

From: Jim Bruce  
To: [Paul Lukens](#)  
Subject: Fwd: 160007 A  
Date: Saturday, May 06, 2017 1:26:27 PM  
Attachments: [30.36.1006.5-6-17.pdf](#)

---

To Whom it May Concern:

Please see email string below between myself and the editor at our local paper, Bend Bulletin. I wrote a letter to the editor in response to an editorial they had written May 30th, which was rejected. Like most in the press, these guys print what they want regardless of the facts. My redone letter attached, not sure they'll print that either. But it reflects accurately the story of how we got to where we are. Thank you.

Best regards,  
Jim Bruce

Richard Coe

May 4 (2 days ago)

To: me

Hi

Thank you for your reply.

If you want to argue that Lukens misrepresents the facts at almost every level you have to provide examples of his alleged comprehensive disregard for the facts in your letter. Clearly state in the letter the facts that he gets wrong and the correct facts. I think you tried to do some of that but it needs to be clearly spelled out.

You also make the broad claim that subjective reporting has become the norm for the Bulletin. I would like to see what you can provide as evidence for that.

You assert that there must be a taking of private land in Sunrise Village or Bachelor View. It looks to me like they could just run the trail along the sidewalk or existing trails or get agreements with landowners without taking private land. But if you have evidence to the contrary, I would love to see it.

I am not familiar with the Deschutes County DA's office looking into the park district not supplying records. That would not surprise me, but I would need to see evidence that it was true before I could allow you to include it in your letter.

That's it. Thank you.

Richard Coe  
Editorial Page Editor  
The Bulletin  
[541-383-0363](tel:541-383-0363)

On Wed, May 3, 2017 at 7:48 AM, Jim Bruce <[jimbruce@gmail.com](mailto:jimbruce@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hi Richard,

With all due respect, Mr. Lukens facts are not substantiated. My wife, Nancy, and I have been involved in this bridge process for quite some time now. Nancy is a member of UDAG (Upper Deschutes Advisory Group), and has attended all meetings. That group's findings will be published soon, but the net result from their crowd sourcing and public input supports no rules change by OPRD. Additionally, Mr. Lukens' representation of the proposed trail and bridge location is inaccurate.

If the tone of the letter needs to be softened, I can do that. However, it seems wrong to me that you can publish whatever you want as long as it's penned by somebody there at the paper, but when presented with an "inconvenient truth", you kill the article. Mr. Lukens narrative pits a "few large homeowners" against the public interest, which is not the issue. The issue is one of preserving the last bit of scenic waterway we have left in Bend.

Your publication has a long history of subjective reporting, as do most media. Editors have axes to grind and causes to support, that's human nature. This can be seen during every political campaign and any time there's a contentious topic, i.e. OSU Cascades campus location. But isn't the reason you have "letters to the editor" and "in my view" to give those who either agree or disagree with you a platform to be heard? Particularly on an op-ed piece.

If you can define the "problems" with the piece and tell me what you'd like substantiated, I'd be happy to re-write and see if it meets your criteria.

Thanks for the consideration.

Best regards,  
Jim

On Tue, May 2, 2017 at 1:02 PM, Richard Coe <[rcoe@bendbulletin.com](mailto:rcoe@bendbulletin.com)> wrote:

Thank you for your submission.

It is declined.

It's indictment of Lukens for misrepresenting facts and The Bulletin for subjective reporting is not substantiated. And there are problems, as well.

Richard Coe  
Editorial Page Editor  
The Bulletin  
[541-383-0363](tel:541-383-0363)

On Mon, May 1, 2017 at 10:45 AM, Jim Bruce <[jimbruce@gmail.com](mailto:jimbruce@gmail.com)> wrote:

Please see attached letter for your consideration. Thank you.

Jim Bruce  
63227 Service Road  
Bend, OR 97703  
[541-390-6776](tel:541-390-6776)

Jim Bruce  
63227 Service Road  
Bend, OR 97701  
[541-390-6776](tel:541-390-6776)

Jim Bruce  
63227 Service Road  
Bend, OR 97701  
[541-390-6776](tel:541-390-6776)

April 6, 2017

### "In My View" Submission

Beginning Sunday, May 30th, there have been several articles and editorials in The Bulletin about a proposed bridge crossing over the Deschutes river, a legislative bill introduced and passed by the House that would prohibit such a crossing, and scrutiny directed at those who introduced and supported HB2027-1, along with those who organized to oppose the bridge/trail project by BMPRD. Nowhere in the subject editorials or articles thus far has anyone brought up the history of how we came to this point in the debate about a bridge crossing in the Deschutes Scenic Waterway. This is extremely important as the historical perspective will allow the reader to render an opinion from being fully informed, rather than hearing just one side of the issue.

Contrary to the information provided in the Bulletin thus far, the trail/bridge project by BMPRD proposed not one, but two bridge crossings in the 1.2 mile scenic waterway. Even though there is already a pedestrian bridge just below Mt. Bachelor Village, less than .5 miles from the first proposed bridge. This was to facilitate the goal of having a continuous river trail from Sunriver to Bend, while providing access from the east side of the river to the trail system on the west side. The first setback BMPRD encountered was early on in the process when the USFS ruled it would not allow any bridge construction to occur on USFS land, expressing environmental concerns with the resulting additional pedestrian, dog and bike traffic on an already over-used west side of the river.

Absent voluntary private property donation, the approach adopted by BMPRD was to move forward whereby there would be a public condemnation via eminent domain, to obtain the property necessary from private landowners to locate a river trail and bridge crossing access points through the subject area. Part of that plan was to apply to the Oregon Park and Recreation Department (OPRD) for an exception to the existing rules which specifically prohibited bridge construction in a scenic waterway, which was denied. When pressed on the issue, OPRD agreed to sponsor a study to determine if it was time to adopt rule changes. As part of this process, the Upper Deschutes Advisory Group (UDAG) was formed by Community Solutions of Central Oregon to undertake a study of existing rules, garner input from the public at large, the scientific community, recreation enthusiasts, environmentalists, and local property owners.

My wife, Nansee, served as a member of UDAG from it's inception last year through it's conclusion just over a month ago. Six month's time and 22 meetings (including public input forums around Bend) later, the findings of this study were forwarded to Lisa Sumption, director of OPRD on May 5th. Noteworthy results include: 1) of the 317 responses to crowdsourcing prompts, "81% advocated for increased waterway protections"; 2) of the 175 attendees at 3 public meeting around Bend, 88 voiced opinions about this subject; 78 of the 88 (88%) were negative to opening the rules for any type of bridge construction, 3) Final findings did not support opening OPRD rules for change.

So by now, you should be asking yourself, why the need for a legislative strengthening of protections when the rules are not going to change. Great question. The answer is, because the "rules" are really only "suggestions": they don't have any teeth. If a property owner wants to build a bridge in this area and is told no, he or she just needs to wait a year and then start construction. Pretty much as simple as that. BMPRD, it's director Don Horton, and it's board have illustrated that they will do whatever it takes to accomplish their objectives. They (Steve Jorgenson, specifically) have been on the record supporting eminent domain as a means to an end in this quest.

If the original intent had been simply to have a bridge crossing on USFS land connecting the east with the west, as reflected in the Bulletin's maps shown this past week, I don't think there would not have been all the fuss. To the contrary, we are at this point with pending legislation as a result of BMPRD throwing it's weight around and threatening public taking of private property on the last scenic waterway in Bend. The maps shown in the editorials since Sunday depict a new option adopted by BMPRD's board at their monthly board meeting this past Tuesday. I'm not sure how the Bulletin gets the new map before Tuesday's decision; I know it's the first time I've seen it and I've been involved for some time now. In my opinion, Don Horton, et al, have been anything but transparent in this process, and have become adept at manipulating public opinion via various press outlets, the Bulletin included.

One final point. I've been reading the social media responses to Mr. Luken's editorials. To say this issue is contentious would be an understatement. However, I'd encourage my fellow readers to look past the headlines and editorial pieces and investigate on your own before forming your opinion based on those of others, including Mr. Lukens or me. There is a lot more to this bridge topic and the movements of BMPRD that we all need to be aware of.