# Board of Directors

July 16, 2024

**District Office Building | 799 SW Columbia | Bend, Oregon**

***A video of the regular board meeting can be viewed on the website:***
https://www.bendparksandrec.org/about/board-meeting-videos/

**BOARD PRESENT**

Donna Owens
Deb Schoen
Jodie Barram
Cary Schneider
Nathan Hovekamp

**STAFF PRESENT**

Michelle Healy, Executive Director
Matt Mercer, Director of Recreation
Kristin Toney, Administrative Services Director
Julie Brown, Director of Community Engagement
Sheila Reed, Assistant to the Executive Director
Sasha Sulia, Director of Park Services
Brian Hudspeth, Director of Planning and Development
Ian Isaacson, Landscape Architect
Henry Stroud, Principal Planner

**VISITORS**

**Bruce Churchill:** Mr. Churchill commented about Hollinshead Park and shared his concerns about the plan for the fenced dog park. He said it is too large and changes the flow of the park and the picnic use of the park.

**Kimberlee Lear:** Ms. Lear shared her concerns about Hollinhead Park. She is opposed to the asphalt trail that is planned. She said there are parks nearby that offer paved trails. She showed a map that she provided and pointed out her areas of concern.

**Donn Curry and Ken Kelso:** Mr. Kelso spoke about the egress of the pathways and the invasion of privacy at his fence and backyard. He added that he did not think the design honored the intent of the donors of the land.

**Lincoln Mayer:** Mr. Mayer said he objects to the dog park, he said he feels that it is too big for the park. He mentioned the historic nature of the park and the incompatibility of the dog park. He suggested not adding the dog park and requiring dogs to be leashed at all time and suggested adding a dog park to Al Moody Park.

**Daniel Philip**: Mr. Philips said he lives on the border of the park and removed his fence to access the park easier. He said the area used by people is fenced off in the plan and the fencing makes accessing the park from his home more difficult.

**Daniela Ahmed:** Ms. Ahmed said she visits Hollinshead Park with her dog. She said she keeps her dog on a leash due to all the dogs. She acknowledged that the park is out of control and requested that it

become a park that requires a leash. She suggested that people that want to have their dog off leash can go to other areas to have their dog off leash.

**John Heylin:** Mr. Heylin said he advocates for adding two additional county commissioner seats. He attended Munch and Music stated there was no water to drink. He suggested a water filler by the stage and a requirement of event planners to provide free water. He advocated for the paved path at Hollinshead and the South UGB Bridge.

**Brigitte Cronier:** Ms. Cronier said she goes to Hollinshead every day and lives in the neighborhood. She is opposed to the fenced dog park, she said she has a shy dog that doesn't do well entering in a gated and fenced dog park.

**Tryg Baxter**: Mr. Baxter said he has be going to Hollinshead his whole life and is opposed to the asphalt path in the park and the fenced in dog park.

**Mike Baughoran:** Mr. Baughoran expressed his concern for keeping Hollinshead Park as a natural and historic park. He said he takes his dog to the park and said he thinks fencing the dog park will cause more problems than it helps. He encouraged the board to take action to make some changes in the park.

**Kelsey Schwartz:** Ms. Schwartz said she agreed with Ms. Ahmed. She said that she finds that Hollinshead is not a park that she can visit with her dog due to number of dogs that are not controlled in the park as it is. She said the dog poop is not picked up and is all over the park. She stated that it is a community park, not a neighborhood park and everyone should be able to use it.

**Tricia Gardner**: Ms. Gardner said she has used Hollinshead Park for the last 11 years. She mentioned the amenities that she enjoys and expressed concern for the dog park area for the dog park is too small. She commented that the fenced in area is takes up too much space of the park.

**Robin Vora:** Mr. Vora said he does not understand why the district is prioritizing dogs over people. He thinks the park should be kept to the intention of the space when it was donated.

**Andrew Dimfeekarb:** Mr. Dimfeekarb said his family loves Hollinshead Park, the park is well attended and holds people well. He said the fence would change the park from that. He said he favors keeping the park as it is. He supports the ADA improvements and restrooms.

**Maitreya Sriram:** Mr. Sriram supports the S. Bend footbridge. He said that he does not think that the community opposes the bridge and used the support in the room as an example.

**Christine Seidel:** Ms. Seidell said she loves to ride her bike and loves nature. She would like the S. UGB bridge to go through and added it more important now to spread the recreational use in Bend.

**Erik Fernandez**: Mr. Fernandez said he supports the work of the district. His concern about the bridge is the precedent that it would set for other protected areas of the river. He encouraged the board to explore other downstream options. He said this has divided the community and suggested other areas of focus for staff to work on instead. He criticized the survey taken by the district and said that the question about the bridge was not asked fairly.

**Katrina Hays:** Ms. Hayes thanked the district for the river trail. She said she voted for the bond in 2012 for the sole reason of the bridge proposal. She said she cannot reach forest service land without a 25 min. drive. She said the district should show their work more, and added the district does good work, but does not show it off enough.

**Michael Ogle:** Mr. Ogle said he has lived in Bend since 1972 and spoke in opposition of the S. UGB bridge.

He said the bridge would result in more urbanization. He asked the board to let this proposal die a natural death.

**Craig Lacy:** Mr. Lacey is opposed to the S. UGB bridge. He gave some history of the community and the wild and scenic designation on the river. He said if the community was properly polled, they would still

oppose the bridge. He spoke of the value of the wildlife in the proposed bridge and spoke about the impact a bridge would have on the area.
**Mary Fleischman:** Said she opposes the bridge and spoke about the history of the protected area. She said her concern is that it would weaken the protections in other areas.
**Michael Doram:** Mr. Doram is opposed to the S. UGB bridge. He said this has been rejected twice by the board and fails to understand why it keeps coming up. He said the forest service opposes it and there is an environmental impact that the bridge would create.
**Michael Tripp:** Mr. Tripp shared that he opposes the S. UGB bridge and gave several reasons and cited laws in place that protect the area.
**Jerry Freilich:** Mr. Freilich said he is opposed to the bridge project. He said the bridge does not connect the trail as promised by the district. He advocated for an alternate location that has forest service land on both sides. He said the current site has no place for parking.
**Royce Kallerud:** Mr. Kallerud said the bridge was promised 12 years ago. He said he is here to ask the board to explore the topic and fact finding. He said another footbridge was just built in a wild and scenic designation in the state. He asked board to pursue the facts on building the bridge.
**Doug White:** Mr. White said he supports the prohibition of bridges in the wild and scenic designation. He read a statement to support the statement. He also remarked that the McKenzie River bridge was a replacement and not a new bridge
**Peter Baer:** Mr. Baer is opposed to the bridge. He said that he thinks the community saw the growth coming and wanted to protect the community. He said the forest service land is already being loved to death and a bridge would only cause more harm.
**Ambrose Su:** Mr. Su said he has lived on the river since 1999 and has experienced the overcrowding and dramatic change to the area on the west side of the river. He shared his concerns for the bridge and the increased traffic it would bring. He added that the city is looking at a bridge further down river as part of the transportation plan that will help the east side residents access the area.
**Bob Ratcliff:** Mr. Ratcliff said the bridge does not provide benefit to him, in his career he worked on protecting areas and is in favor of the bridge. He said the park district's interest is providing the community equitable access to recreation areas. He said he understands the concerns, but footbridges have been installed all over the country on wild and scenic areas.
**Robin Vora:** Mr. Vora said he doesn't understand why the board would want to approve a bridge that benefits people that are not district tax payers, it degrades the land, and the owners in the area don't want a bridge. He said he is opposed to the bridge.
**Courtney Underhill:** She said her family is desperate to have the bridge built. She said there are no sidewalks or parks in DRW and the bridge would really help to gain access. She said it is an underserved area with a lot of kids.

**WORK SESSION**

1. Deschutes River Trail South Project Update – *Henry Stroud*

Mr. Stroud explained the trail and planned trail alignment by showing a map of the location of the area of the trail and proposed bridge site. He explained the planned route of the trail and its design to close one of the remaining gaps on the Deschutes River Trail.

He reviewed the past plans beginning in 1996 and through up to the current plan. He said the current plan is part of the Deschutes National Forest Alternative Transportation Feasibility study in 2015 and is in the BPRD Comprehensive plan.

He spoke about the federal and state river protections in the area, including the state scenic river segment and federal recreation river segment and the state scenic and river community segments. Director Hovekamp pointed out the homes have been developed in the area since the designations. Mr. Stroud explained the federal and state river protections either discourage or prohibit bridges, there is still some flexibility through a notice of intent procedure. He described the procedure as providing a notice of intent to Oregon Park and Recreation Department (OPRD) and then may proceed after a 1-year waiting period if OPRD does not take further action against the project.

Mr. Stroud spoke about the bridge project initiation, including voter approval on the 2012 park bond, application in 2013 to OPRD for the bridge which was denied and indicating that no further action would be taken, but then rescinded the application due to lack of property ownership. He explained in 2015 a citizen advisory committee was formed that included landowners, stakeholders and meetings were open to the public, five potential bridge locations were evaluated and the current location was selected. OPRD convened an advisory group to investigate if a wider review of the river rules should occur, the advisory group ultimately decided against any changes to the river guidelines. Mr. Stroud said that in 2017-2018 two bills were introduced to outright prohibit a trail bridge on the Upper Deschutes and both measures failed signaling that this was a local issue.

Mr. Stroud said that because of the legislation and district resolution #409, the district hired a 3rd party facilitator to write a report with the goal of building consensus amongst the various stakeholders. The report lead to the creation of resolution #419, which postponed the project until such time that the community shares a vision on how to proceed, directed staff to focus on other river restoration efforts and removed the project from the district's CIP and SDC project list.

Director Hovekamp asked staff if the district has followed through on resolutions 409 and 419, staff responded yes.

Mr. Stroud said that since 2019, the district has focused on the Deschutes River Access and Habitat Restoration Plan. He said that outside interest in the bridge has grown with Connect Bend and recent surveys have revealed public support as well, the district has had some limited contact with the forest service and OPRD to see if anything has changed, both agencies have submitted letters to the district clarifying their positions.

OPRD:
Letter received Nov. 13, 2023

- Affirmed the process outlined in ORS 390.845 that application for bridge would result in denial and start of 12-month waiting period
- Typically work with applicant to review alternatives that could comply with administrative rules
- After 12-months if no agreement is reached then the project is not required to adhere to scenic waterway rules

Deschutes National Forest
Letter received July 9, 2024

- Has not taken a position on project
- Bridge could promote safe, equitable and sustainable access
- Proposed change (i.e. bridge) does not meet intent of CMP and could harm public trust

- Do not intend to submit proposal at this time
- *"We hope that we can engage in a broader community discussion of how to provide a sustainable experience of the WSR and SSW corridor. If we gain consensus on a vision of the future, and a pedestrian bridge is compatible with that vision, we would be willing to consider a revision to the CRMP to reflect that change."*

Director Hovekamp commented on the extensive work the district has done to improve the river banks. He shared the views on both sides of the issue of the bridge (recreation vs. protection) and expressed his opinion that the footbridge can do both by creating opportunity to do more river stewardship, including a southside nature preserve, and provide equitable access to the community. He advocated that the board give staff direction to move this project forward.

The board asked questions to further clarify the letters and processes, parking and access and acknowledged that there may not be a community consensus, but there is strong support in the community that was not there before. Ms. Healy said the trust issue in the community is real and asked the board if they would like staff to put some thought in and come back with some ideas about how to move forward to build trust and gain consensus.

Director Barram said she would like to hear more and look at data driven decision making, she would like to be clear on what the will of the community is and the residents in the area. She remarked that community consensus doesn't mean all are going to be in agreement, and she would support allowing staff to gather data.

Director Owens expressed some concern for the amount of energy staff would have to put into this project to move forward and shared concerns about public trust.

Director Schneider suggested looking at all the options in a comprehensive and broad manner, including looking at the city plans. He shared his concerns with the financial resources that would be dedicated to this project

The board directed staff to come back with some ideas of incremental steps to explore the project.

**CONSENT**

1. Minutes: 7/2/2024

***Director Schoen made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Director Schneider seconded. The motion was approved unanimously, *4-0.***

*Director Hovekamp abstained from the vote because he was absent from the meeting.

**BUSINESS SESSION**

1. Approve initial design concepts for Hollinshead Park – *Ian Isaacson*

Mr. Isaacson showed the project location and described it as a 16-acre community park. He noted some of the features of the park. He explained the project focus areas:

- Renovation to the parking lot and extension of maintenance drive

- New permanent restroom
- Accessibility improvements including a new paved loop trail
- Off-leash area fencing
- History walk
- Historical structures maintenance report

He spoke about the extensive public outreach including the district website, A frame poster boards in the park, emails to stakeholders and neighborhood associations, surveys kickoff surveys, mailers to nearby homes, open house events and press releases.

Mr. Isaacson reviewed the project list:

- Proposed parking lot and maintenance drive, no additional spaces just reconfiguring them for safety and improved ADA access.
- Proposed permanent restroom, as single unisex ADA compliant stall with a drinking fountain and bottle fill station.
- Proposed ADA improvements – 6' wide path around the park.
- Proposed off leash area (OLA) fencing, dog park will be roughly the same size and will provide more balance to the park with more safety, animal welfare and cleanliness to the park.
- Proposed interpretive history walk, nodes will be designed that include interpretive signage and seating areas.
- Maintenance Report, this guide will provide park maintenance staff with recommendations for the care and upkeep pf the park's historic structures.

The board asked about the surface of the ADA path and alternatives. Mr. Isaacson explained that the loop path would need to be a hard-surfaced trail due to the grade and other materials would be more costly in the hard surface options. The board acknowledged that the open OLA has created problems in the park due to dogs running wild in the park and through events at the bard and recognized that removing the dog park would not be a popular option.

Mr. Isaacson reviewed the budgetary impact of $1.1M in costs to improve the park. Director Schneider thanked all the staff work to provide information and receive comments on the project and shared his appreciation to the community for their participation.

***Director Hovekamp made a motion to approve the Hollinshead Park updated preferred concept plan. Director Schoen seconded. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.***

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT**

Executive Director Healy thanked the board for reviewing all the public commentsfor the meeting tonight.

**BOARD MEETINGS CALENDAR REVIEW**

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

- Director Schneider appreciated all the public comments from the community.
- Director Owens said she enjoyed passing out popsicles at the July 4th event.

**ADJOURN: 9:25 pm**

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Prepared by,
Sheila Reed
Assistant to the Executive Director

Jodie Barram, Chair

Donna Owens, Vice-Chair

Deb Schoen

Cary Schneider

Nathan Hovekamp