

BEND COMMUNITY SURVEY:  
FALL, 1999

By

Deborah A. Howe, AICP

And

William A. Rabiega

The Center for Urban Studies  
School of Urban Studies and Planning  
Portland State University  
Portland, Oregon

March 9, 2000

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Bend enters the new millennium following an unprecedented decade of development. Population was estimated at 47,635 in May of 1999. The city more than doubled its area with its 1998 annexations. Many public and private projects were built during the past decade, and many are in planning stages or under construction at this time. Given this history, it is prudent for city government to determine how well Bend's citizens feel public services are performing, how they feel about communication with their government, and what their concerns are about Bend's future course.

This document reports a community survey commissioned to the Center for Urban Studies in fall of 1999. It includes demographic profiles and analysis of public assessment of municipal services (including some Parks Bureau services), communication between the government and citizens, and concerns about the future. It compares citizen reactions on these issues according to demographic groupings, particularly older and newly annexed areas of the city.

## ABOUT THE SURVEY

The Bend Community Survey is a mail survey of registered voters in Bend. The Center for Urban Studies has conducted it with the most rigorous scientific protocols. The questionnaire was developed after field interviews with elected officials, city staff, and representatives of community organizations. It was pretested using a small group of city workers as subjects and subsequently revised. The survey and introductory letter were successfully mailed to 3146 voters from the Deschutes County registration lists starting October 1, 1999. A follow-up reminder postcard went out in the last week of October. In all, 988 citizens responded, 31.4 % of the contacts.

Registered voters were selected as the sampling frame for a number of reasons. First, because of the 1998 annexations, none of the standard mailing address frames, for example the Polk listings, were current to the 1999 boundaries of Bend. Second, many of the alternative listings, including Oregon driver licenses, utility subscribers, and the reverse telephone directory, were seriously biased, incomplete, or had privacy restrictions that rendered them inappropriate for this survey. Third, since it was the desire of the City of Bend to replicate this survey at regular intervals, registration lists are virtually the only frame that will be constituted on the same criteria and current for those future surveys. Fourth and most important, voters have a compelling interest in the conduct of government, hence are the most appropriate group to survey on this subject. There are approximately 29,000 registered voters in Bend. The respondents were systematically selected, with random entry, from the master list.

The survey was self-administered by subjects in their homes. The questionnaire was four pages long and took about twenty to thirty minutes to complete. It had four major sections, in order: City Services in Bend; Communication; Bend's Future; and Demographics. The demographics section was used to check for unusually high or low response rates from specific demographic groups in Bend (self-selection bias) and to see if some groups differed as to their satisfaction with services, communication, and/or futures.

Confidence in the veracity of the data yielded from this community survey should be extremely high. The number of responses allow an excellent inherent error of three percent, better than the usual standard of five percent. The 31.4 percent return rate is remarkably high for a survey of this type.

### BEND'S CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The first mission of this report is to profile the residents of Bend at the year 2000. The previous U.S. Census of Population was done in 1990; clearly many changes have occurred since then. Detailed statistics from the 2000 Census for localities like Bend may not be available until 2004. The information reported below does not attempt to replicate the full range of variables gathered by the 2000 Census. Rather the survey sought to collect only some information that is gathered by the Census and other data that is of immediate analytical use in conjunction with the service, communications, and futures assessments. When perusing this section remember that the sampling frame used here was registered voters. Some variables, particularly age breakdowns, will reflect the known tendency for less complete registration in younger age strata.

Over three-quarters of those responding to the survey, 78.3 percent, reported themselves to be married. The remaining 21.7 percent were single. The average household size was 2.56 persons, with 1.95 adults and 0.61 children (a total of 595 children in the respondents' households). The great majority of households, 66.5 percent, reported no children. The most common voting household in Bend has two married adults and no children. This should have a bearing in subsequent service assessments and future concerns.

Table 1 reports the number and percent of respondents by age. Those in the prime working years, ages 35 to 54, constitute nearly half. Seniors, using the traditional definition of those 65 years of age and older, account for 19.7 percent of voters.

---

Table 1: Respondent Ages

<u>Age</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
18 to 34	141	14.3
35 to 54	462	46.8
55 to 64	174	17.6
65 to 74	131	13.3
75 or older	63	6.4
no response	17	1.7
Total	988	100.0

---

Table 2 estimates the distribution of ages assuming that each respondent's household has 1.95 adults combined with the 595 children they reported. Only 15.2 percent of Bend's population are 65 years of age or older by this estimate. This is a typical contemporary profile. Bend's population is preponderantly working age adults.

---

Table 2: Population Distribution Including Reported Children

<u>Ages</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-17	23.9
18-64	60.9
65 and up	15.2
Total	100.0

---

The level of education of the respondents, as reflected in Table 3, is quite high. The percentage of college degrees and advanced university education (45.9) is particularly notable.

---

Table 3: Education Level of Respondents

<u>Highest level of education</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Some High School	11	1.1
High School Graduate	119	12.0
Some College	311	31.5
Associate of Arts Degree	84	8.5
Bachelor's Degree	182	18.4
Some Graduate Work	93	9.4
Master's Degree	110	11.1

Table 3: Education Level of Respondents (continued)

<u>Highest Level of Education</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Beyond a Master's Degree	69	7.0
no response	9	.9
Total	988	100.0

The array of incomes, as portrayed by the categories in the survey, is surprisingly symmetrical (see Table 4). The middle income category, \$35,001 to \$75,000, is most frequent, and the lower and higher categories are about equal. The more common demographic profile is that low income is reported more, sometimes substantially more, frequently than high income.

Table 4: Incomes of Respondents

<u>Income Class</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Under \$35,000	240	24.3
\$35,001 to \$75,000	488	49.4
Over \$75,000	212	21.5
No response	48	4.9
Total	988	100.0

On average respondents have lived in Bend 15.0 years, some with less than a year and others with over 70 years of residency. Table 5 reflects their place of residence by quadrant. The Southwest section is clearly the least densely populated and the other three sections are roughly equal in their proportion of Bend's population.

The proportion of respondents in areas that were part of Bend prior to 1998 and areas that were annexed that year and later is reported in Table 6. Twenty-nine percent report themselves to reside in the newly annexed areas. Respondents from within the city limits prior to 1998, hereafter referred to as "Old" Bend, constitute 58.6 percent of the sample. Ninety-five people did not know if they were in the "Old" or newly annexed

areas of the city. Likely these are relative newcomers who did not participate in the annexation elections, thus would not know where they live relative to the old and new boundaries for the city. For later analysis in this report, only those who declared themselves in the “Old” or newly annexed areas will be used.

---

Table 5: Respondents’ Place of Residence by Quadrant of Bend

<u>Quadrant</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Northwest	311	31.5
Southwest	125	12.7
Northeast	283	28.6
Southeast	255	25.8
no response	14	1.4
Total	988	100.0

---



---

Table 6: Residence in “Old” Bend and Newly Annexed Areas

<u>Area of Residence</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
“Old” Bend	579	58.6
Newly Annexed Areas	287	29.0
Don’t Know	95	9.6
no response	27	2.7
Total	988	100.0

---

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICES

Citizens were asked to assess 28 types of services, 24 offered by the City of Bend and 4 by the Park and Recreation District, on a scale of 1 (very poorly provided) to 7 (very well provided). Table 7 ranks the services by the average (mean) assessment of those responding, and reports the percentages of responses for scores of 1 to 7. A mean assessment of 4.00 implies that the level of service is adequate, viewed neither well nor poorly. As the mean moves below 4.00, some level of dissatisfaction is being reflected. Above 4.00, implies the service is more than adequate. In this type of assessment, a mean rating of over 4.50 implies the service is quite favorably regarded.

The most positive ratings were given to fire response, emergency medical response, fire prevention, police response, crime prevention, street cleaning, landscaping and street trees, sewage lines and treatment, water service, and various parks programs and facilities. While not in this highest grouping, parking signs and markings, parking enforcement, sanding and snow removal, and social services are highly rated. The service areas least well regarded include: enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances; storm drainage; street repairs and surfaces; building permits and other development assistance; and downtown parking. Sidewalks and building inspection are also held in lower regard. Even these services, with mean assessments between 3.42 and 3.94, have most respondents rating them at the “4” level, that for adequate service.

In general, the assessment pattern emerges as quite favorable. Bend is doing exceedingly well with fire services, parks, and water, and well with police services, sewage lines and treatment, landscaping, and street cleaning. Infrastructure and development as it pertains to neighborhoods is least well regarded. The services in this cluster include: street repair and surfaces; sidewalks; storm drainage; downtown parking; building permits and other assistance; building inspection; and enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances.

---

Table 7: Citizen Assessments of Community Services

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percent for:</u>							<u>Replies</u>
			Low <u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	High <u>7</u>	
1.	Fire response	5.74	0.4	1.7	1.1	8.4	21.8	41.8	24.9	522
2.	Emergency medical response	5.68	0.9	2.0	1.8	7.8	21.9	41.7	23.9	552
3.	Recreation programs	5.65	0.2	0.8	3.8	10.7	22.5	37.4	24.6	879
4.	Parks maintenance	5.63	0.2	2.0	3.1	8.9	22.3	40.5	22.8	939

Table 7: Citizen Assessments of Services (continued)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percent for:</u>							<u>Replies</u>
			Low <u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	High <u>7</u>	
5.	Organized sports fields and facilities	5.43	1.3	2.4	4.5	12.0	24.2	35.3	20.3	842
6.	Outdoor parks, trails and open space	5.41	2.3	3.2	4.9	11.2	19.9	36.2	22.3	931
7.	Fire prevention programs	5.26	0.3	1.3	5.2	18.4	28.7	32.1	13.9	613
8.	Water service	5.24	1.9	2.1	5.8	15.7	24.8	34.1	15.6	829
9.	Timeliness of police response	4.97	2.1	5.1	7.4	15.7	28.4	30.1	11.1	605
10.	Street cleaning	4.91	2.1	3.9	9.1	19.8	26.6	28.3	10.3	955
11.	Sewage lines & treatment	4.90	3.9	4.6	8.0	16.0	27.2	29.5	10.8	637
12.	Landscaping & street trees	4.83	3.2	4.9	7.8	20.0	28.4	25.4	10.3	947
13.	Crime prevention & safety awareness	4.80	1.8	3.1	8.9	23.2	33.7	21.4	8.0	734
14.	Sanding and snow removal	4.75	3.9	5.7	10.3	18.6	24.6	27.1	9.7	925
15.	Parking enforcement	4.70	3.3	5.0	8.2	25.0	27.1	22.9	8.5	717
16.	Parking signs & markings	4.53	2.7	5.3	10.6	28.5	28.1	20.1	4.8	941
17.	Social services, e.g., emergency shelter & food	4.50	3.3	6.4	13.1	24.9	26.1	19.9	6.6	513
18.	Street lighting	4.31	4.9	7.4	14.1	25.9	25.2	17.2	5.3	930
19.	Traffic enforcement	4.24	7.0	8.4	12.6	24.0	26.1	16.7	5.1	842
20.	Bikelanes and facilities	4.22	8.5	9.8	14.7	19.8	19.5	20.9	6.8	916
21.	Traffic control	4.00	6.6	12.3	14.1	26.4	25.2	12.0	3.4	941

Table 7: Citizen Assessments of Services (continued)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percent for:</u>							<u>Replies</u>
			Low <u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	High <u>7</u>	
22.	Building inspection	3.94	6.8	13.8	14.2	29.3	19.1	12.3	4.5	471
23.	Sidewalks	3.78	7.4	14.2	19.5	26.4	19.1	11.7	1.7	935
24.	Downtown parking	3.59	13.4	14.4	18.3	23.0	18.9	9.3	2.8	958
25.	Building permits and other development assistance	3.54	12.3	16.3	20.3	22.7	16.5	8.9	3.0	528
26.	Street repair and surfaces	3.52	8.2	17.9	21.5	27.2	17.9	6.2	1.1	965
27.	Storm drainage	3.45	11.7	17.5	21.8	24.4	14.5	8.6	1.6	836
28.	Enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances	3.42	17.5	17.2	17.7	19.1	13.8	10.4	4.2	644

NOTE: Where there are less than 900 replies, many respondents replied, “Don’t Know.”

---

### SERVICE PRIORITIES, ADD-INS, AND CUTS

Citizens were next asked to note which of the services listed in the first question should receive priority in the council’s considerations. The frequency with which services were mentioned is reported in Table 8. They were also asked their first, second, and third choices for additional funding from revenue increases and their first, second, and third choices for cuts if revenues fall short. Most of the responses to the questions on add-ins and cuts drew from services listed in the first survey question, although respondents also offered their own ideas. The frequencies of preferences for add-ins and cuts are also reported in Table 8.

The two services with the highest priority scores are street repair and surfaces (251 mentions) and traffic control (215 mentions). Other services linked to transportation include traffic enforcement (151), downtown parking (116), sanding and snow removal (112), bikelanes and facilities (90), street lighting (78), storm drainage (71), sidewalks (68), public transportation (suggested by respondents, with 31 mentions), and road construction (another response-based suggestion, at a frequency of 21). Public

transportation also received 119 mentions as an add-in program. Taken as a group these transportation and traffic issues emerge with a substantially greater priority than any

---

Table 8: Frequencies for Priority, Add-ins, and Cuts to Services

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Priority</u> # times mentioned	<u>Adds</u>			<u>Cuts</u>		
			<u>1<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup></u>	<u>3<sup>rd</sup></u>	<u>1<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup></u>	<u>3<sup>rd</sup></u>
1.	Street repair and surfaces	251	94	66	60	1	8	3
2.	Traffic control	215	52	69	44	5	5	4
3.	Timeliness of police response	181	18	16	13	13	4	0
4.	Fire response	164	5	14	8	4	1	0
5.	Traffic enforcement	151	36	32	21	14	13	5
6.	Crime prevention and safety awareness	139	33	34	40	7	22	18
6.	Outdoor parks, trails and open space	139	67	48	44	41	29	23
7.	Enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances	132	16	16	28	16	7	10
8.	Emergency medical response	130	6	14	8	1	1	0
9.	Downtown parking	116	22	31	24	25	27	31
10.	Sanding and snow removal	112	16	26	27	7	6	5
11.	Social Services, e.g., emergency shelter & food	93	43	41	32	22	11	16
12.	Bikelanes and facilities	90	23	44	27	39	41	40
13.	Street lighting	78	35	32	18	21	18	18

Table 8: Frequencies for Priority, Add-ins, and Cuts to Services

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Priority</u> # times mentioned	<u>Adds</u>			<u>Cuts</u>		
			<u>1<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup></u>	<u>3<sup>rd</sup></u>	<u>1<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup></u>	<u>3<sup>rd</sup></u>
14.	Storm drainage	71	11	19	29	3	3	1
15.	Sidewalks	68	24	17	27	17	23	19
16.	Sewage lines & treatment	54	25	10	12	2	2	2
17.	Water service	49	4	5	7	2	3	1
18.	Building permits and other development assistance	40	4	6	4	25	19	16
19.	Public transportation	31	119	32	22	2	2	1
20.	Fire prevention programs	30	4	5	7	9	10	9
20.	Parks maintenance	30	8	13	14	7	7	20
21.	Landscaping & street trees	25	10	12	11	75	57	40
22.	Recreation programs	24	16	11	17	67	40	44
22.	Growth management	24		---			---	
23.	Organized sports fields and facilities	23	22	14	13	53	63	50
24.	Road construction	21	9	11	8		---	
25.	Street cleaning	18	4	5	6	29	35	13
26.	Open space preservation	16	9	3	8		---	
27.	Parking signs & markings	14	3	2	1	15	27	18
28.	Parking enforcement	13	2	3	2	92	68	58
29.	Education	12	13	6	5		---	
30.	Building inspection	6	1	2	1	9	8	11

Table 8: Frequencies for Priority, Add-ins, and Cuts to Services

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Priority</u> # times mentioned	<u>Adds</u>			<u>Cuts</u>		
			<u>1<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup></u>	<u>3<sup>rd</sup></u>	<u>1<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup></u>	<u>3<sup>rd</sup></u>
31.	Other single mentions	62						
	Not mentioned as priority:							
	Community service programs	-	12	23	9	---		
	Economic development	-	4	4	0	3	2	0
	Arts programs, free cultural events	-	5	2	2	3	0	2
	Animal control	-	3	1	0	---		
	Tax refund programs	-	5	3	2	---		
	City government	-		---		12	8	7
	Salaries of elected officials	-		---		6	2	2
	Salaries of city employees	-		---		4	3	2

other constellation of services. These services show very frequent mention for additional funding, and with the exception of bikelanes and facilities, relatively sparse attention for cuts in a period of revenue shortfall.

The service of police response (181) heads the second priority constellation of services- public safety. Included in it are timeliness of fire response (164), crime prevention and safety awareness (139), emergency medical response (130), and fire prevention programs (30). Of these services, only crime prevention and safety awareness draws notable attention for additional funds; none of these programs seem targets for funding cuts in a shortfall.

Third in the hierarchy of priorities is a constellation of services/programs that can be tied to “quality of life” concerns. These include outdoor parks, trails, and open space (139); enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances (132); social services (93); and the citizen-generated categories of growth management (24) and open space

preservation (16). Outdoor parks and social services both receive substantial mention for windfall revenue increases, as well as notable attention for cuts during shortfalls. New programs for the arts and community services are mentioned for funding with increased revenues and can also be considered in this constellation.

The funding cut preferences are interesting because some popular and successful programs, including bikelanes and facilities and outdoor parks, trails, and open space, show rather frequent mention for cuts in a short fall. Most other prominent cut candidates, landscaping and street trees, parking enforcement, organized sports fields and facilities, and recreation programs, have low priority scores as well as high cut visibility.

COMMUNICATION

Table 9 shows the ways by which citizens learn about the various activities of the Bend City Government. The media or other agents of communication are listed in rank ordering by frequency of mention. Clearly most read about government in *The Bulletin*. Local television, Z21, is ranked next. Word of mouth slightly exceeds local radio for dissemination of government news. Televised council meetings, *The Source*, and the Bend City Newsletter reach a good number of citizens. Other official media such as hearings, notices, and the city web page, are relied upon less often as an information source.

---

Table 9: Sources of Information About Bend City Government

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
1. <i>The Bulletin</i>	819
2. Local Z21 TV	681
3. Word of mouth	410
4. Radio	395
5. City Council meetings on TV	187
6. <i>The Source</i>	181
7. Bend City Newsletter	122
8. Hearings and Hearings Notices	84
9. Civic/Grassroots organization	79
10. Public meetings	59
11. Bend city web page	39
12. Public Schools	3
13. The Internet	3
14. Other Single Mentions	28

---

## ACCESSIBILITY AND PROFESSIONALISM

Accessibility and Fairness and Professionalism were assessed on 1 to 7 scales with 1 described as very inaccessible or unfair and 7 as very accessible or fair. A score of “4” can again be interpreted as adequate or average. There are three means below 4.00 in Table 10: accessibility of city employees, accessibility of the mayor and council, and fairness/professionalism of the elected officials, the mayor and city councilors. Even within these groups the highest frequency of responses are at the “4” level. The accessibility and fairness/professionalism of the elected officials, mayor and city councilors show a fairly high percentage of “1” and “2” ratings. Perhaps accessibility expectations of citizens are unrealistic and any “no” answer to their inquiries is regarded as unfair. City Manager/ Supervisors and Development Assistance have about

---

Table 10: Accessibility and Fairness/Professionalism of Bend Officials

### Accessibility

<u>Official Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percent for:</u>							<u>Responses</u>
		Inaccessible					Accessible		
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
City employees	3.97	5.7	14.3	16.8	27.2	16.9	14.4	4.7	596
Mayor and Council	3.91	9.6	16.5	13.2	24.3	15.6	12.6	8.4	334

### Fairness/Professionalism

<u>Official Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percent for:</u>							<u>Responses</u>
		Unfair Unprofessional					Fair Professional		
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
City Manager/Supervisor	4.10	9.6	11.8	12.4	24.8	16.1	16.9	8.4	491
Office/Support Staff	4.68	3.0	7.5	11.2	21.3	21.2	25.7	10.1	572
Development Assistance	4.22	6.8	11.7	13.7	22.7	18.3	18.5	8.3	410
Police	5.28	3.3	4.8	7.5	11.6	13.9	35.6	23.2	689
Fire Service	5.73	1.9	3.3	3.1	8.1	11.8	38.3	33.5	517
Elected Officials, Mayor, And City Councilors	3.76	13.5	14.0	13.0	25.2	15.2	14.7	4.5	40

---

20 percent of the low “1” and “2” assessments. Perhaps the “no” answer reaction is also at work in these numbers. All other official groups have fairness and professionalism ratings of 4.10 to a high of 5.73. Fire and police personnel received the highest ratings.

## BEND'S FUTURE

Citizens responded to several questions about Bend's future. The first concerned whether they thought a number of issues would be major or minor in the next twenty years. A score of "5" indicated a major issue, "1" being the most minor. They were further asked whether these issues needed to be planned for immediately (now), or on a 5- or 10-year horizon. The responses are ranked by the means ratings in Table 11; the number of people who rated each issue is also reported. The ranked issues were listed in question one on the survey form; respondents added the three issues at the end of the table; and the "other" category covers issues that were noted only once.

Issues that are perceived as major, those with mean ratings of 4.00 or more, include traffic congestion (4.76); protection of water, river, and open spaces (4.45); north/south traffic flow (4.24); improving east/west traffic flow (4.18); improving public safety and crime (4.15); family wage jobs (4.13) and completing the street system (4.10). In addition, nine respondents saw "master planning" as a major issue with a mean score of 5.00, 36 respondents noted the issue of "residential and commercial growth management" at 4.94, and eleven rated "education" at 4.75. Besides being assessed as major, the first seven ranked issues in Table 11 were also viewed by a majority of the respondents as needing urgent attention. The frequency of respondents, from a 900+ base, who called for plans to be in place now to deal with these issues ranged from 516 to 885. All three respondent-nominated issues were seen to need urgent attention.

Issues of moderate importance, those with mean ratings of 3.00 to 3.99, included water systems (3.70), sewer systems (3.70), hazard from wildland fires (3.69), air quality (3.66), community appearance (3.66), services to seniors (3.64), public transit (3.61), medical services (3.51), public recreation facilities, parks (3.48), housing for low income residents (3.47), sidewalks, trails, and bikelanes (3.46), views (3.45), preserving historic sites and districts (3.39), downtown vitality (3.25), and AMTRAK service (3.24). Urgency on these issues was somewhat less with frequencies of 301 to 537 respondents calling for plans now, and 228 to 425 calling for action within 5 years. Wildland fire hazard with 537 calls for action now and views with 478 are those regarded most urgent in this group of issues rated as being of moderate importance.

---

Table 11: Future Issues and Plan Horizons

<u>Ranked Issues</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Plan Horizon (frequencies)</u>		
			<u>Now</u>	<u>5 yrs.</u>	<u>10yrs.</u>
1. Traffic congestion	960	4.76	855	58	28

Table 11: Future Issues and Plan Horizons (continued)

<u>Ranked Issues</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Plan Horizon (frequencies)</u>		
			<u>Now</u>	<u>5 yrs.</u>	<u>10yrs.</u>
2. Protection of water, river, and open spaces	950	4.45	737	123	90
3. Improving north/south traffic flow	936	4.24	640	175	121
4. Improving east/west traffic flow	945	4.18	610	241	94
5. Public safety and crime	944	4.15	611	220	113
6. Family wage jobs	923	4.13	624	189	110
7. Completing street system	923	4.10	516	282	125
8. Water systems	990	3.70	321	425	163
8. Sewer systems	915	3.70	331	408	176
9. Hazard from wildland fires	937	3.69	537	228	172
10. Air quality	934	3.66	420	295	219
10. Community appearance	931	3.66	425	302	204
11. Services to seniors	929	3.64	396	359	174
12. Public transit	945	3.61	425	298	222
13. Medical services	936	3.51	361	324	251
14. Public recreation facilities, parks	934	3.48	310	364	260
15. Housing for low income residents	932	3.47	417	289	226
16. Sidewalks, trails, bikelanes	941	3.46	389	343	209

Table 11: Future Issues and Plan Horizons (continued)

<u>Ranked Issues</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Plan Horizon (frequencies)</u>		
			<u>Now</u>	<u>5 yrs.</u>	<u>10yrs.</u>
17. Views	910	3.45	478	196	236
18. Preserving historic site and districts	935	3.39	368	297	270
19. Downtown vitality	928	3.25	301	347	280
20. AMTRAK service	924	3.24	329	297	298
21. Availability of industrial sites	921	2.92	257	368	296
22. Size and height of signs	934	2.76	281	272	381
Open-ended Responses:					
Residential and commercial growth management	36	4.94	34	2	0
Master planning	9	5.00	9	0	0
Education	11	4.73	9	0	0
Other	94	---	--	--	--

### POPULATION, GROWTH, AND DENSITY

In general Bend citizens feel their town is already too large. By 2005 the mean “ideal” population was put at 44,143, below its current size. By 2010 the mean moved to 46,800, still less than now. By 2020 it finally moved above the current level to 51,514. Growth is expected, but most residents don’t want Bend to be more than a small city.

Bend residents are amenable to government intervening to affect population growth. Nearly a majority, 49.2 percent, register in favor of intervention, 33.8 percent are against, and 9.6 percent have no opinion (7.4 percent did not respond). They are also not fond of increasing density for Bend. In fact, 42.6 percent of the respondents feel that Bend is already too dense. A plurality, 49.1 percent, feel the current density is about

right, and only 5.6 percent feel it is too sparse. On a 2020 horizon, 28.1 percent want Bend’s density to be lower, 51.7 percent want it about the same, and 16.2 see it as being higher.

If there are density increases, 44.1 percent of the respondents would place it in the outer city, 6.8 percent in the older core of the city, 2.9 percent in the downtown, 2.1 percent in the downtown and older core, 0.8 percent in the downtown and outer city, 1.0 percent in the older core and outer city, and 0.9 percent in all areas. Those who feel no areas of the city should have more density comprise 37.0 percent of respondents. Clearly increased density is not popular among Bend voters.

### QUALITY OF LIFE IN BEND

Citizens seem pessimistic about a continuing high quality of life in Bend. Only 9.4 percent of respondents see the quality improving, 34.3 percent see it as holding steady, and 53.2 percent, a majority, see it as declining. The reasons for such pessimism are clear when reviewing Tables 12, Factors Enhancing Quality of Life, and 13, Fears for Bend’s Future. Clearly, the “environment, open space, and views” and “small town character” are threatened by continuing growth. Low population and low population density are also directly under pressure. Many of the attributes that are held to enhance quality of life in this listing cannot be offset by the increased urban amenities that come with larger and more diverse communities.

---

Table 12: Factors Enhancing Quality of Life in Bend

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>
Environment, open space, views	471
Outdoor activities	309
Climate	188
Small town character	149
People/community spirit	133
City Parks/Facilities	75
Downtown	69
Low population	49
Low crime rate	41

Table 12: Factors Enhancing Quality of Life in Bend (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>
Medical facilities	40
Cultural events	38
Local businesses	26
Clean Streets/sidewalks	18
Low density development	14
Traditional neighborhoods	12
Business opportunities	10
Historic preservation	8
Urban growth boundary	8
Evening entertainment	6
Diversity	3
Farmer's market	2

125 other attributes nominated by a single respondent

---

Most fears for the future are also tied to Bend's growth and increased urbanity. The first five ranked fears, from uncontrolled growth to continued strip development, and many of the lower ranked ones reflect an antipathy to a city environment and associated problems. There is also concern that neither planners nor the council will respond appropriately to growth. What would be deemed an appropriate response is somewhat unclear because, while most respondents fear growth and possible effects from it, some feel anti-growth sentiment in itself is potentially detrimental to Bend's future. Groups may have different anxieties, but all are anxious.

Table 13: Fears for Bend's Future

---

<u>Fear</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>
Uncontrolled growth	330
Increased traffic congestion	215
Expanding population	192
Increased crime	146
Continued strip commercial Development	79
Air, water, ground pollution	78
Inadequate planning	68
Increased residential density	62
Loss of living wage jobs	51
Loss of farmland/open space	46
People becoming less friendly	41
Growing influence of developers	38
Anti-growth sentiment	33
Loss of affordable housing	32
Deterioration of education system	29
City government action/inaction	28
Creation of resort town economy	24
Lack of economic development plan	21
Increased cost of living	18
Increased income disparity	18

Table 13: Fears for Bend's Future (continued)

<u>Fear</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>
No transit plan	16
Increased parking problems	11
Increased Regulation	6
Strained water supply	6

160 other attributes received only a single mention

### IMPORTANT FUTURE PROJECTS, GOOD DEVELOPMENTS

Six hundred seventy-one respondents suggested projects or programs that might positively influence Bend's future. These are reflected in Table 14. The three most frequently nominated programs all relate to transportation and growth. With three exceptions, a four-year university, youth programs, and improving and adding to parks, all the specific programs and projects relate to city planning. Citizens seem to be asking for a high profile planning effort involving visioning for a "master plan" and involving virtually all aspects of policy and implementation. The earlier assessments of service performance, priorities for services, emphases on future issues, and fears for the future reinforce this conclusion.

Table 14: Important Future Projects/Programs

<u>Project/program</u>	<u>Frequency Nominated</u>
Public transportation services	83
Better growth management plan	81
New road construction	76
Better transportation management plan	43
Economic development programs	31
Improve and add to parks	29
Better education system	25

Table 14: Important Future Projects/Programs (continued)

<u>Project/program</u>	<u>Frequency Nominated</u>
Better development review	20
Effective citizen outreach	20
Improve the planning department	19
Open space protection	19
Youth programs	16
Four year college	15
Better bicycle lanes and sidewalks	12
River protection/restoration	9
Revisit zoning code	8
Riverfront development	7
Higher development fees	5
Affordable housing programs	4
Mixed income housing programs	4
Drug prevention programs	4
Increased residential density	3
Energy efficient buildings	2

136 programs/projects received only a single nomination

---

Some guidance as to how citizens want Bend to look in the future can be found in recent projects and developments they see as models. Four hundred eighty-six returns from them noted such developments (see Table 15). The run-away favorite was the Old Mill District with 139 nominations. West Bend Village and Wiesteria were the most popular residential developments with 32 and 27 mentions, respectively. New roads showed a frequency of 22.

---

Table 15: Model Developments and Projects in Bend

<u>Development/Project</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Old Mill District	139
West Bend Village	32
New roads	31
Wiesteria	27
Westside developments	23
Downtown redevelopment	11
Smith Project	7
Brooks Resources	7
Miller Heights	6
Library	5
Projects in other towns	4
Old town revitalization	3
COCC	2
Tennant Westside development	2

181 developments or projects with a single mention

---

## ANALYSES BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPINGS

The times are changing in Bend. During such a period tensions are often assumed to arise between various demographically different interest groups. Do senior citizens assess services differently than other age groups? Do they have distinct views about Bend's future? Do they voice extraordinary support for programs linked to them, such as services for seniors? Do out-of-state migrants bring different notions about needed services and Bend's future than Oregonians? What about Bend's newly annexed areas? This section will test to see if such tensions are evident, and if they are evident, pinpoint where they lie. What will emerge is the preponderance of similar views, and that where divergence exists it seldom follows stereotypical notions.

### SENIORS

Seniors are defined here as respondents aged 55 or older. While this is somewhat younger than the ages often represented under this rubric, it is the youngest juncture for retirement in many pension systems. It can be sociologically significant in that children have usually formed their own households by this life stage. Those in the sample aged 18 to 54 will be described as in "younger/middle" years. About 35 percent of the responding residents are "seniors" under these definitions.

Their responses are compared to those of younger/middle years using a t-test. In this way the differences in the mean assessments are reported, and it is ascertained that those differences show a true divergence of opinion, not just variation inherent to the samples drawn for the analysis. Table 16 reports the mean service assessments of younger/middle year and senior respondents, t-values on the differences of those means, and the probability that the level of difference is random (attributable to sampling variability). If the probability of randomness is 0.10 (one chance in ten) or less, it will be concluded that the difference in means shows a true divergence. If the probability of randomness is greater than that, the difference will be attributed to sampling variation. The ratings are ranked according to the younger/middle year respondents' assessments. These can then be assessed with respect to how they differ from seniors' ratings of the same services.

---

Table 16: Younger/Middle Year and Senior Assessments of Community Services

<u>Rank</u> (for Y/M)	<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>T-value</u>	<u>Probability</u> <u>Random</u>
		<u>Y/M</u>	<u>Seniors</u>		
1.	Fire response	5.68	5.82	-1.464	.144
2.	Parks maintenance	5.65	5.60	0.597	.550

Table 16: Younger/Middle Year and Senior Assessments of Community Service  
(continued)

<u>Rank</u> (for Y/M)	<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>T-value</u>	<u>Probability</u>	
		<u>Y/M</u>	<u>Seniors</u>			<u>Random</u>
3.	Recreation programs	5.63	5.70	-0.809	.419	
4.	Emergency medical response	5.58	5.82	-2.324	.020	TRUE
5.	Organized sports fields and facilities	5.34	5.59	-2.706	.007	TRUE
6.	Outdoor parks, trails and open space	5.31	5.59	-2.934	.003	TRUE
7.	Fire prevention programs	5.28	5.22	0.592	.554	
8.	Water service	5.09	5.48	-4.099	.000	TRUE
9.	Street cleaning	4.94	4.82	1.284	.200	
10.	Timeliness of police response	4.93	5.06	-1.039	.299	
11.	Sewage lines & treatment	4.88	4.93	-0.387	.699	
12.	Landscaping & street trees	4.80	4.89	-0.914	.361	
12.	Parking enforcement	4.80	4.53	2.352	.019	TRUE
13.	Crime prevention & safety awareness	4.80	4.82	-0.206	.837	
14.	Sanding and Snow removal	4.78	4.67	1.094	.274	
15.	Parking signs & markings	4.53	4.53	0.004	.997	
16.	Social Services, e.g., emergency shelter and food	4.37	4.73	-2.824	.005	TRUE
16.	Street lighting	4.37	4.24	1.330	.184	

Table 16: Younger/Middle Year and Senior Assessments of Community Services  
(continued)

<u>Rank</u> (for Y/M)	<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>T-value</u>	<u>Probability</u>	
		<u>Y/M</u>	<u>Seniors</u>		<u>Random</u>	
17.	Traffic enforcement	4.33	4.12	1.885	.060	TRUE
18.	Bikelanes and facilities	4.04	4.53	-4.213	.000	TRUE
19.	Building inspection	3.99	3.89	0.641	.522	
20.	Traffic control	3.98	4.05	-0.723	.470	
21.	Sidewalks	3.80	3.73	0.699	.484	
22.	Building permits and other development assistance	3.64	3.37	1.823	.069	TRUE
23.	Downtown parking	3.59	3.58	0.050	.961	
24.	Street repair and surfaces	3.51	3.53	-0.161	.870	
25.	Enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances	3.49	3.33	1.133	.258	
26.	Storm drainage	3.47	3.40	0.649	.516	

Only 9 of the 28 assessments show a difference between younger/middles and seniors that is not random. The younger/middles assess building permits and other development assistance, parking enforcement, and traffic enforcement more highly than seniors. With building permits both groups rate the service relatively low; seniors exhibit an even lower assessment. While seniors' means for parking and traffic enforcement are above 4.00, the young/middles are more complimentary.

Seniors rate bike lanes and facilities, emergency medical response, social services, water service, outdoor parks, etc., and organized sport fields and facilities more favorably than younger/middles. All of these assessments are favorable; most are above 5.00. Perhaps retired seniors have even more positive experiences with these primarily recreational and senior-related services than younger/middles.

Seniors do have more divergence from those in younger/middle years concerning future issues. Of the 24 issues offered on the questionnaire, 11 significant (non-random) differences in mean importance ratings are evident. These are reported in Table 17.

---

Table 17: Statistically Significant Differences between Seniors and Younger/Middles on the Importance of Issues in the Future

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Y/M</u>	<u>Seniors</u>	<u>T-value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
Improving North/ South Traffic Flow	4.16	4.39	-3.289	.001
Improving East/West Traffic Flow	4.15	4.26	-1.647	.100
Public Safety and Crime	4.04	4.32	-4.483	.000
Air Quality	3.76	3.49	3.205	.001
Public Transit	3.68	3.51	1.734	.083
Size and Height of Signs	2.65	2.92	-2.861	.004
Sewer Systems Public Recreation	3.63	3.79	-2.277	.023
Facilities and Parks	3.63	3.22	5.223	.000
Sidewalks, Trails, Bike Lanes	3.61	3.22	4.638	.000
Preserving Historic Sites and Districts	3.46	3.31	1.810	.071
Availability of Industrial Sites	2.80	3.12	-3.935	.000

---

When the t-values take minus signs, seniors find issues potentially more important than younger/middles. Plus signs indicate that younger/middles attach greater importance to the issue. Table 17 shows that seniors find basic, traditional infrastructure issues, e.g. traffic, industrial land, public safety, to be more important. Younger/middle year respondents attach greater affect to environmental and amenity issues, e.g. air quality, parks, and historic preservation.

Only three of these eleven issues have mean scores of greater than 4.00, the level of moderate importance. These issues include improving east/west traffic flow, improving north/south traffic flow, and public safety and crime. Thus, most of the statistically significant differences are on issues that both seniors and those in younger/middle years rate as relatively lesser concern.

### OREGON AND OUT-OF-STATE ORIGINS

Much of the population growth in Bend derives from in-migration. It is natural to ask if different origins will lead to different assessments of services and visions of the future. Only statistically significant differences between groups will be reported in this section. “In-state” identifies respondents who have always been residents of Bend or moved to it from other Oregon localities. “Out-of-state” are respondents who moved to Bend directly from somewhere other than Oregon.

In-state and out-of-state respondents vary significantly in their assessments on only three of the 28 services listed on the questionnaire. Table 18 reports the figures on this divergence. There is no apparent theme to these differences. They are across relatively low to high assessment scores; with storm drainage and social services the mean in-state assessments are lower. On organized sports fields and facilities in-staters show a higher rating. Given that this demographic breakdown reveals no difference on 25 of 28 services, such difference as exists is likely to be arbitrary.

---

Table 18: Significant Differences in In-state and Out-of-state Mean Assessments of Services

<u>Service</u>	<u>In-state</u>	<u>Out-of-State</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
Organized Sports Fields and Facilities	5.51	5.33	1.947	.052
Social Services	4.37	4.60	-1.728	.085
Storm Drainage	3.29	3.53	-2.330	.020

---

### Origins and Futures

Somewhat more divergence is evident on issues for future concern; there are statistically significant differences in the mean importance attached to 7 of 24 items. Table 19 depicts these 7 issues. In all cases in-staters attach less importance to the seven issues than do out-of-staters. With the exception of protection of water, river, and open spaces, these are all amenity issues that show relatively lower importance ratings. Out-

of-staters while agreeing with the lower importance do not put them quite as low as in-staters.

---

Table 19: Significant Differences between In- and Out-of-Staters on the Importance of Future Issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>In-State</u>	<u>Out-of-State</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
Protection of Water, River, and Open Spaces	4.41	4.53	-1.93	.054
Community Appearance	3.59	3.78	-2.458	.014
Public Recreation Facilities and Parks	3.40	3.59	-2.436	.015
Sidewalks, Trails, and Bike Lanes	3.32	3.62	-3.601	.000
AMTRAK service	3.17	3.36	-2.031	.043
Downtown Vitality	3.10	3.39	-3.389	.001

---

### THE NEWLY ANNEXED AREAS

Approximately one third of Bend's citizens came into the city in an annexation in 1998. It is important to know if their views on services, future issues, and communications are similar to those residents within the previous boundaries (called the Old City for further reference within this section). Tables 20, 21, and 22 present statistically significant differences in assessment of services, importance of future issues, and communication, respectively.

#### Services

Respondents from the newly annexed areas vary from those in the old city when assessing 9 of the 28 services. There is a clear theme to these differences. Those in the newly annexed areas are less satisfied with all the services appearing in Table 20. While they rate street cleaning, timeliness of police response, sanding and snow removal, and water service quite highly, newly annexed areas assessments are not as high as the even more positive assessments of those in the Old City. The stark contrasts concern street lighting and sewage lines and treatment. Here Old City residents are quite satisfied and

those in newly annexed areas are clearly dissatisfied. Most homes in the annexed areas do not have city sewer service and the street lighting that came with them from county jurisdiction is not yet to city standards, nor can it be expected to be so for some time.

---

Table 20: Newly Annexed and Old City Differences in Assessments of Community Services

<u>Service</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>T-value</u>	<u>Probability Random</u>
	<u>Annexed</u>	<u>Old</u>		
Water service	5.07	5.31	-2.207	.028
Timeliness of police response	4.73	5.05	-2.434	.015
Street Cleaning	4.70	4.99	-2.812	.005
Sanding and Snow removal	4.61	4.69	-1.665	.096
Sewage lines & treatment	3.94	5.20	-9.562	.000
Street Lighting	3.92	4.49	-5.244	.000
Street repair and surfaces	3.33	3.55	-2.130	.033
Enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances	3.17	3.44	-1.762	.079
Storm drainage	3.04	3.55	-4.562	.000

---

### Futures

Table 21 reports the significant differences between Old City and newly annexed mean importance ratings for possible future issues. There are only 7 instances among twenty-four possible issues. All of these show mean ratings between 3.00 and 4.00, indicating they are of relatively lesser concern. In general the annexed areas are reflecting their residential location in their lower interest in issues like air quality, downtown vitality, and community appearance. They live in areas that are physically withdrawn from the incidence of these issues. Alternatively, they are more subject to a wildland fire hazard, hence would show greater concern for such fires.

---

Table 21: Significant Differences between Old City and Newly Annexed Area  
Respondents on Possible Future Issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Annexed</u>	<u>Old City</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Probability</u>
Hazard from Wildland Fires	3.77	3.60	1.824	.069
Community Appearance	3.55	3.72	-1.926	.054
Air Quality	3.54	3.71	-1.940	.053
Public Recreation Facilities, Parks	3.35	3.54	-2.255	.024
Sidewalks, Trails, Bike Lanes	3.24	3.61	-4.006	.000
Downtown Vitality	3.09	3.33	-2.674	.008

---

### Communication

Communication differences were analyzed in the same manner as the previous sections. Only three significant differences in mean ratings between the newly annexed areas and Old City are manifest. These are: 1) office/support staff fairness and professionalism; 2) development assistance fairness and professionalism; and 3) fire service fairness and professionalism. With regard to office/support staff and fire service, the difference is that those in the newly annexed rate the services favorably, but not so favorably as those from the Old City. Fire service, with a mean newly annexed area score of 5.52 for fairness and professionalism is, in fact, the highest assessment the newly annexed areas gave to anything. However, it is numerically lower than the even higher 5.80 registered by the Old City. The lower ratings regarding office staff and development assistance may reflect a general anxiety when dealing with new ordinances and a different staff.

---

Table 22: Accessibility and Fairness/Professionalism of Bend Officials: Significant Differences between Newly Annexed Areas and the Old City

<u>Official Group</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Annexed</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Probability</u> <u>Random</u>
Fire Service Fairness/Professionalism	5.52	5.80	-1.981	.048
Office/Support Staff Fairness/Professionalism	4.30	4.79	-3.346	.001
Development Assistance Fairness/Professionalism	3.95	4.31	-1.891	.059

---

## **Appendix A: Survey Materials**

# Bend Community Survey—1999

## CITY SERVICES IN BEND

1. Below is a list of services. Please indicate from your experience how well you think the city is doing in providing those services by circling the appropriate rating.

	<i>Very Well</i>		<<Rating Scale>>					<i>Very Poorly</i>		
1.1. Street lighting	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.2. Street cleaning	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.3. Street repair and surfaces	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.4. Sidewalks	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.5. Bikelanes and facilities	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.6. Landscaping and street trees	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.7. Sewage lines and treatment	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.8. Storm drainage	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.9. Building permits and other development assistance	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.10. Building inspection	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.11. Traffic control (signs, pavement markings, signals)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.12. Downtown parking	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.13. Parking signs and markings	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.14. Parking enforcement	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.15. Traffic enforcement	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.16. Enforcement of zoning, design, and nuisance ordinances	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.17. Timeliness of police response	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.18. Crime prevention programs and safety awareness	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.19. Sanding and snow removal	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.20. Emergency medical response	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.21. Fire response	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.22. Fire prevention programs	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.23. Social services, e.g. emergency shelter and food	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.24. Water service	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.25. Provision of outdoor parks, trails and open space*	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.26. Organized sports fields and facilities*	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.27. Recreation programs*	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
1.28. Parks maintenance*	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		<input type="checkbox"/> don't know	

\*service provided by Bend Metro Park and Recreation District

2. Which three services do you feel should receive the highest priority? Please list them below.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_

3. Assuming revenues to the city increase, what new services would you like to see added and/or which existing services would you like to receive additional funds? Please name three in your order of preference.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Assuming there are shortfalls in revenues, what services do you feel should receive funding cuts or should be eliminated? Please list three existing services in your order of preference.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_



1.22. Views	1	2	3	4	5	now	5yrs.	10yrs.
1.23. Family wage jobs	1	2	3	4	5	now	5yrs.	10yrs.
1.24. AMTRAK service	1	2	3	4	5	now	5yrs.	10yrs.
1.25. other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	now	5yrs.	10yrs.
1.26. other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	now	5yrs.	10yrs.

2. Bend's current population is estimated at 51,000. What population do you think would be ideal for Bend at:  
 2005: \_\_\_\_\_ 2010: \_\_\_\_\_ 2020: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Should Bend city government intervene to influence population growth?  Yes  No  No opinion

4. What about Bend enhances its quality of life?

---



---



---

5. Do you feel that the quality of life in Bend is:  Improving  Holding steady  Declining

6. Do you feel residential density in Bend is:  Too Sparse  About Right  Too Dense

7. By 2020 should the density in Bend be:  Lower  About the same  Higher

8. Check which, if any, areas of Bend you believe can handle increased residential density:

Downtown  Older core of city  Outer city  No areas

9. What is your greatest fear for Bend's future?

---



---



---

10. Is there a single public project or program that you feel would best insure a bright future for Bend?

---



---



---

11. There are a number of recent developments in Bend. Which one do you feel is the best model for future development?

---

## DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Are you currently:  married?  single?

2. How many adults are in your household? \_\_\_\_\_ How many children? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Your age (in years) is best described as:  18-34  35-54  55-64  65-74  75 or older

4. Check the category that best describes your level of education.

Some High School     High School Graduate     Some College     Associate of Arts Degree  
 Bachelor's Degree     Some Graduate School     Master's Degree     Beyond a Master's Degree

5. What is your occupation or job title (retired counts!)? \_\_\_\_\_

6. If you have not always resided in Bend, where did you live immediately before moving to Bend? Please note city or county and state.

---

7. How many years have you lived in Bend? \_\_\_\_\_ years.

8. Out of 10 trips to work how many are:

Alone in a car/truck? \_\_\_\_\_ In a carpool/rideshare? \_\_\_\_\_ By walking? \_\_\_\_\_

By bicycle? \_\_\_\_\_ By motorcycle? \_\_\_\_\_ By taxi? \_\_\_\_\_ By Dial-A-Ride? \_\_\_\_\_

With family/friends in a car/truck? \_\_\_\_\_

9. Out of 10 trips for other purposes, e.g. shopping, recreation, personal business, how many are:

Alone in a car/truck? \_\_\_\_\_ In a carpool/rideshare? \_\_\_\_\_ By walking? \_\_\_\_\_

By bicycle? \_\_\_\_\_ By motorcycle? \_\_\_\_\_ By taxi? \_\_\_\_\_ By Dial-A-Ride? \_\_\_\_\_

With family/friends in a car/truck? \_\_\_\_\_

10. In which quadrant of Bend do you reside?  Northwest  Southwest  Northeast  Southeast

11. Are you in an area that was annexed in 1998 or later?  Yes  No  Don't know

12. Please check the category that best describes your annual household income.

Under \$35,000  \$35,001-\$75,000  over \$75,000

Anything we haven't hit? Again, your comments are confidential.

---

---

---

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please return it at your earliest convenience using the postage paid envelope. If you have any questions, please call Deborah Howe at (503) 725-4016. This survey is being conducted by:

**The Center for Urban Studies**  
Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, Oregon 97207

## **Appendix B: Technical Notes**

There are numerous technical details behind any piece of survey research and/or statistical analysis. Three areas are amplified in this appendix: 1) sample integrity; 2) self-selection bias; and 3) selection of the confidence level in conjunction with the t-tests.

### SAMPLE INTEGRITY

The number of successful contacts reported in the body of this document is 3,146. This is the residual from an original mailing of 3,300. The sampling frame was the Deschutes County Elections Commissioner's listing of all registered voters in Bend. Though very current, 298 packets were returned because of moves, etc. from an original mailing to 3,300 potential subjects. Where the returns could be re-mailed to new Bend addresses they were. Ultimately, 154 persons in the original mailing had either moved away from Bend, left no forwarding addresses, or were otherwise unreachable. Thus the sample size is set at 3,146 for those potential subjects that actually had packets delivered.

### POSSIBLE SELF-SELECTION BIAS

The possibility of self-selection bias was checked in two ways. First, the percentage of respondents from Bend's newly annexed areas was compared to the 25.19 figure from Central Oregon Economic Development Council's estimates.<sup>1</sup> There were 287 respondents in the community survey sample of 988 who reported residence in the newly annexed areas. This calculated to 29.05 percent. While it is impossible to determine a confidence interval and registered voters is a somewhat different variable than the population count, these two percentages are close enough to conclude that, at least on this sensitive criterion, returns were random. If Old City residents self-selected inordinately, the percentage of newly annexed ones would be much smaller. Conversely, self-selection from the newly annexed areas would produce a substantially larger percentage for them.

Second, t-tests were executed on the mean scores for the 28 city service assessments of the first 100 respondents compared to the last 100 respondents. It is generally held that the first group of respondents to a survey are more motivated than the later ones. By responding early they self-select to insure their strongly held views are represented. Later respondents are thought to be more moderate. Hence if the early responders means are different than the later ones, a self-selection bias in favor of the early responders may be present. Not one of the t-tests was significant at the 0.05 level, hence there is also no evidence of self-selection on this criterion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Central Oregon Economic Development Council. Eyes on Bend. May 13, 1999.

## CONFIDENCE LEVEL SELECTION

A confidence level of 0.10 was applied to all t-tests within the body of this report. The conventional level for a TYPE I ERROR situation would be 0.05, reducing the possibility of finding statistically significant, i.e., non-random, differences. These tests, however, were deemed to be a TYPE II ERROR situation. If there were honest differences present, the policy makers receiving this report needed to be apprised of them for their deliberations. Hence, the more liberal 0.10 level was selected. At this level a greater number of differences can be identified as statistically significant.

The final question in the *Bend Community Survey* attempted to capture issues that the researchers did not cover. The question reads as follows:

“Anything we haven’t hit? Again, your comments are confidential.”

Out of the 988 returned surveys 451 responded to this question, a response rate of 45.6%. In some cases, respondents identified new issues. For the most part, however, respondents used this as an opportunity to clarify their feelings on issues explored throughout the survey. Most responses were clarifications and came in the form of admonishments rather than praise. Some of the more frequent responses included commentary on the golf driving as well as expressions of aversion toward newer residents generally characterizing the new residents as "greedy, self-interested and self-satisfied." The listed responses were chosen from the 451 responses on a random basis from early, middle and late returns. The responses are divided by topic heading although there are some overlaps. Errors and emphasis in the responses are maintained.

## **Development/Urban Form Issues**

"I would just like an affordable middle class housing without having to increase my mortgage loan."

"No more golf nets please. How about an amphitheater or cultural center?"

"Quit selling riverfrontage property and develop it into parks that are handicapped accessible."

“Need to attract big businesses/corporations for more family wage jobs.”

"High density growth should nor be limited to certain areas. For those who want to live further from the city they should pay extra for city services."

“The poles for the golf driving range behind Target - ruin the view of the mountains – why wasn’t this built on the east so it wouldn’t block a view.”

"Development is out of control and should be capped. It should not be permitted to destruct and infringe on natural habitat and wilderness areas."

"Bend is already a strip-mall hell. 3<sup>rd</sup> street is ugly, pure and simple. I see future developments such as the Old Mill District as dancing around the issue but not dealing with it. Pedestrians can't get around except for the 3-block<sup>2</sup> area in old town. When you're confined to your car you tend to stay in it and shop at one place, i.e. Fred Meyers, etc. But there are some wonderful businesses that are owned by locals. Find a way to encourage people to get out of their cars, walk from their houses, and frequent the locally owned businesses!"

“The growth rate is excessive causing too many problems that go unsolved.”

## Government

"Bend cannot do everything on its own. Population is the main problem. It is a national and international problem."

"I feel the City Fathers are more concerned about money than quality of lie. I was unfair to be annexed without wanting into the City. They are poorly equipped to service what they had before annexation."

"It is not appropriate for the City Manager to issue "bonus" monies to department heads."

"City management is becoming "top" heavy."

"Do we believe long range growth could be significantly improved? YES!"

"Recently annexed-we want more of a voice in growth, future development and decisions of community life."

"Bend will become a second home for Oregon and California and a resting place for senior services and retirees. Plan for it!"

"The city should be more involved in social services."

"I was annexed as of 7-1-99 much to my displeasure of higher taxes and minimal improvement to services except LIP service!"

"The City needs to protect residents from bright light pouring onto their property from adjacent commercial and residential lights. Often the shields are not enough. Also, keep building at a maximum three-story height."

"City Council should mail out minutes and decisions of meetings. Alert us to major problems, etc."

"City and county planning commissions should always work together in decision making."

"Bend's commissioners have not protected our community well on it's development--allowing very ugly development, such as the driving range's 130' netting which will have lights - (height of 30' was a building ordinance ??). This has blocked many residential views -also- land was rezoned for this monstrosity-also-I consider this poor usage of land in this area."

"Bend one day will be like Eugene because the paid officials are more concerned with the empire that they are creating then what Bend is noted for: beauty and livability."

"Yes, get the city and county planners to get their head out of the sand and open their eyes and ears!"

"Government should be involved in capping population growth since we're not keeping up with what we have. Since we already have more growth than we can handle, why do we support the Chamber (of Commerce) to promote Bend?"

## **Transportation**

"U.S. 97 Bypass should have been made instead of Parkway. Traffic worse than large city."

"We've got small town traffic controls with big city traffic."

"BIKELANES!"

"Hwy. 97 is the worst thing to happen to Bend."

"The roundabouts are confusing and expensive. Quit making Bend "cute" and make it efficient."

"Enforce traffic control at stoplights at south end of town. Resurface east end of Rae Road."

"Tax big cars, more bike routes. Mass transit is good."

"Also, expedite getting the parkway completed. It has been under work long enough."

## **Education**

"The importance of the quality of schools - for our children and for the community. The overcrowding at all levels is unacceptable!"

"Our schools are grossly overcrowded – I feel to the state of crisis and with increased growth the schools are always catching up. There needs to be tremendous coordinate between the city and school admin."

"SCHOOLS, SCHOOLS, SCHOOLS- They need deep attention."

"Education - schools not up to potential for this growing, active, educated community."

"School system improvements in quality of the older schools buildings, computers, etc."

"School overcrowding, low test scores, weak teachers/admin."

## Quality of Life

"This is as close to heaven as you can get (while alive)."

"I moved to Bend in 1987 for its quality of life, recreation and climate. I see Bend losing its quality of lie. It has not met the needs of traffic movement. I feel much of this is caused by the City allowing much development at the expense of its citizens."

"We built our house 9 yrs. ago to take advantage of an outstanding view of the mts. (reason we moved here) & we now look at 26 poles 130' high comprising a new golf driving range at Mt. View mall!"

"I would like to see access to the river and river trail remain public."

"City should encourage more cultural events--art, music theater, sports."

"Bend has a unique opportunity to manage growth and quality of life. Observing what ruined other communities seemed to disappear with the appeal of money. If the current growth policies are continue, Bend will certainly lose its appeal and people will leave to go someplace like Bend used to be."

"Bend is no longer a family community – it is a playground for rich people, yuppies, & retired folks."

"Make COCC a University."

"We value the quality of life here & the quality of life for everyone else: the view of the mts. Belong to everyone!"

"We need to require more green space, trails, sports fields, parks, etc. even if it means business growth slows. We need to maintain the Central Oregon that folks are moving here for."

"I moved here because I felt it was a safe enough place to raise my daughter, a healthy environment. Slowly in the two years I've lived here that feeling is dwindling."

"It's important to keep Oregon dollars in Oregon, and I hope the city will recognize that, and support all the great small businesses in this area."







