

**PATHWAY SAFETY TASK FORCE  
MEETING #3, March 20, 2025  
MEETING NOTES**

The meeting began at 3:00 pm - live in the SROA Board room and via Zoom. The following task force members were present:

- Ray/Marilyn Johnson
- Julie Yount
- Angela Stone
- Al Klascius
- Karen Agee
- John Wiest
- Gwen Gamble
- Greg Slater
- Kris Besson
- Susan Berger
- David Fretwell
- Lee Stevenson
- James Lewis
- Mark Smith
- Clark Pederson
- Bill Burke

The meeting began with a brief roll call. James L. provided a brief recap of the first two meetings

Following the recap, the task force discussed the top ten pathway concerns as identified in a previous task force meeting. Each task force member presented their top solutions to the concerns – as those were presented, the entire task force was able to discuss the ideas presented. Throughout the discussion it became apparent that certain solutions rose to the top of the list for most task force members – some ideas that were previously identified as being the highest priorities fell to lower positions on the list once the information presented at meeting #2 was discussed by the entire task force. Significant factors for some solutions dropping or even being removed from the list included: the inability to legally stop/cite person on pathways who are breaking rules (not including State/local law – statutory law), the inability to enforce some rules against visitors to the community – rule violations do not follow individuals as does State/local law (i.e. warrants), and other obstacles to enforcement. The discussion led to trends in potential solutions with many extending to solve more than just one concern.

These are the concerns discussed the and the solutions identified – and prioritized based on the number of times individual task force members listed these:

1. Overcrowding
  - Add striping to delineate pathway lanes
  - Using signs on the pathways (on the asphalt)
  - Focus on primary entry points to the pathways and congestion (choke) points
    - Increased signage with rules, directions, mapping
    - Identify the priority areas
  - Acknowledge and accept some crowding due to the nature of Sunriver (visitors in summer season)
  - Utilize additional bike patrol (ombudsman/ambassadors) – seek volunteers
  - Direct users to other pathway/trail opportunities adjacent to/outside of Sunriver
  - Enforce existing rules regarding various vehicles not allowed on pathways (Type 2-3 e-bikes, skateboards, inline skates, etc.)
  - Create additional pathway maps
  - Complete the unconstructed segments of the pathway master plan (especially those that are primary safety concerns – Circle 2-3)
  - Conduct regular pathway use assessments/analysis to determine critical issues
2. Pedestrian/Bicycle/Dog mix
  - Keep dogs on leash (6-foot leash)
  - Develop separate, parallel pathways for pedestrians/dogs and bikes
  - Create rules for dog walking dependent on time of day and year
3. Lack of enforcement and issuance of citations
  - Soft enforcement
    - Provide education about rules
    - Promote rule awareness
    - Develop signs/striping
    - Promote behavioral awareness
  - Create ambassadors/ombudsman for pathways
  - Understand that the presence of enforcement officers, even if rule enforcement is legally challenging, has an effect to encourage rule compliance
  - Ensure that officers enforce state/local laws on pathways even if SROA rules cannot be
4. E-bikes (overall)
  - The existing rule limiting e-bikes to Class 1 is OK

5. E-bikes (class 2 and 3 only)
  - The existing rule limiting e-bikes to Class 1 is OK
6. Overall bike speed and reckless behavior
  - Non-motorized (pedal only) and Class 1 e-bikes are OK – existing rule is OK
7. Overall lack of following all rules
  - Education, communication and programs advertising SROA rules is necessary as most visitors are unaware of the rules
  - Make rule awareness easy – use new technology
  - Focus on primary entry points to the pathways and congestion (choke) points
    - Increased signage with rules, directions, mapping
    - Identify the priority areas
8. Overall lack of common courtesy
  - Education, communication and programs advertising common pathway use, courtesy and practice (announcing “on your left”) is necessary as many visitors are unaware of such
9. Dogs off-leash / use of extender leashes
  - Existing voice control (no leash) rule is adequate
  - Dogs on 6-foot leash – no extender leashes
  - Dogs on leashes at certain times of year (such as, busy times – Memorial Day through Labor Day)
  - Dogs on leashes during certain times of the day (such as, from 10:00 am through 5:00 pm)

Although the solutions discussed included all three identified categories (infrastructure, rules/enforcement, education/communication), the overall emphasis focused on education and communication to pathway users with creating physical means to accomplish such (striping, signs, etc.). It was acknowledged that the prohibitions to some enforcement measures made enacting new rules a lower-level solution. The tenor of the most often recognized solutions was aimed at creating a means of influencing user (pathway, bike, dog walker, etc.) behavior – behavior to comply with rules, courtesy and safety.

The meeting closed by determining the next meeting date (Thursday, May 8<sup>th</sup>, 3-00-5:00 pm) and a discussion of the homework assignment and intent for the next meeting.

**Homework** – Conduct individual sub-group meetings (Infrastructure, Rules/Enforcement, Education/Communication). Discuss and prioritize solutions under each category (immediate, near-term, long-term). Provide rationale for each item discussed and why it was/was not prioritized. These will be reviewed at meeting #4.

\*The members of the subgroups were identified at the meeting as follows:

Infrastructure: Linda Beard, Mark Smith, Greg Slater, Marilyn Johnson

Rules and Enforcement: Clark Pederson, James Lewis, Gwen Gamble, Kris Besson

Education and Communication: Bill Burke, Susan Berger, Al Klascius, Lee Stevenson, Karen Agee, Ray Johnson, David Fretwell

\*Note: The Infrastructure and Rules/Enforcement subgroups need additional members. Those members who were not present at the meeting will be solicited after the meeting for participation in these two subgroups.

The next meeting (Meeting #4) will be held on **Thursday, May 8<sup>th</sup>, 3:00-5:00 pm** at the SROA Administration Board room and via Zoom (this will be the format for all meetings).

Meeting #4 will include:

- Finalize the primary concerns
- Review the findings and recommendations from the sub-groups
- Finalize the list of potential solutions
- Begin to develop findings and recommendations