



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Date comment received:**

January 5, 2026 04:37 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

marklroberts@me.com

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

**Public comment:**

NO, we do not want unmanned airships, drones, or other comparable devices overflying Oregon Parks.

If people want to fly their own, personal devices, they should do so over their very own property. They should use their own personal property and NOT over publicly held properties.

These devices both produce unpleasant buzzing sound let alone act as an unacceptable invasion of personal privacy.

Public places are for public enjoyment - not an imposition of personal desires to fly personal property.

There is no place for private aircraft over public parks.

Mark Roberts



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

### Date comment received:

January 5, 2026 04:38 PM

### Commenter email (if provided):

ebruttledge@gmail.com

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

### Public comment:

My name is Ed Ruttledge. My primary residence is 295 Church Street, SE # 404 in Salem. For the past 30 years, I have also owned a home three hundred yards east of the shoreline at Tierra Del Mar. This home is located between Cape Kiwanda State Park and Sitka Sedge State Natural Area.

I am a semi-professional photographer. My photographic and video content has been used by the State of Oregon, the Cascade Volcano Observatory as well as a myriad of non-profit organizations. In 2014 I started incorporating the new perspective of drone photography in my work. As the FAA added more regulatory oversight of “Small Unmanned Aerial Systems” or “drones” as we know them, I acquired the FAA remote pilot certification in 2019. Thus, I am a FAA Part 107 certificated UAS pilot. I am also a “registered” UAS pilot in Ireland. Further, I served on OPRD’s drone “workgroup” in 2022 and 2023.

I support the adoption of the Draft Rule.

### Interests

vary. Oregonians and visitors to our scenic state go hiking, climbing, camping, fishing, clamming, birding, riding, hang gliding, surfing, wind surfing, boating ... an endless list of activities. Some of these activities may be regulated to some degree by OPRD. But NONE are subject to an across-the board system-wide ban. And, yes, there will be circumstances when one citizen’s interests could potentially interfere with another’s. OPRD must balance a myriad of interests and concerns for

all - using valid criteria and thoughtful consideration.

The proposed rules avoid imposing a broad based prohibition of drone missions over our parks and shoreline while articulating some well considered restrictions and protocols.

As a homeowner near the shoreline within a mile of a Western Snowy Plover Management Area, I strongly urge OPRD to adopt the provisions regarding visitor conduct for Oregon's ocean shore. Further, I urge that the provisions regarding these management areas to be extended to Part 103 aircraft ("ultralights"). I have personally observed such aircraft launch from the northern base of Cape Kiwanda and fly as low as about four feet AGL over the probable nesting sites at Sitka Sedge State Natural Area.

Notification is important. UAS pilots have become very sophisticated in the past couple of years. Even "recreational" drone pilots are now required by the FAA to pass an aeronautical knowledge and safety test called the Recreational UAS Safety Test (TRUST) and be able to provide proof of passage if asked by law enforcement or FAA personnel. I t is estimated that over 660,000 people have obtained the TRUST certificate. Further, an additional 400,000 people have passed a rigorous test to obtain a Part 107 certification to qualify for piloting UAS aircraft for purposes beyond recreational use. As UAS pilots have improved their skills, they have also become more attentive to notices and warnings that could impact their ability to fly their aircraft. Posting and maintaining up to date website maps and signage is imperative. Establishing a dedicated mobile app providing such information would be even better.

I wish to thank OPRD, its staff and volunteers who have worked on this issue for the past four years.

Ed Ruttledge  
Salem/Tierra Del Mar, Oregon USA



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Steven Little

**Date comment received:**

January 5, 2026 09:24 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

steven.little52@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

The last thing I want to hear in a Oregon park is the bussing of a drone, nothing would upset me more.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

kent stevens

**Date comment received:**

January 5, 2026 10:17 PM

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

**Public comment:**

I suggest you let drone operators with no restrictions. Oregon State Parks has already turned Gleneden Beach into a rock quarry and gave EV bikes free range so why stop now, Quality of life has taken a dive on our beaches. Kent Stevens



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Tom Sayre

**Date comment received:**

January 6, 2026 12:56 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

tomdsayre@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I haven't viewed the committee meetings nor have read the proposed rules, but do have a few general thoughts for consideration.

I hope there has been a copious amount of documented drone usage complaints from park users and/or park rangers, and these additional rules aren't being initiated for the sake of making predictions. This recreational trend should be supported in parks with little to no regulation, unless it's creating a sensible amount of undue burden on park goers and/or wildlife. Current OPRD rules already contain many prohibited and limiting activities, what's next spending resources on regulating kite flying?

Respectfully, at a time when OPRD has substantially increased user fees and continues to allocate resources for things like additional regulations, doesn't seem like a good look especially for those Oregonians who now can't even afford to take their family picnicking at a state park.

Not saying this work isn't important, but maybe it's time to reevaluate

OPRD's spending priorities and address the real needs of Oregonians, like just visiting a park.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

DYLAN FERAL-MCWHIRTER

**Date comment received:**

January 6, 2026 02:45 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

dfmcwhir@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I oppose the rule changes as written.

I can't find the draft of the purposed rules from the last time this was discussed in 2022, but looking at the current draft, to my eyes, they look roughly the same and doesn't address the mountains of concerns that drone operators raised last time.

I feel that the last time this was discussed, the vast majority of the comments for implementing the rules on UAS in state parks mostly came down to people not liking drones rather than citing actual damage/harm caused by them. In any public space, the way some people choose to enjoy it may be to the detriment of the way other people choose to enjoy it. I feel that a lot of people who want to restrict UAS operations are completely willing to diminish other peoples enjoyment (ie flying drones) to avoid the risk that their own enjoyment MIGHT be diminished. In my mind that just isn't fair.

I know that there are also concerns about UAS operations disturbing wildlife and I don't want to ignore that. But I feel that to a large degree that argument is overstated or applied is applied too much to large of areas.

My proposed changes to rules are:

1. In the case that UAS operations are restricted from an area due to wildlife/ecological concerns, there is some sort of data, expert input, and/or study that shows it that UAS operations in that specific area are more harmful than other allowed activities in that specific area (include hiking, motorized and non-motorized vehicles, pets, etc).
2. All state parks should allow UAS operations by default unless they are restricted rather than restricting UAS operations by default unless allowed.
3. In the case(s) that UAS operations are restricted from a state park for non-wildlife/ecological reasons, there should be a schedule of times/days where UAS operations are allowed in the



park, such as on odd days of the month they are not allowed, on even days they are. That would be a semi-fair way to allow everybody to enjoy the parks in the manor of their own choosing.

I think the other big issue that the rules don't/cant address is related to the fact that the UAS' in the air are regulated by the FAA. If I choose to stand on a public road outside of a state park and fly over state park property, there isn't anything the state can realistically do about that any more than the state can stop a jet plane from flying over the park. That same issue applies if someone operates a UAS from an allowed area in a state park but the drone itself flies outside that area. I understand states and local governments can stop people from holding UAS remotes on parts/all of their property, but only the federal government can stop a UAS from moving through the air regardless of what it is above. For good or bad, the FAA says they own all the airspace from the ground up whether that is over public or private property.

Because of that last issue, I think it is in the state's best interests to work with UAS pilots to try to fairly accommodate them rather than trying too overly restrict them. For instance, if the draft rules are put into effect and some popular place along the coast is restricted, I or other UAS operators may be more likely fly from cliffs, etc near but outside state park property without knowing if flying from those areas may be more harmful to wildlife (nesting birds, etc).



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

erik Maass

**Date comment received:**

January 6, 2026 04:43 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

maasserik92@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I would like to see a maximum distance from Operator and a minimum distance from people. This will help prevent loss, disturbance of public space and user conflict.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

M J Basti

**Date comment received:**

January 6, 2026 04:52 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

unicycledog2@protonmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I am strongly opposed to the general public use of drones in state parks. The proposed rules have a few contradictions: For eg 1 3. c states the drone area May cover the entire park yet other places in the document list certain places within the park are off limits.

My opposition for drone use are the following:

1. drones are noisy - the high pitch buzzing sets off some dogs to barking because it hurts their ears. Barking dogs then are perceived as a nuisance. Some of us go to parks for the quiet peaceful experience of being outdoors. Drones contribute to unnecessary noise pollution
2. The average public member does not know the FAA rules for drone use
3. Whether the drone is in the day use part of the park or designated use area the drone camera has extensive viewing distance and thus results in invasion of privacy.
4. I have been dive bombed by public member drones which is unsettling - by the time one figures out what is going on the drone is gone which makes reporting problems difficult.
5. Wildlife will be disturbed by drone use due to the noise alone let alone drones getting too close which denies others from potentially see wildlife in a natural setting
6. It is doubtful park hosts and staff have the time to patrol and respond to misuse of yet another device, vehicle thus degrading the park experience for the rest of us
7. Drone misuse can be used to see when campers and other leave vehicles or actually look in vehicles thus increasing vehicle content theft

I urge the Parks and Rec staff to NOT allow drones in parks except for emergency responders or law enforcement. Thanks for the opportunity to input to drone use in Oregon state parks.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Ted Vorwerk

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 12:18 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

snowzone600@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I am a drone pilot and I have two main concerns in regards to drones and State Parks and coastal areas.

1. Drone pilots should be away from people and congested areas to take off and land due to the fact that sometimes a drone might have a mind of its own and veer off course with no notice. If that happens low to the ground someone might get hurt.
2. At the coast this is not that big of a deal as it's easy to isolate yourself away from people. however there should be "no fly zones" in nesting areas and that goes for inland too in the areas of nesting Eagles, Ospreys etc.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

malia gibbons

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 03:42 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

m3gibbons@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I am VERY much AGAINST drones in State Parks. I have experience people being harassed by drones flying above them or following them. I go for peace and quiet and drones compromise this in full! Oregon has changed and many new residents bring bad manners and break rules. Banning them all together is the only way to ensure parks continue to deliberate ver a quiet experience. PLEASE BAN THEM ALL TOGETHER! There are few places to go to enjoy nature and have an "away from city" experienced. Thank you M. Gibbons



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Laura Poueymirou

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 03:47 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

freeheeler46@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I do not think drones should be allowed to fly in public places and out in nature. When I am going to a park, I am trying to get away from media and be in the present in nature. I do not want to hear motors flying above. i want to be seeing birds and butterflies flying. Drones could also have a negative impact on wildlife. That is one of the reasons for the establishment of parks is the honoring of wild places. Allowing drones goes against this. i also worry about my privacy.

I am grateful they will not be allowed in campgrounds. yet how is that going to be monitored? There are a lot of parks which have campgrounds within the park. There are not always rangers or camp hosts to help with the legality of not flying them. So I think enforcement may be difficult.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Patrick Chewning

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 04:32 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

pchewn@comcast.net

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

**Public comment:**

I am writing to address a serious error in the wording for the proposed rules regarding The Take-off and Landing of Drones in Oregon State Parks.

The idea is probably to maintain the peace and quiet of the Parks by prohibiting loud, buzzing, motorized drones. These usually have 4 or more small rotor blades, turning at a high RPM creating a loud buzzing sound. They are flown remotely, sometimes even beyond the sight of the operator or pilot.

Please simply insert the word "motorized" into the new rule language. As written, without the word "motorized" you will ban the flying of kites, balloons, model gliders, Frisbees, and other forms of silent flying objects.

Please amend the Rule by inserting the word "MOTORIZED" in the definition of "Drone" to solve this obvious problem!

Sincerely,

Pat Chewning



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Brent Barnett

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 04:42 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

futurefilmworksband@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Hello, I am a part 107 licensed commercial drone pilot of 10+ years and recently [read the webpage](#) on Oregon.gov pertaining to the proposed UAS regulations in Oregon State Parks. I understand the need to protect wildlife and its natural habitat from harm and would think posted advisories at park entrances to UAS pilots would be sufficient to curb any unwanted use around protected areas. If someone is caught violating this "No Fly Zone" then I could see other actions/fines may be needed. However, using specified drone take off and landing spots could hinder our ability to keep a visual line of site on our UAS and cause crowded airspace in those areas. This could be detrimental to safe operations of UAS in this airspace.

On your website you indicate "The work group included representatives with expertise in recreation management, natural resource protection, and visitor use considerations." I am very concerned there were not UAS pilots or organizations on your work group to give any input as to safe UAS operations.

**Questions:**

- How many UAS complaints did you receive in 2025? Where is this data to review?
- Do you have the research data from any impact studies on UAS operations in state parks for the public to review?
- How much will the UAS pass cost? How will this be managed? How are you making this equitable?
- What size aircraft does this pass cover?
- Will there be considerations or priority for Part 107 licensed UAS pilots to obtain passes?

We live in a world where UAS operations are becoming more frequent but making flying harder for law abiding pilots isn't the answer. I'm am very against the proposed UAS rule making, UAS takeoff and landing and UAS pass and frankly don't think people will even adhere to it. Think of all the free advertising your parks are currently getting from UAS pilots which brings more people to your parks from all over the world.

I'm seeing many holes in this attempt to control UAS operations in state parks.

Brent Barnett  
Owner/UAS Pilot - Future Filmworks  
541-788-3442





# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Jenifer Clark

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 05:46 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

jaclark01@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Recreational use of drones in our natural places is akin to ATVs and SxSs who they break the sound of nature and grossly impact the nature experience for others. Recreation use of a drone is not a right to protect. It is not similar to taking a video or image with a traditional camera. The noise is disruptive as well as the flight could impact wildlife particularly birds. Drones near nesting spots, perches and rookeries is unacceptable. Park are set aside for respite and protect nature. The small amount of public land space of OR State Parks not allowing drones is acceptable. Compromise to the majority use is not justified for the few.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Don Graham

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 02:51 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

donjgraham@comcast.net

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

**Public comment:**

Drone cinematography is an emerging and beautiful way to present aerial footage of our planet. The state parks of Oregon offer fantastic opportunities for cinematographers to capture and document stunning footage of the beauty that we are so fortunate to have in our state. I have personally been working on a documentary of Willamette Mission park and have been able to capture some great footage of the park using my camera drone.

So, I am an advocate of continuing to allow the operation of drone in Oregon state parks.

However, I do think there should be guidelines and potentially a permit based system for education and oversight. Drone operators should be required to complete the FAA (It's free) training and keep their certificate with them, They should also be required to submit a flight plan through one of the available apps like Open Sky that registers the flight with the FAA and provide approval for the flight zone.

A state park drone operators permit system may also be desirable. In order to receive a permit, the applicant would have to take a basic training course and a test that reviewed basic etiquette and rules of operation. The drone operator would then be required to keep the permit with them when flying in a park. Violation of the rules should result in revoking of the permit and suspension/banning from flying drones in State Parks

-Don Graham



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

S Heath

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 04:55 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

heathbar97005@yahoo.com

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

**Public comment:**

Drones should not be used in the vicinity of clothing optional beaches.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Cathy Larsen

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 05:13 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

cathylarsen.go@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I am strongly opposed to any and all drone use in our Oregon State Parks. They are a hazard to our precious wildlife, especially our fragile endangered species. I have personally witnessed idiots using drones illegally to buzz and chance birds, deer and other wildlife. Additionally, drones create an obnoxious noise that is incongruent to the peaceful quite natural environment many of us enjoy in our State Parks. Lastly, Drones with cameras violate our privacy. Please do not open this can of worms. If you do, you will be chasing problems instead of having rangers provide education and other activities. Drones should be outlawed in all Oregon State Parks. Thank you.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Robert Binz

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 05:32 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

robert@binz.net

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

**Public comment:**

I am writing in regard to  
"Unmanned Aircraft System Operation Areas" in state parks.

In short, I am IN FAVOR of allowing UAS to be allowed in state parks where  
there is NO current restrictions related to wildlife preservation.

As a UAS owner and pilot, I will also offer up my thoughts and suggestions on  
how to help bring maturity to the UAS flights in state parks.

Background: Current FAA regulations state that UAS of 250 grams or less do not  
require a FAA Part 107 certificate, i.e.: "license".

With UAS under 250g, there is a requirement  
to have taken and pass "The Recreational UAS Safety Test" (TRUST)  
which is a free online course to assure UAS pilots have the very basic  
understanding of safe practical use of the UAS.

As a UAS pilot, I sadly recognize the number of people who go to Walmart, buy a drone, and walk out and start flying with no knowledge of the TRUST foundation or obtaining the Part 107 certificate.

With that, I suggest the following guidelines/regulation/requirements for allowing UAS in state parks for flight.

1) Only Drones of (x weight - my suggestion is 350g or less) be allowed. No need for anyone to bring their 8 pound drone to a state park as they could cause severe damage to persons and property in the event of a crash.

2) REGARDLESS of weight class, all UAS pilots in control (PIC) must have a valid TRUST certificate on their person or ability to present when asked by a state representative.

3) REGARDLESS of weight class, ALL UAS PIC must have a valid FAA Part 107 certificate on their person or ability to present when asked by a state representative.

4) No UAS may take flight in a state park if the wind conditions exceed a Level 5 wind scale.

\*a Level 5 wind rating indicates the ability to maintain stable flight and image quality in a Fresh Breeze. This rating is derived from the Beaufort Wind Scale, where Force 5 corresponds to winds of 19–24 mph (approx. 8.5–10.7 m/s)

5) By Late year of 2026, the FAA will bring a Part 108 rule for Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS), once this rule has been fully defined, these regulations should apply to all PIC in a state

park.

By requiring a UAS PIC to have both TRUST and PART 107 certificates we are assuring that the PIC has the best knowledge of safe and legal requirements for a safe flight. Having a PART 107 also requires the drone to be registered with the FAA and a unique FAA UAS identification associated with the drone. The Level 5 wind restrictions assures that the environment is in a condition to assure safe piloting of the UAS.

Even though the FAA does not require a PART 107 for drones 250g or less, a pilot

**MAY**

obtain one and register the drone. Since a drone pilot MAY obtain a 107 certificate regardless of drone weight class, adding this as a requirement will help assure those PIC in a state park have better education knowledge and know their UAS is registered with the FAA and if found from reckless behavior can and will be found and appropriate legal terms applied to the PIC.

A 107 certificate will also assure the PIC understands

the legal conditions to fly over people and events, how to seek legal approval for a waiver to fly over areas that have people not participating in the flight.

Requiring a 107 certificate defines all the FAA regulations that must be followed by the PIC and will streamline how the state park and rec department must write the approval ruling. The 107 also defines the hours of operations for UAS and will help remove persons being disturbed by the flight hum of UAS during the early morning and evenings/nights.

You also might consider that any person who wishes to be a PIC in a state park should pay a \$5.00 park flight fee certificate, good for that date/s of visit only. While applying for the flight certificate the applicant needs to supply 1) the Drone FAA registration ID (done part of the 107 process) 2) Supply the 107 certificate ID. 3) Carry the proof of the registration with the park and rec department (or maybe a printed receipt of). This will aid park officials in knowing a person has done the required tasks, so they don't have to go and look it up while talking to a PIC.

Thank You for your consideration in allowing UAS in state parks.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

John Rich

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 05:43 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

john.rich44@yahoo.com

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

**Public comment:**

I approve of these general guidelines but would like to hear more about how the director or the director's designee (individual park's head ranger I assume) will actually implement the rules for each park. I am especially interested in Smith Rock State Park and keeping drones from negatively affecting the user groups that are seeking a quiet recreational experience without the buzz of drones overhead. Will there be a mechanism set up to allow park users to give input to park rangers/managers during the rule making process at the local level?

Thank you,  
John Rich





# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Eric Bottorff

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 05:54 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

emsv91@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Then consumer drone hobby is fun, innocuous, and in the public's interest.

Many folks feel we need less laws, not more laws. Let's allow everyone to coexist



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Dr. H. Michael Sweeney

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 06:45 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

proparanoidgroup@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

First of all, you have not defined the PROBLEM for which rules intend a repair.

Without that information, not one of your rules has context or justification. It sounds like yet another Regulatory Agency seeking to expand its power to be authoritarian, grow its infrastructure, and budget, to justify its existence, be creating whole new regulations of no actual value. My group has been flying drones on Oregon and Washington Beaches and parks for years, and in the doing, met and shared information with countless other drone operators, and has NEVER experienced any kind of problem with other citizens, who in general, find drone operations fascinating, not annoying.

Further, regardless of what initial rules you set, given the history of regulatory processes, the rules list will continue to grow and become more restrictive over time, to the point of being punitive, and to include fees or permits, fines, and the like. I for one deny you the right to tell me or my people when, where, or how, or if they can fly their drones. Not your job, unless you can FIRST SHOW CAUSE AND NEED. Based on the information provided thus far, you have not even attempted to do so.

Moreover: proper drone operation REQUIRES safety issues and impact on nearby persons to be considered when choosing when and where to launch or operate. Your advice as to some arbitrary dictated location is neither needed or helpful, and certainly inappropriate, unless you CAN DEMONSTRATE THE NEED.

This appears to be a self-serving make-work effort for your Agency. Not everyone is asleep out here in the real World of Constitutional Rights. I hope your lawyers have considered the consequences of proceeding recklessly, and those behind this proposal can offer justifications which would withstand investigation of their backgrounds and qualifications, toward understanding their true motives, as the stated motives do not appear to hold water.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Victor Trucco

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 08:12 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

slopepilot@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I am writing to address a significant error in the wording of the proposed rules governing the take-off and landing of drones in Oregon State Parks.

I understand that the intent of the rule is to preserve the peace and quiet of the parks by restricting the use of loud, buzzing, motorized drones. These devices typically have four or more rapidly spinning rotor blades, produce significant noise, and are often flown remotely—sometimes beyond the operator’s line of sight.

However, as the rule is currently written, it unintentionally prohibits a wide range of silent, non-motorized recreational activities, including the use of kites, balloons, model gliders, Frisbees, and other non-powered flying objects.

This issue can be easily resolved by inserting the word “**motorized**” into the definition of “drone” within the rule. Doing so would align the language with the apparent intent of the regulation while avoiding unnecessary and unintended restrictions on harmless, traditional park activities.

I respectfully urge you to amend the proposed rule by adding the word “**MOTORIZED**” to the definition of “drone” to correct this oversight.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Austin Brown

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 08:52 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

asbrownpro@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Drones should never be allowed in public parks, except by state parks officials. The noise and nuisance generated by these devices disrupt both wildlife and all other parks users trying to enjoy the park for all other purposes. We cannot trust every person to be responsible and not endanger both wildlife and other humans.

Please never allow public drones.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

ALBERT LEPAGE

**Date comment received:**

January 7, 2026 11:25 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

al.lepage@coasttrails.org

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

**Public comment:**

Hello: I have not read the proposed rules, however acknowledging that, since our organization does not only value protecting the recreational experience of Oregon Coast Trail hikers, but also has a very strong conservation ethic, we want to simply add that anything that would potential impact the OCT experience in a significant way, needs to be addressed in the final version. And also, regarding conservation, and this especially pertains to both Snowy Plover nesting sites on the beach, and also all the offshore seabird nesting areas, such as seastacks (such as Haystack Rock in Cannon Beach), rock formations (such as at Seal Rock), rocky coastline areas where birds could nest too, offshore islands, that in these areas drones be absolutely prohibited. Thank you for your consideration of our input in this regard in finalizing the proposed rules.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

Terry Johnson

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 07:34 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

tj062245@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Hello, when referring to drones I would like the definition to mean 'motorized' drones.

Thank you Terry Johnson



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

George Sexton

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 03:55 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

gs@kswild.org

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

**Public comment:**

Greetings,

As a 5th generation Oregonian I'd like to share that me and my family visit Oregon Parks to relax and see birds, sunsets, rivers and trees- NOT to be buzzed by drones. Please give families a place to disconnect from technology and to connect with nature and each other. No drones in our parks.





# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:32 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

jesswalls@ymail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Hello,

I

have been flying model airplanes and kites for 75 years. They are NOT drones and should be specifically excluded from regulations controlling drone use.

Please consider this change.

736-021-0015 Definitions

“Unmanned Aircraft System” means motorized device defined under ORS 837.300(4).

Simple: Add the word "motorized" to definition.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:33 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

isoar2@frontier.com

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

**Public comment:**

To whom it may concern,

I

am one of the few of us remaining thermal and slope flyers of gliders. We have so few places left to fly and most of us have drives of up to 2,3,5 hours or more just to hand toss a NON-Motorized glider! Please don't take away the remaining options to have our "Quiet" fun!

Thank you,  
Bruce Pearson



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:34 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

dmwwannabe@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I do not want drones in state parks; these parks are for everyone to enjoy and drone enthusiasts detract from enjoyment. Drones are loud, invasive, and can be damaging.

Regards,



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:35 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

kohi.radio@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Hi Robert:

I own KOHI Radio here in St, Helens and we took a short phone poll this morning on drones use in parks and beaches...110 calls and NO ONE WAS IN FAVOR so there's my contribution for what its worth re drones...and I agree with them (most respondents were female btw)

Cheers

Marty :-(



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:35 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

robert.binz@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I wanted to drop a note and thank Lisa Sumption for pausing the rulemaking process to allow additional time to consider public feedback and strengthen the framework guiding future rules.

It was ONLY TODAY I heard about this proposed ruling and I provided my positive feedback via the online form submission.

This  
is a very important ruling and I am glad to have had an opportunity to have a word in helping to shape the positive ruling.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:36 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

jimgeddes@frontier.com

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

**Public comment:**

To Whom it may concern@OPRD

My name is Jim Geddes, I have been a resident of Oregon since 1959.

I

go to State and county parks to be away from the city and the chaos to enjoy something natural, landscapes, wildlife, the sounds of breezes in the trees, seeing various birds, enjoying water flowing many things. I do not go to state parks to be disturbed by some random drone flying around scarring the wildlife off I came to enjoy nor to hear a drone while I'm trying to enjoy peace and quiet. There is no good reason to disturb people trying to enjoy a peaceful moment that there are precious few of with a drone humming / buzzing around the landscape. Emergency use of drones within parks can be very useful and is a great idea. For someone that wants to take overhead photo's to post on social media is selfish as it disturbs people, chases off wildlife and only detracts from an other wise wonderful park experience.

Thank you for your time



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:37 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

uniformscout@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I do not support the use, takeoff or landings of drones in state parks. As an autistic person the noise is terrable. As a disabled person the casual filing feels invasive and as a brown person it seems like another ways to be targeted by racists. Our parks are sacred spaces where people can enjoy nature and drones negatively impact that. Just say no.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:38 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

futurefilmworksband@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Hello, I am a part 107 licensed commercial drone pilot of 10+ years and recently [read the webpage](#) on

Oregon.gov pertaining to the proposed UAS regulations in Oregon State Parks. I understand the need to protect wildlife and its natural habitat from harm and would think posted advisories at park entrances to UAS pilots would be sufficient to curb any unwanted use around protected areas. If someone is caught violating this "No Fly Zone" then I could see other actions/fines may be needed. However, using specified drone take off and landing spots could hinder our ability to keep a visual line of site on our UAS and cause crowded airspace in those areas. This could be detrimental to safe operations of UAS in this airspace.

On your website you indicate "  
The

work group included representatives with expertise in recreation management, natural resource protection, and visitor use considerations." I am very concerned there were not UAS pilots or organizations on your workgroup to give any input as to safe UAS operations.

**Questions:**

- How many UAS complaints did you receive in 2025? Where is this data to review?
- Do you have the research data from any impact studies on UAS operations in state parks for the public to review?
- How much will the UAS pass cost? How will this be managed? How are you making this



equitable?

- What size aircraft does this pass cover?
- Will there be considerations or priority for Part 107 licensed UAS pilots to obtain passes?

We

live in a world where UAS operations are becoming more frequent but making flying harder for law abiding pilots isn't the answer. I'm am very against the proposed UAS rule making, UAS takeoff and landing and UAS pass and frankly don't think people will even adhere to it. Think of all the free advertising your parks are currently getting from UAS pilots which brings more people to your parks from all over the world.

I'm seeing many holes in this attempt to control UAS operations in state parks.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:40 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

pchewn@comcast.net

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

**Public comment:**

Please use the attached PDF file as a public comment regarding the proposed rules for takeoff/landing of drones in Oregon State Parks.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:44 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

dannyhardesty1@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on the proposed updates to drone regulations within Oregon State Parks.

I'm writing as a drone pilot with over ten years of experience flying under FAA rules and established safety guidelines. I fully respect the role Oregon State Parks plays in protecting natural spaces, wildlife, and the experience of everyone who visits them. I also hope the updated regulations can take a balanced approach that recognizes both the potential downsides of drone misuse and the reality that drones can be flown responsibly and respectfully.

There's no question that drones *can*

be used in a disruptive way—but that isn't unique to drones. Like any tool, the impact comes down to how they're used. Many experienced pilots take great care to fly far from people, avoid wildlife entirely, keep flights brief, and operate in ways that don't interfere with others' enjoyment of the park.

State parks have always been places people come to experience awe and to capture memories—whether through photography, video, or simply taking it all in. Drones are a newer technology, but the motivation behind them isn't new: they allow people to appreciate and document landscapes from a

different perspective. When flown thoughtfully, drones don't have to be a nuisance or distraction.

I believe Oregon has an opportunity to lead with policies that focus on:

- Encouraging education and responsible operation rather than blanket bans
- Clearly defining expectations around distance from people, wildlife, and sensitive areas
- Considering designated areas, time windows, or permit systems for compliant pilots
- Focusing enforcement on truly disruptive or unsafe behavior

Most experienced pilots genuinely care about these places and want to enjoy them without causing harm or disturbance. With clear guidance and reasonable rules, responsible drone use can coexist with conservation, recreation, and the shared enjoyment of Oregon's parks.

Thank you for taking the time to consider public input on this issue. I appreciate the work being done and hope the final regulations reflect both environmental stewardship and thoughtful access.

Best regards,



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:45 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

xisled@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

I agree with the proposed changes in the email dated 5 January, especially the requirement for permits.

Unfortunately, enforcement will be an issue and there will still be continued illegal use of drones in restricted and sensitive areas.

Perhaps catching a few and penalizing them to the max will spread the word in the drone community(-ies) and clubs.

Privacy and respect for the land/culture is very important.

Thanks again!



# Submit a public comment on a rule

**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department**

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 05:46 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

loreleiwildcatphotography@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

We've lived this long without drones, I'm against drones. You couldn't police it properly, there are too many people who live to break rules. You don't enforce the rules you have, making more to follow is just a waste and something else to be disgusted about.



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

James Scheidler

**Date comment received:**

January 8, 2026 06:18 PM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

JimScheidler@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

I am writing to address a serious error in the wording for the proposed rules regarding The Take-off and Landing of Drones in Oregon State Parks.

The idea is probably to maintain the peace and quiet of the Parks by prohibiting loud, buzzing, motorized drones. These usually have 4 or more small rotor blades, turning at a high RPM creating a loud buzzing sound. They are flown remotely, sometimes even beyond the sight of the operator or pilot.

Please simply insert the word "motorized" into the new rule language. As written, without the word "motorized" you will ban the flying of kites, balloons, model gliders, Frisbees, and other forms of silent flying objects.

Please amend the Rule by inserting the word "MOTORIZED" in the definition of "Drone" to solve this obvious problem!

Sincerely,  
Capt. James F. Scheidler



# Submit a public comment on a rule

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

**Commenter name (if provided):**

martin ginsburg

**Date comment received:**

January 9, 2026 03:09 AM

**Commenter email (if provided):**

lucky333888333@gmail.com

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

**Public comment:**

There is no reason why any drones should be allowed at our beautiful state parks or public lands. Drones are a hazard to the public. They are a blight to the eye and they take away from the nature views. They also pollute the air with noise that is not nature oriented. They're often used for YouTube posts that monetize Our Land for the profit of the droner. Often these profiteers do not apply for a commercial use. Often they violate FAA laws by being closer than 75 ft to the public. No drones.