

April 16, 2001

Hi Travis,

Thanks for the encouragement on public access. I, too, suspect that this should be a longer-term project--possibly something where the subcommittee puts together a very general framework, or guidelines, to be developed and completed as part of the work of the city parks committee which Phil has said he'd like to see restarted. Part of what the city parks committee would desperately need to address is the (west side) Millican Creek Open Space, which the city recently pushed to the back burner. Your ideas about connecting the network of waterways with public access of some kind is absolutely the sort of thing communities can and should address to increase livability and identity and pride. There's a lot of potential in this town. (I have to credit that sentiment originally to Phil.) And wow, an intercity network; I hadn't even conceived of that. If you ever get going on that and want help, count me in--it's the kind of thing that's a worthwhile life's work.

I had meant to check on seeing if the county might require or desire involvement in watershed recreation/park. Thanks for the reminder.

Your observations about littering and carelessness in parks is backed up by my (still) small survey sampling of other Oregon watersheds. Bend credits the low vandalism rate in their watershed in part to having no vehicular access (in fact, no roads at all) and being too far to walk. (They also credit the mosquitoes.) Cannon Beach has had only one vandalism incident----says their watershed is hard to find and not identified. Both of these are forested situations. But on the other hand, Aumsville, whose watershed is a traditional city park, feels a high degree of public use and therefore public vigilance keeps vandalism in check. Perhaps the lesson is to avoid a situation that is both easily accessible with a low volume of human activity.

Any more thoughts, keep 'em coming.

Carol