotional and physical wellness. A planned trip to the Oregon State park gives everyone something to look forward to! Time in the coastal forest, on the pacific shores, in the Cascade Mountains or lakes, Blue Mountain Forest or along the riverbanks can rejuvenate the mind, body and soul. This has been something that is a big relief for my husband who deals with service-related disabilities that don't allow him to participate in other activities, cause sleepless nights, mental and emotional stress. Reducing the Special Access Pass for veteran's and foster families by 92% is taking away from veteran's and foster families well-being. This is one of the few ways that Oregon Thanks their veteran's. If you don't know or have a veteran in your family, you may not know what they proudly did to serve our Country and State. Their service was not easy, and it was not something you wanted to do, but they did it for us! Please don't take the Special Access Pass away from people who served this state and country for you!

Thanks for your consideration,

Chrystal Rodgers



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Christine Valentine

Date comment received:

January 4, 2026 11:53 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

cvalentinebking@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Commission Members and OPRD Director,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed changes to OPRD rules governing the campsite system (fees, reservations, refunds, waivers, etc.). Your collective ongoing work to manage our wonderful state parks is much appreciated by this Oregonian and certainly by many other residents of our fine state.

I want to share the following concerns with the proposed rules, which are largely organized in the order of topics found in the background information posted on the OPRD webpage for Division 15 Rulemaking:

Reservations/Cancellations

The rulemaking completely ignores the true “elephant in the

room”, which is that OPRD has created a campsite reservation system where individuals who want to camp for a multiple day stretch any time between May and October must make reservations 6 months to the day before they want to arrive. If you do not make a reservation exactly 6 months to the day, chances are extremely slim to none that you will find a site, especially if looking for a full hookup site or site of specific dimensions. The problem with people cancelling reservations or being no shows undoubtedly stems from having to make reservations this far in advance. A lot of life can intervene in that 6-month period. But if you want to be assured of having a campsite for more than a day or 2 during the prime camping months, you have to play the game that OPRD has created because everyone else is playing that game. If you do not make your reservations 6 months ahead, you are locked out as others will have reserved all the sites that will work for you. Why not reduce the 6 month period some? Or why not hold some % of campsites that can only be reserved by Oregon residents perhaps 3 months ahead of time? I suspect that it is Oregonians who pay the price for a lot of the no shows and late cancellations, as it is nearly impossible to find a campsite to reserve on short notice, yet you say many sit empty.

The rulemaking background material refers to revisions to refund, change, and cancellation policies to reduce the amount of refund available or the cancellation charge based on how close to arrival a change/cancellation is requested. But then the rule contains none of the details of what is actually proposed. OAR 736-015-0015 contains proposed language about how reservation changes/cancellations will be per instructions found on the OPRD website. It is disingenuous to say you are accepting comments on these policies as part of this rulemaking when the rule does not contain the specifics. I am not opposed to reasonable charges for cancellations/changes or certainly for no shows. But it is impossible to comment on policies that are not fully disclosed. This is ironic since a stated purpose for the rulemaking is to “create clearer rules for cancellations and no shows.” That purpose is NOT accomplished by the rulemaking.

There is language in OAR 736-015-0015 which states “a person may not make reservations for multiple park areas for the same date range.” This is existing language, but to my knowledge this has not been followed. I am aware of individuals being able to hold reservations for the same time period at two different state parks. It appears this was not supposed to be allowed but that the OPRD Reserve America vendor has allowed this. Perhaps this is an area that can be addressed to reduce late cancellations and no shows. (An as an aside, please change from Reserve America or make them improve!!)

Fee Ranges/Increases

I am not opposed to fee increases, as OPRD campsites have been lagging behind the cost of similar and sometimes less desirable campsites in private campgrounds. But the use of dynamic pricing and fee ranges in the rules should be accompanied by language in the rule that requires some kind of public process to announce proposed fee increases and allow for public comment. This may be what will happen in the future, but the rules appear to allow the Director to implement fee changes without any public process. That is a sure fire way to get the public up in arms, so why not commit in rule to a public review process. OPRD states in the background information posted on its Division 15 rulemaking page that “actual pricing decisions are made later through a public process”, but then why no requirement in rule for that public process? Instead, I only see language proposed for OAR 736-015-0010 that gives total authority to change the rates and charge additional service fees on top of base rates.

A related concern is that fees and policies in place at the time of reservation should always be honored. Increased fees or changes to refund/change/cancellation policies should apply only to future reservations. Those reserving campsites can only acknowledge and agree to the conditions that apply at the time a reservation is made, plus all fees are paid then. I do not see this addressed in the rules.

Special Access Permits

I do not have experience with the special access pass program but wonder if this is the best or most ethical area of the camping program to look to save money. I may support applying the same no show or change/cancellation policies but am not a fan of the other changes proposed. I trust the Commission and Director will carefully consider public comments submitted by those who are directly impacted.

Day Use Parking Permits

It is unfortunate that OPRD will need to start charging day use fees at so many more parks, but I understand the budget situation. I hope that the Commission and Director will consider the impact on lower-income families. I'm not sure how this might be done, perhaps a way for a fee waiver based on total household income disclosed at the time of permit purchase?

Have the costs associated with having to enforce day use fees at so many more parks been considered? If day use fees are not enforced, then those paying will be rightly upset.

As for license plate recognition, I have no objection to use of modern technology to help with enforcement but do strongly recommend that an individual purchasing a day use permit be allowed to connect more than 1 car to the permit. Many families have 2 cars, and a family may have reasons for having to use a different car at different times and should not have to buy a permit per car. OPRD could limit the # of cars to 2 and require the license plates #s to be provided at the time of permit purchase. This would reduce the impact of the day use fee program on families.

Other

I noticed that OAR 736-015-0040 contains proposed language stating "detached trailers are assessed as a separate vehicle from the tow vehicle." What is the purpose of adding this language into the rule? Is this to allow OPRD to charge anyone bringing a travel trailer, boat, or fifth wheel the ability to charge an additional vehicle parking fee on top of the campsite fee? But if you have a RV without a separate car then no extra fee? If so, I am strongly opposed to that change. There should only be an extra charge if the tow vehicle does not fit on the campsite with whatever equipment it towed. The rule language needs to be revised to be clearer about what is intended here.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments and for all the work you do for Oregon State Parks.

Sincerely,

Christine Valentine

Proud Oregonian and frequent visitor to Oregon
State Parks



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Marian Granby

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 01:24 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

marianelaine11@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

WHY DON'T YOU FOLLOW OTHER STATES AND CHARGE OUT OF STATE CAMPERS TWICE WHAT OREGON CITIZENS PAY. WE PAY DOUBLE WHEN WW STAY IN CAMPGROUNDS IN OTHER STATES.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Robert Scott

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 02:35 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

rascott33@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Oregon State Park Committee,

While I do understand the need to ensure revenue streams for the Parks and solve the budget shortfall, there is one rule change that I feel is a gross overstep. Specifically, the 91.6 percent reduction in special access pass. Reducing the benefit so drastically to the population that has served this Nation or is serving the foster care system is a major destruction of benefits. If the committee wanted to reduce to only Oregon residents, as suggested, which also would match what other states have done could help reduce the impact. But as a disabled veteran who uses the benefit I find it appalling the proposed rule change.

I do agree with some of the other changes that I do feel would increase usage, stop people from booking and not using or cancelling late and still getting a refund.

I look forward to a positive rule update, without sacrificing the hard work of veterans and foster families in Oregon. Do not deprive us of a benefit that we sacrifice to be able to enjoy the great outdoor. We have given to the State of Oregon and this nation, we should not have benefits removed.

Thanks
Robert Scott



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Sarah Letterman

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 04:28 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

esletterman@comcast.net

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Hello,

I saw online that there are proposed new rules regarding reservations for camping in Oregon State Parks. While I understand the need for rules with regards to no shows and making an early reservation, then cancelling the first few days. I do not agree with the limit of 10 nights of free camping for Special pass holders, unless there is to be decent discounts (at least 50%-75% off) for pass holders that exceed the 10 nights.

I agree with the current rule of not allowing a refund for the beginning nights of a longer reservation when the entire reservation is not cancelled. I feel an option for pass holders that would make this rule more fair to those that pay full would be to simply require a pass holder to cancel the full reservation and flag no shows of more than 1 consecutive night to not allow future reservations that year. The reasoning for 1 consecutive night is that sometimes a disabled person needs more set up time and arriving after 4pm limits the time available so quite often, a reservation is made for the night before with the

anticipation of arrival early the next day.

Access

to campsites that have electric hookups is quite limited in Oregon unless you are using a State park. The free areas to camp in Oregon are often not appropriate for a disabled camper. As the wife of a disabled Veteran, I can tell you that having limited affordable availability to Oregon State Parks Campgrounds will make it much harder for us to find acceptable sites to camp. I feel that someone that has served our country, and now has a disability due to it, should have free or affordable access to all Oregon Parks and the services they have to offer, without daily limitations.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Sarah Letterman



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 04:29 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

js3844@yahoo.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

To the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission,

I am writing as a resident of Canby, Oregon, to submit formal testimony regarding the proposed updates to **OAR 736-015 (Division 15)**.

As

a long-term supporter of our parks, I find the logic behind these

proposed fee structures to be both arrogant and economically regressive.

Specifically, I wish to address the following points for the public record:

1. The 140% Annual Cost Increase for Residents

While

the Department characterizes the new 12-month permit as a "doubling" of

fees (from \$30 to \$60), the reality for loyal Oregonians who utilized

the 24-month bulk permit (\$50, or \$25/year) is a

140% annual increase

.

By eliminating the 24-month option, the Department is disproportionately targeting its most frequent users—local residents—to

bridge a budget gap that should be addressed through administrative

efficiency, not by penalizing loyalty.

2. Opposition to "Dynamic Pricing" (\$7-\$25 Range)

I strongly oppose the proposed range for daily parking fees of **\$7 to \$25**

.

Public land is a trust, not a market commodity.

Implementing "surge

pricing" based on demand treats our state parks like a private

hospitality business. A \$25 daily fee would effectively ban

lower-income

families from visiting "premium" parks like Silver Falls or Champoeg

during the only times they are likely able to visit: weekends and holidays.

3. Misallocation of Funds (The "Country Club" vs. Operations)

It is galling to be told the Department is facing a \$14 million operations shortfall when millions in **GO Bond funds** have been earmarked for "deluxe" expansions at parks like Champoeg. Investing **\$4-5 million**

in new cabins and high-end RV sites while simultaneously doubling fees

on local day-users proves that the agency has prioritized a "Country

Club" hospitality model over its core mission of providing affordable

public access.

4. Regressive Impact on Seniors and Families

As

a retiree on a fixed income, I see these fees as a "parking tax" that ignores the taxpayer's ability to pay. When \$10 (or a potential \$25) becomes the "cover charge" for a walk in the woods, the Department has officially transitioned from a public service to a pay-to-play luxury.

I urge the Commission to reject the dynamic pricing model, restore the 24-month permit for Oregon residents at a reasonable rate, and reallocate existing capital funds toward basic operations rather than luxury expansions.

Sincerely,
Joseph Shaddix
Canby, Oregon



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 04:30 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

patandjenstravels@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Public Comment on Proposed Division 15 Rulemaking — Special Access Pass (SAP)

January 1, 2026

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Special Access Pass (SAP) program. As a disabled Oregon veteran, I appreciate the work OPRD is doing to address budget challenges while maintaining access to Oregon's state parks.

1. Oregon Has Been One of the Most Generous States in the Country

Oregon's current SAP program is among the most generous in the United States for disabled Oregon veterans. Oregon allows 10 free camping nights per calendar month, and very few states offer free camping to disabled veterans from

any state, as Oregon currently does. Only Oregon and Washington provide free camping for foster families.

This generosity reflects Oregon's longstanding commitment to supporting families and honoring those who served. As the state faces a budget shortfall, it is reasonable to reassess the structure of the SAP program. However, it is equally important to preserve the values that have guided Oregon's approach for decades.

2. Support for Limiting SAP Eligibility to Oregon Residents

I support the proposal to limit SAP eligibility to Oregon residents. This ensures that limited resources are directed toward Oregon families and Oregon veterans. It is a fair and practical adjustment that aligns the program with its intended purpose.

3. Foster Family Benefits Can Be Responsibly Adjusted

Only Oregon and Washington offer free camping for foster families, making Oregon an outlier nationally. Foster families include children who attend school, meaning most camping occurs during school breaks. For this reason, it is reasonable to adjust the benefit to a more sustainable level while still providing meaningful access.

Reasonable alternatives include:

- 10 free camping days per calendar year
- 10 days per year at a 50% discount
- A hybrid model combining a small number of free nights with additional discounted nights

These options maintain support for foster families while bringing Oregon closer to national norms.

4. Disabled Oregon Veterans Should Continue to Receive Enhanced Benefits

Disabled veterans represent a unique group with lifelong service-connected needs. Oregon's

current program — offering 10 free nights per month — has been a meaningful expression of gratitude and support. As a disabled Oregon veteran myself, I can attest to the value and impact of this benefit.

OPRD's own rulemaking notice states that 80% of pass holders do not camp more than 10 nights per year, meaning only 20% exceed that threshold. However, OPRD has not indicated how many individuals make up this 20%, how many are disabled Oregon veterans, and how many are foster families. Without this information, it is impossible to know whether disabled Oregon veterans — the group with service-connected need — are the primary users of the current monthly benefit.

For many disabled Oregon veterans, regular, monthly access to Oregon's state parks is not a luxury — it is a critical component of mental-health stability. Time outdoors, time in nature, and time away from stressors are well-documented supports for veterans living with PTSD, chronic pain, anxiety, depression, and other service-connected conditions. The ability to visit parks consistently throughout the year provides grounding, routine, and relief that cannot be replicated by a small annual allotment of camping nights.

I want to share a personal example. I am writing this comment from an Oregon state park where I chose to spend New Year's in order to avoid the noise of fireworks. Even in the open loops, the park is nearly empty. This is a clear example of why off-season access should not be restricted. There is no apparent operational or financial reason to limit disabled Oregon veterans from using parks during times when occupancy is extremely low.

With this in mind, more balanced alternatives could include:

- Maintaining a higher annual allotment for disabled Oregon veterans than for foster families
- Offering a combination of free nights and discounted nights
- Preserving monthly benefits but at a reduced number of nights
- Allowing more nights during off-season months and fewer during peak season

These approaches would honor Oregon's commitment to disabled Oregon veterans while still addressing budget realities.

5. If OPRD Intends to Reduce Disabled Oregon Veteran Benefits by More Than 90%, Detailed Transparency Is Essential

If OPRD intends to move

forward with a reduction of this magnitude, it is essential that the agency provide clear, detailed, and publicly accessible information explaining the basis for such a change. This is especially important because OPRD's own proposal acknowledges that only 20% of pass holders use more than 10 nights per year — yet the agency has not disclosed how many individuals this represents, how many are disabled Oregon veterans, or whether disabled Oregon veterans are the primary users of the current monthly benefit.

Disabled Oregon veterans deserve to understand the reasoning behind any decision that would dramatically reduce a benefit that has long supported their well-being.

6. Conclusion

I support limiting SAP eligibility to Oregon residents and adjusting foster-family benefits to align with national norms. However, I strongly urge OPRD to preserve enhanced benefits for disabled Oregon veterans, who have earned meaningful and sustained support from the state they call home. Oregon should not move from being one of the most generous states in the country to one of the least generous when it comes to honoring disabled Oregon veterans — especially when regular access to state parks plays such a vital role in their mental health and quality of life.

Thank you for considering this comment and for your continued work to support Oregon families and Oregon veterans.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Moloney

Disabled Oregon Veteran



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 04:34 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

nicholaus.wolchesky@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

To Oregon Parks and Recreation Department,

I'm

writing as a lifelong Oregonian and a disabled veteran with over 20 years of service, including combat deployments to Iraq, to strongly oppose the proposed reductions to the Disabled Veteran Special Access Pass.

This program is not a perk I "take advantage of." It's one of the few public-facing commitments that feels like Oregon is looking veterans in the eye and saying, "We meant it." The parks have been a lifeline for me and for the people closest to me—one of the most reliable ways I can reconnect with friends and family in a setting that lowers stress, calms the noise, and makes it easier to be present. We use this pass almost monthly because it actually works: it turns a beautiful idea into something accessible, predictable, and real.

The

proposed changes—especially dropping camping from the current structure to a 10-night annual cap and tightening access in ways that functionally shrink the benefit—would take a program with measurable impact and reduce it to something symbolic. For veterans who use the outdoors as a reset and a reconnection point, that shift isn't "sustainability." It's a retreat from the very purpose of the pass.

There's

also a practical side that is getting lost in the math. Even when

camping nights are waived, we are not “free users.” We routinely purchase firewood and supplies, stop in gift shops, and spend money in nearby towns—gas, groceries, meals, and local businesses that benefit directly from our visits. The pass doesn’t eliminate spending; it redirects it. It’s the difference between staying home and actually showing up—at parks and in communities.

I’ll be blunt

about my own experience: before I was eligible for this pass, my family and I went nearly two decades without using Oregon State Parks. Not because we don’t value them, but because the costs add up and the value proposition didn’t feel reachable. The Special Access Pass changed that. It brought us back. If the benefit is scaled down to the point that it no longer meaningfully offsets the barrier, you will predictably lose people like us again—along with the downstream spending and the community ties the parks help sustain.

If OPRD needs

tools to manage demand and budget pressure, there are smarter options than sharply reducing the benefit for disabled veterans: seasonal or peak-weekend limits, modest co-pays above a reasonable threshold, a tiered approach that preserves meaningful access, or tightening cancellation policies without gutting the core value. But a flat annual cap that turns a living benefit into a token gesture is the wrong answer.

Please do not move forward with the proposed cuts. Keep this program meaningful. Keep it accessible. Keep Oregon’s “thank you” tangible.

Respectfully,

Nicholaus C Wolchesky, SGT
U.S. Army & Oregon Army National Guard
Canby, Oregon



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 04:35 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

rosenburg639130@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Good day,

It is my understanding. There is a plan to vote on changes to the special access pass for disabled veterans. Reducing free access from 10 days per month and removing free day passes altogether..

Please take note that this disabled and retired veteran would find this displeasing.

We veterans appreciate whatever we can reclaim from the citizens we swore to protect and forfeit our younger years for foreign service and in many cases combat.

Please reconsider this Change/Amendment as it is a slap in the face to card carrying disabled veterans.

Respectfully;

Douglas Rosenberg

Grants Pass, OR



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Chuck Halva

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 07:29 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

chuck.halva@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

I disagree with the proposed reduction of the veterans special access pass from 10 days per month to 10 days per year. Please keep the monthly benefit and reduce it to 7 days.



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Ron Kasco

Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 11:26 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

rkasco@mac.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

As a 100% service-connected disabled Army Veteran, I want to register my concern that Oregon will no longer allow a fee waiver to disabled veterans if they are not Oregon residents. When I served, I swore to defend the entire nation in whatever capacity the government deemed necessary. I have enjoyed and appreciated Oregon state parks and hope to continue to. Please considered not eliminating this most valuable benefit



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Bruce McCoy

Date comment received:

January 6, 2026 03:38 AM

Commenter email (if provided):

realmccoysurf@aol.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

Hi

I am a disabled Vet with a State Park Pass - the new rule

I have a problem with is the change in that pass - I feel the veteran's who are now in the program should be grandfathered in - taking away veterans benefits shouldn't be one of your solutions - thank you for your time -



Submit a public comment on a rule

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Commenter name (if provided):

Shellie Piske

Date comment received:

January 6, 2026 04:39 PM

Commenter email (if provided):

spiske65@gmail.com

Location (if provided): {city}, {state}

Public comment:

First of all these rules are too confusing for most people using our state parks! Secondly it's becoming increasingly unattainable for low income families or families in general to camp in Oregon or enjoy our state parks. We already pay enough taxes in this state! Third specifically with cost increases regarding yurts, it's becoming inaccessible to a lot of families already due to the price increases that have already been instituted. They are rustic, no cooking inside, noisy heater fans, hard mattresses, restroom far away, etc. If they become any more costly it will not make sense to stay in a yurt when you can stay in a very comfortable motel room for not much more. NO MORE FEES OR TAX INCREASES!