

## EDITORIALS &amp; OPINIONS

The Bulletin  
AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPERHeidi Wright Publisher  
Gerry O'Brien Editor  
Richard Coe Editorial Page Editor

# The plan for the Bend Parkway will mean traffic jams

Head up to the north end of U.S. Highway 97 in Bend around 5:15 p.m. on a Friday and motorists can be mummified by bumper-to-bumper traffic.

Move. Stop. Inch forward. Stop. It can take several sequences of the traffic light at Cooley Road to clear the intersection.

That mummification at the north end of town? Expect to see that same sort of thing come to town. In fact, the Oregon Department of Transportation is seeking permission in its Bend Parkway plan to allow the gridlock to grow. The Bend City Council got a preview of the plan Wednesday night.

In Bend's future, peak demand on the parkway will come very close to capacity, if not exceed it. The offramps in town, the Third Street intersections, the Empire Avenue corridor will have a volume to capacity ratio of 1 or very close to 1. That's stop and start.

It's not the future traffic engineers dream about. ODOT and the city of Bend are indeed making some changes that should help keep traffic moving and keep people safe.

You know those right in, right outs that create all sorts of parkway drama, such as at Lafayette Avenue, Hawthorne Avenue and Truman Avenue?

Most of those are being completely eliminated along the parkway. The only thing that will remain will be the right ins at Lafayette and Hawthorne. Those will get longer deceleration lanes. Drivers will no longer be able to do a quick right out anywhere along the parkway.

Other plans include relocating the bike and sidewalk paths along the parkway to adjacent streets. And there are long-term plans for

safe crossings over the parkway for pedestrians and bikes.

Despite those changes and more, congestion is coming. Why does that have to be the future?

Most parkway traffic is actually Bend to Bend — 90% of it. Are you going to give up your car for most local trips? Will your neighbor? Going to take the bus? Bike? Getting people to use alternative transportation is not easy.

The bus system is not that convenient. Biking around can be exhilarating with moments of terror as an escort.

You likely aren't surprised to learn the cost of road improvements is also staggering. Here's just one example: \$10 million for the Highway 97 northbound onramp and southbound offramp at Murphy Road.

A kicker is if ODOT doesn't get permission to allow more gridlock in Bend, local development could grind to a halt. The state's volume to capacity ratio for roads is basically at .85, or 85%. Because some parts of Bend are anticipated to go over that amount, a developer that had a project that would push capacity over .85 would have to pay for the very expensive road project that would push the volume/capacity ratio back down.

A similar problem had threatened to scotch development at Juniper Ridge.

So in March, the Bend City Council is likely to vote on this ODOT plan that Bend drivers will have plenty of time to ponder in the future — as they sit stuck in traffic.

## Healthy Homes bill could be good for low-income families

Lead, radon, allergens, energy inefficiency are just some of the things people don't want in their homes. But improvements cost money and low-income households are going to have trouble paying for them.

House Bill 2842 aims to do something about it. State Reps. Jason Kropf, D-Bend, and Jack Zika, R-Redmond, are sponsors.

The bill creates a Healthy Homes Program in the Oregon Health Authority. It would provide grants to homeowners and landlords so im-

provements to tackle those problems do happen.

A proposed amendment aims to clarify that the money could also be spent on fire and seismic resistance and appropriates \$20 million for the program.

A long list of people submitted testimony in favor of the bill. The question we have: Would it be more important for Oregon to invest that \$20 million in creating more affordable housing for people that don't have it, rather than improving what some people have?



## My Nickel's Worth

### Kebler's odd view of taxes

Bend Councilor Melanie Kebler's recent guest column about parking exposes her lack of understanding of the greater good. She lumps together several diverse cohorts of non-drivers, non-vehicle owners to justify her idea that people falling within this segment of residents are somehow being treated unfairly; that they are unjustly paying taxes to support free parking. She says "unfair subsidies for parking also create revenue we can do other great things with."

Kebler says: "more than 2,500 people in Bend don't own cars, and more than 5,000 people live in households that either have no car or multiple adults share a car, ... the vast majority of which are economically disadvantaged, disabled or elderly." Those are three distinct situations lumped together to make her concern appear valid.

As an elected official, I would hope Councilor Kebler would have a better understanding of taxation. Using her logic, one could make the argument that anyone without children in school should not have to subsidize schools. No kids; no taxes. No subsidies (property tax money) for school districts, special education districts, community college districts, higher education.

Simply, Councilor Kebler exposed her naivete. I hope the other six councilors guide city policy with a better understanding of what constitutes the "greater good" for our residents.

—Don Ptacnik, Bend

### Indigenous lives matter

The Bulletin's Feb. 16 obituary of Native American activist Joyce

Nelson, 86, correctly credited her advocacy to Portland's indigenous community for over fifty years. Nelson was a Lakota, as was her husband, John "Buzz" Nelson, a Marine Corps veteran and great-grandson of renowned Chief Red Cloud, an Oglala Lakota.

While I never met the Nelsons, I was struck by their compassion and community service given to Portland's indigenous people and read of the discrimination they encountered from the larger white community.

Aboriginal people have lived in the American hemisphere for many thousands of years. Europeans came much later, first the Vikings, followed by Columbus in 1492.

The Europeans were late exploring the New World. But when they encountered the natives, it was mostly with killing disdain. Consider the Spanish conquistador Hernando de Soto, whose romp through the southeast pillaged and killed thousands at will. The United States policy regarding the Indian problem was often articulated as "the only good Indian is a dead Indian." Guns, smallpox and broken treaties were the rule. Darwinian theory of natural selection sought to "Kill the Indian, save the man." Ojibwa native David Treuer, 2019, wrote in "The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee" that the Indian cultures deserved to be saved.

And that brings me back to the work of Joyce and "Buzz" Nelson in Portland.

Their influence should not be forgotten by the native community, but celebrated by all. Indigenous people do matter, and they deserve our respect.

—John Schwechten, Bend

### Bring back a timber tax

Many of Oregon's small towns are cash-strapped and struggling. Some blame this on a decline in revenue from logging due to environmental protections. But despite conservation efforts, timber harvests on state and federal land have remained about the same for the past 25 years. So why aren't communities benefiting?

The answer is that timber companies have finagled outrageously preferential tax treatment for themselves, allowing them to wring money from our forests without putting much back into the communities where they operate. In the 1990s, logging industry representatives successfully lobbied Oregon politicians to eliminate the severance tax. This tax was a major funding source for schools and local governments. Washington, California and Idaho still have this tax, and the money it generates helps fund schools, sheriff's offices and public libraries.

Communities are suffering another blow as logging practices contaminate their drinking water, damage their water systems, and threaten their water sources, leading to tax and water rate increases for residents and small businesses. Some claim that bringing back the severance tax would lead to job losses. But the timber industry has been slashing jobs for decades, replacing workers with machines and closing mills to export logs overseas.

Why should Oregonians subsidize an industry that exploits our land and cripples our communities? It's time for lawmakers to put small towns ahead of corporate interests and reinstate the severance tax.

—Reagan Fisher, Portland

### Letters policy

We welcome your letters. Letters should be limited to one issue, contain no more than 250 words and include the writer's signature, phone number and address for verification. We edit letters for brevity, grammar, taste and legal reasons. We reject poetry, personal attacks, form letters, letters submitted elsewhere and those appropriate for other sections of The Bulletin. Writers are limited to one letter or guest column every 30 days.

### Guest columns

Your submissions should be between 550 and 650 words; they must be signed; and they must include the writer's phone number and address for verification. We edit submissions for brevity, grammar, taste and legal reasons. We reject those submitted elsewhere. Locally submitted columns alternate with national columnists and commentaries. Writers are limited to one letter or guest column every 30 days.

### How to submit

Please address your submission to either My Nickel's Worth or Guest Column and mail, fax or email it to The Bulletin. Email submissions are preferred.

Email: letters@bendbulletin.com

Write: My Nickel's Worth/Guest Column  
P.O. Box 6020  
Bend, OR 97708

Fax: 541-385-5804

Editorials reflect the views of The Bulletin's editorial board, Publisher Heidi Wright, Editor Gerry O'Brien and Editorial Page Editor Richard Coe. They are written by Richard Coe.

# Who won't shut up in meetings? Men say it's women. It's not.

BY ADAM GRANT

Special to The Washington Post

The Japanese Olympic Committee was discussing steps for bringing more women onto boards in sports. The male leader of the Tokyo Olympics organizing committee voiced a grave concern: "When you increase the number of female executive members, if their speaking time isn't restricted to a certain extent, they have difficulty finishing, which is annoying." The man was Yoshiro Mori, a former prime minister of Japan. He resigned from the Tokyo committee last Friday over the remarks, which he'd made at a virtual meeting Feb. 3.

When people make claims about behavior in groups, my job as an organizational psychologist is to look at the evidence. The pattern is clear and consistent: It's usually men who won't shut up. Especially powerful men.

In a study of U.S. senators, those who had more leadership roles, seniority, committee assignments, influence, legislative activity and earmarks in spending bills took up more time on the Senate floor — but

only if they were men.

Why didn't having status and influence lead women to be more vocal? Experiments showed that women weren't worried about building rapport. They were afraid of being perceived as too dominant and controlling, which is exactly what happened when they did speak up. Gender stereotypes persist. People expect men to be assertive and ambitious but women to be caring and other-oriented. A man who runs his mouth and holds court is a confident expert. A woman who talks is aggressive or pushy.

This helps explain why meetings are full of "manologues." Political scientists find that when groups of five make democratic decisions, if only one member is a woman, she speaks 40 percent less than each of the men. Even if the group has a majority of three women, they each speak 36 percent less than each of the two men. Only in groups with four women do they each finally take up as much airtime as the one man.

In too many teams and too many workplaces, women face the harsh re-

ality that it is better to stay silent and be thought polite than speak up and jeopardize their careers. As Mori said of the Tokyo committee, "We have about seven women at the organizing committee, but everyone understands their place." If you think women talk too much, it could be because you expect them to talk so little.

When women take the risk of speaking up, they're often silenced by men. In the Supreme Court, research reveals that male justices are about three times as likely to interrupt female justices as one another. Over a 12-year period when women were 24% of the justices, they were the perpetrators of just 4 percent of the interruptions but the recipients of 32%. In 2015, when there were six men and three women on the bench, 66% of the interruptions were of the women.

Maninterrupting — as journalist Jessica Bennett calls it when men are guilty of "talk-blocking" — is widespread. In a meta-analysis of 43 studies, men were more likely than women to talk over others — especially in intrusive ways that silenced the rest of the room and demon-

strated their dominance. At least Kanye West promised to let Taylor Swift finish when he took the mic from her.

But maybe men don't intend to offend. Maybe men see interruptions as a sign of engagement, whereas women take them as a display of disrespect. Not so, says a recent study of 5,000 Americans listening to men and women interrupt with identical scripts. Men judged women as ruder, colder and less intelligent than men interjecting with the exact same words. Women showed no gender bias; they evaluated male and female interrupters the same way.

One hallmark of a patriarchal culture is precarious manhood. The core idea is that masculinity is hard to win but easy to lose. Men face pressure to demonstrate their superiority and strength. An assertive woman can be a threat to a fragile male ego. In countries and companies dominated by alpha males, women are often expected to be seen but not heard. Much ink has been spilled helping them figure out how to walk this tightrope. Women have received many tips on

how to disagree without seeming disagreeable, challenge without being too confrontational, raise their voices without shouting.

But maybe it's overconfident men who need to change.

It's not that women are necessarily naturally better listeners and leaders than men, but that women have had to master these skills to succeed within the shackles of gender stereotypes.

If a woman pointed all this out, she'd be accused of whining and complaining. A growing body of evidence reveals that when women (and racial minorities) advocate for diversity, they tend to get penalized for being self-serving and nepotistic. When (white) men make the same case, we're more likely to get heard. Recognizing this injustice is the first step toward changing it.

When asked at a news conference whether he genuinely thinks women talk too much, Mori responded, "I don't listen to women that much lately, so I don't know." And therein lies the problem.

■ Adam Grant is an organizational psychologist at the Wharton School.