

**Proposed Public Access & Recreation Policy**  
**Public Comments Received: Evaluation and Recommendations**  
**October 19, 2023**

Per Board Motion at the July Water District Board Meeting, Bill Campbell and Tevis Dooley were tasked with formalizing a community engagement process and communicating with the Arch Cape Water District rate payers and property owners. In this capacity, Bill & Tevis have reviewed the public access and recreations policies that were proposed by the National Parks Service Committee, developed a survey for Arch Cape rate payers and lot owners about their perspectives on these proposed policies, drafted a Proposed Policy for Board consideration at the September meeting and posted that Policy for public comments.

Comments were received from 8 Arch Cape rate payers, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and 3 non-rate payers. The comments focused on 7 Subject Areas of the Proposed Policy. Predator Hunting and Restricted Access to the Drinking Water Source Area were of greatest concern.

The table below lists the public comments that were received. Each comment asks for a change to the Proposed Public Access & Recreation Policy. So far, Bill & Tevis have evaluated the submitted public comments for Subject Areas 1- 4 in terms of whether or not there is a compelling reason to change the policy and make recommendations about whether or not to do so and if so, what change should be made. They will continue to do so until all 7 Subject Areas are completed.

The full Water District Board will consider the comments and recommendations in determining if/how to change the Proposed Policy.

SUBJECT AREA with Current Wording from Proposed Policy	PUBLIC COMMENT	CONSIDERATIONS & RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>1. Predator Hunting</b></p> <p><i>“Hunting is allowed for Deer, Elk, Bear and Cougar in the Arch Cape</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person A</li> </ul> <p>From what I gather from historical signage at entryways to the forest, we have had a NO predator hunting policy. That has been for a very long period of time, and from my humble layperson's perspective, the bear and cougar population in this area has not been an out of control issue. Could we possibly have a no predator hunting policy in place and allow changing that, if in the future it becomes evident that some balance needs to be maintained/established?</p>	<p><u>Background / Considerations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to a specific question on the survey about this topic – only a minority of respondents wanted bear and cougar hunting.</li> <li>• The recognized “industry subject matter expert” - Oregon</li> </ul>

<b>SUBJECT AREA with Current Wording from Proposed Policy</b>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	<b>CONSIDERATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p><i>Forest consistent with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) regulations”</i></p>	<p>I would also be curious what NCLC allows for hunting? Just deer and elk? Predator? That might make it simple or complicated depending on their policy. [<b>Response</b> – From NPS document - <i>Hunting in the Rainforest Reserve is limited to elk and deer - draft NCLC policy pending finalizing of the Rainforest Reserve public access plan</i>].</p> <p>If it is just too complicated with ODFW policy recommendations, then we will have to abide by their recommendations, I gather.</p> <p>BUT if less disturbance to the wildlife is a possibility and our community has shown to be in favor(chart of targeted animals in latest survey results) of no predator, then that would be MY vote. "SAVE THE BEARS AND COUGARS."</p> <p>One last thought, Fishing is not included as a category, and may become an issue once the bridge to allow salmon upstream happens, but I guess we will cross that bridge, when we come to it...:)</p> <p>P.S. Good job on ALL of this work, and YES, I am in favor of the Proposed Public access and recreation Policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person B Would want to exclude cougar and bear hunting.</li> <li>• Person C I don't think predator hunting should be allowed, especially for cougar, which really qualifies as a "trophy kill". Removing predators from that ecosystem will have an effect on that system eventually. Bears and cougars don't appear to be problem animals in the community, so preventive hunting for them seems unnecessary. ODFW can regulate a predator hunting ban, while still enforcing regs for deer and elk hunting.</li> </ul>	<p>Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife (ODFW)'s - position is to allow Bear and Cougar hunting. (See email below and ODFW will be at the Board meeting to discuss).</p> <p><u>Options:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Allow Cougar and Bear Hunting</li> <li>2) Restrict Cougar and Bear Hunting</li> </ol> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Decide on the option based upon Board Members' assessment of ODFW position.</p>
<p><b>2. Dog Waste</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person B</li> </ul>	<p><u>Background / Considerations:</u></p>

<b>SUBJECT AREA with Current Wording from Proposed Policy</b>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	<b>CONSIDERATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p><i>“Removal of Dog waste is encouraged.”</i></p> <p><i>“Pack it in, pack it out”. All trash/waste (including human solid waste) must be removed by user. People are encouraged to use “Leave No Trace” principles.</i></p>	<p>want the wording regarding dog waste to be changed to MUST remove dog waste rather than encouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person D</li> </ul> <p>I see a total contradiction in the fact that human waste must be removed, but "Dogs are allowed in the Arch Cape Forest on-leash or under direct owner control. Removal of Dog waste is encouraged."</p> <p>100 percent of dog poop should be packed out. This will likely become the daily dog park, so better do this right. I am not excited having to add extra chemicals to the water because of all the dog poop.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no specific question on the survey about this topic – so the majority’s perspective is not known.</li> <li>• Domestic dog waste does not introduce any contamination into the water source that isn’t introduced by other wildlife in the area.</li> <li>• Dog waste left on the trail can be an inconvenience to other hikers</li> </ul> <p><u>Options:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Leave policy as is</li> <li>2) Change <i>“All trash/waste (including human solid waste) must be removed by user.”</i> To <i>“All trash/waste (including human and dog solid waste) must be removed by user”</i> and Delete <i>“Removal of Dog waste is encouraged.”</i></li> <li>3) Since the community’s perspective is unknown, be silent on dog waste (as is the historical policy) until the community can be surveyed.</li> </ol>

<b>SUBJECT AREA with Current Wording from Proposed Policy</b>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	<b>CONSIDERATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATION</b>
		<u>Recommendation:</u> Option #3
<b>3. Dogs off Leash</b>  <i>“Dogs are allowed in the Arch Cape Forest on-leash or under direct owner control.”</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Person D  My experience on the beach at Arch Cape is that dogs off leash are almost never in control of the owner. I get chased by dogs all the time, and somehow the dog owners all think that it is somehow my fault. Many regular dog owners who let their dogs run are not watching their dogs at all so they are pooping where ever they want. Dog poop is a reason why beaches close due to the e coli etc. So, it doesn't really make sense to allow any dogs off leash. Dogs off leash in a forest will be chasing deer and other wildlife. I see the unleashed dogs chasing all of the birds on the beaches. So, I do not understand how this would be different in the forest. On the beach, when there is a dog off leash that is not under control of the owner, there is not anyone to report it to. I am wondering who I will call if there are dogs loose and running every where, possibly on my property. I really don't want dogs off leash anywhere because they terrorize me on a daily basis.</li> </ul>	<u>Background / Considerations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no specific question on the survey about this topic – so the majority’s perspective is not known.</li> </ul> <u>Options:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Leave policy as is</li> <li>2) Since the community’s perspective is unknown, be silent on Dogs Off Leash (as is the historical policy) until the community can be surveyed.</li> </ol> <u>Recommendation:</u> Option #2
<b>4. Road Access</b>  <i>“Motorized vehicles, to include but not limited to trucks, cars, motorcycles and E-bikes, are not allowed except for</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Person E  It is necessary to permit access through Arch Cape Forest road(s) to the Onion Peak Repeater radio site when no other road(s) is/are available for routine and emergency maintenance. That radio site is critical to Clatsop County emergency preparedness.   Probably both but it’s only practical for vehicular traffic. I believe the total road distance from the Hug Point Rd gate to the repeater site on NCLC land is 6 miles. The requested permission would be to travel on the roads across water district lands and to unlock and lock any gates enroute.</li> </ul>	<u>Considerations:</u> Maintenance of the Repeater seems to fall into the District’s role in Emergency Preparedness  <u>Recommendation:</u> Add to Policy ...

<b>SUBJECT AREA with Current Wording from Proposed Policy</b>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	<b>CONSIDERATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATION</b>
<i>emergencies or for Arch Cape Water District business with permission from the Arch Cape Water District Manager.”</i>		<p>“Access to the Onion Peak Repeater radio site is considered to be Arch Cape Water District business.”</p>
<p><b>5. Access to Source Water Protection</b></p> <p><i>Restricted Access:</i></p> <p><i>“Within the Arch Cape Forest, the Drinking Water Source Area (DWSA), and other areas with sensitive natural resources, will be marked as no access.”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate Payers: Phillip Simmonds, John Mersereau, Dale Mosby, Reed Morrison (see attached emails, letters)</li> <li>• Non-Rate Payers: ODFW, J Caldwell, Levi Cole, Eric Shoemaker (see attached letters)</li> </ul> <p>Allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hiking and bicycle access to maintained rock roads throughout the Forest, inside and outside of the Drinking Water Source Area</li> <li>○ Hunting throughout the Forest, inside and outside of the Drinking Water Source Area</li> </ul>	<p>To Be Discussed at the November Board Meeting</p>
<p><b>6. Access to Rainforest Reserve</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person C</li> </ul> <p>There should not be any wording restricting the easement and access to the Rainforest Reserve through the Arch Cape Forest.</p>	<p>To Be Discussed at the November Board Meeting</p>
<p><b>7. Other</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person C</li> </ul>	<p>To Be Discussed at the November Board Meeting</p>

<b>SUBJECT AREA with Current Wording from Proposed Policy</b>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	<b>CONSIDERATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATION</b>
	Monitoring any regulations in the Forest is problematic. I think there should be clear signage at any access point which explains the policy. Cameras will still require the manpower to monitor, and are susceptible to vandalism in this setting.	

**Email exchange with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)**

**From:** tevis dooley  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 26, 2023 12:52 PM  
**To:** ATWOOD Paul M \* ODFW  
**Subject:** PREDATOR HUNTING IN ARCH CAPE

Paul,

Three questions in my effort to have answers for the community;

- Q: Can we exempt cougar and bear hunting on our property and still have deer and elk hunting?

**A: This would be extremely difficult to enforce, but I suppose the board could enact whatever policy they wanted. We would certainly advocate against this as it's not in the best interest of the local wildlife populations and hampers our ability to manage wildlife.**

- Q: When odfw issues tags for bear and cougar, are they for specific areas?

**A: Only for spring bear hunts which are controlled. Cougar and fall bear are general seasons. Do hunters make requests? No**

- Q: Are there any records of bear and cougar harvests in what is now considered the Arch Cape Forest? If so, how many over the past twenty years?

A: Over the past 15 years, 4 bears and 0 cougars have been hunter harvested, indicating that continuing to provide the hunting opportunity will not result in a negative impact to bear or cougar populations. This result is also what we would expect when we take such a focused look at an area of this size since bear and cougar home ranges

## Email comments received regarding DWSA Access

### Rate Payers

- Person F

Consider incorporating the provision:

Hikers and bicycles must stay on maintained, rockered roads. No off-road use. No creating new trails.

Into your restricted access portion as well.

Specifically, making it clear that for any logging roads that cross through the portions of the map that are restricted, patrons **MUST** remain on the logging road.

This will allow transit of the current logging roads but prohibit patrons from leaving the roads (and therefore potentially impacting water quality).

Folks are going to walk / ride bikes on the logging roads. Creating a policy that makes it crystal clear that they can not leave the roads, particularly in the protected area, can help ensure the rules are followed.

- Person C

I don't think the Forest should be closed in the source water part of the watershed. I see no science that would claim that staying on hard scape roads through the watershed does any harm to source water. Part of the overall regulations is to stay on roads, discouraging any "bushwhacking".

The obvious conflict with hunters not allowed in that area; one might as well not allow any hunting in the whole Forest.

- Reed Morrison

Reed Morrison  
79852 Gelinsky Rd.  
Arch Cape, Or 97102

January 2, 2023  
October 10, 2023

Enclosed is my personal public comment in response to the Arch Cape Management Proposal.

This public comment is dated within the window allotted for public comment and is entitled to be read aloud at all meeting minutes including zoom and or in person meetings.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this Proposal.

Personal back story:

Born and raised in Arch Cape since 1974.



Property purchased in 1945.  
My son's are the 5th generation to enjoy Arch Cape.

Our family has enjoyed gatherings on New Year's, 4th of July and everything in between.

I have fond memories of post New Year's swim get togethers at Betty Snows home since the 70's.

I agree with most of the Proposal except the language regarding hunting specifically.

Hunting in the east hills behind Arch Cape has been a long time tradition for families providing healthy meals for their families while managing the Elk population going back to the Native American early years. Which my family ancestry includes the Clatsop Nehalem and Chinook tribes.

This is a tradition I have grown to enjoy and appreciate. Hiking early up into the hills while watching the sun come up. Passing on traditions of hunting and knowledge to my sons Ashton and Jordan on the meaning of hunting /hiking.

Hunting in the Onion Peak unit is extremely challenging, yielding a below average success rate. ODFW rates this unit at approximately 8 to 10% harvest rate due to the steep, dense difficult terrain. I myself have harvested 1 bull elk in 10 years which falls within this range.

Arch Cape Forest is what it is today as a result of the last 100 years of management including wildlife management. In the last 10 years we have experienced a dramatic increase of wildlife population and predators due to changes from ODFW harvesting limits and urban sprawl. In turn allowing less harvesting ,less Elk habitation and in town non-native vegetation contributing to Elk inhabiting the edge of inner city areas.

Surf Pines, Gearhart, Cannon Beach , Tolovana are experiencing the full effects on wildlife mismanagement currently. On my way to the cabin last weekend there was an Elk harem behind the Coaster Theater in downtown Cannon Beach. Creating a dangerous situation as tourists get closer to captures a picture.

Living in Surf Pines north of Gearhart from 1987 to 1997 I was able to experience the danger that Elk pose as they move into the neighborhoods. This includes dogs being killed by sharp antlers, children being chase in their yards and automobiles being charged and damaged specifically during the months of the Rut.

Currently Elk herds are habitating the properties on the East side of Arch Cape and causing damage to lawns. This can escalate rapidly with the removal of human hunting pressure and excessive harem and herd growth.

Allong with rapid Elk growth comes predator growth including Cougar/ Mountain Lion and Coyote population. Many Game Cameras have documented this over the years. We are currently seeing the highest level of Cougars ever.

ODFW offers a map of Elk Damage areas during the purchase process of a license and tag. Elk cause extreme drainage and erosion damage. This is how the State manages and creates balance for the wildlife and territory.

If hunting is banned as proposed in the Arch Cape Forest Management Proposal this will unequivocally have a negative impact of the balance that has been fostered by the State and

community hunters. Resulting in more damage, erosion, aggression, and predator animals encroaching the watershed/ homes. And if urination and carcasses truly are the reason stated for the concern of water quality. Well, this certainly raises question.

Added , the relatively small group of local hunters apprx 20 that enjoy hunting in the surrounding area share the same feeling and are stewards of the land. Cleaning garbage, reporting illegal poaching, sharing game with neighbors loving and taking care of the land. Ensuring the balance continues for many generalizations to follow.

Visit with a local hunter.

Listen to a local hunter with an open mind.

Explore sustainable options and balance.

Be humble and comprising.

These guys are some of the best people you will meet.

We will be the first to help protect the land and you.

We know the whole area with knicknames for all locations.

Local hunters have formed excellent communication with water treatment employees and neighbors looking out for everyone's best interest.

Before a vote or a decision is made .. please please reach out to some hunters and inquire about areas of mismanagement and heavy Elk populations such as Surf Pines, Gearhart and Cannon Beach.

Elk and Predator animals inhabiting inner cities is extremely challenging to reverse and balance. And poses great risks and liability. Arch Cape is in the cusp of joining them. Let's not disrupt the balance.

In conclusion:

A solution that I would offer is this..

Specially train and permit a handful of locals to keep the Elk at manageable numbers. This will reduce human traffic and assure there will be the lightest footprint. Speaking for myself personally i would also donate the harvest to families in need or a reputable non profit for distribution.

If the watershed is closed to hunting the Elk will recognize this and consider this their safe sanctuary reserve and will overpopulate/ bed / rake trees/ erode the land in a very concentrated way. You think carcasses, urine and skat is an issue now? Wait until there are hundreds of Elk in there daily. Think I'm wasting my time writing this for fun?? Remember.. I was raised here I've seen it happen. Few years from now you will be trying to figure out how to reverse your decision.

We have discussed this issue in detail with Paul Atwood from ODFW and he agrees. Remember the zoom meetings and town halls that you weren't present at to learn this?

Remember this watershed is a highly unhospitable area for wanna be mountain men and tourists. They will not flood this area like Oswald.

We spend many hours and days in the hills behind Arch Cape and know it very well. Not working closely with Local Hunters is not working toward a solution.

Thank you for your time

I am available 24/7 for concerns or questions.

I specifically request again that this public comment be read at all minutes of all meetings pertaining to this response.

Reed Morrison

9712852222

### Non-Rate Payers

- Jeff Caldwell

Dear Board Members,

I hope this letter finds you well. I would like to express my deep concern regarding the currently proposed Public Access & Recreation Policy for the Arch Cape Community Forest, dated September 21, 2023. I previously submitted formal comments on this matter via public comment in meetings along with surveys, and I believe it is essential to reiterate my concerns.

The process of developing this policy, facilitated by federal authorities, was certainly challenging for most of us and didn't holistically align with the values and needs of our community. While it is important to respect our neighbors and maintain the unique character of this place, the recommendation to exclude historic users from over half of the forest is deeply troubling for several reasons.

First, this recommendation is inconsistent with the majority of prior stakeholder input (and acceptance of recommendations). It is clear that the community's collective voice is not being adequately represented in this proposal. The policy should reflect the desires and needs of the people who have long been a part of this forest's history.

Second, the current proposal lacks a rational basis supported by the best available scientific evidence. A policy that restricts access should be firmly grounded in scientific research, particularly when considering the potential impact on the forest and its ecosystems.

Lastly, this policy appears to violate the spirit, if not the outright conditions, of the various public funding sources that were used to acquire this land. Over 95% of the funding for this purchase came from county, state, and federal sources, and it was expected that the forest would remain open for historic public uses, provided that access is consistent with scientifically defensible restrictions related to drinking water source integrity. However, the new Board has not provided any evidence-based analyses to support the proposed updates to the access plan.

It is important to remember that public funds played a significant role in acquiring this land, and we have a responsibility to ensure that the forest remains accessible to the public as originally intended, while also safeguarding its natural resources. The entire process is a behind the scenes play by a small group of NIMBY – Not in my backyard self-serving locals with a myopic view on what they perceive to be their land.

As a long-time user of the Arch Cape Forest with deep roots in this community, albeit not an Arch Cape lot owner or rate payer. However, I am a local, state, and federal taxpayer, and I believe that my voice, along with others who have a similar stake in this issue, should be considered in the decision-making process.

Our shared goal should continue to be the preservation and protection of this unique forest, without drawing unnecessary attention to it. We must nurture a culture of stewardship among all users and ensure the integrity of the watershed through habitat restoration and monitoring. Simultaneously, we should uphold our commitment to historic public access as originally intended when these public funds were allocated.

Let us strive to find a balanced solution that respects our history, our community, and the natural beauty of the Arch Cape Community Forest. It would be a major disappointment if this is allowed to become policy then potentially get negative attention that plays out in a very public way. I am hopeful a meaningful conversation will happen very soon.

I was told personally access would not be inhibited in any way. In very simple terms. Do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Jeff Caldwell

- Levi Cole

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this email to voice my concerns with the proposed change in use and rights for the Arch Cape Water shed Forest area. I have attended the public meetings. And I have heard the voices of many different stakeholders. I believe that excluding the use of these lands to historic uses/users such as hunting, hiking, biking, birding, mushrooming, and what have you is, and would be exceptionally shortsighted.

I understand the concern for this, not becoming an overly used public resource to people that are not from the immediate area. However, there is already, as previously discussed a limited amount of parking and no plans to add any. Which, by its very nature creates a situation that is self limiting in scope and practice.

I have been archery hunting for elk in these woods, most of my adult life and I consider these woods to be a sacred place and treat them as such.

I believe that the way this new proposal has come about is foolish at best, and disingenuous at worst. Please reconsider the previous information and input that has come from all stakeholders in the meetings that were held publicly.

This land was purchased with my tax dollars as well as yours. And I am confident that nothing that I do in those woods will have any deleterious effect on the watershed or drinking water of people who own Arch Cape lots.

I must say that I am shocked and disappointed by the behavior of the board trying to back door this proposal.

Please consider that there are many people with a concerted interest, and long term use history with this land and these woods. I dare say that I spend more time in them than most people who own homes in Arch Cape. As a hunter and a naturalist, please consider the lives and rights of those of us who have historically used these lands.

Thank You for your consideration.

**Levi Cole**

Real Estate Broker, Licensed in Oregon

Premiere Property Group, LLC

Call or Text: (503) 703-8856

[leviticuscole@mac.com](mailto:leviticuscole@mac.com)

- Brandon Dyches (ODFW)

Arch Cape Community,

This letter continues my comment and involvement in the planning process around the Arch Cape Community Forest and surrounding lands. I have attended several meetings from before the planning process began and most recently at the Arch Cap Fire District building.

The latest access proposal dated 9/1/2023 veers strongly off course from the public conversation around balancing historic access, community interests, and public goods.

I completely understand and support protecting the Arch Cape community water source. But what evidence or science shows that limited recreational access in the watershed will contaminate the drinking supply?

More important, what defense is there for raising and spending \$6 million in public funds to purchase public-access land and then block the taxpaying public from accessing that land?

I am a friend of this forest and want to repeat my request that public access continue to honor historic, limited, clean use of this landscape.

Brandon Dyches

**Brandon Dyches**

**Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife**

**Phone 971-707-0098**

Shoemaker  
3139 Pacific Avenue  
Cannon Beach, OR 97110

October 10, 2023

Dear Arch Cape Community:

This letter is further public comment on the Arch Cape Community Forest access planning process. I last submitted formal comments on Dec. 15, 2022.

The currently proposed Public Access & Recreation Policy (dated Sept. 21, 2023) is deeply flawed – both in process and result. Yes, the federally facilitated process felt clunky and inappropriate to most of us. Yes, we must respect our neighbors and avoid publicizing this place. However, excluding historic users from over half the forest as now recommended is: i) inconsistent with the preponderance of prior stakeholder input, ii) does not rationally support a policy goal according to the best available science, and iii) violates the spirit, if not outright conditions, of the various public funding sources used to accomplish this land purchase.

I am not an Arch Cape lot owner or rate payer as defined by the most recent “more statistically representative” survey and therefore did not participate. Our primary residence is Cannon Beach. Our family has been here since the 1930s and we have used this forest consistently since the 1960s. My own time in the Arch Cape Forest is limited to roughly 1,000 trips over the last 20 years and I have actively participated in this process since before it was a formal process.

Perhaps I shouldn't have a vote. However, I am also a local, state, and federal taxpayer and I know this forest was purchased with public dollars (more than 95% of the ~\$6MM was county, state, and federal funds). These funds were made available with the expectation (among others) that the forest remain open for historic public uses so long as such access is consistent with scientifically defensible restrictions related to drinking water source integrity.

No such defensible or evidence-based analyses have been offered by the new Board in support of the proposed updates to the access plan. Absent such support, we appear to have a public land grab dressed up in the strategic redefinition of what it means to be a stakeholder. Given our primary shared goal of not publicizing this forest, it would be unfortunate if such chicanery were to be widely reported within the regional or state press.

Again, let's not publicize this place or our disagreements, let's continue to nurture a culture of stewardship among all users, let's ensure watershed integrity through ongoing habitat restoration and monitoring, and let's please respect historic public access as we originally intended.

Thank You,



Eric R. Shoemaker

Dale Mosby  
31897 Oceanview Ln  
Arch Cape, OR 97102

October 7, 2023  
dale@archcape.com  
(503) 332-5201

Re: Comments on proposed public access and recreation plan

I disagree with the proposed public access plan, specifically prohibiting access to the source drinking water area. The plan states that the “purpose is protecting the quality and quantity of the Community’s drinking water” and to do so “the District would like to keep to a minimum the vehicular, bicycle and foot traffic that may threaten the environment and its water”.

This plan starts with the conclusion that hiking on the rocked roads has a negative impact on water quality. I served on the Water and Sanitary Districts for 9 years during which time there was never any discussion of hiking impacting water quality. The only impact to our water was from logging near stream buffers or blow down resulting from logging introducing sediment.

I sent email (February 5 of this year) to our plant manager, Matt Gardner, asking:

“Do you have any information that suggests that people hiking in the Arch Cape watershed is something contributing to water quality problems? How about hunting?”.

The reply from Matt was:

“To date no issues have been reported that I know of regarding water quality issues stemming from hiking or hunting in the watershed.”.

The proposed plan would allow people to hike east on Hug Point Road and then be forced to stop shortly after turning to the south. There are several miles of rocked logging roads continuing to the North Coast Land Conservancy property that would be removed from recreation by this plan. There is no evidence that the low number of hikers in the forest would impact water quality by using these rocked roads for recreation. If this was a problem, the District should have requested that the private landowners restrict public access many years ago.

The Forest Management Plan that has been adopted states:

“As a result of common practice over the past century, the Arch Cape Forest property has remained open to public access. A significant risk exists that without public purchase, the Arch Cape Forest could be closed to public access and some areas of the property planned for development.”

It is disappointing to think that a century of public access, when the land was in private ownership, would come to an end once the property transfers to public ownership. Simply restricting hiking to existing roads and prohibiting entry during time of fire danger is adequate to protect our water quality while continuing a century of public enjoyment of this forest.

Regards,  
Dale Mosby



# Oregon

Department of Fish and Wildlife

North Coast Watershed District

Tina Kotek, Governor

4907 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Tillamook, OR 97141

(503) 842-2741  
Fax (503) 842-8385

[www.myodfw.com](http://www.myodfw.com)



October 10, 2023

Dear Arch Cape Water Districts Board of Directors:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public access planning process and provide comments. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) agency mission is to protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations. In 2018, ODFW completed a strategic plan where one of the five identified focal issues was public access. Additionally, public access is critical to ODFW's ability to effectively manage wildlife at optimum levels.

ODFW has reviewed the draft public access policy and offers one recommendation: to allow hunting throughout the entire Arch Cape Community Forest. ODFW has been supportive of this project since the first land acquisition grant applications and written many letters of support while also requesting that unrestricted public recreational access continue. Allowing hunting access in this manner serves several important purposes: it retains recreational access that has been historically allowed, allows for management of wildlife populations at optimum levels, and provides avenues for landowners to elect for enhanced enforcement by the Oregon State Police Fish and Wildlife Division (OSP) through ODFW's Access and Habitat Program. Hunting is a useful tool to keep wildlife populations at levels that help maintain forest health and keep conflicts with people in residential areas at a minimum. With access to only a small portion of the property, populations will increase to levels detrimental to both the forest and start causing safety issues within the community. Continuing public recreational access throughout the property including in the drinking water watershed would allow an opportunity to join the North Coast Travel Management Area which will provide the added OSP presence and enforcement referenced above. Most importantly, continuing to allow hunting throughout the forest will not impact drinking water for the community, just as it has not in the past.

ODFW appreciates that the draft policy allows for hunting of all species in accordance with current state regulations. Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide recommendations to the draft policy. Please contact the North Coast Watershed District if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Paul Atwood  
District Wildlife Biologist  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4907 Third Street  
Tillamook, OR 97141