

Should the park district change its event policy?

The Flashback Cruz Car Show rolled back into town this year. Same heights of cool, if you like hot wheels. New location.

After years and years of being in Drake Park, the park district didn't want it there. Hundreds of cars — classic and cool or not — would compact the soil and not be good for the park, the district told us.

As Bend has grown, so have some events. So has, in the park district's view, the need to find the right balance between what some people want at the parks, what other people want at the parks and what's good for the parks.

The district told us the Flashback proposal was for as many as 400 cars on the turf at Drake Park for three days.

Flashback lost. The district suggested an alternative, a parking lot near the river. Terri Scott, one of the organizers of the car show, said it was too small. The district said it also suggested the Pine Nursery. Scott doesn't remember that. In any case, the Flashback moved out to a church on U.S. Highway 20. Scott said it was an excellent location. Organizers did get pushback from people asking why it was no longer at the park. She found being kicked out of the park disappointing, but said



The Bulletin file
Flashback Cruz car show in Drake Park in Bend in 2014.

the Flashback was still a great event.

The district now has a new policy for events in parks. It was just approved by the board and put in place after the Flashback decision was made. With its language, though, there may be more events moved from where they have been or similar decisions made about other events.

You can find more about the district's policy starting on page 17 of this document, tinyurl.com/Parkev-entpolicy. If you have thoughts about what the district's policy should be on events, you can email the board at board@bendparksandrec.org.

Historic editorials: Bend has a better climate than the East

Editor's note: The following historic editorials originally appeared in the July 26, 1907 edition of what was then called *The Bend Bulletin*.

Where can you find a pleasanter more healthful climate than that of the Bend country? While people are dying by the score from heat in the cities of the East, we, who are fortunate to live in this most delightful climate of Central Oregon are enjoying the best of health and a sunstroke is unknown. While the heat of the mid-day sun is a trifle unpleasant, it is always cool and refreshing in the shade. In the East a man tired out by the day's labors lies down and tries to sleep and rest but often is unable to do so on account of the oppressive humid heat that lasts far into the night. Here each night, brings sleep to the tired and honest worker, with an atmosphere so delightfully cool that bed covers are needed during the hottest time of the year. Most pleasant and healthful, indeed,

is the climate of this favored section.

...

A matter worthy of note is in the intention of several people here about to engage in the bee industry next year. The bee is a valuable little insect. It plays an important role in agriculture. Not only does it store up, in the form of honey, a most delicious and healthful food, but as it moves from flower to flower it carries pollen from one blossom to another, thus aiding in the fertilization of all flowers. This is of much importance in the production of fruit. The bee carries the pollen from the male to the female blossoms and thus makes them capable of bearing fruit. Of course this process of pollenization is provided for in various ways by nature, but the busy bee is one of the best. Many swarms of bees in this vicinity will not only make honey more plentiful, but it will also help to increase the yield of fruit.

■ 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.



The Bulletin did not include enough about opposition to piping

BY MARK ELLING

In response to The Bulletin's Sunday piece, "Arnold Irrigation District conservation projects close to approval, district manager says," I am disappointed in what seems like one-sided coverage of the issue.

While Arnold Irrigation District's perspective on this contentious issue was front-and-center, there was no mention that there's a community of Deschutes County residents who oppose its pipeline project and have been seeking a better, more collaborative solution for all parties for over three years. AID's proposed modernization project is not a "conservation" plan but rather a reactive, federal funding money grab. Their plan is designed to get them most easily off the hook of Deschutes Basin Habitat Conservation Plan requirements being enforced as a function of the lawsuit the Basin Districts lost at the hands of environmentalists who sought protection for threatened species critical habitat in the upper Deschutes.

If AID was really interested in a conservationist approach to solving their canal's seepage problem with an aim toward protecting the environment, they'd consider other alternatives to piping that wouldn't kill thousands of mature ponderosa pine, risk

GUEST COLUMN

drying up groundwater wells along the canal and arbitrarily displace wildlife that utilizes the 115-year-old canal corridor as seasonal habitat, water source and travel route. Among other available solutions, a commonly installed concrete canal lining without a plastic membrane would stop 70% of seepage but still allow enough to reduce damage to trees, wells and wildlife — and be less expensive than piping.

The Bulletin might consider the perspectives of residents in piped irrigation districts who've come before us, like Three Sisters Irrigation District, Swalley Irrigation District and Tumalo Irrigation District, where the effect of catastrophic canal corridor logging and subsequent death of trees, eradication of habitat and failure of wells is now also compounded by less-effective water delivery to irrigators and damaging silt build-up in piping and irrigating infrastructure, according to statements made by irrigators in those districts.

While we did appreciate the inclusion of flume resident Alan Keyes' thoughts on the removal of the flume's destruction from AID's mod-

There was no mention that there's a community of Deschutes County residents who oppose AID's pipeline project and have been seeking a better, more collaborative solution for all parties for over three years.

ernization plan, we should be clear that the deletion of that part of the project was less a matter of funding than it was a response to public pressure. We and many of the over 400 others who submitted formal public comments called out AID for attempting to construct an obscene, mile-long eyesore within a federal Wild and Scenic River Area and state Scenic Waterway and thankfully the Natural Resources Conservation Service took notice of that fact.

Many Deschutes County residents remain unaware of all that this proposed project would entail but the more people learn about it, the more it becomes clear that: 1, there are no easy answers; and 2, there are better solutions than a pipeline available to us.

■ Mark Elling is president of Save Arnold Canal.

Letters policy

We welcome your letters. Letters should be limited to one issue, contain no more than 250 words and include the writer's 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 and 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

CDC's updated COVID school guidance ushering in a new normal

BY LEANA S. WEN

Special to The Washington Post

The newly released CDC guidance that eases COVID-19 precautions in schools has it mostly right: At this point in the pandemic, the emphasis must shift from universal mandates to individual decisions to minimize the disruption of in-person learning.

Previous guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention was appropriate for the last school year, but it is out of step with the situation today. It referenced social distancing and separating kids into cohorts, which posed practical difficulties for many schools. It urged masking at schools in communities with high levels of COVID transmission, which is the case for more than 40% of the United States.

Masks and distancing are mitigation measures that were needed before vaccines became widely available for school-age children. That's no longer the case. Everyone 6 months and older can be vaccinated, and those 5 years old and above can be boosted.

Moreover, the vast majority of children have been exposed to COVID. A CDC study found that as of February, 3 out of 4 kids have had the coronavirus. That was before the BA.2 and BA.5 omicron subvariants became the dominant strains. By now, most children, and most of the general population, are well protected from severe illness as a result of vaccination, prior infection or both.

In addition, the omicron subvariants cause less severe disease compared with previous variants. Multiple studies have found that they are also less likely to result in long COVID, which vaccination further protects against. Today's dominant variant, BA.5, is the most contagious strain yet, which means that it's increasingly difficult to avoid infection, despite precautions.

The CDC's new guidance removes blanket distancing and cohorting requirements. It also allows children exposed to COVID to stay in class. This should prevent entire classrooms from being forced to stay home because one child tested positive and will come as

a huge relief to parents who have seen how the unpredictability of COVID restrictions negatively affects their work and their children's education.

Masking in areas of high transmission remains part of the guidance, which schools will not follow anyway; a survey of 500 of the largest K-12 school districts found that 98% no longer plan to mandate masks.

I think it's particularly telling that the revised recommendations no longer advocate regular testing, which diagnosed countless children with asymptomatic infections, forcing them to isolate and miss school. That the CDC is shifting away from asymptomatic screening suggests an overall change in its approach to COVID. Instead of applying across-the-board mitigation measures for everyone in an effort to reduce infection, it is acknowledging the continued prevalence of the coronavirus and encouraging people to choose the precautions right for them.

Indeed, an underlying assumption in the new guidance is that individuals should act based on their own

risk level. People who are immunocompromised or who live with people at higher risk for severe illness should take additional precautions. High-quality masks (N95 or an equivalent) continue to protect regardless of whether others are using them, and students and teachers should be encouraged to wear them if they wish to reduce their risk of infection. I'd add that parents can add measures based on changing circumstances, for example, by asking kids to mask for a week and then test right before visiting vulnerable family members.

This kind of individual risk calculus is already the norm for the rest of society. Adults are already going about their pre-pandemic lives and do not have to distance, mask or quarantine for work, leisure or travel, so it doesn't make sense for children to continue these rules. After all, the downside of mandatory precautions in kids is much higher than for adults. Requirements were justified when there were few protective tools available, but that's not the case now. Moreover, the coronavirus will likely be around for our

children's entire lifetimes. Restrictions cannot last forever.

Those opposed to the CDC easing restrictions warn that the new policies will lead to superspreader events at schools. They are right. Schools will have more outbreaks as layers of protection are removed. But daily outbreaks already occur at conferences, weddings, restaurants, gyms and workplaces. Most are probably not reported or even detected, as there is increased recognition that the United States cannot contain COVID-19 through contact tracing.

Rather, everyone engaging in public life should be aware that those around them could be infected with the coronavirus. They should protect themselves with vaccines, know which treatments they are eligible for and take precautions such as masking according to their level of risk tolerance. Students, teachers and school staff are no different.

■ Leana S. Wen, a Washington Post contributing columnist, is a professor at George Washington University's Milken Institute School of Public Health.