

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/20/2022 3:27:26 AM

First name: Collin

Last name: Cowsill

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Enviro Assessment aside (not my personal concern), in regard to the line of thinking around 'trail expansion in rural Central Oregon communities', I'd like to draw attention to 2 things:

(1) In an OPB article from October of last year, COTA's Vice President (?) Travis Holman was quoted as stating "To a town like Prineville.. Prineville is one of the poorest communities in Oregon. Mountain biking, and cycling in general, brings huge economic benefits to communities like this." This line of thinking in and of itself, more or less, is the underlying mechanism at work when talking about the incessant expansion of trail development (as well as other industry-scale recreational pursuits) in any part of rural North America. This statement by Holman stands out the most, because it paints a clear picture of the (subconscious) intent behind COTA and other orgs wanting to constantly expand trail development near rural communities, of which the MAJORITY (not just a handful of cyclists) simply do not want to be subjected to outside economic ventures (because of what these ventures imply in the 21st century in terms of gentrification, and alteration of the fabric of a community). It's a "build it and they will come" framework which, yes, has some positive economic implications - casual small business spending/general tourism revenue. However, extended and growing appeal to such destinations results in what we've seen happen to Bend, and soon/currently Redmond - gentrification, increase in cost of living, housing market outpacing life-long residents and youth looking to buy for the first time, real estate agencies surfacing all over the basin catering to wealthier outsiders (with little regard for their native kin in the interest of profits), and of course, exponential increase in a homeless population. These are FACTS of what 'regional appeal' brings to an area over time (and it doesn't take much time these days); it's an empirical formula at this point. Growers and generation farmers/ranchers (the lifeblood) of Prineville don't want to see this from the Lemon Gulch project, and neither does Jefferson County with COTA's continuing interests there. We see Bend/Redmond, and we fear for our communities.

(2) -- Just a sample to relate the above point -- Regarding 2014 economic impact study for Oakridge, Oregon, on the subject of mountain biking attraction for the area: the basis of the Oakridge study was anchored primarily on the concept of "what tourism/mountain biking industry can do for a community in decline". I just want to point out here that, again, as I mentioned above, benefits from mountain biking tourism for a rural community manifests in the form of casual small business spending and tourism revenue - this can be good for some areas, up to a point. But everywhere in the world and for all phenomena, too much and too persistent a good thing becomes a bad thing. Overtime (again, not much time), it's the larger impacts which result in what has happened to Bend, every major hotspot in CA, Seattle, other Oregon cities, etc. There's evidence of this everywhere you look. Prineville/Jefferson County are not in economic decline (reference our agricultural contributions to international markets); it does not need outside recreational ventures to boost its economic prowess. We're already seeing housing developments and subdivisions popping up because people want to escape places like CA/Portland/Bend due to the condition they're falling into. Outside ventures will only exacerbate this issue for us. My intent here, in recognizing what late-stage capitalism (in the form of: over accommodating recreational industry expansion in sensitive ecosystems and small rural communities who PREFER to remain such, and these things' direct ties to real estate ventures and over development/cost of living/homelessness/ etc.) can do to rural North America, is to draw attention to this element of our current societal trajectory - a "larger picture" perspective, that not every area with good land for recreation needs to become an socialized vibrant thriving bougie community with microbreweries and overpriced coffee, traffic jams on 2-lane roads, hotels and parking lots, catering to out of towners who tend to lack the deep-seated respect that these communities expect from any visitor, and ultimately resulting in gentrification/the "Bend" effect.

The point I'm making is more rooted in the ethos of Ag's preservation and mitigation of decadent conditions in rural America (run away real estate, and everything that comes with that), not so much about what a few folks would like to see in the area in terms of recreation, or how "healthy it is for the Prineville community".

I'm concerned over the continuing incessant subdividing and sell-off of Ag land to private developers who will

ultimately alter the fabric of rural Ag communities like Prineville. I don't mean to display a particular bias against mountain bikers, but when you build a theme park, people are gonna wanna live close by.

The ultimate point is that both these conquests (expansion of recreational accommodations + housing development) in conjunction with one another, expedite the process and shorten the road toward gentrification. From the 10,000 foot economic view, developers and/or organization leaders might not be considerate of the following: that farmers are evermore at a crossroads to either sell their parcels due to water constraints affecting yields, or scale back temporarily while we improve conservation measures in our basin, biding time which can be subsidized through state and federal resources (as we've seen from this years Drought Relief assistance and loan forgiveness program specifically for farmers). During this "layover" period, farmers have a chance to keep their business alive and improve on-farm efficiencies - and equally significant is that they don't feel that their only option is to sell to a developer who 90% of the time is just going to build a tightly packed subdivision. The more buyers that are in line to pressure farmers to sell, the faster and more easily that process occurs. Thus, the greater appeal to Prineville that is compounded through the tacking-on of recreational accommodations, the more these buyers line up. Again, this an 'ethos' of the matter but an ethos rooted in analysis of exactly what is happening/has happened elsewhere, and most of the time it's not part of conversation, but it's at the root of the decadence we see in the areas that are getting hammered by developers and gentrification. Do we just continue the trend and the behavior that comprises it, or do we step back a bit and reassess what we're doing.