From: Gavin Hoban
To: SENR Exhibits
Subject: Comments in Opposition on House Bill 2027-A
Date: Monday, May 08, 2017 9:17:51 PM

Dear Committee Members,

I respectfully wish to convey my opposition to House Bill 2027-A. I am writing as a taxpaying resident of Bend, Oregon and of the Bend Park and Recreation District.

Exurban-urban trail connectivity is key to state trail plan goals. And the trail bridge proposal and trail connection is directly consistent with four of the six, "Priorities for the Future" of the Oregon 2013-2017 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan:

- Soft surface walking trails
- Access to waterways
- Nature and wildlife viewing areas
- Off-street bicycle trails

Trails actually increase property values of those adjacent to trail corridors. See Economic Benefits here: http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/PLANS/pages/trailsplanning_benefits.aspx and here: https://www.cdlandtrust.org/sites/default/files/publications/Benefits%20of%20Trails-NPS.pdf

Bend Park and Recreation District's vision for the Deschutes River trail corridor is inclusive and will likely provide direct long-term economic benefits to both local businesses and adjacent landowners alike.

When my young family moved to Bend 17 years ago, the vacant lot immediately adjacent to our property sat weedy and unused for a couple of years. Working with neighbors and the BPRD's board and staff, a beautiful neighborhood park, trailhead and later a nearby dog park was constructed. The associated trail is now one of the longest within the urban growth boundary connecting Bend's westside with the Phil's trail system in the Deschutes National Forest to the west. Now, years later and fully built out, I can tell you firsthand and affirmatively how important this park and trailhead has become to local neighbors and residents of extant neighborhoods alike. People enjoy the fun, the access, the connectivity and the healthful aspects which this park and trailhead provides.

Indeed, NIMBY-ism is alive and well amongst the "affected" opposition to this pedestrian bridge proposal. As is now well documented, bridge opponents will pay to oppose standing rules, obfuscate the facts and will go so low as to present themselves as actual river defenders while apparently asserting non sequitur private property rights over adjacent public lands.

I urge the committee to see through the shallow and largely anonymous attempts of bridge opponents to trump legislatively-established process to further their wholly self-serving, myopic-envisioned future. We are bigger than this.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Respectfully,
Gavin Hoban

Bend, Oregon