



Bend Metro Park & Recreation District

January 15, 2019

Board of Directors

Agenda and Reports

www.bendparksandrec.org



play for life



Our Vision

To be a leader in building a community connected to nature, active lifestyles and one another.

Our Mission

To strengthen community vitality and foster healthy, enriched lifestyles by providing exceptional park and recreation services.

We Value

Excellence by striving to set the standard for quality programs, parks and services through leadership, vision, innovation and dedication to our work.

Environmental Sustainability by helping to protect, maintain and preserve our natural and developed resources.

Fiscal Accountability by responsibly and efficiently managing the financial health of the District today and for generations to come.

Inclusiveness by reducing physical, social and financial barriers to our programs, facilities and services.

Partnerships by fostering an atmosphere of cooperation, trust and resourcefulness with our patrons, coworkers and other organizations.

Customers by interacting with people in a responsive, considerate and efficient manner.

Safety by promoting a safe and healthy environment for all who work and play in our parks, facilities and programs.

Staff by honoring the diverse contributions of each employee and volunteer, and recognizing them as essential to accomplishing our mission.



District Office | Don Horton, Executive Director

799 SW Columbia St., Bend, Oregon 97702 | www.bendparksandrec.org | (541) 389-7275

BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION

AGENDA DATE:	January 15, 2019
SUBJECT:	Southern Connection of the Deschutes River Trail - Conflict Assessment Report Next Steps
STAFF RESOURCE:	Michelle Healy, Planning and Park Services Director Don Horton, Executive Director
PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:	Adopted Resolution No. 409, 2/20/18; Received Conflict Assessment Report 12/18/18
ACTION PROPOSED:	None – for discussion only
STRATEGIC PLAN:	
Theme:	Community Connection
Objective:	Analyze and Adapt to Changing Community Need
Initiative:	Acquire land, and plan and develop trails, river access, parks, natural areas and recreation facilities to meet identified community demand and future need.

BACKGROUND

On December 18, 2018 Oregon Consensus (OC) and The Mary Orton Company (TMOC) presented the findings from the Southern Connection of the Deschutes River Trail (DRT) Conflict Assessment Report that they prepared for the District (Attachment 1). They explained the myriad of concerns and issues surrounding the project and suggested a multi-step process for moving forward, which is summarized below:

1. Trust – Building Conversations: One-on-one or small group conversations to rebuild relationships and trust among stakeholders.
2. Neutral Convener: Identify a neutral, outside convener to lead the process.
3. Joint Fact-Finding: Stakeholders come together to address factual disagreements surrounding the issue.
4. Community Collaborative: A multi-faceted, facilitated community process to consider options for the southern connection of the DRT. (The scope of work for this step would be determined based on outcomes of the prior steps, and only if a decision is made to move forward with this step).

(More details about the recommended process are located on pages 16-20 of the conflict assessment report – Attachment 1).

The Board requested that staff bring this item back for further discussion and consideration. They also requested a cost estimate for the process suggested by OC and TMOC. OC is currently preparing a cost estimate for steps 1 and 3 of the process listed above. The fourth step will be dependent upon the outcome of the preceding steps and subsequent decisions around what this work might entail. It is too preliminary at this point to prepare a cost estimate for this effort.

BUDGETARY IMPACT

The District spent \$32,000 on the initial conflict assessment. The OC is preparing a cost estimate for steps 1 and 3 described in the conflict assessment report. Staff should have that information available during the board meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

None

MOTION

None

ATTACHMENT

Attachment 1: Southern Connection of the Deschutes River Trail – Conflict Assessment Report



The **Mary Orton** Company
TRANSFORMING HOW PEOPLE WORK TOGETHER

Southern Connection of the Deschutes River Trail Conflict Assessment Report

prepared on behalf of Oregon Consensus



by

Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company, LLC
Bend, Oregon

mary@maryorton.com ☞ www.maryorton.com ☞ 702.210-9642

Final Report, December 15, 2018

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Background on the Issue	2
Oregon Consensus	3
Role of The Mary Orton Company	3
Methodology.....	4
Report Organization	4
Interviewees' Comments	6
Concerns and Interests	6
Laws and Regulations	6
Wildlife	7
Access, Connectivity, and Increased Use	7
Off-Leash Dogs	8
Local vs. State/National Decision.....	9
Neighborhood Impact.....	9
Social Equity and Environmental Justice.....	9
Barriers and Complicating Factors	9
Trust	10
Public Processes.....	10
District Management.....	10
Wildlife.....	10
Resources.....	10
Legislative Efforts	10
Alternatives	11
Eminent Domain	11
Elected and Appointed Officials	11
Claiming Support	11
Impacts.....	11
Bridge Location	11
Differences as to Fact.....	12
Level of Development.....	12
Previous Processes	12
Wild and Scenic Regulations.....	12
State Scenic Waterways Restrictions	12
Wildlife Presence.....	12
Conservation Easement	12
Impacts at Rimrock	13
Lack of Data.....	13
Polarization	13
Capacity of Stakeholders	13
Laws and Regulations	13
BPRD's Experience with Restoration	13

Possible Common Ground from Interviewees	13
Possible Alternatives from Interviewees.....	14
Interviewees' Perspectives on a Collaborative Process.....	15
Recommendations	16
Introduction	16
Collaborative Opportunity.....	16
Step 1: Trust-Building Conversations	16
Step 2: Neutral Convenor	17
Step 3: Joint Fact-Finding	17
Step 4: Community Collaborative.....	18
Convenor.....	18
Facilitator	18
Process Development.....	18
Scope	18
Funding.....	18
Stakeholders to be Involved	18
Board Action	19
Transparency.....	19
Allow Enough Time	19
Consensus.....	19
Summary	20
Attachment A: BPRD Board of Directors Resolution	21
Attachment B: Interview Questions	23
Attachment C: Interviewees	25
Attachment D: Process Ideas from Interviewees	26

Executive Summary

The areas close to the Deschutes River are precious: in general, people who are there want to protect what they have, and those who are not desire more access. All persons interviewed for this report are concerned about avoiding negative environmental impacts.

The issue of a southern crossing of the Deschutes River addressed in this report is a controversial one. After being part of a Bend Park and Recreation District bond measure that voters approved in 2012, it has been the subject of several public processes with diverse purposes and outcomes, as well as two unsuccessful legislative attempts to prohibit a bridge.

This conflict assessment report, commissioned by the Bend Park and Recreation District through Oregon Consensus, was designed to advise whether and how a collaborative agreement-seeking process might help address ongoing concerns about the alignment and construction of a trail segment to connect the Deschutes River Trail on the south end of Bend. It is the result of 25 face-to-face interviews of 29 people from September 9 through October 9, 2018. It summarizes their concerns and interests, as well as barriers to addressing those concerns.

The concerns of stakeholders are complex and include wildlife, the ecosystem, social equity, access, neighborhood impacts, private property rights, and erosion of environmental protections. The issue has been marked by the loss or simply lack of trust, misinformation, wildly divergent opinions as to facts, lack of data, and polarization among stakeholders. Considering these and other factors, BPRD has several options at this point, including forgoing the project of a crossing in this reach of the river.

Should BPRD and stakeholders decide to proceed with a collaborative process, this report contains a number of recommendations intended to help shape that process, including a stepwise approach that would test at each step whether there is adequate commitment to support a full collaborative process. This stepwise approach would include small private facilitated conversations to rebuild trust, the engagement of a neutral convenor, a joint fact-finding process, and then, only if indicated, the initiation of a community collaborative with a number of elements that would help it be successful.

We also recommend that such a process address more than simply a crossing. It should include broader concerns that were evident in the interviews: the tension between equitable recreational access and environmental protection in a growing area. We also recommend that participants include those who are traditionally underserved with recreational opportunities, residents who live in different parts of the community, and those who live near any possible proposed crossing.

The collaborative group will need enough time to address the differences as to fact and to rebuild relationships and trust, and then generate, evaluate, and choose among alternatives. We estimate this will take at least one year.

We believe that, should BPRD and stakeholders decided to initiate a collaborative process, especially if in alignment with the recommendations herein, they could ensure that the community would benefit. It could offer a way forward for all stakeholders with increased recreational access, environmental protection, and social equity, as well as increase trust and enhanced relationships.

Introduction

BACKGROUND ON THE ISSUE

Bend Park and Recreation District (BPRD or District) is a special tax district, separate from the City of Bend, that is governed by a five-member elected Board of Directors and managed by an Executive Director. BPRD maintains and operates about 3,000 acres of parkland (including 70 miles of trail), offers recreation programs, and manages several facilities.

BPRD's Bond Measure 9-86, approved by voters in 2012,¹ included, among several other projects, "pedestrian crossings connecting the east and west sides of the River Trail." The BPRD does not own land that could be used for such a crossing. The BPRD convened a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) in 2015; staff presented several options for a trail alignment and bridge location and the CAC agreed on one that is just outside the Bend Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) on Forest Service land.

All bridge locations studied—some on private land, some on public land—were in a reach of the river that has special designations under the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Oregon Scenic Waterways Act, or solely under the Scenic Waterways Act.

According to the Oregon Park and Recreation Department, "The Scenic Waterways Act was created to strike a balance between protecting the natural resources, scenic value, and recreational uses of Oregon's rivers by designating them."² Additionally, "...the Oregon Legislative Assembly designated [as a State Scenic Waterway] portions of the river from the [Wickiup] reservoir to Bend through a bill in 1987. In 1988, Oregon voters approved Measure 7 and added the last, most-downstream mile inside Bend's Urban Growth Boundary."³

The Wild and Scenic Rivers designation extends from Wickiup Dam up to but not within the Bend UGB. The *Upper Deschutes Wild and Scenic River and State Scenic Waterway Comprehensive Management Plan*⁴ (hereinafter "Management Plan"), developed by fifteen federal, tribal, state, and local agencies, notes that the federal Wild and Scenic designation was established due to the "scenic, recreational, cultural, geologic, wilderness, fish and wildlife as well as historic and botanical values" in the area.

The Management Plan also reads (page 42), with regard to the Wild and Scenic reach of the river, "New bridges, transmission, gas or water lines will be discouraged." With regard to the Scenic Waterways reaches of the river, the Management Plan as well as the Upper Deschutes River Scenic Waterway—Oregon Administrative Rule 736-040-0073⁵ reads, "New bridges will not be permitted."

BPRD approached the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD), which manages the Scenic Waterways Program, and requested an amendment to the rules to allow a footbridge on the Upper Deschutes. In 2016, the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Commission took comments through a

¹ See page 5 of the voters' pamphlet at <https://weblink.deschutes.org/public/0/doc/13654/Page1.aspx> for the text.

² See <https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/NATRES/scenicwaterways/Pages/index.aspx>.

³ See <https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/Pages/upper-deschutes-scenic-waterway.aspx>.

⁴ July 1996, <https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/docs/deschutes-sww-plan.pdf>.

⁵ See <https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/docs/deschutes-rules.pdf>.

public review and declined to amend the rule. Instead, it directed OPRD staff to look at the rules for that reach at a higher level, rather than specifically targeting the one restriction that affects crossings. That review was completed in 2017 and the decision was made to not to pursue any new rule amendments at that time. The OPRD process included, among other outreach efforts, a citizens' committee named the Upper Deschutes Advisory Group (UDAG).⁶

By this time, the bridge proposal had become controversial. Bills to ban a bridge were introduced in the 2017 and 2018 legislative sessions. They did not pass.

The BPRD Board of Directors adopted a resolution on February 20, 2018 (see Attachment A) that directs the District to enlist the help of a third-party facilitator to help stakeholders resolve how to best connect the Deschutes River Trail on the south end of Bend. Later that year, BPRD retained Oregon Consensus to assist them to find and contract with such a facilitator. Oregon Consensus suggested, and BPRD agreed, to first perform an assessment to ascertain whether initiating a collaborative process would be advisable. This report is the result of that assessment.

OREGON CONSENSUS

Oregon Consensus (OC) is Oregon's legislatively established program for public policy consensus building and conflict resolution, providing assessment, facilitation, mediation, and other services to communities, public entities, and stakeholders on complex public policy issues.

OC issued a Request for Proposals to its Affiliated Practitioner Team for this conflict assessment. After reviewing proposals and consulting with a few stakeholders, including BPRD, OC selected The Mary Orton Company, LLC to perform the assessment.

ROLE OF THE MARY ORTON COMPANY

The Mary Orton Company, LLC (TMOC) is a Bend, Oregon firm that has provided conflict prevention and management services, primarily for environmental and public policy issues and conflicts, throughout the country for 20 years. TMOC also provides facilitation, public involvement, and organization development services.

TMOC worked on behalf of OC to conduct a neutral assessment to advise whether and how a collaborative agreement-seeking process might help address ongoing concerns about the alignment and construction of a trail segment to connect the Deschutes River Trail on the south end of Bend.

The role of TMOC and OC in this assessment is to provide a thorough, accurate, and impartial analysis of the situation, in order to assist stakeholders to increase their mutual understanding of the interests and concerns of others and to help BPRD and stakeholders to decide whether to embark on a collaborative process.

Neither TMOC nor OC is an advocate for any particular outcome or interest except good process, and we conduct our work in a fair, deliberate, and impartial fashion. TMOC and OC staffs are bound by the code of ethics of the Association of Conflict Resolution that reads, in part, "Impartiality means freedom from favoritism, bias, or prejudice." To that end, without endorsing any interviewee's

⁶ See <https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/Pages/upper-deschutes-scenic-waterway.aspx>.

opinions, we have strived to include a summary of all points of view expressed by interviewees in this report.

We hope this report is useful to both BPRD and stakeholders as they decide on their next steps with regard to this issue. Of course, the recommendations in this report are advisory only; the parties will decide whether to move forward with a collaborative process after taking into account the data and recommendations in this report and other information as they choose.

METHODOLOGY

This assessment is based upon data collected through voluntary interviews of stakeholders. Mary Orton conducted 25 face-to-face interviews of 29 people from September 9 through October 9, 2018. Mary developed the interview questions (see Attachment B) in consultation with OC and BPRD.

Mary requested and received from BPRD a list of 19 potential interviewees, 17 of whom agreed to be interviewed. Two of those invited another person from their organizations to attend their interviews. Mary asked all interviewees to suggest others who should be interviewed. Based on those recommendations, Mary contacted 14 additional potential interviewees, 10 of whom agreed to be interviewed. Three of these were interviewed at one time.

The interviews and report structure were designed to encourage frank and open answers to interview questions. Interviewees were told that a report would be written, that their names would be listed as interviewees, and that a summary of their comments would be included in the report. They were also told that their comments would not be attributed to them or their organization. In addition, interviewees were invited to designate any part of their interview as private, in which case it would not be used in the report or shared outside TMOC.

TMOC encouraged feedback on the report. Interviewees were sent a draft version of the report (one that did not include the executive summary or recommendations) and were invited to alert Mary if something important they said was inadvertently not included in the report.

TMOC thanks the interviewees who took the time to share their thoughts, opinions, hopes, and concerns. A list of those invited to be interviewed is in Attachment C.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

An **Executive Summary** precedes this **Introduction**.

The report continues with **Interviewees' Comments**, a detailed summary of comments made by interviewees. Readers should note that not every comment made is included here; it is intended to be a summary of the main themes we heard during the interviews. The first subsection here contains interviewees' concerns and interests, organized by issue area. The next section lists barriers to addressing those concerns and interests. After barriers is a section on possible common ground and a section on possible solutions suggested by interviewees. A reference to process ideas from interviewees completes this section.

The final section of the report contains the recommendations from TMOC for the BPRD and others to consider as they determine next steps and is aptly named **Recommendations**.

Attachments include the BPRD Board of Directors resolution on the subject (referenced above), interview questions, the list of interviewees and interviewees' process ideas for a possible collaboration.

Interviewees' Comments

This section describes, without attribution, the comments and opinions of the interviewees. It is intended to include the full range of opinions shared by interviewees, without indicating how many made one comment or another. The terms “interviewees” and “some interviewees” should be viewed as interchangeable. These terms are not intended to mean all interviewees and could mean one interviewee.

Statements from interviewees are treated as opinions for the purposes of this report, and, because this is not a fact-finding report, they were not checked for accuracy.

Mary Orton, TMOC, and OC neither endorse nor necessarily agree with the following comments and opinions; they are included here because one or more interviewees said them.

CONCERNS AND INTERESTS

This section describes the concerns and interests of the interviewees, and is organized by issue.

Laws and Regulations

Many interviewees cited the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and State Scenic Waterways Act designations when discussing their desires vis-à-vis this reach of the river, whether they were in favor of or against a crossing.

Some interviewees, including some who preferred to have a connection across the river, cited their fear of losing protections on federal and other public lands. They felt that if a bridge were allowed despite the language in the rules, it could set a strong and negative precedent that would weaken the integrity of the Scenic Waterways Act and perhaps also the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Others said with the large number of private homes built on the river, as well as the high level of recreation by people and dogs in the area, this reach of the Deschutes should no longer qualify as a protected area, and so the designations or the rules should be reconsidered. Some said a bridge would not detract from a Wild and Scenic or Scenic Waterways reach, especially when private development has occurred up to the shoreline in those reaches. They also said that there are many examples of Wild and Scenic and Scenic Waterways rivers that have bridges, including the Upper Deschutes, and that a bridge would enhance the corridor because it would allow people to access the river.

Some interviewees said the Wild and Scenic and Scenic Waterways laws and regulations were so restrictive that pursuing a bridge had no legal basis, and would open the BPRD to lawsuits if they continued.

Other laws and regulations were also cited. Interviewees noted that the Deschutes County Transportation System Plan has language supportive of a bike/pedestrian bridge along the

Deschutes River, provided there is adequate outreach to affected property owners.⁷ Others noted the private property rights of residents near any proposed bridge site would have to be respected.

Wildlife

Some interviewees mentioned the potential negative impact on wildlife of a bridge, and resultant increased use by people, dogs, and bicycles, as a reason not to build a bridge. While acknowledging that this is not a pristine river corridor, some said that it is still critical for wildlife, and that impacts to wildlife from a bridge would extend beyond the bridge location, affecting nesting areas as well as migration corridors.

Some cited the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 2015 letter to the Oregon Park and Recreation Department regarding a bridge that said, “Much of the area on the west side of the River between River Miles 174.6 and 172 is part of a U.S. Forest Service Key Elk Management Area as described in the Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1990). In addition, according to the Deschutes County Comprehensive plan, the west side of the river is part of the Statewide Goal 5 Tumalo Deer Winter Range.”

Some noted that the privately-owned “Thompson Wildlife Sanctuary” was an undeveloped area on the east side of the river that provides a significant habitat for several riparian species, as well as serving as a mule deer crossing point. They were concerned that a bridge at the District’s preferred location and a trail leading to that bridge would irreparably harm the wildlife and the Sanctuary.

Some said they had seen elk in the area in recent years, and others said the elk would return if the dog park were removed and no bridge were built. Others stated that the elk were no longer in the area and that a bridge would not have a negative impact on wildlife. They noted that the area is mostly developed, with subdivisions already built in what used to be elk wintering habitat and a new subdivision being built in the area, and they doubted that a bridge would have a significant impact above and beyond these developments.

Still others said there is no recent study of the current usage level of the area by wildlife, and without those data, no decision should be made about a crossing in the area. Some said if studies showed wildlife were no longer using the area due to current recreational use and housing development, then the area could be considered a “sacrifice area” and increased recreation should be allowed.

While some interviewees opposed to a bridge due to wildlife concerns suggested that a set of eastside trails would address the needs of those residents, others said eastside trails could also have a negative impact on wildlife.

Access, Connectivity, and Increased Use

Interviewees of different opinions about a crossing said they believed that more recreational use of any area would encourage more environmental stewardship of the area.

⁷ See Policy 15.3(m), 15.9, and 15.10 at <https://weblink.deschutes.org/public/DocView.aspx?id=6061&page=12&searchid=bf0cd6e9-f1a3-4d44-b7a4-d39f2f9f2ec1>.

Some interviewees said as Bend grows, more access and more trails would need to be built; other interviewees said as Bend grows, the special places would need more protections. Some interviewees said they wanted to find a balance between conservation and recreation. Some found that balance with a bridge, some without a bridge, and some said while they didn't know where that balance was best found, the cost of access needed to be weighed against the benefits.

Interviewees said additional connections and trails were needed to prevent over-use of existing trails, especially trails along the river. "People are hungry for places to walk along the river," one interviewee said.

Some said a bridge makes good sense from an environmental point of view, instead of requiring people to drive several miles to connect. They noted the potential to reduce car trips, carbon emissions, congestion, and vehicle-miles traveled, helping to achieve the goal of decreased reliance on vehicles and reduction of air pollution. Others thought that increasing trails throughout the city would be a better way to decrease vehicle-miles traveled.

Some interviewees felt a crossing in this reach was fulfillment of a promise of the bond measure they supported and the goal of a continuous trail connection between Tumalo and Sunriver. Others pointed out the projections of significant growth in the southeast part of the City, and viewed a crossing in this area as a way to address the demand for westside recreation by moving people from the east to the west side. They also said a crossing in this area would allow eastside children too young to drive to enjoy the Deschutes National Forest on their bikes.

By contrast, some interviewees said they were concerned about "opening the floodgates of people" coming into the area. At the same time, some opponents said any bridge in that area would only be used by a limited number of people in the River Rim development. (BPRD has not indicated how many additional recreationists are predicted to use the area if a crossing were there, a source of frustration for some interviewees.)

Some interviewees said they consider this a wild section of river, and others noted the list of "outstandingly remarkable values" that warranted designation as Wild and Scenic as reasons to not build a bridge. While they acknowledged houses and dogs already impact the area, they said impact from a bridge would exacerbate the situation. Others noted that the visual impact of the bridge alone would negatively impact others' enjoyment of that reach of the river, and trash and other impacts from the increased numbers of visitors would be detrimental. Others said there could be unintended consequences of a bridge, including increased river use by inexperienced floaters unprepared for the dangerous rapids below.

Off-Leash Dogs

Supporters and opponents of a crossing noted that the riparian area, especially on the west side in the Rimrock area (also known as Good Dog, and which is a year-round off-leash area with access to the river), has already been heavily impacted by people and dogs, and that the increased turbidity of the water can negatively affect fish and other riparian wildlife. (Whether that impact and turbidity is attributable to dog and dog-owner use is disputed—see "Differences as to Fact," below.) They opined that this area has not been well managed by the Forest Service and that increased use could mean further degradation if there were no change in management strategy. Some who value the off-leash river access were concerned that more users would mean their year-round off-leash access would

be restricted or eliminated. They point out that Rimrock is one of only two places in or near Bend where people can legally take off-leash dogs to swim in the river in the summer (when many trails don't allow off-leash dogs and when access to water is important to many dog owners) and is the only such place that also allows for hiking.

Local vs. State/National Decision

Interviewees said because the Wild and Scenic designation is federal, and the Scenic Waterways designation was established (in part) with a statewide vote, local stakeholders should not be the only ones to weigh in on a crossing. Others felt strongly that local stakeholders should be the primary decision-makers.

Still others believe that the community as a whole wants to have a crossing, and that desire should outweigh the opposition of nearby property owners. Others remarked that the community doesn't have those kinds of conversations very well.

Neighborhood Impact

Some interviewees were concerned about the impact of a crossing on their neighborhoods, including increased traffic, crime, potential for fire, trespassing on private property, where people will park, and undesirable people who might be attracted by a trailhead or crossing. Some were concerned about conflict between trailhead users and residents. Others responded to these concerns by noting that "we all have to share" the beautiful parts of the city.

Some interviewees said it would be a "travesty" to ruin such a beautiful stretch of river with a bridge, while others pointed out that there were already many private property owners with homes built near the river and with private access to these areas. Interviewees said local people who have a trail or an area to themselves wouldn't like additional people, but it would be a good trade-off for getting more people active and outside. Some characterized opposition and support of a crossing as: those near the river don't want it, and those further away support it.

Social Equity and Environmental Justice

Some interviewees brought up environmental justice and social equity issues, with the lower-income (east) side of the river having less access to the river and to Deschutes National Forest trails. They noted that eastside trails off the river would not equate to the experience of the Deschutes National Forest river trails. This is in contrast to others who said a trail system on the east side could provide the same values.

Interviewees said there were 30-40,000 people on the east side without easy access to trails west of Bend, despite living quite close to them. Almost all the trail networks are on the west side, but more than 50% of the population lives east of the river. Interviewees also said the area immediately south of the City has no parks; if a crossing existed, the Forest Service land could serve as their park.

BARRIERS AND COMPLICATING FACTORS

This section details the complicating factors or barriers to addressing the concerns identified by stakeholders.

Trust

Many events and occurrences have increased distrust among both opponents and proponents of a river crossing. Many interviewees expressed dismay at the erosion of trust and wished it could be rebuilt.

Public Processes

Interviewees said there had been several public processes that have resulted in a recommendation of no bridge (this is in dispute—see “Differences as to Fact,” below). However, because in their view the District has not accepted those outcomes, they could not be trusted to accept another process that didn’t recommend a bridge.

Also, because the District has indicated that they could wait one year and build a bridge under the Scenic Waterways rules (this is in dispute—see “Differences as to Fact,” below), some interviewees felt that meant that they could not trust that the results of a collaborative process would be followed.

Some interviewees said that the CAC process was flawed because members were not told of the restrictions on bridges from the two overlays (federal Wild and Scenic and state Scenic Waterways).

Some interviewees said the UDAG process, run by OPRD, was supposed to only address whether the Upper Deschutes Scenic Waterway rules should be reopened. They say that despite the fact that the participants were told that they were not to discuss the bridge, they did end up discussing the bridge, which some saw as unfair. Also, while some say that this process recommended against a bridge (this is in dispute—see “Differences as to Fact,” below), others said it was not a representative or well-run process.

District Management

Some interviewees strongly distrust BPRD management. For them, the lack of trust is so strong that virtually every action of the Director is seen as malicious or at least ill-intentioned.

Wildlife

Some interviewees said they do not believe there is enough data to know whether a bridge in the area would be detrimental to wildlife; yet, in their perspective, BPRD personnel indicate that they know it would not be detrimental. They said this increased their distrust of BPRD and the District should not be so quick to opine about a subject on which they are not expert.

Resources

Some interviewees said they distrusted BPRD because they usually seem to have enough funds to do what they want. Similar distrust was cited toward some of the landowners near the bridge area because they were viewed as spending their funds on spreading misinformation and fear.

Legislative Efforts

Some interviewees saw the two legislative efforts as trying to prevent a collaborative process and public input, which increased their distrust of the bridge opponents. Other interviewees considered the two legislative efforts as valid public processes. Also, interviewees mentioned that the first legislative effort was launched during the UDAG process, which was trying to find common ground, and they felt blindsided at a time when “they were supposed to be open and honest with each other.”

Alternatives

Some interviewees indicated they didn't trust other stakeholders who proposed an eastside trail that would be the "equivalent" of the Deschutes National Forest trails. They said eastside trails would be a totally different experience: lava rock instead of ponderosa pines and away from the river instead of on the river. They said if the connection to Sunriver were past Lava Butte, there is less accessibility to the Deschutes National Forest and many would not be interested in that trail.

Eminent Domain

Several interviewees told the story of hearing second- or third-hand that a BPRD staff member threatened a landowner with eminent domain (condemnation), before BPRD decided the preferable site for a bridge was on public land. Others told of hearing first-hand a former BPRD staff member say that condemnation was a possibility or that BPRD was "prepared" to take land through that process. Still others told of an email that said BPRD would have "no problem using condemnation." Interviewees also said Don Horton, BPRD Executive Director, has said publicly that BPRD would never say that.

Elected and Appointed Officials

Interviewees said they knew of political candidates who were offered significant sums in campaign contributions for opposing the bridge, or of significant contributions given to other candidates because they supported the bridge. Others said there should be a change in the leadership of the BPRD if the bridge idea continued to be pushed. Still others said the BPRD Board tends to uncritically do what their Executive Director suggests, which decreased their trust of the Board.

Claiming Support

Some interviewees said their trust of BPRD eroded when the District claimed publicly that the interviewees' organizations supported the bridge. While they had supported the bond issue that included "pedestrian crossings connecting the east and west sides of the River Trail," they didn't understand at the time the full implications or the restrictions against a bridge in state and federal law. Some felt that the District should have been more forthcoming about those restrictions when they were first approached to support the bond election, and others said that BPRD should have checked with them before using their organization's name later in support of a bridge when they had more generally supported the bond issue.

Impacts

Interviewees said opponents' reasons for opposing the bridge were not honest because there was so much development and use in the area already that the bridge would not have a negative impact, even to wildlife. In addition, District funding could help mitigate even current impact from overuse in the Rimrock area.

Bridge Location

Interviewees said BPRD announced at a legislative hearing that the bridge location had been moved from private property to Forest Service land, and they felt BPRD had been disingenuous because they hadn't disclosed that change before the hearing. Others said the CAC had chosen the Forest Service site in 2015 as the preferred location, and the Board adopted that location during the discussion of the first legislative bill.

Differences as to Fact

In addition to the differences of opinion described above, there were multiple instances of disagreements about facts that might be clarified by a mutual exploration of the issues, learning, or fact-finding.

Level of Development

Some interviewees said the area in question is quite developed with houses and recreational trails, while others said the area is not all developed.

Previous Processes

Some interviewees said, “State Parks has said ‘no’ twice to a bridge,” while others said that never happened—that instead OPRD declined to open the rules to amendment. Some said the UDAG process resulted in consensus against a bridge, while others say there was no consensus on the bridge. While some said the UDAG process was designed only to ask how well the Scenic Waterways designation was working to protect the values for which it was made, others said it was about whether to build a bridge, and still others say its purpose was to come to consensus on a trail alignment.

Wild and Scenic Regulations

Some interviewees said there was “no mitigation allowed under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act,” while other pointed out that the Wild and Scenic part of the Management Plan not only doesn’t prohibit a bridge, but it seems to encourage mitigation: “New bridges, transmission, gas or water lines will be discouraged. Where no reasonable alternative exists, adverse effects to scenic quality will be minimized by using existing rights-of-way and structures or burying lines (page 42).”

State Scenic Waterways Restrictions

Some interviewees said the Scenic Waterways regulations prohibit a bridge, and so there can be no bridge. Others said to allow a bridge would require a change in state law or regulations. Still others said no change would be needed, as there is a provision in the Scenic Waterways Act that allows a property owner to propose a change that is counter to the rules, be denied, and then after a period of a year (designed to allow the state to work with the property owner), the property owner can do as she pleases on her property. Still others said this latter provision applies only to persons, not to districts or other non-individual landowners. Still others said if that provision applies only to persons, the entire Act would probably apply only to persons.

While some characterized utilizing the one-year waiting period as failing to adhere to the rules, others pointed out that this provision was actually a part of the Act, and so abiding by this provision would not be acting counter to the rules or the Act.

Wildlife Presence

As noted above, some interviewees who have lived or recreated in the area for years disputed assertions by others (also including some who have lived or recreated in the area for years) that there is a significant amount of wildlife still in the area.

Conservation Easement

Some interviewees stated that the privately-owned Wildlife Sanctuary that is posted in the area is protected by a conservation easement (with some saying it was not adequate to truly protect the area). Others said there is no conservation easement, but county zoning protects it.

Impacts at Rimrock

Some interviewees said there were significant negative environmental impacts from dogs and people at the Rimrock area. Others said there was some impact on small section of bank because users are concentrated, but the dog impact is less than that from humans; and that fluctuating river flows cause more streambank erosion than dogs.

Lack of Data

Some interviewees emphasized the importance of doing a serious assessment of the wildlife utilization in the area, because there is no good recent assessment. Others emphasized that community data, such as the level of support of such a crossing, is also lacking.

Polarization

Interviewees noted that many people involved with this issue are “dug in” and have polarized views. Some named as a barrier certain individuals, on all sides of the issue, who were viewed as holding their views so strongly that they would be an impediment to any community solution that didn’t closely align with their own views. Both opponents and proponents of a bridge expressed the view that the other side’s positions were “narrow and self-centered.”

Capacity of Stakeholders

Some interviewees said BPRD has the capacity to address many issues at once, but the individuals and organizations that might be expected to participate in a collaborative process have less. They were concerned this might make it difficult to have real engagement, especially for a process that lasted as long as a year.

Laws and Regulations

Some interviewees listed the Wild and Scenic and Scenic Waterways designations as a barrier to addressing their concerns. They said finding an option to connect the River Trail that complies with the Management Plan and state rules, or a legislative change that would allow a bridge, would be difficult. Others said they viewed the fact that the state cannot enforce the Scenic Waterways rules as a barrier to addressing their concerns.

BPRD’s Experience with Restoration

Interviewees said the BPRD is not greatly skilled or experienced at addressing wildlife, habitat, and riparian restoration concerns. They noted that BPRD had just started with its own restoration projects (in conjunction with the Upper Deschutes Watershed Council [UDWC]) and so were unproven. Others said BPRD has experience in this area, and has restored more riverfront within the UGB than any other agency. They pointed out that BPRD has partnered with UDWC on riparian restoration since 2003.

POSSIBLE COMMON GROUND FROM INTERVIEWEES

When asked whether they felt there was common ground among all stakeholders, interviewees had some ideas, as listed below. (Some interviewees said their own views were potential common ground, but those are not listed here when others expressed strongly-held and opposite views.)

- Access, exposure, and the opportunity for people to be outside is important, at least in part so they continue to invest in those places and steward them.
- We want to protect the values that brought people here: the outdoors, wildlife, views, landscapes, and quality of life.
- The river is a special part of our community and we need to protect its health.

- The issue of managing recreation on public land while protecting that land is difficult, especially for a community that celebrates outdoor recreation, and is growing, like Bend.
- Trails along the river are special and provide a different experience from trails not along the river.
- It's a fine idea to have a trail that connects from Tumalo to Sunriver.
- We should examine alternative solutions.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FROM INTERVIEWEES

While interviewees were not asked for specific alternatives or solutions, some were offered. Some possible alternatives had to do with development of eastside trails.

- While some interviewees talked about the equity of connecting eastside residents with the Deschutes National Forest trails, others talked about the equity of building more trails on the east side.
- Interviewees said there is a "beautiful" eastside trail that connects Deschutes River Woods to Benham Falls Bridge through Lava Lands, and back through the Haul Road.
 - Others said this trail doesn't exist on the east side unless you walk on the railroad tracks. They also said while a trail on the east side could be built, it would be away from the river unless easements were obtained from the many homeowners on the east side whose property runs to the river's edge.
 - Interviewees also said a trail away from the river is not the same as, and is far less desirable than, access to the river trail.
 - Others said to build a trail through the lava would disrupt habitat.

Interviewees also had the following suggestions:

- There is a potential route for a trail starting on the west side, out to the new Visitor's Center, then south, crossing on Benham Falls existing bridge, then connecting via Lava Lands.
- No bridge is needed because trail connectivity already exists: people can cross the Bill Healy Bridge and travel along the Haul Road Trail, which leads to the Deschutes National Forest and ultimately to Sunriver.
 - Others said this was not a river trail and put trail users along a highway instead of in nature, which is much less desirable.
- Figure out if better management, sharing among different users (bikes, dogs, pedestrians), seasonality and hours restrictions, and restoration along the stream bank, especially at Rimrock, would help bring the elk back and meet the values that people have for the area, even with a bridge.
- BPRD could allocate funding for protection and restoration of the area impacted by any bridge, including Rimrock.
- A crossing might be acceptable where the canyon is so steep there are no homes there. Engineering would be difficult and the cost of a bridge there would be expensive, and there would still be issues with private lands.
- Move the bridge site inside the UGB, away from the Scenic Waterways reach, further downstream.
- Move the bridge site to Meadow Camp, on private property.
- Move the bridge site to Lava Island.
- Reduce the state Scenic Waterways reach to allow for the bridge, in order to make the rest of it rock solid. If it were reduced by half, that would be a big concession; if it were reduced by a quarter mile, it would not be such a big deal. (Note: this idea came from a bridge opponent.)

- Buy the right to build a trail at the existing pedestrian bridge downstream.

INTERVIEWEES' PERSPECTIVES ON A COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

Most interviewees were willing to consider and participate in a collaborative process on this issue. For some, it was a way to potentially find a creative solution for trail connectivity that everyone could agree to. For others, it would at least offer a path to increase mutual understanding and rebuild trust, even if a consensus did not emerge.

Interviewees offered many suggestions for what ground rules or approaches might be useful or not useful, and also had suggestions for who should be involved in any such process. Many of these suggestions have been incorporated in our recommendations. Please see Attachment D for interviewees' ideas.

Recommendations

This section contains our recommendations to address the central question of the assessment: whether and how a collaborative agreement-seeking process might help address ongoing concerns about the alignment and construction of a trail segment to connect the Deschutes River Trail on the south end of Bend.

Introduction

There is common ground among all interviewees: they all cherish the river, and they want to protect the river from environmental degradation. Many of those without easy access want to more fully experience the river in this reach, and those with access, particularly private access, are concerned that more users will denigrate their own experience, the ecosystem, or both. Recreational experiences along or near the river are clearly valued more highly than those away from the river.

Whether or not to build a bicycle and pedestrian bridge near the southern UGB of Bend—the narrow question that has embroiled many of the interviewees to date—is a manifestation of a broader issue facing the community: the tension between equitable recreational access and environmental protection in a growing area, especially with an overlay of private property rights. It is difficult to have a productive conversation solely about a particular bridge or river crossing in that context. To address this issue properly, the community would need to engage in a broader conversation: How do we want to manage this area that is valued by so many for so many different reasons?

Whether or not to engage in such a community conversation is discussed below.

Collaborative Opportunity

Almost all the interviewees were in favor of a collaborative process as a way to have a civil conversation about these issues. Even some who were pessimistic about the possibility of achieving agreement saw value in a process that might rebuild trust and relationships.

There is no guarantee that a collaborative process would result in consensus or even broad agreement on the question at hand. Many stakeholders have strong and polarized views and mutual levels of distrust are quite high. The challenges would be many should a collaborative process ensue. BPRD has several options at this point, including forgoing the project of building a connection for the Deschutes River Trail in this reach of the river.

That being said, we believe that a collaborative process, deliberately designed with certain elements described below, holds the potential of being of value to the District and the community, both to provide an opportunity for rebuilding trust and to explore whether agreement could be reached. Should the District and stakeholders decide to explore this possibility, we recommend a stepwise approach with an evaluation at the conclusion of each step to determine whether it makes sense to proceed to the next.

Step 1: Trust-Building Conversations

The trust issues raised in this report need to be directly addressed both in advance of and throughout any process, and indeed, should be addressed even if there is no process. Many

interviewees expressed distress at finding themselves at odds with other stakeholders on this issue and said they would like to repair those relationships.

As a first step, stakeholders would be invited to participate in one-on-one or very small group conversations with each other to begin the process of rebuilding trust. These voluntary conversations could be facilitated or mediated by a professional trained in helping people have difficult conversations.

Depending on the tone and outcome of these conversations, the process might proceed to the next step.

Step 2: Neutral Convenor

Due to high levels of distrust discussed above, we recommend that a neutral outside convenor or leader be engaged for the remaining steps, to prevent any impression that BPRD is attempting to control the process or the outcome. This should be a person or persons with credibility who is highly respected by stakeholders of all points of view. Perhaps a former elected official or another community leader, or a pair or small group of such individuals, could be found to fill the role. An alternative might be to form a diverse group of involved stakeholders who could collectively serve as convenor.

It would be helpful if a convenor were engaged at this point to assist with the subsequent steps. The convenor's role might include, among other tasks, potentially forming a small group of stakeholders to serve as an executive committee for the process, retaining a facilitator, working with the facilitator (and executive committee, if one is formed) to develop process design options, issuing invitations to those who would participate in the process, and chairing meetings as appropriate. (Note that this convenor role is separate from the idea of retaining a facilitator to help with process design and implementation.)

In our view, BPRD would serve both as a participant in any ensuing process (with a Board member potentially serving in that role), and as a resource to any group that is formed (at the staff level).

It is possible that the convenor for the Joint Fact-Finding step might be different from the convenor for the Community Collaboration step.

Step 3: Joint Fact-Finding

The large number of "disagreements as to fact" in this report speaks to the need to address and attempt to resolve those disagreements—or at least find a way to amicably agree to disagree on interpretation of facts. Here we are recommending this as a stand-alone preliminary step. There would likely be additional joint learning that takes place as part of the educational phase if a full-fledged collaborative process moves forward from here.

Joint fact-finding typically involves all sides of a conflict working together with experts to address factual disputes. Key elements are that

- Experts, decision makers, and key stakeholders from all sides of an issue work together.
- Information and resources are shared.

- The result is a single text embodying the sum of the joint efforts.⁸

When this step is completed, a decision would be made, based on how parties worked together and the outcomes, whether to proceed to the next step—or to an unforeseen interim step if that is indicated.

Step 4: Community Collaborative

If it is decided that a community collaborative should be convened, we recommend the following elements be adopted.

Convenor

A convenor should be selected, or the convenor that has been serving re-confirmed, for this step.

Facilitator

Retaining a trusted third-party facilitator, as the BPRD Board has indicated is their intention, will help to both increase trust in the process and ensure the process has integrity.

Process Development

Before any collaborative process begins, the convenor, facilitator, and a small group of key stakeholders should develop a proposed process to vet with potential participants. Elements of this proposed process could include those listed in this section of the report (scope, participants, funding, etc.), and perhaps more. During the vetting process, the process managers should be open to changing their draft plan to accommodate good ideas from potential participants.

Scope

The scope of the collaborative should be broader than just a bridge. It might include, for example, how to provide access, connectivity, and eastside recreational opportunities while protecting the natural resources the community loves.

This will not only address a community need; in addition, the broader scope will allow for more opportunities for tradeoffs and outcomes that could meet diverse needs of different stakeholders.

The actual scope should be developed with the convenor, the facilitator, and other key stakeholders (including BPRD) and should be thoroughly vetted with all participants early in the process or before it begins. We anticipate this could take a substantial amount of time and energy, and that the time invested here would provide a significant return as the process ensues.

Funding

There could be value in having multiple entities fund the process both to share the expense and to ensure there are no perceptions that one entity is controlling the process.

Stakeholders to be Involved

This collaborative process should include many or all of the individuals, agencies, and organizations that have been involved in the issue to date, including, as noted above, a BPRD Board member. Without listing all these, we point out a few categories that might otherwise be missed.

⁸ See <https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/joint-fact-finding> for more information.

Representatives from all neighborhoods and neighboring landowners with the potential to be impacted should be included. These should include many neighborhoods along the river, even those that previously have not been engaged, to avoid the potential problem of engaging them later after norms and relationships have been developed.

Organizations and individuals that represent populations that are traditionally underserved with recreational opportunities should also be invited to participate.

Also invited should be trail users and other stakeholders who do not live near the crossing site, and even some outside the District boundaries. Just as some interviewees pointed out that federal Wild and Scenic and state Scenic Waterways designations are not solely local issues, but rather of statewide or nationwide scope, so too relying only on the opinions of those near the crossing site would be incomplete, especially if the scope were broader. Even if the scope is narrow, the process should include participants who live away from the crossing site who believe they have a stake in the outcome.

In addition, representatives of governmental agencies, some of whom might be unable to participate at the consensus-building table, should be requested to serve as a resource to the group. These might include agencies such as the Deschutes National Forest, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, BPRD, and various local government transportation planners. Some of these might choose to attend every meeting, while others could be called in to help the group address specific issues.

Board Action

The District Board should be clear about what it will do with the results of any process. Specifically, they should consider under what circumstances they could accept no new bridge as an outcome, and be open about that with potential participants.

As a trust-building step, the Board should consider pledging to not initiate any bridge-building projects for the duration of the process.

Transparency

Throughout the collaboration, the process managers should ensure the strictest rules for transparency and integrity to enhance trust.

Allow Enough Time

Everyone involved should be willing to allow enough time for trust to be (re)built and for participants to develop relationships. Only when that happens will people be able to be creative and honestly consider alternatives that are not their own.

Participants should assume that this process would last, at a minimum, a year, in order to rebuild trust, address the differences as to fact, identify values and criteria for success, generate alternatives, evaluate alternatives, and then choose among alternatives.

Consensus

The full group should discuss and decide on a definition of consensus at the outset of the process. Consensus can be defined in many different ways; one of the most common is that everyone's point of view has been heard and understood, and everyone can live with the proposal. The advantage of

adopting a consensus decision-making rule is that it would be clear that any outcome would be acceptable to all parties at the table, and it gives parties an incentive to not just reject proposals but rather to work to find ways that a proposal could be made acceptable to everyone.

If the BPRD board can commit to implementing a consensus proposal (flowing from a consensus-based process in which they have fully participated), this would offer an incentive for individuals to find a way to achieve consensus as opposed to relying on the relative uncertainty of a legislative or litigated solution. This idea, as well as other details such as the definition of consensus, could be vetted as part of the detailed process proposal.

Summary

A well-designed and skillfully led community collaboration with participants fully participating in good faith could help rebuild trust among stakeholders, and might find a way to balance environmental protection, social equity, and recreational access. Should this be determined to be an appealing option, whether a collaboration is truly indicated should be carefully considered with a series of pre-collaboration steps to determine feasibility and potential.

Attachment A: BPRD Board of Directors Resolution

BPRD RESOLUTION NO. 409

A RESOLUTION OF THE BEND METRO PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR A COMMUNITY PROCESS TO DETERMINE BEST ROUTE AND METHOD TO CONNECT THE DESCHUTES RIVER TRAIL ALONG BEND'S SOUTHERN BOUNDARY

Whereas, Bend Metro Park and Recreation District (the "District") has a responsibility to plan for connectivity of the Deschutes River Trail, equitable access to outdoor recreation and education opportunities throughout the District, and fully account for impacts to fish and wildlife habitat in the process; and,

Whereas, since the conclusion of the 2017 State legislative Session, the District has taken no action to pursue a bicycle and pedestrian bridge across the Deschutes River at or near Bend's southern boundary,

Whereas, in the District's 2017 comprehensive plan needs analysis, trails were the top ranked need among Bend residents; and,

Whereas, a bicycle and pedestrian bridge at or near Bend's southern boundary is included in local transportation system plans, recommended in the Deschutes National Forests Alternative Transportation Feasibility Study (2015), is identified in the District's system-wide trails plan, and is one of several projects specifically called for in Measure 9-86 (2012); and,

Whereas, trails offer healthy recreation and transportation options to communities, allowing people of all ages to walk and bike to key destinations, engage with community and connect with nature; and,

Whereas, the District believes the best way to build the next generation of conservation supporters involves opportunities for them to enjoy the outdoors in an environmentally sound manner; and,

Whereas, the District is the park and recreation provider for the City of Bend and manages 49 percent of the riverfront within the District boundaries; and,

Whereas, the District has a history of rehabilitating riverfront habitat along the banks of the Deschutes River on properties owned by the District and is committed to continuing and improving upon past work with community partners to rehabilitate and manage riverfront habitat; and,

Whereas, the District recognizes that there have been past processes, including an Oregon Park and Recreation Department (OPRD) process about whether to alter scenic waterway rules and a District process to select a desired trail alignment for a possible bridge, and that neither process fully considered conservation goals within the reach of the river where a potential bridge may be located; and,

Whereas, the District proposes to participate in a broad community process to develop and build community support for a preferred trail alignment connecting the Deschutes River Trail along the Deschutes River;

Whereas, the preferred trail alignment should offer net benefits to nearby fish and wildlife habitat; and,

Whereas, the District has a responsibility to ensure that habitat impacts of recreation are minimized to the greatest degree possible. Wherever possible, investments in outdoor recreation and education are accompanied by conservation investments and seek to provide habitat improvements.

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of the Bend Park and Recreation District does hereby resolve as follows:

1. The District supports a process to consider connection of the Deschutes River Trail, conducted by a neutral, third-party facilitator with demonstrated expertise and success facilitating natural resources, recreation and community issues.
2. The fundamental question that the process would seek to address is: "How should the community provide for trail connectivity in this reach of the Upper Deschutes River to provide for human needs while seeking to provide a benefit to fish and wildlife habitat?"
3. The District understands that a community process may not lead to a bridge across the Deschutes River at or near the location in question. Conversely, the District would hope that other participants accept the possibility that a bridge, if properly designed and conditioned upon achieving certain conservation outcomes, may stand out as the preferred alternative.
4. The District supports a data-driven process informed by the most current assessments of the impacts of recreation activities, trails and bridges on river ecosystems and wildlife habitat within the area in question, as well as the growth and development projections for the Bend metropolitan region. The process should include an assessment and evaluation of past, present and desired future conditions in order to identify the most appropriate ecological outcomes.
5. The process will fully consider conservation measures, including both rehabilitation and operational, that would seek to provide a benefit to fish and wildlife habitat while providing for trail connectivity in partnership with the USFS and conservation groups.
6. The District supports a community process where participants would include a group of representatives from different stakeholder groups (to be vetted by the facilitator) including:
 - Community and neighborhood interests
 - Recreation interests
 - Conservation and environmental interests
 - Relevant local, state and federal agencies including the United States Forest Service, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, City of Bend, Deschutes County and Bend Park and Recreation District.
7. The District resolves to honor any broadly-supported outcomes that aim to complete the Deschutes River Trail and asks other participants to do the same.
8. District will not pursue any other avenues to plan, develop or construct a bridge within the Upper Deschutes River, or support such activities by others, while this process is underway and until it has concluded.
9. District supports a timely initiation of these procedures. District's goal is that such a process would not only resolve a very complex local matter in the context of a specific State Scenic Waterway, but participants in the collaborative process would gain a better understanding of how to address concerns over recreation projects on Scenic Waterways statewide. We ask the State Legislature to take into consideration the potential for collaborative problem solving among local conservation, environmental, recreation and community interests.

ADOPTED by the Board of Directors on this 20th day of February 2018.

/s/ Nathan Hovekamp, Board Chair

Attest:

/s/ Don P. Horton, Executive Director

Attachment B: Interview Questions

Oregon Consensus/BPRD Southern Connection Project Issues Assessment Interview Protocol

Note: These questions were used as a starting point of the interview. Other questions may have been posed if they flowed from the conversation.

INTRODUCE MARY ORTON AND THE PROCESS

- I am a mediator with a practice in public policy issues and disputes. Been doing this work all over the country for about 20 years. I live just outside Bend.
- As you may recall from the email, I work with the Oregon Consensus program as an affiliated practitioner. Oregon Consensus is Oregon's legislatively established program for public policy consensus building and conflict resolution - providing assessment, facilitation, mediation and other services to communities, public entities, and their stakeholders on complex public policy issues - like this one!
- I was retained by Oregon Consensus to talk with stakeholders regarding the issue of a southern connection for the Deschutes River Trail, in order to determine whether a collaborative, consensus-based process might be feasible and productive.
 - From the District Board resolution: "The fundamental question that the process would seek to address is: 'How should the community provide for trail connectivity in this reach of the Upper Deschutes River to provide for human needs while seeking to provide a benefit to fish and wildlife habitat?'"
- I will make a written report from these interviews. This report will include all the major points that I hear during the interviews. It will also include my analysis and recommendation about whether a collaborative process should be undertaken, and if so, how.
- While the report will include a list of everyone I interview, none of your comments will be attributed to you by name. Also, if you ask me to keep something private, I will not mention it at all in the report or to anyone.
- You will have a chance to review the draft report before it is finalized.
- My code of ethics requires that I disclose potential conflicts of interest. For two years ending in 1999 (almost 20 years ago), I was Southwest Regional Director of American Rivers, a national conservation organization. Since then, I have had a mediation practice as a third-party neutral, primarily in the public policy and natural resources arena. I do not believe my background would impair my ability to be impartial. If you have any concerns, please let me know. You can also alert Turner Odell of your concerns, if you prefer: he is senior project manager with Oregon Consensus and is OC's primary contact for this project.

INTERVIEW

1. Please tell me about you: your background (and your organization, if any).
2. How have you been involved to date with the southern connection for the Deschutes River Trail?
 - a. (If not already answered:) What are your connections, concerns, and interests?
3. What are the barriers or obstacles to addressing your concerns?
4. Where do you think there is common ground? What do you think are the things everyone could agree on?

5. If there were no collaborative, inclusive process to address these issues, what would you do?
 - a. What would be your best-case outcome?
 - b. What would be your worst-case outcome?
6. If there were a collaborative process regarding a southern connection for the Deschutes River Trail:
 - a. What do you think could be accomplished?
 - b. (Would you continue with your current efforts, do you think?)
 - c. Who should be involved?
 - d. Would you want to be involved?
 - e. What approach or ground rules would be useful? Not useful?
7. Who else should I interview on this topic? (Please note, while I cannot commit to interview everyone you suggest, I will interview as many as I can.) People invited to an interview to date:

Neighbors

Eastside River Rim: Larry Waters

Westside Bachelor View: Bob Brell

Westside Bachelor View: Tim Phillips

Westside Sunrise Village: Cynthia Eckoff

Agencies

Bend Park and Recreation District Board: Ellen Grover

City of Bend: Sally Russell

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs: Bobby Brunoe

Deschutes County transportation planner: Peter Russell

Metropolitan Planning Organization: Tyler Deke

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife: Corey Heath

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department: Chris Havel

US Forest Service: Kevin Larkin

Environmental and Recreation Organizations

Bend Paddle Trail Alliance: Jayson Bowerman

Central Oregon Landwatch: Paul Dewey

Central Oregon Trails Alliance: Woody Keen

DogPAC: Val Gerard

Oregon Wild: Erik Fernandez

Trout Unlimited: Shaun Pigott

Upper Deschutes Watershed Council: Ryan Houston

8. Is there anything else I should know?
9. Do you have any questions?

Attachment C: Interviewees

INTERVIEWED

Jim Baker, DogPAC
Jayson Bowerman, Bend Paddle Trail Alliance
Bob Brell, westside neighborhood (Bachelor View), and former Century West Neighborhood Association Chair
Greg Bryant, Deschutes River Woods Neighborhood Association
Brad Chalfant, Deschutes Trails Coalition*
Jim Clinton, eastside neighborhood
Judy Clinton, eastside neighborhood
Tyler Deke, Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cynthia Eckoff, westside neighborhood (Sunrise Village HOA)
Erik Fernandez, Oregon Wild
Val Gerard, DogPAC
Ellen Grover, BPRD Board Member
Chris Havel, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Louise Hawker, eastside neighborhood
Corey Heath, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Don Horton, Bend Park and Recreation District
Ryan Houston, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council (now working for Oregon Natural Desert Association)
Woody Keen, Central Oregon Trail Alliance
Kevin Larkin, Deschutes National Forest, US Forest Service
Tim Phillips, westside neighborhood (Bachelor View)
Shaun Pigott, Trout Unlimited
Mike Riley, The Environmental Center
Nikki Roemmer, Oregon League of Conservation Voters
Peter Russell, Deschutes County transportation planner
Sally Russell, City of Bend
Karen Swirsky, City of Bend transportation planner
Stosh Thompson, westside neighborhood (Bachelor View) and Director of the Thompson Wildlife Sanctuary
Bridget Tinsley, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Larry Waters, River Rim Homeowners Association

* Brad Chalfant's comments reflected his personal observations, as the Deschutes Trails Coalition has neither reviewed nor taken a position on the project.

DECLINED TO BE INTERVIEWED

Bobby Brunoe, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
Paul Dewey, Central Oregon LandWatch
Bridget Moran, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Bill Moseley, City of Bend
Gail Snyder, Coalition for the Deschutes
Southwest Bend Neighborhood Association

Attachment D: Process Ideas from Interviewees

Approach Ideas from Interviewees

Interviewees had the following suggestions when asked what ground rules or approaches might be useful or not useful.

Convenor and Funding Ideas from Interviewees

- An entity other than the District should be in charge of collaborative process.
- Financial support for a collaborative process should come from outside the BPRD.

Participant Ideas from Interviewees

- The group needs to be carefully constructed with balanced interests.
- BPRD should be equal to every other member of the group.

Process Ideas from Interviewees

- Make sure the process has integrity and there is transparency.
- Figure out what everyone can agree to.
- If a consultant is retained, ensure that person is not promoting her own agenda.
- BPRD has to be open to a “no bridge” answer, and say if that is the result of the process, they will stop pursuing a bridge.
- Provide clarity on how the BPRD Board will respond to what comes out of the process.
- Have the group elucidate their values and a vision for the future. Give everyone a chance to hear everyone’s positions and interests.
- The group could define some alternatives for trail connectivity and identify what information was needed to evaluate those alternatives. The BPRD could then pay for assessments or studies if information were not available.
- Develop wide support for a trail that connects east and west or both to Lava Lands and Sunriver, and then hand off that project to the Forest Service, BPRD, and OPRD to coordinate agencies to work on it.

Decision Making Ideas from Interviewees

- While private property concerns should be a consideration, they should not be a controlling consideration.
- Resource considerations at the proposed location have to be weighed. All data should be evaluated to determine the best options for a connection point.
- Clearly define how decision-making will occur.
- Give participants adequate time to make decisions.

Logistics Ideas from Interviewees

- Record meetings and make videos available online.

Scope Ideas from Interviewees

- Give clear scope and context to the group.
- Make sure the scope is broader than just a bridge: make it about connectivity.
- Create a master plan from Meadow Camp or Widgi Creek to the Central Oregon Irrigation District diversion, or the Upper Deschutes Wild and Scenic river corridor, that acknowledges the

reality of the many people using the trails and river, the new Pahlisch development, River Rim Park, and Rimrock, and addresses how to manage transportation and recreation in the corridor. Address all the restrictions, habitat needs, recreation desires, and mandates of the various land management agencies.

- The scope should include a broad look at trails:
 - Part of the District's comprehensive plan is to expand non-river trail opportunities. The group should look at its job in the context of larger trail build-out in the District.
 - Broaden the discussion to address how far to go on development of all these trails.
 - The conversation should be about a more expansive, inclusive, and inviting trail system, not solely a bridge.
- Address growth head-on: congestion in recreation areas is happening everywhere in the state and will continue. Have an honest community conversation about growth and how to manage it without sacrificing resources, while getting what we need.
- Clearly define terms from the BRPD Board resolution if that is still in play; e.g., "broadly supported." Should it "seek to benefit" or should it benefit?
- Address unregulated travel (people going off trail).
- Address social equity issues for underserved low-income people and increased access to public areas.
- Recognize the need and create the urgency to actually manage these areas that have been lost to development. There needs to be more management and much better management.

Outreach Ideas from Interviewees

- Engage the entire district population, including some kind of polling or survey.
- Allow for public comment and input with broad public outreach.

Ground Rules and Operating Procedures Ideas from Interviewees

- There should be clear ground rules and operating procedures developed by the group.
- No one should work outside the collaborative process to get what she wants (legislature, litigation, public relations, ballot initiative, etc.).
- No surprises if you plan to go outside the collaborative.
- Participants should be required to attend and cannot just show up for the decision-making meeting.
- Participants will need to explain why they have the positions they have.
- Define consensus as "I can live with the proposal."
- Participants should work for the benefit of the community.
- Participants should treat others with respect.
- Participants should say what they believe is true.
- Participants should make a commitment to understand issues and respect others' points of view.
- Participants should be open to various solutions.

Education Ideas from Interviewees

- Make sure the discussions are fact-based.
- Allow time for mutual education and information sharing on the part of all stakeholders.
- Have reliable data that shows impacts of alternatives on environment, wildlife, or ecosystem.
- Make sure people understand the rules for the Scenic Waterways and Wild and Scenic designations on the Upper Deschutes.

- Participants need to know:
 - What is impact from bridge building?
 - What would it cost?
 - How many people would use it?
 - What wildlife in what numbers are in the area and would be negatively impacted?
 - What is the usage and impact of dogs and dog owners at Rimrock?
 - What is the big picture of trails in the District?

Relationships Ideas from Interviewees

- Give the people at the table the opportunity to get to know each other, build relationships, and rebuild trust.

Ideas for Participants from Interviewees

In answer to a question about who should be involved, all of the following persons, entities or groups were mentioned at some point by one or more interviewees.

Governmental Agencies

All signers of the original Management Plan (see pages 4 and 5 of the Management Plan)

Bend Metropolitan Planning Organization

Bend Park and Recreation District: Executive Director Don Horton and all Board Members

City of Bend (elected and appointed officials)

City of Bend climate action staff

Deschutes County (elected and appointed officials)

Deschutes National Forest (U.S. Forest Service)

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development

Oregon Department of State Lands

Oregon Department of Transportation

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Neighbors and Neighborhood Organizations

Bachelor View neighborhood

Brookwood area residents

Citizens Advisory Committee members from 2014

Jim Clinton, eastside resident

Deschutes River Woods Homeowners Association (HOA)

Eastside residents who want to see a connection

Landowners

Neighborhood Leadership Alliance

Neighbors to all prior proposed bridge sites

Tim Phillips, Bachelor View neighborhood

River Canyon Estates HOA

River Rim HOA

Southeast Neighborhood Association

Southwest Neighborhood Association

Stosh Thompson, Bachelor View neighborhood

Sunrise Village HOA

Organizations and Non-Profits

American Rivers
Audubon Society
Bend Bikes
Bend Endurance Academy
Bend Paddle Trail Alliance
Central Oregon Land Watch
Central Oregon Trails Alliance
Central Oregon Visitors Association
Coalition for the Deschutes
Commute Options
Deschutes Land Trust
Deschutes Trails Alliance
Deschutes River Coalition
Deschutes River Conservancy
DogPAC
The Environmental Center
Great Old Broads for Wilderness
Oregon Wild
Oregon League of Conservation Voters
Trout Unlimited
Upper Deschutes Watershed Council
Visit Bend
WaterWatch of Oregon

Businesses

Commercial connections to the trails
LOGE Camps (the former Entrada Lodge)
Pahlisch Homes
Sun Country Tours

Others

Basin Study Work Group participants (Central Oregon irrigation districts, cities, environmental organizations, and others)
The broader community
Environmental community (local and statewide)
Environmental experts
Local and statewide legislators
Low-income advocates
Organizations that work with at-risk youth (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs)
Pedestrian advocacy organizations
People who have been involved in collaborative processes who have seen them work well
Recreation advocates
Schools
Social service organizations that serve underserved communities
Someone involved in non-motorized transportation planning for the region
Someone who can explain how the laws work

Taxpayers

Trails advocates

Users and user groups of all kinds: hikers, runners, bikers, etc.

Wildlife biologists

BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION

AGENDA DATE:	January 15, 2019
SUBJECT:	Community Recreation Survey Report
STAFF RESOURCE:	Matt Mercer, Director of Recreation Services Sarah Esralew Hutson, RRC Associates
PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:	None
ACTION PROPOSED:	None – For Information Only
STRATEGIC PLAN:	
Theme:	Community Connection
Objective:	Analyze and Adapt to Changing Community Need
Initiative:	Complete Recreation Services Survey

BACKGROUND

The District last conducted a community survey focused on recreation programs and services in 2011. This survey helped inform the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Update, the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan and the 2014 Recreation Programming Plan. The current Strategic Annual Action Plan called for conducting a new community recreation survey to help inform recreation priorities for the new Strategic Plan and a new 5-year Recreation Programming Plan.

The District selected RRC Associates in September after evaluating responses to a request for proposals issued on August 10, 2018. Since then District staff has worked with RRC on developing the survey goals, questionnaire and methodology. A copy of the final survey questionnaire and invitation is attached to this report.

RRC conducted the survey in two phases during the months of October and November. The first phase consisted of a random mail survey designed to collect a statistically valid and representative sample of respondents. The second phase included an open link survey that anyone was welcome to complete. The survey link was emailed to all households in the District registration system and was also promoted at District facilities and via District website and social media. The District also conducted targeted outreach to Latino and low income residents as these two populations are typically under-represented in both the mail and open link surveys.

RRC targeted 500 respondents for the statistically valid survey but greatly exceeded this by collecting 800 surveys. The open link survey and related targeted efforts generated approximately 1,200 respondents. These response rates are well above national averages and attest to the high level of engagement the community has with the District and its recreation programming. It also provides excellent opportunities for deeper analysis including cross tabulations.

Sarah Esralew Hutson from RRC Associates will present a summary of the survey methodology and results, and Matt Mercer will discuss how these results will be used to help inform future recreation priorities and plans.

BUDGETARY IMPACT

The survey was budgeted in the 2018-19 Fiscal Year Budget

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

None – for information only.

MOTION

None

ATTACHMENT

Survey Questionnaire



Bend Park & Recreation DISTRICT

Name _____
Address _____
City, ST, ZIP _____

Dear Park District Resident,

WHAT'S THIS ABOUT? The Bend Park & Recreation District is distributing this survey as part of the effort to better understand residents' needs and desires for organized recreation programs and services. Your input is needed to help shape the District's plan to reflect the community's priorities. This survey builds upon the recently completed Comprehensive Plan survey by focusing on recreation programs and services.

HOW YOU CAN HELP: You can support this effort by taking a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey.

MAIL OR ONLINE: Either complete the survey on paper and mail it back within 10 days in the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope, or go online using the website below and logging in with the password provided:

www.bprdsurvey.org and enter the password:

WHAT IF I DON'T USE BPRD PROGRAMS? Even if you are not a current user, we would like to hear from you so we can better serve everyone.

We appreciate your feedback and thank you for your time!

BEND PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT COMMUNITY RECREATION SURVEY PRIZE ENTRY

To enter the prize drawing, detach and enclose this entry form:

Name _____ Email _____ OR

Daytime Phone _____

Return with your survey or separately to: RRC Associates, 4770 Baseline Road, Suite 360, Boulder, CO 80303

Five winners will be
randomly selected to
each receive a \$50 Visa
gift card.

To enter the drawing, simply follow
the directions at the bottom of the
page. Or, if you respond online, you
will have the opportunity to enter the
drawing after completing the survey.

Winners of the random drawing will
be contacted by phone and/or email.

**Si necesita esta información en
español, por favor contactar:**

Kathya Avila Choquez

541-706-6190

Kathya@bendparksandrec.org

Bend Park and Recreation District (BPRD) - Community Recreation Survey

1. How long have you lived in Central Oregon? Please enter number: Years OR ☐ Mark this box if less than a year
2. In what area of town do you live?
- ☐ Northwest Bend
☐ Northeast Bend
☐ Southeast Bend

☐ Southwest Bend
☐ Outside of Bend city limits
☐ Don't know

CURRENT USAGE

3. Have you or other members of your household participated in any of the following activities offered by the Bend Park and Recreation District (BPRD)? **Select all that apply.**
- ☐ Youth activities
☐ Adult activities
☐ Older adult (age 60+) activities
☐ Family activities

☐ Non-instructed drop-in activities (e.g., swimming, ice skating, fitness center/weight room)
☐ Other: _____
☐ OR *None of the above*
4. Have you or other members of your household visited any of the following BPRD recreation facilities? **Select all that apply.**
- ☐ Juniper Swim & Fitness Center
☐ The Pavilion Ice and Sports Center
☐ Bend Senior Center

☐ Art Station
☐ OR *None of the above*
5. What are the top three reasons why you have used BPRD programs and facilities? (If you have not used BPRD, skip to question #6.)
- ☐ Affordable/good value
☐ Convenient location
☐ Convenient times/hours
☐ Good customer service
☐ No other options available
☐ Offerings meet my interest(s)
☐ Prefer public versus private services

☐ Quality of facilities
☐ Quality of instruction
☐ Safe/secure environment
☐ Well organized/run
☐ Other 1 (specify): _____
☐ Other 2 (specify): _____
☐ Other 3 (specify): _____
6. If you aren't using BPRD recreational programs or facilities as frequently as you would like, or not at all, why not? **Select all that apply.**
- ☐ Activities are full or overcrowded
☐ ADA accessibility concerns
☐ Don't have facility features I want
☐ Don't have the programs I want
☐ Don't have time to participate
☐ Facilities are not well maintained
☐ Fees too high
☐ Lack of childcare
☐ Lack of parking
☐ Lack of public transportation
☐ Language/cultural barriers
☐ Location of programs/classes not convenient

☐ Not aware of the programs/activities offered
☐ Overall quality of programs lacking
☐ Poor customer service
☐ Registration process is difficult
☐ Safety and security concerns
☐ Times not convenient
☐ Unable due to health considerations
☐ Use other program provider
☐ I have no concerns/barriers
☐ Other 1 (specify): _____
☐ Other 2 (specify): _____

SATISFACTION

7. How satisfied have you and your household been with the following aspects of BPRD recreation programs and facilities?

	NOT AT ALL SATISFIED				VERY SATISFIED	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	
Program quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Instructor/staff quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facility quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Value received for price paid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Affordability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. How effective is BPRD at reaching you with information about recreation activities, programs and facilities?

NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE		VERY EFFECTIVE		
1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. When considering which BPRD programs to participate in, what level do you use the printed Playbook versus online information to aid in your search?

- ☐ Exclusively use printed Playbook
- ☐ Use mostly printed Playbook
- ☐ Use a combination of printed Playbook and online information
- ☐ Use mostly online information
- ☐ Exclusively use online information
- ☐ Don't use either

BPRD PROGRAMS, ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

10. How important is it for BPRD to provide the following types of programs for the community, keeping in mind that other organizations may offer similar programs in the community?

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	2	3	4	VERY IMPORTANT
	1				5
1) Youth activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Adult activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Older adult activities (60+)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Therapeutic recreation programs for individuals with disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Open/public drop-in times (swimming, fitness center, ice skating)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Fitness and exercise classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Instructional sports classes (swimming, ice skating, tennis)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) Recreational sports leagues and camps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9) Advanced/competitive sports leagues and camps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10) Facilitated outdoor exploration and adventure programs (hiking, paddling, rafting, trips)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11) Nature/environmental education programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12) Art, music, theater, dance classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13) STEM classes (science, technology, engineering, math)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14) Before and after school care programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15) Youth day camps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16) 4 th of July Pet Parade and Festival	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17) Free recreation activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18) Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. From the list in the previous question, which three items are most important to the community as a whole? Select your top three priorities for the community. (INSERT NUMBERS)

Most important # Second # Third #

12. And which three items are the highest priorities to you and your household? Select your household's top three priorities. (INSERT NUMBERS)

Most important # Second # Third #

FINANCIAL CHOICES

13. Bend Park and Recreation District is a special tax district, separate from the City of Bend. The District uses property tax revenues in addition to fees to help fund the cost of operating many recreation programs and facilities. To what degree should tax dollars be used to financially support the following groups' use of recreation facilities and services?

	None	Limited	Some	Significant
Youth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adults	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Older adults (60+)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individuals with disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low income individuals/families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BPRD program and drop-in use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-profit/sport club use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private/commercial use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VALUES AND VISION

14. Please rate A: How important is it for BPRD recreation programs and services to address the following community issues/values, and then B: How effective is BPRD in addressing these community priorities currently? Please provide an answer for both A and B.

	A. IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS					B. CURRENT EFFECTIVENESS					DON'T KNOW
	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT			VERY IMPORTANT		NOT AT ALL			COMPLETELY		
Fill in two boxes per row (one each in column A and column B):	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	x
1) Contributing to a physically active community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Contributing to enrichment of the community through arts, music, theatre, STEM, special interests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Providing safe and enriching activities for youth outside of school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Providing social, wellness and enrichment activities for older adults	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Connecting and strengthening families/communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Serving diverse populations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Attracting tourists/visitors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Which three items are most important to the community as a whole? Select your first, second, and third highest priorities. (INSERT NUMBERS)

Most important # Second # Third #

SUGGESTIONS

16. Do you have any further comments about the programs/activities BPRD currently offers or should offer in the future?

DEMOGRAPHICS

Just a few more questions about yourself for statistical purposes only. Results are completely confidential and will only be reported in aggregate.

17. Please indicate the gender with which you identify:

- ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Non-binary/third gender
☐ Prefer to self-describe: _____
☐ Prefer not to answer

18. In what year were you born? _____

19. Including yourself, how many people in total typically reside in your household?

20. How many of those people are in the following age ranges?

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age 0-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> Age 40-49 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age 5-9 | <input type="checkbox"/> Age 50-59 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age 10-14 | <input type="checkbox"/> Age 60-69 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age 15-19 | <input type="checkbox"/> Age 70-79 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age 20-29 | <input type="checkbox"/> Age 80+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age 30-39 | |

21. Do you own or rent your residence in Bend?

- ☐ Own ☐ Rent ☐ Other

22. Does your household have a need for ADA-accessible (Americans with Disabilities) facilities and services?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

23. Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

24. What race do you consider yourself to be?

- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Black or African American
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ White
☐ Other

25. Which of these categories best describes the total gross annual income of your household (before taxes)?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$25,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$150,000–199,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000–49,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$200,000–499,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000–74,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$500,000 or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$75,000–99,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to answer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000–149,999 | |

FUTURE RESEARCH

The Bend Park and Recreation District thanks you for taking the time to share your opinions. Your input is very valuable to future planning efforts. Survey results may prompt follow-up research to explore themes that emerge from this survey. Would you be willing to participate in future research? This may involve being emailed an invite to a short online survey or in-person focus groups.

If you are interested in participating in follow-up research, please include your email or phone number below. Your survey responses are completely confidential.

First Name: _____ Email address: _____

OR Phone number: _____

BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION

AGENDA DATE:	January 15, 2019
SUBJECT:	Athletic Facility Policy Update and 2018 Athletic Field Use Report
STAFF RESOURCE:	Michael Egging, Management Analyst Russ Holliday, Sports Program Manager Becky Young, Sports Program Coordinator
PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:	February 6, 2018: Approved Athletic Field and Sport Program Policy Guidelines December 19, 2018: Approved modifications to Athletic Facility and Sport Program Policy Guidelines
ACTION PROPOSED:	None – For Information Only
STRATEGIC PLAN:	
Theme:	Community Connection
Objective:	Analyze and adapt to changing community need
Initiative:	Update athletic field utilization information and revise methodology to better determine future needs

BACKGROUND

On February 6, 2018, after multiple work sessions, the Board of Directors approved the Athletic Field and Sport Program Policy Guidelines. At the time, staff informed the Board that it would take a full year to implement all of the policy guidelines. Staff will provide an update on the progress of implementing these guidelines, including sharing a summary of 2018 athletic field use based on the new methodology adopted in the policy.

BUDGETARY IMPACT

Some additional athletic field rental revenue is anticipated as a result of requiring field reservations for organized use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

None – for information only.

MOTION

None

ATTACHMENT

None

BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION

AGENDA DATE:	January 15, 2019
SUBJECT:	District's Alcohol Permit Policy Update
STAFF RESOURCE:	Sasha Sulia, Superintendent of Park Operations Jeff Hagler, Park Steward Manager
PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:	Previous Work Session 12/4/18
ACTION PROPOSED:	None
STRATEGIC PLAN:	
Theme:	Operational Excellence
Objective:	Improve Business Practices
Initiative:	Provide a safe and healthy environment for all who work and play in our parks, facilities and programs.

BACKGROUND

On December 4, 2018, staff shared with the Board possible changes to the District's Alcohol Permit Policy. Specifically, staff suggested eliminating the current alcohol permit that allows for alcohol consumption by an individual or group in any park or trail in the system, and instead only issue alcohol permits to groups who are renting a picnic shelter or sports field. In addition, proof of liability insurance would be required for all alcohol permits.

After hearing the proposed changes and rational, the Board felt it was important that individuals or small groups continue to have the option to obtain an alcohol permit. They directed staff to develop procedures that would allow individuals and small groups the ability to obtain an alcohol permit without the requirement of renting a picnic shelter or sports field. The Board agreed that liability insurance should be required for all alcohol permits, no matter the group size.

A working group of staff that regularly manages alcohol permits took the Board's feedback and developed the following proposed guidelines:

- Small groups (≤ 10 participants) are permitted to consume alcohol in any park or trail, with an alcohol permit.
- Medium groups (11-30 participants) are permitted to consume alcohol only in picnic shelters (rental and non-rental) and sports fields with an alcohol permit.
- Large groups ($31 \geq$ participants) permitted to consume alcohol only with a picnic shelter or sport field rental and an alcohol permit.
- Liability insurance is required with the issuance of all alcohol permits.
- Alcohol permits still remain free of charge.

Staff will further explain these proposed guidelines and the logistics of administering these changes to the policy during the Board meeting.

BUDGETARY IMPACT

None - the District does not currently charge a fee for alcohol permits.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff took the Board's feedback and will adjust the policy based on the guidelines described above. Staff is requesting the Board's support of these proposed changes.

MOTION

The District's alcohol permit policy is an administrative policy that does not require Board action. However, staff would like feedback and support from the Board about the proposed changes before finalizing the policy.

ATTACHMENT

None

**Board Calendar
2018-2019**

**This working calendar of goals/projects is intended as a guide for the board and subject to change.*

January 29

- ◆ SDC Workshop

February 5

Work Session

- ◆ Recreation Program Report – (15 min)
- ◆ Approve updated Fees and Charges Policy and Out of District Fee Policy – *Matt Mercer (45 min)*

Business Session

- ◆ Approve Guaranteed Maximum Price for Construction of Larkspur Community Center – *Brian Hudspeth (45 min)*

February 19

Work Session

- ◆ Board Training Best Practices – *Dave Crowther and Jeff Griffin WHA (80 min)*

Business Session

March 5

Work Session

- ◆ Recreation Program Report (15 min)

Business Session

- ◆ Northpointe Park Award Design Contract – *Laura Underhill (20 min)*

March 19

Work Session

- ◆ Outreach Report – *Amanda Jamison, Kathya Avilia Choquez (30 min)*
- ◆ Needs-Based Assistance Report – *Sue Boettner (30 min)*

Business Session

- ◆ Approve Needs-Based Assistance Plan for FY 2019-20 – *Sue Boettner (30 min)*

April 2

Work Session

- ◆ Recreation Program Report (15 min)

Business Session

April 16

Work Session

Business Session

April 17 - Budget Committee Tour

May 7

Work Session

- ◆ Recreation Program Report (15 min)

Business Session

May BUDGET MEETINGS (Tentative: May 13,15,16)

May 21 – Election Night

Work Session

Business Session

- ◆ Public Hearing - SDCs

June 4

Work Session

- ◆ Recreation Program Report (15 min)

Business Session

- ◆ Adopt Resolution No. XXX – Adopting a Revised Fee Schedule for System Development Charges, effective July 1, 2019 – *Lindsey Lombard*
- ◆ Hold Public Hearing and Adopt Resolution No. XXX – Adopting the Budget and Making Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2019-20, and Adopt Resolution No. XXX - Imposing and Categorizing Taxes for Fiscal Year 2018-19 – *Lindsey Lombard*
- ◆ Adopt Resolution No. XXX – Adopting the Capital Improvement Plan Summary for Fiscal Years Ending 2020 - 2024 – *Michelle Healy (10 min)*

June 18

Work Session

Business Session

TBD

IGA with the City for Planning – *Michelle Healy and Don Horton (45 min)*

Award construction contract for Big Sky Park – *Brian Hudspeth (15 min)*

Alpenglow's BNSF Aerial Easement – Ian Isaacson

PCMS Fields Award Construction Contract – Brian Hudspeth

Adopt Strategic Plan

Strategic Plan Update

First and Second Reading for SDC Ordinance and Methodology

SDC Methodology Updates

Extend Applicable Athletic Field Policies to Operated Recreation Facilities – Matt Mercer

Independent Contractor Guidelines for Recreation Programs?? – Matt Mercer

Recreation Programming Plan – Matt Mercer and Michael Egging

Drake Park DRT Trail Easements – *Brian Hudspeth (20 min)*

Empire Crossing Park – Award Construction Contract – *Jason Powell (20 min)*

Goodrich Park Award Construction Contract – *Jason Powell (20 min)*

Shevlin Park ADA / Bridge Work Award Construction Contract – *Brian Hudspeth (20 min)*

Preliminary Larkspur Business Plan Review – *Matt Mercer and Sue Glenn (45 min)*