BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY, OREGON

ORDER NO: 15-11-10-09

In the matter of supporting the recommendations of the County Administrator's Lane County Parks Large Events Task Force and directing staff to implement the recommendations in regular administrative processes for acceptance, review and approval of large event applications, as well as to include the recommendations where appropriate in the Lane County Parks Master Plan.

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners formed the Large Events Task Force on March 11, 2014 as an administrative task force under BO 13-03-11-06 to develop and recommend operational policies and standards for the use Lane County parks to be applied in all Lane County Parks special event contracts and to determine the appropriateness of such events throughout the park system; and

WHEREAS, the Large Events Task Force held 20 regularly scheduled business meetings open to the public from June 21, 2014 to September 28, 2015, as well as two separate public input sessions on October 15, 2014 and June 3, 2015. The group also met separately in several subcommittee meetings as it worked through specific topics of concern. This represents more than 1,000 hours of volunteer effort and time dedicated to this process; and

WHEREAS, the task force has submitted its final report to the county administrator as attached in EXIBIT A - Findings and Recommendations of the Lane Country Large Event Task Force, September 28, 2015; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of County Commissioners of Lane County ORDERS as follows:

1. The recommendations of the task force are hereby accepted and staff is directed to implement the recommendations into regular administrative processes for acceptance, review, and approval of large event applications.

2. Staff shall work to incorporate the recommendations into the Lane County Parks Master Plan.

ADOPTED this 10th day of November, 2015.

[Signature]
Jay Bozievich, Chair
Lane County Board of Commissioners
Findings and Recommendations of the Lane County Large Events Task Force

September 28, 2015
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1. The Charge of the Lane County Large Events Task Force

- In the summer of 2013, large events were held in the Emerald Meadows portion of Howard Buford Recreation Area which generated concerns surrounding the events and the criteria used to approve events. As a result, the Lane County Board of Commissioners expressed interest in establishing “success criteria” for large events that must be met in order for an event to be approved.
- In June 2014, the Lane County Board of Commissioners directed the Lane County Administrator to create a Lane County Large Events Task Force charged with the responsibility of developing and recommending to the Board operational policies and standards to be applied in all Lane County Parks Special Event Contracts and to determine the appropriateness of such events throughout the Park System.
- Fourteen Lane County citizens were appointed to the Task Force representing the following interests: local tourism, lodging, Lane County Parks Advisory Committee, Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah, Mount Pisgah Arboretum, Sheriff's Mounted Posse, outdoor events industry, the Seavey Loop neighborhood, young adults (18-34 years of age) and general park users. The Task Force was staffed by Lane County Parks Division personnel. (See Appendix A.)
- For purposes of the Task Force, a “large event” was defined as a single event attended by 1,000 or more people; the event may occur within a single day, or may be spread over several continuous days. It may be an event open to the public or by private invitation only, and it may be conducted by a commercial enterprise, not-for-profit organization, private individual, governmental agency, or public institution.
- The Lane County Parks Division proposed, and the Task Force concurred, that 10 county parks either are currently capable, or with improvements are potentially capable, of accommodating large events. The criteria used to select the parks included: the park is at least 10 acres in size; the land is zoned either Parks & Recreation (PR), Rural Parks & Recreation (RPR), Impacted Forest Land (F2), or Rural Public Facilities (RPF); the land is either in Lane County ownership, or it is leased on a long-term basis; and parking is available on-site. (See Appendix B.)
- Examples of large events which have occurred in recent years include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triton Yacht Club Boat Show at Richardson Park</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Supported Living Pedal for People at Armitage Park</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon Eugene at Richardson Park</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear Heads Classic Car Show at Armitage Park</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower Festival at Mount Pisgah Arboretum/HBRA</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th of July at Richardson Park and Orchard Point</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushroom Festival at Mount Pisgah Arboretum/HBRA</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faerieworlds at Emerald Meadows/HBRA</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleidoscope Music Festival at Emerald Meadows/HBRA</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dirty Dash at Emerald Meadows/HBRA</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Task Force met during 20 regularly scheduled meetings, each at least two hours in duration, from June 23, 2014 to September 28, 2015. Additionally, smaller working groups composed of Task Force members met on a number of occasions to study specific issues, the results of which were discussed with the entire Task Force.
- To inform the Task Force’s recommendations, expert testimony was obtained from “subject experts” versed in law, public administration, economics, land use planning, transportation, environmental analysis, law enforcement and public advocacy. (See Appendices C, D and E.)
Additionally, substantial efforts were made to engage the general public by providing opportunities for comment before and after each Task Force meeting, two widely advertised public workshops, an on-line web comment form, the “Engage with Lane County” web site, and a professionally conducted survey.

2. Reasons for Hosting Large Events in Lane County Parks

- Lane County parks meet the needs of people seeking a wide range of outdoor activities, including opportunities associated with large events. Large events that are well managed can provide recreational, educational, physical, intellectual, spiritual and professional experiences to people of all ages.
- Large events can contribute to the local economy by generating tourism dollars in the form of gas, food, lodging and miscellaneous spending. While estimates vary, studies indicate that out of town visitors spend an average of $57 to $127 in a day trip to the area, and overnight visitors spend an average of $166 to $270 (Lane County Travel Impacts and Visitor Volume, 2014, by Dean Runyan & Associates for Travel Lane County; Oregon Travel Impacts, 1991-2014, by Dean Runyan & Associates for Oregon Tourism Commission). Overnight hotel stays generate transient room tax, of which approximately 9 percent is distributed to Lane County Parks, accounting for nearly 15 percent of the gross revenue of the Lane County Parks Division.
- Large events can contribute to revenue for the Lane County Parks Division by introducing new users to the parks.
- Large events can provide funding or volunteers for controlling invasive plants or improving wildlife habitat.
- Large events such as trail, obstacle course and “fun” runs can promote healthy living.
- Large events can promote community identity and foster cultural development by encouraging volunteerism, support of local non-profit and charitable organizations, enjoyment of the diverse offerings of local vendors, fellowship, and cooperation among groups that might otherwise have no opportunity to connect.

3. The Mission of Lane County Parks

- The mission of the Lane County Parks Division is: To preserve and enhance parks and open space within Lane County in a manner that provides visitors outstanding customer service and a diverse, high-quality recreational experience that meets their needs and expectations.
- There are 70 recreational sites in the county parks system. The sites range from 0.1 acres to 2,260 acres in size, totaling 4,317 acres.
- Over 1.5 million people visit the county parks annually. Approximately 60 percent of day use visitors, 34 percent of campers and 72 percent of moorage holders are Lane County residents. Visits have grown by more than 70 percent since 2010.
- Visitors participate in a broad variety of park activities, ranging from individual or small group activities such as hiking, picnicking, weddings and horseback riding, to water-oriented activities such as swimming, fishing and boating, to large events such as festivals, athletic competitions and concerts attended by 1,000 or more people.
- Customer service is provided by the parks division staff consisting of 14.8 FTE. This ratio of 1 FTE to 291 acres of park land compares to the 2014 nationwide median of 1 FTE to 46 acres as reported in the National Recreation and Parks Association 2015 Field Report.
• The current annual budget for park operations and maintenance is $3.2 million. Funding is derived primarily from camping and user fees, grants and special taxes, e.g., transient room, car rental and boater fees. No funding is derived from the county general fund, i.e., real property taxes are not used to support county parks.

• At present, the Lane County Parks Master Plan is being updated. This plan was adopted in 1980 with the purpose to “project and plan for the parks and open space needs of Lane County to the year 1995”. The plan contains two General Goals: 1. Provide a comprehensive and balanced park development program which offers a variety of park and recreational opportunities for Lane County residents and visitors consistent with the Statewide Planning Goal #8 [Recreational Needs]; and 2. Provide for adequate open space and protect important scenic and historic areas consistent with Statewide Planning Goal #5 [Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces]. While the plan does not specifically address large events, it anticipated that “There appears to be a greater demand for more ‘active’ facilities near population centers, as opposed to ‘passive’ park and recreation areas” (Finding 9, page 19). It also contains policies that are still relevant today, for example: “… continue to show appropriate concern to adjacent land use when planning a park or recreational area. (Examples – lighting, noise, traffic in developed residential neighborhoods.) Buffer areas or other modifications might be considered in the planning process” (Policy 11, page 12); “… consider environmental quality with regard to recreation. Areas shall be developed to ensure a minimum damage to the environment, while still providing a recreational experience to the user” (Policy 15, page 12); and “… respond to requests for recreational areas and facilities by various organizations and special interest groups. Each request shall be reviewed on its own particular merit” (Policy 24, page 13).

• The use and development of one park, the Howard Buford Recreation Area, is guided by a specific master plan which was adopted in 1994. The plan’s goals support the stated purpose of this park to “provide varied opportunities for primarily low intensity outdoor recreation and education activities while protecting, conserving, enhancing and maintaining the natural, scenic, historical, rural, and recreational qualities of this large, strategically located regional park”. The park is subject to the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 15 – Willamette River Greenway.

• The mission, plans and operations of the county parks system contain inherent conflicts and challenges. That is, by attempting to provide a wide variety of visitors with “a diverse, high-quality recreational experience that meets their needs and expectations”, the experience of some park users can be adversely impacted by the activities of others. Furthermore, adverse impacts can affect neighboring farm, forest and rural residential activities. In particular, impacts associated with some large events can create the most significant conflicts.

• Adverse impacts of most concern include: noise, traffic, environmental degradation, fire, trespass, vandalism, and negative economic impact on neighboring farms.

• Staffing shortfalls in both the county parks division and sheriff’s department limit the county’s ability to enforce nuisance and unlawful activities associated with these adverse impacts, thereby affecting the county’s ability to achieve its stated parks mission.

• The Oregon Resident Outdoor Recreation Demand Analysis Summary for Lane County (part of the Supporting Documentation for the 2013-2017 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan prepared by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and Oregon State University in 2012) identifies the types of outdoor recreation activities in which Lane County residents participate. Of those residents who responded to a survey, over 50% participated in each of the following activities: walking on local streets/sidewalks; sightseeing/driving or motorcycling for pleasure; relaxing, hanging out, escaping heat/noise, etc.; walking on local trails/paths; picnicking; attending outdoor concerts, fairs, festivals; and beach activities-ocean.
Preserving open space and the environment, improving physical health and fitness, making their community a more desirable place to live, and improving mental health and reducing stress received the highest value for benefits of parks and recreation services. According to the analysis, among the highest priorities in which park and forest agencies should invest in the future include: dirt/other soft surface walking trails and paths; public access sites to waterways; children’s playgrounds and play areas made of natural materials (logs, water, sand, boulders, hills, trees); nature and wildlife viewing areas; and picnic areas and shelters for small visitor groups.

- A survey was conducted by the Lane County Parks Division in collaboration with an LETF subcommittee and ECONorthwest in January 2015 to assess whether Lane County residents think large events should be allowed in some Lane County Parks and, if so, under what conditions they should be allowed. Two thousand surveys were mailed and 736 (40 percent) were returned. Young adults, ages 18-35, were oversampled to ensure the comments of this particular demographic group were statistically represented. Some of the key conclusions of the survey are: Lane County residents value Lane County’s parks and think that parks play an important role in the quality of life in Lane County; 21% of the respondents support allowing all large events, 71% support allowing large events under some circumstances, and 3% responded that no large events should take place (the level of support was relatively constant across respondent age groups and income levels); more than 60% of respondents indicated that mitigation measures would either address their concerns or that they had no concerns (this level of confidence in the ability to mitigate concerns about large events held for respondents living in neighborhoods closest to the Howard Buford Recreational Area and Armitage Park, two of Lane County’s largest parks where events are more common); as Lane County Parks Division develops policies to manage large events in parks, it will be important to pay close attention to policies to mitigate key impacts on neighbors, such as noise, traffic, and concerns about public safety (Lane County already implements many mitigation measures); the results of this survey provide opportunity for Lane County Parks Division to educate the public about the mitigation measures already implemented by the County, new mitigation policies resulting from the work of the Large Events Task Force and this study, and the results of studies about the impacts of large events in key areas of concern. (See Appendix F)

- The Task Force conducted two workshops at which the general public was invited to share thoughts with the Task Force members. A total of approximately 75 people attended, largely from residential areas adjacent to Howard Buford, Zumwalt and Hendricks Bridge parks. The main concerns centered on the impacts that large events could have on the parks themselves as well as on the adjacent neighborhoods; there was also discussion of the recreational and financial benefits that managed control of various activities can provide.

- The Task Force also provided on-line opportunities for the general public to provide feedback. 523 comments were received (including some duplication) and according to LCP staff analysis, 38% of the respondents support allowing all large events, 41% support allowing large events under some circumstances, and 21% responded that no large events should take place.

4. Existing Rules and Restrictions Regarding Park Use

- The Lane County Parks Division has written rules “designed to help [visitors] have a safe and enjoyable visit while protecting our park resources and ensuring enjoyable use of the park by others.”
• Exceptions to the park rules as well as requests to conduct special events and uses such as overnight use, amplified noise equipment, lawn parking, charging of admission or the sale of goods, services or alcohol, require a Special Event contract addressing matters such as environmental impact, transportation/access impact, noise, indemnification and usage fees.
• Most county parks are zoned for park and recreation purposes. Some parks are located within areas zoned for farm, forest, natural resource, watershed protection, rural residential or rural public facility purposes; these zones may limit the types of activities for which the parks may be used.
• The land for some county parks was granted with deed restrictions or is leased with provisions regarding the types of activities that may occur in the parks. In general terms, these restrictions and provisions limit the use of the parks to “recreational purposes.” For most, the types of activities that are considered to be “recreational purposes” are not specifically defined.
• Lane County Code Chapter 5.600 regulates noise by establishing maximum sound levels during certain hours of the day. LC 5.620 provides parks and other civic activities some exceptions to the standards, and LC 5.625 prescribes an administrative variance process to exceed the standards. Park rules require “sound producing devices” such as radios, tape decks and car stereos to “be operated so as not to be plainly audible from a distance of 50 feet”.
• Lane County Code Chapter 15.205 regulates the use of county roads through a Facility Permit process. The Lane County Parks Division coordinates with the Lane County Road Maintenance Division to ensure roadways are properly signed to prohibit parking and maintain smooth flow of traffic. The Parks Division also uses onsite mitigation measures such as temporary event, traffic and parking plans to control the flow and queuing distance of vehicles entering a site.
• The Lane County Board of Commissioners may adopt ordinances and/or policies that regulate the types of activities allowed in county parks and/or the rules by which visitors to county parks must abide.
• In December 2014, the Lane County Board of Commissioners adopted Lane County Code Chapter 3.995 regulating Outdoor Assembly License Review Procedures pertaining to large events held on privately owned property, which excludes Lane County parks and certain other potential venues.

5. General Conclusions & Guiding Principles

After reviewing and discussing preliminary information obtained from invited “subject experts” and the general public, the Task Force adopted the following five general conclusions and guiding principles to direct its efforts:

• **Large events and the mission of Lane County Parks**
  Large events can fit the mission of Lane County Parks if properly managed as to their frequency and impact on neighbors, environmental qualities, and other park uses.

• **Revenue as a motivation for large events in Lane County Parks**
  Lane County Parks are underfunded and we recognize that useful revenue can be generated by large events. This potential generation of revenue, however, does not supersede the need to follow a set of requirements regarding the type, frequency, duration and certain quality factors for these events.
• **Legality and policy issues associated with large events in Lane County Parks**
  Although the Large Events Task Force is not qualified to make legal judgments, the hosting of large events in Lane County Parks appears to be a legal activity that raises policy and management issues that need to be addressed.

• ** Appropriateness of large events in Lane County Parks**
  Large events can be appropriate in some Lane County Parks, but only if requirements limit their frequency/duration and impact on neighbors, environmental qualities, and other park uses.

• **Safety as the overriding factor associated with large events in Lane County Parks**
  Safety considerations are based on objective criteria, and so must be the foundation of a comprehensive and functional management plan for every event, large or small. Each large event being considered should first be required to demonstrate its capacity and willingness to operate successfully within both safety policy and contractual operational requirements established by Lane County Parks.

With these guiding principles in mind, the Task Force divided into three working groups to study identified concerns and to make recommendations for consideration by the entire Task Force. Sixty-three proposed recommendations were submitted to and considered by the Task Force. After considerable discussion, votes were taken on the recommendations, and the final adopted recommendations are provided below, followed by the concerns and findings which provide background and context. It should be noted that while strong consensus was achieved on most recommendations, a small number of amendments or proposals were adopted or rejected on closely split votes. Although individuals had different perspectives on the issues under consideration, there was usually a broad middle ground supported by most or all task force members. The general cohesiveness of the task force is indicated by strong support for a final motion stating that “LETF approves the Findings and Recommendations of the Lane County Large Events Task Force” Each member of the task force was provided with an opportunity to comment as well as vote on this motion. The final vote was for unanimous approval (11-0) with three members absent.

6. **Recommendations for Policies and Standards Regarding Large Events**

The Large Events Task Force recommends inclusion of the following policies and standards in the body of the Lane County Parks Master Plan.

Frequency and Duration of Large Events

• The appropriate number of days per event could vary depending on the nature of the event and the park where it would take place. Therefore, no overall limit is recommended.

Noise

• Enforce the provisions of Lane Code Chapter 5.600 Prohibited Noise.
• Prohibit the use of amplified sound, i.e., sound that is amplified electronically or by any other means, e.g., megaphones, air horns or explosive devices, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.
• Obtain a sound engineer’s report if needed to determine proper placement of sound producing equipment.
• Contracts with large event providers must delineate county noise restrictions and contain a mechanism for monitoring decibel levels as well as enforcing compliance.
• Advertise and establish a continuously monitored telephone number through which noise complaints can be channeled and acted upon in a timely manner, e.g., an on-site Park Ranger.

Environmental Impacts

• The Lane County Parks Division should map “strategy habitats” within any park area considered for large events. Strategy habitats are defined in the Oregon Conservation Strategy (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 2006; available online). In general, they are rare and significant habitat types within each region of Oregon.
• The Parks Division should obtain rare species documentation data annually from the Oregon Biodiversity Information Center, or similar source, for each park being considered for large events in the following season.
• The Parks Division should conduct invasive species surveys in each park being considered for large events. Surveys should be done in advance and in anticipation of event applications, i.e., the most likely parks to receive applications should be surveyed first. Treatments of priority invasive species should be undertaken as soon as possible.
• An impact assessment tool should be used to determine impacts from proposed events on the two environmental resources in each proposed park (strategy habitats and rare species). Habitat connectivity also should be considered.

Traffic and Parking

• Require large event organizers to prepare traffic management plans which address criteria similar to that found in Lane Code 3.995. Submission of these plans to the Lane County Parks Department needs to occur well in advance of large events in order for adequate review and coordination with the Lane County Road Maintenance Division, Lane County Sheriff’s office, and other appropriate county departments and jurisdic- tional agencies, e.g., ODOT.
• Consider preparing master traffic management plans for roads used to access parks where large events are conducted. Such “template” plans could specify the types of mitigation measures required for various levels of traffic volumes. Depending on the size of the event and traffic generated, these measures could range, for example, from the use of signage to certified flaggers to traffic and/or parking monitors to requiring the use of shuttle vehicles during peak entrance and exiting hours, or for day use ticket holders only.
• Where they don’t currently exist, review and develop capital improvement projects that provide alternative or emergency access to parks that serve as venues for large events.

Fire Safety/Emergency Response

• Require event organizers to conduct at least one meeting well in advance of an event to coordinate emergency response procedures. This meeting should include the event organizer, the event’s private security manager, all applicable emergency responders, and Lane County Sheriff and Parks Division officials. Radio frequencies, cell phone numbers, and 911 call procedures are among topics to be discussed. (Note: “well in advance” means that at least one
meeting with all involved parties should be held at a minimum of one week prior to the date when vendors load out and set up for the event to ensure all contractual obligations are in order; preferably, an initial meeting would be conducted several months in advance of the event, or whenever the special events contract is signed.)

- Ensure that emergency action procedures are communicated to those attending large events, e.g., location of refuge zones, evacuation routes. Color-coded maps outlining evacuation routes should be prepared and distributed to private security, traffic control, medical, fire and law enforcement personnel. Signage should be used to delineate these areas and routes. Helicopter landing sites should be designated for large events held in remote parks, where road access for emergency medical vehicles is constrained, and/or in anticipation of the need to evacuate large numbers of injured or ill event attendees.

Public Safety/Security

- Require, well in advance of a large event, coordination among the event organizer, Lane County Parks Division and the Sheriff's office to determine responsibilities and chain-of-command procedures for maintaining public safety and security at the event venue, on neighboring properties, and on roads leading to the venue through adjacent neighborhoods. Additionally, ensure all other affected agencies, e.g., public works, public health, are notified of the nature of the event in a timely manner. (Note: “well in advance” means that at least one meeting with all involved parties should be held at a minimum of one week prior to the date when vendors load out and set up for the event to ensure all contractual obligations are in order; preferably, an initial meeting would be conducted several months in advance of the event, or whenever the Special Events contract is signed.)
- Limit the size, frequency and hours of operation of large events based on the anticipated availability of Lane County Parks Division and Sheriff’s office personnel to adequately monitor and enforce the terms of special events contracts and ensure public safety and security.
- In addition to providing liability insurance coverage, require event organizers to provide adequate bonding or cash deposits to adequately cover the cost of contracted services and contingencies. The Lane County Parks Director needs to have copies of all contracts the event organizer has with service providers, e.g., Sheriff, sanitation, security, flaggers, medical, etc.
- Consider limiting the maximum number of attendees at events.
- Consider establishing “tiered” standards to adequately support the size and duration of large events, e.g., the amount of private crowd control and medical personnel, and water, sanitation and fire prevention requirements per 1,000 attendees and/or hours per day.
- Consider establishing legally defensible qualifying standards based on the experience, reputation and/or financial strength of event organizers.

Alternatives to Large Events as Sources of Park Revenue

- Where appropriate, fees collected from organizers of large events should, at a minimum, cover all costs (including overhead) incurred by the Lane County Parks Division and any other county departments involved with the events.
- Consider increasing camping, parking and other user fees.
- Consider the construction and expansion of improved campgrounds in county parks where such facilities are appropriate and would generate net revenue for the Parks Division.
Appropriateness of Large Events throughout the Parks System

- The purpose of a proposed large event must be compatible with the spirit of, and all specific provisions contained within any deed, lease, master plan or other approved guidance documents applicable to a given park.
- To encourage stakeholder involvement and provide transparency in the review of large events, the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) should draw on experts and stakeholders to form a PAC/Stakeholder Event Review and Oversight Group. Membership would include individuals with expertise in event management, environmental and economic impact, neighbors, relevant nonprofit/volunteer groups, and a parks pass holder. Following a two-step process, the Parks Manager and staff would first review large event applications and either move an event application forward to step two, help organizers improve their application, or deny the application and remove it from further consideration. In the second step, the PAC/Stakeholder Group would use an assessment tool to analyze and score applications forwarded from Parks staff and recommend to the Board of County Commissioners the approval or denial of each application. The assessment tool would be developed by Parks staff and the PAC/Stakeholder Group based on appropriateness, impact, safety and other criteria included in this report. In addition to reviewing large event applications, the Parks Manager would also have the option to seek the help of the PAC/Stakeholder Group in reviewing selected smaller events. For example, this group might be asked to help Lane County Parks staff evaluate new events with unusual characteristics or those that, while small, might still have a high impact on the park. Due to the seasonal nature of applications, it is estimated that the PAC/Stakeholder Group could complete most or all reviews during a meeting early in the calendar year. The full PAC/Stakeholder Group recommendation is presented as Appendix G.
- “Occupant density” standards should be established by the Parks Division for parks capable of serving as venues for large events, and event organizers should be required to limit the maximum number of people and vehicles that will be admitted to the event at any time. (As a guideline, 10 people per 100 square feet of space should be used for events where attendees will primarily be standing; less than 10 people per 100 square feet should be used for non-standing events, e.g., dancing, running, picnicking. The calculation does not include space for uses such as roadways, vendor booths, stages, toilets, service areas.) Event organizers should be required to keep a count of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the event, and shall not be allowed to exceed the contracted amount. Additionally, event organizers should submit an emergency evacuation plan and document how they have calculated the exit capacity of their event.
- The Parks Division, PAC/Stakeholder Group, and event organizers should:
  - Establish and map an appropriate event footprint, and document how they have considered impacts on the environment, neighbors and other park users.
  - Evaluate the adequacy of plans for managing traffic, protecting the environment, controlling noise, providing for public safety, health, and security, and other requirements of the contract.
  - Serve timely notice (a minimum of 30 days) of proposed large events to general park users and neighboring property owners (such notice would be accomplished by posting on the Parks Division website, park information boards, parking areas and host stations, and should include the type of event, expected number of attendees, attendance fees and location within the park).
Take public comments and suggestions from, and evaluate and consider concerns of, impacted park users, neighboring property owners, individual parks’ non-profit or volunteer groups, or event organizers.

Determine appropriateness of the event for the park, and abide by deed/lease restrictions, individual park’s master plans, and land use considerations.

Using the assessment tool, Lane County Parks staff and the PAC/Stakeholder Group should evaluate, among other things, 1) noise impact, with lower assessment scores given to events focusing predominantly on amplified music; 2) lodging and extended stays, with higher assessment scores given to events which generate significant overnight stays in off-site lodging and camping facilities; 3) revenue to Lane County Parks, with higher assessment scores given to events whose revenue offsets expenses (with preference given to multi-year contracts); 4) outside spending, with higher assessment scores given to events which promote local spending and/or use of local vendors; 5) job creation, with higher assessment scores given to events which create or expand local temporary, seasonal or year-round jobs; and 6) opportunities for local non-profit or volunteer groups to earn revenue or fulfill their mission (e.g., education), with higher assessment scores given to events which promote “give-back” opportunities.

Limit the size, duration and/or frequency of large events in a manner that is manageable by Lane County Parks Division personnel in order to ensure compliance with the provisions of a Special Event contract.

Limit camping to parks with developed campgrounds in order to manage the impacts that camping associated with large events may have on parks, other park users and adjacent neighborhoods. (The one recognized exception to this policy is the arrangement between Lane County and the City of Veneta which allows camping at Zumwalt Park during the Country Fair; the contractual obligations that have made this arrangement successful should be reviewed by the LCPAC to determine the appropriateness of similar implementation at other parks.)

7. Concerns and Findings Regarding Large Events

Frequency and Duration of Large Events

• Some large events last one day while others span two, three or more days in duration; some events occur during daylight hours, while others can last into late night or early morning.
• Some events, e.g., concerts, tend to generate “peak traffic” volumes within relatively short periods of time as attendees travel to and from the venue, while other events, e.g., festivals, generate a more consistent flow of traffic throughout the duration of the event.
• Impacts created by certain types of large events can disturb native vegetation, wildlife and people attending a park for other purposes. Additionally, such impacts can disturb people and domestic animals that live in close proximity to the parks. At some point, such impacts can become intolerable nuisances.
• In addressing the impacts that large events conducted on private property may have on adjacent land uses, in December 2014 Lane Code 3.995 was adopted. This code restricts large assemblies, i.e., 1,000 to 3,000 people gathered for 12 to 120 hours, to once “in any 90 day period and no two assemblies may be held closer than 90 days apart,” and establishes standards and requirements pertaining to traffic management, public health, public safety, noise and other considerations. The code does not apply to “any assembly in a local, county or regional park authorized by the regulating authority”.
Noise

- A number of loudness comparison charts exist which provide information on typical ambient or background noise levels for various activities. One such chart prepared by the California Department of Transportation is especially informative to this study in that it identifies typical noise levels in various relevant settings: noisy urban area during daytime – 70-80 dBA; quiet urban area during daytime – 50-60 dBA; quiet urban area during nighttime – 40-50 dBA; quiet suburban area during nighttime – 30-40 dBA; quiet rural area during nighttime – 20-30 dBA; and rock band – 100 dBA.
- A report titled “Code of Practice on Environmental Noise Control at Concerts” prepared by The Noise Council in London, England in 1995 provides information on “large music events involving high powered amplification equipment held in sporting stadia, arenas, open air sites and within lightweight buildings”, and offers guidelines to minimize disturbance caused by noise. Highlights of the report include the following: assessment of noise in terms of dBA is very convenient but it can underestimate the intrusiveness of low frequency noise; topographical and climatic conditions can be such that music noise level can be lower at locations nearer to the venue; concerts can be accompanied by associated activities which can be noisy, e.g., audience applause can be a significant contributor.
- Lane Code Chapter 5.600 Prohibited Noise regulates noise emissions. It specifies that noise generated on one property cannot exceed a certain noise level across the boundary of another property that “is used for the overnight accommodation of persons”, e.g., a house, apartment, trailer or hospital. Between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. the sound cannot exceed 60 dBA; between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., the sound cannot exceed 50 dBA. Furthermore, between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. such sound cannot be audible inside such a structure. There are exceptions to this rule; among them, group activities at parks are allowed to exceed the established noise levels between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.
- Other jurisdictions regulate noise more-or-less in the same manner. Of particular note is that both the City of Eugene and Willamalane Park District have provisions disallowing “amplified music” to be played between certain hours, e.g., 10:00 or 10:30 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
- Lane County Park Rules state: “Creating a Disturbance - Radios, tape decks, car stereos, or other sound producing devices [emphasis added] must be operated so as not to be plainly audible from a distance of 50 feet”.
- The Lane County Parks Special Event Application requires event organizers to provide information regarding “any anticipated noise issue and what your plan may be to reduce or control noise”.
- Enforcement of the Lane County Noise Ordinance and Park Rules is provided by Land Management Division and Parks Division personnel. Given current limited staffing, enforcement is complaint driven and it is often difficult for staff to respond to complaints in a timely manner. The Lane County Sheriff does not enforce noise violations in county parks.

Environmental Impacts

- The 10 parks identified as suitable or potentially suitable for large events display a broad range of biological diversity, including coniferous and deciduous forests, savannas and meadows, lakes and rivers, and hills and low lands. These lands provide important habitat for a variety of wildlife.
The 10 parks also exhibit various levels of improvements ranging from undeveloped, natural conditions to fully serviced campgrounds and moorage facilities.

Farming and grazing have occurred in some parks, degrading native vegetation in some areas and allowing invasive plant species to grow.

Improvements and excessive human use can degrade the natural, scenic and spiritual values of these parks.

Potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife resulting from noise, proximity of humans and pets and trampling associated with short term, locally concentrated events include outright mortality, and impacts on mating, reproduction, feeding and movement.

Potential impacts of short term, locally concentrated events on aquatic wildlife are less well known, but storm water runoff from parking areas can introduce toxins and sediments into water bodies, and proximity of humans and their pets can stress fish, turtles, frogs and other aquatic life.

Potential impacts of short term, locally concentrated events on native plants and habitats include these general categories: reduction/loss of habitat, conversion of habitat from native to non-native by physical disturbance and introduction of non-native (sometimes invasive) species, alteration of hydrology, and degradation of soils by compaction, application of chemicals, and human or other contamination which affects ground dwelling organisms.

Traffic and Parking

Large events generate large volumes of automobile traffic which can approach or exceed the capacity of roads that provide access to the events. This can cause traffic congestion, inconvenience and safety issues, and parking concerns on the roads, in the parks and in neighborhoods adjacent to parks. Depending upon the type of event, these problems can occur within relative short “peak” times, e.g., before the start and at the conclusion of a concert, or over a relatively long period of time, e.g., a festival at which attendees come and go during the course of a few days.

Access to and from some Lane County parks is limited to one road. While this may be adequate for normal park usage, traffic congestion can quickly become a problem during large events. Additionally, where only one road accesses a park, access by emergency vehicles or evacuation of park users could be significantly impeded or even dangerously precluded. It should be noted that the primary access to the west side of Howard Buford Recreation Area is a two-lane road, i.e., Seavey Loop Road, which includes a bridge across the Coast Fork of the Willamette River. A network of private gravel roads and one-lane bridge located west of this main park entrance can be used as a secondary emergency route, but the route is complex and access is contingent on the owners’ permission. No such alternative route is available east of the main entrance, potentially impacting event safety in the Arboretum area of the park.

Roads are classified according to their design and construction, e.g., lane width, number of lanes, and they are categorized as local roads, collector roads and arterial roads. These “functional” classifications are indicators of the traffic volume or capacity that a road can carry safely and efficiently at designated speeds.

The Lane County Road Maintenance Division is responsible for maintaining and regulating roads belonging to the county; the Oregon Department of Transportation is responsible for state highways; city public works departments are responsible for city streets.

Whenever a permanent or temporary use is made of a county road right-of-way, e.g., driveway access, temporary sign placement, a Facility Permit must be issued by the Road Maintenance
Division in accordance with Lane Code 15.205. If an event will generate more than 50 additional traffic trips during peak demand on county roads outside of urban growth boundaries or more than 100 additional trips during peak demand on county roads inside of urban growth boundaries, a Special Events and Public Benefits permit is required. The types and placement of signs and the use of flaggers must meet certain legal standards. Standard signage, including reader boards advising locals of upcoming events, is available for rental through Lane County.

- The Lane County Parks Special Event Application requires event organizers to “provide a general Anticipated Transportation/Access Impact on roads”. This information is to “include any potential route conflicts, ingress/egress, or other possible conflicts”. It also asks if the event organizer has “a Transportation Access plan or can one be established?”
- There have been inconsistencies in the degree to which Lane County Parks personnel have coordinated with the Road Maintenance Division to determine the extent to which mitigation measures, e.g., temporary signage, flaggers, and parking plans, should be required in order to maintain an adequate and safe flow of traffic to and from a large event venue. It should be noted that while signage and flaggers may be used to warn or direct traffic, speed limits cannot be modified for large events.
- In late 2014, the Lane County Board of Commissioners adopted Lane Code 3.995 Outdoor Assembly License Review Procedures for large events conducted on privately owned land. This code section requires event organizers to provide a traffic management plan “demonstrating how traffic will be managed and parking will be provided” in greater detail than that currently required by the Special Event Application for events conducted at county parks. (Such a plan does not, however, involve as much technical detail as a Traffic Impact Analysis which is required for various land use proposals, e.g., housing subdivisions.)
- Although not required to be prepared by a registered traffic engineer or certified transportation planner, the cost of preparing a traffic management plan that satisfies the criteria of Lane Code 3.995 is estimated to be several hundred to a few thousand dollars. Traffic control measures, e.g., certified flaggers, and/or devices, e.g., signs, signals, which may be required by such a plan would add additional cost.
- For events such as University of Oregon football and basketball games in the City of Eugene, standard traffic management plans have been developed with requirements specified or “tiered” depending upon the anticipated volume of traffic that an event is expected to generate. The conditions imposed range from the use of temporary signage, to the use of certified flaggers or police officers, to the establishment of temporary directional lanes, to the use of shuttle buses. Such a “template” plan can cost several thousand dollars to develop, but it eliminates the need for individual event organizers to develop their own plans.

Fire Safety/Emergency Response

- Hot summer temperatures, dry field and forest conditions, and human activity, e.g., smoking, cooking, parked vehicles and camp fires, can inadvertently result in wildfires in Lane County parks.
- Precautionary measures, limits on use, and coordinated emergency action plans and procedures are needed to manage fire hazards associated with large events.
- Most, if not all, county parks are regulated and covered against fires by local rural fire districts (for structural fires) and/or Oregon Department of Forestry fire control districts (for forest and rangeland fires).
• The Lane County Parks Department coordinates with rural fire districts and/or the Department of Forestry for fire protection.
• The Oregon Fire Code contains guidelines for fire prevention and life safety at fairs, trade shows, carnivals and common venue events that are applicable to large events in Lane County parks. ORS Chapter 477 prescribes regulations for fire protection of forests and vegetation that are also applicable to large events in certain Lane County parks.
• The Lane County Parks Division Special Event Contract requires large event organizers to abide by the Oregon Fire Code and interagency agreements, and to develop Emergency Action Plans for events.
• Some inconsistencies exist in the degree to which contract requirements are implemented or enforced, e.g., provision for two ingress/egress routes, fire extinguisher requirements, maintenance of adequate fire lanes.

Public Safety/Security

• Some large events conducted in Lane County parks have the potential for creating a nuisance and/or criminal activity, both within the park and on neighboring properties. The likelihood of such activity is largely dependent upon the demographic composition of those attending the event, the nature and duration of the event, and the amount of planning and coordination involving affected agencies, other users of the park and neighbors adjacent to the park.
• Lane County Parks Division personnel are responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of special events contracts. To the extent staffing levels allow, they conduct on-site inspections and continuous enforcement. They have the legal authority to “shut down” an event for noncompliance.
• The Lane County Sheriff can be called upon to enforce laws pertaining to criminal activities, e.g., driving under the influence of intoxicants, sale of illegal drugs, assault and trespass, but the Sheriff does not enforce the provisions of special events contracts, e.g., adequacy of sanitation, hours of operation or noise standards. The Sheriff can also enforce parking violations along the roads leading into the event - a job made much easier if proper signage is posted along the primary access routes and at the entrance(s) to the venue(s).
• Based on a statewide standard for law enforcement in municipalities, a suggested ideal ratio for maintaining adequate public safety and security in cities is 2.2 officers per 1,000 population. For large events in Lane County parks, this standard is not achievable with the Sheriff’s office given the current low staffing level. As a result, it may be necessary for large event coordinators to contract with off-duty deputies or licensed and bonded private security contractors, but the availability of personnel for this service cannot be guaranteed.
• Unanticipated attendance of excessive numbers of people at large events can overwhelm the ability of the event organizer and Lane County Parks Division personnel to adequately manage the unintended consequences associated with such attendance, e.g., inadequate sanitation, parking and traffic control, and crowd control.
• While on-site or nearby camping associated with a large event can provide an additional recreational experience for participants and reduce the inconvenience and safety concerns of driving home after a late night event, camping sites themselves can create additional public safety and security concerns. If camping standards are not addressed in the special events contract, management of unintended consequences can create problems both within the camp and on neighboring properties.
• The lack of early coordination among the event organizer, Lane County Parks Division personnel, and the Lane County Sheriff can result in inadequate management of the event attendees and provision of emergency services. Notable problems in this regard include the “collapse” of emergency cell phone coverage if communication towers are overwhelmed by the use of cell phones by event attendees, and the inability of emergency vehicles to access the event site in case of an emergency.

Park Revenue

• The current Lane County Parks Division budget is $3.2 million.
• The Parks Division does not receive any funding from the County general fund or property taxes.
• The Parks Division is funded from approximately 37 sources. These include: user fees, e.g., parking, moorage, picnicking and camping; state taxes and fees, e.g., hotel room tax, and recreational vehicle and boater registration fees; car rental tax; fees for hosting large events.
• For Fiscal Years 2009-10 through 2013-14, the top five sources of gross revenue for the Parks Department were: camping – 20.47%; transient room tax – 14.91%; recreational vehicle fee – 13.82%; car rental tax – 11.32%; admissions, i.e., parking – 8.75%. Fees collected from large event organizers ranked ninth on the list, providing 1.86% of the Park Department’s gross revenue during this time period.
• The Park Division’s experience with fees collected from large events suggests that net operational revenue to the department is negative for the first two to three years of such events’ use of county parks.

 Appropriateness of Large Events throughout the Parks System

• The 10 Lane County Parks that can accommodate large events vary in size, natural features, available infrastructure and amenities, proximity to users, and proximity to farms, forests and rural neighborhoods.
• Because of the variability of the characteristics of the 10 parks, they each have a range of uses that are appropriate, as well as a range of uses that are not. Most, if not all, have the potential for more passive, lower intensity/lower impact activities such as hiking, picnicking and small weddings. Some of the parks may lend themselves to more active, higher intensity/higher impact activities which range, for example, from athletic competitions, e.g., cross country foot races, or “fun runs”, e.g., the Dirty Dash, to festivals, concerts, regattas, recreational vehicle jamborees, and radio-controlled model airplane events.
• While these parks, both individually and collectively, have the ability to accomplish the Lane County Parks mission to “preserve and enhance parks and open space within Lane County in a manner that provides visitors with a diverse, high-quality recreational experience that meets their needs and expectations”, increasing use of the parks – and in particular the conduct of certain types of large events – has the potential to degrade the natural and improved amenities that the parks provide, and to diminish the quality of the recreational experiences of visitors with differing needs and expectations when their uses interfere with each other. For example, a rock concert and a bird watching event in close proximity to each other would likely not be compatible.
• Furthermore, increasing use of parks has the potential to increase traffic, noise, fire hazard, trespass and vandalism in adjacent farm, forest and rural residential areas.
• At a number of parks, e.g., Howard Buford Recreation Area, Zumwalt Park and Hendricks Bridge Park, volunteers from the adjacent neighborhood and/or volunteer organizations have invested time and resources in varying degrees to maintain and/or make improvements to those parks. For example, in 2014 non-profit groups contributed the equivalent of 19 FTE or $850,000 in service to Howard Buford Recreation Area. Such private/public partnerships are critical to the maintenance, development, and management of parks and have generated a strong knowledge of and interest in the types of activities which occur in those parks.

• One approach to managing the impacts associated with large events is to specify the types of large events allowed at each park. This would require prescribing the uses, or categories of uses permitted, and establishing operating policies. This approach would require a considerable expenditure of resources to develop management plans for each park. Additionally, with this approach it is possible to overlook and exclude certain uses that would be appropriate, or to create policies that result in unintended outcomes. Furthermore, as time progresses, policies established in management plans of this nature tend to become obsolete or irrelevant in the face of changing circumstances.

• Another approach to managing the impacts associated with large events is to specify standards eliminating, minimizing or mitigating the adverse impacts that can lead to conflicts among park visitors and between park visitors and land uses adjacent to the parks where such events may be held. This would entail establishing, or revising existing, standards for the frequency and duration of large events, noise, traffic, environmental impacts, public safety and emergency response. It may also entail the establishment of criteria for evaluating and selecting the large events that may be held; such criteria could include the experience and financial capability of the event promoter, and the benefit that the event may have on the economic, social and/or environmental values of the county.

• Some communities use an “assessment tool” to score and rank the costs and benefits associated with large events in order to determine their appropriateness. A number of criteria are evaluated and assigned “plus” or “minus” points based on impacts. The criteria include such categories as: “community impact”, e.g., effects on residents and businesses, utilization of public transportation, number of years event has been held; “economic impact”, e.g., lodging demand, outside spending, job creation; “social and cultural impact”, e.g., charity fund raising, wellness, citizen engagement, cultural understanding, urban place making; “environmental impact”, e.g., green initiatives, amplified sound, event containment, recovery time; “road impact”, e.g., time of day, duration of closure; and “impact on city services”, e.g., police, fire, park maintenance.

8. Special Considerations for Howard Buford Recreation Area

Recommendations

• Limit the frequency of large events to a maximum of four large events per year, with no more than two large events in any one calendar quarter.

• Large events should be limited to those with a primarily educational or nature based theme.

• Limit the duration of large events to no more than 10 hours per day, between sunrise and 7:00 p.m.

• Emergency access routes serving both the north and south portions of the HBRA should be evaluated within at least the contexts of safety and environmental impact, and improved if appropriate and cost-effective. Lacking such improvement, safety concerns should inform the
type, size, and time of year large events are held. For example, fire season may be an ill-advised
time to hold large events.

FINDINGS

• Of the 10 Lane County parks that are capable or potentially capable of serving as venues for
large events, one park is subject to additional considerations in regard to such events. This is
the Howard Buford Recreation Area (HBRA) for which a master plan was adopted by the Lane
County Board of Commissioners in 1994.
• As stated in the HBRA master plan, “the purpose of Howard Buford Recreation Area is to provide
varied opportunities for primarily low intensity outdoor recreation and education activities
while protecting, conserving, enhancing, and maintaining the natural, scenic, historic, rural and
recreational qualities of this large, strategically located regional park” (page 2). The HBRA is
described as a place where people “can leave the noises, sights and crowds of the city behind
and experience the peacefulness of the rural countryside” (page 7). Furthermore, “users believe
that anything that requires large motors, bright lights, fire or that encourages loud, raucous
behavior should take place elsewhere” (page 21).
• The intended use of the recreation area is best expressed by the following statement: “It is clear
that all of the things that make the Howard Buford Recreation Area what it is today are the
things people value about it – the rural character, a place to hike, a place to ride horses, a place
rich in its diversity of plants and wildlife, a place which has drawn people to it for hundreds of
years. These things should, at the very least, be preserved; at best, they should be enhanced by
any changes which are made in the years to come” (page 23).
• Since the HBRA master plan was adopted, 1412 acres of land adjacent to the HBRA have been
acquired by The Nature Conservancy and the Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah for the
primary purpose of restoring and protecting fish and wildlife habitat, adding to the intended use
of the park.
• In regard to large events, the HBRA master plan offers the following guidance:
  1. Goal 1, Management Objective E. Limit festivals and large gatherings to avoid disturbing
     visitors who are seeking a peaceful experience. (page 28)
  2. Goal 2, Management Objective A. Limit the location and type of festivals and large
     gatherings to those which do not damage sensitive botanical resources or wildlife habitat.
     (page 28)
  3. Goal 8, Management Objective A. Restrict overnight camping to organized group events
     and require a special permit for each event. (page 31)
  4. Goal 8, Management Objective B. Restrict overnight camping to areas which are easily
     accessible by emergency vehicles.
• A number of large events have been held in the HBRA. The Mount Pisgah Arboretum has held a
mushroom festival annually since 2001 attracting an estimated attendance of 4500 people. In
the Emerald Meadows portion of the HBRA, music, art and athletic events have drawn 4,000 to
10,000 attendees. At times, these events have generated noise, traffic, environmental and
public safety concerns among both other park users and residents living near the park.
• Seavey Loop Road, a two-lane road with a bridge across the Coast Fork, is the primary access to
the park. A gravel road with a one-lane bridge across the Coast Fork can serve as emergency
access to events held north of the main entry, but no emergency route is available to access
events held south of the main entry.
9. Overarching Observations

- It became clear during the Task Force’s deliberations that the mission of the Lane County Parks is challenging to accomplish. Concurrently preserving and enhancing parks and open space, providing visitors outstanding customer service, and offering a diverse, high-quality recreational experience that meets their needs and expectations while faced with growing demand, understaffed personnel, and budget constraints would stretch any park authority’s capability to satisfy all the maintenance and operational responsibilities expected of it.
- It also became clear from the public input opportunities provided by the Task Force that people are passionate about Lane County Parks – but often for different reasons. Some value the natural and spiritual amenities that open space provides, while others enjoy the chance to simply experience the outdoors while exercising, camping, boating, fishing or attending a festival or concert.
- When the Kaleidoscope Music Festival was held at Emerald Meadows, the Lane County Park Division’s ability to manage a large event was exceeded, the adverse impact of the event was felt by not only other users of Howard Buford Recreation Area but by the adjacent neighborhood as well, and the challenges noted above became noticeably apparent.
- Notwithstanding the recommendations included in this report, the members of the Task Force found that the Special Event application and example contracts used by the Park Division largely contain provisions that address the concerns that became a problem during the Kaleidoscope event. It is likely that better planning, coordination and communications could have alleviated or perhaps prevented the problems that arose. In any case, the lesson learned is that enforcement of contract provisions is essential if large events are to succeed.
- In this regard, the members of the Large Events Task Force encourage the Lane County Administrator and Board of Commissioners to provide the necessary resources that will enable the following to be accomplished:
  - Effective screening of proposed events and event organizers
  - Active involvement of those who have a stake in Lane County parks and adjacent neighborhoods
  - Mindfulness about what types of events are appropriate in each of the parks
  - Engaged management by Lane County Park Division personnel
  - Strict enforcement of Special Event contract provisions
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Ada Park
82244 Siltcoos Station Rd., Westlake

Armitage Park
90064 Coburg Rd., Eugene

Baker Bay Park
35635 Shoreview Dr., Dorena

Blue Mountain Park
76135 Blue Mtn. School Rd., Cottage Grove

Cinderella Park
34293 E. Cloverdale Rd., Creswell

Howard Buford Recreation Area
34639 Frank Parrish Rd., Springfield

Orchard Point Park
27060 Clear Lake Rd., Alvadore

Perkins Peninsula Park
26647 Hwy 126, Veneta

Richardson Park
25950 Richardson Park Rd., Junction City

Zumwalt Park
Jeans Rd. MP 2.6, Veneta
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Biodiversity Inventory Update for Emerald Meadows

Biodiversity Inventory Update for Emerald Meadows in the Howard Buford Recreation Area, Lane County, Oregon

July 2014

Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Surveys in mid May and mid June 2014.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>North Bottomlands, Howard Buford Recreation Area, Lane County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS centroid</td>
<td>T18S, R03W, Sec. 12 and T18S, R02W, Sec. 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM centroid</td>
<td>WGS84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Public, owned by Lane County Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Plant nomenclature follows: Oregon Flora Project (<a href="http://www.oregonflora.org/atlas.php">http://www.oregonflora.org/atlas.php</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Lane County Parks contracted with Salix Associates to resurvey vegetation along the Dirty Dash race route within Emerald Meadows (formerly the North Bottomlands) in the Howard Buford Recreation Area (HBRA) and complete a summary report. The area initially was surveyed in 2012. Botanical and incidental wildlife surveys were conducted within a corridor 20 feet wide straddling the course center line. The survey did not include parking or spectator areas.

The race centerline was marked in most portions in the field in 2012. In 2014 the map of the route surveyed in 2012 was used for the surveys (Figure 1.). Because of minor centerline uncertainty in some areas, and to allow for small tweaks during actual race course layout and construction, the survey was slightly wider in many areas.

Figure 1. Emerald Meadows area, showing approximate Dirty Dash race course (2012) as turquoise line.
In the report following, as in 2012, the race course survey area is numbered in four loops. Loop 1 is the northernmost: essentially the perimeter of the meadow with the horse arena in its southeast corner and bordered by land owned by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) to the north and west. Loop 2 is in the northwest corner of the Emerald Meadows area, to the south and east of land owned by TNC. Loop 3 is down and back Frank Parrish Road, approximately from the west boundary of the nursery to the closed gate at the western edge of the HBRA at the entrance to TNC lands. Loop 4 is the perimeter of the Faerie Worlds Meadow.

Highlights

The vegetation was impacted strongly by cattle grazing in loops 1 and 2 to the extent that the survey (as in 2012) likely missed some species that were browsed or trampled and not visible or recognizable. Additionally, the Faerie Worlds Meadow was mowed prior to the second survey.

The 50+ cows present repeatedly approached surveyors during the first survey (apparently out of curiosity), which was a major distraction and limitation to effective surveying in loops 1 and 2. (Their interference was reported to Lane County staff just after the survey and a second incidence of cow interference was noted by the avian point count surveyor.) A staff member came along on the second survey and kept the cattle away during the survey, greatly reducing the distraction and improving the procedure and outcome of that survey.

No rare plant or wildlife species were observed during the surveys, with the exception of two Chipping Sparrows located on and near Frank Parrish Road and along the adjacent north edge of the Faerie Worlds Meadow. Chipping Sparrows do not have status under federal or state ESA regulations, but they are noted as a Strategy Species in the 2006 Oregon Conservation Strategy produced by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (available on line). It is unknown whether or not Chipping Sparrows breed in the area, and it is possible that this species was recorded separately in the 2014 avian point counts.

Other plant species exist in the corridor that are not identifiable during the timing (phenology) window of the survey. Specifically, the vegetation surveys were conducted in the mid May and mid June, at which time some later flowering species are not readily visible. It is highly unlikely, however, that any of these later-flowering species would be categorized as rare natives because of the high level of site disturbance and likely that most of them would be non-native. Invasive non-native plant species which are present likely would have been visible in the timing window of the 2014 surveys.

A list of vascular plants observed in the survey area in 2012 and 2014 follow this report.

All birds and other vertebrate and invertebrate wildlife seen or heard within and near the route during plant surveys were recorded as incidental observations, and a list of those species follows the plant list.

Two highly invasive weed species, Shining Geranium (*Geranium lucidum*) and False Brome (*Brachypodium sylvaticum*), were noted along the route during the 2012 surveys: both were known previously in the area, and both are still present. However, they both seem greatly reduced in amount in 2014 compared with 2012 observations, likely in response to targeted treatments. A new area of False Brome infestation not within the survey corridor was noted just west of the Faerie Worlds Meadow on the south side of the southeast access road. One large, healthy plant was noted on the side of the road, and it is not known if more exists in the forest farther back from the road.

Shining Geranium also is much less common in the survey area now than in 2012, however, it still is scattered throughout the area: such as in much of Loop 3 (the sides of Frank Parrish Road) and the woods on the south side of Loop 2 (mostly outside the survey corridor).
Species Totals

PLANTS
In 2012, the numbers of native plants species and exotic plant species observed were 63 and 83, respectively (146 total). In 2014, the numbers were 56 native and 81 exotic (137 total). In 2012, 16 native and 18 exotic species were observed that were not seen in 2014. In 2014, 9 native and 16 exotic species were observed that were not seen in 2012. These numbers do not show any large changes between the two times of observations. The somewhat lower total number of natives seen in 2014 than in 2012 may have been caused by weather and phenology differences, the race event, grazing (including distraction and vegetation impacts) or mowing or other reasons. It is also to be expected that these numbers and observations are not perfect: that in fact, they do not exactly represent the presence and absence of particular species more than just differences in observation. It is possible that the number of species seen in 2014 is slightly lower also because of the reasons just mentioned, but nonetheless, many species still were observed in 2014 that were not seen in 2012. Altogether in the two surveys, 171 species of vascular plants were observed.

The following tables show 2012 and 2014 plant observations by species groups and other categories: native and a subset, rare native; and exotic (non-native) and a subset, exotic invasive. The site has a high proportion of exotic species present, likely because of the long history of grazing. 2012 data is corrected slightly from the 2012 report table. A warm, dry spring in 2014 resulted in earlier plant phenology (by about 2-3 weeks).

**FLORISTICS 2012: Plant species observed in the Dirty Dash corridor in 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Native (Rare)</th>
<th>Exotic (Invasive)</th>
<th>TOTAL Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>9 (0)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs &amp; Small Trees</td>
<td>13 (0)</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbs</td>
<td>29 (0)</td>
<td>52 (18)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasses, Sedges &amp; Rushes</td>
<td>9 (0)</td>
<td>19 (9)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferns</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>63 (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>83 (36)</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of TOTAL SPECIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>57 (25)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLORISTICS 2014: Plant species observed in the Dirty Dash corridor in 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Native (Rare)</th>
<th>Exotic (Invasive)</th>
<th>TOTAL Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>8 (0)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs &amp; Small Trees</td>
<td>12 (0)</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbs</td>
<td>22 (0)</td>
<td>49 (17)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasses, Sedges &amp; Rushes</td>
<td>11 (0)</td>
<td>20 (8)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferns</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>56 (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>81 (32)</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of TOTAL SPECIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>41 (0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>59 (23)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILDLIFE

During plant surveys in 2012 and 2014, incidental bird observations were noted and 48 total species were detected: 43 in 2012 and 24 in 2014 – with 20 species detected during both years. Surveys in 2012 included avian point counts, but in
2014 such counts were conducted by a separate individual and are not a part of this report – resulting in the lower number of species detected in 2014.

No bird species with federal or state ESA status were noted. No grassland bird species were noted in Loops 1 or 2, likely because of regular grazing by cattle. A dog-sitter was observed running a large number of dogs in Loop 4 (the Faerie Worlds Meadow), and second hand reports confirmed that activity is regular there. That use (and any other disturbances) likely renders that meadow unsuitable for grassland bird nesting.

One or two Chipping Sparrows were observed (one photographed; see Fig. 2) in the trees on the north edge of Loop 4 and in the adjacent portion of Frank Parrish Road. Chipping Sparrows are not an ESA listed species, but they are listed as a Strategy Species in the Oregon Conservation Strategy. They nest 1 - 4 meters above the ground from May through early July (Altman and Stephens 2012: Bird Habitats and Populations in Oak Ecosystems of the Pacific Northwest).

Other wildlife species noted during the surveys also are shown on the attached list.

![Chipping Sparrow](image)

**Fig. 2: Chipping Sparrow at north edge of Faerie Worlds Meadow June 22, 2014.**

**Recommendations**

- Continue restoration actions to increase the ecological health of the area and maximize native plant and wildlife values. Focus use management on minimizing soil disturbance and human and livestock use during the plant growing season and bird nesting season. Pollinators would benefit from management to decrease non-native pasture grasses and increase native, herbaceous plants allowed to complete their flowering cycles. This would necessitate reducing trampling and limiting maintenance activities to no more than 30-50% of any one meadow in any one year.

- Continue to treat the two species known to be the most highly invasive (specifically, Shining Geranium and False Brome) as much as possible in the areas impacted by events well before those events. The goals of treatment should be to reduce and maintain numbers as low as possible so as to minimize movement of these species to uninfested areas of the HBRA and off of the site onto uninfested public or private sites.

- For longer term reduction of potential impacts on the site, downstream and adjacent to the site, and other sites subsequently visited by site users, consider control of invasive species on the entire site, and eradication of the most invasive species.

- Recognize that grazing has a large impact on ecological health of the site. Creation of disturbed areas by livestock (areas which are most successfully colonized by exotic and exotic invasive species) and trampling of and near bird nesting areas are examples of two likely impacts of site grazing.

- Recognize that use and impacts during scheduled events are greater than the limits of the race course survey area.

- Install rinsing stations as obstacles and at the finish of the Dirty Dash race and dispose of water so as not to spread weed seed that might be contained in it.

- Consider re-surveying in two years if there are more events, with the possibility that trends may become visible.
# 2012 and 2014 Emerald Meadows Dirty Dash Route Biodiversity Lists:
Howard Buford Recreation Area
Lane County, Oregon

**Key to the Following Species Lists**

**N/E:** Native / Exotic (non-native)  
**R/I:** Rare (ORBIC listed) / Invasive (existing or potential; modifies native habitats by forming a near-monoculture in a vegetation layer in wildland areas).  
**I!** = very invasive

Loops numbered counterclockwise, starting from NE: Loop 1 = NE pasture, Loop 2 = NW (long) pasture, Loop 3 = Frank Parrish Road, Loop 4 = Faerie Worlds meadow.

Regular font = seen in both 2012 and 2014.  
Red font = seen in 2012 only.  
Green font = seen in 2014 only.

## PLANT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>N/E</th>
<th>R/I</th>
<th>(2012) Loop</th>
<th>(2014) Loop</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Bigleaf Maple</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calocedrus decurrens</td>
<td>Incense Cedar</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus monogyna</td>
<td>English or One-seeded Hawthorn</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus monogyna × suksdorfii</td>
<td>Hybrid Hawthorn</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some hybrids seen in 2012, but not recorded separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus latifolia</td>
<td>Oregon Ash</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4 = close to surveyed area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans nigra</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans regia</td>
<td>English Walnut</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>Black Cottonwood</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>4 = close to surveyed area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus avium</td>
<td>Sweet Cherry</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus virginiana var. demissa</td>
<td>Chokecherry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudotsuga menziesii var. menziesii</td>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus communis</td>
<td>Domestic Pear</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus garryana var. garryana</td>
<td>Oregon White Oak</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus purshiana</td>
<td>Cascara</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shrubs & Small Trees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>N/E</th>
<th>(2012) Loop</th>
<th>(2014) Loop</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acer circinatum</td>
<td>Vine Maple</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier alnifolia</td>
<td>Pacific Serviceberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>N/E</td>
<td>R/I</td>
<td>(2012) Loop</td>
<td>(2014) Loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berberis aquifolium</td>
<td>Tall Oregongrape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus cuneatus</td>
<td>Buckbrush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus sericea</td>
<td>Creek Dogwood</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corylus avellana</td>
<td>European Hazelnut</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus scoparius</td>
<td>Scot’s Broom</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>English Holly</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum vulgare</td>
<td>European Privet</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus x domestica</td>
<td>Domestic Apple</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oemleria cerasiformis</td>
<td>Osoberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physocarpus capitatus</td>
<td>Pacific Ninebark</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa multiflora</td>
<td>Multiflora Rose</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa nutkana var. nutkana</td>
<td>Nootka Rose</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa pisocarpa</td>
<td>Clustered Rose</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus armeniacus</td>
<td>Himalayan Blackberry</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus laciniatus</td>
<td>Evergreen Blackberry</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus vestitus</td>
<td>European Blackberry</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix hookeriana</td>
<td>Hooker’s Willow</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus mexicana</td>
<td>Blue Elderberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus racemosa</td>
<td>Red Elderberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphoricarpus albus var. laevigatus</td>
<td>Common Snowberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicodendron diversilobum</td>
<td>Poisone-oak</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>N/E</th>
<th></th>
<th>(2012) Loop</th>
<th>(2014) Loop</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabidopsis thaliana</td>
<td>Thalecress</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctium minus</td>
<td>Common Burdock</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 1 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemisia douglasiana</td>
<td>Douglas’ Mugwort</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellis perennis</td>
<td>English Daisy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassica rapa</td>
<td>Field Mustard</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calystegia atriplicifolia ssp. atriplicifolia</td>
<td>Night-Blooming Morning Glory</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camassia leichtlinii ssp. suksdorfi</td>
<td>Tall Camas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014 surveys may have been after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardamine hirsuta</td>
<td>Hairy Bittercress</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carduus tenuiflorus</td>
<td>Slender-flowered Thistle</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>One plant, N side of road, in W half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerastium glomeratum</td>
<td>Sticky Chickweed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 1 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamerion angustifolium</td>
<td>Fireweed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirsium arvense</td>
<td>Canada Thistle</td>
<td>E /</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>N/E</td>
<td>R/I</td>
<td>(2012) Loop</td>
<td>(2014) Loop</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirsium vulgare</td>
<td>Bull Thistle</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvulus arvensis</td>
<td>Field Bindweed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crassula tillaea</td>
<td>Moss Pygmy Weed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daucus carota</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s Lace</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicentra formosa ssp. formosa</td>
<td>Bleeding Heart</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipsacus fullonum</td>
<td>Teasel</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erodium cicutarium</td>
<td>Filaree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschscholzia californica ssp. californ.</td>
<td>California Poppy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Considered a native spp., but all material likely orig. in CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria vesca ssp. bracteata</td>
<td>Woods Strawberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria virginiana ssp. platyphylia</td>
<td>Broadpetal Strawberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galium aparine</td>
<td>Cleavers</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 4 1</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium lucidum</td>
<td>Shining Geranium</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium molle</td>
<td>Dovefoot Geranium</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium pusillum</td>
<td>Small-flowered Cranesbill</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geum macrophyllum</td>
<td>Large-leaved Avens</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracleum lanatum</td>
<td>Cow Parsnip</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypericum perforatum</td>
<td>Common St. Johnswort</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Did not see in 2014, but likely present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypochaeris radicata</td>
<td>Hairy Cat’s Ear</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris tenax</td>
<td>Pacific Iris</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamium purpureum</td>
<td>Red Deadnettle</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsana communis</td>
<td>Nipplewort</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucanthemum vulgare</td>
<td>Oxeye Daisy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linum bienne</td>
<td>Narrow-leaved Flax</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malva sp.</td>
<td>Mallow</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-flowering; roadside near nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marah oreganus</td>
<td>Oregon Bigroot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matricaria discoidea</td>
<td>Pineapple Weed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa officinalis</td>
<td>Lemon Balm</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentha pulegium</td>
<td>Pennyroyal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myosotis discolor</td>
<td>Yellow And Blue Forget-Me-Not</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmorhiza berteroi</td>
<td>Mountain Sweet Cicely</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantago lanceolata</td>
<td>English Plantain</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantago major</td>
<td>Common Plantain</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygonum aviculare ssp. aviculare</td>
<td>Prostrate Knotweed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunella vulgaris var. lanceolata</td>
<td>Native Heal-All</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>2012 Loop</td>
<td>2014 Loop</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hybrid Heal-All</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hybrid Heal-All</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Native Heal-All</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tall Woollyheads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meadow or Tall Buttercup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 Photographed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Buttercup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Perhaps a little late to see this species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Little Buttercup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jointed Charlock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curvepod Yellowcress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Dewberry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheep Sorrel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clustered Dock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curly Dock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad Leaved Dock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Dock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willow Dock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Snakeroot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 4 1 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tansy Ragwort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodland Groundsel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Madder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rose Checkermallow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedge Mustard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bitter Nightshade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prickly Sowthistle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooley’s Hedgenettle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Chickweed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Tansy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 In 2012, only at W end of 3. In 2014, some plants farther E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Dandelion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringecup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 1 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tall Meadowrue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pig-A-Back Plant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Torrilis arvensis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3 4 3</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rabbit’s Foot Clover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>3 4 Invasive along roadsides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Least Hop Clover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 2 4 1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aisike Clover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red Clover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>N/E</td>
<td>R/I</td>
<td>(2012) Loop</td>
<td>(2014) Loop</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium repens</td>
<td>White Clover</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium subterraneum</td>
<td>Subterraneum Clover</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triphysaria pusilla</td>
<td>Dwarf Owl Clover</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urtica dioica ssp. gracilis</td>
<td>American Stinging Nettle</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerianella locusta</td>
<td>European Cornsalad</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbascum blattaria</td>
<td>Moth Mullein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica peregrina var. peregrina</td>
<td>Purslane Speedwell</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica serpyllifolia var. serpyllifolia</td>
<td>Thyme Leaved Speedwell</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicia hirsuta</td>
<td>Hairy Vetch</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicia sativa</td>
<td>Common Vetch</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca major</td>
<td>Periwinkle</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graminoids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aira caryophyllea var. caryophyllea</td>
<td>Silver Hairgrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrostis capillaris</td>
<td>Colonial Bentgrass</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrostis stolonifera</td>
<td>Creeping Bentgrass</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopecurus pratensis</td>
<td>Meadow Foxtail</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthoxanthum odorumatum</td>
<td>Sweet Vernalgrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena sp.</td>
<td>Oats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachypodium sylvaticum</td>
<td>False Brome</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 way in to FW Meadow on S access road, on S side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus commutatus</td>
<td>Meadow Brome or Hairy Chess</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small amount roadside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus diandrus</td>
<td>Ripgut Brome</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 4 1</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus hordeaceus ssp. hordeaceus</td>
<td>Soft Brome</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 4 1</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus secalinus</td>
<td>Chess Brome</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus sitchensis</td>
<td>Sitka Brome</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus sterilis</td>
<td>Sterile Brome</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex densa</td>
<td>Dense Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex hendersonii</td>
<td>Henderson’s Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex leptopoda</td>
<td>Slender-foot Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex pachystachya</td>
<td>Thick-headed Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex tumulicola</td>
<td>Foothill Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 4 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dactylis glomerata</td>
<td>Orchard Grass</td>
<td>E/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 1</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>N/E</td>
<td>R/I</td>
<td>(2012) Loop</td>
<td>(2014) Loop</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danthonia californica</td>
<td>California Oatgrass</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elymus glaucus</td>
<td>Blue Wildrye</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca rubra var. commutata</td>
<td>Chewing’s Fescue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca subuliflora</td>
<td>Crinkle-awn Fescue</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holcus lanatus</td>
<td>Common Velvetgrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum jubatum</td>
<td>Squirreltail Barley</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum marinum ssp. gussoneanum</td>
<td>Mediterranean Barley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus bufonius</td>
<td>Toad Rush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus patens</td>
<td>Spreading Rush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus occidentalis</td>
<td>Western Rush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolium multiflorum</td>
<td>Annual Ryegrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolium perenne</td>
<td>Perennial Ryegrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poa annua</td>
<td>Annual Bluegrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poa compressa</td>
<td>Canada Bluegrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poa pratensis</td>
<td>Kentucky Bluegrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poa trivialis</td>
<td>Fowl Bluegrass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedonorus arundinaceus</td>
<td>Tall Fescue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulpia bromoides</td>
<td>Rattail Fescue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferns and Allies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equisetum hyemale</td>
<td>Scouring Rush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypodium glycyrrhiza</td>
<td>Licorice Root</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polystichum munitum</td>
<td>Western Sword Fern</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteridium aquilinum</td>
<td>Bracken Fern</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALGAE (nonvascular)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WILDLIFE LISTS**

Birds: Avian Point Counts in 2012, incidental in 2014. All other: incidental. **F** = Flyover
Loops numbered counterclockwise, starting from NE: Loop 1 = NE pasture, Loop 2 = NW (long) pasture, Loop 3 = Frank Parrish Road, Loop 4 = Faerie Worlds meadow.

Regular font = seen in both 2012 and 2014. **Red font** = seen in 2012 only. **Green font** = seen in 2014 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>2012: Loops</th>
<th>2014: Loops</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/E R/I</td>
<td>1 1 1 2</td>
<td>3 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERTEBRATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Kestrel</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Goldfinch</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 1 3</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td>Summer resident; most migrate</td>
<td>N 2 3 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N R F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Swallow</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 1 2 4</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewick’s Wren</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-capped Chickadee</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-headed Grosbeak</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 4</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Gray Warbler</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown-headed Cowbird</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock’s Oriole</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Quail</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Goose</td>
<td>Mostly winter resident; some year-round</td>
<td>N 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassin’s Vireo</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Waxwing</td>
<td>Year-round resident; rare in winter</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Sparrow</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N R</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Merganser</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Starling</strong></td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>E 1 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-crowned Sparrow</td>
<td>Winter resident</td>
<td>N 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Blue Heron</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N F F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Wren</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton’s Vireo</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killdeer</td>
<td>Year-round resident</td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazuli Bunting</td>
<td>Summer resident</td>
<td>N 2 3 4</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>2012: Loops</td>
<td>2014: Loops</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/E</td>
<td>R/I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Goldfinch</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGillivray's Warbler</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning Dove</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Flicker</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-crowned Warbler</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pileated Woodpecker</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-breasted Sapsucker</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-shouldered Hawk</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-tailed Hawk</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Sparrow</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Towhee</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steller's Jay</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson's Thrush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Vulture</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaux's Swift</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet-green Swallow</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbling Vireo</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Scrub-jay</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Tanager</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Wood-Pewee</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Warbler</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrentit</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-rumped Warbler</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMMALS</td>
<td>Mammalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Ground Squirrel</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Gopher, unid.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend’s Chipmunk</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPTILES</td>
<td>Reptilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Alligator Lizard</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVERTEBRATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| INVERTEBRATES                     |         |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

*Dead; appeared to have been trampled (in meadow used often by cattle)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>N/E</th>
<th>R/I</th>
<th>2012: Loops</th>
<th>2014: Loops</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRUE BUGS</strong></td>
<td>ARTHROPODA: Hemiptera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Box Elder Bug, cf.</td>
<td>Boisea rubrolineata</td>
<td>N/E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLIES</strong></td>
<td>ARTHROPODA: Diptera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dung Fly</td>
<td>Scathofaga stercoraria</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEES, WASPS, ANTS</strong></td>
<td>ARTHROPODA: Hymenoptera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Bumblebee</td>
<td>Bombus californicus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Honeybee</td>
<td>Apis mellifera</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUTTERFLIES &amp; MOTHS</strong></td>
<td>ARTHROPODA: Lepidoptera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anise Swallowtail</td>
<td>Papilio zelicaon</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorquin’s Admiral</td>
<td>Liminitis lorquini</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylitta Crescent</td>
<td>Phyciodes mylitta</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochre Ringlet</td>
<td>Coenonympha tullia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchman’s Tiger Moth</td>
<td>Platyprepia virginalis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Admirable</td>
<td>Vanessa atalanta</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyr Anglewing</td>
<td>Polygonia satyrus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Tiger Swallowtail</td>
<td>Papilio rutulus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAGONFLIES/DAMSELFILIES</strong></td>
<td>ARTHROPODA: Odonata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Saddlebags</td>
<td>Tramea lacerata</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Dasher</td>
<td>Pachydiplax longipennis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID by C. Kerst (photo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Whitetail</td>
<td>Plathemis lydia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darter, unid.</td>
<td>Aeshna or Rhionaeschna</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damsel, teneral</td>
<td>Cf. Enallagma</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flame Skimmer</td>
<td>Libellula saturata</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant Green Darner</td>
<td>Anax junius</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Clubtail</td>
<td>Gomphus kurlis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Jewelwing</td>
<td>Calopteryx aequabilis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule Bluet</td>
<td>Enallagma carunculatum</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Skimmer</td>
<td>Libellula luctuosa</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Birds seen at Emerald Meadow during surveys May-July, 2014  
Survey by Dan Gleason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>seen during a count period</th>
<th>between or after count period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada Goose, <em>Branta canadensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallard, <em>Anas platyrhynchos</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Merganser, <em>Mergus merganser</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Quail, <em>Callipepla californica</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-necked Pheasant, <em>Phasianus colchicus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Blue Heron, <em>Ardea herodias</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Vulture, <em>Cathartes aura</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey, <em>Pandion haliaetus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle, <em>Haliaetus leucocephalus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper’s Hawk, <em>Accipiter cooperii</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-tailed Hawk, <em>Buteo jamaicensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Sandpiper, <em>Actitis macularius</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band-tailed Pigeon, <em>Patagioenas fasciata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning Dove, <em>Zenaida macroura</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaux’s Swift, <em>Chaetura vauxi</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna’s Hummingbird, <em>Calypte anna</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufous Hummingbird, <em>Selasphorus rufus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belted Kingfisher, <em>Megaceryle alcyon</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-breasted Sapsucker, <em>Sphyrapicus ruber</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downy Woodpecker, <em>Picoides pubscens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairy Woodpecker, <em>Picoides villosus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Flicker, <em>Colaptes auratus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pileated Woodpecker, <em>Dryocopus pileatus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Kestrel, <em>Falco sparverius</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive-sided Flycatcher, <em>Contopus cooperi</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Wood-Pewee, <em>Contopus sordidulus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Flycatcher, <em>Empidonax traillii</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassin’s Vireo, <em>Vireo cassini</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton’s Vireo, <em>Vireo huttoni</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbling Vireo, <em>Vireo gilvus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steller’s Jay, <em>Cyanocitta stelleri</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Scrub-Jay, <em>Aphelocoma californica</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Crow, <em>Corvus brachyrhynchos</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Raven, <em>Corvus corax</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Swallow, <em>Tachycineta bicolor</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet-green Swallow, <em>Tachycineta thalassina</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-capped Chickadee, <em>Poecile atricapillus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut-backed Chickadee, <em>Poecile rufescens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushtit, <em>Psaltriparus minimus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-breasted Nuthatch, <em>Sitta canadensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-breasted Nuthatch, <em>Sitta carolinensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Creeper, <em>Certhia americana</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewick’s Wren, <em>Thryomanes bewickii</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Wren, <em>Trogilodytes aedon</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Wren, <em>Trogilodytes pacificus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrentit</td>
<td>Chamaea fasciata</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson’s Thrush</td>
<td>Catharus ustulatus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td>Turdus migratorius</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Starling</td>
<td>Sturnus vulgaris</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Waxwing</td>
<td>Bombycilla cedrorum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-crowned Warbler</td>
<td>Oreothlypis celata</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Warbler</td>
<td>Oreothlypis ruficapailla</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGillivray’s Warbler</td>
<td>Geothlypis tolmiei</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td>Turdus migratorius</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Starling</td>
<td>Sturnus vulgaris</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Waxwing</td>
<td>Bombycilla cedrorum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-crowned Warbler</td>
<td>Oreothlypis celata</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Warbler</td>
<td>Oreothlypis ruficapailla</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGillivray’s Warbler</td>
<td>Geothlypis tolmiei</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Yellowthroat</td>
<td>Geothlypis trichas</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga petechia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-throated Gray Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga nigrescens</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson’s Warbler</td>
<td>Cardellina pusilla</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-breasted Chat</td>
<td>Ictera virens</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Towhee</td>
<td>Pipilo maculatus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Sparrow</td>
<td>Melospiza melodia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-crowned Sparrow</td>
<td>Zonotrichia leucophyra</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark-eyed Junco</td>
<td>Junco hyemalis</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Tanager</td>
<td>Piranga ludovicia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-headed Grosbeak</td>
<td>Pheucticus melanocephalus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazuli Bunting</td>
<td>Passerina amoena</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-winged Blackbird</td>
<td>Agelaius phoeniceus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown-headed Cowbird</td>
<td>Molothrus ater</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock’s Oriole</td>
<td>Icterus bullockii</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Finch</td>
<td>Haemorhous purpureus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Finch</td>
<td>Haemorhous mexicanus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crossbill</td>
<td>Loxia curvirostra</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Goldfinch</td>
<td>Spinus psaltria</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Goldfinch</td>
<td>Spinus tristis</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Sparrow</td>
<td>Passer domesticus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Species Accounts Specific to Emerald Meadow
by Dan Gleason

Canada Goose, *Branta canadensis*
The Canada Goose is mostly a flyover species, utilizing the river and adjacent wetland sites. The geese may occasionally utilize the meadow in the spring for grazing if the grass is young and tender, but seldom later in the year. This activity was not observed during the period of the survey.

Mallard, *Anas platyrhynchos*
Mallards may rest briefly on the meadow, but mostly they will be seen flying over and on the river or adjacent wetlands.

Common Merganser, *Mergus merganser*
This is a fish-eating duck that is seen on the river adjacent to the meadow, but not on the meadow. They are a cavity-nesting duck so large, old trees can provide possible nest sites for these birds.

California Quail, *Callipepla californica*
No California Quail were seen directly on the meadow. They inhabit the thickets of underbrush along the edge of the meadow where more food and shelter is available.

Ring-necked Pheasant, *Phasianus colchicus*
These birds are found in open, grassy expanses surrounded by wooded thickets. Emerald Meadow partially fits the habitat needs, but these birds are very low in number here. Ring-necked Pheasants are not native to North America and numbers slowly decrease in some places where re-introductions do not occur and reproduction is low.

Great Blue Heron, *Ardea herodias*
Great Blue Heron are seen along the river and often fly over the meadow. On one occasion during the survey, one heron was observed standing in the meadow. No hunting was observed, but it is likely that herons use the meadow to hunt mice and other small animals from time to time. They are not strictly fish-eating and will sometimes even take animals from the fields as large as a gopher.

Turkey Vulture, *Cathartes aura*
Vultures often fly over the meadow or roost in nearby trees. Some of the densely wooded areas nearby offer possible nesting sites. They would certainly feed on any carcasses found in the meadow, although this was not observed during the study time. Turkey Vultures are absent during the late fall and winter.

Osprey, *Pandion haliaetus*
Osprey do not directly utilize the meadow. They may be observed flying over or hunting along the river nearby. They will also rest in tall snags adjacent to the meadow. Osprey are found here only in spring and summer.

Bald Eagle, *Haliaetus leucocephalus*
Bald Eagles fly over the meadow and may sometimes be seen resting in adjacent trees. They might feed on a carcass found in the meadow, but mostly, they do not utilize the meadow.

Cooper’s Hawk, *Accipiter cooperii*
This is a woodland species which seeks prey (mostly birds and some squirrels) in the woodlands surrounding the meadow. One seen over the meadow is most likely not hunting, but flying over from one wooded area to another.

Red-tailed Hawk, *Buteo jamaicensis*
This is a resident species that is usually observed flying over or perched on nearby trees. No hunting for prey was observed during the survey times, but it would be expected that Red-tailed Hawks probably do use the meadow as a source of some prey, mostly snakes or an occasional small rodent. Human presence on the meadow (such as my survey times) would be a deterrent to any nearby hunting attempts.

Spotted Sandpiper, *Actitus macularius*
Spotted Sandpipers may occasionally be heard from the meadow, but they are found along the edge of the river and do not use the meadow.

Band-tailed Pigeon, *Patagioenas fasciata*
The Band-tailed Pigeon is our largest, and only native pigeon. It is a woodland species that is sometimes seen in the wooded areas adjacent to the meadow or simply flying over.

Mourning Dove, *Zenaida macroura*
Mourning Doves are common in the surrounding woodlands. They were observed foraging on the ground at the edge of the meadow, but most often heard calling from surrounding woodlands or flying over.

Vaux’s Swift, *Chaetura vauxi*
This is a summer resident and will be observed only as a flyover. Swifts spend all of their daytime hours in the air (they cannot perch) and may be heard or seen foraging high over the meadow in search of flying insects.

Anna’s Hummingbird, *Calypte anna*
Anna’s Hummingbirds are resident and do not migrate. They are found in the brushy thickets surrounding the meadow.

Rufous Hummingbird, *Selasphorus rufus*
Like the Anna’s Hummingbird, the Rufous Hummingbird may be observed in brushy thickets at the edge of the meadow or in the larger thickets within the meadow. The Rufous Hummingbird is found only from late February through mid-summer.

Belted Kingfisher, *Megaceryle alcyon*
Belted Kingfishers can be seen or heard flying along the river or resting in trees adjacent to the river. They will fly over the meadow but do not utilize it in any way directly.

Red-breasted Sapsucker, *Sphyrapicus ruber*
The Red-breasted Sapsucker is a resident woodpecker that may be found in the woods surrounding the meadow. They especially are attracted to maples, but utilize other kinds of trees as well. Rufous Hummingbirds will often nest near to where sapsuckers have made active sap wells.

Downy Woodpecker, *Picoides pubescens*
Downy Woodpeckers are often seen or heard in the woodlands surrounding the meadow. This is our most common woodpecker and is frequently seen or heard nearby. Tall, weedy plants, such as mullein are often attractive to these birds when they mature and dry. The woodpeckers seek the insects found in the seed heads and are small enough to be able to alight on these plants without causing them to bend over.

Hairy Woodpecker, *Picoides villosus*
Although less common than the Downy Woodpecker, the habitat of the Hairy Woodpecker overlaps much of that of the Downy Woodpecker and thus, they may be observed in the surrounding woodlands. They cannot feed on the seed heads of the mullein plants as the Downy Woodpecker does.

Northern Flicker, *Colaptes auratus*
Northern Flickers are common in the surrounding woodlands and may occasionally be seen on the ground on or near the meadow. Ground-dwelling ants are a very high portion of a flicker’s diet and thus, it is not uncommon to see them on open ground.

Pileated Woodpecker, *Dryocopus pileatus*
Pileated Woodpeckers typically nest in mature conifers, but they will forage in much younger stands of trees and will sometimes be heard or seen in the woodlands surrounding the meadow. Carpenter ants and termites are two of their primary sources of food.

American Kestrel, *Falco sparverius*
The American Kestrel is our smallest and most common falcon. It may be seen perched in trees in or surrounding the meadow. It could be observed hovering over the meadow in search of prey (small rodents, shrews, large insects, or an occasional small bird) and may nest in a large tree cavity adjacent to the meadow. (No nesting activity was observed during the time of the study, but could have occurred unobserved.)

Olive-sided Flycatcher, *Contopus cooperi*
The Olive-sided Flycatcher is uncommon, but present in the woodlands surrounding the meadow. It was observed high on a bare perch and flying out to catch insects flying in the open. The wooded edges provide good foraging sites for this species. This is a summer resident only.

Western Wood-Pewee, *Contopus sordidulus*
This is our most common flycatcher, and like most other flycatchers, is only present during spring and summer when there is an abundance of flying insects. Pewees will frequently be heard and seen on any of the trees surrounding the meadow or growing within the meadow itself. Flying insects are caught over the margins of the meadow, but at lower heights than those sought by the Olive-sided Flycatcher. Often, more than one individual will be heard calling from nearby locations.

Willow Flycatcher, *Empidonax traillii*
Brushy thickets within and surrounding the meadow are utilized by Willow Flycatchers. They are seldom seen high and forage for flying insects within the first few feet above the ground. The Willow Flycatcher is a species of concern in the Southwest, but most of our populations in the Willamette Valley are relatively stable where appropriate habitat remains.

Cassin’s Vireo, *Vireo cassinii*
Cassin’s Vireo is common and expected in the woodlands surrounding the meadow. It is a summer resident.

Hutton’s Vireo, *Vireo huttoni*
Hutton’s Vireo is the only vireo species that is found throughout the year in western Oregon. Its habitat is similar to that of our other vireos and is found in the deciduous and mixed woodlands surrounding the meadow.

Warbling Vireo, *Vireo gilvus*
The Warbling Vireo is uncommon, but always present during the summer in habitat such as the woodlands that are adjacent to the meadow.

Steller’s Jay, *Cyanocitta stelleri*
The Steller’s Jay is a common resident of the coniferous woodlands and is a frequent visitor to the mixed and deciduous woodlands around the meadow. They can be seen or heard during most visits to the meadow.

Western Scrub-Jay, *Aphelocoma californica*
This is a common resident in and around the meadow and may often be seen in the numerous thickets of blackberry and other brush where it calls and defends its territory. It prefers the open habitat provided by the meadow and the adjacent brush over the dense woodlands.

American Crow, *Corvus brachyrhynchos*
American Crows are always active and present in the woodlands surrounding the meadow and they frequently are found on the ground of the meadow where they may forage or engage in other activities.

Common Raven, *Corvus corax*
Ravens may sometimes be seen flying over the meadow and can be heard calling from woodlands around, and usually some distance from, the meadow. It is possible that one may sometimes find prey within the meadow, but this is not their normal foraging area (and none of this behavior was observed during the observations of the study).

Tree Swallow, *Tachycineta bicolor*
The meadow provides a good open area for Tree Swallows to fly over in search of low-flying insects. They will also nest in natural cavities or old woodpecker holes in the woodlands overlooking the meadow. During spring and summer, they are usually present and observable.

Violet-green Swallow, *Tachycineta thalassina*
Like the Tree Swallow, the Violet-green Swallow forages over the open meadow and will also nest in tree cavities in the wooded edges of the meadow. The two species often intermix while foraging.

Black-capped Chickadee, *Poecile atricapillus*
Black-capped Chickadees are common and always present in the woods and brushy areas around the meadow. They do not use the meadow directly, although they may be seen occasionally in thickets and brambles within the meadow as they move from place to place.

Chestnut-backed Chickadee, *Poecile rufescens*
The Chestnut-backed Chickadee is a bird of the coniferous woods and may be heard or seen from the meadow near such woodlands. They will be seen less often along the brushy margins of the meadow than is the Black-capped Chickadee, although it would be expected to see them there more frequently during the winter months when they disperse over a wider area.

Bushtit, *Psaltriparus minimus*
Bushtits are permanent residents found in the brushy thickets and woodland margins surrounding the meadow. They occasionally cross the meadow where it is narrow to reach similar habitat on the opposite side of the meadow, but do not utilize the meadow directly.

Red-breasted Nuthatch, *Sitta canadensis*
Nuthatches are permanent residents, but are not found in the meadow. They require the surrounding trees for nesting and foraging opportunities.

White-breasted Nuthatch, *Sitta carolinenses*
Like the Red-breasted Nuthatch, the White-breasted Nuthatch does not venture directly into the meadow. In this region, it is most often associated with oaks.
Brown Creeper, *Certhia americana*
Brown Creepers are not birds ever found in the meadow, being restricted to life on tree trunks and branches. They can be heard singing from the woods around the meadows.

Bewick’s Wren, *Thryomanes bewickii*
Bewick’s Wrens nest and forage is the brushy thickets adjacent to the meadow and may be sometimes seen in larger, brushy thickets within the meadow. They are common throughout the year.

House Wren, *Troglodytes aedon*
Like Bewick’s Wrens, House Wrens are found in brushy thickets near the meadow. They are migratory and not present in the winter.

Pacific Wren, *Troglodytes pacificus*
During the winter, Pacific Wrens breed and are found in the dense, low understory of coniferous forests. Where coniferous woodlands abut the meadow, these wrens can often be heard singing. During the winter, they disperse into more varied habitats and could be expected to be found along the margins of the meadow. Until recently, this bird was considered conspecific with the Winter Wren of the east.

Wrentit, *Chamaea fasciata*
The wrentit is a bird of dense thickets and seldom seen in the open. Some extensive thickets of bramble and other vegetation along the dike at the northwest portion of the meadow is home to these birds. They are very sedentary and will not be found away from their chosen area unless forced to leave due to habitat destruction.

Swainson’s Thrush, *Catharus ustulatus*
Swainson’s Thrush is a common thrush in riparian environments during the summer months. Its song may be frequently heard coming from the dense woodlands at the edge of the meadow. These birds seldom come into the open and are not found on the meadow itself. During the winter, it will likely be replaced in this habitat by the Hermit Thrush which breeds at higher elevations.

American Robin, *Turdus migratorius*
The American Robin is one of the few species that may be regularly found on the meadow itself where they look for earthworms, insects and other invertebrates. They are also common in the surrounding habitats and may be seen throughout the year.

European Starling, *Sturnus vulgaris*
This non-native species is sometimes seen foraging on the meadow and is frequently seen in the surrounding trees or flying over. Because of special adaptations of the beak and associated muscles, starlings are able to forage for some insect larvae burrowed in the ground that such that they are unobtainable by many of our native species. The European Cranefly larvae, a common yard pest, is one such species that the starling feeds upon that native birds cannot reach.

Cedar Waxwing, *Bombycilla cedrorum*
Cedar Waxwings use a wide variety of habitats and may be seen in the surrounding woodlands, along the river, or fly-catching over the meadow. As fall and winter approaches, they will depend more upon many of the native fruits provided by the native plants surrounding the meadow.

Orange-crowned Warbler, *Oreothlypis celata*
This is one of our most common warblers and is present in most of the meadow’s surrounding woodlands and brushy thickets. Like other warblers, it has a diet high in insects. A few individuals may remain during the winter.

Nashville Warbler, *Oreothlypis ruficapilla*
A few Nashville Warblers are present and likely breed in the surround deciduous and mixed woodlands around the meadow. They are usually at mid-height in the forest structure.

MacGillivray’s Warbler, *Geothlypis tolmiei*
MacGillivray’s Warblers are usually found low in the trees or the brushy vegetation. Their numbers have declined in this region over the last 30+ years, but are still present at this location.

Common Yellowthroat, *Geothlypis trichas*
This warbler species is typically associated with marsh edges and brushy thickets in open meadows. Thickets in and around Emerald Meadow provide adequate cover for nesting during the summer when present. No direct evidence of breeding was found (nests, young or adults carrying food to nests), but singing males were seen and heard defending territory.

Yellow Warbler, *Setophaga petechia*
The Yellow Warbler is common in riparian habitats. Singing males will be seen and heard along the river corridor adjacent to the meadow.

Black-throated Gray Warbler, *Setophage nigrescens*
Black-throated Gray Warblers are usually found in the top portions of the forests where they live. They can be heard singing in the woodlands around the meadow.

Wilson’s Warbler, *Cardelina pusilla*
Wilson’s Warbler is common in riparian habitats and may be heard singing from brushy area at the edge of the meadow. They are usually present in the dense underbrush of the woodlands.

Yellow-breasted Chat, *Ictera virens*
This large, atypical warbler is not common in much of the Willamette Valley, but some pairs are always present in this region. They like the dense understory of the deciduous woods from which their loud calls can sometimes be heard.

Spotted Towhee, *Pipilo maculatus*
The Spotted Towhee is common throughout the year in brushy areas of the woodlands and occasionally in thickets within the meadow. They will forage on the ground and will sometimes venture a few feet into the open habitat of the meadow. They are sometimes seen or heard calling from blackberry brambles, but they seldom nest in them, or if they do it is usually within the first meter from the edge.

Song Sparrow, *Melospiza melodia*
The Song Sparrow is our most common native sparrow and will be heard singing from most of the surrounding brushy areas of the meadow. They seldom use the meadow directly but will be found along all of the margins.

White-crowned Sparrow, *Zonotrichia leucophyrs*
White-crowned Sparrows like grassy areas with brushy regions nearby for nesting and safety. The structure and vegetation of the meadow is not best suited for this species, but a few are present. It is probably the case that they are more prevalent during the winter months when they may share the habitat with a related species, the Golden-crowned Sparrow, which breeds in British Columbia and the Yukon.
Dark-eyed Junco, *Junco hyemalis*
Dark-eyed Juncos are present throughout the year. These are ground-nesting birds and a few may breed in the heavily vegetated areas at the very edges of the meadow (near woodlands), although many more will breed just slightly higher in the nearby hills. Their numbers will increase during the winter as they disperse into more habitats.

Western Tanager, *Piranga ludoviciana*
This summer resident breeds most often in the coniferous forests. Although it is not found on the meadow its song can often be heard from the surrounding woodlands. When it arrives in mid-May, it can be found in a wide variety of habitats to feed after a long journey before moving to the conifers to build a nest.

Black-headed Grosbeak, *Pheucticus melanocephalus*
Black-headed Grosbeaks arrive in mid-May and leave by late summer. During the breeding season, they are common and their song is frequently heard from the surrounding woodlands. They make no direct use of the meadow itself.

Lazuli Bunting, *Passerina amoena*
Lazuli Buntings prefer grassy meadows dispersed with brushy thickets and scattered trees. A few are present in the area of the meadow, but higher quality habitat is found elsewhere in the park. (On the backside of Mt Pisgah and along the summit trail from the westside parking lot.)

Red-winged Blackbird, *Agelaius phoeniceus*
Red-winged Blackbirds may be seen at numerous sites around the meadow, but most often they occur where there are nearby wetlands or river corridors.

Brown-headed Cowbird, *Molothrus ater*
Brown-headed Cowbirds are obligate brood parasites and may be seen in any portion of the meadow and its surrounding habitats. Small groups of males frequently fly over and are often seen displaying in the nearby treetops. Females and pairs can be seen early in the morning searching for nests to parasitize in the surrounding brushy areas. By mid-June, this behavior will cease as the time of egg-laying for this species passes.

Bullock’s Oriole, *Icterus bullockii*
Orioles are uncommon, but when present, they are usually associated with riparian habitats, especially where mature cottonwoods are present.

Purple Finch, *Haemorhous purpureus*
The Purple Finch is a year-round resident of coniferous forests. The song of the males may be heard from the meadow where such habitat is nearby. Birds occasionally may be seen flying across the meadow.

House Finch, *Haemorhous mexicanus*
The House Finch is much more common than the Purple Finch and is often seen and heard in the treetops overlooking the meadow.
Red Crossbill, *Loxia curvirostra*

Red Crossbills wander through the coniferous forests. Breeding can occur at anytime of the year and depends upon availability of a good cone crop to provide the young seeds these birds depend upon. These birds typically remain high in the conifers and as such, should only be considered as a flyover species in the meadow.

Lesser Goldfinch, *Spinus psaltria*

The Lesser Goldfinch is common in the wooded areas around the meadow. Some years, they may be more numerous than the American Goldfinch. They will usually remain in the trees and brushy areas surrounding the meadow.

American Goldfinch, *Spinus tristis*

The American Goldfinch can be seen around the meadow and frequently, in the meadow itself. The current structure of the meadow does not provide especially good habitat for these birds and their numbers are lower than might otherwise be expected. These are the latest nesting birds in North America (mid-July before nesting begins) and depend on a high concentration of plants that produce a high volume of very small seeds, especially plants like thistle, dandelion and their relatives. While many of these plants are found in the meadow, the grazing and mowing that occurs prevents the large number of seed heads with their numerous seeds that is desired by the goldfinches. This is a limiting factor for American Goldfinches at this site. Without great quantities of these tiny seeds, no food will be available to feed the young.
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EMERALD MEADOWS
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PLAN
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) for the Lane County events facility Emerald Meadows. The objective of the Transportation Demand Management Plan is to efficiently manage the inflow and outflow of event traffic, to minimize traffic disturbances to normal flow of traffic on the adjacent roadway, and to allow normal operations for the rest of the park.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Sandow Engineering has evaluated the traffic control options provided for the Emerald Meadows event venue. It is Sandow Engineering’s opinion that after evaluating the site layouts, the traffic flow options, the event types, attendance, and traffic levels that with the appropriate traffic control plan and traffic demand management strategy in place that the traffic to the site can flow safety and efficiently while providing minimal back up of traffic onto Seavey Loop Road.

The following highlights Sandow Engineering’s recommendations:

- Sandow Engineering has evaluated the 10 event layout options created by Lane County Parks. Sandow Engineering has determined that event options 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 maximize the safe and efficient traffic flow. Each of these options provide the optimal layout on site to achieve the most efficient traffic flow and reducing the probability of vehicle backups external to the site. Options 7, 8, and 9 are recommended for removal from the usable options.

- An efficient flow of traffic within the parking areas is the first area of focus for the TDM. Each of the event operations has a traffic demand plan that has been created to provide efficient inflow and outflow of vehicles to the parking areas. The traffic control plan that focuses on managing all queueing and traffic back-ups internal to the park site and keeping traffic from backing up onto Seavey Loop Road.

- This plan is intended to serve as a base traffic control plan. Understanding that each event is unique. Once a layout/option is selected the County staff should work with the event staff to ensure that specific demands of the event are considered and addressed.
1.0 OBJECTIVES

This report provides a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) for the Lane County events facility Emerald Meadows. The objective of the Transportation Demand Management Plan is to efficiently manage the inflow and outflow of event traffic, to minimize traffic disturbances to normal flow of traffic on the adjacent roadway, and to allow normal operations for the rest of the park.

Emerald Meadows is an 80-acre section of the Howard Buford Recreation area at the base of Mount Pisgah. The event venue hosts large gathering events (over 1000 in attendance) that include concerts, festivals, races, and can host camping events for festivals. The park has the capacity to handle very large gatherings of 10,000 attendees.

Several options for venue layout have been created by Lane County Parks staff that provide options for event and parking lot layout as well as number of parking spaces.

Festival at Emerald Meadows

There is a singular vehicle access to Emerald Meadows. Access is provided via Seavey Loop Road, Seavey Loop Way, and Frank Parrish Road. The event access point is located about 0.2 miles down Frank Parrish Road from Seavey Loop Way/Buford Access Road. In order to have little impact on the other park activities, access would need to be relatively fee flowing from Seavey Loop Road to the intersection of Frank Parrish Way, Seavey Way, and Buford Park Road. The object of the plan is to maximize the ability of events staff to efficiently move traffic to and from parking and/or camping areas.

2.0 EVENTS

2.1 EVENT TYPES

There are two general types of events that occur at the facility. The events are described below:

EVENT TYPE A:

A Type A event is characterized by a distinctive start and end time, i.e. a concert event that starts at 7 PM and ends when the music is over. Events may see attendees arrive within one hour of the event start. Typically attendee traffic clears within 30 minutes of the event end for these type of events. These events can include camping on site, although they generally do not.
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EVENT TYPE B:

A Type B event is characterized by an all-day inflow and outflow of traffic. The events have a start/end time but are generally characterized by random arrivals throughout the day, i.e. the Mushroom Festival. This type of event typically has a constant turnover of cars within the parking areas and demand of inbound and outbound vehicles during the entire event. These events can include camping on site and can be multi-day events.

Each event layout option can be used for an Event Type A or Type B.

2.2 EVENT LEVELS

Each event type are be broken down into event levels. Each attendance level provides a separate need for traffic control:

- Level 1: 1000-3000 attendees
- Level 2: 3000-6000 attendees
- Level 3: 6000 + attendees

2.3 VEHICLE OCCUPANCY AND DEMAND

For events, attendees typically arrive with 2-4 people per vehicle. Vehicle occupancy is a function of the type of event. The Federal Highways Administration has provided studies that indicates vehicle occupancy ranges from 2.1 to 3.8 persons per vehicle for special events. Due to the limited availability of parking on site, limited areas for overflow parking if not planned for, and the undesired effect of parked vehicle on Seavey Loop Road, Sandow Engineering suggests that in general a vehicle occupancy of 2 people per vehicle should be used unless the event can illustrate with certainty that occupancy will be higher. This can be done by providing historical information about the event or by having the event illustrate active measures for reducing the number of vehicles on site. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Paid parking on site
- Shuttle service with off-site parking
- Discounts to attendees who carpool

The number of vehicles that can be expected for each level is found in the table below (assuming no shuttle service is provided and a vehicle occupancy of 2 people/vehicle).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Vehicle Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000-3000</td>
<td>500-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3000-6000</td>
<td>1500-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6000+</td>
<td>3000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The event levels are broken up in relation to the number of vehicles generated. Each event level has a specific level of traffic demand, congestion, and traffic control. The following provides an illustration of how the event layout options correspond to the event levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Level 1 0-3000*</th>
<th>Level 2 3000-6000*</th>
<th>Level 3 6000+*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layout 1</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout 2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout 3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout 4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout 5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout 6</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout 10</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attendance level estimates based on available parking and an assumed vehicle occupancy of 2.0 people/vehicle. If higher vehicle occupancy can be shown attendance can be increased for each event level.
3.0 TRAFFIC FLOW CHARACTERISTICS

TYPE A EVENTS

As stated before, this event type has a distinct start and end time. Typically for a Type A event 25-30% of attendees will arrive 60-30 minutes prior to the event and the remaining 75% arrive within 30 minutes of the event start time. Each of the event levels assumed traffic flows are described below:

A1 This is a Type A event at a Level 1 attendance. This type of event is projected to have between 1000-3000 attendees and 500-1500 vehicles. Within 60-30 minutes prior to the event 125-375 cars will arrive. This is an arrival rate of 4-13 cars/minute. Within the 30 minutes prior to the event 375-1125 cars will arrive. This is an arrival rate of 13-40 cars/minute.

A2 This is a Type A event at a Level 2 attendance. This type of event is projected to have between 3000-6000 attendees and 1500-3000 vehicles. The expected arrival is 375-750 vehicles at 13-25 vehicles/minute during the 60-30 minutes prior to the event and 1125-2250 vehicles at 40-75 vehicles/minute in the 30 minutes prior to the event.

A5 This is a Type A event at a Level 3 attendance. This type of event is projected to have 6000 plus attendees and 3000 plus vehicles. The expected arrival is more than 625 vehicles at more than 25 vehicles/minute during the 60-30 minutes prior to the event and more than 2250 vehicles at more than 75 vehicles/minute in the 30 minutes prior to the event.

TYPE B EVENTS

B1 This is a Type B event at a Level 1 attendance. This type of event is projected to have between 1000-3000 attendees and 500-1500 vehicles. As stated previously, this type of event is characterized by an all-day arrival and departure of vehicles.

B3 This is a Type B event at a Level 2 attendance. This type of event is projected to have between 3000-6000 attendees and 1500-3000 vehicles. As stated previously, this type of event is characterized by an all-day arrival and departure of vehicles.

B3 This is a Type B event at a Level 3 attendance. This event is projected to have 6000 plus attendees and 3000 plus vehicles. As stated previously, this type of event is characterized by all-day arrival and departure of vehicles.
4.0 TRAFFIC CONTROL

The objective of the Traffic Demand Management plan (TDM) is to create an efficient ingress/egress of vehicles to the event venue without backing up traffic onto the adjacent road system and to allow efficient use of the remainder of the park.

The first step in a good traffic control plan is to ensure that the parking and traffic flow on site is adequate to handle the traffic flow.

Lane County has 10 layout options available for events. Each option provides substantial parking and specific areas for large gatherings. All of the options except Option 1 and Option 4 have provisions on site for camping.

4.1 PREFERRED LAYOUT OPTIONS

Sandow Engineering has evaluated the 10 event layout options created by Lane County Parks. Sandow Engineering has determined that safe and efficient traffic flow is achievable through event options 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10. Each of these options provide the optimal layout on site to achieve the most efficient traffic flow and reducing the probability of vehicle backups external to the site. Options 7, 8, and 9 are recommended for removal from the usable options based on the following traffic flow observations:

- **Option 7 (recommended for removal):** The biggest issue with this site is the parking in relation to the event and camping areas. A substantial amount of parking is provided on the far side (west side) of Lot A. This requires that vehicles travel through the main portion of the event area for primary parking. This increases conflicts with pedestrians and bisects the main camping with the event area.

- **Option 8 (recommended for removal):** The biggest issue with this site is the parking in relation to the event and camping areas. A substantial amount of parking is provided on the far side (west side) of Lot A. This requires that vehicles travel through the main portion of the event area for primary parking. This increases conflicts with pedestrians and bisects the main camping with the event area. Additionally, Lot B includes camping in nearly one half of the lot. The share camping and parking within one lot creates traffic flow issues as it increases vehicle pedestrian conflicts and reduces the access points to the parking areas.

- **Option 9 (recommended for removal):** Option 9 and 10 are nearly identical. However in Option 9, Lot A has parking and camping. The parking in Lot A sits between the camping in Lot A and the event location. This configuration increased vehicle and pedestrian conflicts, reduces access points for parking and creates circulation issues for the parking in Lot A.
4.2 SITE LAYOUT TRAFFIC CONTROL

As stated an efficient flow of traffic within the parking areas is the first area of focus for the TDM. Each of the plans need to create an efficient inflow and outflow of vehicles to the parking areas. Appendix A provides recommendations for the traffic flow for each of the preferred options. The layouts provide traffic flow management that will work for all event types and levels.

Each event layout has a specific traffic control plan that focuses on managing all queueing and traffic back-ups internal to the park site. In general:

- **Inbound traffic**: All inbound traffic is to be managed diligently, quickly, and efficiently. The main objective is to handle inbound traffic on site and minimize any backups by having temporary by-pass accesses to additional parking. This will require constant contact between parking attendants along the access roads in the event venue. Each layout has a “trigger point” identified. This is the point that when backups occur the parking staff should open up an alternate route to allow the section of congestion to clear up then normal operations can continue. Additionally, if traffic backs up from the park to Seavey Loop Road then the alternate route of using the Buford Access Road to the Arboretum to increase the on-site vehicle queueing should be used. During the Level 2 and Level 3 events there needs to be staff present and identified to open up this access and flag vehicles through the Arboretum access road to move vehicles efficiently and to keep vehicles from parking along this route.

- **Outbound traffic**: As with the inbound traffic, the traffic is to be managed as much as possible on site. This will require parking attendants to hold traffic on-site if traffic backs up along Seavey Loop Road until traffic can be cleared.

4.3 ADJACENT ROADWAY TRAFFIC CONTROL

The second area of focus for the TDM is the flow of traffic on the adjacent roadways leading up to the venue, paying particular attention to Seavey Loop Road. The traffic control for the Type A events will focus on the large directional flow before and after events. The traffic control for a Type B event will focus more on managing parking and efficiently moving traffic internally within the venue to keep traffic from backing up onto the roadway.

For all event types it is recommended that:

- Traffic control should be in place at a minimum of one hour before the event start time.
- Traffic control should be in place for 30-60 minutes to one hour after the event or until a majority of the traffic has left.

Appendix B contains the recommended traffic control plans for the each attendance level.
5.0 SHUTTLE SERVICE

Shuttle service should be encouraged to be used by all events regardless of size. However, events with larger than 4000 attendees should be required to provide shuttle services from off-site parking locations. There are several close by locations that have adequate parking that shuttles can run.

- Lane Community College: Located on 30th Avenue in Eugene. This location has a high availability of parking. The drive time is 6 minutes from LCC to the park. Each shuttle can run at headways of 30 minutes.
- South Eugene High School: Located on 19th Avenue in Eugene. This location has a high availability of parking. The drive time is 14 minutes from SEHS to the park. Each shuttle can run at headways of 45 minutes.
- Pleasant Hill High School: Located on Highway 58. This location has a high availability of parking. The drive time is 12 minutes. Each shuttle can run at headways of 40 minutes.
- Springfield High School. Located on G Street in Springfield. This location has ample parking. The drive time is 12 minutes. Each shuttle can run at headways of 40 minutes.

There are also several churches within the Eugene/Springfield area that have provided parking areas for shuttles for UO event. The locations are further away from the venue but may be good options to explore:

Each event should designate a shuttle pick up and drop off area. This area should be relatively close to the event and allow shuttle busses to enter/exit with little delay. It is desired to keep them out of the traffic flow as much as possible. For a Type A event, multiple shuttles should be available at the pick-up area 15 minutes before the event end. It is ideal to have enough shuttles available to minimize the number of trips for each shuttle, thus minimizing the wait time for attendees.

6.0 EMERGENCY ACCESS

In the event of an emergency, more specifically, an emergency event in which the park needed to be evacuated, alternate routes need to be established. Evacuation routes to the north/west and south/east were reviewed. Appendix C provides the proposed layouts

The route to the north/west follows the network of existing gravel roads through the nature conservancy land and route to the existing bridge to the northwest of the park and then access Seavey Loop Road.

The route to the south/east follows the existing gravel road through Howard Buford Park where an upgraded gravel road should be created that follows north along the river connecting to an existing gravel road within the park and exiting onto Ridgeway Drive at the park trailhead. This route would be entirely on Lane County land.
Emerald Meadows Traffic Demand Management Plan
Option #1:
Event Type: A and B    Max Parking: 2,712    Attendance Level: 1,2,3    Max Camping: 0
Option #2:
Camping Event
Event Type: A and B
Max Parking: 3,096
Max Camping: 2,315
Attendance Level: 1,2,3
Option #3:
Camping Option
Event Type: A and B
Max Parking: 2,395
Max Camping: 2,575
Attendance Level: 1,2
Option #4:
Event Type: A and B
Max Parking: 4,112
Attendance Level: 1,2,3 Max Camping: 0

Traffic Control Legend
- Access/Traffic Control Loop
- Two-Way Parking Lanes & Emergency Vehicle Access
- Emergency Vehicle Access Only
- Two-Way, Extra Wide Emergency Vehicle & Main Traffic Lanes

All other lanes: One-way parking and emergency vehicle access if necessary.

Legend
- Event Area
- 30' Tree Buffer
- Parking Area (7.3 Acres)
- Oversize Parking Area (1.3 Acres)
- Overflow Parking Area 1 (11 Acres)
- Overflow Parking Area 2 (18.7 Acres)
- Overflow Parking Area 3 (8.4 Acres)
- Disabled Parking Spaces
- Overhead Parking Spaces
- Parking Spaces 10' x 22' - 4,070 Spacious

Amenities
- ADA Privy (5)
- Privey (36)
- Garbage/Compost (20)
- Recycling (20)
- Water Truck (Potable)
- Water Drum (Non-Potable)

Trigger Points:
A. Traffic should generally flow to location "B" if traffic backs up to trigger point A, then vehicles should be directed to Lot C or Lot B using flagger at location "C". Try to maintain a one way flow as illustrated on the maps.

If traffic backs up to Seavey Loop Road the access road to the Arboretum should be opened to loop traffic around to the arboretum access road. If that does not alleviate the traffic back up, Flagger 1 and Flagger 2 internal to the site should 1) bypass lot A and send traffic to lot B 2) open up "Arena road" to send the vehicles up to lot B
Option #5:
Camping Event
Event Type: A and B   Max Parking: 3,076
Attendance Level: 1,2   Max Camping: 1,770

Create a one-way traffic flow. Inbound vehicles towards Lot A then use the access route get to Lot B when Lot A fills. If traffic backs up to Flagger #1 then divert traffic to Lot B at Flagger #2.

Trigger Points:
A Traffic should generally flow to location "C" if traffic backs up to trigger point A, then access to Lot B from driveway at point "B" should be used. Once traffic from point "C" to point "B" has cleared point "B" parking attendand will send traffic back to point "C".

If traffic backs up to Seavey Loop Road the access road to the Arboretum should be opened to loop traffic around to the Arboretum access road. If that does not alleviate the traffic back up, Flagger #1 and Flagger #2 internal to the site should bypass Lot A and send traffic to Lot B.
Option #6: Camping Event
Event Type: A and B  Max Parking: 2,460
Attendance Level : 1,2  Max Camping: 2,315
Option #10: Camping Event
Event Type: A and B  Max Parking: 3,096
Attendance Level : 1,2  Max Camping: 1,714

Traffic Control Legend
- Access/Traffic Control Loop
- Emergency Vehicle Access
- Two-Way, Extra Wide Emergency Vehicle & Two Way Traffic Lanes

Legend
- Event Area
- 30' Tree Buffer
- Parking Area (14.4 Acres)
- Overhead Parking Area (1.3 Acres)
- Overhead Parking Area 1 (11 Acres)
- Overhead Parking Area 2 (18.3 Acres)
- Overhead Parking Area 3 (8.4 Acres)
- Shared Parking Spacing 12" x 24" - 49 Spaces
- Overhead Parking Spaces 12" x 24" - 49 Spaces
- Overhead Parking Spaces 10" x 22" - 3,017 Spaces
- Campground Area - A, B, C (11.7 Acres)
- Overhead (ADA) Camp Area (0.62 Acres)
- Camping Spaces 13" x 13" - 2,448 Spaces
- Camping Spaces 15" x 15" - 36 Spaces
- Overhead Spaces 15" x 40" - 139 Spaces

Amenities
- ADA Privy (25)
- Privy (90)
- Garbage/Dumpster (40)
- Recycling (40)
- Water Truck (Potable)
- Water Onsite (Non-Potable)
- Showers

Flagger #1:
Pre Event: Flagger to start by moving traffic to Lot A via Buford Access Road. If traffic starts to back up past Seavey Loop Road divert traffic to Flagger 2 and use west access road. When Lot A fills use Buford Access Road to divert traffic to Lot B.
Post Event: Move the converging outbound traffic through. Hold traffic if starting to back up on Seavey Loop

Flagger #2:
Pre Event: Divert traffic to West Access Road
Post Event: Move the converging outbound traffic through. Hold traffic if starting to back up on Seavey Loop

All Flaggers to have radio communications

Trigger Points:
A Traffic should generally flow to location "C" if traffic backs up to trigger point A, then access to Lot A from driveway at point "B" should be used. Once traffic from point "C" to point "B" has cleared point "B" parking attendand will send traffic back to point "C"
If traffic backs up to Seavey Loop Road the access road to the Arboretum should be opened to loop traffic around to the arboretum access road. If that does not alleviate the traffic back up Flagger 1 and Flagger 2 internal to the site should 1) bypass lot A and send traffic to lot B 2) open up "west access road" to send the vehicles to lot B
Emerald Meadows Traffic
Demand Management Plan
Event A Levels 1

Attendance: 1000-3000
Vehicles: 500 - 1500

Frank Parish Rd → To Emerald Meadows
Frank Parish Rd

Howard Buford Park
Franklin Boulevard

Seavey Loop Road

Station 3: For both the inbound and outbound events flaggers/event marshals should be placed here to ensure that traffic is efficiently moving and visitors to Howard Buford Park can efficiently move in and out of the park. This crew should be in direct communication with the flaggers/parking attendants internal to the site. If the traffic backs up past the bridge the direction should be given to the attendants inside to move to the secondary infow routes.

Station 4: For both the inbound and outbound events and event marshal should be placed here to watch traffic issues, encourage the movement of traffic flow on site, and to make sure that there is no parking along Seavey Loop.
Event A Levels 2-3 Inbound

Attendance: 3000+

To Emerald Meadows

Frank Parish Rd

Howard Buford Park

Seavey Loop Road

Franklin Boulevard

Flagger at Station #

Event Ahead" Sign

"Be Prepared to Stop" Sign

"Flagger" Sign

Dynamic Messaging Sign to Alert Motorists that Event is ahead

No Parking Signs Placed along Seavey Loop Road

Station 4: Flagger encourages flow of traffic so it does not back up. Station 4 to communicate with Station 3 so that they can alert Station 3 and internal parking attendants to open up additional parking lot routes.

Station 3: Flaggers/event marshals should be placed here to ensure that traffic is efficiently moving and visitors to Howard Buford Park can efficiently move in and out of the park. This crew should be in direct communication with the flaggers/parking attendants internal to the site. If the traffic backs up past the bridge the direction should be given to the attendants inside to move to the secondary inflow routes.
Event A Levels 2-3 Outbound

Attendance: 3000+

To Emerald Meadows

Frank Parish Rd

Howard Buford Park

Station 3: Will respond to any backups on Seavey Loop Road by holding traffic internal to the event site.

Station 4: Flagger to stop westbound traffic if traffic backs up more than 10 cars on Seavey Loop at Franklin. Station 5 to communicate with Station 4 if this is happening. Station 4 can stop traffic and wait for the clear or divert traffic to the south to Highway 58. The object is to have any back up occur on-site and not on Seavey Loop.

Station 5: Flagger to keep traffic moving off of Seavey Loop onto Franklin Boulevard by not having traffic stop the traffic can flow more efficiently and quicker.

Flagger at Station #

A "Event Ahead" Sign

B "Be Prepared to Stop" Sign

C "Flagger" Sign

Seavey Loop Road

Franklin Boulevard
Event B All Levels

To Emerald Meadows
Frank Parish Rd
Howard Buford Park
Seavey Loop Road
Franklin Boulevard

Flagger at Station #
"Event Ahead" Sign

Station 3: For both the inbound and outbound events flaggers/event marshals should be placed here to ensure that traffic is efficiently moving and visitors to Howard Buford Park can efficiently move in and out of the park. This crew should be in direct communication with the flaggers/parking attendants internal to the site. If the traffic backs up to the bridge the direction should be given to the attendants inside to move to the secondary inflow routes.

Station 4: For both the inbound and outbound events an event marshal should be placed here to watch traffic issues, encourage the movement of traffic flow on site, and to make sure that there is no parking along Seavey Loop.
Emerald Meadows Traffic
Demand Management Plan
Figure 1: Emerald Meadows Event Center
Proposed Emergency Route to Highway 58
Figure 2: Emerald Meadows Event Center
Proposed Emergency Route to Highway 58
Figure 3: Emerald Meadows Event Center
Emergency Route to Seavy Loop Road

- Existing Route
- Proposed Alternate Route
Appendix F
Lane County Parks Large Events Survey

http://www.lanecounty.org/Departments/PW/Parks/Documents/Lane%20County%20Parks%20FINAL%20Public%20Opinion%20Survey.pdf
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Summary

Lane County owns and operates 70 parks throughout the County, attracting more than two million visitors annually. Over the last few years, Lane County Parks has partnered with vendors and the community to host about 15 large events (events with 1,000 or more attendees) per year. Community concerns about past large events point to the need for policies that address impacts from large events such as noise, traffic, impacts on neighbors, and other issues.

Lane County Parks staff and the Lane County Board of Commissioners want a broader understanding of public opinion about hosting large public events at selected Lane County Parks facilities. The Board of Commissioners appointed a 13-person committee, the Large Events Task Force, to develop recommendations about allowing and managing large events in Lane County’s parks. Lane County Parks staff contracted with ECONorthwest to develop and implement a statistically valid opinion survey of Lane County residents about allowing large events in Lane County’s public parks.

The survey assessed whether Lane County residents think large events should be allowed in some Lane County Parks and, if so, under what conditions they should be allowed. The survey also asked questions about usage of Lane County Parks, which will provide information to staff for the update of the Lane County Parks Master Plan. This report presents the results of the survey about opinions of Lane County residents about large events and usage of Lane County parks.

**Survey Approach and Methods**

The purpose of the survey was to obtain information about Lane County’s residents’ opinions about allowing large events in selected Lane County parks. The survey methodology was designed to obtain a statistically valid survey results (e.g., results that are representative of all Lane County Residents). The survey asked questions about:

- Opinions about Lane County’s parks, to gauge respondents’ level of satisfaction with the quality of County parks, as well as respondents’ use of the parks.
- Opinions about use of Lane County parks for large events. The survey defined large events as an event with 1,000 or more attendees. The survey asked specific questions about areas of potential concern with hosting large events at Lane County Parks, such as environmental impacts, traffic issues, impacts on neighborhoods, and public safety issues.
- Demographics of respondents, to provide information about people who responded to the survey.

The first task in the project was to identify who should receive the survey. The population of interest was initially defined as adults who reside in Lane County. We used the Lane County Voter Registration database as the sample frame because it provides the most comprehensive list of
resident’s names and mailing addresses. About 204,000 of Lane County’s 284,3281 residents age 18 years old and over are registered voters.

The Voter Registration database contains information about all registered voters in Lane County, including information about their place of residence and age. Using this database allowed us to select a random sample of Lane County residents. To better understand if people living closer to Lane County Parks have different opinions, the sample included 1,000 respondents living in areas near large Lane County Parks and 1,000 randomly selected respondents from the rest of the county. To compensate for demographic groups who generally respond less frequently to surveys, we oversampled populations such as people under 45 years old.

SURVEY RESULTS

ECONorthwest received a total of 736 valid responses, with an effective response rate of 40%. The response to the survey gives a confidence interval of 99% with a +/-5% margin of error. This confidence interval means that if we conducted the survey 100 times, in 99 of those times, the results would be within +/-5% of the figures presented in this report.

Respondents indicated high support for and satisfaction with Lane County’s park system.

- Ninety-seven percent of respondents said that parks are important or very important to quality of life in Lane County.
- Seventy-nine percent of respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of Lane County’s park system.
- Eighty-eight percent of respondents had visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months. Respondents indicated that they visited Howard Buford Recreation Area and Armitage Park most frequently.

The majority of survey respondents are supportive of allowing well-managed large events in Lane County parks. Respondents were asked whether Lane County should allow large events in some or all of Lane County’s large parks. Respondents were asked to indicate whether the County should: allow all large events, allow large events under some circumstances, do not allow any large events and not sure. Respondents were then asked a series of questions about the circumstances for allowing large events, such as the hours of large events, allowing camping, and which large parks large events should be allowed in.

The majority of respondents (92%) supported allowing large events or allowing large events under some circumstances. Some respondents (between about 35% and 45% of respondents) indicated that they are concerned about the management of large events. Some areas of particular concern in the operation of large events were:

1 U.S. Census, American Community Survey, 2013
- **Hours of events.** Half of respondents indicated that large events should not operate between the hours of 11 PM and 7 AM. Forty-one percent of respondents said that allowing large events to operate between 11 PM and 7 AM might be acceptable if the County ensures that the event minimizes impacts. One of the key impacts that respondents were concerned about was noise and the hours when noise is allowed at a large event.

- **Camping.** Respondents were divided about allowing camping in conjunction with large events. About 15% of respondents indicated that camping should be allowed and one-quarter of respondents indicated that camping might be acceptable in parks with non-designated campgrounds. Forty-two percent of respondents indicated that camping should be allowed only in parks with designated campgrounds. Fourteen percent of respondents indicated that camping should not be allowed in conjunction with large events.

The majority of respondents indicated that they do not have substantial concerns about the impact of multiple large events in Lane County parks or think their concerns could be mitigated. Fifty-eight percent of respondents either have no concerns about the impact of multiple large events in Lane County parks or they have some concerns but think the County can adequately address their concerns without special action. In addition 39% of respondents have concerns that require mitigation measures. Three percent of respondents' concerns about the impact of multiple large events cannot be mitigated.

Respondents were generally supportive of allowing large events but many respondents had some concerns about allowing large events and about 97% of respondents indicated that their concerns could be mitigated. Respondents were asked questions about their potential areas of concern resulting from large events, such as traffic, environmental impacts, or impacts on nearby neighbors. Exhibit S-1 shows the areas of concern and respondents' level of concern about each topic.

- Depending on the area of concern, between 67% and 46% of respondents indicated that they had no concerns or that they have some concerns but not enough that they oppose allowing large events (or they think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action).

- While some respondents were concerned about impacts of large events, they generally thought that either the County could adequately address the concerns without special action or that the County could mitigate their concerns with specific actions.

Depending on the area of concern, between 52% and 32% of respondents indicated they had concerns that could be mitigated. The most common areas of concern with allowing large events at Lane County parks were: environmental impacts, traffic impacts, impact on neighbors, criminal activity, and noise.

- Between 2% and 3% of respondents indicated that they had concerns that could not be mitigated.
### Exhibit S-1. Summary of Areas of Concern by Percent of Respondents that have Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No concerns</th>
<th>Some, but not enough</th>
<th>Yes, but mitigation measures would reduce my concerns</th>
<th>Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts (n. 720)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic (n. 707)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Neighbors (n. 718)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise (n. 719)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Activity (n. 714)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Multiple Events (n. 715)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Other Visitors (n. 694)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety (n. 715)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey  
Note: Answers for Traffic were limited to either "Yes" or "No".

**Lane County Parks already implement some of the mitigation measures listed in the survey.** Some examples of mitigation measures that the County already implements in managing large events include:

- Environmental impact measures, such as requirements that a park is returned to its former state after the event, protection of water quality, protection of native plants and animals, and protection of rare, threatened, or endangered species.
- Noise control measures, such as restrictions on the hours when noise is allowed or restrictions on when noisy events are allowed to protect nesting birds.

- Neighborhood impact measures, such as designating parking areas and enforcing parking rules, noise control measures, and consideration of the need for additional support facilities and equipment.

- Criminal activity measures, such as requiring presence of security guards, volunteers for event safety compliance, or ensuring that there are on-site park rangers.

- Public safety measures, such as requiring on-site first aid or medical staff, and ensuring that there are access lanes for emergency vehicles.

- Fire safety measures, such as ensuring that there are access lanes for emergency vehicles, requiring designated smoking areas, or requirements for fire extinguishers at each vendor booth.

The County should continue to implement and publicize mitigation efforts, prioritizing the areas with the greatest concern. The fact that some (and perhaps many) respondents were unaware of the fact that the County already implements these measures suggests that the County may need to educate the public on how large events are managed. For example, the County has recently completed traffic and environmental studies related to large events. Publicizing the results of these studies provide an opportunity to educate the public about management of these issues for large events at Lane County Parks.

The results of the survey suggest that the County should continue to refine and develop its management protocols for large events to respond to the areas of greatest concern. One of the areas of greatest concern in managing large events was the impact on nearby neighborhoods, such as noise or traffic impacts. One of the mitigation measures suggested was to develop systems to rapidly respond to neighborhood complaints about events. Developing such a system would provide an opportunity for the County to manage issues as they arise, rather than responding to the issue after the event. This system could be especially important for large events with the greatest potential impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

The parks that were best known and that respondents indicated were appropriate for large events were Howard Buford Recreation Area and Armitage Park. About 80% of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed or allowed under some circumstances at Howard Buford Recreation Area and Armitage Park. Fifty percent of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed at these parks and about 30% of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed under some circumstances. More than 70% of respondents living in the zip code area closest to each of these parks indicated that the mitigation measures presented in the survey would address their concerns (or they had no concerns) and about 15% indicated that the mitigation measures would partially address their concerns.
CONCLUSIONS

The key conclusions of the survey are:

- Lane County residents value Lane County’s parks and think that parks play an important role in the quality of life in Lane County. Respondents are generally more supportive of Lane County using limited resources to develop and maintain existing parks, as well as protecting natural resources in parks.

- Respondents expressed broad support, about 92%, for allowing large events, provided that large events are properly managed. The level of support was relatively constant across respondent age groups and income levels. More than 60% of respondents indicated that the mitigation measures presented in the survey would either address their concerns or that they had no concerns. Between 15% and 25% of respondents indicated that their concerns were partially addressed by the mitigation measures in the survey.

This level of confidence in the ability to mitigate concerns about large events held for respondents living in neighborhoods closest to the Howard Buford Recreational Area and Armitage Park, two of Lane County’s largest parks where events are more common. About 60% or more of respondents living near these parks indicated that the mitigation measures presented in the survey would either address their concerns or that they had no concerns. See Figures A-26 to A-37 in Appendix A for more detailed information about respondents living closest to these two parks.

- As Lane County Parks Department develops policies to manage large events in parks, it will be important to pay close attention to policies to mitigate key impacts on neighbors, such as noise, traffic, and concerns about public safety. The majority of respondents, including respondents living near the largest Lane County Parks, generally support allowing large events and think that Lane County can mitigate key problems. We suggest that Lane County Parks continue to work closely with stakeholders to develop policies that respond to the key issues identified in the survey.

- Lane County already implements many of the mitigation measures described in the survey. In addition, Lane County has completed (or is in the process of studying) key issues identified in the study, such as the traffic and environmental impacts of large events on the parks and surrounding neighborhoods. The results of this survey provide opportunity for Lane County Parks Division to educate the public about the mitigation measures already implemented by the County, new mitigation policies resulting from the work of the Large Events Taskforce and this study, and the results of studies about the impacts of large events in key areas of concern.
Chapter 1. Introduction

Lane County owns and operates 70 parks throughout the County, attracting more than two million visitors annually. Lane County parks provide a broad range of recreational opportunities, including boating, camping, hiking, bicycling, walking and running, wildlife and bird watching, and many other activities. Lane County parks facilities include boat ramps, marinas, trails, day-use and picnic areas, campsites, and many others.

The Lane County Parks Department (Lane County Parks) has an annual budget of $3.2 million and does not receive any support from the County General Fund or property taxes. Lane County Parks is funded through fees from parking, moorage, picnicking, camping, state taxes and fees (such as the hotel room tax, the recreational vehicle registration fee, and boater registration fees), car rental tax, and hosting large events. Allowing large events at selected Lane County Parks’ facilities provides the County with revenue to support the operation and maintenance of County parks.

Over the last few years, Lane County Parks has partnered with vendors and the community to host about 15 large events per year. Some examples of the events held in Lane County Parks over the last few years include single-day musical festivals (such as the Cascadia Music Festival), multi-day musical festivals (such as Faerieworlds), community celebrations, sporting events (such as Triathlon Eugene, the Dirty Dash, or the McKenzie River Half Marathon), botanical events (such as the Mushroom Festival or Wildflower Festival), classic car shows, cultural arts events, historical reenactments (such as the Civil War reenactment), and youth camping events (such as the Boy Scout Camporee). Community concerns about past large events point to the need for clear policies and protocols around large events and event management that address impacts from large events such as noise, traffic, impacts on neighbors, and other issues.

Lane County Parks staff and the Lane County Board of Commissioners want a broader understanding of public opinion about hosting large public events (with more than 1,000 attendees) at selected Lane County Parks facilities. The Board of Commissioners appointed a 13-person committee, the Large Events Task Force, to develop recommendations about allowing large events in Lane County’s parks.

Lane County Parks staff contracted with ECONorthwest to develop and implement a statistically valid opinion survey of Lane County residents about allowing large events in Lane County’s public parks. The survey assessed whether Lane County residents think large events should be allowed in some Lane County Parks and, if so, under what conditions they should be allowed. The survey also asked questions about usage of Lane County Parks, which will provide information to staff for the update of the Lane County Parks Master Plan.

This report presents the results of the survey about opinions of Lane County residents about large events and usage of Lane County parks.
**Organization of this Report**

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- **Chapter 2 Survey Methodology** provides an overview of the sampling methodology used in this project. It also provides a discussion of how the survey was administered and analyzed.

- **Chapter 3 Survey Findings** presents the results of the survey. The chapter is organized in the order the questions were asked on the survey.

- **Chapter 4 Key Findings and Conclusions** highlights key survey findings and conclusions from the survey results.

- **Appendix A Additional Data** presents charts showing the results of key question by age group, income group, and for respondents in selected zip codes.

- **Appendix B Survey Instrument** presents a copy of the survey.

- **Appendix C Transcript of Written Survey Comments** includes the written comments for all comments respondents provided to open-ended survey questions.
Chapter 2. Survey Methodology

**STUDY OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of the survey was to information about Lane County residents’ opinions about allowing large events in selected Lane County parks. The survey methodology was designed to obtain a statistically valid survey results. The survey asked questions about:

- Opinions about Lane County’s parks, to gauge respondents’ level of satisfaction with the quality of County parks, as well as respondents’ use of the parks.
- Opinions about use of Lane County parks for large events. The survey defined large events as an event with 1,000 or more attendees. The survey asked specific questions about areas of potential concern with hosting large events at Lane County Parks, such as environmental impacts, traffic issues, impacts on neighborhoods, and public safety issues.
- Demographics of respondents, to provide information about people who responded to the survey.

**STUDY METHODS**

Before describing the survey methods, it is useful to review a few key survey concepts.

- Population – the universe of interest. The sample population is often referred to as “N.” In this instance, the sample population is all adults living in Lane County.
- Sample frame – the sample frame is the source or device from which a sample is drawn. In short, it is a list of all those in the population who can be sampled. For this survey, we used the Lane County voter registration database as a source of the sample.
- Sample size – the number of samples drawn from the sample population. In this survey, we selected 2,000 people from the Lane County voter registration to receive the survey.

**Survey Sample**

The first task in the project was to identify who should receive the survey. The key population was initially defined as people who reside in Lane County. We used the Lane County Voter Registration database as the sample frame because it was the best available data source with individual’s names and mailing addresses in it. About 204,000 of Lane County’s 284,328\(^2\) residents over 18 years old are registered voters.

The Voter Registration database contains information about all registered voters in Lane County, including information about their place of residence and age. Using this database allowed us to

\(^2\) U.S. Census, American Community Survey, 2013
select a random sample of Lane County residents. To better understand if people living closer to Lane County Parks have different opinions, the sample included 1,000 respondents living in areas near large Lane County Parks and 1,000 randomly selected respondents from the rest of the county.

To mitigate for anticipated survey response bias by age, the sample oversampled slightly within age groups under 45. Exhibit 1 shows the number of surveys administered and the approximate response rates from each age group. Half of the samples were delivered to individuals within five miles of a Lane County Park and half to residents further than five miles.

A primary goal of the project is to have a large enough survey sample so that the results of the survey are statistically valid results that can be generalized to Lane County’s population. About 400 randomly collected responses will yield a result with a ±5% margin of error at the 95% confidence level. Obtaining this many responses will require sending the survey to about 1,600 residents of Lane County. In addition, the County chose to add 400 additional respondents to allow for oversampling of respondents living near large Lane County Parks and people under 45 years old.

Of the 2,000 surveys sent out, 168 were returned as undeliverable due to incomplete mailing information or undeliverable addresses. Lane County Parks received a total of 736 valid responses for an effective response rate of 40%.

**Exhibit 1. Sample composition and response rates by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>All County Residents</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years</td>
<td>47,528</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>43,288</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>42,107</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>44,015</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>51,331</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>59,678</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>287,947</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2009-2013, B01001; Lane County Voter Registration Database; Lane County Parks Survey

One limitation of the study’s methodology is potential non-response bias. Survey respondents represented higher percentages of registered voters, females, and households with higher incomes than reported by the U.S. Census American Community Survey. Despite these areas of potential response bias, our assessment is that the results provide an accurate representation of the attitudes and opinions of registered voters in Lane County with respect to large events at County parks.
Development of the Survey Instrument

We worked closely with Lane County Parks staff and a three-member subcommittee of the Large Events Task Force to develop a general framework for the survey and to review and get feedback on specific questions. We field-tested the survey with seven people and revised the survey questions based on feedback from field testers.

The survey instrument is provided in Appendix B.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

There are multiple ways to conduct a survey, such as by mail, online, by phone, or in-person. The project used a mailed survey methodology. To administer mailed surveys, we use a process called “the tailored design method” developed by Dr. Don Dillman at Washington State University. The tailored design method is a systematic survey development and administration process intended to boost response rates. The administration process consists of a number of steps and at least three “contacts” with respondents:

1. **Mail a postcard to the respondent 7-10 days prior to mailing the survey.** The postcard notified the respondent that they will be receiving a survey and provides a brief summary of the purpose of the survey. The postcard was mailed on January 6, 2015.

2. **Mail the survey.** The survey was accompanied by a cover letter or newsletter with background information. The survey was mailed on January 14, 2015 and respondents were asked to return the survey by February 2, 2015.

3. **Follow-up postcard.** A follow-up postcard was mailed on January 28, 2015 to encourage non-respondents to complete the survey.

The Parks Division offered an Annual Pass to Lane County Parks as an incentive to complete the survey. The Pass provides recipients with free parking at any Lane County Park through August 2015, a $40 value.

Respondents were asked to return the survey by February 2, 2015. Responses received by February 19, 2015 (nearly two weeks after the due date) were included in the analysis for this report.

SURVEY ANALYSIS

We analyzed the survey using STATA 12.1 statistical software to manage and analyze the responses. This analysis included basic descriptive statistics, as well as cross-tabulation of data to describe different results for different respondent groups. For example, STATA enabled us to examine the variance in responses to Question 9, “Do you think that Lane County should allow large events at some or all of the County’s large parks?” by the age of the respondent.
This analysis includes selected use of inferential statistics, which are designed to determine causal relationships or correlations. Appendix C includes a transcript of the full comments from the open-ended responses.
Chapter 3. Survey Findings

The survey resulted a total of 736 valid responses, with an effective response rate of 40%. The response to the survey gives a confidence interval of 99% with a +/-5% margin of error. This confidence interval means that if we conducted the survey 100 times, in 99 of those times, the results would be within +/-5% of the figures presented in this report.

The survey analysis is divided into three sections:

- **Use of Lane County Parks** presents responses to questions about use of and satisfaction with Lane County Parks, the frequency of use of large Lane County Parks, and respondents’ opinion of the level of priority that should be given to possible park facility and services.

- **Large Events in Lane County Parks** focuses on how respondents opinions about whether to allow large events in Lane County parks. This section presents respondents’ opinions about areas of potential concern related to managing large events and potential mitigation measures to address respondents’ concerns about allowing large events. This section presents the results from each question in the survey. Additional information about key questions by respondents’ age, income, and selected locations near key parks is presented in Appendix A.

- **Demographics of Respondents** examines the demographic characteristics of respondents and their households. We compare key respondent characteristics, such as age, income, and household composition, with data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau to show the similarities and differences between the survey respondents and all of Lane County’s population over 18 years old.
USE OF LANE COUNTY PARKS

Exhibit 2 displays the importance of parks to quality of life for Lane County residents. Eighty percent of respondents indicated that parks were very important to quality of life and 17% indicated parks are somewhat important to quality of life in Lane County. Fewer than 1% of respondents considered parks to be somewhat unimportant to quality of life.

Question 1. In your opinion, how important or unimportant are parks to quality of life in Lane County?

Exhibit 2: Importance of Parks to Quality of Life

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

3 Throughout the report, we report the number of respondents to each question, referred to as the “n.” The number of respondents to Question 1 (Exhibit 2) was 728 or n=728.
As seen in Exhibit 3, 16% of survey respondents were very satisfied with the overall quality of the Lane County parks system, 63% were satisfied, and 15% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Five percent of people surveyed were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall quality of the Lane County Parks system.

**Question 2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall quality of the Lane County parks system?**

**Exhibit 3: Satisfaction of Parks in Lane County**

n=723

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 4 shows that 84% of respondents lived within 5 miles of a Lane County Park, 10% did not live within 5 miles, and 6% of respondents did not know their households distance to a Lane County Park.

**Question 3. Do you live within 5 miles of a Lane County Park?**

**Exhibit 4: Proximity to a Lane County Park**
n=715

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Note: While it is possible that 84% of respondents live within 5 miles of a Lane County park, it seems unlikely that such a large percentage of respondents do live within 5 miles of a County park.
The majority of respondents did not have a valid Lane County Annual Parking Pass. Exhibit 5 shows that 86% of respondents did not have an annual parking pass.

**Question 4. Do you currently have a valid Lane County Parks Annual Parking Pass?**

**Exhibit 5: Percent of Respondents with Lane County Parking Pass**

n=728

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
As seen in Exhibit 6, 88% of respondents had visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months. Twelve percent of respondents had not visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months.

Question 5. Have you visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months?
Exhibit 6: Visitation to Lane County Parks
n=720

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 7 displays the primary reasons that survey respondents who answered “no” to Question 5 (“Have you visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months?”) have not visited a Lane County park. Thirty-four percent of respondents that have not visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months did not do so because they don’t have time, 21% don’t know where parks are, and 19% would rather do something else. All of the other responses were selected by 10% of respondents or less frequently.

**Question 5a. If you do not use Lane County parks, what are the main reasons?**

**Exhibit 7: Reasons for not using Lane County parks**

- Don’t have time (n. 29): 34%
- Don’t know where parks are (n. 18): 21%
- Would rather do something else (n. 16): 19%
- Too far away (n. 9): 10%
- Feel unsafe (n. 9): 10%
- Condition of facilities (n. 8): 9%
- Too crowded (n. 7): 8%
- Inadequate facilities (n. 7): 8%
- Limited parking (n. 6): 7%
- Not handicap accessible (n. 3): 3%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 8 shows the frequency of use at Lane County Parks for well-known and less-known parks in the County.

- Howard Buford Recreation Area was the most frequently visited park with 78% of respondents visiting the park at least once a year and 7% visiting at least once a week.
- Armitage Park was also visited by 78% of respondents at least once a year and 2% visited at least once a week.
- The following parks were unknown by 30% or more of respondents: Zumwalt Park, Blue Mountain Park, Ada Park, Cinderella Park, Kinney Park, and Peaceful Valley Park.

**Question 6. If you do use Lane County parks, approximately how often do you or members of your household use the following large parks? (Please check the appropriate box for each facility.)**

**Exhibit 8: Frequency of Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a Year</th>
<th>A Few Times a Year</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Month</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>More Frequently than Once a Week</th>
<th>Don’t know facility</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Buford Recreation Area (Mt. Pisgah)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage Park</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Bridge Park</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lane County park</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Point Park</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Peninsula Park</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Park</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Bay Park</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumwalt Park</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain Park</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Park</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderella Park</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful Valley Park</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 9 shows respondents’ priorities for possible park facilities and services. At least half of respondents indicated that all of the services in Exhibit 9 were very or somewhat important.

- The services that respondents indicated were very or somewhat important most frequently were: maintaining parks and facilities (97% of respondents), park development (94%), and protecting natural resources (89%). More than two-thirds of respondents indicated that each of these were very important.

- The services that respondents indicated were very or somewhat important least frequently were: parkland acquisition (57%) and marinas (58%). Fewer than one-quarter of respondents indicated that each of these were very important.

**Question 7. For each of the following possible park facilities or services, please indicate your opinion about what the level of priority should be for Lane County parks generally.**

**Exhibit 9: Priority at Lane County Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Service</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range planning</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining parks and facilities</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinas</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Development (trails, restrooms, picnic shelters, etc.)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park land acquisition</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrons or code/law enforcement</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving or Protecting Covered Bridges or other historic structures</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting natural resources</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing more recreational facilities</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
LARGE EVENTS IN LANE COUNTY PARKS

This section focuses on how survey respondents felt about hosting large events in Lane County parks, concerns they had, and the mitigation efforts that would best address respondents’ concerns.

As seen in Exhibit 10, 42% of people responding to the survey attended at least one large event at a Lane County Park in the last year, 10% had been to 3-4 large events, and 2% went to 5 or more large events.

**Question 8. In the last year, how many large events have you attended?**

**Exhibit 10: Attendance at Large Events**

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Allowing Large Events

The next questions ask respondents about whether to allow large events in Lane County Parks.

Exhibit 11 shows that the majority of respondents indicate that Lane County they support allowing large events at some or all of the County’s large parks, either outright or under some circumstances. Twenty-one percent respondents said that large events should be allowed and 71% said that large events should be allowed under some circumstances. Three percent of respondents indicated that large events should not be allowed.

Question 9. Do you think that Lane County should allow large events at some or all of the County’s large parks?  
Exhibit 11: Allow / Do not allow large events  
n=730

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Respondents who primarily indicated that large events should not be allowed gave the following reasons for not allowing them. Exhibit 12 shows that the most common reasons to disallow large events were: impact on neighbors (n. 49), noise (n. 46), and substance abuse (n. 41). A number of respondents noted concerns for issues from impacting other park visitors (n. 37), to traffic (n. 35), to public safety (n. 28).

**Question 9a. If you do think that large events should not be allowed, what are the main reasons?**

*Note: This question was generally answered by people who selected “Do not allow any large events” on Question 9. As a result, fewer than 50 respondents gave reasons not to allow large events.*

**Exhibit 12: Reasons to Not Allow Large Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on neighbors</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise from amplified performances</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness and controlled substance abuse</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on other park visitors</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late event hours</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative impacts from multiple events</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise from other event activities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large events are incompatible with other park uses</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire safety</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

---

4 The “n” indicates the number of respondent that gave a specific answer. For example, 49 respondents indicated that large events should not be allowed because of the impact on neighbors. This question was generally answered by people who selected “Do not allow any large events” on Question 9. As a result, fewer than 50 respondents gave reasons not to allow large events.
We examined the difference in responses to Question 9 (Exhibit 11) by age of respondent (Exhibit 42). Exhibit 13 shows that 98% of respondents aged 18 – 34 indicated that large events should be allowed or allowed under some circumstances, compared to 93% for persons aged 35 – 54, and 87% for people aged 55 and older.

Analysis of the responses by age group using a chi-square analysis showed that answers about allowing large events were statistically different across age groups. In other words, there appears to be a relationship between the sentiments indicated by respondents about allowing large events at Lane County parks and age groups.

**Question 9. Should Lane County allow large events at some or all of the County’s large parks by Age**

**Exhibit 13: Allow / Do Not Allow Large Events by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Allow / Allow under some circumstances</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Do not allow any large events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 34</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 54</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and Older</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.01 level
We also examined the difference in responses to Question 9 (Exhibit 14) by income of respondent (Exhibit 44). Households with incomes under $40,000 annually were least likely to think large events should be allowed (91%). Households earning greater than $75,000 per year were most likely to think large events should not be allowed (4%).

Analysis of the responses by income group using a chi-square analysis showed that answers in regards to allowing large events were not statistically different across income groupings.

**Question 9. Should Lane County allow large events at some or all of the County’s large parks by Income**

Exhibit 14: Allow / Do Not Allow Large Events by Income

n=651

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Allow / Allow under some circumstances</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Do not allow any large events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $75,000</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $75,000</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Exhibit 15 presents responses about the length of large events. Seventeen percent of respondents indicated that an event should be one day or less, 57% indicated the events should be allowed to last 2 to 3 days, and 14% indicated that large events should be able to last 4 to 5 days. Forty-two respondents indicated that events should be allowed to last at least three days and no more than five days.

**Question 10. How long should a large event be allowed to run?**

**Exhibit 15: Length of Events**

n=722

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Fifteen percent of respondents indicated that overnight camping should be outright allowed in conjunction with large events and 42% indicated overnight camping should be allowed in parks with designated campgrounds. Exhibit 16 shows that 26% think overnight camping in non-designated campgrounds should possibly be allowed.

**Question 11. Should overnight camping be allowed in conjunction with large events?**

**Exhibit 16: Overnight Camping**

n=729

- **Yes**: 15%
- **Yes but only in parks with designated campgrounds**: 42%
- **Maybe allow camping on non-designated campgrounds**: 26%
- **No**: 14%
- **Not sure**: 3%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 17 shows that 50% of respondents indicated large events should not be allowed to continue after 11 PM or before 7 AM. Forty-one percent indicated that large events should be allowed during those time if the County minimizes impacts.

**Question 12. Should a large event be allowed to continue after 11 PM or before 7 AM?**

**Exhibit 17: Time of Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe, if the County ensures that the event minimizes impacts</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=726</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Mitigation Measures to Address Concerns about the Impacts of Large Events

This section presents responses to questions about actions that the County can take to mitigate potentially negative impacts of large events at Lane County Parks. Respondents were asked questions about their concerns about potential areas of concerns resulting from large events, such as traffic, environmental impacts, or impacts on nearby neighbors. Respondents were presented with potential mitigation measures for each issue and asked to indicate which mitigation measure(s) would reduce their concerns.

Exhibit 18 presents a summary of responses to Question 13 and Questions 15 through 22 in the survey. Exhibit 18 summarizes responses about each issue in one of the following categories:

- If the respondent was not concerned about the issue, they answered “No.”
- If the respondent was concerned but not concerned enough to require additional action, they answered “Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action.”
- If the respondent was concerned and thought additional action was necessary, they answered “Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts of multiple events on Lane County Parks.”
- If the respondent was concerned and no action on the County’s part would mitigate their concern, they answered “Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated.”

Exhibit 18 shows:

- Between 9% and 50% of respondents indicated they were not concerned about the issue, with the fewest respondents concerned about criminal activity and half of respondents were not concerned about environmental impact.
- Between 32% and 48% of respondents indicated that they had some concerns but either not enough concern to oppose allowing large events or the respondent thought that the County could adequately address the concerns without special action.
- Between 32% and 52% of respondents indicated that they had concerns that could be mitigated. The areas with the most concerns that could be mitigated were environment impacts, traffic, impacts on neighbors, noise, and criminal activity.
- 3% or fewer respondents indicated that they were concerned and their concern could not be mitigated.
Exhibit 18: Summary of Areas of Concern by Percent of Respondents that have Concerns

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Answers for Traffic were limited to either "Yes" or "No".
Exhibit 19, Exhibit 20, and Exhibit 21 present the concerns of respondents about traffic at large events. Half of respondents had concerns about traffic with large events. Of respondents with concerns, 87% were concerned about traffic backups, 59% were concerned about traffic delays near parks, and 48% were concerned about traffic entering and exiting parks.

**Question 13. Do you have concerns about traffic with large events?**

Exhibit 19: Traffic, n=707

![Bar chart](chart1.png)

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Respondents who indicated “Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns…” gave responses to the question below about areas of concern for transportation related to large events. For this question, only 50% of respondents indicated that they have areas of concern and provided answers shown in Exhibit 20.

**Question 13a. What are your areas of concern about transportation related to large events?**

Note: This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about traffic associated with large events, which included 50% of respondents.

Exhibit 20: Concerns about Transportation

![Bar chart](chart2.png)

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 21 shows that most respondents found some traffic delay as a result of large events acceptable. Forty percent of respondents indicated that slower traffic (but no backup) is acceptable and 31% indicated that up to a five minute delay was acceptable. Two percent of respondents indicated that any traffic delays are unacceptable and five percent indicated any traffic delay is acceptable.

**Question 14.** Ensuring that traffic is managed well is an important part of managing large events. What is the most traffic delay (if any) that is acceptable as a result of a large event at a County park?  

**Exhibit 21: Length of Traffic Delay, n=721**

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 22 shows respondents’ level of concern about public safety associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 15. Do you have concerns about public safety associated with large events?**

**Exhibit 22: Public Safety, n=707**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about public safety at large events.</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
For questions about areas of concern and potential mitigation measures (in Exhibit 22 through Exhibit 37), respondents who indicated “Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concern about public safety at large events” (in Exhibit 22) gave responses to the questions about mitigation measures (such as mitigation measures shown in Exhibit 23).

For example, only 43% of respondents indicated that they have concerns that would require mitigation measures and provided answers shown in Exhibit 23.\(^5\)

**Question 15a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about public safety at large events.**

*Note: This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about public safety associated with large events, which included 43% of respondents.*

Exhibit 23: Public Safety Mitigation Measures

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who indicated that the given mitigation measures would reduce their concerns about public safety at large events.](chart.png)

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

\(^5\) Of the 707 respondents who provided answers to Question 15 (Exhibit 22), up to 304 respondents (43% of respondents) may have given responses to Question 15a (Exhibit 23) about mitigation measures to address their concerns.

For the vast majority of the surveys, the only respondents who provided answers on Question 15a were respondents who gave the answer “Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concern about public safety at large events” on Question 15. In a few cases, respondents who did not indicate “Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concern about public safety at large events” to Question 15 gave answers to Question 15a. This is true for responses to other questions about mitigation measures.
Exhibit 24 shows respondents’ level of concern about criminal activity associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 16. Do you have concerns about criminal activity associated with large events?**

**Exhibit 24: Criminal Activity, n=714**

![Bar chart showing responses to question 16](chart.png)

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 16a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about criminal activity at large events.**

**Note:** This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about criminal activity associated with large events, which included 42% of respondents.

**Exhibit 25: Criminal Activity Mitigation Measures**

- Presence of more security guards (n. 220): 74%
- Presence of sheriff deputies (n. 212): 71%
- Volunteers for event safety compliance (n. 202): 68%
- On-site park rangers (n. 193): 65%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 26 shows respondents’ level of concern about fire safety associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 17. Do you have concerns about fire safety associated with large events?**

Exhibit 26: Fire Safety, n=716

![Bar chart showing responses to Question 17.](chart)

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 17a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about fire safety at large events.**

Note: This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about fire safety associated with large events, which included 32% of respondents.

Exhibit 27: Fire Safety Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access lanes for emergency vehicles (n. 204)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated smoking areas (n. 190)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for fire extinguishers at each vendor booth (n. 163)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with official fire alerts (n. 161)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically placed water for fire suppression (n. 158)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site fire district staff (n. 114)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire buffers or breaks (n. 98)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 28 shows respondents’ level of concern about noise associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 18.** Do you have concerns about noise associated with large events?

**Exhibit 28: Noise, n=719**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about noise at large events</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 18a.** Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about noise at large events.

Note: This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about noise associated with large events, which included 41% of respondents.

**Exhibit 29: Noise Mitigation Measures**

- Restrictions about the hours when noise is allowed (n. 288): 98%
- Restrictions about the use of amplification of music or announcements (n. 192): 65%
- Systems in place to respond rapidly to neighborhood complaints (n. 174): 59%
- Restrictions on when noisy events are allowed to protect nesting birds (n. 142): 48%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 30 shows respondents’ level of concern about environmental impacts associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 19. Do you have concerns about the environmental impacts of large events on Lane County’s parks?**

**Exhibit 30: Environmental Impacts, n=720**

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 19a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about environmental impacts.**

Note: This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about environmental impacts associated with large events, which included 52% of respondents.

**Exhibit 31: Environmental Impacts Mitigation Measures**

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 32 shows respondents’ level of concern about impacts on other parks visitors associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 20. Do you have concerns about the impact of large events on other visitors to Lane County’s parks?**

**Exhibit 32: Impacts on Other Visitors, n=713**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action</th>
<th>Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on other park users.</th>
<th>Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 20a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on other park users.**

**Note: This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about the impact of large events on other park visitors, which included 31% of respondents.**

**Exhibit 33: Mitigation Measures for Impacts on Other Parks Users**

- Designated parking areas for large events (n. 197) - 89%
- Informing potential park visitors about large events with public announcements and signage about events (n. 187) - 85%
- Additional temporary support facilities when needed (n. 178) - 81%
- Alternative entrances for large events (n. 154) - 70%
- Control the level of noise that may be heard outside of the designated event area (n. 134) - 61%
- Staggering of attendee arrivals to reduce traffic delays (n. 79) - 36%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 34 shows respondents’ level of concern about impacts on neighbors associated with large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 21. Do you have concerns about the impact of large events on neighbors near Lane County’s parks?**

**Exhibit 34: Impacts on Neighbors, n=718**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern Level</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action</th>
<th>Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on park neighbors</th>
<th>Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 21a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on park neighbors.**

**Note:** This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about impact of large events on neighbors near Lane County parks, which included 43% of respondents.

**Exhibit 35: Mitigation Measures for Impacts on Neighbors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that event attendees do not park in inappropriate areas</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of neighborhood appropriate event beginning and ending times</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated parking areas for large events</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional temporary support facilities or equipment when needed</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control the level of noise that may be heard outside of the designated event area</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased law enforcement patrols in neighborhoods during events</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems in place to respond rapidly to neighborhood complaints</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative entrances for large events</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staggering of attendee arrivals to reduce traffic delays</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 36 shows respondents’ level of concern about the impacts of multiple large events and the mitigation measures to address their concerns.

**Question 22. Do you have concerns about the impact of multiple large events on Lane County’s parks?**

**Exhibit 36: Impact of Multiple Large Events, n=715**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts of multiple events on Lane County Parks.</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

**Question 22a. Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts of multiple events on Lane County Parks.**

**Note:** This question was generally answered by people who indicated that they had concerns about public safety associated with large events, which included 39% of respondents.

**Exhibit 37: Mitigation Measures for Impacts of Multiple Events**

- Limit the number of large events allowed in each park annually (n. 251) - 90%
- Limit the frequency (time duration between events) of large events allowed in each park (n. 241) - 86%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
After answering the questions about specific issues associated with large events, respondents were asked to consider whether the mitigation measures outlined in the questions above would address their concerns. Exhibit 38 shows that about two-thirds of respondents indicated that the either they had no concerns or the mitigation measures would address their concerns. Taking into account the mitigation measures, respondents were least concerned with issues such as fire safety, public safety, and criminal activity, and more frequently concerned with impacts on other parks visitors, impacts of multiple large events, and overnight camping.

**Question 23. Would the mitigation measures outlined in questions 10 through 22 address your concerns about allowing large events in some Lane County Parks?**

Exhibit 38: Perception of Current and Proposed Mitigation Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Address My Concerns</th>
<th>Partially Address My Concerns</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Don’t Address My Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety (n. 697)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety (n. 699)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Activity (n. 699)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Length (n. 700)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day When Events Are Allowed (n. 702)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise (n. 701)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic (n. 700)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts (n. 699)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Neighbors (n. 703)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Camping (n. 701)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Multiple Large Events (n. 700)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Other Park Visitors (n. 699)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 39 presents the percent of respondents who think large events should be allowed or not allowed at each park. For parks with lower percentages for “allow”, note the large percentage of the population that does not know the park. For each well-known park, parks will fewer than 30% of respondents selecting don’t know park, more than 60% of respondents thought large events should be allowed or allowed under some circumstances. Also note that this percentage increases markedly if you exclude respondents who did not know the given park.

**Question 24. The following parks are sufficiently large enough to allow large events. At which of these parks (if any) should large events be allowed?**

**Exhibit 39: Large Events at Specific Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Allow</th>
<th>Allow under some circumstances</th>
<th>Do not allow</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Don’t know park</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well-known Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Buford Recreation Area (Mt. Pisgah)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage Park</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Bridge Park</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Point Park</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Park</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Peninsula Park</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less-known Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Bay Park</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumwalt Park</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain Park</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Park</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Park</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful Valley Park</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderella Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 40 shows the types of large events that respondents were most interested in allowing or prohibiting. Respondents had the most favorable responses for botanical events, cultural arts events, and educational events. The least favorable responses were for multi-day musical events, private business events, and religious events.

**Question 25. If you think that Lane County should allow some large events at large parks, what types of large events should Lane County allow at large parks?**

**Exhibit 40: Types of Large Events**

- **Botanical events (n. 712):** 80% Allow, 16% Allow under some circumstances, 1% Do not allow, 3% Not sure
- **Community celebration (n. 712):** 79% Allow, 19% Allow under some circumstances, 1% Do not allow, 1% Not sure
- **Educational events (n. 713):** 79% Allow, 19% Allow under some circumstances, 1% Do not allow, 2% Not sure
- **Cultural arts events (n. 711):** 79% Allow, 17% Allow under some circumstances, 2% Do not allow, 2% Not sure
- **Single-day musical events (n. 712):** 77% Allow, 20% Allow under some circumstances, 2% Do not allow, 1% Not sure
- **Historical reenactment (n. 711):** 65% Allow, 30% Allow under some circumstances, 3% Do not allow, 3% Not sure
- **Sporting events (n. 710):** 64% Allow, 30% Allow under some circumstances, 3% Do not allow, 3% Not sure
- **Classic car shows (n. 710):** 62% Allow, 31% Allow under some circumstances, 5% Do not allow, 3% Not sure
- **Youth camping (n. 713):** 58% Allow, 35% Allow under some circumstances, 4% Do not allow, 2% Not sure
- **Sail and motor boat shows (n. 714):** 57% Allow, 35% Allow under some circumstances, 5% Do not allow, 3% Not sure
- **Religious events (n. 709):** 50% Allow, 34% Allow under some circumstances, 11% Do not allow, 5% Not sure
- **Private business events (n. 707):** 43% Allow, 40% Allow under some circumstances, 9% Do not allow, 8% Not sure
- **Multi-day musical events (n. 706):** 43% Allow, 42% Allow under some circumstances, 12% Do not allow, 3% Not sure

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 41 presents the percent of respondents who think large events should be allowed or not allowed at each park and the percent of the population that uses the park at least once a year. The most well-known parks, which 70% or more of respondents visited at least once per year, were the Howard Buford Recreation Area, Armitage Park, Orchard Point Park, and Hendricks Bridge Park.

Half of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed at Howard Buford Recreation Area, Armitage Park and about 30% of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed at these parks under some circumstances.

**Question 24 and Question 6. how often do you or members of your household use the following large parks? At which of these parks (if any) should large events be allowed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 41: Allow / Do Not Allow Large Events by Park Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Buford Recreation Area (Mt. Pisgah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Bridge Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Peninsula Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Bay Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumwalt Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderella Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful Valley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Park Users includes households that use the park at least a few times a year.
DEMORPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Comparing the demographics of respondents can provide insight into the ways that survey respondents are similar to and different than all residents of Lane County who are 18 years and older. In most surveys, respondents are typically older, more likely to be female, have higher income, and more educated than the entire population. For the most part, this characterization is true of respondents to the Lane County Park survey.

Exhibit 42 displays the percent of the age distribution of the survey respondents, as compared to the sub-population of Lane County Registered Voters, and as compared to the distribution of the whole population, as provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. The survey received 10% of all responses from persons aged 18-24, an age group that traditionally has low response rates to surveys. Sixteen percent of respondents were aged 25-34, 20% were aged 35-44, 22% were aged 45-54, 18% were aged 55-64, and 14% were aged 65 and older.

**Question 26. How old are you?**

**Exhibit 42: Age of respondents compared to age of Lane County Registered Voters and all residents of Lane County over 18 years old**

n=718

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Lane County Registered Voters</th>
<th>Lane County Population (U.S. Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2013, B01001; Lane County Voter Registration Database
Exhibit 43 shows the gender distribution of survey respondents. Fifty-seven percent of respondents were female and 43% were male.

**Question 27. What is your gender?**

Exhibit 43: Gender

n=713

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 44 displays the distribution of survey respondents by household income as compared to the greater Lane County population. The incomes of survey respondents closely resembled the incomes of all Lane County Households. The greatest share of respondents had household incomes between $10,000 and $49,999.

**Question 28. What was your household’s total income in 2014?**

**Exhibit 44: Household Income**

$n=657$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Survey respondents</th>
<th>Lane County households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2013, S1901
Exhibit 45 displays the household composition among survey respondents and in Lane County as a whole. Thirty-eight percent of respondents lived in households with one or more person under 18 and 20% of respondents lived in households with one or more persons over 65. In the greater population, 24% of households have at least one person under 18 and 29% contain one or more persons over 65.

**Question 29. Household Composition**  
**Exhibit 45: Household Characteristics**

![Household Composition Chart](chart.png)

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Exhibit 46 shows the percent of respondents living in the top six zip codes.

**Question 30. What is your home zip code?**

*Exhibit 46: Home Zip Code*

*n=714*

Using information provided by Google Maps, ECONorthwest matched zip codes identified in Question 30 with cities in Lane County. Summing the total responses for zip codes associated with each city revealed that the majority of respondents lived in Lane County’s metropolitan areas.

Exhibit 47 presents the percent of respondents by city. Approximately 51% of respondents lived in Eugene zip codes, 29% in Springfield, and 20% live throughout the rest of Lane County.
Question 30. What is your home zip code?

Exhibit 47: Percent of Respondents by Lane County City

n=714

Source: Lane County Parks Survey; Google Maps; ECONorthwest calculations
Chapter 4. Key Findings and Conclusions

This chapter presents the key findings and conclusions about the Lane County Parks Large Events Survey.

**KEY FINDINGS**

The majority of survey respondents are supportive of allowing well-managed large events in Lane County parks. Respondents were asked whether Lane County should allow large events in some or all of Lane County’s large parks. Respondents were asked to indicate whether the County should: allow all large events, allow large events under some circumstances, or do not allow any large events and not sure. Respondents were then asked a series of questions about the circumstances for allowing large events, such as the hours of large events, allowing camping, and which large parks large events should be allowed in.

The majority of respondents (92%) supported allowing large events or allowing large events under some circumstances. Some respondents indicated that they are concerned about the management of large events. Some areas of particular concern in the operation of large events were:

- **Hours of events.** Half of respondents indicated that large events should not operate between the hours of 11 PM and 7 AM. Forty-one percent of respondents said that allowing large events to operate between 11 PM and 7 AM might be acceptable if the County ensures that the event minimizes impacts. One of the key impacts that respondents were concerned about was noise and the hours when noise is allowed at a large event.

- **Camping.** Respondents were divided about allowing camping in conjunction with large events. About 15% of respondents indicated that camping should be allowed and one-quarter of respondents indicated that camping might be acceptable in parks with non-designated campgrounds. Forty-two percent of respondents indicated that camping should be allowed only in parks with designated campgrounds. Fourteen percent of respondents indicated that camping should not be allowed in conjunction with large events.

**Respondents had concerns about the impacts of large events, especially on the surrounding neighborhood.** While many respondents were concerned about impacts of large events, they generally thought that either the County could adequately address the concerns without special action or that the County could mitigate their concerns with specific actions. The areas of concern for the most respondents were:

- **Environmental impact.** Fifty-two percent of respondents had concerns about environmental impacts associated with large events that could be mitigated.

- **Traffic.** Half of respondents had concerns about traffic with large events, such as traffic backups or delays on roads near parks. The majority of respondents indicated that traffic...
delays or backups of five minutes or less were acceptable as the result of a large event at a Lane County park.

- **Impact on neighbors.** Forty-three percent of respondents had concerns about impacts on neighbors near large parks that could be mitigated.

- **Criminal activity.** Forty-two percent of respondents had concerns about impacts on neighbors near large parks that could be mitigated.

- **Noise.** About 40% of respondents had concerns about noise associated with large events that could be mitigated.

- **All areas of concern.** On each of the areas of concern, between 2% and 3% of respondents indicated that they had concerns that could not be mitigated.

The implementation measures proposed in the survey generally address the concerns about large events for the majority of respondents. Between 64% and 72% of respondents’ either had no concerns or the mitigation measures addressed their concerns. For 15% to 25% of respondents, the mitigation measures partially address their concerns. For 7% to 13%, the mitigations measures do not address their concerns or respondents are unsure if the measures address their concerns. These results suggest that Lane County Parks is generally on the right track in understanding how to manage large events to respond to the community’s concerns.

**Lane County Parks already implements some of the mitigation measures listed in the survey.** Some examples of mitigation measures that the County already implements in managing large events include:

- Environmental impact measures, such as requirements that a park is returned to its former state after the event, protection of water quality, protection of native plants and animals, and protection of rare, threatened, or endangered species.

- Noise control measures, such as restrictions on the hours when noise is allowed or restrictions on when noisy events are allowed to protect nesting birds.

- Neighborhood impact measures, such as designating parking areas and enforcing parking rules, noise control measures, and consideration of the need for additional support facilities and equipment.

- Criminal activity measures, such as requiring presence of security guards, volunteers for event safety compliance, or ensuring that there are on-site park rangers.

- Public safety measures, such as requiring on-site first aid or medical staff, and ensuring that there are access lanes for emergency vehicles.

- Fire safety measures, such as ensuring that there are access lanes for emergency vehicles, requiring designated smoking areas, or requirements for fire extinguishers at each vendor booth.

**The County should continue to implement and publicize mitigation efforts, prioritizing the areas with the greatest concern.** The fact that some (and perhaps many) respondents were
unaware of the fact that the County already implements these measures suggests that the County may need to educate the public on how large events are managed. For example, the County has recently completed traffic and environmental studies related to large events. Publicizing the results of these studies provide an opportunity to educate the public about management of these issues for large events at Lane County Parks.

**The results of the survey suggest that the County should continue to refine and develop its management measures for large events to respond to the areas of greatest concern.** One of the areas of greatest concern in managing large events was the impact on nearby neighborhoods, such as noise or traffic impacts. One of the mitigation measures suggested was to develop systems to rapidly respond to neighborhood complaints about events. Developing such a system would provide an opportunity for the County to manage issues as they arise, rather than responding to the issue after the event. This system could be especially important for large events with the greatest potential impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

**The parks that were best known and that respondents indicated were appropriate for large events were Howard Buford Recreation Area and Armitage Park.** Half of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed at Howard Buford Recreation Area and Armitage Park and about 30% of respondents indicated that large events should be allowed at these parks under some circumstances. More than 70% of respondents living in the zip code closest to each of these parks indicated that the mitigation measures presented in the survey would address their concerns (or they had no concerns) and about 15% indicated that the mitigation measures would partially address their concerns.

More than half of respondents visited the park at least once a year and thought that large events should be allowed or allowed under some circumstances at: Orchard Point Park, Hendricks Bridge Park, and Perkins Peninsula Park.
CONCLUSIONS

The key conclusions of the survey are:

- Lane County residents value Lane County’s parks and think that parks play an important role in the quality of life in Lane County. Respondents are generally more supportive of Lane County using limited resources to develop and maintain existing parks, as well as protecting natural resources in parks.

- Respondents expressed broad support for allowing large events, provided that large events are properly managed. The level of support was relatively constant across respondent age groups and income levels. More than 60% of respondents indicated that the mitigation measures presented in the survey would either address their concerns or that they had no concerns. Between 15% and 25% of respondents indicated the their concerns were partially addressed by the mitigation measures in the survey.

This level of confidence in the ability to mitigate concerns about large events held for respondents living in neighborhoods closest to the Howard Buford Recreational Area and Armitage Park, two of Lane County’s largest parks where events are more common. About 60% or more of respondents living near these parks indicated that the mitigation measures presented in the survey would either address their concerns or that they had no concerns. See Figures A-26 to A-37 in Appendix A for more detailed information about respondents living closest to these two parks.

- As Lane County Parks Department develops policies to manage large events in parks, it will be important to pay close attention to policies to mitigate key impacts on neighbors, such as noise, traffic, and concerns about public safety. The majority of respondents, including respondents living near the largest Lane County Parks, generally support allowing large events and think that Lane County can mitigate key problems. We suggest that Lane County Parks continue to work closely with stakeholders to develop policies that respond to the key issues identified in the survey.

- Lane County already implements many of the mitigation measures described in the survey. In addition, Lane County has completed (or is in the process of studying) key issues identified in the study, such as traffic and environmental impacts of large events on the parks and surrounding neighborhoods. The results of this survey provide opportunity for Lane County Parks Department to educate the public about the mitigation measures already implemented by the County, new mitigation policies resulting from the work of the Large Events Taskforce and this study, and the results of studies about the impacts of large events in key areas of concern.
Appendix A. Additional Data Charts and Tables

Chapter 3 presented the results from each question in the Lane County Parks survey on large events. This appendix includes additional tables and figures that resulted from the analysis, including cross-tabulations and results from statistical tests.

Figure A-1 shows the full data table of survey responses for Question 23, for all respondents.

**Question 23. Would the mitigation measures outlined in questions 10 through 22 address your concerns about allowing large events in some Lane County Parks?**

**Figure A-1: Perception of Current and Proposed Mitigation Efforts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>I Have No Concerns About This Issue</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event length</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight camping</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of day when events are allowed</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire safety</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on other park visitors</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on neighbors</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of multiple large events</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Park Users includes households that use the park at least a few times a year.
**MITIGATION MEASURES BY AGE GROUP**

This section presents answers to Survey Question 23 by age group.

**Question 23.** *Would the mitigation measures outlined in questions 10 through 22 address your concerns about allowing large events in some Lane County Parks?*

**Figure A-2: Event Length**

![Chart showing event length by age group](image)

- **Yes / Have No Concerns:**
  - Age 18 - 34: 76%
  - Age 35 - 54: 75%
  - Age 55 and Older: 73%

- **Partially:**
  - Age 18 - 34: 16%
  - Age 35 - 54: 16%
  - Age 55 and Older: 18%

- **No:**
  - Age 18 - 34: 4%
  - Age 35 - 54: 5%
  - Age 55 and Older: 5%

- **Not Sure:**
  - Age 18 - 34: 3%
  - Age 35 - 54: 4%
  - Age 55 and Older: 4%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-3: Overnight Camping

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-4: Time of Day When Events are Allowed

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-5: Traffic

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-6: Public Safety

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-7: Criminal Activity

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-8: Fire Safety

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-9: Noise

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-10: Environmental Impacts

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-11: Impact on Other Park Visitors

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-12: Impact on Neighbors

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-13: Impact of Multiple Large Events

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: Statistically significant difference across age groupings at the 0.1 level
MITIGATION MEASURES BY INCOME

This section presents answers to Survey Question 23 by income.

Question 23. Would the mitigation measures outlined in questions 10 through 22 address your concerns about allowing large events in some Lane County Parks?

Figure A-14: Event Length

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-15: Overnight Camping

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-16: Time of Day When Events are Allowed

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-17: Traffic

- Yes / Have No Concerns:
  - Less than $39,000: 68%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 69%
  - Greater than $75,000: 67%
- Partially:
  - Less than $39,000: 19%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 25%
  - Greater than $75,000: 25%
- No:
  - Less than $39,000: 7%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 4%
  - Greater than $75,000: 5%
- Not Sure:
  - Less than $39,000: 3%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 3%
  - Greater than $75,000: 3%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-18: Public Safety

- Yes / Have No Concerns:
  - Less than $39,000: 76%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 71%
  - Greater than $75,000: 70%
- Partially:
  - Less than $39,000: 17%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 24%
  - Greater than $75,000: 21%
- No:
  - Less than $39,000: 5%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 3%
  - Greater than $75,000: 6%
- Not Sure:
  - Less than $39,000: 2%
  - $40,000 to $75,000: 3%
  - Greater than $75,000: 4%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-19: Criminal Activity

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-20: Fire Safety

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-21: Noise

Less than $39,000 | $40,000 to $75,000 | Greater than $75,000

Yes / Have No Concerns: 68% | 22% | 3%
Partially: 68% | 25% | 2%
No: 64% | 7% | 3%
Not Sure: 7% | 5% | 3%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-22: Environmental Impacts

Less than $39,000 | $40,000 to $75,000 | Greater than $75,000

Yes / Have No Concerns: 67% | 26% | 8%
Partially: 64% | 25% | 4%
No: 4% | 4% | 3%
Not Sure: 4% | 5% | 5%

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-23: Impact on Other Park Visitors

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level

Figure A-24: Impact on Neighbors

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
Figure A-25: Impact of Multiple Large Events

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Note: No statistically significant difference across income groupings at the 0.1 level
**Mitigation Measures for Respondents Living Near Buford or Armitage Parks**

This section presents answers to Survey Question 23 by the two zip codes with the largest number of responses. About 20% of responses to the survey (144 surveys) were from zip code 97478, which includes neighborhoods near Buford Park. About 15% of responses (108 surveys) were from zip code 97408, which includes neighborhoods near Armitage Park.

**Question 23. Would the mitigation measures outlined in questions 10 through 22 address your concerns about allowing large events in some Lane County Parks?**

**Figure A-26: Event Length**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buford Park, Springfield (97478)</th>
<th>Armitage Park, Eugene (97408)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes / Have No</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Figure A-27: Overnight Camping

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Figure A-28: Time of Day When Events are Allowed

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Figure A-29: Traffic

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

 Buford Park, Springfield (97478)  Armitage Park, Eugene (97408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Buford</th>
<th>Armitage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes / Have No</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A-30: Public Safety

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

 Buford Park, Springfield (97478)  Armitage Park, Eugene (97408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Buford</th>
<th>Armitage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes / Have No</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A-31: Criminal Activity

![Criminal Activity Bar Chart]

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Figure A-32: Fire Safety

![Fire Safety Bar Chart]

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Figure A-33: Noise

![Bar chart showing noise concerns at Buford Park, Springfield (97478) and Armitage Park, Eugene (97408).]

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Figure A-34: Environmental Impacts

![Bar chart showing environmental impacts at Buford Park, Springfield (97478) and Armitage Park, Eugene (97408).]

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Figure A-35: Impact on Other Park Visitors

Source: Lane County Parks Survey

Figure A-36: Impact on Neighbors

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Figure A-37: Impact of Multiple Large Events

Source: Lane County Parks Survey
Appendix B. Survey Instrument

January 13, 2015

Dear [Lane County Resident]:

We need your help! The Lane County Board of Commissioners and Lane County Parks staff want a broader understanding of public opinion about large events at selected Lane County Parks. Community concerns regarding past large events hosted at Lane County Parks point to the need for new or revised policies that address impacts from large events such as noise, traffic, impacts on neighbors, and other issues.

This survey assesses whether Lane County residents think large events should be allowed in some Lane County Parks and, if so, under what conditions they should be allowed. The results of this survey will help the Lane County Board of Commissioners set policies about large events in Lane County Parks.

Your opinion is important to us. The survey should take 15 to 20 minutes to complete and will provide valuable information. I encourage you to complete this Survey and return it in the enclosed, postage paid envelope by Monday, February 2, 2015.

We know that your time is valuable, so in appreciation, we are offering an Annual Pass to Lane County Parks, which will provide you free parking at any Lane County Park through August 2015, a $40 value. In order to receive your Annual Pass, please fill out the “Free Annual Pass” form provided in this packet of materials and send it to Lane County Parks. The form for your free Annual Pass can be submitted individually or with your submitted survey.

All individual survey responses are strictly confidential and are for research purposes only. If you have any questions regarding the survey, feel free to contact Dave Stockdale at Lane County Parks Department at 541-682-2000.

Thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Steve Mokrohisky, County Administrator
INTRODUCTION
Lane County owns and operates 70 parks throughout the County, attracting more than two million visitors annually. Lane County parks provide a broad range of recreational opportunities, including boating, camping, hiking, bicycling, walking and running, wildlife and bird watching, and many other activities. Lane County parks facilities include boat ramps, marinas, trails, day-use and picnic areas, campsites, and many others.

Lane County Parks wants to better understand public opinions about allowing large events at Lane County’s larger parks. This survey assesses whether Lane County residents think large events should be allowed in some Lane County Parks and, if so, under what conditions they should be allowed. Community concerns about past large events point to the need for policies that address impacts from large events such as noise, traffic, impacts on neighbors, and other issues.

Lane County Parks has an annual budget of $3.2 million and does not receive any support from the County General Fund or property taxes. Lane County Parks is funded through fees from parking, moorage, picnicking, camping, state taxes and fees (such as the hotel room tax, the recreational vehicle registration fee, and boater registration fees), car rental tax, and hosting large events.

Allowing large events at selected Lane County Parks' facilities provides the County with revenue to support the operation and maintenance of County parks. Lane County Parks staff and the Board of Commissioners want a broader understanding of public opinion about large events at selected Lane County Parks facilities.

This survey also asks questions that will help Lane County Parks to update the Parks and Open Space Master Plan. The Master Plan will guide development, establish a vision for management of Lane County Parks and prioritize activities to achieve that vision. The Master Plan will allow County Parks to better achieve its mission of providing “outstanding customer service and a diverse, high-quality recreational experience that meets their needs and expectations.”

INSTRUCTIONS
Your household has been randomly selected to participate in this survey about parks in Lane County. This questionnaire should be filled out by an adult in the household, someone 18 years of age or older. Please answer the questions on behalf of all members of the household. To receive the Annual Pass to Lane County Parks mentioned in the cover letter, please return this survey and the completed Lane County Parks Annual Pass Promotional Survey Coupon in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by February 2, 2015.

No response to the survey is necessary to receive the Annual Pass but you must return the enclosed form requesting the annual pass.

All responses will be kept confidential.

Your participation is voluntary. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact Dave Stockdale at Lane County Parks Division at 541-682-2000. Mail completed surveys to Lane County Parks Division at 3050 N. Delta Hwy, Eugene, Oregon 97408.
First, we would like to ask you some questions about Lane County Parks.

Q-1 In your opinion, how important or unimportant are parks to quality of life in Lane County?
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Neither important nor unimportant
   - Somewhat unimportant
   - Very unimportant
   - No opinion

Q-2 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall quality of the Lane County parks system?
   - Very satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied
   - No opinion

Q-3 Do you live within 5 miles of a Lane County Park?
   For a map of the locations of Lane County’s Parks, see: http://www.lanecounty.org/DEPARTMENTS/PW/PARKS/Documents/ParksMap.pdf
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

Q-4 Do you currently have a valid Lane County Parks Annual Parking Pass? (Your answer will not affect your eligibility for a new Annual Pass)
   - Yes
   - No

Q-5 Have you visited a Lane County park in the last 12 months?
   - Yes (Go to Q-6)
   - No If you do not use Lane County parks, what are the main reasons? (Check all that apply.)
     - Condition of facilities
     - Don’t have time
     - Don’t know where parks are
     - Feel unsafe
     - Inadequate facilities
     - Limited parking
     - Not handicap accessible
     - Too crowded
     - Too far away
     - Would rather do something else
     - Other (Explain) _______________________________________________________

[If you answered NO to Q-5, skip to Q-7.]
Q-6   If you do use Lane County parks, approximately how often do you or members of your household use the following large parks? (Please check the appropriate box for each facility.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a Year</th>
<th>A Few Times a Year</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Month</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>More Frequently than Once a Week</th>
<th>Don't know facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Bay Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderella Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Bridge Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Buford Recreation Area (Mt. Pisgah)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Point Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful Valley Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Peninsula Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumwalt Park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lane County park</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-7 For each of the following possible park facilities or services, please indicate your opinion about what the level of priority should be for Lane County parks generally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Service</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining parks and facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinas</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Development (trails, restrooms, picnic shelters, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park land acquisition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrons or code/law enforcement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving or Protecting Covered Bridges or other historic structures</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting natural resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing more recreational facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, we would like to ask you some questions about large events at Lane County Parks.

Lane County Parks has regularly hosted large events—events with 1,000 or more attendees—at selected parks since 1997. Lane County allows these events at its largest parks, which are listed by name in Question 6 and shown on the Lane County Parks Map on the County’s website at: http://www.lanecounty.org/DEPARTMENTS/PW/PARKS/Documents/ParksMap.pdf

Over the last few years, Lane County Parks has partnered with vendors and the community to host about 15 large events per year. Some examples of the events held in Lane County Parks over the last few years include single-day musical festivals (such as the Cascadia Music Festival), multi-day musical festivals (such as Faerieworlds), community celebrations, sporting events (such as Triathlon Eugene, the Dirty Dash, or the McKenzie River Half Marathon), botanical events (such as the Mushroom Festival or Wildflower Festival), classic car shows, cultural arts events, historical reenactments (such as the Civil War reenactment), and youth camping events (such as the Boy Scout Camporee).

Rental and other fees from large events have the potential to contribute gross revenues of up to $100,000 to Lane County Parks each year. The portion of revenue from these fees remaining after expenses support the Parks Division in providing maintenance at existing parks and support habitat restoration and other activities in Parks. Large events also provide opportunities for community enrichment and outdoor activities. However, large events can have negative impacts such as impacts on neighbors, environmental impacts, impacts on other park visitors, or traffic.

The following questions ask your opinions about allowing large events in Lane County Parks.

Q-8 In the last year, how many large events have you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many large events have you attended at any location?</th>
<th>How many of these large events were held at a Lane County park?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 0 (none)</td>
<td>□ 0 (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 1-2 large events</td>
<td>□ 1-2 large events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 3-4 large events</td>
<td>□ 3-4 large events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5 or more large events</td>
<td>□ 5 or more large events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Do not know</td>
<td>□ Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-9 Do you think that Lane County should allow large events at some or all of the County’s large parks?

□ Allow all large events
□ Allow large events under some circumstances
□ Not sure
□ Do not allow any large events

If you do think that large events should not be allowed, what are the main reasons? (Check all that apply.)

□ Cumulative impacts from multiple events
□ Environmental impacts
□ Fire safety
□ Impact on neighbors
□ Impact on other park visitors
□ Large events are incompatible with other park uses
□ Late event hours
□ Noise from amplified performances
□ Noise from other event activities
□ Parking
□ Public safety
□ Drunkenness and controlled substance abuse
□ Traffic
□ Other (Explain) _________________________________________
Potential concerns for large events at Lane County Parks

The following are questions about potential areas of concern that Lane County Parks Division has identified when managing large events. Lane County Parks defines large events as an event with 1,000 people or more.

Q-10 How long should a large event be allowed to run?

- One day or less
- Two days
- Three days
- More than three days, but no more than 5 days
- Not sure

Q-11 Should overnight camping be allowed in conjunction with large events?

- Yes
- Yes but only in parks with designated campgrounds
- Maybe allow camping on non-designated campgrounds, if the County ensures that the event minimizes impacts to neighbors, the park, and other park users.
- No
- Not sure

Q-12 Should a large event be allowed to continue after 11 PM or before 7 AM?

- Yes
- Maybe, if the County ensures that the event minimizes impacts to neighbors, the park, and other park users.
- No
- Not sure

Q-13 Do you have concerns about traffic with large events?

- No
- Yes What are your areas of concern about transportation related to large events? (Check all that apply.)
  - Traffic delays entering or exiting parks
  - Traffic delays that result in slower traffic on roads near parks
  - Traffic delays that result in traffic backups (stop and go traffic) on roads near parks

Q-14 Ensuring that traffic is managed well is an important part of managing large events. What is the most traffic delay (if any) that is acceptable as a result of a large event at a County park?

- Any traffic delay is unacceptable
- Traffic is slower than usual but is not backed up
- Five minute delay (backup)
- Ten minute delay (backup)
- Twenty minute delay (backup)
- Any traffic delay is acceptable
Q-15 Do you have concerns about public safety associated with large events?

- No
- Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action
- Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about public safety at large events. (Check all that apply.)
  - Presence of additional security guards
  - On-site park rangers
  - Volunteers for event safety compliance
  - On-site first aid or medical staff
  - Access lanes for emergency vehicles
- Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated

Q-16 Do you have concerns about criminal activity associated with large events?

- No
- Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action
- Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about criminal activity at large events. (Check all that apply.)
  - Presence of sheriff deputies
  - On-site park rangers
  - Presence of more security guards
  - Volunteers for event safety compliance
  - Other: ______________________________________________________________
- Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated

Q-17 Do you have concerns about fire safety associated with large events?

- No
- Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action
- Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about fire safety at large events. (Check all that apply.)
  - On-site fire district staff
  - Access lanes for emergency vehicles
  - Compliance with official fire alerts
  - Strategically placed water for fire suppression
  - Requirement for fire extinguishers at each vendor booth
  - Designated smoking areas
  - Fire buffers or breaks
- Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated

Q-18 Do you have concerns about noise associated with large events?

- No
- Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action
- Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about noise at large events. (Check all that apply.)
  - Restrictions about the use of amplification of music or announcements
  - Restrictions about the hours when noise is allowed
  - Restrictions on when noisy events are allowed to protect nesting birds
  - Systems in place to respond rapidly to neighborhood complaints
- Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated
Q-19 Do you have concerns about the environmental impacts of large events on Lane County’s parks?

☐ No

☐ Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action

☐ Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about environmental impacts. (Check all that apply.)

☐ Requirement that the event managers return the park to its former state after the event

☐ Measures to protect water quality of nearby local waterways, such as requirements for restrooms, portable restrooms, and controlling water runoff

☐ Protections of native plants and animals

☐ Protections of known habitat of rare, threatened, or endangered plants, insects, or animals that may include not allowing some events during certain times of the year or in some places

☐ Other: ___________________________________________________________________________________

☐ Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated

Q-20 Do you have concerns about the impact of large events on other visitors to Lane County’s parks?

☐ No

☐ Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action

☐ Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on other park users. (Check all that apply.)

☐ Alternative entrances for large events

☐ Designated parking areas for large events

☐ Staggering of attendee arrivals to reduce traffic delays

☐ Informing potential park visitors about large events with public announcements and signage about events

☐ Control the level of noise that may be heard outside of the designated event area

☐ Additional temporary support facilities when needed, such as portable restrooms or generators for electricity

☐ Other: ___________________________________________________________________________________

☐ Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated
Q-21 Do you have concerns about the impact of large events on neighbors near Lane County’s parks?

- [ ] No
- [ ] Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action
- [ ] Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on park neighbors. (Check all that apply.)
  - [ ] Alternative entrances for large events
  - [ ] Designated parking areas for large events
  - [ ] Staggering of attendee arrivals to reduce traffic delays
  - [ ] Control the level of noise that may be heard outside of the designated event area
  - [ ] Additional temporary support facilities or equipment when needed, such as portable restrooms or temporary large tents
  - [ ] Ensuring that event attendees do not park in inappropriate areas (such as across private driveways) within nearby residential neighborhoods through parking direction and enforcement
  - [ ] Consideration of neighborhood-appropriate event beginning and ending times for large events
  - [ ] Increased law enforcement patrols in neighborhoods during events
  - [ ] Systems in place to respond rapidly to neighborhood complaints
  - [ ] Other:

- [ ] Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated

Q-22 Do you have concerns about the impact of multiple large events on Lane County’s parks?

- [ ] No
- [ ] Some, but not enough that I oppose allowing large events or I think the County can adequately address the concerns without special action
- [ ] Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts of multiple events on Lane County Parks. (Check all that apply.)
  - [ ] Limit the number of large events allowed in each park annually
  - [ ] Limit the frequency (time duration between events) of large events allowed in each park

- [ ] Yes, and my concerns cannot be mitigated
Q-23  Would the mitigation measures outlined in questions 10 through 22 address your concerns about allowing large events in some Lane County Parks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>I Have No Concerns About This Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight camping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of day when events are allowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on other park visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of multiple large events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-24  The following parks are sufficiently large enough to allow large events. At which of these parks (if any) should large events be allowed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Allow</th>
<th>Allow under some circumstances</th>
<th>Do not allow</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Don’t know park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Bay Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderella Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Bridge Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Buford Recreation Area (Mt. Pisgah)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Point Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful Valley Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Peninsula Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumwalt Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-25 If you think that Lane County should allow some large events at large parks, what types of large events should Lane County allow at large parks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Event</th>
<th>Allow</th>
<th>Allow under some circumstances</th>
<th>Do not allow</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-day musical events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-day musical events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community celebration (e.g., 4th of July)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic car shows</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural arts events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical reenactment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth camping</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private business events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sail and motor boat shows</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, some questions about yourself and your household.

Q-26  How old are you?

☐ 18 to 24 years
☐ 25-34 years
☐ 35-44 years
☐ 45-54 years
☐ 55-64 years
☐ 65 years and older

Q-27  What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female

Q-28  What was your household’s total income in 2014?

☐ Less than $10,000
☐ $10,000 to $19,999
☐ $20,000 to $29,000
☐ $30,000 to $39,000
☐ $40,000 to $49,000
☐ $50,000 to $59,000
☐ $60,000 to $74,999
☐ $75,000 to $99,999
☐ $100,000 to $149,999
☐ $150,000 or more
Q-29  How many people live in your household:

_______ Number of people under 18 years old
_______ Number of people between 18 and 64 years old
_______ Number of people 65 years and older

Q-30  What is your home zip code?

____________________ Zip Code at home

Q-31  Do you have other thoughts or comments about Lane County Parks or activities held in Lane County Parks?

Thank you for your assistance!
Appendix C. Open-Ended Comments

This appendix presents open-ended comments, transcribed verbatim from survey respondents. On some comments, we have blacked out some words, primarily names, contact information, and language inappropriate for a County report.

Q-5: If you do not use Lane County parks, what are the main reasons?

Other (Explain):

1. I am currently quite disabled due to a stroke.
2. I ride my horse at Elijah Bristow State Park next Dexter.
3. Charging for parks is ridiculous
4. Pay parking
5. Seldom have a reason to
6. I get more use out of a Coastal Passport. (worth the fees paid)
7. Don’t want to pay
8. Parking fee charge
9. The last 12 mos. have been crazy because of work. The couple of years before we did but don’t remember which ones.
10. Use state and fed parks for camping.
11. Medical reasons.
12. Recently moved to area.
13. If it costs money – we can’t do it.
15. Cost
16. Didn’t get fishing licenses last year
17. As I live in Florence, the only park I “use” is *unreadable* point river bar overlook at Harbor Vista CG. As I may only check bar conditions or catch a quick sunset.
18. We usually don’t have he money to pay day use fees.
19. We are pretty new to the area and have not had a chance to explore much yet.
20. RV Camping – Not Enough Parks
21. Traveled for work a lot last year
22. I live by one. I walk in lots but not the big ones.

Q-9: If you do think that large events should not be allowed, what are the main reasons?

Other (Explain):

23. All of the above need to be addressed.
24. Rampant Drug Use + DUI.
25. Not paying for services rendered such as fire / police
26. Litter / Pollution
27. Large crowds destroy natural habitat and fauna. There are stadiums, fairgrounds and some private agencies that can be used that are equipped to handle such things.
28. This survey is a waste of my time and $$. Do your job!!
29. Damage / wear and tear irretrievably
30. So loud inside my own house = no sleep!
31. Dogs running at large. Children (under ten) with no parents present.
32. Curfew on time for amplified music
33. Designate / Build a Large Event park for specific usage out in the country. Advertise it!
34. Using taxpayers resource to fund private industry is wrong.
35. Expense to the County.

Q-16: Do you have concerns about criminal activity associated with large events? Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about criminal activity at large events.

Other (Explain):

36. Breath test before entry / no alcohol or drugs allowed.
37. Enforce the law. Zero tolerance.
38. A fine from event.
39. Easy access for emergency vehicles.
40. Reduction of environmental impacts.
41. Security watching parked cars for break ins, people being raped or beaten, etc.!
42. Canine patrol
43. No drugs, weapons + only alcohol sold at events.
44. Pre-event notice to the public of restrictions (pets, alcohol, drugs, stupidity)
45. Event holder pays extra cost for deputies and ranger not taxpayers
46. Drug sniffing dogs. Adult events should only allow events in
47. All above at events expense
48. Choose events that do not attract those who use alcohol or drugs. It seems that alcohol + drug use are the root of most “criminal activity”
49. No camping
50. Additional law enforcement tasked to surrounding area immediately before / during / after events to control periphery.
51. Event security staff
52. Audit county employees for bribe taking from large outside vendors.
53. No ‘hidden’ areas where criminal activity can take place. Well-lit areas w/ security presence, even in parking areas.
54. Limit alcohol and drugs.
55. Someone there to watch.

1. Entry check.
Q-19: Do you have concerns about the environmental impacts of large events on Lane County’s parks?

Other (Explain):

56. Pay for any damage and percentage of what they make from event go directly to park above and beyond paying for employees and etc....
57. Recycling areas – like Eugene marathon work great.
58. Recycling available for all events.
59. 10PM – thru – 5AM. Noise Pollution.
60. Leave no trace policies as strong as found at Burning Man.
61. Using events as opportunity to teach about *arrow pointing to all 4 checked boxes*
62. Legal means to enforce these standards.
63. Recycling available.
64. Provide recycling and compost
65. Huge concern to me although I realize its an unpopular view. I appreciate your considering it.
66. Use of alt energy sources
67. Adequate restroom facilities NEED to be provided to protect the environment.
68. As parking will damage grass, irrigation systems, etc.
69. Sound levels, fire prevention, neighborhood impact all relate to this category too – environmental impacts outside the park must be included in event studies.
70. Parking restrictions
71. I believe in leaving or returning things in better than when you got them.
72. All of the above

Q-20: Do you have concerns about the impact of large events on other visitors to Lane County’s parks? Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on other park users.

Other (Explain):

73. Working with other homeowners as neighbors?
74. Have surveys available to visitors to improve each time.
75. Shuttles
76. Handicap accessible
77. LTD services
78. Identify large events at campgrounds during reservation process.
79. I wouldn’t go to a park if a large event were occurring.
80. Protect specialized parking that is critical for other visitors to access the park during events, such as handicap and horse trailer parking areas. Also, limit the frequency of events.
81. Plenty of notice, like weeks or months ahead.
82. Access to boat ramps must remain open within reasonable time.
83. As long as its cleaned up after the event.
84. Continue to allow access to the public.

Q-21: Do you have concerns about the impact of large events on neighbors near Lane County’s parks? Yes, but the following mitigation measures would reduce my concerns about impacts on park neighbors.

Other (Explain):
85. Listen to neighbors concerns and improve for next time.
86. Acceptable volumes should be found prior to events so that they don’t interfere with others.
87. Use of illegal drugs not cleaned up (hidden)
88. Law enforcement to be paid be event, not taxpayers
89. I don’t know – I haven’t dealt with it. I’d ask the neighbors.
90. Checking for banned alcohol and drugs...
91. Terminally ill folks in their own homes should NOT have to listen to distasteful loud music.
92. Mailbox flyers for local residents describing upcoming event(s)
93. Communication before events (size, duration, plans, parks dept. liaisons, etc.); neighborhood traffic can be slower than usual but not backed up; trash and event signage should be removed after; local businesses must be able to operate as usual, meaning that their customers and employees and suppliers can access businesses; sobriety checks.
94. I like festivals but don’t want to anger neighbors.
95. Addressing measures raised in Q-18.
96. There will always be someone that will be upset no matter what is done.

Q-31: Do you have other thoughts or comments about Lane County Parks or activities held in Lane County Parks?
97. It is important to me to preserve riding trails available especially at Mt. Pisgah
98. Yes! More events bring in more revenue for Lane County! Let them in! Community events are a part of life... people will find anything to complain about but Lane County could use the revenue and people will get over the noise that comes with it, for a few days out of 365 a year. But the revenue generated will go so far for businesses etc....
99. I support using our larger parks that can hold permitted events. The revenue generated would help with operation and maintenance for years to come.
100. Parks are essential to my life.
101. Great job
102. I don’t mind having events, but want to be sure the impact is minimal to both the neighbors and parks!
103. Our parks would benefit from revenue producing events!
104. I believe we should first of all maintain our parks or close them but allow them to be reasonably used as long as negative impact on the residents and the general public. We should not put additional drain on our law enforcement and public safety agencies. Use common sense.
105. After Country Fair in Veneta have traffic help when campers are leaving. Traffic is horrible Monday and parents are trying to pick up children from multiple schools near there.

106. In general, the priority should be the protection of the natural environment of the park.

107. Parks are an important part of city’s having open space and natural settings. Events help citizens connect with one another and their city environment. Developing positive safe opportunities for these events to continue is important.

108. More concerts at Day Island Park.

109. Parks and Recreation are a vital part of our community and need to be used and maintained or they will not benefit the people who “own” them – we all “own” these public places and should be able to use and enjoy them even though a “few” people “complain” and are unhappy with the events – why punish the majority when only a few are against – people live by the parks then want them to only be enjoyed by them on their terms and now allow the “public” who truly owns them to use and enjoy them – This is not how America is supposed to be – The “Elite” – Against the “Common”

110. We don’t know where the parks are located or how to get there; We need “senior parking” (not handicapped); We need adequate restrooms that are clean; We need to feel safe; We are fearful of being knocked over by running children whose parents are inattentive; we need places to sit down without having to carry folding chairs with us.

111. Clean it up!

112. I believe event organizers should make a monetary deposit to get to use the park. If it is left in original condition that would be returned if not the money would be used as needed for clean up.

113. I think events like the Mushroom Festival and Faerie World were fine for Mt. Pisgah but the over amplified 2 day music fest was way too over the top for that area.

114. I have not attended any events at Lane County Parks, if I knew more abut them I would probably attend. So far, I have zero complaints.

115. I think if it brings in more income for the county to support and improve the parks its ok with us.

116. There should be more variety in music choices when hosting at parks. It would be awesome to have more country concerts. More interactive events and less art shows would be nice.

117. Love the ones I’ve been to! With this free pass, we will make a point to check out more parks too! Thanks

118. Mostly Good.

119. To me, more attention to existing parks is more Important than buying land for future use or more hiking trails in South Eugene.

120. I think is it important to keep our parks as natural as possible for future generations to enjoy recreation and natural beauty.

121. I think activities should be held at parks. The parks are there to be used.

122. Not at this time.

123. Large events should employ off-site parking and shuttle buses, much as the Oregon Country Fair does.

124. No. I am appreciative of the work done and commitment to keeping the parks clean. Safe and community focused.

125. I do not have an issue with events at Lane County Parks. The event should be allowed if there will be no major impact to the neighbors, the park, and visitors. Reasonable
measures should be taken regarding fire safety, criminal activity, and the park environment. Events that encourage nudity drug use, drinking and violence should not be allowed.

126. I visit the parks behind VRC on a very regular basis. In my opinion the lack of bathrooms and obvious suspicious activity is more of a problem than large events. Is it possible to give the money earned from large events to the homeowners nearby and rent spaces in the park to vendors? Then someone would be always present watching that same group of park users who need watching while earning the revenue needed by renting their cart space? The extra money being given to homeowners for large events would also make them more tolerable.

127. We appreciate having these parks available for public use. We have always had good experiences when we have visited Lane County Parks and we would like to thank you for taking such good care of them and giving us an opportunity to voice our opinion about them.

128. I greatly value being able to take my dogs to Armitage Park approx. 6 days/week. I’m impressed with the new RV Park and how the park is maintained. Last year there were various flowers planted on logs, etc. that was very nice. I feel safe there and it is great to be able to have affordable events there (such as weddings) in a nice setting. Thank you for all you do! I will definitely use the pass!

129. I don’t feel if one group fails that those actions should affect the next guy. I feel that maybe more meetings with concrete proof of parking crews, security crews, weekend schedules of all activities, and maps of how they plan to set up and use the land would help alleviate any issues that could occur. Also deposits on the land if damage and/or trash is left then assess fines out of these deposits.

130. Part of the enjoyment in having parks is the opportunity to attend appropriate activities. All activities including citizen picnics must include “Leave it like you found it.” Parks improve the quality of life and property values.

131. When the conduct large events, they do a good job on dealing with security. At large events they should have more volunteering to help conduct the large events. The only other thing is to protect the environment and the plant life better when large or small events are not going on.

132. Thank you for helping keep parks open, safe and enjoyable for all!

133. Living in a house or owning property near a park is your choice. If you don’t like the impact of the parks don’t live there. It’s not fair for the rest of the community to suffer because a few people don’t like it. Thanks.

134. We need more entertainment around Lane County would go to more if the price per ticket was a little bit cheaper.

135. Parks are for everyone to enjoy. If you live near one accept the responsibility that you moved near the park.

136. I think it is wrong that Armatage Park has become an RV Campground and has signs competing with Premier RV in Coburg – The signs are right next to Premier RV; I also think it is wrong that you close access to parks if you cant fund. Just lock the bathrooms, but still allow access. It is after all, public land! Sometimes the county thinks it’s their land, but it is everyone’s land.

137. We have enjoyed the Parks for camping + boating + parties for the 14 years we have lived here in Oregon. Thank you the concerts are great keep them coming back. Families can enjoy them. There 17 in our family that lives here and we go to the parks a lot.

138. More Doggy doo doo stations with bags and trash cans.
139. Consider Lane County Residents (Tax Payers!) getting a reduced or no charge pass to the parks.
140. We are blessed to live in a community which allows us access to community parks. We need to keep these parks safe and accessible for families and communities to come together.
141. Try to avoid having a PETA convention at Perkins during waterfowl season.
142. Last years’ outcomes of large events proved what a bad idea!! It was to allow large events in County Parks, hoping the error will not be repeated.
143. Parks need to be well cared for so they can be used and appreciated for day use and events.
144. Lane County Parks are in general very accommodating and maintained very satisfactorily.
145. I think Lane Co. is the only Co. that charges for parking and day use parks. I don’t like it.
146. I live a block away or less from Orchard Point Park, I am surprised how little activity there is considering the size of the park. I know protecting wildlife in this area is important. However if you can limit large events and create revenue the ground could be better maintained. Thank you for including me on this survey.
147. If you only gross 3% of annual operating budget from these events -> what is the point? And what are the honest net returns to the park system after added expenses?
148. I would like to hear more of events offered as I haven’t heard of many of these opportunities. Environmental education is very important to our household. Thank you.
149. I value our community’s public park spaces and hope our parks are maintained and expanded. I think large public events help more people value these parks, as well. Therefore, as long as they are held responsibly and respectfully (of neighbors and habitat) public events can be a net good for our parks and public support for their continued funding and preservation.
150. No.
151. Parks and opens spaces are vital to a health community.
152. Less concerned with large events than with accessibility / welcoming nature of Lane County Parks – the expense to enter and the expense to rent shelters is enough to keep me away. If the funds raised go toward reducing / eliminating fees or making park admission worth (nicer trans, more “natural” nature areas, ...) the cost, then rent away folks!
153. I like having parks available, so if we need to allow events access to pay the way, and ease our tax burden, then that’s ok with me. I trust the park management to set limits on usage so that the parks are there for everyone.
154. The events should have to prepay all agencies for usage. So there are no bills owing when they leave – such as fire / ambulance / police. These events drain these agencies.
155. No
156. Metal detecting and the use of metal detectors for recreational use should be ALLOWED! It is a great hobby! Check out www.cdclc.org Please tell Mike Russell to respond to the Email I sent him about this! 
157. Geez now I know about the other parks I haven’t been to in Lane County and I look forward to visiting them!
158. I have not attended large events but I appreciate the parks.
159. More appropriate guidelines and stick to them NO waivers.
160. Personal loud music needs to be monitored for other peoples enjoyment of the park. I love the parks!
161. Tired of potheads at these events.
162. A little better (thorough) cleaning and grooming of the grounds. Just my opinion. May not be shared with others.
163. Love the access to so many awesome parks and we’d love to hear more music. People will volunteer to help out maintenance and such if you let them... but in the meantime – keep up the good work!
164. I welcome outdoor events as a healthy way to build a sense of community and enjoy the outdoors. Thank you for all you do! (and keep the bathrooms open!)
165. If revenue from the events brings only $100k, surely the mitigating measures and cleanup / management would use that up? Impact on the parks by these events is not worth it, no matter the revenue – you can’t reverse damage done with $$$ why would you in the first place?
166. Nope
167. I believe that Lane County Parks and recreation team should have full and final say in any regards to its parks and camping grounds.
168. The need to be well-organized – only service dogs allowed – in other words leave your pets at home. No drugs or weapons – if it is seen being used – enforce the law. Handicap parking up front and lots of it.
169. Yes, I just wanted to say some people are ridiculous to move close to a park or airport and then complain about the sound. If they don’t want to hear it then they shouldn’t move there. My tax dollars pay for parks, etc. and I shouldn’t have to worry if my kids playing or a band playing is going to offend someone.
170. Our parks should be used by small groups and individuals. Events should be held at stadiums or other facilities. Keep our parks for what they were intended to be used and enjoyed for.
171. I feel events help the whole community. Parks are a great place to hold community events. If an event is NOT open to the public – then it should not be held at a park.
172. None – Thank you for providing great parks.
173. Keep up the good work! Thank you!
174. I think if people are paying to use our parks it is generating revenue, which is a good thing.
175. I bought Lane County permits, National Forest permits, and Coastal Passports. The Coastal Passports are the only one I get my monies worth. It’s the only one useful to me due to its wide use.
176. Allowing these events would greatly increase Revenue for Lane County Parks and allow maintenance of parks.
177. The main problems come with overnight multiday events (i.e. OVERNIGHT)
178. As a social scientist who has taught research methodology at UO, I am *unreadable* of the qualifications of the constructors of this survey.
179. Seniors should get a discount on park fees. To expensive for us to just go for the day and have a picnic.
180. I think having events that were too noisy, too late hurt the parks reputation. But this should be able to be mitigated.
181. Provisions for portable sanitation units.

182. I feel that belonging to a community requires some unavoidable inconveniences. Festivals, concerts, events, etc. are all to benefit and enrich our community. Yes it can temporarily cause delays, frustrations, and problems. However as a community member, we should be willing to sacrifice “comfort” for such events to happen. However, these events need to be heavily maintained and managed to minimize problems. I trust Lane County Parks employees can handle such problems and I am thankful that you are reaching out for opinions.

183. The parks are there to be utilized; I just do not want to see taxpayers pay the bill; require security deposits; implement a 1 strike + your out policy; be relatively restrictive on what can be held like no kkk or black panther rallies. Try to keep them respectable; if money can be made do it. As long as it goes back into the park, not [redacted] away on something else or a feel good project; make it mean something that is a benefit.

184. When we have used the parks and taken out of state visitors. We have always enjoyed being able to use them just hope this continues.

185. I do not support large singe and multiday musical events, such as Fairieworlds, being held at Mt. Pisgah. There is too much impact on a natural area and too much trouble for the neighbors. Mt. Pisgah is much more suited for events such as the wildflower festival, mushroom festival and native plant sale.

186. No

187. None

188. I would say, that events should still be allowed, but to a degree, not too much excessiveness and yelling or extra noises that are not needed, that truly does disturb residences nearby and other visitors in the same park location.

189. In the past, I have enjoyed events at Monteith Park in Albany, a beautiful setting for such events and also the 4th of July celebration at Day Island Park. If large events can be managed to limit the impact on the neighbors to the park, and park users who are not attending the event, it would be great revenue source for the county. Frequency of events would be a key so that the parks are available to the public and access not negatively impacted. I think single day events would prevent some issues.

190. Just thank you for what you do allow; Parks are a place of peace; I quit going some because of the fee parking issue. I filled out this form and I am also sending in my filled out form for a free pass. A nice way to see if the fee with worth buying in the future. Thank you for sending the free pass to use for a year. I will enjoy receiving and using it.

191. Town hall meetings and follow-up surveys before and after events (implementing new reqs or rules) I know initially there is a cost for printing and postage, but the information gathered would be priceless. Town hall meetings include affected areas better than just a survey. Enforcing any regulation (existing or not) would satisfy citizens and making events more welcome.

192. If you require a parking pass at a site, there should be a way to purchase a day pass at the park! Hendrick's Bridge for sure! Also making 2 passes available for the price of 1. (even just an additional launch site pass?) We use the river frequently which requires 2 vehicles which means our family has to shell out $80 a year *gasp*

193. We love Parks! (the URL in this survey is inaccessible. (parksmap.pdf) we had to go to the parent directory and search for something similar. A piece of paper isn’t clickable.)

194. Appreciate all you do to make our parks clean and beautiful! Thank you for all your work!

195. Allow car shows
196. I would like to see a ordinance that would fine individuals who trash or don’t pick up their own garbage. (diapers, drink containers, paper products, etc.) I would also like to see a Lane County Park Information booth or grounds person hired during events.

197. I’m an active runner, and have participated in many Eugene runs. Maurie Jacobs Park is getting much better with homeless population and garbage, but recently ran Amazon Creek/Fern Ridge Trail, and it was rally dirty with trash and homeless people laying along path. I’m not sure what department that is. Alton Baker can be sketchy also. I wish our running areas were more safe so people can enjoy Track Town more. Otherwise, our parks are beautiful!

198. Love the parks! Keep allowing disc golf events, please. They are some of our favorite activities.

199. Not Lane County, But THOUSANDS of people wish we had more parks and parking at South Jelly Florence etc. – Bad Situation there.

200. I believe parks are an important part of the livability of Lane County. I wish we also had designated green space. Thank you for the Park Pass.

201. Overgrown bushes and grass, trails are difficult to navigate sometimes w/ fallen shrubbery.

202. Large events make more people happy than the few that complain about them.

203. I hope more events take place locally. A thriving, active community is well worth the occasional inconvenience!

204. I think Lane County Parks are, in general, better managed and maintained than parks in many areas, especially urban parks with heavy usage. Thank You! The only negative I think of are college kid activities, litter and vandalism. They’d be undesirable anywhere, not just Lane County.

205. Maintain existing parks more efficiently and regularly. Some parks seem neglected while others are “overly” maintained.

206. At Richardson, near Marina, the trailer parking only areas is confusing especially the lot at the Far West of the lake. If a boat and a trailer is parked at the curb and a boat parks in behind them, then no backing out.

207. Several articles in Register Guard and on the evening news during large multi-day music events caused me to answer the questions in favor of the neighbors and the environment. Thank you for gathering public opinion! Appreciate it!

208. Multi-day music festivals at Mt. Pisgah are fun. Try it some time.

209. The decision to allow an organization to continue using the parks should be made according to how well they followed through with the requirements for use of the park. Notification of the event should be posted at the park at least two weeks prior.

210. Togetherness makes the people grow stronger.

211. Set out rules for large events and hold people accountable to obey rules.

212. Lane County Parks need to be used!!! Large events might bring in revenue to offset operating costs. They also have the potential to bring in revenue for improvements.

213. Would be nice to have more free day use parks

214. Activities (held at Lane County Parks) are a great way to bring people together with in the community and bring in additional revenue.
215. The Bruce Hornsby/railroad Earth show was sublime. Thank you. Shame on One Eleven – Kaleidoscope Festival was ridiculously loud. We should not have lost Fairy World Festival – they will probably never return. Life is boring, Bring on the music PLEASE!!

216. Our main concern is that trash is picked up. Should be cleaned by those in charge of event. Ranger – to ok clean up before event managers leave.??

217. We have so little protected space and just everyday use takes its toll. Our populace is growing and saturation during these “events” can damage our areas beyond repair. Some/most of the attendees to some of these concert type events could care less about where the event is held, let alone take care during their visit.

218. Love taking my son to the park and events! You are doing a great job!! – 

219. Thank you for taking care of our parks.

220. I have always loved visiting all these parks! I’ve always had a great experience every time I have went! Thank you for choosing me! Glad I was able to give my feedback! Keep up the great work and Thank you for all you do!

221. Always enjoy taking out-of-town visitors to our beautiful parks!

222. It seems that the people who live near the parks dictate way too much what happens in them. They are for everyone... just because of proximity doesn’t dictate “grand central”

223. 0

224. Good luck with your data collection! ; Parks need funding just like any other department. I think you should use them to have events as long as they are respectful and do not trash the place.

225. Hope that drugs, alcohol and marijuana will be prohibited from the county park system

226. There needs to be more restrooms available.

227. I’ve grown up never paying to go into parks what you charge is more than I’m willing to pay for the most part.

228. I believe the parks should be used and enjoyed as much as possible.

229. Always concerned about how much taxpayers will have to fork out particularly when it comes to clean up and damage done to the parks.

230. I think that allowing large events a all of the Lane County Parks would be a great way to gain income and thus expand the system in the long run. As with many new idea there will be challenge and resistance, but I believe over time, and with proper attention by the Park service, everyone will be able to live with (tolerate) and reap the benefits of expansion.

231. Our parks are the perfect place to hold large events. Please do all you can to make our community a better place by hosting these events in our parks.

232. No

233. Allowing large events will introduce more Lane County residents to the parks they already pay for, lets use the parks!

234. I am fairly new to the area but love Eugene already.

235. Thank you for allowing me to give input. To me parks are pastoral and should be used for picnicking, hiking, and otherwise enjoying nature. However, I do see the benefit financially for the parks, in allowing larger venues. Perhaps sometimes in the future land could be purchased with these larger venues in mind. For now, using the parks causing the least amount of impact possible on wildlife and humans, may be the best idea. This was a thoughtfully put together questionnaire and I feel you covered all the issues well.
236. Bring back the Dirty Dash please!
237. Consider transferring or selling of smaller parks located farther away from communities.
238. N/A
239. Parks are meant to be used by every member of the community, including special events. We need more outdoor events in Lane County.
240. I’m very happy that you are seeking information from ordinary citizens like me. I have lived in Eugene only one year, so that might make me not typical. So far I think Eugene’s parks are excellent.
241. We frequent Richardson Park in the summer sometimes 2 to 3 times / week. We would love to see some portapotties the bathrooms are very far away from the water. More trash cans closer to the water. Better signage if there is an Algae Bloom or not. Last year we just were not sure if we were safe or if our animals were safe.
242. I don’t frequent the parks, so it’s a bit difficult for me to make decisions about the large events.
243. The last event at Mt. Pisgah was horrible on our entire neighborhood. We are miles away and it was rumbling our houses. Blocks and blocks of the neighborhood were out all of us quite mad and calling the police and were told to call another number where we couldn’t even leave messages. The music and light shows were very disturbing and I can’t imagine what it was doing to the wildlife. Completely do not stand how this was EVER ALLOWED! I have never been so upset at an event that was occurring!
244. It’s difficult to distinguish between of a low-key, day event like mushroom fest, and a loud late night rock concert. Parks w/ delicate habitat should be exempt from large gatherings ~ left to be enjoyed in pristine condition. Perhaps large groups could be steered first toward the fairgrounds. Maybe we need a little park there.
245. My main concern is keeping neighborhoods quiet and safe.
246. I believe that the parks are there for the use of the public since it is funded by taxpayers and I see no harm in allowing events to occur there with certain rules and regulations. Understand that there are people who ruin this option by littering, drinking and noise but if it’s just a one-day event it should be affordable to keep under observation.
247. I am very concerned about the 4th of July fireworks that occur at Alton Baker Park. The fireworks have a significant impact on the park wildlife – particularly the ducks that make their home at Alton Baker Park in the summers. I would like to see the fireworks moved to a location that would disturb the ducks less. I would also like to see more security ensuring that people attending the 4th of July event do not disturb the ducks w/ personal fireworks and trash.
248. I strongly believe large events are important to the community. With the beautiful outdoors in this area Lane County Parks are perfect venues for these to happen.
249. Please maintain boat ramps and restrooms so they are useable, available, and clean. Access to the lakes and rivers through parks is great but they all need to be open and available for use.
250. I think we have these parks, let’s use them and take care of them!
251. Allow more activities at the parks to encourage more use.
252. Charging park fees is like taxing salad. Hells Bells.
253. Frequency of events is a concern. Limit number of times per year. And consider each site and the impacts on the environment + wildlife + neighbors separately. Please don’t apply a one-size-fits-all solution. Thank you for doing this! I think it’s important.
254. Lane County has some densely packed areas of population and these urban residents need a nearby “escape” into the “natural” the natural integrity of parks is very important for the physical, psychological + spiritual health of residents. Many urban residents cannot afford to go “far away” (time +/- or $$) for natural experiences. The proximity of natural experiences, and the quality of these experiences is very important to a “sane” quality of life.

255. Nope.

256. I would like a map of Lane County Parks on-line in PDF format. And maybe a list that I can check-off as I visit them, with the map.

257. More dog parks! I have a especially energetic dog and he needs room to run and play on his own.

258. Keep up the good work!

259. N/A

260. Revenue needs to be generated some how and events allow people to enjoy our natural resources first hand that may not otherwise have a chance to get outdoors, or to a new place. *Thank you very much for the free pass! We will now have the opportunity to enjoy more of our parks this year + not let fees stand in our way.

261. Many of the parks I have heard little about. Maybe a mailing could be sent out about the parks and what they have to offer.

262. The park @ Alton Baker for kids is in very poor shape – dirty + unkempt. I have only been w/ my 6 yr. old. 2x in the last yeah – each time we leave because of the disrepair. Very disappointing for a new park. Also, the lack of signage and fast traffic make the park at Best Lane a scary situation. Someone will be hurt by a vehicle if something is not done!

263. I love Lane County Parks, especially Mt. Pisgah. Wish there were more equestrian areas though.

264. I think it is a great idea to generate extra revenue and provide opportunities for county residents to experience the events if they choose.

265. No.

266. I am mainly supportive of the idea as long as events are handled responsibly with minimal noise, environmental impacts, and frequency is not too great.

267. I think that allowing appropriate events in Lane County Parks will bring more money in and provide some fun and exciting new things for families to do who live here, as long as the most needed security measures are met while allowing these events.

268. Designated clean up crews to clean up all trash and restore the park in same condition or better than when they arrived. Volunteer! In their contract.

269. Have fun, enjoy, and be safe!!!

270. No I don’t

271. Allow events such as the Dirty Dash. THESE one day events bring people to the area – don’t allow one really bad apple such as kaleidoscope to ruin events @ Mt. Pisgah

272. N/A

273. Lane County Parks have had many events which have been professionally run + diverse enough to allow e very one something to enjoy. Most event goers have been respectful of the environment and follow rules. Don’t let a few ruin it for the majority. Of course safety comes first, and I believe the county has their concerns addressed. Lane County has beautiful parks that are well maintained according to those I know including relatives
that frequent these parks. Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this important issue.

274. No.
275. I generally ride my bike to Pisgah to enjoy a hike once in a while.
276. Please don’t stop the concerts at the parks, because music is good for the soul. Plus it can make you feel good on a bad day. Thank you.
277. Love the trails + hiking!
278. Thanks.
279. Thank you for keeping up the Lane County Parks. We really enjoy them when we visit.
280. I really appreciate the parks and the facilities we have in Lane County.
281. Keep up the great work
282. I work in emergency services within Lane County. If events are managed correctly with an emphasis on mitigating impact on park neighbors and traffic issues I believe large events could benefit the County and local businesses. The current management of one of the largest events in our state the Oregon Country Fair proves this. OCF is a model other event organizers should look closely at. You will never please everyone but we as public servants should do our best to please the majority. Good Luck.
283. Wish that I didn’t have to pay to hike Mt. Pisgah. Or at least the machine didn’t eat my money. (have has to pay twice the two times I went this year!) Thank you for the free pass
284. None
285. People should not be kept awake by park noise at any hour. Reporting it to police doesn’t help when they have a permit for the music. Many terminally ill folks chose to die at home, they should be able to sleep at any hour in their own home! They don’t have the option of going somewhere to get away from the noise. This is also a problem for parents of young children that can’t sleep due to noise.
286. Weigh the cost of repair vs. what may be gained.
287. The parks are a resource, I like to see them being used. If allowing large events that are carefully managed, then I see that as drawing more people in to the parks.
288. We are so uptight about rules in this county, Have a little fun today. PS I didn’t get a postage paid return envelope.
289. More concerts
290. Parks are the perfect place to have large events I trust the parks staff to manage these events appropriately
291. Yes. Please mitigate the noise around Buford park neighbors, but allow events, especially Fairieworlds, to continue. Thank you!
292. Consider use of volunteers to assist with maintenance, cleaning + fee collection to keep parks open year around. Community meetings, by park location could determine volunteer resources available to assist with large events. We’re glad to see a proactive effort to increase revenues for LC parks. Thanks!
293. I want more events in Lane County.
294. I think events of this kind are a great idea and an excellent use of our park spaces.
295. Orchard Point children’s play area had a lot of weeds and the play structures had hornet nests in the pipes – etc. shallow water area was dirty; main concern was the amount of dog poop all over the park – yuck – at one time I saw people who lived across the road –
trailer park – walk dogs over and didn’t clean up after them. 4th of July public fireworks left a lot of trash after they left the park.

296. This survey pretty much covers all my thoughts. –

297. My son from out of town attended the Kaleidoscope Festival at Buford Park. I am aware that the noise level was extreme! + neighbors had a right to complain as well as disturbance of wildlife in that area. We could hear it out in our area of 38th street in Springfield + it sounded like a party was next door to us! As long as restrictions + cautions are in place I think having festivals + events in our parks is good + brings in revenue. My son also said he was aware that the type of music “bass” was loud but was astonished to hear of the extreme level the music reached out in into our community.

298. Overall our Parks are very special! Really enjoyed by out of state visitors.

299. I would really appreciate having restrooms are all parks – even neighborhood parks. I understand they’re expensive, but they are much needed – especially for people with bladder control issues – to enjoy the parks.

300. Our family really our county parks. We used them a lot when our kids were at home + we are beginning to use them more now that we’re retired. Thanks to all the staff that keep our parks “up + running.”

301. Any event should get 1 chance. If they treat the park with respect + obey the rules, they get invited back. If they do not, there needs to be a clause allowing them to be refused (with clause only + with proof) for the following year, this allows access for everyone, but blocks those who have proven themselves destructive to be banned. Ones like SCA might even get discounts for brush clearing, etc. (agreed on beforehand) if they take extra good care of things. Thank you for all our parks!

302. I think the parks should be kept up better. The lawns are terrible, need mowed and watered.

303. Kaleidoscope Music Festival – is that what’s caused the concern? That was a one-time learning experience. Making appropriate adjustments would be beneficial and should not stop events all together. Events generate income, participation, attendance, and exposure to the parks. They are a good thing. They are good for people and the community. It’s better than people sitting around on their cell phones.

304. Waive fees for off-season.

305. I like walking distance from one of the parks and for the most part I am happy with how it is ran and kept up

306. Thank you for having parks.

307. Loud, late crowded musical events should be held on private lands, or actual venues, IE. *unreadable*, MNA, and such. I don’t believe that promoters or musicians should benefit from public lands even if all repairs, and I’m sure there are many are fixed or paid for in which I doubt they are if you were to ask a park maintenance employee!

308. Watch Parks for break in, in cars. Set cameras up!

309. Sorry I just don’t have any opinion whatsoever on large events. Ironically I didn’t use the parks too much because I hate having to pay to park in them

310. I personally think that most events are ok – except I think the drug and alcohol issues – should be enforced faithfully. We all like to visit the parks as long as our safety isn’t challenged or compromised. Also the noise levels + times should always be considered – in any event.

311. 1. Not big on crowds; 2. Not big on being disturbed by loud, noisy events; 3. Don’t think I should be forced to leave the peaceful atmosphere of my home so a few others can let
off steam. I.e.: illegal fireworks; 4. I don’t have the right to tell others what they have to tolerate in order to live peacefully, which goes vice versa. Any Q’s

312. You’re handling park events wonderfully! Have a great year!
313. Thanks for the survey! Keep them clean and safe, please.
314. N/A
315. We have great parks. Thanks!
316. Nope.
317. None
318. Big event will help fund all park(s) maintenance
319. There should be places with designated off leash hiking for dog owners
320. Keep up the good work! Appreciate survey effort.
321. I think you should use the “Country Fair (3 day event) as an example of how things run smoothly and how all walks of life needs are met. Traffic, parking, buses, all are run with permission. Portapotties are cleaned and changed (refilled with supplies) on an hourly basis, buses run to and from. It’s a great example for a starting spot for your questionnaire. Thank you for your time and thanks for letting me share my input. P.S. more dog parks would be a great asset to the community.
322. I think that events in parks will increase visibility and usage of parks, and, as long as it is well managed, would be a positive thing for the park system.
323. I think it is a great idea.
324. Party on! But clean up after you party!
325. We think the Mt. Pisgah Arboretum’s festivals are good examples of appropriate, well planned events. When in doubt, large events at all county parks should err on the side of single day, educational / music events such as these; Events should be consistent, with the Parks Department’s mission, not just money making schemes; Events should relate to the site where they are held, and this may differ depending on the park. For example, some parks (HBRA) have remarkable environmental value and would be good for educational, low impact events. Other parks may be more resilient for high impact events; Events must produce profit not just income. Financial plans and budgets should be closely detailed and closely examined; No county park should expand campground areas; there must be a system / process to penalize event hosts who do not comply with restrictions and mitigation measures; The county parks department must adhere to all policies and mitigation measures. They should not grant special privileges for any events.
326. Thank you for your service, and your interest in our concerns for our communities and parks.
327. None
328. Let’s do it!
329. It would be nice if there were play structures at more of the parks and covered ones would be nice. Also would be nice if there were more RV dump stations open to the public.
330. Based on news I heard about criminal activity, drug and alcohol abuse, and environmental impact that large events such as multi day music festivals and botanical festivals, had on parks grounds and neighbors I believe these activities should no be allowed or sponsored by lane county on parks grounds.
331. Yes, we have rented parks for birthday parties in Eugene, and when we wanted to set up we had issues with the homeless that were living at parks, would NOT leave in time for us
to clean up the cig butts, cans, garbage etc. they have on the tables and around shelters – when they finally move off – they hang around waiting for our party to be over, so they can move back in. we always have to sweep, scrub + pick up trash – that is a problem, at many parks – sad + hard when wanting to use the parks for Family fun.

332. This is a benefit to residents and a resource for Lane County. Some of the negatives are part of choosing to live next to publicly owned property. A single individual’s upset / inconvenience is not sufficient to negate the financial benefit. As long as notice is given to neighbors, it’s their choice to stay during events.

333. N/A

334. Bringing in events adds to our community’s enjoyment. More things for families to do, more money for our parks. So long as parks are left as they are found, (i.e. In the same or better condition) the idea of more events is fantastic! Great idea Lane County!

335. I look forward to exploring them. Thank You!

336. The park employees be friendly more.

337. Fun fun fun! Glad we have so many vibrant community events!

338. N/A

339. Thanks for the pass, we will use it. We will fill out more surveys!

340. Please review some of my comments near the questions you’ve asked! Have a great day (survey 576)

341. Nothing.

342. N/A

343. You should change your policy for passes for veterans and allow all veterans passes or follow the same protocol as the State Parks and Federal Parks.

344. Q-6: I’ve been to Hendricks Park, but it was only twice and 2-3 yrs. ago. There wasn’t a choice to mark for that so I chose “Once a year”; Q-4: We had a pass last year, but it expired. Never had time to use it; Q-24 + Q-20: If there are campers already camping at a park such as Richardson, they would be disturbed by a large event they weren’t aware of being planned there at the same time. There would have to be special circumstances to allow large events.

345. It would be great to add revenue and to be more of a “destination” my concerns are 1) noise levels, 2) amount of time per day noise levels would be allowed, 3) traffic. Thank you for asking.

346. Keep up the great job you do with our park system

347. I wish there were more open. I live in Creswell all our parks around here are closed. I don’t think that is right. I go to Oakridge a lot most parks there are closed to. It’s not right.

348. My family loves Armitage Park!

349. I am concerned about environmental impacts to our treasured park spaces primarily. I love the Dirty Dash, but it is too damaging in many ways to be allowed at Mt. Pisgah. Thanks.

350. Main concern is to be considerate of others – follow the rules provided.

351. Rental of some facilities are way over priced for the type of use and structures. Armitage comes to mind.
352. No comments
353. I wish we had more music fests here. (like Gathering of the Vibes or High Sierra) I know it annoys lots of neighbors but just as many need something like this (I have no proof. Just a hopeful assumption)
354. I would like to see large events advertised in rural areas.
355. Enact a curfew on noise after 12-1am. We all love music, but not at 3am and so loud that pictures are rattling on my walls.
356. Allowing large events would raise funds o improve our parks without going after tax funds. Good move!
357. Great
358. We are fairly new to the area and are very grateful for the outdoor recreational offerings in the area. However, in researching the names of many of the parks listed in this survey I found your website in general and your specific park listings somewhat confusing. Additionally, the facilities at parks I have visited (Orchard Point for example) appear run down and not very well maintained. If hosting the different events mentioned in this survey helps bring in revenue to better inform the public about the parks in Lane Co., as well as better maintain the parks, I’m all for it, as long as it is handled responsibly.
359. Use the parks for lots of stuff. Homeowners in areas need tolerance!
360. Mainly I think having parks but not allowing events is a waste of resources and taxpayer money. However, there must be a balance so that we do not destroy their natural beauty or make it so individuals cannot have access on a regular basis.
361. Should use large events to help with financial cost of maintaining and improving parks without raising taxes.
362. Our household includes seasonal (summer) residence of our son and his family who normally live abroad.
363. No I don’t. Thank you
364. Weddings + Family reunions should be allowed also.
365. The activities I attended were well planned and ran smoothly. I think events should be allowed, as they show off beautiful Lane County and bring revenue.
366. N/A
367. Lane County Parks are outstanding; Try to avoid overdevelopment – the cost of upkeep will cripple the budget; Book events that show profit; Park rangers should also be laborers this results in better compliance among park users; petty tickets = property damage and resource destruction.
368. Keep them open!
369. I believe if you allow events at the park and charge fees within reason, you would have more money to maintain the parks and be able to educate more people about responsibility and conserving our natural resources.
370. We support well mgd large events. We have attended the mushroom fest multiple times + support scouting. We support mitigation measures such as limiting area of impacted ground. Loud music events are a concern + limiting noise + traffic should be done for the sake of neighbors, visitors + wildlife. We enjoy + regularly use Westlake boat Ramp. We request consideration for allowing a vehicle or a vehicle + trailer (w/ pass) to park overnight but no camping. “Sitting Duck” seems to be very expensive but we don’t see it used. Consider pulling it to save $, but please maintain Westlake ramp + restroom. Thank you for Lane County Parks.
371. I do not like any events that are adult based – like the county fair, or dangerous, like boating events.

372. Events bring people out to parks, which are in pretty good shape. I see no problem in hosting activities for all to enjoy and appreciate what Lane County has done for its citizens. I say have events even if there are those that complain because they are the people that will complain about anything. Have events for the people in the parks that people are paying for.

373. Thank you for asking for my input + keep up the good work!

374. My only concern at parks has been the level of homeless loitering allowed. I will NOT hang out at parks where I fear being accosted by drunk, loud, begging groups of bums. This has happened at Alton Baker and Hendricks. I encourage allowing large group activities that people pay for. Not people who sleep on benches and scare off families and taxpaying citizens.

375. N/A

376. I’m pretty sure I shouldn’t be taxed for Lane County parks since they gave away all of the parks in my local area. Large events belong at the Land Count Fairgrounds, Alton Baker Park, NOT at parks. Parks are for boating, fishing, picnicking and camping. A dog park is for dog events. A horse park is for horses. A bicycle park for bikes. A parking lot for car shows. You get my point.

377. Went on a biking all the way to Springfield along River Trail to End Trail and found Bathroom really Bad.

378. I have not been to Lane Co. Parks in several years, but did visit them often when my children were young. Now that they have families, they use the parks all over Lane Co. regularly. The events held at the larger parks should all/mostly be family oriented. Thank you for sending out the survey.

379. Sorry this is late. I love the parks so this is important to me and the events are a nice break from a crazy workweek.

380. N/A

381. No

382. No.

383. I believe we have the right people in place in the county that would make decisions that are best for all involved depending on the event. One size does not fit all – so each event may have restrictions that another event it would not be feasible.

384. I lived for many years near FernRidge Reservoir and enjoyed he many parks in that area. I remember Zumwalt being open to campers during the Country Fair. I thought this was a great idea to bring in extra revenue to a unused park.

385. Since I have lived in LC my ENTIRE life, I feel access to parks (when events are NOT going on) should be free. I pay taxes to live here and should not have to pay additional fees to visit places in my area. Fern ridge, for example, is a short distance from my house... I visit it less because of the ‘pass’ fee. If more events fees were collected then it may balance out NOT charging a ‘pass’ fee. Encourage more events in the parks. Perhaps it would encourage more visitors to the parks in general. It would create more opportunities for other types of vendors. If visitation to the parks is up then vendors (like food kiosks, bike rentals, photo booths) would flourish even when large events weren’t going on. LC could, of course, charge those vendors a fee to conduct their business at the park, thus creating more revenue for LCP.

386. Keep up the good work!
387. I believe the user need to be charged enough to cover all expenses + security + law enforcement.

388. No

389. Lane County Parks are an important part of this area, and one of the key reasons I moved here. Any efforts that are made to protect they beauty and keep it safe for future visitors has my support!

390. Lane County has wonderful, clean parks. I’ve been here in Lane County for 8+ yrs. And it is wonderful to see, and be able to have all access to all Lane County Parks.

391. Thank you for this survey. I am truly excited to visit the new parks. I wish I knew of them sooner. Holding the events brings in the $ we need to support our park staff and parks. I support it fully. I love how Lane County hosts large events. Communication on traffic, noise etc. must be public so people can prepare. Also, make sure the public knows they bring in revenue for the parks and their community. I trust the park staff, fire department, police to work together to assure safety first. I do NOT support events that encourage marijuana. Good luck and Happy Large Event Planning to support our parks for future generations!

392. Just should be allowed as long as things are acceptable.

393. Children should be supervised; Bicyclists should share the road + slow down when approaching pets; Dogs off leash in designated areas; Large events are fine if people are considerate – how do you assure residents of good behavior.

394. More equine parks would be great – Love – Elija Bristow –

395. None

396. Thank you.
Appendix G
Parks Advisory Committee/Stakeholder Event Review and Oversight Group

Goal
To encourage stakeholder involvement and provide transparency in the review of large events proposed to be held in Lane County Parks.

Charge
Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) draws on stakeholders to form the PAC/Stakeholder Event Review and Oversight Group. The PAC/Stakeholder Group reviews event applications, applies criteria developed by the Large Events Task Force and approved by the Board of County Commissioner (BCC) in order to recommend to BCC the approval or denial of all large events (those with 1,000 or more total participants) and selected smaller high-impact events proposed to occur in Lane County Parks.

Process
Step 1: Lane County Parks Manager & staff consider applications
The LCP manager and staff consider applications and decide to move an event application forward to Step 2, or provide feedback to the event organizer for improvement of the application, or deny the application and remove it from further consideration. The manager and staff also exercise judgement to determine which smaller events should be reviewed by the PAC/Stakeholder Group. In making such a determination about smaller events, the LCP manager and staff are guided by the appropriateness of the event and its potential impact based on the criteria developed by LETF and approved by the BCC.

Step 2: PAC/Stakeholder Group considers applications
The PAC distributes applications along with master plans and any other relevant documents and schedules a meeting of the PAC/Stakeholder Group to consider applications and apply an assessment tool. Meetings are expected to occur at most 2-3 times each year and are scheduled well in advance to encourage participation. All relevant stakeholder groups are made aware of scheduled meetings and are provided an opportunity to comment. Members of the PAC/Stakeholder Group vote and discuss as equals, whether part of PAC or the stakeholder community. Decisions are reached via majority vote of a 2/3 quorum of combined PAC and stakeholder group. The PAC/Stakeholder Group’s recommendations are forwarded to BCC for approval.

First year considerations
In the first year, the PAC/Stakeholder Group and LCP develop an assessment tool based on criteria developed by LETF and approved by the BCC. The assessment tool may need to be assessed and refined over time as experience is gained. In this first year, PAC makes a particular effort to include members of the Large Events Task Force since those individuals have useful background and experience.

Chair & Membership
PAC reviews applications from individuals interested in serving on the PAC/Stakeholder Group and recommends stakeholder appointments to BCC for approval. Stakeholders serve staggered two-year terms and may be reappointed. It is intended that this process be modeled after that used to recommend and appoint PAC members-at-large. When considering a park not already represented on the PAC/Stakeholder Group, two neighbors and up to two non-profits are invited to join as voting members for the consideration of that one park. For example, if Zumwalt is under consideration but nobody from
that area is on the PAC/Stakeholder Group, then two neighbors from the Zumwalt area are invited to join in discussion and voting concerning events at Zumwalt.

The Chair of the PAC also chairs the PAC/Stakeholder Group.

Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Advisory Committee (full membership)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Event expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Environmental impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. At-large parks pass holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neighborhood impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-profit organizations or volunteer stewardship groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>