From:	Standish McCleary
To:	TSP comments
Subject:	Chapman Point Marine Conservation Area
Date:	Thursday, April 15, 2021 1:12:10 PM

4/15/21

I am writing to comment on the proposed new Chapman Point Marine Conservation Area. My wife and I have been Chapman Point homeowners for the last 16 years and have enjoyed Cannon Beach for several decades. My enjoyment of the beach and ocean extends as far as I can remember, and one of the main pleasures of my lifelong enjoyment of surfing is the communion with and immersion in what is essentially a wilderness, the natural world. It is partly what likely draws everyone to the beach, a dose of something wild, not man-made, a tonic for the soul. Everyone, certainly including dogs, loves the expansive freedom of it. As a former environmental attorney and advocate for many years I certainly support the intention and purpose of the conservation zone. As a currently practicing psychologist I have the following observations which might raise the likelihood of it succeeding in raising awareness of the value and protection of wildlife.

It is my understanding now after the working group has reviewed the proposal that many of the elements are covered by existing laws, or have feasibility issues. If there ends up being no dog leashing recommendation after all, this may be a bit outdated, but if there were to be one, that is in need of balance. Also the boundaries of the zone need clarification as well.

In the proposal the conservation zone boundaries, and leash boundaries, are said to be:

"From approximately 0.11 miles (0.18 km) north of the tip of Chapman Point to approximately 0.12 miles (0.19 km) south of the tip of Chapman Point, and extending from the statutory vegetation line out to approximately 0.23 miles (0.37 km) west into the ocean from the tip of Chapman Point. The southern boundary lines up with the West 7th Street beach access. Please see the attached map."

The map indicates somewhat different boundaries:

https://www.oregonocean.info/index.php/opac-documents/2020-ipp-rocky-habitat-proposals/2020-initial-proposal-period/chapman-point-mca/2208-attachment-13-chapman-point-mca-map/file

The referenced statutory vegetation line is considerably east of the boundary indicated in the map. It is in the middle of the dunes, well away from the rocks, by probably three or four hundred feet. The boundaries depicted in the map show more proximity to the rocks, and is a more feasible eastern boundary. That would be be far less impact on beach use. It is my understanding that the agency staff of the Rocky Habitat Working Group has also opined that this MHW boundary appears to be sufficient to meet stated goals.

In the attachments to the proposal there is a study reciting "surveys indicate that many dog owners desire fewer restrictions, while non-dog owners often feel the opposite. However dog owners don't always follow the rules, and some dog owners allow their dogs to run free in leash-only natural areas. In a Santa Barbara study, only 21% of dogs were leashed despite posted leash requirements… People and their dogs disturb wildlife, and people are not always aware of or willing to acknowledge the significance of their own impacts." This is perhaps not a surprise. Dogs, perhaps most living things, love being off leash.

An important issue in addition to what may be a desirable buffer for dog leashing near protected wildlife is what people will actually respect and observe. Relatedly, what recommendation will community members, frequent users, embrace and assist in educating others. Guidelines that are evidently reasonable will more

likely promote local beach user support and overall public awareness. Apparently unreasonable ones, even if arguably more effective in ideal application, are far less likely to garner respect and observance.

The proposed conservation zone boundary and leash requirement extends north and south from the Point 0.12 miles, or 212 yards.That appears to be a very large dog buffer. It looks on the map to be around be about 100 yards from the southernmost rocks. It would not likely readily occur to dog owners to leash up at that great a distance, or to respond favorably to being asked to do so. Consideration of a recommendation that is more evidently specific to usual ideas of rock proximity, recommended leashing at perhaps 10-20 feet, would serve the same purpose and likely receive more public support.

In sum, the eastern boundary of the proposed conservation zone should not be several hundred feet away from the rocks at the statutory vegetation line, in the middle of the dunes. Normal beach use that far from the rocks would likely continue. The southern boundary of any possible dog leashing recommendation should be proximate to the rocks that the birds inhabit if education and observation is to be optimized. In the absence of very much available or feasible enforcement finding a good balance for public acceptance would seem to be the goal.

I very much appreciate all of the work of the Rocky Coast Habitat Coalition to elevate awareness of the need to protect the wildlife we all enjoy, and do hope these efforts are influential.

Standish McCleary J.D., Ph.D.