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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the production of recreational resources associated with amenity development. I argue that recreational resources are produced along lines similar to the production of timber, water, or mineral resources. Their production depends on the material characteristics of the resource, infrastructure of development, institutional arrangements, and the cultural symbolic value of rural and natural spaces. Scholars of amenity development have glossed over both the material elements of recreational resources and the history of resource development related to amenity landscapes. As a result, these scholars have overlooked insights concerning the production of resource spaces and evolving relationships between the city and the countryside. The dissertation utilizes insights from critical resource geography, the environmental history of resource development, cultural landscape studies, and histories of the American West. Drawing from sources such as government reports, business records, archival records, personal interviews, and newspaper research I construct a narrative of recreational development in Bend, Oregon since 1950. Before Bend became emblematic of the recreational development of the New West it functioned largely as a single industry company town, making it an ideal place to consider the production of recreational resources at the end of the 20th century.

After introducing the dissertation’s goals and exploring the theoretical interventions it makes in chapter one, I examine, in chapter two, the resource relationships between Bend and its hinterland leading up to World War II, with particular attention to how the region’s recreational opportunities were used alongside its timber
and ranching resources. Chapter three addresses national concerns about recreational resource supply and demand by considering the work of the Outdoor Recreational Resource Review Commission and their effort to rationalize recreational resources and make them legible for conservation and development. Chapter four examines how one firm, Brooks Scanlon, converted some of its timberlands to a golf resort, capitalizing on the recreational amenities offered by its former timberland and setting the standard for further amenity development in Central Oregon. Chapter five examines the political debate about how to manage land on the urban fringe—land valuable for real estate development—in light of conflicts between the right to develop private property and the common good associated with symbolic and material characteristics of the countryside, in this case, migratory deer. Chapter six considers the infrastructure of the countryside and the city in the production of recreational resources through an examination of historical development and commercialization of the Century Drive Scenic Byway, Black Butte Ranch, and the Old Mill District. In Chapter seven, I return again to real estate development on the urban fringe to consider the impact of fire on exurban development and the institutional arrangements associated with reducing the risk and damage to recreational resources. Finally, I offer a conclusion that considers the production of recreational resources and its relationship to the production of space and the cultural landscape.
RECREATION CAPITAL:
NATURAL RESOURCES, AMENITY DEVELOPMENT
AND OUTDOOR RECREATION IN BEND, OREGON

By

Brent Olson

B.A. Carleton College, 1998
Masters of Liberal Studies, University of Denver, 2003

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Geography
in the Graduate School of Syracuse University

May 2012
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

“One for my family. Two for my friends. Three for my muse. Four elements in Bend. Five for the sort of guys that bring a little more to life. Six for the seven person people here to Oregonize.” (Oregonize, Person People, 2007)

*Person People*, Bend’s most popular hip-hop group, ends every show with their anthem for the city. In it they thank the town and consider what it means to be part of a community in Central Oregon and how that community might move forward. Similarly, any dissertation depends upon a community of support around its author. This project represents the cumulative result of years of work, conversation, debate, and thought. Despite the time spent alone in front a computer screen, a box of documents, or the pages of a book the project was never a lonely one. Quite the opposite. Along the way I have been blessed with support from expected and unexpected places.

Most immediately, Bob Wilson provided thoughtful guidance throughout the project, from its original conception clear through to completion. Without fail, Bob provided useful corrections when things began to go awry and much needed encouragement and praise if things went well. I am grateful for his care, his insight, and his patience as he has worked to shape a reckless snowboard instructor and canoe guide into a scholar. Bob has continually reminded me of the importance of telling a story, of getting it right, and following ideas and leads with passion. I’ve done my best to abide by those ideas in the pages that follow.

The members of my committee, Don Mitchell, Tom Perreault each provided insight and encouragement at each stage of the project. They have pushed me to be more
clear and articulate and I am thankful for their confidence in my work. Matt Huber officially joined the committee later in the process, but I am thankful for the conversations and discussions we have had throughout his time at Syracuse. John Mercer stepped in at a critical moment to help me through the final stage and for that I will always be grateful. Finally, Sue Wadley has been a key ingredient throughout my career at Syracuse, helping me find funding during my first year, guiding me through proposal writing, and chairing my defense. Student colleagues have also helped shape my thinking about the relationship between people and the natural world. Marla Torrado and Jeremy Bryson deserve a special thank you in this regard as do Leisl Carr Childers and Mike Childers. Countless dinners, games and movie nights with Bethany Bloomston, Adam Arbree, Carolina Arango Vargas, Julian Velandia Arango, and Jesse Harasta, Chris Klivak, Lori Klivak, Holly Norton, and Dale Theiling helped provide space for thinking and opportunities to think out loud.

The archivists and volunteers at the Denver Public Library, The Des Chutes County Historical Society, the Oregon Historical Society, and the State archives in Salem were helpful beyond measure. In particular, Les Joslin and Kelly Cannon-Miller provided help, context, and insight beyond measure during my time in the research library at the Historical Society. Conversations with them invariable broke up the day and led to more valuable resources and ideas. Beyond the library, the people I met in Bend were equally kind in sharing their time, their memories, and often their homes with me while I asked them questions about their city and how they used the countryside. Thanks to them and the others in Bend that I had a chance to talk, hike, ski, with, Bend, I enjoyed my time
there immensely. More importantly, I learned from them and those that shared their time
with me in interviews and meetings. The people of Bend provided a wonderful
community to hammer out ideas and laboring over the puzzle of history. Kelsi Erkilla, the
survivors of the house on Riverside Blvd and the members of the Bend Ultimate scene
provided a much needed respite from research and a clever, engaged, and enthusiastic
group of folks with which I could pursue a variety of interests. Bill Kleinsasser
graciously sent me his notes from his previous study of Bend. Luke Smith at Mt.
Bachelor graciously introduced me to the ski and snowboard instructors. Conversations
with them about work and play were valuable in helping me think about the mountain as
a resource and reconnect with my roots in outdoor recreation.

Beyond the boundaries of the university, the library or the site of my research my
family deserves a special note of thank you. He never got the chance to see what might
come from the research, but he is the one that taught me to love reading, writing, and
thinking about topics. Without his model of commitment and curiosity, none of this
would ever have crossed my mind. Throughout the process Mom, Sara, and Clark (the
immediate family) has gamely tolerated my enthusiastic ramblings as I have thought
through ideas with them. Their support has been, and will continue to be, immeasurable.

Finally, Connie. There aren’t enough ways to say thank her for the work she has
done and the support she has provided in this project. She taught me what it means to do
research, to engage with the literature. She read every word of the dissertation too many
times to count. She provided much needed distraction and resolve in equal measure.
Thank you, Connie.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Figures</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The View from Mt. Bachelor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creating Natural Advantages</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Paper Trails: Making Recreation Count</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Higher Use: In the Real-Estate Business Whether We Like it or Not</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deer Ranges and Subdivisions</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The City, the Country, and In Between</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FireFree: Planning Nature’s Trespass</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Natural Resources and the “Recreation Capital of Oregon”</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1: THE VIEW FROM MT. BACHELOR

Figure 1.1 Looking north from near the summit of Mt. Bachelor 2
Figure 1.2 Looking east from near the summit of Mt. Bachelor 3
Figure 1.1 Public lands in Deschutes County, OR 6
Figure 1.2 Recreational Opportunities Surrounding Bend 15

CHAPTER 2: CREATING NATURAL ADVANTAGES

Figure 2.1 Opening up Central Oregon, 1911 43
Figure 2.2 James J. Hill in Bend, 1911 44
Figure 2.3 Lumber Production in Deschutes County, 1940-1950 75

CHAPTER 3: PAPER TRAILS: MAKING RECREATION COUNT

Figure 3.1 Camping: Call of the Wild, 1960 79
Figure 3.2 The ORRRC Classification Scheme, 1962 100

CHAPTER 4: HIGHER USE: IN THE REAL ESTATE BUSINESS WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR NOT

Figure 4.1 The 1967 Yearbook of Agriculture cover photo 107
Figure 4.2 Black Butte Ranch and Deschutes County 118
Figure 4.3 Black Butte Ranch and Mt. Jefferson, 1910 120
Figure 4.4 Mt. Bachelor expansion map, 1970 127
Figure 4.5 Black Butte Ranch Map, 2010 131

CHAPTER 5: DEER RANGES AND SUBDIVISION

Figure 5.1 The Metolius and Tumalo Deer Ranges 135

CHAPTER 6: THE CITY, THE COUNTRY, AND IN BETWEEN

Figure 6.1 Map of the Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway 174
Figure 6.2 Projected number of visitors to Mt. Bachelor, 1980-1995 180
Figure 6.3 Mt. Bachelor visits by decade 181
Figure 6.4 Shevlin-Hixon Lumber Company Mill, 1926 182
Figure 6.5 Shevlin-Hixon Mill and the Deschutes River, 1950 184
Figure 6.6 Brooks Scanlon Mill and the Deschutes River, 1950 184
Figure 6.7 REI in the Powerhouse at the Old Mill District 192
### Figure 6.8
An old bandsaw becomes a sculpture

### Figure 6.9
Exurban Growth in Deschutes County, 1940-2005

---

**Chapter 7: FireFree: Planning Nature’s Trespass**

| Figure 7.1 | Partner organizations and agencies of Project Wildfire and Fire Free |
| Figure 7.2 | Human caused wildfires in Oregon, 1950-2958 |
| Figure 7.3 | Core growth areas, 1970-2005 |
| Figure 7.4 | Wildland/urban interface in Central Oregon |
| Figure 7.5 | Elevated catastrophic wildfire risk in Central Oregon |
| Figure 7.6 | Large historic fire starts |
| Figure 7.7 | Map of the Awbrey Hall fire, 1990 |
| Figure 7.8 | 10 tips, 1 reason |
| Figure 7.9 | Visit Bend |
| Figure 7.10 | Golfing in the face of fire |
I sat on the snow enjoying the view while I waited for Anne to make her way down from the summit. Soon she slowed down and sat beside me. Anne taught snowboarding at Mount Bachelor and spent nearly every day working on the mountain. The job required energy, enthusiasm, and a certain chattiness. But on that rare clear and calm day on a ski mountain known for its biting wind, Anne sat quietly. Below us, and to the south, Kwolh Butte, the cinder-cone we often considered hiking up in order to snowboard down, rose clear and white over the forest. Further below us we could see the city of Bend, free of the snow that covered the mountains, nestled at the border between the dull olive and browns of the High Desert, and the brighter greens of the ponderosa canopy of the Cascades. Highway 97, the Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway, twisted through the forest between the city and the parking lot at the base of the ski resort. Perhaps most dramatically, Broken Top and the Three Sisters towered above the Deschutes National Forest. “Wow,” she murmured after she had caught her breath. A chunk of ice tumbled past us, broken loose by a ski or snowboard edge above us. “It’s perfect.”

I believed her. For a moment, under the blue sky, with my cheeks cold from the descent from the summit, under the stunning blue sky and surrounded by stunted trees coated with the rime ice that clung to everything, it felt perfect. The mountains, the trees, the small town at the edge of the desert matched my own conceptions of the ideal mountain town.
But I also remembered the conversation we had just had on the chair lift. Her husband worked as a house framer and they had a daughter. She had told me how difficult it was for her and her husband to survive the winter primarily on her meager wages as an instructor. She was paid only for the hours she taught classes, a maximum of six hours a day. They had the lifestyle they wanted: hiking, skiing, and paddling all in close proximity and with easy access. But they wondered how long they would last in this way, sacrificing their finances for their lifestyle. The schools were good and the pubs offered an endless variety of spectacular local beer. Each year her husband framed new homes for people moving into town and typically made enough money during the construction season to save for the winter. Already they were concerned about how long the boom would last, how long the region could keep growing, how many summers he could go back to his job.

“Perfect?” I asked.

“Perfect.” She stood up, pointed the nose of her snowboard down the hill and dropped off a small cliff into a bowl beneath us (figures 1.1 and 1.2).

Figure 1.1. Looking north from near the summit of Mt. Bachelor. The Three Sisters and Broken Top above Central Oregon’s recreational landscapes. (Photo by the author)
I got the sense that she wasn’t simply talking about the view, but about everything the landscape contained. She was describing how she felt about Central Oregon at that moment. We had talked about the beauty the region offered and the diversity of the landscape before. I waited a bit, cast another glance at South Sister across the Valley and up at the ice covered summit of the old volcano and followed her down. We rode out of the bowl and into the trees, stopping for a moment to look out over the High Desert of Central Oregon. There, lower on the mountain, we had a different view. The Three Sisters
still dominated the skyline to the North. But old timberlands, scars of wild fires, the
snowmobile trails and highways cut through the forest and over the desert. The lava-beds
stood out in greater relief, as did the golf courses and the new resort construction, scraped
desert landscapes cut with roads that led to empty, unsold lots. I wondered what Anne
would say here, with a view that felt more complicated and more clearly reflected our
discussion on the lift.

I took one last ride to the summit, but the clouds had moved in, obscuring the
view and adding a frozen crust to the snow. The perfection of the view disappeared with
the afternoon sun. Without the view to distract me, I thought more about what Anne had
said, about how those experiences fit into the history of the region. How did the
difficulties she described on the chair lift connect with her awe on the way down the
mountain? How do the aesthetic experiences of the region relate to the processes of
resource use and dramatic urban expansion? How do the mountains, the forests, the old
timberlands and new snowmobile trails connect to the city through our work and our
play, our productive economies and the consumption of amenity landscapes and natural
resources in the city’s hinterland? This dissertation is an attempt to answer some of these
questions, to examine the space between the gritty spatial realities of the recent
population growth associated with the New West and the aesthetic splendor of the
outdoor recreation fueling that growth.

David Harvey (1996) writes that places are “the focus of the imaginary, of beliefs,
longings, and desires...They are an intense focus of discursive activity, filled with
symbolic and representational meanings and they are a distinctive product of
institutionalized social and political-economic power” (p. 316). These “discursive products,” the stories we tell about places and relationship to the natural world reflect different histories, geographies, and, in Raymond Williams’ (1973) words, “almost every kind of imaginable future” (p. 148). Whether they are the dry statistical accounts of urban planners and resource managers, the purple prose of resort developers, the winding histories of local residents, or Anne’s simple “perfect,” the representations of Bend and the lands around it reflect ideas of exclusive private property, participatory democracy, natural resource management, and cultural values. The history of Central Oregon illustrates past resource production, consumption, and protection. The stories of Bend and its hinterland suggest dramatic change from extractive to recreational uses of the land. *The New York Times* wrote in 2004, “the last of the huge timber mills closed a decade ago. In its place are a Victoria’s Secret and an outdoor amphitheater. In short, in Bend, it is out with the old and in with the New West” (Preusch, 2004).

Throughout the American West, the political, cultural, and economic relationships between cities and their hinterlands are changing (Bryson & Wyckoff, 2010; Hines, 2010; Jackson & Kuhlken, 2006; Nicholas, Bapis, & Harvey, 2003a; Robbins, Meehan, Gosnell, & Gilbertz, 2009; Travis & Robb, 1997). Geographers, however, have done little to understand the history behind these changes. According to Peter Walker (2009), “so much of the literature about exurban land uses doesn’t talk about history” (p. 2). Recreational and amenity landscapes have emerged through specific interactions between the region’s major developers, planning commissions, local environmental organizations, federal land management agencies, and the natural processes of the land itself (figure
1.3). These interactions impact the landscapes of Bend, its urban fringe, and the public lands of the Central Oregon countryside. The histories of Central Oregon’s landscapes embody the expansion of scientific resource management in the production, consumption, and preservation of recreational resources and amenity landscapes. The critical perspective concerning the production and regulation of recreational landscapes in this dissertation can contribute to debates concerning amenity development and natural resource production.

An Outdoor Playground
A federal forester wrote in 1936 that “the history of the economic development of Deschutes County is largely the history of its timber industry” (Forest Service, 1936, p.3
quoted in Robbins, 2004, p.157). Today, however, according to The Economist, the area’s “fabulous scenery attracts people with fabulous amounts of money” (Booming Bend, 2007). Those people, and the money they bring with them, represent a shift in the primary economic activity of the region. While the texture of the relationship between people and the surrounding landscape has changed dramatically, this economy may not be as “new” as it initially seems. Central Oregon’s economy is built at once upon existing ties between the city and the countryside and a reconfiguration of the practices associated with those spatial relationships. These reconfigurations are written into the representations of the region and in the production of natural resources and the space that support them. They emerge in the continued discovery of value in the natural world and continues to place that value in the hands of a wealthy few. They are at once divorced from the timber history of the region and fully dependent upon the forested landscapes on the horizon and resource management agencies.

The golf courses, ranchettes and condominium developments have replaced the ranches and alfalfa farms once dominant on the desert landscapes north and east of Bend. Mountain bikers and cross-country skiers move over the old logging roads to the town’s west and south. Public and private lands alike face new pressures of access and use related to their aesthetic or recreational potential. The forests themselves still resonate with the whine of engines but now those engines move ATVs, snowmobiles, and groomers on the ski slopes, instead of logging trucks and chainsaw blades. The historic timber, ranching, and farming landscapes retain value, but less for their productive capabilities than for their consumptive potential. These landscapes, now valuable as
landscapes of play, are supported by the same resource knowledge that supported the timber industry and by new kinds of recreation based labor. Bend, once a small timber town on the edge of the High Desert, is advertised as the “recreation capital of Oregon” and in the process, it has reconfirmed the relationship between the city and the landscapes that surround it.

Bend provides only one example of a much larger trend. Rural communities across the American West have looked to outdoor recreation as a means to remain viable following the collapse of primary resource availability and plummeting commodity prices. These communities, once centers of mining, timber, or ranching industries, have garnered new attention for the access to outdoor recreational opportunities they provide. The National Parks, National Forests, and Bureau of Land Management lands that surround these communities once provided the timber, forage, and minerals that supported local towns and cities. Those lands however, have begun to serve a different purpose. “An economically diverse postindustrial regime of services, information technology, light manufacturing, tourism, and retirement now drives growth” (Travis, 2007, p. 3). These communities occupy the space between the rapidly expanding large urban areas and the strikingly rural spaces that often dominate discussions of the region.

The unbroken skies, open prairies, solitary deserts and endless mountain vistas of the western landscape have produced an iconic national landscape of rugged terrain. The narrator of Owen Wister’s novel The Virginian, often hailed as the first Western, describes the town in which he has disembarked from the train.
Town, as they called it, pleased me less. The longer I saw it. But until our language stretches itself and takes in a new word of closer fit, town will have to do for the name of such a place as was Medicine Bow. I have seen and slept in many like it since. Scattered far and wide, they littered the frontier from the Columbia to the Rio Grande, from the Missouri to the Sierras. They lay stark, dotted over a planet of treeless dust, like soiled packs of cards. Each was similar to the next, as one five-spot of clubs resembles another. Houses, empty bottles, and garbage, they were forever of the same shapeless pattern. More forlorn they were than stale bones. They seemed to have been strewn there by the wind and to be waiting till the wind should come again to blow them away. Yet serene above their foulness swam a pure and quiet light, such as the East never sees; they might be bathing in the air of creations first morning. Beneath sun and stars their days and nights were immaculate and wonderful. (Wister, 1902, p. 12-13)

Medicine Bow was an outpost, a waypoint for people coming into the country, trains passing through it, and resources leaving it. Further, the Medicine Bow of The Virginian is a set for the drama of the frontier. The houses all have false fronts, presenting more stature than the hovels that hide behind them. The people also regularly hide disrepute and vileness behind elegant fronts. Yet the town conveys an edenic quality in the “pure and quiet light.” The light of the West invites a pure nature into the town, distinctly separating the West from the East. Wister’s novel establishes a myth surrounding the
country and the city in the American West, one that continues today and provides a foundation for the amenity development associated with the New West. “The combination of sentiment and romance (Turner’s dream of the lost West, restored), with economic ambition (Turner’s recognition of the pleasant rise in buffalo prices) characterizes the New West” (Limerick, 1997, p. 166). The countryside of the American West, the openness, the light, and its nature, are the amenities that have drawn people to the region, and they have become the resources upon which communities depend.

Today Medicine Bow remains a quiet outpost in Wyoming. Dry, dusty, and known for little more than its connection to The Virginian. While Medicine Bow remained small, many similar towns that were dusty stops for the railroad at the turn of the century are now booming recreational meccas. Towns like Aspen, Missoula, and Bend, Oregon have grown substantially over the past few decades. Their storefronts and streets present a cosmopolitan facade. But behind them are legacies of mineral extraction, timber production, ranching, and farming. Despite the history written on the landscape, many people continue to find the “pure quiet light” in the towns and small cities of the West. Those edenic qualities, and the imagined memories of the dusty frontier towns now frame an understanding of the region that has often been called a “New West.” “The West as a home for dust chewing cowboys, lonely ranchers, and strong willed miners and loggers has all but disappeared, but their legends remain and the West as a theme park built around its legends is stronger than ever” (Egan, 1992). Those legends rest upon the region’s productive and frontier past. They depend upon the open spaces, open skies, and seemingly endless natural resources spreading over the distant horizon.
Anne’s awed reaction to the view from the summit of Mt. Bachelor echoes in this rapture and recalls the legends and the power of the western landscape. The dramatic peaks, canyons, and vistas of the American West have been described as culturally comparable to the great cathedrals and castles of Europe, and America’s great contribution to world culture (Schama, 1996). That contribution is now also an economic one, located today where the peaks, rivers, canyons, or endless deserts form the crux of the recreational activities that support the recreational retail industry and countless resort communities. Western communities depend upon the tourists and new residents who come seeking the sublime landscapes of the American West that promotional materials for national parks and communities throughout the West sell. Both embodied and aesthetic, these sublime experiences are foundational for the supposed “theme park” that constitutes the New West.

As key components of American cultural identity and history, the landscapes of the American West have become sites of political contestation. “Contentiousness in the modern West centers around such jarring collisions as managing parks for new values like ecosystem protection or natural fires, while those lands were created and set in motion by older, nineteenth century values” (Flores, 1998, p. 37). The history of Deschutes County, as the forester remarked in 1936, is linked to the resources that surround the city. Under the conditions of the “New West,” however, the specific resources have changed from timber to recreational amenities and landscapes. The ranches have lost most of their sheep and cows. The green grass of golf courses has replaced the alfalfa fields. Local diners have lost out to tapas bars and brew pubs.
Logging roads see more bicycles than trucks. Bill Travis (2007) has characterized this shift as one in which “many of our conceptions--our mental maps--of the region are out of date, like my daughter’s grade school atlas that bedecks the West with oil derricks, copper mines and a couple of ski areas instead of high tech office parks, sprawling suburbs, and hobby ranches that now take pride of place in the contemporary western landscape” (p. 33). These new developments are often presented as more culturally inclusive and environmentally sustainable than the practices they are replacing (Power & Barrett, 2001).

Recent debates however have raised questions about the difference between the Old West and the New West—or even whether these terms have much analytical utility. The difference may lie largely in the degree to which the aesthetic conditions of the landscape have been regulated and capitalized upon as natural resources. Paradoxically then, the population and economic booms of the 1990s associated with the New West are tightly bound to the modernist, scientific, and capital intensive developments associated with the booms, busts, exploitation and environmental degradation often associated with resource use in the “Old West.” Further, the impact extends far beyond the lands in North America west of the Mississippi River. Outdoor recreation activities and the resources upon which they depend emerge at a nexus of environmental and cultural change associated with nature-based tourism and a global boom in amenity development (Buckley, 2002; McCarthy, 2007; Walker, 2003).

While the results of the economic shift in the West away from timber and mineral extraction may resemble the Old West, the new migrants to the region have brought with
them specific sensibilities in regards to both urban landscapes and those beyond cities’ boundaries. Considering this cultural shift, historians Liza Nicholas, Elaine Bapis and Thomas Harvey argue that, “for us, the ‘New West’ is less about the loss of feed stores and the proliferation of espresso shops, as the Atlas of the New West (Travis & Robb, 1997) would have it, and more about the circulation of a certain kind of knowledge, an emergent taken-for-granted-ness of ‘the way things ought to be’ particularly with regard to western space” (Nicholas, Bapis, & Harvey, 2003b, p. 21). This “taken-for-granted-ness” percolates through debates over the appropriate uses of public lands, the common good and private property, resource management, and suburban and exurban development. Further, the very mechanisms through which Western space comes to be “taken for granted” are at play in the production of space and the amenity resources of the New West. Bend provides an ideal case study to examine that production of space. Once a prime example of the single industry resource production towns throughout the region, Bend has become emblematic of the amenity development of the New West. The dramatic population growth of the 1990s expanded real estate markets. The timberlands were redeveloped as golf resorts. The town now sports at least four organic coffee roasters and eight breweries or brewpubs. It, and other towns in Deschutes County are regularly mentioned in the popular press as among the best places to hike, paddle, ski, golf, run, bicycle, or buy a second home.

The debates about space in the New West in general, and Bend in particular, beg the questions that frame this dissertation. How did recreational landscapes in the countryside become a natural resource for the community? How are recreational
resources governed and how does that governance depend upon and deviate from earlier resource production? How has the shifting cultural landscape, the changed understanding of ‘the way things ought to be,’ produced new kinds of resource space and reinforced existing links between the city and the countryside? Outdoor recreation, as a resource, depends upon the production of a particular resource space. In what follows I provide an analysis of that production.

**Cultural shifts and the production of resource space**

In Bend, the practice of promoting recreational amenities began long before the boom of the 1990s. Regional boosters touted the region’s recreational possibilities at the moment of the town’s founding in 1905. Throughout the twentieth century the mountains, rivers, and deserts have provided local residents and visitors alike the opportunity for hunting, fishing, skiing, horseback riding and paddling. As these amenities faced pressure from resource developers and more intensive recreational use, recreational resource planning commissions have been appointed at the federal and state levels to look for ways to maximize resource use and find compatibility among conflicting uses without diminishing the characteristics that make the recreational resources so valuable in the first place. Timber firms have worked with local governments and federal agencies to find ways to allow recreational use on private timberlands without diminishing the value of timber crops (figure 1.4). Resort developers have negotiated with local regulators and firms to maximize development opportunities to capitalize on specific cultural and natural imaginations of the region. Together these efforts represent a broad effort to merge recreational amenities into the broader natural resource programs of the region and to transform those amenities into natural resources. Like the production of timber, oil, or
mineral resources, these efforts are always highly political (Bridge, 2004, p. 396). Their production is bound up in the relationships between institutions of capital, government, and the natural landscapes themselves.

As Gavin Bridge and Phil McManus (2000) discuss in relation to mining and timber sectors, amenity landscapes, the recreational lands of much of the modern West, have become enmeshed in narratives of environmentalism as they deal with tensions surrounding urban and rural sustainability. This shift revolves partly around an increased importance on the consumption of nature, even as it continues to be produced. The history of environmental politics “can be thought of as a history of consumption rather than the history of production. They arose not out of the way in which people carried out
an occupation and earned an income, but out of the kind of life that income made possible and the ways in which people chose to express their new standards of living” (Hays, 1987, p. 4). This fundamental change in American society during the twentieth century, especially after the Second World War, reframed the natural amenities of the countryside as a critical component of people’s livelihoods, of “making a living and making it meaningful” (Bebbington, 2000, p. 498). This is the key shift associated with the amenity migration of the New West and the environmental politics that have conserved the value of recreational landscapes.

The consumption of nature by amenity seekers, however, does not preclude its production. As these natural amenities, these cultural landscapes at the center of how people understand their quality of life, have become produced as natural resources themselves, they challenge us to ask how they reinforce or resist existing understandings of the production of nature and what constitutes a resource and its consumption. They challenge us to consider the ways that amenity landscapes are developed through similar institutions and governance patterns dominant in earlier production regimes. Finally, they challenge us to examine the institutions through which those resources are produced and consumed. This production however also resides in the production of place, in the myths of perfection and aesthetic value of the landscape. The very shift in cultural ideals discussed by Hays in terms of environmental politics has emerged as a critical component of the economic landscape of small cities throughout the West.

The shift in environmental values have, according to Hays, resulted in a “postmanufacturing society” (Hays, 1987, p. 12) that entails a shift in how resources are
produced. “The shift from one mode to another must entail the production of a new space” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 46). The history of these resource landscapes might be said to be a history of space, “even though space is neither a ‘subject’ nor an ‘object,’ but rather a social reality--that is to say, a set of relations and forms” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 116). For Lefebvre, these relations and forms produce three kinds of interrelated kinds of space--spatial practice, representations of space, and spaces of representation. At the core of each of these spatial forms lies an understanding of the workings of capital, space as a social product, built upon social relations and practices and embedded in processes of capitalism. “Contradictions of capitalism henceforth manifest themselves as contradictions of space. To know how and what space internalizes is to learn how to produce something better, is to learn how to produce another city, another space” (Merrifield, 2006, p. 108). Yet these three conceptions of space are each the result of different processes, and so operate differently. They flow into each other as they enact a dialectic of their own production.

*Representations of space* refer to the conceptual project of planners and cartographers. These representations are abstract, heady and technical; they are characteristic of state agencies and corporations. Representations of space provide order and a structure to chaotic lived spaces and *spaces of representation*—Lefevbre’s lived spaces. Representations of space are the seemingly objective spaces of planners and scientists. They are practical and pragmatic. “We may be sure that representations of space have a practical impact, that they intervene in and modify spatial textures which are informed by effective knowledge and ideology” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 42). These “spatial
textures” can be found in the *normalbaum* described by James Scott and climatologists’ models (Demeritt, 2001a). They are found in both the highly capitalist spaces of the American West and the former Soviet Union. “By enticing and coercing, by offering opportunities laced with threats, by dividing time, space, and materials into discrete units, Soviet functionaries and American capitalists found it possible to line up the bodies to build and extract, to build the machines that would build more machines and make it easier and faster to extract more” (Brown, 2001, p. 44). Yet for all of their power to produce the world in their image, they also consistently fail to complete that production. Like the grids of both Montana and Kazakstan, representations of space are only partial, merely one component in the fluid mix of spaces in which people build their communities and live their lives.

The second part of this fluid mix is *spaces of representation*. Like the language would imply, it might be useful, if overly simplistic, to think of these spaces as simply the inverse of representations of space. Spaces of representation are everyday lived spaces. They are quotidian rather than specialized, vernacular rather than jargon laden. A space of representation “has an affective kernel or center: bed, bedroom, dwelling, house; or, square, church, graveyard. It embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 42). These are the spaces we know through our engagement with them and our emotional attachment to them. While the spaces of technocrats and planners lean towards the quantitative, spaces of representation tend to be qualitative. The door to the library or the barn, the fairway of the 9th hole on the golf course, the warehouse, train depot, or workshop are the spaces of
representation, the spaces in which we live our lives, engage those around us, and attach meanings. It “is space as lived and experienced through a set of symbolic associations” (White, 2010).

Finally, Lefebvre describes *spatial practices*. “Spatial practices structure lived reality, include routes and networks, patterns and interactions that connect places and people, images with reality, work with leisure” (Merrifield, 2006, p. 110). Spatial practice concerns the ways that our movements construct new spaces and relates to our infrastructure, patterns of movement, and the separation of different spaces. For Lefebvre, these spatial practices are interwoven with questions of scale, allowing us to move through and between scales through our engagement with space. “According to Lefebvre’s ‘principle of superimposition and interpenetration of social spaces,’ geographical scales cannot be understood in isolation from one another, as mutually exclusive or inclusive containers; rather, they constitute deeply intertwined moments and levels of a single worldwide sociospatial totality” (Brenner, 2000, p. 369). Our spatial practices provide the means to merge scales, to make manageable and livable the diversity of spaces around us and the scales at which those spaces operate.

The three broad forms of space theorized by Lefebvre are fluid and porous. Spaces bleed into each other and across these broad forms even as they present distinct productions. Richard White asks how this works operationally, just what is it that we are studying when we examine spatial histories. Initially, his answer seems to be simple. “Movement. I don’t want to be simplistic as to say that if space is the question then movement is the answer, but I fear that I am nearly that simple. We produce and
reproduce space through our movements and the movements of goods that we ship and information we exchange” (White, 2010, pp. 3). In the case of recreational resources, Lefebvre’s architecture of space is valuable in that it provides a way to simultaneously consider the cultural, technical, natural, and economic components of the production of resource space, of the recreational landscape as it is governed and capitalized upon. The recreational resource space of Deschutes County connect the country and the city through the conservation and production of recreational amenities as natural resources. That production, however, must also contend with the natural characteristics of the landscape—the mobility of fire and deer, for example, and it depends upon the scientific, cartographic and statistical accounting made by firms and government agencies.

The production of space in and around Bend is a production of resource space within recreational landscapes. Its production depends upon Lefebvre’s three interrelated kinds of space: scientific abstraction and simplification, cultural imaginaries of the countryside and of leisure, and the infrastructure and movement of people and natural organisms. Through abstractions, representations, symbolic and affective engagement and built infrastructure that enables and guides movement, the recreational resources of Central Oregon are produced as space. The production of space is a necessary and immediate component of the production of resources, their histories, and the cultural landscapes of which they are a part. This dissertation is an exploration of the production of that space, its history and its material implications.

**Environmental Governance, Critical Resource Geography, and Environmental History**

Drawing on theories of critical resource geography, environmental governance, and the environmental history of natural resource production, I examine the ways that
recreational landscapes become natural resources and how these resources are inscribed with the history of resource production in the region. Lately, there has been “a growing excitement surrounding rural dynamics among North American geographers” (Nelson, 2011, p. 2). The focus of this has been upon the cultural and political economic conditions of amenity development throughout the country. “Contemporary geographical research on amenity migration has emphasized the relevance of political ecology for understanding the interaction of power and environment in the First World as rural areas move from productivist to ‘post-productivist’ economies” (Larsen and Hutton, 2011, 2). These studies have considered the environmental governance of amenity development. “If social scientists are interested in ‘environmental governance’ as a generic aspatial category, geographers are eager to investigate the actual spaces and places in and through which the relationships between societies, economies, states, and nature continue to unfold” (Jonas & Bridge, 2003, p. 959). Through careful analysis of water markets, wetland services, natural gas, copper, timber, fish and other natural resources regulated, trafficked, and traded as materials, landscapes, and as futures, the new resource geography literature has presented a picture of natural resources that is firmly ensconced within existing market practices and reproduced as “socio-natures” (Bakker, 2004; Mansfield, 2004; Robertson, 2004). The ways that these integral components of the natural world are stripped of their context in order to enter the market as commodities reveals the way that state regimes simplify and rationalize complex cultural and natural processes to make them legible for governance (Li, 2005; Scott, 1998). This governance is in turn embedded in scalar relationships between localities, the state, firms, and non-
governmental organizations. As scholars of environmental governance pay explicit attention to differential power relations inherent in the production and management of nature. In this sense then, questions of environmental governance are questions of who has access to the management, use, and definition of nature (Miller & Edwards, 2001; Sonnenfeld & Mol, 2002; Swyngedouw, 2004).

Critical resources geographers have tended to focus on the commodity itself, the geographic conditions and movement on its way from extraction or harvest to the market, and the institutions responsible for its governance.

Geographers working in this field seek to illuminate the ways that particular institutional configurations – for example resource rights, policies regarding resource extraction and conservation, or codified social norms and management practices – mediate the metabolic relationship between nature and society, and in so doing serve to stabilize environmental and social regulation within a given regime of accumulation. (Bridge & Perreault, 2009, p. 483)

An institutional turn within the geography of natural resources has driven a research agenda loosely gathered under the similar umbrellas of “critical resource geography” or “new resource geography” which “often combines neo-Marxist, institutionalist, and Foucauldian concepts to make sense of modern mining or forestry” (Castree, Demeritt, & Liverman, 2009, p. 11). Largely scrapping the seemingly apolitical approaches dominant in earlier resource geography, this research has sought to “denaturalize and account for
the processes by which particular parts of the environment become produced as resources (Bridge, 2004, p. 395).

This line of research focuses on the link between the ecological characteristics of resources and the political economic contexts of their production and consumption as commodities. The particular growth patterns of Douglas fir, for example, along with emerging sawmill technologies, enabled a greater foray into the forests for the logging of smaller trees for the production of veneer and plywood. This enabled the Pacific Northwest’s larger firms to diversify their production lines to include more processed wood products. “By diversifying wood products facilities, firms can develop a set of material pathways from raw logs to finished products that suit the mix of log types (species, age, class, wood densities, etc.) coming off their lands in a given area” (Prudham, 2005, p. 109). In terms of the amenity landscapes of Central Oregon, critical resource geography provides a frame to consider the production of those landscapes as natural resources, including institutional arrangements, process through which resources are contested, managed, and capitalized upon, and the material conditions of their production. The recreational landscapes of Central Oregon are not simply amenities waiting to be enjoyed, but linked to historical processes that involve government regulation and capital investment. Critical resource geography outlines a geographic toolkit for considering the combination of institutional and material elements of “the traditional materials of the western story--landscapes turned into property, the commodifying of physical nature, and the federal influence in shaping the region's always
temporary social and economic relations” (Robbins, 1999, p. 278-279) and their role in the history of capitalism in the American West.

Critical resource geography, however, has tended to focus on contemporary resource issues, often glossing over the historical developments and prior arrangements between capital and resource management agencies that concerned Robbins. This dissertation seeks to bridge the emerging literature in critical resource geography with the established literature surrounding the political and material natures of natural resources within environmental history. Char Miller (1997) for example, writes in the introduction to an environmental history of the Forest Service that there is a lesson here for historians. Most scholarship on forest history has focused on the human perspective, on the economic structures, social institutions, and political strategies that have developed to exploit this well-wooded terrain, an emphasis that American Forests necessarily reflects. Shifting that vantage point just a bit to incorporate the land and its biota, as well as the disturbances, natural and introduced, that affect its evolution will complicate our research yet reveal rich insights. (p. 12)

The environmental history of resource production and research concerning ecological changes in the landscape emerge in two of the field’s founding texts, William Cronon’s (1983) Changes in the Land and Donald Worster’s (1979) Dust Bowl. In each case Worster and Cronon demonstrate that the ecological conditions of the landscape played important roles in the ways those landscapes might produce commodities, the ways they might enter the economy. Asking the question “how did things get to be this
way?” (Cronon, 2003, p. 171) in the context of natural resources has challenged environmental historians to consider the long and complicated production histories of natural resources landscapes (see for example Evenden, 2004; Harvey, 2005b; Hays, 1959; Hirt, 1994; Jacoby, 2001; Langston, 2003; Pisani, 1996; Taylor, 1999; Wilson, 2010, though the list could go on).

The research concerning the environmental governance of amenity landscapes has yielded important discussions about institutional arrangements and the scalar relationships to nature, but it remains tied to present conditions of accumulation, with particular emphasis upon neoliberal arrangements and rarely considering the historical relationships and patterns involved in the production of recreational amenities and their constituent resources. Throughout this dissertation I adopt understandings of resource governance, the production of amenity landscapes and their management, with a focus on their historical development, on how firms, agencies, and government programs establish the conditions through which they might be produced. These institutions, however, did not emerge fully formed. By offering an historical approach to this production I push this research forward to consider the ways that contemporary capital processes are built upon past patterns of government and capital investment and the materiality of natural resources. In short, I offer a historical perspective missing from much of the discussion concerning amenity and exurban development.

As my approach bridges the critical resource geography literature with environmental histories of resource management, it necessitates a consideration not just of the commodity, its natural characteristics and its institutions, but also an awareness of
the landscape and its history. The cultural and natural landscapes of resource production are produced through both compromise and contest. To better understand these hybrid productions we must recognize historical specificity, natural and cultural variability, and persistent efforts of simplification. For Mark Fiege (1999), this implies a consideration of how the social, natural, and political landscapes are changed through irrigation practices. “[The irrigators] soon learned that this land was not a blank slate waiting for the inscription of a mythic dream. It was a dynamic environment with a great capacity to limit, circumvent, confound, and in turn shape human systems. The interaction with the land wedded artifice and nature in a hybrid landscape whose complexity and irony we have only begun to appreciate” (p. 209). Natural resources, for many environmental historians, are embedded in their specific landscapes and their historical contingencies. We cannot remove the production of the resource from the landscapes of production. Richard White (1995), using the example of the Columbia River, concludes that we need to come to grips with the river as a whole. “If the conversation is not about fish and justice, about electricity and ways of life, about production and nature, about beauty as well as efficiency, and how these things are inseparable from our own tangled lives, then we have not come to terms with our history on this river” (p. 113).

The history of resource landscapes includes contests over access to and management of natural resources, histories that revolve around shifting arrangements between the state, the market, and cultural values associated with conservation and consumption. The standardization, technological developments, and capital flows that supported the flows of resources through Chicago at the beginning of the 20th century,
for example, can be located in the history of natural resource production in the links between the country and the city (Cronon, 1991). This link depends upon institutional arrangements and historical contexts which range from technological developments to the biological properties at play within individual resources. As a result, the resource links between the country and the city produce a network that is at once natural and cultural. Research has shown similar networks at play in the organization of irrigation, the conservation of migratory birds, the management of Ponderosa pine forests, and the production of salmon (Fiege, 1999; Wilson, 2010, Langston, 1995; Taylor, 2001). Like the analyses of natural gas, urban water development, and wetland services gathered under the banner of critical resource geography, these natural resource histories have described the processes through which parts of nature become resources, maintaining many of their physical characteristics even as they enter a network of institutions and capital driven processes.

Yet the political economic context of these developments are dramatically different. Each of these cases represent situations of significant state leadership focused simultaneously on state-led conservation efforts, production for economic use, and an increase in regulation concerning access to the resource and individual or corporate property rights. The results were far from a landscape that witnessed a hollowing out of the state, the neoliberal context of much of the work in critical resource geography, with resource control ceded to corporations under a globalized market, but rather a “federal landscape,” particularly in the American West.
By providing much needed capital, the government achieved what private enterprise would have found much more difficult to accomplish in the time span of a century... The American--and the western--economy is the result of an intricate mix of government and free enterprise. In the crazy-quilt pattern that developed during the course of the twentieth century, it is difficult to discern where the function of one began and the other ended.

(Nash, 1999, p. 160)

In both cases--under state and private development--we see that parts of nature become natural resources in particular ways, through relationships governed at once by their natural characteristics, shifting political economic contexts, historical path dependencies, and a range of cultural values associated the means we attach to the environment.

One similarity that runs through the history of resource production in America is a drive to rationalize and quantify portions of the environment to further its productive capacity and allow for a degree of resource conservation. To consider the historical geography of natural resources, we must also consider the history of the ways resource landscapes have become known, made legible for management and conservation. We must consider the production of resource space and its consumption. The shift towards their production as resources is linked to the broad shift in the aesthetization of the countryside linked to new understandings of quality of life (Hays, 1987), and towards a reshaping of the relationship between cities and the landscapes of the countryside in the American West.
David Demeritt has argued that statistical picturing—the quantification and representation of resources or natural phenomena—“helped redefine the basis for public trust in trained scientific experts whose technical practices lay people had to depend upon but could not fully understand (Demeritt, 2002, p. 455). By exploring the ways that progressive era foresters accounted for the scope of cutover lands across the country and the ways they transformed that accounting into easily readable maps, he argues that quantification efforts were not simply a tool used by powerful interests to further their own economic and political standing. Rather, they became an important device to help scientists gain credibility in the public sphere, a public sphere already engaged in debates about conservation of natural resources (Demeritt, 2001b).

Statistical picturing is both a way of seeing—of making resources legible—and a way of speaking. The statistical picturing of natural resources, their abstraction from their ecological conditions, represents a critical moment in their transformation into a natural resource, the ways those resources are brought into the market, and the means through which they might be conserved (Kirsch, 2002). The representations are at once stand-ins for material things, purportedly objective and scientific facts, and rhetorical manifestations. The statistical representations of the recreational landscapes of Central Oregon have been critical in the region’s emergence as the “recreation capital of Oregon.” The material landscapes, once quantified as timber resources, then as resorts, golf courses, campgrounds, and wilderness areas enter markets as real estate and supportive amenities and inform the ways they are conserved through environmental and community activism.
Throughout this dissertation I consider the histories and statistical picturing of natural resources as I tease out the changes in the relationships between nature, science, conservation, commercialism, and government policy in the production of recreational landscapes. By adopting perspectives from critical resources geography, environmental governance, and environmental history, in this dissertation I hope to bridge contemporary work concerning amenity development, the material conditions of natural resources and the history of resource production, capital development, and the relationship between the country and the city in the American West. Speaking about changes in hydropower management, Karl Boyd Brooks (2006) writes that disputes about a region’s natural resources recast them into new relationships between people and their history (p. 4). At the core of these changes is a reconfiguration of the relationship between property and the landscape, between private capital and the public good. In the context of urban planning and resource management in Oregon, local government and federal land management agencies (the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management) have helped to shape the political economic context which links the preservation of aesthetic landscapes and sublime experiences with strict urban and rural boundaries and strong property divisions. Yet lines of sight, deer, and wildfire regularly cross those boundaries, trespassing across the orderly distribution of the private resources they are meant to capture.

When Anne marveled at the view from the top of Mount Bachelor, she, perhaps unknowingly, marveled at a landscape deeply inscribed by boundaries and by the calculations, regulations, and political posturing that supported them. It is the product of an environmental ethic that remains skeptical of the intrusion of the city into the country.
While geographers and environmental historians have clearly demonstrated the ways that these categories are always interrelated, they have become valuable categories for land use planners and public land managers. This political boundary making, however, has done little to take the natural world out of our cities or to curb human involvement in natural areas. Following the decline of the timber industry and a reduction in the number of working ranches in Deschutes County, these political boundaries have reinforced ideological and material distinctions between the country and the city.

**Methodology**
This narrative of the production of recreational resources and amenity development in Bend and Deschutes County is built upon a research design centered upon archival research supported by interviews and observations in Bend, Oregon. At archives in the Des Chutes County Historical Society, the State Archives in Salem, Oregon, the Special Collections at the University of Oregon, the Oregon Historical Society, the Bend and Deschutes Planning records, and the Western History and Conservation Collection at the Denver Public Library, I read and analyzed government reports, oral history transcripts, meeting notes, board decisions and other helpful resources. During my time in Bend, the Des Chutes County Historical Society made the Brooks Scanlon Papers (on loan from the Oregon Historical Society) available for my use. Given Brooks Scanlon’s long involvement with Bend and importance to the economic history of Deschutes County, these records proved critical to the construction of my larger story concerning the history of recreational development in the region.

*The Bulletin*, Bend’s local newspaper has dutifully, if conservatively, reported the news of the region and the world since 1903. I examined the editions in the Des Chutes
County Historical Society’s research library gleaning articles concerning the relationship between Bend and its resource hinterland and recreational activity in the area. I took photographs of these articles and coded them with keywords in iPhoto. Since those weeks I spent flipping through dusty newspaper volumes, many editions of the Bulletin have been digitized and made searchable through Google’s newspaper archive, making searching for relevant articles, op-eds, and editorials significantly easier. Google’s collection, however, is not complete and the time spent with the paper copies of the newspaper has proved important.

In addition to research in archives, I conducted formal interviews with 11 key planners, politicians, environmental leaders, and business leaders in the region. These interviews provided important verification of some historical events and much needed context to contemporary trends in the region. They helped me fill out the gaps left in the puzzles presented in the archive and provide a more colorful perspective than the dry business memos and meeting minutes typically presented. The interviews were unstructured and usually lasted about an hour, though a couple stretched over three hours. Informal conversations with people I met in Bend helped me gain familiarity with how people engaged with recreational landscapes and the city as it underwent change. opting instead to talk to people more informally and off the record whenever I could. These conversations, whether held at community events, the brewpub after a city council meeting, the ski resort, the Turkish Bath at McMenamins, or the coffee shop, were relaxed and led to open and frank discussing lacking in some of the more formal interviews. When I told people why I was in town and what interested me, they were
more than willing to talk and share their memories, opinions, and impressions about Bend. I used these conversations as clues to what people found important and as sounding boards for some of my own hypotheses.

Bill Cronon (1999) writes that “if environmental history is successful in this project, the story of how different peoples have lived and used the natural world will become one of the most basic and fundamental narratives in all of history, without which no understanding of the past could be complete” (p. 1375). The narrative that follows, informed by insights and perspectives gleaned from critical resource geography, studies of environmental governance and environmental history, and built upon the documents, interviews, reports, and conversations with people in Bend is the story of how one community engaged the natural world that surrounded it. It is a narrative of how the natural landscapes around and within Bend have been produced as natural resources, how those resources have been used and governed, and the stories people in Bend tell about them through their political action, their planning documents, and the ways those resources have become taken for granted. It is a narrative of how the rural spaces on the urban fringe have become a contested site through which we might query the tensions in the simultaneous production, consumption, and conservation of the landscape. Those tensions link private property, public good, the urban, the rural, and the sublime and pastoral landscapes in the countryside.

Amenity Landscapes and Recreation Capital: An Outline
In this dissertation I examine the relationships between natural amenities and natural resources, between politics and leisure, and between capital and nature as they relate to
the production and conservation of recreational resources on the urban fringe. An approach that combines insights from environmental history and critical resource geography exposes spatial contradictions within the production and consumption of landscapes and the political and scientific processes of amenity development. Throughout the dissertation I will argue that the recreational landscapes link the city and the countryside as natural resources through diverse spatial practices of production, consumption, and conservation. The stories we tell about these landscapes shape our uses of them as resources. Their cultural geographies reconfigure their resource geographies.

This dissertation is an attempt to bind together the cultural, natural, and political geographies of production and consumption of the natural resources represented in the city and the country, our planning processes and our cultural politics.

The environmental history of amenity development and resource production in Deschutes County is rooted in its history as a ranching and timber community. Its early expansions at the beginning of the 20th century signaled a trend that would be repeated throughout the twentieth century, linking real-estate, timber production, and “quality of life” issues with national political and economic trends. Chapter two paints in broad strokes the pre-World War II history of the region as it became established as a site of recreational development in the second half of the 20th century. This early 20th century history of the resource relationships between the city and the countryside not only demonstrates the long record of natural amenities in the region, but also the ways those amenities were made alongside other resources. Bend’s “natural advantages” included both the timber resources and the recreational opportunities of the countryside. The
recreational opportunities would become natural amenities, and then the natural resources that fueled the growth at the end of the century.

Chapter three examines the rationalization of recreational resource conservation at the national level. As the United States experienced a boom in outdoor recreational activity in the years following World War II, the federal government considered the conservation of recreational opportunities a significant concern. In 1956 Congress authorized a comprehensive study assessing the current state of outdoor recreational opportunities throughout the country. The Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission (ORRRC) published the results of this survey in 1962, solidifying an understanding of recreational areas as natural resources that would need to managed with “the support of thorough knowledge and extensive data” (Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962a, p. 183). Bend is almost completely surrounded by federally managed lands, making its relationship to its resource hinterland highly dependent upon federal resource management priorities. I argue that the federal resource management agencies began to apply the techniques they used to manage timber, water, and mineral resources to recreational landscapes. This led to an increased effort to codify and quantify outdoor recreation on the lands upon which it depends. These statistical representations of outdoor recreation became tools for conservation advocacy, the prosecution of interdisciplinary disputes, and an extension of government efforts to rationalize and govern recreational landscapes as natural resources. In effect, this brought outdoor recreation into a system of modernist scientific conservation that would come to guide
land use decisions and debates surrounding the relationship between the public good and private property throughout the West.

This approach would be echoed in both state level recreational resource inventories and, as will be seen later, the resource elements of local comprehensive plans. It also served as a model for private transitions from primary resource production to excursions into resort development. Chapter four examines the early history of resort development in the region around Bend and how these properties were conceptualized, planned, and ultimately built with an eye towards capitalizing on sublime views and promoting domesticity within a newly commodified wild nature. Before Brooks Scanlon, Bend’s largest timber firm, spun off Brooks Resources to manage their recreational developments, they commissioned a survey of their private timber holdings. Like the ORRRC at the national level, the executives at Brooks Scanlon wanted to know the exact recreational potential of each of their properties, and ultimately, whether those timberlands might be put to more profitable use as resort developments. They found that much of their property would be more profitable as resorts, complete with second homes, condominiums, golf courses, tennis courts, and of course, unrivaled views of the Central Cascades’ peaks. The sublime landscapes of Deschutes County, now thoroughly embedded in the process of natural resource production and capitalization, expose new relationships between capital development, practices of environmentalism, and the consumption of natural and cultural landscapes.

While Brooks Scanlon began building resorts, the Bend City Council and the Deschutes County Planning Commission were busy trying to fulfill their obligations
under Oregon’s new Comprehensive Planning Program. Chapter five explores how efforts to negotiate wildlife management with exurban amenity development resulted in conflicts between wildlife managers, scientists, environmental organizations and property owners. At the core of this program was a set of regulations designed to control urban sprawl and increase participatory involvement in the planning process. Among the most contentious of the debates over how this would play out in the region were the ways potential land use changes would effect local deer herd migrations on the edge of the city. At play in these debates were not only the biological necessity of the deer herds, but more importantly, the question of who could speak for nature, the institutional arrangement of land use management, and the tensions between private property and the public good. In resolving these land use conflicts, planners developed a community-centered model of environmental management with an emphasis on institutional involvement across scales. The fight over the deer herds exposed rifts in the ways the community would manage wild nature on the urban fringe.

Chapter six returns to a focus to the landscapes and the public and private infrastructure that enables the consumption of recreational resources. Recreational development depends upon access to resources and the maintenance of specific natural landscapes. In the case of wilderness areas, one only needs access to the resource. In other cases however, the resource, and indeed, the nature of the experience requires active construction and reconstruction. In this chapter I turn my attention to three sites: The Old Mill District, Mount Bachelor, and the Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway to consider the role of infrastructure development, both public and private, in amenity development and the
production of resources. The three cases present vastly different ownership contexts, natural conditions, and historical processes, yet in each case the development of specific infrastructure developments, natural conditions, and shifting cultural priorities were critical for their implementation.

Chapter seven looks more closely at the relationship between private property, the public good, interactions with natural phenomena, and environmental governance on the urban fringe through an examination of the development of “FireFree,” the wildfire prevention program in Bend. While both the government and large firms were building new infrastructure to support the “recreation capital,” property owners were being asked to assume more responsibility in confronting the incursions of wildfire into residential neighborhoods on the expanding urban fringe. A key component of this new relationship to wild nature, an incursion of the natural world into the city that matched the push in the opposite direction, was an introduction of the concept of “defensible space” into the lexicon of property maintenance and the implementation of a new, citizen driven, government guided program to limit the spread of wildfire into residential neighborhoods. It increased private responsibility for the aesthetic and ecological resources distinctive to the region.

At the heart of Bend’s transition from a thriving timber town in the 1950s, to a small city with a lifestyle often described as “poverty with a view” in the 1970s and 1980s, to the bustling “recreation capital of Oregon” today lies a dynamic relationship to the natural world within the city’s limits, at the urban fringe, and in its extended hinterland. This relationship has been shaped by local political economic arrangements,
national trends and cultural movements, changes in state and federal governance strategies, and by the dynamism of nature. The final chapter brings together the major arguments focusing on 1) the ways that residents, government, and developers in Bend have utilized the region’s recreational landscapes as a resource, valued primarily for their aesthetic characteristics and the cultural ideals they evoke, 2) how contemporary strategies of natural resource management have their roots in earlier modernist models, and 3) the ways that the production of resource spaces is dependent upon way that “our knowledge of [that space] must be expected to reproduce and expound upon the process of production” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 36). That process of production, in the case of recreational landscapes, is also tied to processes of consumption. The resulting landscapes, simultaneously preserved and produced, regulated and privatized, are deeply imbued with political economic, cultural, and natural histories that continue to play upon mythic values of the landscape and reproduce resource oriented understandings of nature. These developments revolve around questions bound up in the debates over resource inventories, planning programs, citizen’s committees, property agreements, and the public good: How have the landscapes surrounding Bend been governed, produced, and consumed as natural resources? How do processes of governance and production reflect the representational and natural geographies of the region? These are not only questions of political geography, urban sustainability, and institutions and their political economy, but also questions that begin to help us understand Anne’s reaction to the view from Mount Bachelor, how the view came to be and just how much work is necessary to maintain the perceived perfection.
On October 5th, 1911, a crowd gathered on the banks of the Deschutes River to help James J. Hill celebrate the opening of a new railroad. The Oregon Trunk Line would link Bend with the Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railroad. Trains would be able to travel from Bend to the Columbia river, and the rest of the country. The new line would open markets for Central Oregon’s agricultural products--primarily alfalfa--and bring new people and goods into the region. For the people of Bend, Railroad Day provided a chance to consider the potential for a vibrant future as part of a booming economy and a connected nation. The official program for the festivities set a lofty tone in its invocation of Hill and his vision for Bend and Central Oregon.

On this day, “The Empire Builder,” Mr. James J. Hill will here drive a golden spike, signifying not the end, but the beginning, of what future generations will consider his greatest achievement... Wherever James J. Hill has gone, deserts have bloomed and cities have sprung like magic. Now he is here; and never, barring Seattle, has he come to a spot so certainly the site of a great city. Mr. Hill has built his success through the success of others. Let us never forget this. Bend will not make Central Oregon, Central Oregon will make Bend. Work then, for Bend. The business of none of us will make Bend: Bend will make our business...

This is the lesson of James J. Hill. He made the town of Spokane; and his
spirit among the people made the city of Spokane. Similarly situated, Spokane had not for years, if she has today, the advantages of Bend. Let this then be our slogan: Bend, the Spokane of Oregon. (The Bend Company, 1911)

Like many towns in the American West at the turn of the century, Bend remained relatively isolated from the rest of the country. Large open spaces and poor roads made moving goods and people into the region difficult. When Hill pounded the golden spike through the rails and into the railroad tie on the banks of the Deschutes, he did more than drive a piece of metal into a piece of wood. He hammered home a lasting link between Central Oregon and the rest of the country. Over time the connective infrastructure would include highways, airports, fiber-optic cables, and ski lifts, but the first railroad ties were critically important to Bend’s growth throughout the twentieth century as locals and outside firms sought to capitalize on the region’s natural advantages.

Changing technologies, and the ways they moved goods, people, and resources through the region reconfigured the resource space and the cultural landscape in the region. In this chapter I will trace these changes in movement through and within the region as it relates to its capital development. The “natural advantages” of Bend provided immediate opportunities local development. Their production established resource links to the countryside that were economic and cultural, linked to capital investment and rural qualities of life. I argue that the resource history and geography of the region depended upon building the infrastructure to move timber and agricultural products from the country to the city and from the city to the market. It also depended upon attracting
people to the community and providing a place for them to live. The early economic
development of Bend depended upon the capacity to bring people into the region, and
produce and ship resources out of it. The expansion of the town and its housing
infrastructure depended upon capital investment and labor from the same sources (both
private and public) that would shape the recreational development later in the century.
The region’s natural advantages had to be transformed into resources and amenities
before they could support the growing town.

A small town dreams big
The Oregon Trunk Line, the leaders of Bend hoped, would establish Bend as the
commercial center of the High Desert, adding a second rail hub in the inland Northwest
that would link Oregon, Washington, and California with the rest of the country (figure
2.1). According to the proposal, the town would act as a gathering point for the region’s
agricultural products and the timber from the ponderosa pine forests higher up the slopes
south and west of town. From there, those products would be loaded onto Hill’s freight
cars and shipped for further processing and sale. The “advantages of Bend” referenced by
Hill, lay in its proximity to the raw timber and agricultural lands surrounding the town, in
its potential for success as a ranching and farming community, and ultimately in the
people of the region who would provide the effort, leadership, and labor necessary for
production. At the Railroad Day celebration, Hill exhorted the crowd to be diligent in
their efforts to develop the region and to help it grow. “Now get your eye on the gun-
barrel and keep it there and hit the mark. The mark is to get people into this country. Now
what you must have and what we must have is people.” He concluded by sharing his own
confidence in the people of Bend. “There is no reason why Central Oregon should not
produce enormous wealth. We have a good deal of faith in it. If we did not have, we would not have come here” (Railroad magnates in Bend at road's finish, 1911). The people of the region were ready to take up the challenge and to buy into the hype.

Figure 2.1. Opening up Central Oregon. The Oregon Trunk Line would connect Bend to Spokane and markets throughout the country. (The Great Northern Railway Company, 1911)
Photographs from the celebration show Hill looming above the crowds on a stage, his hands on his hips, his beard and jaw lifted, shouting his message of interconnection and economic prosperity across the desert horizon (figure 2.2). His message wasn’t unique to Bend, but one he delivered to communities across the West hoping to profit from the agricultural and timber resources of their hinterlands and to efficiently move those resources to markets in the East (White 1991, 256).

Hill also stood to profit tremendously from the transport of freight away from these towns and small cities and the transport of new residents to them. Hill anticipated that his railroad would serve as the conduit between Bend and the Pacific Northwest and the East. Newly built market roads would facilitate efforts by farmers to bring in
agricultural products while smaller, private rail lines would extend into the timber regions, bringing logs into the city for processing before the finished lumber would also be shipped out along Hill’s railroad.

The railroads of the West represented a gamble. Unlike the railways of the East, which connected established population centers, the lines of the West spread thin tendrils across largely open and unpopulated lands. In order to return their investment, railroad companies had to drum up passengers and inspire growth in new towns that could supply the freight for the railroads to carry. The railroads of the West would “have to generate passenger and freight revenue by running from nowhere in particular to nowhere at all” (Schwantes, 1989, 142). The railroads of the West at the turn of the century depended on the promise of future settlement and development. Hills exhortation to build a thriving, populous city was largely an effort to make good on that promise. In 1911 Bend was indeed nowhere in particular. Spokane functioned as a hub for five different transcontinental lines: the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific, the Union Pacific, and the Canadian Pacific. The convergence made Spokane a critical link for the transport of freight in all directions around the country (Morrissey, 1997). The region had become known simply as “the Inland Empire,” “that rich interior domain which the Chamber of Commerce was equally fond of calling more explicitly the Spokane Country.” (Meinig, 1968, 460).

The “natural advantages” of Bend however were still future lines in the ledger and on the landscape, lines that would depend upon new people and new investments arriving in the city. The dream of a new Spokane in Oregon would expand the Inland Empire to
the South, recoup Hill’s investments, and fulfill the dreams of Bend’s own boosters and investors.

The arrival of Hill’s railroad and the growth of the city was more than simply a question of dreams and hopes. It brought with it the pragmatic problem of building and planning the city, of selling real estate, platting new neighborhoods, and ultimately of constructing homes. The ceremony on the banks of the Deschutes River in 1911 served a second purpose. The coming of the railroad signaled an opportunity to open the “Park Addition,” a new housing development in the nascent town that would presumably house many of the residents Hill counted on. The new neighborhood lay on the southern edge of the existing town on the east side of the river. The homes that would be built there would be close to the commercial center, the railroad, and a new park on the east bank of the river. Further, the neighborhood would offer new residents dramatic views of the Central Cascades, views that would feature prominently in the marketing of the neighborhood.

The Park Addition would be the first in a long series of expansions of the city into the surrounding countryside. In each expansion city planners and developers would carefully plat the new neighborhood and fold it into the plans of the city. Real estate marketers would sell people on the site, views, and easy access to the stunning natural landscapes on the fringes of town. In each case the new neighborhood would house workers and businesses that would boost the local economy create the Spokane of Oregon (Deschutes County Historical Landmarks Commission, 2009). For, according the new development’s promoters, “There is not a town in the state of Oregon, nor is there one in the entire West where the resources and conditions are such as to make a city of
the size that Bend is sure to be” (Lots available, 1913).

**Advantages, resources, and amenities.**
Residents and visitors to Bend understood that the natural advantages of Bend, even at this early phase were simultaneously aesthetically beautiful and needed for industrial development. The aesthetic nature of the countryside and its amenities depended upon the movement from the country to the city. In 1921 *The New York Times* sent reporter Walter Prichard Eaton (1921a) on an automobile tour of Oregon. He documented the speeches he gave to members of Chambers of Commerce. “Apparently Oregon Chambers of Commerce are always lunching or dining and always ready to listen to speeches from visitors who know nothing at all about commerce” (19). He provided accounts of trash at campgrounds. “The West has learned how to camp, but not how to clean up after camping. The East, of course, has learned neither” (19). Eaton also described the roads and the scenery. Describing the stretch of land between Crater Lake and Bend he wrote,

> I think I never pitied a car so much, nor inhaled so much dust, nor hit my head on the car top so many times as on this trip of 300 miles [from Crater Lake to The Dalles] at an average speed of less than fifteen miles an hour. Also, I think I never enjoyed a trip so much, taking it, as it should be taken, in two stages, with a two weeks pack train trip into the mountains to break the journey. The southern half of the ride, from Crater Lake to Bend is almost entirely through a marvelous virgin forest of yellow pine. There being but nine inches of precipitation a year on this side of the Cascades, very little will grow in the pumice soil except the yellow pines, the lodge pole pines, a few bright wildflowers and sage brush. Consequently there is
practically no underbrush in the woods. You look through them for hundreds of feet on both sides of the roads, as if you were looking through a park, and see their great copper colored, heavily plated, clean trunks rising up, dappled with sunlight. No tree is so vivid in color, so trim and clean and well groomed. When you come at last to a long stretch of privately owned land where the lumbermen have stripped off everything and the fire has followed, reducing the wilderness to an arid desert, treeless, almost soilless, naked and desolate, you are ready to weep with rage (and dust in your eyes) at the short-sightedness of a nation which cannot even save a strip of green along its highway. (Eaton 1921a, 20)

The very landscapes that were so rich aesthetically for their park-like appearance and towering trees were the ones required for production and commerce that would make Bend a vibrant city. The production necessary for economic growth seemed inevitably pitted against the region’s aesthetic resources that would enhance the quality of life.

Eaton was certainly an Easterner, sent by an eastern paper to cover the great transformation of the American West. But he wasn’t alone in his view. Henry Simmons visited the town for a convention in 1921 and wrote to The Bulletin complementing the city. “The future of Bend lies to a considerable extent in the exploitation of its scenery in the nearby mountains. The lumber industry now makes the city, but the timber will be gone in a few years. But if the scenery is properly advertised and made available to tourists, the future of the city is secure” (Simmons 1921, p. 2). Bend’s own residents also understood the spatial overlap between the aesthetic and productive countryside. The
number of campers in the Deschutes National Forest caused considerable fear that the campfires would spark forest fires and destroy the timber crop. Campers in 1922 were required to purchase fire permits which gave specific instructions about how to maintain and extinguish a campfire. At least 120 permits were said to have been issued in the first ten days of the requirement (Forest much used, number of fire permits shows, additional caution urged, 1922). The aesthetic and commercial “natural advantages” occupied the same space and would share a connected history.

In 1931 geographer Isaiah Bowman (1931) described Central Oregon as a “western zone of experiment” (93). The region, Bowman argued, offered a paradox in which old and new technologies met with urban and rural spaces to produce wealth and poverty, fantastic success and devastating failure. Along the way this paradox fostered traditional livelihood and ideas at the same time it promoted modern, even revolutionary modes of engagement with the land and social institutions.

With a firm road underneath and a cloudless sky overhead, cool breezes and wind rippled through the ‘meadows.’ One might think it a land of plenty...[The owner] may have a radio as his one luxury, and his family may be housed in a two room dugout or a tar-paper shack. He may own a square mile of lovely countryside, but his wife may be required to carry the water half a mile for kitchen use (Bowman 1931, 138). The land of plenty, the life of poverty, and the connections between the urban and the rural exemplify the geographic contradictions of the region and the production of space within it. These contradictions are deeply embedded in the physical and human
geographies of the region, its “peculiar diversity of environments, by its hoards of concentrated resources, and by a unique convergence of historical events which occurred in these settings during the last 150 years” (Wyckoff & Dilsaver 1995, p. 1).

The resource geography of Central Oregon during the first half of the twentieth century revolved around finding ways to overcome the distances and challenges posed by moving through the countryside, bringing resources to town, and from town to markets around the country. According to a 1978 report, “the early economic history of Deschutes County was based on abundant free or low cost land, extensive ponderosa pine forests, available water for irrigation and rail transportation” (Butler, 1978, p. 1). The geographic conditions of Bend increased the ease with which timber processing could proceed and the woods might be industrialized (Robbins, 1997, p. 230-231).

The industrial production of the forest during the early part of the twentieth century demonstrates the ways that “natural advantages” are transformed through capital investment, regulation, and infrastructure development into natural resources. Hill’s railroad, and later the highways, airports, and reservoirs, served to produce a resource space in Central Oregon that was critical for its economic development. The physical and bureaucratic infrastructure of that production, the railroads, roads, airports, camps, housing developments, and resource plans provided a method for that production.

“Spatial relations,” writes Richard White (2010), “are established through the movement of people, plants, animals, goods, and information” (3). This movement allowed leaps between scales, government, and capital development, acting as a marriage between federal and corporate investment, between the region and the nation, and between the city
and its countryside. In Central Oregon, this meant periods of successful irrigation agriculture and intensive timber production followed by crop failures and local timber shortages. The movement of resources, people, and information increasingly has flowed through Bend, solidifying its place as the region’s cultural and economic hub. “The influence of cities followed not only the goods, services, and associations that they offered, and on the transportation systems, factories, and military bases that they attracted, but also on their ability to represent it in interests, aspirations, and spirit of the regions that depended on them” (Pomeroy, 2008, p. 233). In the years following World War II, Central Oregon would need to find ways to simultaneously capitalize on a set of cultural ideals that valued both the aesthetic, seemingly natural landscapes of the mountains and the high deserts, and its potential for timber production. That capitalization would require the coordination of information and regulatory structures, upon the bureaucracy of production as well as the infrastructure (Clarke & McCool, 1996).

Timber resources and beauty spots. Don Meinig’s (1968) account of development in the Inland Northwest draws our attention away from the environmental conditions of the region toward the historical and cultural ones. “Despite the bold relief of nature’s frame of mountains and valleys, canyons and passes, the resultant human geography is only explicable in terms of particular groups of people working out their particular programs of action within the particular circumstances of their history” (p. 492). For environmental historian William Robbins (1997), Bend provides a “fascinating story of the conjunction between culture and nature, between economics and ecology, between a thriving lumber town and the forested wealth
within reach of an extensive transportation system” (p. 232-233). Bend, in short, provides an opportunity to examine the interconnectedness between the cultural landscape and the ways that “natural advantages” become natural resources and the material and institutional conditions of their production.

While the Federal Government was luring farmers to the deserts of the West with irrigation schemes and homesteading programs, transferring much of the desert lands to private ownership, it was also working hard to conserve forest resources in the National Forests, keeping the natural resources they contained in the public domain. According to Robbins (1997, p. 230), the arrival of Hill’s railroad accelerated speculation in the region, bringing in more outside capital and moving lands from the public to the private domain. The Forest Service however was vigilant in preventing homesteaders from establishing large homesteads on prime locations in productive meadows (Forest Service, 2010). Smaller recreation sites however within the National Forest were opened to development. As part of an effort to “popularize the beauty spots” they did offer five acre plots for sale at nominal charges (Forest beauty spots offered, 1916). The significant timber acreages outside the National Forest, of course, remained the purview of major investors. The investments in private timberlands came primarily from Hill himself and from fellow Minnesotans from the Brooks Scanlon and Shevlin Hixon timber companies looking for uncut stands to replace the timber on their cutover lands in the Midwest. The rich forests of the Cascades offered a splendid alternative and the companies started cruising timber almost as soon as Hill completed the railroad plans (McKay, 1991). The companies invested heavily in private timberlands, but all parties involved recognized that the
National Forest timber would be integral in keeping the new mills in Bend running after the initial cuttings on private timber acreage. The National Forests, it was thought, would model scientific and efficient forest management (Hays, 1959; Steen & Miller, 1997). They were established to prevent precisely the kinds of over-harvesting and inefficiency that had forced the Minnesota timber companies to look elsewhere for uncut trees. But in the early years many complained they were woefully underfunded, especially concerning fire control (Eaton, 1921b). The scientific management of the forest and local irrigation and agricultural plans assumed an almost limitless productivity of nature in the Bend hinterland, a bounty that, boosters and local residents hoped, would drive population growth and economic development. The natural advantages of the region were linked to the timber with a nod toward the sublime splendor of the area. The economic value of the hinterland remained firmly embedded in the value of its timber.

It was hoped that the timber mills would provide the town with some economic stability and help produce a sizable city in the high desert. Yet the instability of the 1920s was accentuated during the Depression of the 1930s. Deschutes County struggled with ongoing drought and a major drop in timber values (Cogswell, 1981). In 1925, The Bulletin’s editors declared that Bend was still “a pioneer country, who’s development has not yet stabilized” (Editorial 1925, quoted in Bowman 1931). The Bulletin’s 1925 editorial, Bowman’s articulation of the farming families’ struggles in the “pioneer country” of Central Oregon, and the struggles of the timber industry through the Depression, evoke images of hard scrabble life of grueling labor on a ranch, a farm, or in the forest. But Hill and Bend’s leaders knew that the success of the town lay not only in
the success of those farmers, ranches and loggers, but in the capacity to bring more people into the region and provide a more robust economic platform for development.

**Compelling interest and peculiar beauty**

Planning market roads, railroads, shipping routes, or irrigation systems (the production of representational spaces) and creating new patterns of movement between the country and the city (new spatial practices) would be insufficient. They also worked hard to produce an image of the region and a sense of place based upon the aesthetic characteristics of the landscape. Building on the spectacular scenery and streams full of fish, the early boosters collected descriptions of the region’s wonders (McKay, 1991). These descriptions were readily available. John Thomas Faris (1920), for example, wrote that “The town of Bend, Oregon is noted not only because of its huge sawmills but also because it is a convenient starting point for all sorts of trips, each of compelling interest and peculiar beauty. Some of them may be made by rail, others by motor, still others by trail” (p. 248). The report of a tour by 67 of the Mazamas, Portland’s outdoor recreation group, in 1921 echoed the sentiment. “The day was bright and promising. Looking towards the west, we saw with delight the snowy summits of the range, shining in the morning sunshine. We regretted that we could spend so little time in Bend, for it seemed to be an unusually attractive town, most picturesquely situated” (Parker, 1921, p. 1).

Similarly, the town leaders and businesses themselves realized the importance of keeping the sublime splendor of nature close at hand when it came to attracting new residents. As a memorial to Thomas Shevlin, Shevlin-Hixon donated much of the land in Tumalo Canyon to the city to create a park framing the road leading into town. “This bit of protected highway will be in striking contrast with the road leading into Bend which
for many miles is a desolation of burned out pine” (Grant, 1919, p. 737). Though wildfires clearly detracted from the scenery and the sense of safety in the town, the region was free of many of the hazards that plagued other Americans. An advertisement in *Cosmopolitan Magazine* simply stated that irrigated government land was available. A key feature of the land: “No blizzards, floods, nor cyclones” (Government land, 1910).

The boosters described a landscape that was bountiful, beautiful, and ready to reward hard work with the opportunity for hard play (Bend speakers will describe vacation land, 1923).

In 1925 a group of investors formed to finance and build the town’s first golf course, featuring nine holes and a social club. Brooks Scanlon’s internal publication, the *Pine Echoes* featured employees’ hunting and fishing exploits in nearly every edition. The editors of *The Bulletin* may have seen Central Oregon as “pioneer country” in 1925, but many in Bend also realized that the pioneer country would make a fine vacationland.

“Bend is attracting attention as a tourist center. Innumerable lakes, streams, and mountains within a short riding distance offer a summer vacation ground of unparalleled beauty and interest. The tourist trade is likely to prove an important factor as it is in many cities without Bend’s natural advantages” (Dubois & Koon, 1925). Throughout the city’s early years, the region’s outdoor recreational opportunities were featured as components of the region’s identity, creating a unique quality of life for the city’s residents and a means to bring tourists and new residents into the region.

Access to those recreational opportunities often depended on the same roads that were responsible for bringing timber and agricultural products into the cities. Aldo
Leopold wrote in 1925 that

> We are building good roads to give the rancher access to the city, which is good and to give the city dweller access to recreation in the forests and its mountains, which is good, but we now, out of sheer momentum, thrusting more and ever more roads into every little remaining patch of wilderness, which in many cases is sheer stupidity. For by so-doing we are cutting off, irrevocably and forever, our national contact with the covered wagon days.

(215)

By the time Leopold mourned the passing of the covered wagon, the Bend Commercial Club was already promoting the region’s own tourist road, Century Drive, a 100 mile loop from Bend, through the rugged Cascade Mountains, and back to Bend (Century Drive at prettiest, 1922). The region’s road system was critical for Bend in part because, despite early hopes, the Oregon Trunk Line would remain a spur, without an extension into California. Without the extended rail line, any traffic directly to the south or the Oregon coast would need to go over roads (Judge forbids extension of Oregon Trunk, 1927).

The infrastructure that supported Bend’s development as a hub for the region’s resources in the 1930s also supported a small tourist economy. Like many places around the West, roads democratized tourism, opening up parts of the country beyond the railroad lines and presenting new opportunities for people to experience nature in new places and in new ways (Louter, 2006; Rothman, 1998; Schwantes, 2003, p. 136). As Paul Sutter (2002) writes, “it is difficult today, conditioned by the circumscribed nature of
roads as public space, to appreciate how open and liberating roads seemed to the first
generation of autocampers and tourists... Autocampers often celebrated nature as an open
space rather than a series of predetermined destinations” (p. 31). Century Drive provided
key infrastructure required to open the backcountry. By 1923, people were complaining
about traffic on the Century Drive Loop and the preferential treatment some resorts
received from the Commercial Club (One way road plan disliked by supervisor, autoists
make suggestions, 1923). By 1927, the highway received so much use that demands
rolled in for more maintenance (Forest Service, 2010). Century Drive, and the other new
highways in the region, helped open a new market in Bend, one that explicitly marketed
the region’s aesthetic characteristics of the region and hinted at tension between increased
use and diminished quality that would continue throughout the twentieth century.

The recreation problem in the United States and Central Oregon
Bend wasn’t the only city in the country looking to bring tourists into the region to pull
fish out of streams, kill game animals, build campfires in the woods, or gaze at rugged
mountain peaks. In the midst of the hardship of the Great Depression, around the country
people took to the woods to enjoy the nation’s public lands and sublime vistas. New
highways across the country, like the McKenzie and the California-The Dalles Highway
which linked Central Oregon to the coast and California, enabled people to escape the
cities to enjoy the woods and mountains.

More people in the mountains, however, also meant a greater impact on those
landscapes. As campgrounds became parking lots during the summer and roadsides grew
littered with tin cans, the federal government placed a greater emphasis on expanding
recreational infrastructure on public lands. When Calvin Coolidge convened the National
Conference on Outdoor Recreation in 1924, he described the profound role that the federal government would play in promoting outdoor recreation throughout the country. Coolidge advocated a clear and singular national recreation policy that would appeal to a larger spectrum of the public. Together the Secretaries of War, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor would be responsible for crafting the specifics of that policy (Landrum, 2004, p. 94). The increased demand for recreational opportunities on the public lands shifted some of the focus of its management. Recreation had moved out of the woods and the domain of on-site foresters and into distant offices. It became a key concern for management and the bureaucracy that the word implies.

By 1934 Federal land managers, legislators, and assorted recreational organizations all realized that the country faced a “recreation problem,” which was deeply connected to the ways Americans moved through public lands (National Park Service, 1941). The conference addressed two contrasting concerns: how to bring even more people into the woods and what to do with them once they were there so that the quality of natural landscapes would not be diminished. Outdoor recreation could restore the rigor and vitality of the American public at a time when fewer and fewer people were doing physically demanding work. For some at the conference, outdoor recreation could provide an adjustment to life in the city and reconnect people with their distinctive American character, restore American military readiness and national pride (Sutter, 2002, p. 42).

Another group at the National Conference for Outdoor Recreation, however, saw a chance to advocate government action in the preservation of wildlands and wildlife.
This group, led by the Izaak Walton League and other sporting groups, saw a chance to encourage the government to step in to limit the degradation associated with overhunting and automobile use. These preservationists were fiercely opposed at the meeting by those arguing for more access to recreational sites, more paved roads, and more facilities for visitors (Sutter, 2002, p. 43). The NCOR offered, in short, a chance to air different views of outdoor recreation and the role of the government in promoting, providing access, and developing facilities in support of outdoor recreation. Aldo Leopold (1926) attended the second meeting of the Conference in 1926 and argued that Americans no longer needed to be “urged to go play outdoors. The best way to encourage Americans to play outdoors is to provide them some outdoors to play in” (p. 62).

Established as a work program as part of the New Deal, The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) would be critical to these efforts across the West and in Deschutes County. The CCC provided much needed labor to aid in building the public infrastructure that provided access to recreational landscapes on public lands. The CCC was founded in 1933 with the explicit objective of

killing two birds with one stone. We are clearly enhancing the value of our natural resources, and we are relieving an appreciable amount of actual distress. This great group of men has entered upon its work on a purely voluntary basis; no military training is involved and we are conserving not only our natural resources, but our human resources. (Roosevelt, 1933)

The twin bird killing Roosevelt had in mind would prove critical to existing efforts to increase the capacity for recreation on lands that had previously been primarily used for
resource production. The production of natural resources, for Roosevelt, also depended upon the mobilization of labor, now construed as a human resource, an asset ready to help build the nation. When young men enrolled in the CCC they signed up for a job that put them in immediate contact with natural landscapes and made them involved in their conservation. The CCC not only expanded the infrastructure of outdoor recreation on the public lands, it also served to directly introduce people to outdoor recreation through their work. The CCC sought to simultaneously put men to work during the Great Depression and to keep them strong and healthy. The agency sent men from across the country to improve infrastructure on the public lands. CCC crews throughout the American West focused their energies on providing access to the nation’s public lands by building new recreational amenities and trails. Neil Maher (2008) argues that the CCC democratized conservation during the Great Depression. More than that however, “it also defined it. This process began when Corps work projects started a national debate that expanded the meaning of conservation beyond the wise use of natural resources to include concerns for human health through outdoor work and play” (p.14). The infrastructure built and improved by the CCC provided the means for a broader group of citizens to access the resources that had been largely restricted to more committed recreationalists or natural resource producers.

The two CCC companies stationed in Deschutes County, however, focused their attention not on building recreational infrastructure but on providing water to the region’s cities and farmers. These two companies, the largest concentration of CCC enrollees of the Depression Era West, were based in Redmond. A total of 1,200 men set to work
rebuilding the Wikiup Dam and Reservoir about 35 miles southwest of Bend. They were reinforced during World War II by a group of Mennonite conscientious objectors who guided the project towards completion. The dam was authorized after a 1934 drought devastated local farmers and was intended to revive the dream of turning Bend into an agricultural hub (Autobee 1996). “Give these districts an adequate supply of water,” the Bend Chamber of Commerce Secretary speculated, “and farmers here will be as prosperous as in any section of the United States” (Cramb 1931, p. 18). Irrigation planners at the federal levels supported the assessment and authorized a reservoir that would supply irrigation water to 50,000 acres of dry but fertile land in the region and hold up to 209,000 acre feet of water (Hall, 1994). At the height of construction, the project supported 600 CCC men based at the site and another 600 housed in Redmond (Deschutes County Historical Landmarks Commission 2000).

The Deschutes County-based CCC camps focused their attention on the agricultural infrastructure of the region, but around the country enrollees built trails and campsites, restored forests, and generally increased the recreational capacity of the public lands. The movement of people from the cities to the woods, and their activities there further shaped the production of recreational spaces in the years prior to World War II. In 1936 it was estimated that 52,000 people set out to enjoy the natural spaces of the Deschutes National Forest. They visited the lakes, rivers, and any of the 33 established camping facilities, not to mention the countless backcountry-undeveloped sites (Kirkpatrick, 1936). People came for more than to simply get a temporary fix for their “scenery habit” (Rothman, 1998, p. 150). The Californians that came for the fishing
afforded by the Central Cascades regularly set up more permanent residences, even if those homes were only occasionally occupied. In 1939 The Bulletin reported that “many of the summer homesites [in the Deschutes National Forest] with scenery unsurpassed in the Pacific states are owned by residents of California, especially the Bay Region” (Deschutes recreation areas popular in Western America, 1939). The Californians, at the end of the thirties, had yet to be viewed as the interloping scourge they would become later in the century. Rather, their presence signaled the capabilities of the region to lure outsiders in, and once they had visited, to convince them to invest in the area. They were, simply put, a sign of success and promise for the future.

While local officials and boosters spent much of thirties celebrating the region’s capacity to lure tourists, land managers at the federal level were deeply concerned about the ability of the public lands in Deschutes County and elsewhere to support tourism without succumbing to degradation. In 1941, the Department of the Interior released an analysis of recreational use of the nation’s public and private lands. The Recreation Problem in the United States (National Park Service, 1941) recognized recreational overcrowding and sought to explain the geographical components of the problem. This document built upon the 1926 recreation conference and advocated for a strong regional planning model. “A complete recreation system for an urban region includes areas and facilities for all appropriate types of recreation located at varying distances from the population so that full enjoyment and benefit may be obtained by all of the people during the various recreational periods” (p. 128). The intensive use of the recreational landscapes endangered the very characteristics that made them valuable to visitors.
Importantly however, the National Park Service understood the process of producing and maintaining these facilities and areas as a fundamentally different endeavor than the quantitative resource planning occurring in regards to other natural resources. “How many parks can we afford? How many acres will be required for protection? The answer to these questions is expected to be in quantitative terms. But recreation cannot be measured quantitatively, because it is a quality of living. Who can say when our living is good enough” (National Park Service, 1941, p. 39)? Despite similar fears about resource degradation between recreational landscapes and timber landscapes, recreational planning and management remained distinct from other resource challenges facing the country. Timber, mineral, and water resources had been largely folded into scientific, Progressive Era ideals surrounding sustained yield and resource development and conservation with varying degrees of success (Bolle & Miller, 1997; Hays, 1959; Wilshire, Nielson, & Hazlett, 2008, p. 100-136).

For the writers of The Recreation Problem, outdoor recreation was primarily a qualitative issue, bound by geographies of access and proximity to population centers. While The Recreation Problem dismissed the efficacy of any attempt to quantify recreational resources, it clearly articulated the need to address the problem of recreational overcrowding through efforts across scales of government. “National, State, and local interests and responsibility are inextricably intermingled in this as in almost every other field of human endeavor, but there appears to be no good reason why a community of interest and responsibility cannot be placed ultimately on a coordinated and sound basis” (National Park Service, 1941, p. 142). Any efforts in managing outdoor
recreation would involve tight integration of scalar governance and an emphasis on the specific conditions within a “community of concern.” Many of the solutions proposed by the Forest Service to deal with the recreation problem echoed solutions to the timber famine that threatened the country’s timber supply. In the case of timber, the potential shortage “strikingly illustrates the relation of geography to timber supply” which would require a “systemic” conservation program (Greeley, 1926, p. 533).

That program would seek simultaneously to expand recreational opportunities and access and maintain the qualitative values associated with recreation. The work of the CCC, building trails and facilities, reduced much of the ecological impact of intensive recreation by limiting impacts to developed areas. Yet overcrowding persisted and challenged officials to rethink how to manage tourist locations on public lands (Harvey 2005b, p. 42-43).

In 1941, Deschutes Forest Supervisor, Ralph Crawford led a discussion with residents concerning the recreational possibilities of the Deschutes National Forest. “The Deschutes is an important recreational forest,” he began his opening remarks, “providing a vast lake studded playground for those who are in position to enjoy it” (Crawford 1941). Crawford went on to list the myriad ways that recreational users from the town and those with the means to travel could enjoy the forest, detailing the campsites, the trails and the potential for summer homes. Despite this attention to recreation, before World War II the Deschutes National Forest was still primarily a timber forest. He dedicated nearly half of his talk about recreational opportunities to the ways that the Forest Service manages the wealth of timber in the forest and the dangers wildfire posed
to those resources. The connection between Bend and its hinterlands remained one of natural resources, primarily timber and agricultural products, coming into the city for processing before being sent out over the railways. The infrastructure for a significant expansion of outdoor recreation had been put in place prior to World War II, but the economic conditions of the Great Depression limited the degree to which people could participate in recreational activities. As the Depression eased, many expected significant growth in recreational use, but full involvement in World War II again curtailed people’s ability to travel to enjoy the woods.

On the eve of the War the Works Progress Administration published a guide for tourists to the state. It described Bend and the region in 1940:

The city owes its economic importance chiefly to the lumber industry, although agriculture has been no small factor in development. More than 16 billion feet of timber, after a generation of ruthless cutting, still stand in the Bend area, and two sawmills annually produce a third of a billion feet of finished lumber. Yet the city has none of the stark ugliness of some mill towns. It conserves the natural charm of its environment by well-planned streets skillfully laid out through a naturally wooded park. Modernization characterizes the business area, and schools, hospitals, parks, clubs, and libraries add to the material comforts of the residents, 90 percent of whom own their homes...With the coming of [the timber and agricultural] industries, the original population of 21 persons (1900) increased to 536 by 1910, and ten years later, to 5,415. This was an increase of 910 percent,
a record in the United States for the decade. Bend is the center of an extensive recreational territory. More than 100 lakes and 300 miles of fishing streams lie within 50 miles of the city. There are swimming and boating on clear mountain lakes, horseback rides along forest trails, camping in primitive areas, golf on a mile-high course; there are lava cones, lava tunnels, lava forests; ice-caves and subterranean rivers; canyon depths and mountain heights. (Works Progress Administration, 1940, p. 136).

Bend’s “extensive recreational territory” overlapped with its timber territory, and both were heavily used and highly valued. The recreational use of the region had grown considerably as ease of access increased and more people moved through the region. Prior to the War, however, tourism and recreation in the region remained a secondary activity, one linked to the quality of life of the region. The timber companies continued to drive the economy and dominate shape the relationship between the city and the countryside.

**War and resource development in Deschutes County**

Historian Gerald Nash (1999) has argued that prior to World War II, the American West functioned similarly to a colony, sending natural resources to support capital accumulation in the East. World War II however saw significant expenditures by the federal government in technology and infrastructure to support the war effort. Those investments would remain after the war, resulting in an expansion of the “federal landscape” of the American West.
Everywhere the imprint of the federal government is writ large. It could be seen in the dams that produced energy. It was evident in the shape of western cities and the network of national highways and airports that bound them together. It was evident in the extensive network of national defense installations and the research and development clusters so visible in many areas of the West. It was evident on Indian reservations and in the ubiquitous national park system, which became a part of the human landscape as surely as that created by nature. (Nash, 1999, p. 160-161)

Similarly, Richard White (1991) argues that World War II fundamentally altered the western landscape through investment from the federal government. The government provided funds to build new aircraft factories, aluminum plants, and research centers throughout the West. “In a few years the federal government altered the regional allocation of power within the United States... Not all of the West benefitted equally, or permanently, from the change, but by the end of the war the West had secured new sources of federal revenues, an enlarged infrastructure, and a new industrial base” (p. 497).

Like many newspapers across the country, The Bulletin splashed a banner headline across the top of the paper: “WAR DECLARED.” Accompanying articles detailed a massive mobilization across the West and celebration of locals involved in the push toward war and those boys who had rushed to enlist. Sharing the front page was news that, in light of the attacks on Pearl Harbor and the larger war effort, the timber unions had agreed to new contracts, returning men to the woods and the mills in support
of the war effort. “Talking war, not strike,” the paper reported, “Brooks-Scanlon men filed through the gates this morning, obviously eager to do their part in helping the country” (Men return to work at Brooks mill, 1941). Meanwhile, Japanese laborers on the local rail lines were confined, ostensibly to protect Central Oregon industries from sabotage (Vital local spots guarded, 1941). World War II had come to Central Oregon, inspiring nationalism, returning men to the mills, sending young men to fight, and raising fears of outsiders. In the face of war, Central Oregon industries would run safely, efficiently and patriotically. The paper was pleased to report that even trout were sporting “V for Victory” signs (Canadian trout marked with V for victory, 1941). The war led to an increase in timber demand throughout the country, which meant expansions in production and greater pressure on the region’s private timberlands (Davidson, 2005, p. 173).

The region’s public lands were also brought into the war effort. In 1943 the Army opened Camp Abbot, a training base for Army Combat Engineers. Between May 1943 and June 1944, 75,000 members of the 153rd Engineers Corps would temporarily call Camp Abbot home (Houser, 1997, p. 33). The army built barracks, dining halls, and an Officer’s Mess on the banks of the Deschutes River south of Bend. At the end of the war, much of Camp Abbot was deeded back to the Forest Service, but portions of the riverfront land and the Officers’ Mess was sold to private interests. That land, and the remaining buildings would later be transformed into the conference center and the community hub for SunRiver, a very upscale resort community south of Bend (Quinn, 1990). The war served to reinforce links between the city and its hinterland, both in terms of resource dependence and opening new housing opportunities and new means of
bringing people into the county, often temporarily. The military didn’t just build housing during the war. They also provided a key piece of new infrastructure that would serve to connect Central Oregon to the rest of the country.

When an airplane journey terminated in Deschutes County, it ended at Roberts Field. Prior to 1942, Roberts Field was just a small regional airstrip. The Army transformed the airport into a training base, and later the home to bomber groups running antisubmarine operations off the West Coast (Maurer, 1983, p. 150). While little of the population growth was associated with the airfield expansion at the time, the military operations at Roberts and at Camp Abbot served to introduce thousands to the region. In addition to the engineers who trained at Camp Abbot, another 75,000 troops participated in maneuvers at the airbase, many of them quartered at the recently abandoned CCC camp (Deschutes County Historical Landmarks Commission, 2000). When the 91st Bomber Group arrived in August 1941, their official daily report noted that “everyone around seemed war conscious and wanted us to furnish a guard detail for the town’s water supply piped in from a mountain stream - this would have been a fine detail for some of the men, for there was good fishing there, but no personnel could be spared” (Davison, 1942). Whether the men were itching to catch fish in Deschutes County rivers or flying planes over the Pacific Ocean, they depended upon an improved runway and expanded terminal at the airport. At the end of the war, the Army returned the base to the city of Redmond, selling the entire facility for $1. The city completed the terminal remodel in 1950, establishing Roberts Field as the region’s air transportation hub.
Like the railroad in 1911 and the Mackenzie and California-The Dalles Highways, the improvements to the airstrip and the advancements in aviation engineering provided another way for visitors to get to the relatively isolated landscapes of Central Oregon. The railroad provided the infrastructure for capitalizing on the resources the region’s boosters consistently described as “natural advantages.” “Mark the change that is in process today,” wrote Lewis Mumford in 1937. “The emerging sources of power, transport and communication do not follow the old highway network at all. Giant power strides over the hills, ignoring the wheeled vehicles; the airplane, even more liberated flies over swamps and mountains, and terminates its journey not on an avenue, but in a field” (Mumford, 1937). The new transportation infrastructure, new means of moving people and goods into and out of the country, added to the development of the city and the countryside through projects that linked national agendas and local development and the spatial practices of cities in the West. Chief among these would be the system of airports throughout the country. “By midcentury, the national government was playing an unprecedented role in the geographic shaping of a major new transportation service” (Meinig, 2004, p. 77) and the development of new spatial practices in relation to the country and the city.

World War II provided an impetus for significant federal expenditure aimed at improving access to the region and strengthening connections to the rest of the world. “Essentially, the federal government promoted the restructuring of a natural resource based colonial economy into a technologically oriented and service economy stimulated by massive federal expenditures” (Nash, 1999, p. 52). Federal involvement in local
development was not a new factor in the history of the American West, but the scale of
direct investment in infrastructure added a new characteristic to the economy of the
American West. The federal landscapes of the American West that emerged from World
War II established new economic relationships and reshaped the operation of markets
across scales. “Whether it was workers in war industries or men and women in the Armed
Forces, the federal government acted as a great people mover speeding the westward
progress of the population during the conflict” (Nash, 1999, p. 53). The urban West,
significantly more consolidated after World War II, could count on more stable economic
development bureaucratically managed from the region’s cities (White, 1991, p. 531).
The experiments associated with the war reverberated through Central Oregon and
beyond as local, state, and national leaders grappled with ways to integrate new
infrastructure and urban centers with the existing base built upon the region’s “natural
advantages.” The military developments in Central Oregon would come to play crucial
roles in the development that followed even as the critical “natural advantages” shifted
from timber to the region’s lakes, streams, and dramatic vistas.

Post-war production
Following World War II the nation’s timber firms and recreational users both sought to
extract more value, either economic or aesthetic, from the National Forests, setting the
stage for conflicts over how the forests should be managed. These conflicts exposed deep
tensions between timber interests and aesthetic and recreational expectations of
recreational users of the forest (Burnett & Davis, 2002; Robbins, 2004, p. 183). Forest
managers at the time advocated for ever more intensive scientific forestry practices to
support increased timber production. Scientific sustained yield policies on the National
Forests pushed for even aged stands and single species forest crop management in both the public and the private forests (Langston, 1995).

The very measures established to ensure continued timber production, however, destroyed many of the aspects that recreational users found most valuable. Deschutes Forest Chief Forester Crawford maintained that “when uses of an area conflict, such as grazing and recreation may, the use that serves the greatest number of people in the long run takes priority. Thus grazing and timber harvesting are not permitted in recreational areas, as recreation use is always given a high priority” (Crawford, 1941). In practice however, resource and recreational conflicts were never so easily resolved, and following the war, their frequency increased dramatically.

In the years immediately following World War II the campgrounds in the National Parks and other areas represented small cities during peak seasons and available campsites were “as rare as the bald eagle” (Rothman, 1998, p. 203). Youth groups, including the Boy Scouts and religiously affiliated groups, increased efforts to bring children into the woods. Echoing some of the rational for the CCC, these groups both implicitly and explicitly tied their adventures to discourses of freedom, strength, resourcefulness and preparedness designed to socialize children to specific gendered roles within corporate America (Mergen, 2003, p. 662). The decade following the war saw an increase in the cultural value associated with time spent involved in outdoor recreation as a panacea for the pressures of urban life (Cordell, Green, & Betz, 2002; Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1961). While roadside campsites saw much of the growth, backcountry trail use also rose considerably as lighter backpacks, tents, and
sleeping bags brought back from the battlefields made hikers more self-sufficient (Turner, 2002). Technological developments opened more of the region’s mountains and lakes to more people and made difficult recreational activities such as skiing and climbing easier to learn (Rothman, 1998).

Outdoor recreation at the time wasn’t simply an individual or family affair. Major recreational organizations like the Sierra Club regularly led backcountry trips to popular locations throughout the West, bringing hundreds of people at a time to hike, ride, fish and climb. National groups weren’t the only ones to sponsor large trips into the backcountry. On the morning of August 6 1954, “300 members of the Oregon Association of Mounted Posses and their wives” gathered for a three day ride around Todd Lake at the foot of Mt. Bachelor. A local cafe prepared food for the group and eight tons of hay was trucked in to feed the horses (Turnbull, 1954). The OAMP helped local law enforcement agencies by providing mounted patrols, and help with search and rescue missions. They used their time at Todd Lake however, primarily as a social gathering, constructing a small city at the foot of Mt. Bachelor in the National Forest.

The increased demand, unsurprisingly, came with consequences. The effort to reconcile those different demands, to find ways for recreation and resource production to coexist on the landscape rested upon understanding the relationship between the federal agencies and local communities (Schrepfer & Miller, 1997). As the Forest Service made more land available for timber production just as many people were using those same landscapes for outdoor recreation, the Forest Service found itself at the center of the fight between “the unprecedented escalation in demand for national forest timber and outdoor
recreation. The Forest Service welcomes the increased demand in both sectors” (Hirt, 1994, p. 44). Following the War, timber producers urged the Forest Service to offer more timber leases so they could meet demand and maintain local employment. More public timber was necessary as many timber producers had overharvested their private lands during the war years (Robbins & Wolf, 1994). The Forest Service initially encouraged this transition, as leases on public lands would provide an opportunity for the Service to more carefully monitor sustained yield production. “Sustained yield regulation reinforced generally state interventionist and science based regulatory tendencies typical of the New Deal, becoming the linchpin of federal attempts to secure ecological and socioeconomic renewal in the forest sector” (Prudham, 2004, p. 140). The aim of sustained yield practices on the public lands was constant harvest volumes, providing long-term stability for timber communities.

Outdoor recreation and tourism held an important place in the quality of life in the region and in the way boosters represented Central Oregon to the rest of the country, but it didn’t yet figure prominently in Bend’s economic development. Though overall timber production fell sharply following the war, Bend remained predominantly a timber town. “A strong case can be made that Bend was the most timber dependent community in Oregon, or at least until the timber began to run out and entrepreneurs launched an effort to capitalize on a resource of another kind, namely, snow” (Robbins & Wolf, 1994, p. 30). As early as 1936, local foresters feared a collapse in harvestable timber and pushed for a dramatic reduction in production (Deschutes timber resources are studied by Forest Service, 1936). The cuts never materialized and by 1942 the Chief Forester described the
situation as “acute,” strongly advocating an immediate reduction to sustained yield levels. “Immediate adoption of sustained yield would mean drastic reductions in the cut of principle lumber manufacturing centers. In spite of present sacrifice involved in reducing the cut now, the longer such reduction is postponed, the greater will be the shock of eventual curtailment enforced by the lack of merchantable raw material” (Cowlin, Briegleb, & Moravets, 1942, p. 18). Wartime production however remained high and by 1948 Brooks Scanlon board members and the Forest Service noted that there simply wasn’t enough local timber to keep two mills--Brooks Scanlon and Shevlin-Hixon--in operation (Davidson 2005, p. 145). The nominal sustained yield plans of the 1930s gave way to almost limitless wartime production, stretching private timber reserves and pushing timber companies to cut more publicly available timber. The result was a drastic reduction in total timber produced in the county (Figure 2.3).

Figure 2.3. Lumber production in Deschutes County 1940-1950. Lumber production declined precipitously following World War II as availability of timber declined (no data available for 1944 and 1945). (Robbins and Wolf 1994)
The regional decline in timber availability pushed the timber companies further afield to access the timber necessary to keep mills running. “The Bend situation that was much discussed a few years ago,” the regional forester reported, “has now resolved itself into a realization by most of the people... In time they will have only one big mill in Bend and that maybe this won’t be too bad” (Franklin, 1948). Ultimately, citing diminished timber reserves resulting from wartime and post-war over-harvesting, Brooks Scanlon purchased the mill from their rivals across the river on November 17, 1950. Executives from both mills reported that Shevin-Hixon’s timber reserves would be completely cut within three years (Central Oregon logging mills change hands, 1950). On Christmas Day 1950, J.N. Mahoney, who sent the first log through the mill in 1915, cut the last log at the Shevlin-Hixon Mill, signaling the end of the mill, 850 jobs, and, in many ways, Bend’s era as a thriving timber town (Brogan, 1950).

When Bowman looked at the region in 1931 he foresaw an extended era of stability and prosperity based upon steady timber production and lumber manufacturing. In 1950 however, these efforts too were on the verge of failure. For Bowman, timber production would provide a stabilizing influence. He was wrong. Consolidation of the industry and over-harvesting threatened the very stability that once seemed so sure to Bowman. According to historian Thomas Cox, “The mills in Bend represented the last, spectacular flowering of the old order” (Cox, 1994, p. 61), an order characterized by intensive cutting on private lands. The infrastructure that had expanded the hinterland, including the roadways, rails, and suburban housing developments, allowed the timber companies to venture further easing the transportation of goods out of the region. That
same infrastructure also served to introduce new people to the region, people that would reshape again the relationship between Bend and its hinterland.

The beginnings of recreation resources
By 1960 outdoor recreation had not yet been effectively tapped as a primary economic resource. The forests, streams, fish, and views had proven effective at capturing visitors and occasionally convincing them to stay. Businessmen and government officials of the region had long marketed the beauty of the countryside but that beauty had yet to become the primary economic resource. Looking back in 1981, Samuel Dicken observed that “to Isaiah Bowman’s four phases of development in Deschutes County, a fifth has been added in recent years--recreation and retirement. Although the region began attracting fishermen, hunters, and even a few sightseers many years ago, growth began to accelerate in the last 25 years” (Dicken & Vaughn, 1981, p. 145)

The “natural advantages” of Central Oregon did not automatically emerge as natural resources. “Technology, competitive advantages over rival producing regions, and the virtual absence of constraints on private timber harvesting contributed to the halcyon years in the Bend/Klamath Falls district. But more than any other factor, the nearly pure stands of ponderosa pine explain the booming productivity of the area’s timber mills” (Robbins, 1997, p. 233). The materiality of the forest matters just as the cultural components of the region matter. The natural imaginaries of the region, created a “world in the making” (Fiege, 1999, p. 209) for local residents. It created a world deeply tied to the recreational opportunities of the region.

Residents of Bend don’t celebrate the anniversary of Railroad Day in Bend anymore, but every winter many citizens gather for WinterFest, complete with a ski race,
wine tasting, an outdoor market, and an ice sculpting competition. WinterFest is a core element of the most recent development. The recreational opportunities celebrated at WinterFest would be bound to developments at the federal level and to the city’s relationship with the public and private lands on its fringe. Increased demands on the National Forests—both for timber and recreational amenities—challenged the assumption that recreational landscapes might be different from other resources. Another recreation crisis in the 1950s would provide the impetus for a more complete quantification of the nation’s recreational landscapes, one that would render them legible as resources and fold them into already dominant resource management programs. These recreation resources would form the resource base for Central Oregon at the end of the twentieth century, and would again refashion the links between Bend and its resource hinterland. The links would, however again be refashioned far from the forest itself, in the committee rooms in Washington DC and in the statistical modeling and cartographies of government planners.
The nation’s outdoor recreation demands will be met only through wise decisions on resource allocation, sound planning and effective development of facilities. These all require the support of thorough knowledge and extensive data. (Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962, p. 183)

The cover of the July 14, 1961 edition of *TIME Magazine* (figure 3.1) showed a cartoon of a picturesque beach, forest, and mountain, all overrun with campers and hikers, with tents, picnic tables and cars. A child in a canoe appears ready to paddle over a waterfall while a boy with a guitar in another serenades a bikini-clad woman. There is hardly space for such private activity. Fisherman, mountain climbers, photographers, and picnickers all swarm the natural playground, leaving little room for other people and little open, natural space. A smiling sun, angry rain cloud, and a slightly bewildered bald eagle survey the chaotic scene (Artzybasheff, 1961). The headline reads “Camping: Call of the Not So Wild.” The article associated with the cover image describes America’s desire for a natural retreat in 1961:
But as their industries, their urbs, suburbs and highways encroach upon the wilderness, that wilderness becomes particularly precious. Where it remains, its symbol has become a disturbingly anthropomorphic grizzly named Smokey the Bear, who wears pants and a hat and speaks. With perhaps too much urgency, a physician's wife, drawing water from a campground faucet in the Rockies last week, explained: ‘We have to get away from the daily routine once in a while, and we want our children to see something of an America that may not be here much longer.’ (Recreation, 1961)

The overcrowding on public lands in the early 1960s reflected yet another “recreation crisis” which demanded another solution to the ongoing problem. Recreational and conservation groups stepped forward to push for changes in the way federal agencies managed outdoor recreation on these lands. Joe Penfold and the Izaak Walton League provided momentum for constructing a framework of outdoor recreation resource conservation. Central Oregon was in the midst of its own recreation crisis resulting from dramatically increased usage of the National Forest. Before World War II, in 1941, the Forest Service recorded just over 140,000 patrons. After a decline in use during the War, use again skyrocketed, with 483,000 visitors in 1947, 488,000 visitors in 1957, and almost 713,000 visitors in 1960 (Deschutes National Forest, 1961). Because so much of Deschutes County is managed by federal agencies, policies and debates at the federal level have had a profound impact on local development. The boast that Bend represents the “Recreation Capital of Oregon” involves the creation and conservation of recreation
resources across scales and in concert with the management of timber, agriculture, and mineral resources. The national politics and management of recreation and its relationship to timber production would have significant impacts on Bend’s relationship to the federally managed lands in its hinterland. Decisions made concerning outdoor recreation at the federal level would be implemented in Bend’s own backyard.

Former Representative Morris Udall once praised the Conservation Director of the Izaak Walton League, saying that “Joe Penfold was the creative genius and driving force behind the most important and far reaching conservation legislation in American History” (Lorenz, 2005). Among Penfold’s primary achievements were the successes surrounding the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission (ORRRC). Under Penfold’s guidance and the sponsorship of Senator Clinton Anderson and Representative Stuart Udall, the ORRRC was established in June 1958 to answer three questions:

What are the recreational wants and needs now and what will they be in the years 1976 and 2000? What are the recreational resources of the nation available to meet those needs? What policies and programs should be recommended to ensure that the needs of the present and future are adequately and efficiently met? (Establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Review Commission Act, 1958)

The release of the ORRRC reports in 1962 remains a key moment in post-war conservation and resource planning, establishing recreational landscapes as resources, protected under a rational resource planning and conservation umbrella, the same umbrella that governed timber, mineral, and water conservation. The findings and policy
recommendations of the ORRRC released in 1962 have had a lasting impact on conservation policy and recreation planning on the public lands in Oregon and around the country. They removed significant obstacles to the passage of the Wilderness Act (Brown, 2002; Siehl, 2008) and led directly to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, later part of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service within the Department of the Interior (Fitch & Shanklin, 1970). The ORRRC solidified outdoor recreation as a key component of multiple use management, granting it a permanent place in resource planning across the nation’s public lands (Public Land Law Review Commission, 1970). Due to the success of the ORRRC, subsequent commissions have adopted the bipartisan, citizen-led structures of the ORRRC to deal with myriad public land concerns, most immediately the Public Land Law Review Commission (Public Land Law Review Commission, 1970, p. 197; Siehl, 1981, p. 41; Siehl, 2008). Perhaps the most lasting and important policy initiative proposed by the ORRRC has been the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) established in 1964. At the same ceremony that celebrated the creation of the Wilderness Preservation System, President Johnson assured the country that through the LWCF “we will begin, as of this day, to acquire on a pay-as-you-go basis the outdoor recreation lands that tomorrow’s Americans will require” (Johnson, 1964). The LWCF established a permanent fund for improving federal recreation resources and continues to provide matching funds for state and local recreation and conservation projects. The LWCF’s role in securing and developing outdoor recreation resources continues today as President Obama has encouraged more robust dispersal of LWCF funds to support conservation efforts across the country.
Recreational landscapes are not merely beautiful pieces of nature, but part of a historical process of modernist, scientific planning that reproduced them as resources, rendering them legible for state management and commercialization that included “efforts to introduce efficiency and standardize production and measurement” (Robertson, 2007, p. 504) through processes of “statistical picturing” (Demeritt, 2002). The statistically simplified landscapes of outdoor recreation privileged policies and planning options that valued efficiency and greater use. They required seemingly contradictory but simultaneous steps towards abstraction and consideration of the resources’ specific material, ecological, and geographic contexts.

As the ORRRC set about producing a program to manage recreational resources, they tried to resolve the tension between the abstraction of landscapes necessary for governance and legibility on the one hand, and those resources’ situated natures on the other. The ORRRC encountered this tension in their production maps, surveys and plans. Backpackers, skiers, and communities dependent recreational landscapes also encountered it in their efforts to use those resources. The tension between abstraction and ecological and geographic complexity and situatedness was an integral aspect of the debates that surrounded the creation of the ORRRC and in their recommendations. The solutions proposed by the ORRRC have shaped the ways we manage and develop recreation resources but they have not eliminated the conflict associated with them.

The work of the ORRRC challenges critical resource geographers to expand the scope of their analyses to consider not only the spaces of resource extraction, production,
and commodification, but also to query the specific landscapes that are implicated in the process of regulation and governance. In the United States the ORRRC abstracted recreational resources through accounting that aggregated information by census region and collapsed recreational opportunities into a categorization scheme, a patchwork landscape compatible with a wide variety of other resource uses and geographic conditions. The ORRRC emphasized “effective acres” (Outoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962a, p. 5) that considered questions of access, the provisioning of amenities, proximity to population, and the role of private commercialization within the larger recreational resource framework. These situated resource spaces—the material geographies of the patchwork landscape—simultaneously provided a public good while reinforcing a resource model that encouraged private development. It facilitated capitalization of recreational resources and sought to maximize use without diminishing the quality of the resource.

For Deschutes County and Bend, the quality of that resource and its conservation would be critical to the transition from a timber focused economy to one geared towards capitalizing on the region’s recreational resources. The ORRRC established guidelines for the management of recreational resources that would provide a foundation for the recreation based development of the late twentieth century. The trails, highways, fishing regulations and the maps and plans for their conservation produced at the federal level helped produce the recreational resources in Central Oregon, as would the maps and federal plans for their conservation.

Resource accounting and critical resource geography
For James O’Connor (1998), the tendency of firms to over-exploit their resource base in a
given area represents a “second contradiction of capitalism.” The over-exploitation results in a short term gain in productivity but long-term losses. The state then, holds responsibility for establishing regulatory rules and institutions responsible for curtailing the capital impulse. Resource regulation in the United States is built upon a framework of state scientific knowledge mobilized to negotiate the tension between maximized use and long term potential for development (Hays, 1987).

Scientific resource conservation was in large part built upon a simplification of resource landscapes and a quantification of those resources. David Demeritt’s (2002) understanding of “statistical picturing” builds upon Timothy Mitchell’s (1988) articulation of “enframing.” Through this process “the forest was arranged to appear before viewing subjects as something graspable in terms of the distinction between reality...and its objective” (Demeritt, 2001b, p. 435). The quantification of resources became a way to increase the perceived objectivity of conservation science and the value of expert knowledge in demands for resource conservation and production. This objectivity “derives not mainly from the wisdom acquired through a long career, but from the application of sanctioned methods, or perhaps the mythical, unitary ‘scientific method,’ to presumably neutral facts” (Porter, 1996, p. 7).

“Statistical picturing” and quantification are ways of seeing, of making “legible” (Scott, 1998), and a way of speaking. It is simultaneously a purportedly objective, scientific act and a rhetorical, political one. The ORRRC produced a scientific accounting of the recreational resources of the United States that provided conservationists with a powerful set of arguments for the preservation of natural spaces
and the expansion of recreational development as a public good. At the same time, it brought outdoor recreation into existing discourses and practices of resource conservation, reifying many of the resource practices that put recreational and wild landscapes at risk.

My analysis of the ORRRC considers the ways that recreational resources are specifically situated, even as they are abstracted for the sake of legibility and scientific, rational management. In this chapter I argue that the value of these geographically fixed resources depends upon a complex set of relationships between other resource production activities, potentially incompatible uses, aesthetic qualities, and questions of access and proximity to population centers. They are, in short, valuable to the extent that they remain in place and unspoiled by other resource activities or development. These amenities are valuable as commodities--stripped of ecological context and specificity--yet bound in place. Recreational forests, mountains, and lakes are more valuable, in other words, for their embeddedness in the landscape, than their capacity to be extracted from it. Situated resources are not “coaxed or coerced” (Tsing, 2005, p. 51) from lived landscapes, but continue to be embedded in them. These situated resources, in the words of Gavin Bridge (2009), help us to “ask why something is regarded as a resource, who benefits from prevailing patterns of resource production and consumption and who pays the price, the valuations of nature that facilitate these patterns and the valuations which can prove more resistive [to commodification], and to query physical augmentation of supply as the default strategy for dealing with scarcity” (p. 1238). Given their situated natures, however, recreational resources demand that we ask questions not only of the resources
themselves, but of the relationship between the resources and their geographic contexts.

Multiple Use and Outdoor Recreation: More Fully Enjoying the Country

_Boating, fishing, camping, hiking, skiing and hundreds of other recreational opportunities can and must be wisely developed so that present and future generations can more fully enjoy their own country._

*(Eisenhower, 1958)*

The boom in outdoor recreation following World War II exposed deficiencies in recreation planning in the United States and spawned more conflicts over the most appropriate uses for the public lands. The Forest Service made more timber available following the war at exactly the same time that many firms and local communities found new ways to capitalize on the forests and recreational amenities in the countryside. In this context, recreational resource planners would need to find a way for recreation and primary resource activities--timber, mining, ranching--to coexist on the landscape and within the regulatory systems that managed the nation’s public lands. As part of an effort to coordinate all resource management and to maximize efficient resource production, the Forest Service implemented an agency-wide policy of “Multiple Use Management” *(Hays, 1959)*. While the term had gained a great deal of traction in debates surrounding resource conservation practices by the late 1950s, its meaning often spawned more confusion than clarity *(Hirt, 1994, p. 141-150).* Originally the term was taken as a “directive [to the Forest Service] to manage tracts of land for some combination of uses” *(Hagenstein, 1992, p. 31).* By the late 1950s however, it seemed more a rhetorical device than an established managerial practice. Arthur Carhart wrote to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of his dissatisfaction with the term that had once meant an integrated
approach to resource management. “It now has taken on more of the idea of ‘laminated’
use--of each specialty piled on top of the others by the ‘experts’ who do the Multiple Use
planning, without regard to other uses and their all-use balance” (Carhart, 1958).

The concept of Multiple Use and its application was never monolithic and, at least
rhetorically, has included space for outdoor recreation (Forest Service, 1960). At both the
hearings concerning the creation of the ORRRC and the debates surrounding the
Wilderness Act, it became clear that extractive interests took advantage of the confusion
surrounding the concept of Multiple Use to limit the scope of recreational uses on the
public lands (Burnett & Davis, 2002; Harvey, 2005b; United States Senate, 1957).
Despite lip service to a literal interpretation of Multiple Use that included outdoor
recreation, many foresters and their allies in Congress tended to see Multiple Use as a
“timber first” policy in which other uses might be accepted (Langston, 1995, p. 266).

Conservationists tended to disagree. David Brower, the Executive Director of the
Sierra Club, went so far as to define Multiple Use as simply “timber production plus
anything else that is compatible with stumps” (Brower, 1959). Nonetheless, the concept
of Multiple Use enjoyed a great deal of support in Congress and outdoor recreation was
often viewed as an unnecessary limitation on full resource exploitation. Outdoor
recreation, given its incompatibility with stumps, challenged beliefs about what might be
considered a resource under a system of Multiple Use management established to manage
natural resources “for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run” (Gifford

By the middle of the 1950s many of the recreational facilities built during the
Depression had fallen into disrepair. In 1956 the Park Service commenced work on “Mission 66” in an effort to better understand and improve their facilities in time for their 50th anniversary (Appleman, 1958). In 1957 the Forest Service followed suit with their own “Operation Outdoors,” modeled after the Park Service Program (Hirt, 1994). Both of these programs were primarily concerned with recreational facilities, the public infrastructure that supported recreational experiences. They were part of a wave of resource assessments in the early 1950s which included the Forest Service’s “Timber Resource Review,” an agency-wide assessment of the availability of timber (Forest Service, 1955). These programs had little impact outside of their various agencies and subgroups, accounting for facilities and resources in isolation. None of them made a concerted effort to account for the qualities of the landscape that were necessary to meet the diverse set of needs associated with different resources. Further, each reflected the rancor that characterized the relationship between the Forest Service and the Park Service (Williams, 2005).

Outdoor recreation depends upon specific types of landscapes. Whether a park-like forest, the sky reflected in a lake, a stream populated by fish, or a mountain covered in snow, outdoor recreation happens in landscapes that maintain a degree of aesthetic beauty and ecological integrity. Writing to the Executive Board of the Izaak Walton League, Joe Penfold compared recreation to farm products. “Like all other crops, outdoor recreation results from sound management and intelligent conservation of basic natural resources” (Penfold, 1956). Later, while sick in a hospital bed, Penfold recounted the reasons he thought a recreational resource inventory would be a valuable tool for
conservationists.

The water developers could detail voluminous figures down to the last quart of water which the city of Denver would require in the year 1990...
The timber people knew how much a cut off the National Forests would be required to keep their mills fully busy... The conservationist, recreationist, the outdoor enthusiast had nothing of this sort to portray to the public at the various meetings and hearings which we have attended.

(Penfold, 1966)

Penfold understood recreational landscapes as natural resources, amenable to rationalization and standardization under a system of modernist resource management. For Penfold, the quantitative administrative logic of management could most effectively bolster a preservationist argument. “Although it is of course possible to use numbers casually and informally, quantification for public as well as scientific purposes has generally been allied to a spirit of rigor” (Porter, 1995, p. 74). They could be mapped, managed, regulated and developed through similar schemes that regulated hay, water, or timber. Statistical tables made more effective and handy arguments than complex unique landscapes. The numerical accounting of the resources would allow more efficient inter-agency management (United States Senate, 1957, p. 13).

Penfold’s push for a recreational resource inventory proved uncontentious to members of Congress. Demonstrating that outdoor recreation was not just compatible, but essential to an efficient Multiple Use management program however took considerably more work. Throughout the debates surrounding the ORRRC bill,
conservationists were forced to confront the perception that recreational landscapes were essentially single use landscapes, incompatible with any other use. W.F. McCulloch, a faculty member at the Oregon School of Forestry, succinctly expressed the views of much of the timber industry at a Forest Supervisors meeting:

One situation which resource managers will find increasingly difficult to tolerate is the ascendancy of the urban bird watchers, the daffodil wing of nature lovers. These often self-styled experts in all phases of resource use, having rarely spent so much as a single day in actual resource occupation...The naïveté of the fanatic ‘preservers’ is the frequent, and often political outcry for preservation of recreational areas. The tracts of land dedicated to just one use nullifying the long established principle of Multiple Use. (Recounted in James, 1960)

The question of just how outdoor recreation would fit alongside timber, mining, or forage resources in a Multiple Use management program remained unresolved. At the hearing introducing the ORRRC bill to the House of Representatives’ Subcommittee on Public Lands, Penfold attempted to preempt the arguments put forward by those who marshaled Multiple Use arguments in opposition to increased recreational planning. In his opening remarks, he stepped directly into the sights of extractive industries. Timber lobbyists and others had been arguing that outdoor recreation forced single use management on public lands at the expense of resource production. Penfold however argued that, “outdoor recreation requires the use, but not necessarily the consumption of basic natural resources. Recreational uses of resources may conflict with other resource
uses, but they are seldom mutually exclusive. When they become so, it is usually the result of poor planning or no planning at all” (quoted in United States Senate, 1957, p. 37). For Penfold and the other early advocates of the ORRRC, the connection between Multiple Use and outdoor recreation rested upon rational resource planning and management. Like timber or forage resources, recreational resources and their users benefitted from clear, long term planning. Further, effective planning across the resource spectrum, and including outdoor recreation decreased potential conflicts between resource users. Rather than placing outdoor recreation outside of the Multiple Use umbrella, they simply gave existing recreational uses equal standing. After all, they argued, it already oversaw contradictory uses (Salyer, 1957). Claiming a space for outdoor recreation within this concept had the auxiliary effect of placing outdoor recreation firmly within the dominant modernist planning frame, regardless of whether or not it was compatible with stumps.

Despite arguments that outdoor recreation could easily be folded into a Multiple Use paradigm, it did pose a number of difficulties for planners and exposed tensions within the practice of Multiple Use management. Edward Crafts, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, testified “the demand for all resources and needs of the National Forests is growing each year. If Multiple Use is to work, it is necessary when considering recreation needs for example to also consider other needs and to maintain a reasonable balance between all National Forest resources and services” (United States House of Representatives, 1957, p. 69). Few however could establish a clear path toward that reasonable balance, represented by an aesthetic landscape, and an extractive landscape of
commodity production. David Brower, while recognizing the importance of Multiple Use, was wary of the trickiness of the details.

Loosely worded regulations, which were adequate for a loosely populated land largely free of conflict, will have to become specific-and must in turn be based upon more specific law if we are to avoid a dangerous concentration of discretion. For instance, there will need to be a clearer understanding of the full meaning of Multiple Use, and the limitations of Multiple Use. This has never meant a great number of cooks working over the same broth, although many people thought this was the meaning.

(quoted in United States House of Representatives, 1957, p. 54).

In 1960, just as the ORRRC was beginning their hearings and gathering data, the legal relationship between Multiple Use and outdoor recreation became somewhat more clear. The Forest Service supported the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield (MUSY) Act in 1960. Environmentalists immediately saw the bill as an attempt by the Forest Service to scuttle wilderness legislation and initially opposed the bill (Brower, 1960; Marshall, 1960). Howard Zahniser, Executive Director of the Wilderness Society and a leading architect of the Wilderness Preservation Act, instead saw the MUSY Act as an opportunity. Zahniser firmly believed that wilderness preservation, and by extension all kinds of outdoor recreation, could fit within Multiple Use and Sustained Yield resource management programs. He and Charles Callison succeeded in amending the MUSY Bill at the last moment in order to explicitly write into the law language defining wilderness as compatible with Multiple Use (Callison, 1960; Harvey, 2005, p. 204). The new language
represented a legislative victory, but its importance to actual planning remained debatable (Editorial: Multiple Use, 1960b).

The final draft of the MUSY Act determined that National Forest lands should be administered for “outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes” (Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act, 1960). Given the importance granted to outdoor recreation throughout the bill, some assumed that it was primarily an effort by the Forest Service to “remain in the recreation business” (Editorial: Multiple Use, 1960a). In practice however, the legal clarity granted by the MUSY Act did little to quell on the ground conflict between forestland uses. It provided no guidelines to establish usage priorities (Burnett & Davis, 2002, p. 207). Part of the ORRRC’s task would be to determine just how agencies might prioritize outdoor recreation within a Multiple Use paradigm that was closely linked to Sustained Yield resource production.

**Accounting for Recreation Resources: Recreationalists and Recreational Environments**

*Recreation is a protean term that can mean almost anything people do with their leisure time. It is not a resource, but an activity compounded of two parts, recreationalists and recreational environments. Resources such as timber, forage, water, or minerals exists in land. Recreation exists in the mind and takes place in an environment based on the land. (Wildlands Resource Center, 1962, p. 32)*

The abstraction associated with the aggregation of the ORRRC’s inventory and survey would go far to place outdoor recreation into the larger MUSY frame and provide the voluminous statistics that Penfold felt would help conservationists make their case. Ultimately however, the ORRRC needed to find a way to put that aggregation into practice, to use the statistical data to devise a framework for recreational resource
management. This forced them to bridge the gap between statistical aggregation leading to legibility and the situated, contingent natures of recreational resources and their management. As a result, they produced a new landscape of recreation that included a broad set of infrastructural, demographic, and political-economic contexts that attempted to be compatible with continued mining, timber, and forage production. In essence, the demand to make recreational resources “effective”--to maximize their use within the larger geographic contexts of outdoor recreation--resituated natural landscapes as resource landscapes, products of political-economic decisions, ecological conditions, and specific processes involved in the production of space.

The initial findings and recommendations of the ORRRC were released in 1962 and accompanied by 27 supplementary reports which covered subjects ranging from the history of the idea of wilderness (Wildlands Resource Center, 1962), contemporary understandings of Multiple Use (Shanklin, 1962), foreign travel and outdoor recreation (Martin, 1962), survey results, (Ferriss, 1962), and the economics of outdoor recreation (Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 1962b). After almost five years of meetings, surveys, and data gathering, the ORRRC produced a rich assessment of the nation’s recreational facilities and needs. Even more than that however, they produced a statistically detailed frame around which to construct arguments about how to conserve recreational landscapes in co-existence with timber, mining, and forest uses. The reports provided the “voluminous figures” which conservationists could use in debates surrounding “the way things ought to be” (Nicholas, Bapis, & Harvey, 2003b, p. 5). The ORRRC’s reports fit outdoor recreation within the same resource management discourse
as extractive uses against which conservationists had fiercely fought.

The statistical base for the ORRRC’s reports was a thorough and geographically specific inventory of recreational areas. In the analysis of that data, however, all geographic specificity and any accounting for natural variation disappeared. For nearly all of the reports, the data collected at the county level were aggregated for analysis by census region. As a result, a planner might be able to learn a great deal about recreational sites in the West as a whole, ranging from the amount of developable acreage for winter sports, the existing capacity of the region’s campgrounds, or the expenditure for construction by federal, state, and local governments. That planner however would be unable to distinguish how many of those acres, campgrounds, or allocated moneys pertained to a specific reservoir, watershed, or county. The degree of aggregation helped to elucidate broad trends in recreation practices and needs throughout the country, but did little to acknowledge the vastly different ecological and social characteristics of different recreational areas. The failure to account for the specific human and natural geographies of recreational landscapes promoted a planning regime at the national scale dependent upon a great deal of simplification and abstraction counter-productive to local efforts and ecologically specific requirements.

Similarly, the ORRRC aggregated data pertaining to the people who used the public lands for recreation by census region. Again, by simplifying the geographic variation among users, the ORRRC precluded the possibility of making geographically specific arguments at the local and state level. The aggregation of both the inventory and survey data compounded the difficulty associated with making recommendations
concerning the very specific and locally situated uses of recreation resources. The aggregation of data, like the simplification plans described by Scott (1998), enabled the ORRRC to make broad policy recommendations without getting bogged down in locally contingent day-to-day operations.

The aggregation however did allow the ORRRC to make specifically geographic observations and policy recommendations at larger scales. First, they found that while existing recreational facilities were sufficient to meet demand in 1963, they were not necessarily located in the places where they could be most efficiently used. The increasingly urban nature of the United States set much of the population far from the rural landscapes that supported outdoor recreation. The problem of distance and access operated at a number of scales. At the national level, the bulk of the population lived in the East while most of the recreational areas could be found in the rural West. Specifically 16% of the nation’s recreational acreage was in Alaska, 72% in the West, and just 4% in the Northeast, the most populous region in the country (Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962a, p. 51). At the regional and state level, the Commission found that “few places are near enough to metropolitan centers for a Sunday outing. The problem is not one of total acres, but of effective acres” (Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962a, p. 5).

Making Effective Acres: Resituating recreational resources in the patchwork landscape

Well, the sustained yield idea...really was a timber concept. While Congress, in the Multiple Use, Sustained Yield Act of 1960 and presumably in the FLPMA also, seemingly applied to all other resources, it was never clear how it would work out. (Hagenstein, 1992, p. 84)
A recreational experience, as Penfold told the Subcommittee on Public Lands, was more than simply pounds of fish caught or “checkmarks on a bird list.”

The stream fisherman wants the sound of running water, the feel of the smooth rocks under his feet, the overhanging willows which give shade and cool the water, and intercept the backcast. He wants the chance to outwit the trout, and to enjoy the impertinent camp robber for being part of his lunch. On Granby he wants the sun rising over the Front Range and absorbing the early morning mists, the slap of waves against the prow of his boat, the purr of his outboard, the leisurely lunch cooked on shore and righteous wrath when he hooks bottom and loses his Pop Geer, leader, and length of line. (quoted in United States House of Representatives, 1957, p. 39)

Recreational resources, for the fisherman, hiker, skier, or four-wheeler, encompass the entire landscape and their embodiment in it, not simply one component, a tree, a rock, or a quantity of water. Recreational resource planning necessitates that entire landscapes, inclusive of their aesthetically interconnected components and their cultural geographies, are folded within the planning regime. These resource landscapes are explicitly placed into a dynamic relationship with the urban, rural, and economic landscapes that surround them. The increased scale of management and the diversity of uses and ecological conditions places significantly greater challenges on its management (Hanley, Alvarez-Farizo, & Shaw, 2002). Any effort to effectively build a management plan based upon a resource inventory of acres would need to do more than simply count fish in a stream,
total acres of reservoir or miles of trail. Rather, the ORRRC was charged with devising a plan that combined numerical tabulations with aesthetic characteristics, the produced amenities on those lands and their relationships with existing urban areas so that they might be conserved indefinitely despite increasing pressures of increased use for recreation and competing uses.

Towards this end the ORRRC devised a classification system that would categorize recreational landscapes according to their potential uses. This system would act as a framework for management and resource development across scales and bureaucratic boundaries. The Commission felt that these categories would not only ensure the continued availability of recreational resources, but provide a framework to smoothly implement outdoor recreation with existing Multiple Use programs (Public Land Law Review Commission, 1970, p. 206). The classification scheme separated recreational areas into six different categories, ranging from Class I--high density recreational areas--to Class V--wilderness-- and Class VI--historic and cultural sites. A site’s classification would depend upon its size, the degree of development, and its capacity to comply with other, non-recreational uses. Areas that might fit within more than one class would be managed according to that which would receive the greatest use. The classification scheme established a zoning of outdoor recreational uses depending upon their natural and social characteristics and placed an emphasis on orderly development and increased utilization. In effect, they created an idealized recreational landscape, abstracted to standardized recreational classification (figure 3.2). The scheme served to make legible and simplify the complex social, political, and natural
relationships of the landscape. In doing so, it reconfigured material landscapes to facilitate optimized use within a Multiple Use, Sustained Yield context.

This move towards bureaucratic abstraction and classification was accompanied by a move in the opposite direction. The demand for “effective acres” necessitated a simultaneous shift toward an understanding of recreational landscapes as part of geographically specific relationships between the country and the city. “The problem is not one of number of acres, but of effective acres--acres of land and water available to the public and usable for specific types of recreation. For reasons of location or management, much of the vast acreage nominally designated for recreation is not available for general

Figure 3.2. The ORRRC classification scheme (ORRRC, 1962a, p. 90–91). In order to maximize effective acres, the ORRRC developed a classification scheme which established different regulatory goals for different landscapes depending upon their relationship to existing resource practices and geographic conditions.

The potential value of recreational acres, or recreational resources, depends upon a functioning relationship between the abstracted recreational classes, local communities, purveyors of recreational amenities, and effective negotiation between conflicting uses of the same lands.

The patchwork landscape provided a template for managing that relationship. The patchwork landscape--recreational resources effectively enframed--constitutes a relational space of resource production even as it is guided by abstraction and simplified quantifications. The negotiation between abstraction and geographic specificity, or situatedness, glosses over differences between traditional resource production and recreational planning. At the same time, it establishes a framework in which recreational resources might be placed squarely within a resource production lens focused on Multiple Use and Sustained Yield--practices that seem on many levels to degrade the characteristics valued in recreational resources. Indeed just seven years after the publication of the ORRRC reports, the Public Land Law Review Commission “considered all the resources and uses of the public lands to be commodities. Accordingly, in addition to the traditional resources of minerals, timber, forage, intensive agriculture, water, fish, and wildlife, there were included outdoor recreation and the various spatial uses such as for residential, commercial, and industrial purposes” (Public Land Law Review Commission, 1970, p. xi). The ORRRC’s categorization scheme provided a critical step towards making recreational resources compatible with Multiple Use/Sustained Yield planning in practice, not just in legislation. This step would help to
provide a platform for increased recreational planning throughout the federal landscape.

The ORRRC’s emphasis on the production of “effective acres” helped to provide a productive gloss to recreational planning which had earlier been too easily derided as merely preservationist, at odds with productive activities. The emphasis on effective acres, coupled with the abstracted patchwork landscape shifted debates about the carrying capacity of recreational landscapes away from a neo-malthusian concept of over-use towards one that sought to search for new ways to expand efficiency in the provision of recreational amenities (Haas, 2002). The ORRRC summary report argued that

Management decisions can increase the supply of outdoor recreation without an increase in acreage. If a given area is transferred from low-density use emphasizing natural to high-density use emphasizing facilities, more recreation opportunities are made available. At the same time, intelligent concentration of use in this way can protect other natural environments by diverting mass pressures from them. (Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962a, p. 42)

The members of the ORRRC realized that the provisioning of effective acres was not only a matter of designating some landscapes as “recreational” or of simply devoting their attention to the public lands. They realized that effectiveness and efficiency revolved in large part around the relationships between agencies, concessionaires, firms, and communities on the fringes of the public lands.

Further, a given acre’s effectiveness would increase through efficient packaging, commercialization of access, services, and infrastructure improvements in support of the
recreational experiences. Private enterprise was crucial to the public management of recreational resources and played a key role in the policy the ORRRC devised.

“Individual initiative and private enterprise should continue to be the most important force in outdoor recreation, providing many and varied opportunities for a vast number of people, as well as the goods and services used by people in their recreational activities” (Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission, 1962a, p. 7). In constructing a plan for the conservation of outdoor recreation resources, the ORRRC was conserving a public good for efficient public use and rational conservation even as it created new opportunities to capitalize upon it. Indeed, the model of efficient use and expanded capacity produced under the umbrella of the patchwork landscape necessitated the involvement of private capital through the commercialization of access, the construction of nature-based tourism infrastructure, and the countless retail goods associated with outdoor recreational activities. To resolve the tension between abstraction and situatedness, they introduced another--the tension between private capital and the public good.

When Joe Penfold pushed for a thorough inventory of the nation’s recreational resources, he set in motion a process that would solidify outdoor recreation landscapes’ place within resource planning programs. The ORRRC established specific policy and regulatory guidelines that integrated outdoor recreation into the Multiple Use/Sustained Yield paradigm as it was legislated in 1960. The emphasis on effective acres essentially linked Sustained Yield Forestry and Progressive Era production and conservation ideals with emerging resources that were valuable as a public good for direct consumption and
commercialization insofar as they retained their situated natures. Effective acres were valuable in their geographic, material, and aesthetic specificity even as they were managed through broad simplifications and abstractions. By enframing recreational resources through their capacities for diverse uses and searching for ways to maximize their use within a conservation agenda that promoted modernist efficiency, the ORRRC produced new spaces for outdoor recreation that were simultaneously abstracted through statistical picturing and re-inscribed as situated natures and recreational resources.

Conclusion

The first piece of legislation to emerge from the findings of the ORRRC was the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963, which established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as a new agency within the Department of the Interior. President Kennedy praised the Commission for their work at the signing ceremony with language that could have been applied to the conservation and development of any resource. Kennedy recognized that the work of the ORRRC filled in any gaps between use, protection and utilization, bringing them squarely within the modernist, utilitarian resource governance frame: “The bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission established by the Congress in 1958 has submitted a valuable report demonstrating in a most persuasive manner the need for an affirmative program to ensure the best possible use of those resources which will rapidly be swallowed up for other uses unless adequately protected and utilized” (Kennedy, 1963).

The history of the ORRRC and its influence in making recreational resources legible within larger resource conservation discourses helps us consider the paradox implicit in the abstraction and statistical picturing of recreational landscapes and
consideration of their situated nature. The quantitative inventory of recreational resources provided a frame through which they could be regulated. At the same time the categorization and emphasis on effective acres encouraged local agencies and concessionaires to maximize the use of those resources insofar as they were compatible with existing uses of the landscape.

The production of outdoor recreation resources at the federal scale in the 1950s and 1960s demonstrated that the process of producing natural landscapes as natural resources requires this simultaneous movement between abstraction and specificity. This negotiation involves new resource spaces dependent upon the abstract space of statistical picturing and the relational space within their situated natures. The work of the ORRRC was fundamentally an effort to produce a knowledge of recreational landscapes that would support their production and conservation as resources, as quantifiable and governable spaces simultaneously abstracted from and discretely placed within existing natural, political, and cultural landscapes. “The politics of space, as it has been practiced in the Modern Era, has implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) framed its project within the terms of the calculable” (Crampton & Elden, 2006, p. 683). The spatial environmental politics of recreational resources produced them in an abstract space which “entails transformations not only in political practices and institutional arrangements, but also in political imaginaries” (Brenner and Elden, 2009, p. 358). The calculations and abstractions of the ORRRC provides an example as to how space might be made “amenable to thought” (Osborne & Rose, 2004, p. 212) through the production of knowledge.
That knowledge would lead directly to the production of new recreational landscapes in Central Oregon. Not only did the ORRRC provide the model through which states would conduct their own recreation resource timber inventories, but the work of the ORRRC itself would alter the ways that firms would consider investments in recreational amenities in the region. During the planning stages for a new resort community outside of Sisters, Oregon which would later become Black Butte Ranch, Bill Smith wrote to the Lawrence Stevens, the Director of the newly formed Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in Washington DC.

During the conduction of research on land development and vacation housing, the publications and surveys of the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation have been used extensively. We are now at the point in our research where we must translate aggregate national and regional estimates of demand for outdoor recreation facilities into local demand for Brooks Scanlon owned properties. (Smith, 1969a)

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was unable to provide Smith with the more detailed specifics he was looking for. But he did go on to order the more geographically aggregated reports from the ORRRC, including the final report and the recreation survey (Carl, 1969). It would be up to local governments and firms like Brooks Scanlon to put the simplified and abstract landscapes of the ORRRC into practice and to make them profitable.
The 1967 USDA Yearbook of Agriculture was titled simply “Outdoors USA.” The cover featured a Kodachrome image of a group of men in cowboy hats, one with a guitar, gathered around a campfire (figure 4.1). The handbook aimed to provide a resource for all Americans interested in conserving the nation’s natural resources, in particular those “small fry eager to learn about the great outdoors, farmers and rural developers interested in profit-making recreational enterprises” (United States Department of Agriculture, 1967, p. 3). Orvill Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, opened the yearbook with an invocation to conserve rural resources. “A mountaintop symbolizes man’s goals, aspirations, and yearnings for a ‘better life’...Through conservation and the development of our natural resources, the rural areas can be ideal sites for our communities of tomorrow; communities where blight and urban sprawl will be unknown. Rural America will be synonymous with good living. And you may be able to see that mountaintop from your backyard patio” (United States Department of Agriculture, 1967, p. iv). Outdoor recreation, recreational development, and rural landowners’ capacity to...
support their families and earn income from recreational opportunities would be critical to making that mountaintop visible.

All this thinking at the federal level about how outdoor recreation fit into practices of multiple use and broader resource management programs prompted changes in regional, state and local planning as well (Pacific Northwest River Basin Commission, 1975). The ORRRC recognized that the aggregation of data at the national scale did little to help states understand their own recreation problems. It encouraged states to compile their own inventories, consider ways that outdoor recreation might fit with existing land uses and help people provide recreational opportunities on their privately owned land. The state recreational inventories filled a gap in the knowledge, adding geographic specificity and an additional focus on state managed lands.

Bend in 1967 might best be understood as a timber town with a great view of the mountains from many backyard patios. Timber that came to the city for processing came from further and further afield as the timber mills exhausted more local supplies. Brooks Scanlon’s timber base extended throughout Central Oregon. The desert ranches and alfalfa fields in closer proximity to the town contributed little economic security to the region. In the residents’ minds, however, Bend wasn’t a typical Oregon timber town. One resident reported in 1967, “it seems that Bend is clear and memorable in the minds of most who have been there--more so than other places--it seems special, desirable, a lingering part of experience, unchanging, dependable; an addition to normal routines and patterns which makes awareness of self, and life, richer” (quoted in Kleinsasser, 1969, p. 33).
Changes, however, were already afoot. The dependability of the town’s economic base, if not its population, was eroding as the timber mills ran out of timber to process. Yet, despite the pressures associated with timber production and declining agricultural yields, some foresaw a sprawling urban expanse on the high desert and potential conflict as new residents began moving into the region. These new residents didn’t come to farm or work in the mill. Rather, they came explicitly for the scenic views and the chance to hunt, fish, and hike. The came for the natural amenities rather than for the chance for a job based around the timber or agricultural industries. The influx of people however, threatened the very amenities they sought. “There is a potential conflict between preservation of an enviable natural environment and extensive economic growth.” A 1967 study reported.

As more individuals seek to live in attractive areas with desirable climate, freedom from congestion, freedom from pollution, and accessibility to outdoor recreation, these same locations tend to develop into population concentrations with sprawling housing developments, extensive road systems, and commercial and industrial development with their related pollution potential. (Battelle Memorial Institute, 1967).

There was great hope that this new rural amenity development could revitalize the countryside across the nation. “Rural America has adequate space for more people to live, work and play; to perpetuate our heritage; and to assure a strong community and family life with gainful employment and wholesome leisure. The enduring strength of our society may well depend on the future development and use of America’s
countryside” (Partain, 1967, p. 395-396). The challenge for states, communities, and firms, like the challenge the federal government faced in the early 1960s, would be to manage the use and exploitation of those aesthetic recreational amenities in ways that didn’t devalue them or conflict with existing resource uses.

In this chapter I will examine the ways that local firms and state agencies built upon the findings and structures of the ORRRC to provide a finer grained analysis of recreational opportunities in Central Oregon and elaborated on mechanisms to capitalize on outdoor recreation on public and private lands. In many of these cases, Multiple Use continued to be driven by the most economically valuable uses of the land. Shifts in local economies and broad cultural trends however had now made outdoor recreationalists and recreational landscapes more valuable for many rural landowners. This process of commercialization and its impact on the landscape however is never monolithic or smooth. Different ownership patterns, ecological conditions, and broader cultural trends produced different opportunities for different agencies and firms. For small rural landowners, it would might mean branching out as a bed and breakfast or opening a small campground. Large landowners, such as Brooks Scanlon, could consider a much more dramatic reconsideration of how to capitalize on their real estate. The National Forest Service and the BLM, charged with managing much of the land in Deschutes County, would also need to redefine the ways they supported local recreational development. Commercializing that play would take work and investment in the countryside and in the city. When Outside Magazine listed the town as one of the 30 best towns in the country they wrote
Every place has its season – when living there makes you feel blessed. In Bend, one of the country’s fastest-growing cities, the showcase season happens to be, well, all of them. Take a midsummer night. It’s light until nearly 9:30 pm, plenty of time to lob Wooly Buggers into crisp holes on the Deschutes River after work or hop on a bike to catch Beck at the amphitheater. You can ski through May and mountain bike all year and 10,000-foot volcanoes dominate the skyline. And there’s a lot of good beer: five breweries for 67,000 people, plus swanky restaurants, art walks, and film festivals. (Where to live now, 2007)

The resort developments, breweries, amphitheaters of Bend and recreational resources outside of Bend, however, are built on the grounds and the history of timber production, on processes of planning and scientific resource management, on the porous volcanic soils, cultural values of beauty and open space, and the juniper and ponderosa forests.

The emergence of the “New West” has reframed the ideological and political contests over those landscapes. The “New West” is often understood as a cultural and economic shift away from primary resource industries towards economic activity based upon leisure, amenities, and a preference for espresso. Liza Nicholas and her co-authors (2003b) however argue that the New West represents new understandings of space. These reconfigurations are a decidedly cultural assessment based upon broad historical trends and with implications for relationship between the country and the city and the production of space that contains them both. The economic development of the region continues to depend upon its resource hinterland--in this case recreational landscapes
produced as spaces of cultural consumption and identity. Put another way, the aesthetic encounter with nature in the New West merely camouflages the resource histories and similarities between golf courses and timberlands, between ATV trails and logging roads, between timber camps and campgrounds. Considering the resource histories of tourist frontiers, Michael Redclift (2006) writes that tourist spaces are “in fact full of ambiguities. First, there is the ambiguity of abandoned spaces that open the door, as it were, to new discovery, settlement, and occupation. These discoveries erase some histories just as they illuminate others” (p. 188).

The timber history of Deschutes County however, is only partially erased, it is painted over, textured, or, to mix a metaphor, re-sod as golf courses. It was erased, in large part, by the same agencies, firms, and processes that produced it. I argue in this chapter that recreational development of the New West in general, and Central Oregon in particular, is built upon this strategic reproduction of resource space on the urban fringe. Whether in terms of brownfield redevelopment in Spokane or the transformation of timberlands to suburbs outside of Seattle, the conversion of industrial landscapes to residential ones requires a re-imagination of the place and a reconfigured understanding of the value of it (Bryson, 2010; Klingle, 2007). The knowledge systems developed by scientific resource managers and adapted by the ORRRC were deployed by state agencies and local firms to reestablish connections between the city and its hinterland. These connections followed the same routes that mapped out its timber history. Deschutes County, as an icon of what has become the New West, reproduced existing patterns of land ownership and capital investment that emerged in the resource intensive “Old West.”
The reorganization of space in Central Oregon, and the knowledge and capital that produces it, follows the well-worn trails of timber production, abstraction, and resource dependence. Following the work of the ORRRC, Oregon conducted its own resource inventory and worked to help landowners capitalize upon the recreational possibilities of their rural lands.

“Outdoor Recreation is a Salable Product”
In Oregon, Governor Mark Hatfield empowered the State Highway Department to conduct the Oregon review. The report concluded that “the state’s recreational charm in mountains, coast, and desert will continue to lure travelers in such increasing numbers that they will soon overtax the state’s present facilities” (Oregon State Highway Department, 1962, p. 12). Oregon faced the challenges of coordination posed by their expanses of open space and few metropolitan areas as federal agencies managed much of the state’s land. This included over 95% of recreation lands under the governance of the Forest Service. While the ORRRC centered their guiding questions around issues of resource availability, Oregon took a more pragmatic approach, seeing themselves as a bridge between federal agencies and tourists, local residents, and firms involved in resource production and outdoor recreation. “Just how is the coordination to take place? What is the extent of the pressure on Oregon’s resources? Exactly what needs to be done” (Oregon State Highway Department, 1962, p. 13)?

The initial report relied heavily on pictures, maps, and purple descriptions, including a glowing account of the Cascades region.

The mountains themselves are lofty and snow-capped, and are especially striking from the Bend region, where the visitor obtains a full view of the
vivid array of giant glistening white cones. Elevations vary from 500 feet in the foothills on the west to 11,245 feet at the summit of Mt. Hood, the highest point in Oregon. The region contains the magnificent Three Sisters Wilderness Area and the Mt. Jefferson Primitive Area, and is dotted with mountain lakes, alpine meadows, and tumbling streams (Oregon State Highway Department, 1962, p. 26).

Overall, the first half of the report reads more like a high school geography textbook concerning the physical geography of Oregon than a resource planning document. Yet, throughout the volume, authors emphasized resource availability under different jurisdictions and the pressures that supersede those bureaucratic boundaries. Pressures like population growth, demographic changes and increased tourism to the state led to the conclusion--reported in large font spanning two otherwise blank pages--that “the future of Oregon recreation depends upon the Federal government” (Oregon State Highway Department, 1962, p. 80-81). The commission would later argue less emphatically in a more detailed appendix that local firms can open up new private lands to recreation to capitalize on increased demand (Oregon State Highway Department, 1971).

The commission responsible for the Oregon State Resource Inventory focused primarily on matching the supply with the demand of recreational resources. “From the beginning it was decided not to emphasize the economic values of recreation since the prime aim of recreation planning is not necessarily income but to provide service to the people” (Oregon State Highway Department, 1967, p. 14). Statements such as these, along with the purple prose describing the mountains and the desert surrounding Bend,
downplayed the capitalist nature of outdoor recreation planning. Instead, recreation was cast as an emotional experience, a chance to escape the dreary city to find a place in nature. Part of producing “The Recreation Capital of Oregon” included masking the inherent commercialism of the project, of naturalizing the development and the production of recreational resources even in the process of buying and selling real estate. The highly capitalist real estate transactions and resort developments helped to capitalize upon the publicly own recreational resources of the National Forest, lands spatially and jurisdictionally distinct from the explicit capitalism of real-estate development.

In order to help homeowners discover the recreational potential of the rural lands, the Oregon Extension Service began to distribute pamphlets to landowners throughout the state. PROFIT (Planning Recreation Opportunities for Income and Tourism) aimed to provide those people with the tools to capitalize on the economic potentials of outdoor recreation and rural tourism on lands that were no longer providing an income through agricultural or resource production.

With the continuing high demand for outdoor recreation opportunities by an increasingly urbanized and affluent population along with the changing pattern of land use and public policy, we find many landowners throughout the state of Oregon considering carefully the development of private recreation enterprises. It is the special hope of the author that this publication will encourage potential operators to explore the various aspects of private enterprise operation in detail. (Wilder, 1970a, p. 2)

PROFIT provided tools and assistance for landowners to inventory their property,
the potential market, and ways their property might be improved to increase its profitability as a tourist resource. One survey, meant to be an “idea generator” (Wilder, 1970b, p. 2) asked landowners to consider the hunting, fishing, and resort potential of their lands. “Recreation is a salable product,” the report concluded. “Thousands of people are making a good income from operating or working in recreation enterprises” (Wilder, 1970b). Those that started small could imagine getting bigger. Finally outdoor recreation and rural tourism might be their primary source of income. Other reports provided a bibliography for interested landowners and a lease template for those interested in leasing their property.

PROFIT was primarily geared toward small agricultural landowners who might be able to use portion of their property to make some money from the recreational masses. Large landowners in Oregon however also began to wonder if they could take advantage of the increase in recreation and the people seeking recreational opportunities. In Central Oregon, Michael Hollern and the other executives at Brooks Scanlon began to consider the recreational potential of the 201,335 acres they owned. They had owned the same 201,335 acres for 30 years, neither buying nor selling any acreage. The amount of timber on these lands had declined significantly as the company had harvested far more than sustainable harvesting practices would dictate. Hollern decided that the company needed to begin buying, selling and leasing property. “It was pretty clear that we were in the real estate business whether we admitted it or not” (Hollern, 2008). Brooks Scanlon’s real estate activities would move beyond simply buying and selling property. The company would embark upon a whole new venture, the development of a new upscale
resort community in the woods of northern Deschutes County.

The local ski resort, Mt. Bachelor, had recently undergone a major renovation and recreational use of the Deschutes National Forest continued to grow significantly every summer. In 1962 the US National Ski team chose Mt. Bachelor as their winter training grounds, solidifying Deschutes County as a winter recreation destination (Lucas, 1999, p. 207). Suddenly Brooks Scanlon’s greatest asset wasn’t the trees that grew on their lands, but the land itself. The company realized that they needn’t limit themselves to the timber business, but could pursue real estate options (Hollem, 2008). In order to understand just which lands might be the most valuable, the timber company contracted a group of consultants to complete their own recreational resource inventory. Brooks Scanlon, with their vast holdings of ponderosa forest both near Bend and throughout Central Oregon, hired a consulting firm from Seattle to survey the land and provide an inventory of recreational development possibilities.

The study would determine which lands should remain in timber production, which weren’t adding to company revenues, and which might be more profitably put to other uses, in particular resort development. The report found considerable lands that would be amenable to recreational development, particularly those “very substantial” Brooks Scanlon acreages that met five basic criteria: 1) near a primary highway, 2) near a river or other recreational facility, 3) improved roads to the highway, 4) fairly level topography, and 5) some availability of water. The authors noted that these conditions didn’t “indicate a very sophisticated or highly selective market” (Fanning & Fenton, 1969, p. 23), though that would change as population pressures increased. The patchwork
landscape in the report categorized the landscape into different areas to be targeted for
different kinds of development. They predicted an increase in population in the area, and
that outdoor recreation and tourism would contribute substantially to Deschutes County’s
economy in the coming years. The Black Butte Ranch land was the parcel that most
clearly met these criteria, and the report urged prompt development of the land (Fanning
& Fenton, 1969, see figure 4.2). The categories articulated by the report produced another
patchwork, reminiscent of the ORRRC patchwork landscape, dividing resources
according to their most productive path towards capitalization.

Fortunately for Brooks Scanlon in this endeavor, the characteristics of ponderosa
forests and the practice of ponderosa logging allowed them to consider previously logged
lands as potential recreational developments. Unlike timber operators on the west side of
the Cascades, who could clear cut high value Douglas fir, ponderosa forests mandated a
selective logging approach, because younger trees needed the shade of more mature trees in order to grow. While the resulting stands no longer contained the majestic older trees, the multiple aged stands maintained an aesthetic value that was lost through logging operations in other parts of the state due to the clear cutting associated with even aged management.

Following the report from WK Fanning, Hollern hired Bill Smith and Jeff Carl, two business school interns from Stanford, to ascertain the best way to go about developing Black Butte Ranch. It quickly became apparent that planning and managing a recreational development, and the opening of more recreational developments of Brooks Scanlon lands, would require a different corporate infrastructure than what was required to run a timber company (Carl & Smith, 1969; Smith, 1969). In Hollern’s understated words, “the real estate business is different” (Hollern, 2008). In order to more carefully address concerns specific to the development business, Brooks Scanlon spun off “Brooks Resources” which would be responsible for developing and managing the company’s new recreational and real estate holdings. Free from the demands of timber management and lumber production, the new company was charged to find ways to capitalize on the recreational opportunities of the region, and to develop a plan for recreational development (Black Butte Ranch Corporation, 1970). The company sought to build new communities with close relationships to the towns of Central Oregon, and perhaps most importantly, the dramatic landscapes and recreational opportunities on the public lands in the region (Harrison, 1969a, figure 4.3).
Brooks Resources was hardly a trailblazer in transforming timberlands to resorts. Boise Cascade had attempted a similar trick, investing in resort communities in Southern Oregon and Northern California. On a tour of Boise Cascade’s resorts, the director of Boise Cascade’s development program carefully counseled Hollern to “Never consider real estate with prime beauty, the Sierra Club will kill it” (Hollern, 1971). The Sierra Club had emerged as the dominant environmental voice on the West Coast and their individual chapters, supported by the national office, discovered that the threat of litigation could effectively delay or stop development on undeveloped natural landscapes. “Environmentalists argued that they had environmental rights as well as the right to property ownership and freedom from physical harm that could be protected by legal action” (Hays, 1987, p. 484). The Sierra Club viewed Boise Cascade’s development plans as an infringement upon environmental rights. The planned sites constituted ecological and aesthetic commons, view-sheds and natural landscapes to be set aside for the common good. The Sierra Club launched a series of lawsuits against Boise Cascade.
arguing that their developments failed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

The Sierra Club and other organizations had discovered that litigation could provide a powerful tool for preserving pristine landscapes, slowing the process of development and making the whole process considerably more expensive. Often, these lawsuits revolved around the necessity for, or inadequacy of, the Environmental Impact Statements mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act. Sierra Club attorney James Moorman commented in retrospect: “had Congress understood what the EISs [environmental impact statement] would be and what the law suits over EISs would do, I doubt if they would ever have passed NEPA” (Moorman, 1994, p. 57).

The Sierra Club’s proactive use of NEPA to protect lands from development, logging, or other degradations demonstrates their capacity to enact the reconfigured resource space of the New West. They enacted a set of values that sought to protect a nature free from obvious human interference, a perspective on conservation that broadened the appropriate uses of natural resources to include aesthetic and ecological concerns. For timber, or real estate companies, the resource space of the timberlands continued to provide opportunities for investment and profit, but the ways in which profit could be made was expanding into recreational home development. At the same time, the field of dispute opened new opportunities for environmental organizations to limit the behaviors of firms even on their private lands. Even before the spotted owl controversies in Oregon’s woods, the federal government had passed significant environmental and land use legislation that would have a major effect on the workings of Brooks Scanlon. At
The national scale, NEPA provided environmental organizations a tool to limit the behavior of firms as they sought to capitalize on their undeveloped lands (Hays, 1987; Rothman, 2000; Rothman & Nash, 1998). At the state scale, new land use planning laws would provide opportunities for environmental groups to protect the middle landscapes of Oregon’s agricultural and ranching areas (see chapter 5).

Mismanagement in other parts of the company nearly ruined Boise Cascade, but “it was recreational real-estate that put Boise on the ropes” (Cinderella, 1972, p. 73). Hollern was justifiably skeptical about Brooks Scanlon’s own recreational endeavor, yet the two scenarios are less synonymous than they would initially seem (Hollern, 1971).

First, while environmentalists held up some of Boise’s projects, they were hit hardest by their own accounting practices. Boise Cascade had already entered into large amounts of debt to finance their recreational project. A series of court decisions regarding the accounting practices and the hard sell pitches of their real estate agents would further limit their recreational investments (Cinderella, 1972, p. 74). Further, the lands that Hollern and Brooks Scanlon were looking to develop could hardly be considered pristine landscapes. They were hard used, heavily trammeled ranch-lands and cut through ponderosa timberlands. These were not the pristine landscapes that garnered environmentalists’ attention and lawsuits, but were lands already heavily impacted by human use. Unlike Boise Cascade, Brooks Scanlon and Brooks Resources faced little opposition from environmental groups in their plan to develop Black Butte Ranch.

Brooks Scanlon had established long history in the area as a civic benefactor and as the largest employer in the region. Their reputation in the town, and the social capital they
had built with local civic and political leaders helped them to make the case to environmentalists and others that their resort developments would have fewer environmental impacts than their logging activities and would provide a sustained economic base for the region in the midst of a timber downturn (Hollern, 2008).

The original plan for Black Butte Ranch consisted of a set of condos grouped around a central club and restaurant, a championship golf course, and would feature an open meadow that had been a distinctive part of the land when it had been a working ranch, as well as dramatic views of the Three Sisters and the iconic butte from which the community took its name. Hollern was unimpressed by Boise Cascades’ recreational developments in California and Central Oregon. But Bob Harrison, the director of the newly formed Brooks Resources, took his own tour of recreational developments in Colorado. He returned with a commitment to ensuring that the condos and homes of Black Butte Ranch would be placed close to local recreational amenities, including the golf course, and horse riding areas. He was particularly impressed with the “highly sophisticated job” the developers of Snowmass had done in planning the central area of the community (Harrison, 1969b). William Janss, the developer of Snowmass, sought to integrate all aspects of the resort business.

The Janss developments created a primacy for the one developer resort, the ordered, structured location that functioned as a result of predetermined precepts and that followed the patterns of planned communities. This highly structured and controlled environment, company owned or tightly zoned elsewhere, served as a precursor of later housing
developments across the West. (Rothman, 1998, p. 237)

Brooks Resources intended for Black Butte Ranch to fit within that mold.

Brooks Resources promoted the meadow, the golf course, the views, and the chance to be in close contact with nature. Hollern himself had long recognized that the future of Black Butte Ranch would be linked to the recreational and cultural resources throughout the county. Chief among these resources were the town centers of Sisters and Bend, the hiking, camping and fishing opportunities of the Deschutes National Forest, and, more commercially, the continued expansion and growth of Mount Bachelor, the region’s largest ski area (Hollern, 1968a).

The small town of Sisters, just east of Black Butte Ranch was in the midst of significant economic hardship due to the timber decline of the late 1960s. As part of an effort to construct an identity for the region as a whole the company offered up to $5,000 and architectural help to merchants to redesign their storefronts to create an Old West image for the town. Most businesses in town took the company’s offer. And so, just outside the New Western, elaborately crafted deluxe resort community of Black Butte Ranch, the smaller timber and ranching community of Sisters refashioned itself as an Old West town with clapboard buildings, wide streets, and fake hitching posts (Deschutes County Community Development Department, 2009; Nave, 2002, p. 1).

By 1975, units were selling at Black Butte Ranch so quickly that salesmen had to be cautioned against over-emphasizing the popularity of the place. Reporting back from a homeowners meeting, Bill Smith noted that “I get the feeling that those in attendance at the meeting would be quite happy if we cease selling and building immediately. Can we
avoid the subject? Rather than brag about it” (Smith, 1975). They never stopped building or selling, but continued to expand Black Butte Ranch and to open other resort developments throughout the county. Their logging lands, with the opportunities for construction, access to the National Forest and Bend, dramatic vistas of the Central Cascades and recreational opportunities proved indeed to be a salable resource. Don Bauhofer, the developer behind Tetherow, Bend’s newest golf community described Black Butte Ranch as the model for recent resort development in the county.

With Black Butte Ranch established as an exclusive enclave outside the Old West bubble of Sisters, Brooks Resources looked for ways to further capitalize on the recreational opportunities of Deschutes County. Hollern’s plan for the future of Black Butte Ranch and Brooks Resources involved a dramatic reworking of the entire county. That transformation would involve more than simply the construction of condos, golf courses, and ranchettes. Unlike the other big resort communities of the West, including Snowmass and Sun Valley, Black Butte Ranch lacked ski resort in its immediate backyard. Mt. Bachelor, fresh off a wave of modest expansion, was a full 40 minutes away. Hollern approached Bill Healy, the founder and owner of Mt. Bachelor, in 1972 about buying the resort. Hollern was disappointed with the ski area’s modest pace of expansion and saddened by Healy’s decision to eliminate the on-site lodging at the base of the mountain. Inspired by Harrison’s trip to Colorado, Hollern’s vision for the county echoed Hill’s vision on Railroad Day in 1911. Perhaps “The Spokane of Oregon” was simply an objective wrong for the times. Aspen or Vail served as better models for development in the region. Bend would act as a hub for the ski resort, golf and condo communities, and
the hiking, camping, and fishing opportunities of the Deschutes National Forest (Smith, 1972).

Healy, however spurned Hollern’s offer to buy a controlling interest in the local ski resort. Healy remained committed to controlling Mt. Bachelor himself and slowly implementing changes in order to maintain its local feel (Hollern, 1968b, figure 4.4). This left Hollern and later Bill Smith to focus their energy on the transformation of Bend from a provincial timber town to a small cosmopolitan hub that would attract an endless stream of tourists and second home owners from across the country. Black Butte Ranch, though 45 minutes from Bend, grew squarely within the orbit of Deschutes County’s largest city. While Sisters, as a small community in the ponderosa forest worked effectively with an 1880s vibe, Bend would be the hub for the upscale shopping, dining, and entertainment that national visitors desired. Bend residents, though proud of the small town feel of the city and the intimacy they felt with fellow residents, recognized the need to develop the cultural institutions that would bring people from Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, and, more importantly, convince them to move to the town or the country that surrounded it (Kleinsasser, 1969, p. 44). In a fit of “self interested altruism” (Hollern, 2008), Hollern funded the “Bend Foundation” to promote the arts within Bend and he encouraged the board members of both Brooks Scanlon and Brooks Resources to involve themselves in the downtown redevelopment project the city embarked on in the 1970s (Hollern, 1973). Both companies and individuals from the boards played significant roles in the project which re-imagined the downtown core along the lines that Harrison found exciting about Colorado’s ski communities.
Natural Resource Production and the “New West.”

The early success of Black Butte Ranch, the changes in Sisters, and the redevelopment of the Central Business District in Bend demonstrate the links between the country and the city in the region’s movement from a timber town to “the recreation capital of Oregon.” It reveals the early machinations of the process through which Anne could look at the county from the top of Mt. Bachelor and imagine the region as “perfect.” The stories of Oregon’s recreational resource survey, PROFIT, and Black Butte Ranch and the early days of Bend’s progression towards an economy centered on amenities and outdoor recreation may be read simply as a story of boosterism at a time of economic hardship, of big capital demonstrating flexibility in continuing accumulation by promoting the
region’s natural characteristics and investing in resources that would capitalize on them. The story however can tell us much more than that, in particular as we consider natural resource production in the emergence of the New West. The cultural attitudes of the New West are deeply enmeshed in an aesthetic understanding of the countryside along with a cosmopolitan urban core. The development of recreational resources, and the links between them and the cultural landscapes of the city can help us understand the production of space in the New West and the relationship between the countryside and cities.

Often, discussions about the growth of the urban West following World War II focus on incursions of the city into the country, about unchecked sprawl and accompanying ecological and social devastation. Talk of loss of farmlands, fragmentation of ecosystems, the cost of expansive infrastructure and increased pollution dominate these conversations (Daniels, 1999, p. xii). The history of resort development, and the relationship of that development to Bend, might point to a different analysis. This analysis doesn’t necessarily look past those environmental impacts, but examines the impacts of the city and the country alongside corporate and governmental motivations and entanglements. Hollern’s “self interested altruism” of recreational capital developments is wedded to the development of new knowledge and value in the context of the New West. The knowledge that guides resource production and conservation links the resource and cultural landscapes of the New West through representations of space, spaces of representation and spatial practices. That production is mobilized through representations of space, through the inventories, surveys, plans and accounting of the
land that produce spaces of leisure and capture the memory and myth of the region. As Brooks Scanlon moved from an emphasis on cutting trees to building homes and golf courses, they continued their work of capitalizing on the region’s resources, refashioning space and the sense of place in the region through both a naturalization of the capitalist landscape and the production of “representations of space, established from objective, practical, and scientific [planning] elements” (Lefebvre, 2009, p. 229).

The history of recreational resources depends upon knowledges “with a particular regard for western space” (Nicholas et al., 2003b, p. ix), their representations, and the spatial practices of tourists and residents. In the case of Black Butte Ranch, the shift from timber production to recreational development was supported by resource inventories at the local and national level and in the representations of nature based leisure living, the value of living in the woods as it pertains to a family’s quality of life.

Karen Bakker (2007) has described water as an “uncooperative commodity,” that makes governing its use, conservation, and capitalization difficult.

Water is a flow resource over which it is difficult to establish private property rights; is characterized by a high degree of public health and environmental externalities—the costs of which are difficult to calculate and reflect in water prices; and is a partially non-substitutable resource essential for life with important aesthetic, symbolic, spiritual, and ecological functions which render some form of collective, public oversight inevitable. (p. 441)

Recreation resources, like water, pose challenges for private development. They have
important aesthetic, symbolic, and ecological functions. Indeed, much of their value is in those cultural implications. Unlike water, however, they are not flow resources. They are fixed geographically in specific landscapes thought they are impacted by the movement of nature (deer or wildfire, for example) through the resource landscapes. Capitalizing upon them requires bringing people to them, developing means of access, and creating value within that access (Figure 4.5). For Brooks Scanlon, this meant converting former timberlands into a new resort development. The economic success of Black Butte Ranch depended not only on the construction of homes or new golf courses, but on the character of the countryside beyond the development’s borders and the built landscape of the town.

Amenity development in Deschutes County is built upon a resource that is at once symbolic and material. If “recreation is a salable product” (Wilder, 1970b) then that product is made from the natural resources upon which it depends. Those resources are geographically grounded, produced from meadows transformed into golf courses, made up of trees, lakes, rivers, snow, sun, and views of the mountains. They are, in short, simultaneously cultural and natural landscapes, profoundly symbolic, material, and historical. The story of Black Butte Ranch is one in which a timber company opened a new regional market for one of their key assets, land. But it is also the story of how the resources linked to that asset extend across jurisdictional boundaries into the National Forest and the town of Sisters. Potential recreational development is closely linked to the meanings built into a place, the representations of that place and the ways its history is represented (Nicholas, Bapis, & Harvey, 2003). Brooks Scanlon was able to take the
Figure 4.5. Black Butte Ranch. Today, Black Butte Ranch sports 1251 home sites with 35 miles of private roadways, 18 miles of bike paths, two 18 hole championship golf courses, 19 tennis courts, five swimming pools, three main dining areas, retail shops, a spa, and a general store. (Black Butte Ranch, 2010)
large-scale shift in how Americans related to the natural landscape and how natural amenities related to their quality of life (Hays, 1987) and transform those amenities into resources.

The New West is both a new development, centered on access to spectacular scenery and recreational opportunities, and a reinvigoration of the entrenched relationships between cities, capital, and the development of natural resources in the countryside. The history of space in Deschutes County, and in regions throughout the West, demonstrates these entrenchments, revolving around the history of timber production, to its scientific management to its decline and the shift of timber producers toward recreational development. Outdoor recreation, like timber, is a salable resource, but it is one linked to a lifestyle centered in cosmopolitan urban areas and in preserved, natural landscapes. The towering peaks of the Central Cascades, the inches of snow, and the region’s timber and cowboy history as refashioned in Sisters, are key to the capitalization of recreational resources. The restaurants, art, live music, good schools, ski resort and golf courses are necessary just as timber companies needed the railroads, highways, river, timber mills and ready labor of the city. This relationship between the city and country, the relationship between urban and rural space, is at the heart of the New West. Yet as Joseph Taylor (2004) has argued, this relationship is neither particularly new, nor uniquely western. It is at once grounded in the capital formulations and institutions of resource production and conservation dominant in the Old West and representative of the new productions of space and knowledge related to recreational resources (Pomeroy, 2008). The capacity for the recreational development of the
countryside in central Oregon also depended upon specific institutional arrangements, including zoning and environmental regulations and the continued availability of land to develop and the ongoing viability of a leisurely middle landscape.

Oregon’s resource inventory, PROFIT, and Brooks Scanlon’s efforts in the 1970s to reshape space in Deschutes County in favor of recreational development elaborate the process of capital working to produce a resource space that was at once under great pressure of degradation, and seemingly infinite. “The array of potential demands is infinite,” the Department of Agriculture announced in 1967. “The opportunities appear to be legion. The challenge is clear. We, as a Nation, can have a better, richer life than ever before if we only use our potential for recreation wisely” (United States Department of Agriculture, 1967, p. 321). The wise use of recreational resources would emerge in Deschutes County, as the wise governance of the relationship between the countryside and the city, between privatized recreational home development and the public good. In one particular case, it would emerge in the debate about whether to accommodate development or deer.
The success of Black Butte Ranch had Brooks Scanlon and other developers looking for more properties to develop in the former timberlands of Deschutes County. One prime location for such development was the Tumalo Range, located just at the foot of the Cascades between Bend and Sisters. Brooks Scanlon owned about 60% of the land. The Forest Service managed another 30%. Deschutes County and a few small developers owned the remaining 10%. Brooks Scanlon’s land use assessment described the area as “having potential for subdivision.” In particular, the fringe of the Brooks Scanlon’s holdings would be ideal for recreational home sites (Fanning & Fenton, 1969, p. 24). The Metolius Winter Deer Range, north of Sisters, was smaller than Tumalo, but faced the same development pressures. The Metolius Natural Area was established in 1931 and along with the Columbia Gorge, the Willamette Greenway, and the Public Lands on the Cascade Crest was one of just four Areas of Critical Concern in the state (Hall, 1972; McCall, 1974a, figure 5.1). The recreational resources of the region supported development on the lands at Black Butte Ranch with little or no controversy. The mobile nature of deer, their symbolic relationship to rural landscapes, and their value as game however, became obstacles for development projects in the Central Oregon countryside. The negotiations around the regulations governing development in the Tumalo and Metolius Deer Ranges revolved around how to put into practice the legal structures of
Oregon’s new land use planning program. They exposed tensions between private capital development and the perceived public good of recreational resources.

The Tumalo Deer Range, and the Metolius Deer Range north of Sisters, seemed to be ideal sites for subdivision to meet the increased demand for recreational housing in the county, to further the transition from a predominantly timber community to recreation capital. They were also ideal for deer. Deer herds on the east side of Oregon’s Cascade Mountains spend most of their summers feeding in the high meadows. When the winter snows fall they move to the east, down off the mountains and into the ponderosa forests of Central Oregon’s High Desert. The winter feeding grounds are particularly important as they provide food while the does are pregnant and when fawns are young, a time when disturbance posed particular risk to the herd. These winter feeding grounds border the county’s major cities and towns. Deer must share their winter habitat with exurban

Figure 5.1. The Metolius and Tumalo Deer Ranges. The deer ranges of Deschutes County overlap land managed by the federal government, local agencies, and private developers.
residents, resort developments, and recreational users of the forest. The resulting conflicts between wildlife managers, environmental organizations, recreational hunters, private land holders, loggers, and governmental planning agencies helped define the parameters of Oregon’s influential land use planning program in the 1970s. The program, discussed later in this chapter, emphasized institutional involvement across scales, citizen involvement, and careful assessment of the region’s cultural characteristics and natural resources as it sought to contain urban sprawl and protect agricultural landscapes on the urban fringe.

The recreational resources of the urban fringe are tied to both the rights of property, the possibilities of construction and the nonhuman elements of the landscape—including the deer on the urban fringe and the ecologies and aesthetics of the viewshed. They also include the regulatory and management systems designed to govern those rights and resources. Recreational resources, to the extent that they provide a situated common good, pose a challenge to privatization. Nevertheless, recreational development of Central Oregon is built upon real estate development and subdivisions, upon the buying, selling, and building of private property that affects ecosystem integrity and the condition of the views prized by residents and visitors alike. The deer ranges represent an attempt to reconcile the fixed etchings of property boundaries and regulations with the mobility of migratory deer and the continuities of the visible landscape within the regulatory context of an emerging planning paradigm designed to preserve the pastoral landscapes on the urban fringe.
In this chapter I examine the workings of the three goals of Oregon’s land use planning program—the preservation of wildlife, open space, and citizen involvement in the planning process—as they form the crux of a series of debates surrounding how rural landscapes should be valued, the place of nature, and the relationship between cultural, political, and natural landscapes. After a discussion of the relationship between private property and the public good, I describe the historical development of Oregon’s land use planning program in the context of the pastoral landscape, its legal enactment on the landscape in the case of the Metolius Deer Range, and articulations of the community value of rural space in the context of the Tumalo Deer Range just outside of Bend, OR. These articulations privileged governance at the scale of the landscape, including concerns for property rights, natural characteristics, and community values as they were articulated by the citizen involvement in the planning process. The debates surrounding the Deschutes County deer ranges expose complexities within the relationship between space, property and landscape. Through those debates we can see that landscape is a way of governing by providing a particular way of thinking about space. Property owners, individual citizens, organizations, science professionals, government officials, and the ecology of the landscape are all implicated in the landscape and its governance. Understanding property regulation and resource production demands not simply an analysis of institutional practices and politics, but also an awareness of the production of particular resource spaces and the highly contentious and variable characteristics of the natural and cultural landscape.
Private Property and the Public Good

“All the grass is being staked out now, with a lock on it.” (How the West Was Won 1963)

Jethro, the old hermit and buffalo hunter played by Henry Fonda in the 1963 extravaganza How the West Was Won, refused to leave his isolated mountain home to return to more “civilized” country, or more specifically, more privatized country (Ford, 1962). Much of the film was shot in the Deschutes National Forest. Jethro’s hovel sat on a generic rock outcrop, making it’s actual location impossible to determine, he may very well have been looking at the lands surrounding the forest as he uttered his epithet against locking up parcels of the countryside. The privatization of and urbanization of the West have been defining processes throughout its history leading some to argue that “this is ‘How the West was Won’” (Miller, 2010, p. 4). The expansion of Western urban centers has in turn accentuated the great expanses among them; expanses filled with farms, ranches, and publicly owned lands. Large areas of rural production coupled with growing cities produced two different Wests, “one mostly rural and powerless and the other largely metropolitan and increasingly powerful” (White, 1993, p. 541). Yet the city continually remade the countryside on its fringes, drawing it into its political, cultural, and material footprint.

The rise of the “New West” has reconfigured the nature of the countryside on the urban fringe and beyond largely through a re-imagining of the ways those landscapes should be valued as a public good and as private property. “Population growth, private land development, and the divestment of corporate timberlands to real-estate schemes and
subdivision developments pose a unique challenge to natural resource management” (Nie & Miller, 2010). As demonstrated by the actions of Brooks Scanlon, Bend’s City Council, the Deschutes County Commission, local agencies and firms promoted population growth and construction in Deschutes County throughout its history. Beginning in the 1970s, local leaders redoubled their efforts to expand the city, devoting considerable energy to promote economic development in the region and looked for ways to move beyond timber dependence, introducing what some have called “the Go-Go years.” (Gramlich, 2008).

As cities across the American West, and indeed around the world, undergo dramatic spatial expansion associated with exurban development and sustained suburban growth, the recreational resources of the urban fringe are intricately linked to urban planning and the political economy of urban development. The urban fringe is both a geographic borderland upon which contestations over the relationship between the country and the city are enacted.

The debates that surrounded the Tumalo and Metolius deer ranges in Central Oregon, and the form those debates took, provide an opportunity to query tensions over the public good and private property. Negotiating this tension would demand a reconsideration larger trends reshaping Americans’ desire to maintain and experience a more satisfying natural environment and the proper role of land management agencies. This desire included revitalizing inner cities, changing interior design, and development in the suburbs. Environmental issues emerged as major political concerns both locally and at the federal level (Pomeroy, 2009, p. 204). Many of those political battles were
fought over the place of nature at the edges of cities and in the suburbs. “The urban fringe continued to be a major battleground between environmental and developmental objectives (Hays, 1987). The contradiction between a desire to live in close contact with nature and the environmental impacts of the development of the countryside that contact necessitated raised political questions and debates. Within the “culture of nature” in the post-war United States, the relationship between people and the land exposed contradictions of environmentalism and economic development. Alexander Wilson (2002) argues that “it is no surprise that many of these contradictions are being worked out on the land itself” (p. 17). The construction of single family homes on the fringe presents a paradox between the home as “one of the defining symbols of the ‘American way of life’” and concerns about the loss of open space on the urban fringe (Rome, 2001, p. 6-7). The debates surrounding private property and the public good within the context of environmentalism on the urban fringe provide an opportunity to query the historically specific ways people, nature, and institutions interact to produce landscapes that are “a nexus of law and cultural identity” (Olwig, 2002, p. 19). We must confront not only the politics of resource production and the materiality of natural resources, as critical resource geographers have argued, but also its relations to the cultural landscape as “nature and ‘the environment’ have been central to urban change and urban politics since the birth of planning” (Kaika, 2005, p. 16). The working out of these contradictions in the production and planning process involves attentiveness to scalar institutions involved in the management of natural and cultural landscapes, the workings of a diverse network of actors, and the materiality of nature itself in the production and maintenance of specific
meanings embedded in the landscape.

The regulation of private property on the deer ranges requires careful attention to the movement of deer and the ways that movement is impacted by anthropogenic changes. Jennifer Wolch (2002) has argued that animals represent the very breath of a city, and so should be included in studies of urban dynamics. On the urban fringe, those animals regularly step across the porous divide between the country and the city and across public and private property boundaries. That movement presents a challenge to the more rigidly defined ownership patterns and scalar institutions of governance and ownership (Haggerty & Travis, 2006). In discussing the birds of the Pacific Flyway, Robert Wilson (2010) argues that migratory landscapes might best be understood as “shared space. Through their migratory journeys, these birds connect seemingly disparate places, since for them, the wetlands along the flyway serve as one habitat” (p. 172). The ways that deer, elk, birds, or salmon use these disparate places, and the fluidity with which they move between them, challenge the institutions charged with governing them to reassess the relationships between property rights, wildlife conservation, and economic development. The production of recreational resources—trees, creeks, ski areas, resorts, and mule deer—and the planning processes that surround that production, must contend with a mobile nature. In the case of deer, this means recognizing moving bodies dependent upon specific habitats and conditions the cultural value they maintain. The deer of Deschutes County are hungry bodies crossing jurisdictional boundaries, hopping fences and dodging cars in the search for food. They are also scientific data used for wildlife managers and urban planners, barriers to development, powerful symbols of the
quality of life in Central Oregon. For Oregonians, that quality of life was linked to the state’s agricultural landscapes which were threatened by urban expansion into the countryside.

**Land Use Planning in Central Oregon**
Governor Tom McCall, a staunch advocate for environmental measures and public access to environmental amenities, launched his effort to preserve Oregon’s rural landscapes with a stirring speech opening the 1974 legislative session.

The coasts, mountains, rivers and lakes are key elements in the lifestyle of many Oregonians. A threat to this environment is, in a very real sense, a threat to the way of life for Oregonians. If Oregonians have been more committed than others to the preservation of the environment, perhaps it is because Oregonians believe they have more to lose. (McCall, 1974b)

In Oregon in particular, the potential loss of the state’s rural landscapes mobilized a broad base of activists to conserve the state’s middle landscapes (Judd & Beach, 2003). Yet, the pastoral ideal is highly paradoxical. Agrarian, bucolic landscapes are produced in conjunction with densely populous, commercial urban landscapes that produce a host of social issues that are anything but ideal (Duncan & N. Duncan, 2004; Harvey & Works, 2002; Wyckoff, 2010). Alexander Wilson (1992) has argued that the suburbanization of the urban fringe has brought the pastoral ideal into a state of crisis.

[The suburb’s pastoral landscape] was meant to negotiate the cultural boundaries between the rustic and the urbane. But its mission was a compromise and an unsuccessful one at that. Today North American suburbs are surrounded by dead zones—degraded river corridors,
abandoned farm land, deforested areas, and the uninhabitable “public” spaces of shopping malls and superhighways. Exclusive bedroom communities deep in the woods are merely another broken promise, for they do not reconcile productive with ornamental landscapes, work with pleasure. (p. 202)

Deschutes County’s deserts and forests resonate quite clearly with Wilson’s series of failed negotiations, broken promises, and dreams of living close to nature. Perhaps this tension is most evident in the expansion of the suburban landscape following World War II and its influence on cities in the American West. “Indeed, the postwar sprawl of suburbia was a critical factor in a momentous shift in public policy—a shift analysts called ‘the quiet revolution in land use control’...the new laws all had a similar goal—to prevent private property owners from using land in ways contrary to the public good” (Rome, 2001, p. 263). Oregon’s land use planning program was a key part of that revolution. McCall and other land use planning advocates understood the public good, in this case, to be the pastoral landscapes in the Oregon countryside. Preserving those landscapes would require strong tools to “restrict commercial and residential development beyond the urban growth boundaries” (Robbins, 2004, p. 293).

As those boundaries encroached upon rural landscapes and uses of them shifted from timber or ranch production to denser residential housing, the ecological makeup of the landscape changed as well. Changes in the ecological conditions associated with amenity development, though perhaps less obvious, can be profound, resulting in “ecologies of sprawl” (Robbins, 2004, p. 281-313). Deschutes County deer, in particular,
were affected by these changes as they escaped the snow to find winter forage in the 
ranges in the High Desert and ponderosa forests of Central Oregon. The summer range in 
the mountains and the winter range on the lower slopes, closer to town, comprise an 
annual shifting territory of deer habitat. Rather than a sudden, one time movement 
between ranges, mule deer tend to move slowly and steadily across the landscape, 
gaining access to forage and appropriate temperatures as it becomes necessary or 
available (Sawyer, Lindzey, & McWhirter, 2005, p. 1268). Maintaining migration 
corridors and seasonal feeding grounds requires bringing greater acreage into the 
management zone and longer closures throughout the deer range. Further, the expanded 
winter ranges provide critical habitat and quiet for the deer during the time of year fawn 
survival and reproduction depends upon a lack of disturbance (Sawyer, Nielson, Lindzey, 
& McDonald, 2006). The spatial expansion of Bend cast doubt upon the viability of the 
winter ranges the deer depended upon.

Oregon’s land use planning program tightly linked the maintenance of a high 
quality of life with the preservation of the state’s rural landscapes (Judd & Beach, 2003). 
Testifying about the Metolius Deer Range, McCall argued that the rural could be both 
natural and human and that deer were part of the valuable rural landscape. “I want to re-
emphasize that it is neither my intention or yours to lock up a 185 square mile area for the 
exclusive use of deer. An area of Critical Concern is to be managed to protect values that 
otherwise might be lost, but compatible uses are not to be denied” (McCall, 1974a). 
Those values represented the public good as it was embedded in the landscape.

Comprehensive planning in Central Oregon
At the beginning of the Legislative Session in 1973, McCall challenged Oregon
legislators to give the pastoral ideal legal, as well as cultural, import. He challenged them to address rampant development in the state, particularly evident on the peripheries of the state’s major cities.

There is a shameless threat to our environment and to the whole quality of life, an unfettered despoiling of the land. Sagebrush subdivisions, coastal ‘condomania,’ and the ravenous rampage of suburbia in the Willamette Valley all threaten to mock Oregon’s status as the environmental model for the nation. We are dismayed that we have not stopped misuse of the land, our most valuable finite natural resource. (McCall, 1973)

To minimize the misuse of land, McCall championed Senate Bill 100, which established the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), a quasi-judicial body at the state level providing oversight to city and county planning programs and their compliance with 19 different planning goals. These goals included the maintenance of wildlife and open spaces, as well as a commitment to citizen involvement in the planning process.

The planning program that emerged was based on 19 goals of that would need to be addressed by cities and counties throughout the state. In order to comply with the new rules every city and county in the state was required to submit a comprehensive plan for approval. The plans would need to explicitly articulate how they achieved the goals laid out by the planning law. Much of the planning program’s legitimacy rested upon a new structure of citizen involvement in the land use planning project to help bring people into the system and better gauge the public good. The first goal that any comprehensive plan
had to meet was the goal of “Citizen Involvement,” which states that “the governing body charged with preparing and adopting a comprehensive plan shall adopt and publicize a program for citizen involvement that clearly defines the procedures by which the general public will be involved in the ongoing land-use planning process” (Land Conservation and Development Commission, 1974a, p. 9). The Committee for Citizen Involvement was further instructed to act as a conduit for state and federal agencies that had a stake in the planning process. Officials were required to provide feedback to the Committees.

Following Governor McCall’s emphasis on Oregon’s rural quality of life and slowing development of “sagebrush subdivisions,” Goal #5 of the Statewide Comprehensive Planning Program dealt with the preservation of natural resources, scenic areas and open space. The goal mandated that planning commissions inventory riparian areas, wetlands, wildlife habitat, scenic waterways, various recreational resources and unique cultural areas as part of their planning program. Goal 14, “Urbanization,” charged planners to “provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities” (Land Conservation and Development Commission, 1974a, p. 38). These Urban Growth Boundaries separated the city, dense and highly developed, from the pastoral, primarily agricultural and rural. These three goals – setting guidelines for citizen involvement, prioritizing preservation of open space, and establishing clearly delimited urban areas – provided the structure for a multi-scalar negotiation of the public good and private property in the relationship between the city and the countryside.
Under the guidelines of the Planning Program each urban area in the state was required to define an “Urban Growth Boundary” (UGB) designed to delimit “urbanizable” land in accordance with projected growth rates, the needs of the population and any other applicable planning goals. Counties, in the meantime, were charged with integrating each city’s comprehensive plan within a larger countywide planning program. The county’s job was made more difficult as they sought to provide avenues for local planning and act as a bridge between state defined goals while providing avenues for local planning and citizen input (Abbott, Howe, & Adler, 1994). At the same time the county comprehensive plan also needed to reconcile existing regulations and policies which managed state and federal lands and existing property rights with the mandate to maintain a 20 year reserve of developable land. The core of the land use planning program rested upon a desire to protect Oregon’s pastoral landscapes, agricultural production, and open spaces from the unchecked expansion of cities (Abbott, 2008a). That protection depended both upon the citizen involvement in land use planning and on the application of the law and its negotiation across agencies and scales of land management.

“Land use is a conflict,” said Robert Logan, McCall’s Government Relations Officer. “We don’t know what is ‘good’ in land use. What is needed is a conflict resolution system. The proper place for conflict resolution is the legislature. That forces the issue into the public arena” (quoted in Cassidy, 1974). The land use planning program served as a mechanism for conflict resolution. Senate Bill 100 and the land use planning program established a legal resolution system, through legislative action, that filtered
dispute into the quasi-jurisdictional body of the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

Nearly every other municipality in the state completed their plans before Deschutes County and the city of Bend finalized their own plans for approval by the LCDC. The delays were partly a result of a mandate from the LCDC to reconsider plans to develop the deer ranges (Land Conservation and Development Commission, 1978). The compliance process in Bend and Deschutes County revealed deep fissures between the town’s history as a timber town and its potential future as an outdoor recreation hub. County Commissioners’ agendas and City Council members’ dreams of resort development ran up against the LCDC’s commitment to preserve rural landscapes and wildlife on the urban fringe. The comprehensive planning program sought to provide a regulatory framework for the cultural value of rural landscapes throughout the state by bureaucratically delimiting the country and the city and by limiting the right for property owners to subdivide and sell portions of their property in the rural landscape. Indeed, while certainly linked to environmental trends throughout the country, Oregon’s land use planning program emerged primarily from a concern “about the conversion of agricultural land to non-farm uses” (Walker & Hurley, 2011, p. 50, see also Sullivan, 2008; Sullivan, 2010), exactly the kind of non-agricultural uses imagined by resort developers in Central Oregon.

The pastoral landscape and the law: The Metolius Deer Range.
In the summer of 1977, Deschutes County proposed rezoning two large parcels of land north of Sisters, Oregon to facilitate development of two new subdivisions. The land was home to about 300 deer during the summer, but that number swelled considerably in the
winter, when between 3,000 and 4,000 deer moved into the area (LCDC 1977a). Deer faced increased exposure to traffic and disturbance by the threat of subdivision and development. “Private land within the critical winter range is rapidly being subdivided,” a report warned in 1974. “If subdivision continues to increase, this in turn disrupts the migratory routes of Mule Deer between summer and winter range. If the majority of migratory routes are severely hampered due to construction or closed completely the total deer population for the area would decrease dramatically” (Land Conservation Development Commission, 1974b).

When the county went ahead with their planned zoning change, the Fish and Wildlife Department alleged that Deschutes County Planning Commission had failed to consider the new Goal #5, which governed open space planning in their decision to rezone the lands. Specifically the Department of Fish and Wildlife, arguing for the wellbeing of the deer herd, maintained that the County had approved the plan “without determining the economic, social, environmental, and economic consequences of the conflict between the subdivision and deer uses” (LCDC 1977b). They argued that the County should be required to hold off on the rezoning until they completed the countywide comprehensive plan in order to demonstrate that the rezoning would comply with Goal #5. The county, for their part, argued that, by moving immediately to the jurisdictional body of the LCDC, the Department of Fish and Wildlife failed to exhaust their administrative options in dealing with the issue. Further, they argued that “goal #5 is a planning goal, and therefore alleged violation of that goal must allege deficiencies in the County’s Land Use Plan, which the petitioner has not done” (LCDC 1977b). As the
County planning board had been granted an extension to revise and implement its comprehensive plan, the Fish and Wildlife Department could not effectively argue that the county was out of compliance with it (Donaldson, 1997).

The LCDC was asked to adjudicate two major questions: What was the appropriate procedure for raising challenges to zoning decisions during the formative period of the comprehensive plan? Were the goals, as they were defined in Senate Bill 100 legally binding or merely guidelines that would guide the comprehensive plan that would become law? The questions raised were questions of who governs, at what scale, and how to adjudicate distinctions between qualitative goals and more Cartesian comprehensive planning laws. They were questions concerned less with the legal formulation of the landscape, and more dedicated to the process of the landscape’s governance. Local commenters complained that the Fish and Wildlife Department “wanted to set itself up as the arbiter of local land use planning decisions (Editorial: Wildlife’s mistakes, 1977). The questions raised by the complaint surrounded about the legal formation of the landscape How should the qualitative goals be matched to quantitative and cartographic zoning and planning programs? In short, they were questions that linked the natural landscape through the concern for deer to the cultural values of ruralness and the political landscapes of planning commissions who would determine the parameters of private property development.

After some deliberation, the LCDC found the substance of the complaint valid and ordered the county to explicitly consider Goal #5 in future planning decisions. However, they recommended that the Department of Fish and Wildlife’s petition should be
dismissed because the Department of Fish and Wildlife had failed to exhaust the potential remedies at the local level (LCDC 1977b). The decision by the LCDC to dismiss the complaints on administrative grounds established a system of scalar governance in which the State established a set of broad guidelines and oversight structures. At the same time it provided local communities with the authority to create and adjudicate the implementation of those guidelines. The LCDC would continue to hold the final say in matters of dispute, but only as a last resort. The Department of Fish and Wildlife, a state agency charged with management of the very resources protected under Goal #5, would still need to exhaust local administrative remedies before they could appeal the state to or to issue a rebuke to the county planners (Rede, 1977). For the Deschutes County planners, it was hoped that the decision would provide “valuable guidance in what has been a very difficult and confusing area not just to Deschutes County, but also to Clackamas County, Benton County, the city of Klamath Falls, and to one degree or another to every city and county in the state” (Young, Grubb, & Montgomery, 1977).

The scalar government of the deer range–state level agencies in combination with a legal process of complaint and conflict resolution–produced a specifically local governance process in Deschutes County for the remainder of the planning process. The courts maintained the importance of conserving the rural pastoral and its ecological characteristics as valuable components of the state’s landscape. “While state wildlife officials stand to lose the battle over the subdivision approvals, they still may win the war over whether the statewide planning goal should have been considered” (Rede, 1977). The statewide land use governing board sharply criticized the county for over-stepping
their bounds, for treating the Metolius Deer Range as established private property at the expense of the common good represented by the deer and open space.

The pastoral landscape of the deer range ultimately has indeed become private property in the strictest sense, private property that would become critical to the future development and Deschutes County and its tax revenue and expenditures. In response to the Metolius Deer Range Decision, LCDC Director Kvarsten drafted a policy memo spelling out the relationship between these subdivisions and the Land Use Planning Program. “The problem is not recreational subdivisions themselves as a number of well conceived and executed developments demonstrate,” he wrote. “Rather the problem appears to be an apparently excessive number of recreational subdivisions that are being created in some areas and the policy questions” associated with them. He expressed a concern that “continued approval of recreational subdivisions may create a pattern of development that is incompatible with the objective of orderly growth and development and the possibility that existing local and state regulations do not adequately control recreational subdivisions” (Kvarsten, 1977). “Recreational subdivisions,” an accompanying study went on to argue, raise questions that require policy decisions, decisions grounded in legal action.

What are the overall, long term range goals of the community? Is the proposed development compatible with these goals? Are the physical characteristics of the proposed site appropriate? Who provides the water systems, sewerage system? What standards are required for those facilities? What housing standards are in force? Who should really pay the
cost of education? (Tillson, Youmans, & Thomas, 1977)

The Department of Fish and Wildlife’s complaints about the subdivisions on the Metolius Deer Range were based on potential damage to the deer herd, but it exposed challenges to how the landscape would be managed under the planning program. The statewide planning program set up a legal instrument for preserving the rural landscapes and the resources they contained, but the institutional mechanisms to enforce that legal standing needed sorting out. The debate between the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the County helped to establish a precedent for local control within a statewide system attempting to determine and act upon politically charged understandings of the public good. The space of the deer range would necessitate planning and governance as a hybrid landscape, simultaneously ecological, cultural, and political.

Public input and private property: The Tumalo Deer Range
While the county was facing pressure from the state regarding proposed subdivisions in the northern part of the county, they were facing challenges from local environmental groups further south over a deer range on the edge of the county’s biggest city, Bend. The Tumalo deer range covers approximately 60,000 acres (the size of the range varies seasonally and from year to year) of forest between the city of Bend and the foot of the Cascade Mountains. Deschutes County owned a total of 2,700 acres and, given the potential for development, many thought that selling the land would significantly increase property taxes for the county (Welch, 1976). Much of this land had been logged early in the 1960s (Maben, 1992). The controversy over the range erupted when the county proposed to auction off some of its 200 acres to facilitate resort development (Deer Range planning begins, but decisions still far away, 1976). “Basically, the problem is: if
private developers are allowed to subdivide and build on the land, will it be fatal for the herds of mule deer which depend on the range for shelter and food during Central Oregon’s harsh winter months” (Smith, 1976). Groups of environmentalists opposed the plan on the grounds that it would adversely affect deer’s ability to find winter feeding grounds and that the range represented a public good in need of stewardship. The League of Women Voters was particularly adamant about the importance of finding a way to protect the area.

The Board of Directors of the League of Women Voters of Deschutes County, recognizing that land is a finite resource and not just a commodity, believes that land ownership, whether public, or private, implies responsibilities of stewardship…In decisions about land use, public as well as private interests should be respected, with consideration for social, environmental, and economic factors. (Spofford, 1977)

Of course environmental concerns were not the only ones at stake. In addition to the potential recreational development and subdivision of the range, it was economically important for its hunting and, potentially, further logging of the area. According to one Brooks Scanlon representative, 40% of the area was overstocked with timber and could be logged at a value of $1,625,000 (Rounds, 1977).

While they were writing the city’s own comprehensive plan, the Planning Board convened a citizen’s committee to study the deer range under the rubric established by the comprehensive planning program. The committee was charged to study the deer range and provide recommendations for its use and classification under the county’s
comprehensive plan with specific analyses relative to the 19 statewide planning goals. When they were asked about it, the LCDC made “some very strong statements that the goals do apply” even though Deschutes County had yet to complete its comprehensive plan (LCDC says state goals to be used, 1977). Ultimately, the planning department was “looking for alternative ways of developing the land which could leave room for both deer and human residents” (Smith, 1976). The committee explicitly invited representatives of the major land owners of the area, the Forest Service, and the State Department of Fish and Wildlife to participate (Smith, 1977b). They opened all of the meetings to the general public. Reflecting on the importance of the citizen’s committee, Rick Craeger, The planning associate in charge of the study, wrote: “Failure to involve the citizens for which the benefit of comprehensive planning is ultimately aimed would naturally diminish the result” (Tumalo Winter Deer Range Advisory Committee, 1977).

Citizen involvement in the production of the comprehensive plan was a critical component to the Oregon planning law. According to pamphlets explaining the planning law, “Each jurisdiction must provide opportunities to participate in each step in the planning process. Your involvement can greatly help officials develop a comprehensive plan that reflects local public concerns” (LCDC 1969, p. 10). The decision to participate however was an individual one. Notably, one of the key land owners of the area, Newell Baker, declined to participate, though that didn’t stop him from later arguing that he was going to be “regulated out of business...My God given rights have been taken away from me by a few who think they know more about my property and what can be done with my property than I do” (quoted in Smith, 1977b). The League of Women Voters’ commitment to both
public and private stewardship of the land ran right up against Baker’s “God given rights” to develop it.

Baker’s comment, at its core, represents the crux of the conflict between the planning program, citizen involvement in environmental planning, and private property rights. The fight over the deer range was an early skirmish in the debate over how to regulate private property rights within the context of the pastoral landscape and the common good. While the debates over land use planning and deer ranges in Deschutes County were often cast in terms of deer vs. development, at their core they were questions about the rights of property and the process of maintaining the rural pastoral and a natural aesthetic beauty on the city’s edge. Baker’s appeals for the right to develop were not simply met by a court or a planning board, but by a loosely organized and broad committee of citizens who put forward proposals that would significantly impact government agencies, organizations, business, and themselves. Baker would continue to fight for his right to develop his land on the deer range (Development, deer to clash Tuesday, 1978) and his fight would mirror many debates over the private development rights and regulation at the core of contests over the land use planning program continue to reverberate (Robbins, 2004; Walker & Hurley, 2011, 281-313).

The committee took five months to compile the report. After studying the natural characteristics of the area, the current ownership patterns, the potential for development, and the biological characteristics of the area in light of all 19 planning goals, the committee recommended that the area be zoned with three different minimum parcel sizes. They would be 40, 60, and 320 acres, depending on the potential value of the land
for development and the parcels’ importance as deer habitat. Describing the process, Craeger remarked, “there’s nothing magic about the recommendations, they’re just an objective approach to following statewide planning goals” (Planners get county deer range proposals, 1977)

The 180 page document described the deer range in light of each of those goals before recommending that the range be divided into three planning zones with different building density and clustering strategies. Equally significantly, the committee recommended that none of the county-owned land should be sold (Tumalo Deer Range Advisory Committee, 1977). The study group’s report was to form the core of the comprehensive plan for the area including the deer range, and potentially serve as a model for final decisions concerning the other deer ranges in the county (Deer range studies to continue despite Commissioner’s action, 1977). The decisions articulated in the report were couched within the objective language of science, carefully noting the economic potentials of both development and hunting, on the deer populations and the seasonal feeding habits. Its recommendations were carefully constructed models of rural density and clustered housing plans that would maintain the rural character of the range that simultaneously suited the migratory feeding practices of the deer herd and the pastoral objectives of the comprehensive planning program. Ecologists from the local community college provided scientific arguments declaring the importance of the deer range to the local herd, but many argued that too little was known about the potential impacts of development to put strict policies in place (Boyer, 1977). Bill Smith of Brooks Scanlon wrote the Bulletin to say that they supported the process, but that its ecological
findings were based on guesswork, and so would need to give some thought to how they would approach the study (Smith, 1977a).

The county Planning Commission however shelved the findings and recommendations of the study group until it knew just how the city of Bend would establish its urban growth boundary. Arguing that planning on the deer range could not be finalized in isolation, the county promoted an ostensibly integrated approach to planning on Bend’s urban fringe. The rural countryside, the well-being of deer, and the conditions of resort development in the pastoral landscapes of the range were intimately linked with the material shape of urban development in the city. The report itself cited the importance of the aesthetic values of the range to the economic life of the city.

This seems to be the dominant aesthetically brilliant gem of central Oregon. As an individual travels from the North, East, or South the focus of attention is Westward towards the panorama. A brief examination of tourist promotional literature quickly confirms this observation...The view of the Three Sisters and Broken Top from Hwy 20, between Bend and Sisters is a valuable natural resource outstanding above all others. Since tourism and recreation are paramount to Central Oregon’s economy, any development which may affect this visual orientation must be seriously reviewed to determine its impact in this area. (Tumalo Winter Deer Range Advisory Committee, 1977)

Ultimately the recommendations of the deer range were largely accepted, but not until plans for the range were also written into Bend’s local planning program, the Forest
Service’s plans for the Deschutes National Forest, and the County’s broader planning vision. The zoning regulations rose out of citizen concerns about the local deer herd and were ultimately decided in a process of negotiation outside of traditional technocratic planning process and with little concern for the protection of deer. While the deer of the Tumalo Range were the impetus for the work and the report, the decisions concerning its use had much more to do with the region’s future recreational development and the kind of community Bend might become. The herd had, primarily, become a symbol for the countryside and the common good it provided. The Citizen’s Committee served to negotiate that common good with the rights of property owners within the deer range.

The Citizen’s Committee worked in open meetings with a broad range of stakeholders to devise a solution. Planning decisions for the range operated at the landscape scale, across jurisdictional and property boundaries to include the 60,000 acres of the winter deer range and to understand how it fit within the larger plan for the county. The shifting boundaries of the range involved political conflicts between citizens, firms, agencies, and policy makers at the local, county and state level. While the legal structures that regulate development on the deer range continued to hold sway, the articulation of those legal positions are only a part of the governance of the landscape. An understanding of the deer range as private, federal, or county property only illuminates a portion of the story surrounding the production of the pastoral on Bend’s periphery. Only when the individual pieces of the property are pieced back together as a landscape can the often messy processes of its governance be analyzed.

Recreational Resources, Private Property and the Public Good
McCall’s effort to bring more citizens into state decision making and protect the
environment opened up the black box of government. One commenter noted that “The McCall years have made government interesting and fun” (Cassidy, 1974, p. 20). To some degree that may have been true, but it was also tedious, contentious, and full of unknowns. The initial comprehensive planning process for Deschutes County in general, and Bend specifically, was particularly contentious (Robbins, 2004).

The ranges are less defined by political boundaries, than by elevation, aspect, and historic migratory patterns of deer and elk, and seasonal variation in the availability of food (Hostick, 2004). Changes in ownership or zoning might in fact do little to change the existing ecological conditions of the landscape, but new roads, fences, and demands upon the land can force sudden changes in historical migratory patterns. A deer’s attempt to cross a road at the wrong time can mean disaster for the deer and the unfortunate driver, and the noise of cars is often enough to keep does from even coming close to the road. “Territory,” writes environmental historian Jon Coleman, “is space with teeth, and the promise of violence arranges spatial relations among similar species” (Coleman, 2004, p. 20). The territory of the deer ranges in Deschutes County establishes a violent landscape of interaction between deer and people. The promise of violence is less one of teeth than of guns, roads, fences, and logging trucks. But, the promise persists and is written into law, practice, and compromise.

In the summer of 1977 the urban planners in Deschutes County faced a crisis in their efforts to develop and implement a comprehensive plan in accordance with Oregon’s new comprehensive planning law. In particular they had difficulty reconciling state planning goal #5, relating to agricultural lands, with their own emphasis on enabling
recreational resort development on Bend’s urban fringe and other rural areas in the county. As the County Planning Commission made preliminary motions to auction off and rezone acres that were perceived to be critical deer migration routes and winter habitat they faced vocal concerns from state agencies and local citizens. These concerns emerged as two local controversies. One which focused on a court case brought by the State Department of Fish and Wildlife against the county. The other centered on the demands presented by a group of vocal residents who prized the open space associated with the timberlands on Bend’s urban fringe. In each case, models of property regulation faced new challenges from arenas outside the traditional government that guaranteed the bundled rights of property. Conflicts over the deer ranges exposed tensions over how to regulate property and the practices of environmental governance in the production of specific landscapes. The Metolius and Tumalo Deer Ranges represent spaces in which deer may be impeded by fences, harassed or killed by cars, or starved due to changing vegetation and a lack of access to food. They are also a place where the deer are embedded within a complex system of law, property, and cultural values. The recreational resources of the fringe include the deer and the viewsheds of the ranges, but they also include private property and the potential to capitalize on property through subdivision. The recreational resources of the countryside include those property rights and the deer, water, trails, and views that regularly and easily cross property boundaries.

The quasi-judicial LCDC and the Citizen’s Committees that helped to shape the plans for the deer ranges operate as institutions regulating these resources and guiding the ways that the recreational resources of the urban fringe can be capitalized upon.
Expanding on understandings of landscapes as polity, Don Mitchell and Lynn Steaheli (Mitchell & Staeheli, 2005) have argued that, rather than conceptualize them as space, we would be better served considering landscapes as property. Nicholas Blomley (2005) has asserted that a reevaluation of property and the structures though which it is maintained might provide a critical understanding of “consequential geographies of property” and the ways it produces particular landscapes (127). Despite an awareness of the range of political conflicts associated with the production of landscape through law and as property, much of the analysis seems to assume a singular legal instrument which establishes and enforces the bundle of rights associated with property.

Oregon’s land use planning program and the landscapes it produced in the late 1970s were grounded in the legal structures of property and often guided by planning policies at the local and county level. Conflicts over the development of the deer ranges on the urban fringes in Deschutes County highlight the contests over the production of natural resources, private property, and common benefits of the landscape. The deer of Deschutes County spend their summer primarily on National Forest lands. In the winter, when they come down out of the mountains, they cross land that is owned by residential landowners, development companies, and local governments. Successful deer management practices on the winter ranges requires that each of those land managers act in concert, under a fairly unified set of policies and practices that preserve habitat and avoid the kinds of disturbances that have negative effects on doe fertility and fawn survival.

The development of recreational resources in Deschutes County linked private
property with public lands and the public good associated with them and the environment as a whole. The result was a land use negotiation in which the bundled rights of property and the legal establishment of those rights butted against public land use, environmental concerns, and ideas of the public good as it related to quality of life questions and Oregon’s pastoral landscapes. The process that produced the mechanisms of governance on the deer ranges involved significantly more than a “statistical picturing” (Demeritt, 2001a) of the deer and the property. As Blomley, (2008) has noted, the simplification of nature into property is complicated. It “entails the organization of space (networks, assemblages, boundaries, and so on) as well as the organization of time. Thus, the parcels of land in dispute can be thought of as having a legal biography, traceable through alienations and transfers and dispossession” (1839). The deer ranges of Deschutes County, were once potential resorts, timber farms, and (depending on the season) feeding grounds for migratory deer. They constitute a field in which natural processes, legal processes, and cultural imaginations come together to expose negotiations between the public good and private property.

The deer that moved between the National Forests and Wilderness Areas of the Central Cascades into the urban fringes of Deschutes County contend with the prickly political geographies of development and environmental conservation. The citizen’s groups, made up of a diverse set of stakeholders, politicians, activists, and scientists, set to shaping the territorial relationship to the deer and codifying it into development plans and private property arrangements. The negotiations demonstrate that this debate was not primarily about who was able to speak for the deer and what the potential impacts on deer
migration might be. Rather it became a debate about the relationship between private property and the public good, about private resource development and common values embedded in the landscape, and about the relationship between the city and the countryside. Deer ranges provided an opportunity, given their ecological complexity and nuance, to hold a debate over economic development and the cultural value of open space.

The fluidity of the deer range, the way the territory of the landscape became defined and the ease with which deer move through jurisdictional boundaries and property lines, produced a great deal of tension with the more rigid spatial fixes associated with private property. The open space that was conserved due to the debates over the deer ranges reinforced Bend’s effort to become a leader in amenity development within the region. While it has yet to produce the glitz of a place like Vail or Jackson’s Hole, the land use planning program, as it was contested through the debates surrounding the deer ranges helped to establish a governance program through which developers could work to produce new pastoral landscapes. The presence of deer, as animals for hunting, components of a healthy ecosystem, and a perceived public good, are critical elements of the amenity pastoral. This allows resort developers to focus on bringing people to the pastoral amenities on the urban fringe as they provide access to the spectacular scenery and recreational activities of the Central Cascades. The Land Use Planning program has solidified the conditions of the landscape and its production, maintaining rural pastoral characteristics that have become the cornerstone for the region’s explosive resort development. The debates over land use planning in Deschutes
County wouldn’t end with the decisions about the Deer Ranges, but would continue to shape the cultural, political and natural landscape into the twentieth Century. The “ecologies of sprawl” (Robbins, 2004) represented by the resort development on the urban fringe would be built in the landscape and in courtrooms. They would continue to reshape the relationship between the city and the countryside and the ecologies of the region. The resorts, however, were only one component of the capitalization of the region’s recreational resources. Those resources would be further capitalized upon through highly developed destinations in the mountains, on the river through town, and along the road that connected them.
Wilderness advocate and longtime Bend resident Scott Silver (2008) told me about Bend in 1988, when he moved to town. “The head of the Chamber of Commerce used to say that at midday he could shoot a cannon off in the middle of Bond Street and he wouldn't hit a damn thing. Or was it Wall Street?” His wife responded mournfully, “it hardly mattered.” Silver resumed:

It was called poverty with a view and that’s why we moved here. There were bumper-stickers put together by one of the radio stations that talked about the Central Oregon Lifestyle. It wasn't the golf life style. Everyone was here for a purpose. Almost everyone was here with an interest in the forest. They were either interested in Monday - Friday going and cutting it down and going hunting on Saturday and Sunday or they were here to play Monday through Friday. Now it’s golf courses and you just want to look at it.

As the timber boom came to an end in the region and the mills closed, the community’s dependence upon the industry, long described in Forest Service Reports, began to manifest itself in an economic downturn in the region. Despite the new exclusive housing communities and the wealthy people choosing to summer in resorts, the bulk of Bend’s population was forced to deal with an economic downturn resulting from a lack of locally available timber. The timber companies had already over-harvested their own lands and
the Forest Service sought to keep a check on the amount of timber it made available from the National Forest. The new timber alleviated the short term crisis, but it only led to a greater catastrophe in the long run. Chief Forester Silcox feared that without strong sustainable yield plans the community wasn’t viable in the long term. Until such plans were in place, he refused to release large patches of the Deschutes National Forest for logging. “Although accelerated harvests on adjacent national forests might prolong the life of Bend, Silcox refused to allow federal timber to be used to support such a program of ultimate community disintegration” (Robbins, 1987, p. 192). While staving off “ultimate community disintegration,” the Forest Service’s tight rationing of federal timber further exposed the town’s close dependence upon its immediate resource hinterland. Yet it is exactly this view, which once made people like Scott Silver willing to abandon other jobs to live in the region or simply provided the balm on an otherwise depressing economic situation, upon which the next boom in Bend would be built.

When the Department of Land Conservation and Development finally approved the county’s comprehensive plan in 1980, planners estimated that the local timber and wood products sector employed 2,720 people. The plan also assumed that maintenance of an allowable cut would facilitate some growth in the industry. It was predicted to play a proportionally smaller role in the regional economy through the 1980s (Deshutes County Planning Commission, 1979, p. 19-20). The tourist industry, it was assumed, would pick up the slack. The change that accompanied amenity development, however, was already being noticed. “I love the place,” one resident wrote in 1968. “The air is so fresh. The view is so crisp. It has feel good weather and is quiet. You can see so much, go so many
places” (as quoted in Kleinsasser, 1969, p. 83). Another wrote, “as soon as amenities start getting ruined or if it gets too crowded, I’ll leave” (as quoted in Kleinsasser, 1969, p. 66). The freshness of the air and the places to go and see gained importance as timber production fell, but already the region’s population growth threatened the view and the treasured places in the countryside.

The resource geographies of Deschutes County are not simply comprised of the lakes, streams, fish, trails, and deer, but also the civic infrastructure and capital investment that support them, and the cultural tropes and values that allow their commercialization. The reframing of the cultural and resource relationships between Bend and its hinterland reflect the transition from a landscape shaped in large part by extractive resource consumption fashioned to support the amenity boom at the end of the century and the proud boasts of Bend as “the recreation capital of Oregon.” The public and private infrastructure behind those relationships provides an opportunity to query the relationship between the production and consumption of natural landscapes.

In this chapter I trace the shifting understandings of the value of Bend’s hinterland and the material changes in the landscape that supported that change. In particular, capitalizing upon this new recreational value depended upon similar infrastructure, development, and government and capital investment that existed for extractive industry. I analyze that investment in the connections between the city and the country (the Cascade Lakes Scenic Highway), in the countryside (Mt. Bachelor), and in the city (the Brooks Scanlon Mill site). Each of these developments built upon existing relationships between the city and the countryside even as they facilitated the recreational development
of the region.

Resource Infrastructure in the New West
Like nearly every winter issue of Bend’s local tourist magazine *Cascades East*, the winter 1981-1982 edition featured a special report concerning recent developments at the local ski area, Mount Bachelor. The 1981-1982 ski season would feature the opening of a new lodge, new lifts, and plans to build a lift to the summit that would be ready for the area’s 25th anniversary in 1983. “Prior to that, Mt. Bachelor was little more than an overgrown cinder cone, dark brown in the summer, white in the winter” (Linn, 1981, p. 25). The difference between an “overgrown cinder-cone” and the centerpiece of Deschutes County’s winter outdoor recreation scene lay in more than the concrete, cables, and chairs of the ski lifts, or the bars, grills, and tables of the lodges. It also grew in the grass planted on the ski runs to hold the snow better, in the leveled and filled marsh that made up the parking lot, the improvement of Century Drive and the expansion of hotels and resorts in Bend itself (Hill & Heekin, 1981). The infrastructure of play at Mount Bachelor involved not only civic developments such as roads, sewer, and electrical services, but also private investment in lifts and lodges within the public lands of the National Forest.

Changes in both the built environment and the natural environment depended upon carefully negotiated processes involving local and national regulatory regimes and bureaucracy. Perhaps most importantly, these processes linked private capital with state institutions that were charged with regulating capital investment towards the public good even as they provided the public services that enabled its expansion (Perry, 2003). The production of tourist infrastructure results in “the hegemony of ‘growth politics,’ the use of public subsidies to entice private investment (including sport), and the manipulation
and regulation of urban land, one of the few autonomous realms of local-level
governance” (Schimmel, 2006, p. 162; see also Zukin, 1991).

The production and consumption of recreational resources involves both planning
and implementation of those plans. The maps and categories of recreational resources
eventually become roads, campsites, and shops. The configurations involved in
constructing and privatizing the tourist city’s new institutional arrangements echo a
utopic relationship between nature, capital, and government agencies, at once embedded
in history and seemingly set loose from it and the injustices involved in its creation. As
deeply as this utopia is embedded in history, it has also meant dramatic alterations of the
material landscapes of the city and the countryside (Wallach, 2010). The built and
cultural landscapes of the city are embedded in its institutional landscapes. The stadiums,
convention centers, harbors, theaters, and condos represent a collaboration between
planning and regulatory agencies and the firms that built and benefit from them. At the
same time they are the glittery surface of the city’s infrastructure: roads, sewer lines,
docks, electrical and cable wires, and water pipes. “Government, because of its dual role
of regulator in support of the public good and constitutor of the institution’s relationships
with other levels of government, ultimately defines the nature (public/private) of
infrastructure” in the city (Perry, 2003, p. 44). The same holds true for rural tourist
landscapes. The rural infrastructure that supports nature tourism require similar
institutional gymnastics, stretching the built environment to render the natural landscape
attractive, accessible, and amenable to capitalization. The recreational lifestyle is built on
top of this infrastructure. The recreational lifestyle provides the mechanism that makes
these recreational landscapes valuable as resources.

Building a tourist city requires building infrastructure to support tourism (Judd 2003). In Bend’s case, this involved not so much building, but modifying existing infrastructure to change resource regimes from timber production to recreation and to transform natural amenities into natural resources. In the 1980s, property was cheap. The views were spectacular. Recreational opportunities were abundant. Jobs weren’t. Unemployment in the city reached toward 25% during the decade as the region’s economy reeled following the mill shutdowns (Davidson, 2007, p. 334). Shauna Quistorff, development director for the Central Oregon Environmental Center, described the situation in 1980. “During the 1980s there was a massive exodus. No one could find jobs. Families couldn’t support themselves and so during that time Bend realized that we had to reinvent ourselves. We had to actually mimic the recreational aspects of tourism that is available around us. So, let’s start accommodating that in a proactive manner” (Quistorff, 2008).

The rural infrastructure of play in the American West emerge from the infrastructure that enabled resource production and agriculture. The railroads and highways that moved timber and wheat out of Deschutes County also served to bring visitors into the region. Today the logging roads in the Deschutes National Forest are used primarily used for cross-country skiing, mountain biking, and four-wheeling. The processes of rural gentrification follow those infrastructure developments as well. As timber workers or ranchers watch commodity prices decline, visitors are attracted by the low cost of living and the lifestyle, visitors occasionally becoming second home-owners
If Bend continued to be a frontier town through the 1930s, according to Isaiah Bowman (1936), then it had become a new kind of frontier by the beginning of the 1980s. Rural gentrification has presented a new kind of frontier in the West with a significant impact on communities and the very nature of the region (Jackson and Kuhlken, 2006). The rural gentrification of the New West, is “reshaping the social and environmental landscapes of the urban region” (Bryson, 2010, p. 289). The city and the countryside in Deschutes County are linked through connections to the forest and to the palimpsest of resource infrastructure. In the process, Bend, like Red Lodge Montana, and countless other towns scattered throughout the West, reflected a landscape geared toward the consumption of outdoor amenities (Wiltsie & Wyckoff, 2003).

Much of infrastructure that supports the “playground just waiting to be explored” (Bend Chamber of Commerce, 2007, p. 6), of the New West, once served as critical infrastructure to resource extractions and production. Bend’s transition towards a more specific amenity infrastructure is often linked to cultural changes within the region, with rural gentrification and amenity development. These transitions are also discussed in terms of a shift from ranches to ranchettes, from timber cruises to golf courses, from resource production to retail consumption, and from watersheds to viewsheds (see for example Ghose, 2004; Gosnell & Abrams, 2009; Robbins, Meehan, Gosnell, & Gilbertz, 2009; Bryson & Wyckoff, 2010; Hines, 2010). The infrastructure that supports these reconfigurations of the relationship between the country and the city mediates people’s experience with the landscape, the way that they focus on it. The roads that lead from the
country to the city form the very foundation for the relationship between them. The built environment and its infrastructure—the buildings, parking lots, water pipes, and sewer systems—represent paths of resources and people in the production and consumption of both resources and cultural values.

In between the city and the country
“Roads,” writes J.B. Jackson (1997), “belong in the landscape. Roads no longer merely lead to places, the are places. And as always they serve two important roles: as promoters of growth and dispersion, and as magnets around which new kinds of development can cluster. In the modern landscape, no other space has been so versatile” (p. 251). The most common route out of town towards Mount Bachelor or the scenic drive through the Central Cascades, starts just outside of the Deschutes Brewery on the edge of the Old Mill District. The road was originally built to bring people to a health resort planned for Soda Springs in 1909. The resort was never built and “Soda Springs, which provided the first impetus for a road into the recreation area, remained known to few” (Brogan, 1969, p. 110). Today, skiers, hikers, and sightseers take a left turn at a roundabout (with helpful sculptures noting the cardinal directions) at the edge of town, they pass the Cascade Lakes Brewpub, and shortly come across a large sign that details for drivers the distances to Mt. Bachelor, Eugene, and many of the lakes from which the nearby brewpub derived its name.

Century Drive officially becomes the Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway at the boundary of the Deschutes National Forest. It leaves town through the ponderosa forests on the lower slopes of the Central Cascades before passing Mt. Bachelor, the lava flows left over from eruptions of South Sister, past a string of alpine lakes, and the region’s two
major reservoirs before emerging from the National Forest south of Pine, Oregon (figure 6.1). Much of the route follows the original Century Drive tour road, the original 100-mile auto tour of the Central Cascades which was completed and given the unofficial name of “Century Drive” in 1920 (Brogan, 1979, 111). In the process of smoothing out grades, and after a number of health resorts in the Alpine Lakes region were denied permits, the Forest Service shortened the road. It might lack some of the adventure that it carried in 1920 as the drive is considerably easier now, but it continues to provide access to the woods through the windshield.

The “windshield wilderness” of highway based nature tourism presented wild nature to mobile travelers. Tourists with cars could cover more miles and see more of the spectacle even as roadside signs and the windshield framed their experience. For many the Cascade Lakes Scenic Highway isn’t simply a means to access nature, but is the experience of nature itself. That experience is different, however, than the way Luke Smith, Director of the Ski School at Mt. Bachelor, describes why he came to work at Mt. Bachelor. “I love the natural terrain here. It changes everyday. It’s unexpected. It challenges you” (Smith, 2008). Beginning in 2008, the mountain offered 360 degree
skiing from the summit, meaning that skiers at the top of the mountain could pick any direction they chose to get to the base as long as they avoided cliffs or trees. The mountain changes with the wind and the snow conditions. The highway, however, is fixed in concrete, with established vistas and picnic areas. The highway and the automobile bring the machine into the garden as they provide more and more people access to nature as scenery even as it removes them from the immediate experience of it by fixing the gaze and the path. The automobile serves to frame the natural scene and negotiate the experience of movement through nature. Scenic Highways complicate the distinction between the natural world and modern life (Louter, 2006, p. 165).

In 1989 the drive became a National Forest Scenic Byway and gained status as a National Scenic Byway in 1997. The Scenic Byway Program codified the aesthetic values of the drive which determined that the highway was one of the nation’s ten most important byways (Forest Service, 2007). The program identifies and protects roads with “features that are considered representative, unique, irreplaceable, or distinctly characteristic of an area” with particular emphasis on six “intrinsic qualities: scenic, historic, recreational, archeological, natural and cultural” (National Scenic Byways Program, 2007, appendix e).

From the outset the Byway was understood as a means to bring people into the region to give them something to do while they were here. It was understood as one component of a local tourist resource portfolio. The Scenic Byway Program requires local sponsors who assume the bulk of the responsibility for interpretation, providing amenities along the route, and the production of print, photo, and video materials that draw people
The first, and biggest partner for the Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway was the Bend Chamber of Commerce (Forest Service, 2008, p. 23). The scenic byways program in the national forests reflects an ongoing effort by the Forest Service to build partnerships with local communities and convince them to reconsider their priorities in light of increased recreational use. The highway itself is a tourist destination in which the views and experience are scripted by the ribbon of the road, the Corridor Management Plan, the brochures and maps printed by the Forest Service and the Chamber of Commerce, and by the roadside signs. It’s importance as a tourist destination and activity, however, implies that it is also a resource.

In October of 1998, just months after the Cascade Lakes Highway gained its designation as a National Scenic Highway, the Congressional Research Quarterly interviewed Michael Dombeck, Chief of the Forest Service. In that interview, Dombeck echoed the ORRRC in placing outdoor recreation in the same administrative frame as extractive activities, noting that, “we’ve got to make sure that the same principles apply to recreation as apply to mining or logging, that we work within the limits of the land, because these are our options for the future” (The Congressional Quarterly Researcher, 1998, p. 911). The Scenic Byway System, at its beginning, was deemed an efficient way to grant people access to the forest and provide local communities with a key scenic resource to support their tourism industries (National Scenic Byways Program, 1995).

The Cascade Lakes Scenic Highway links the recreational opportunities and the aesthetic vistas of the National Forest to the city. “Automobiles and the highways they travel have shortened the distance and time it takes to reach national parks. They have
brought the cities in which we live and the parks we visit closer together. In our minds as well as our journeys out of town, the places we live and the natural places we visit merge” (Louter, 2006, p. 4). The road seemed barely to be commercial or developed in any way. A review of the trip by the *New York Times* in 1969 began by celebrating its remoteness from people and the immediacy of nature and lack of development. “For miles there is no sign of habitat; not a billboard, not a placard, not a farmhouse, not a woodsman’s hut. Filling stations are scarce; only one in 90 miles. Deer and elk cross the road as though they owned it and the wind joins with the hermit thrush for a forest melody” (Friedman, 1969, p. 253). When the *New York Times* came back to celebrate the opportunities of the region, they noted Century Drive only to comment on the large resorts and most of the smaller ones lay along it and that it was the access road to Mount Bachelor (Rosenthal, 1997). Aside from some minor changes in the route, the core infrastructure of the road didn’t change between the 1920s and the 1990s, but the importance of the road as a defining space of the region did. Far from the rough and wild, if beautiful drive of the 1920s, the nationally recognized Scenic Byway of the 1990s provided access to the views and a well defined and easily traveled route through the aesthetic resources of the region. The experience of the road changed as it was developed with resorts, repaved, regraded, smoothed out, scripted and framed by brochures, signs, and windshields.

**In the Mountains: Mt. Bachelor**

The Cascade Lakes Highway connects the city to the scenic country in the mountains, providing a physical connection between the city and its recreational hinterland. It also connects the city to Mt. Bachelor, the commercial center of outdoor recreation in the
Central Cascades. The connections between Bend and Mt. Bachelor are economic, cultural, and deeply connected to the region’s identity and growth. While the scenic highway as a whole presented a nice feather in the cap of Bend to help draw people in, the entire highway was only open during the summer months (Klug, 1991, 23). The most heavily travelled part of the highway, particularly during the winter, was the part that brought people from Bend to Mt. Bachelor, the local ski resort and the forest’s most capital intensive recreational development. The development of Mt. Bachelor was closely monitored by the ski area’s founder Bill Healy, who sought to expand the terrain open to skiing on the mountain without sacrificing the local feel of the resort. Healy believed in the sense of place of Central Oregon and wanted to reflect that in the operation of the mountain. For Healy, this meant building slowly and carefully. For Mike Hollern, president of Brooks Resources and Brooks Scanlon, however, that pace of development was too slow, limiting the capacity for more aggressive resort development.

Healy continued to slowly expand the area throughout the 1960s, but not quickly enough for Mike Hollern. When Hollern approached Bill Healy about purchasing Mt. Bachelor and combining the resort and ski area interests under one corporate banner in 1968, he understood the importance of the resort to the region and the importance of cooperation between resort owners and the management of the ski area. By 1980, skiers at Mt. Bachelor comprised nearly 80% of all winter hotel stays (Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council [COIC], 1981, p. 37). Healy however had just hired a new manager for the struggling Mt. Bachelor Lodge (the resort own by Healy and Mt. Bachelor, Inc. on Century Drive) and refused to surrender control of the ski area (Hollern,
Healy had big plans for the ski area, but continued to emphasize local control and a slower pace of expansion than Hollern desired. During the 1970s and 1980s, however, the popularity and footprint of Mt. Bachelor grew steadily. During the 1986-1987 season—the year before Bill Healy finally did step down due to illness—the resort hosted a record 635,000 skiers and ran ten lifts that featured skiing on 70% of the dormant volcano (Lucas, 1999, p. 157). The record numbers and many of the new lifts were the result of a significant expansion project that began in 1981.

The original expansion plan called for ten more chairlifts and a tramway to the top of the mountain and would be expected to bring between 821,000 and 1.5 million visitors by 1994 (See Fig. 6.2) (COIC, 1981). There were also plans to build a road to the top of the dormant volcano in an effort to lure visitors to the mountain during the 148 days that the lifts were closed each year (“Word expected soon,” 1981). Healy hoped the expansion would open more ungroomed terrain to allow experienced skiers to get away from the crowds and, on good snow years, would allow Mt. Bachelor to operate year round (Hill & Heekin, 1980). The expansion however would do more than simply bring more skiers to the mountain and extend the season, it would also have a significant impact on the city of Bend itself. The expansion was expected to add between 1,930 and 5,800 wintertime jobs and between 2.4 and 6.1 million dollars of community revenue. By 1995 it was thought that the ski industry would support between 14% and 25% of the regional labor force (COIC, 1981, p. 71).
The huge range in the estimated local impact resulted from the decision to include both high and low estimates. The bullish estimates came from the Intergovernmental Council, who clearly saw Mt. Bachelor as a key employment and economic force that could balance summer and winter tourism in the region and would help to “[close] the gap between Mt. Bachelor and the elite ski resorts” (COIC, 1981, p. 69).

Healy sought to improve the facilities while maintaining the local feel of the resort to bring new visitors into the region without sacrificing the small town feel. “Mt. Bachelor is a little bit western, a little bit family, but with all the full advantages of a complete destination resort” (Hill & Heekin, 1980, p. 34). Many in the town cherished its “rural yet cosmopolitan nature” and the “recreation atmosphere” that characterized people’s image of the town (Your Community 2000 Group, 1990, p. 26). While Hollern and the executives admired the expansive synthesis in ownership and real estate development at Vail and Aspen, Healy maintained dreams of a family oriented, small town ski area. As they approved another phase of the expansion in 1986 (the Pine Marten Express Lift), Healy reminded the board of their commitment to the community. “We cannot be an industrial isolationist. We are as much a public utility as Pacific Power and Light” (Lucas, 1999, p. 158). He did not however say exactly what vital service the ski
area provided, but rather recommitted to continued improvement and investment in the resort.

The process of expansion has continued as Mt. Bachelor adds runs, faster lifts, and opened new terrain. Increasingly the mountain and the town are linked. The production of the recreational resources, the road that links the city to the countryside and the resort that gives visitors and residents something to do in the winter produce a resource space centered on recreation that is built on top of the old timber industry. Bend doesn’t feel like a ski town the way that Breckenridge or Vail does, in part because it sits 20 miles down the hill from the ski lifts. But the region has been recognized for its diverse recreational offerings, including trail-running, kayaking, climbing, cycling, rodeo and increasingly, golf. Even as Bend has emerged as a recreational hub however, Mt. Bachelor’s numbers have plateaued (figure 6.3).

![Figure 6.3. Mt. Bachelor Visits by Decade. After significant growth until the mid 1980s, attendance stabilized despite continued investment in the ski area's infrastructure. (PowdrCorp, 2009, p. 3)](image)

Officially, executives cite Mt. Bachelor’s distance from major population centers and the local economic downturn for the numbers. Yet, even as Bend has grown considerably
during the last two decades, the attendance at Mt. Bachelor has remained fairly stable failing to live up to the high expectations of the COIC, providing evidence for one golf resort developer’s argument that Bend’s reputation has less to do with its winter recreational opportunities than with summer tourists and part-year residents. “You’re a snowboarder, so all you think about is the winter. But I make my money because of the summer,” he told me (Bauhofer 2008). The summer in Central Oregon is the time to get out and enjoy the outdoors. Despite the importance of Mt. Bachelor in providing some seasonal balance to the economy, from the perspective of capital, outdoor recreation remains a fair-weather game, one more dependent upon sun than snow (Klug 1991). The value of the ponderosa pines, however, gave way to the value of slope, snow, and the infrastructure required to bring skiers to the top of a mountain. The recreational investment in the countryside supported the changing cultural values of the city. But the story is incomplete without the seasonal balance of the summer, and without a return to the city.

At the City’s Core: The Old Mill District
In the middle of the 20th Century, the timber mill on the banks of the Deschutes River provided the most vivid, noisy, and sometimes smelly symbol of the relationship between Bend and its resource hinterland. By the beginning of the 21st century, the tents on the floor, bikes on the ceiling, and skis on the walls of the new REI store provided the symbol for a new relationship to the resource hinterland of the city. The bikes, tents, and skis occupied the same building as the furnaces that once fueled the mill. The timber industry connected the country and the city during most of the 20th century as it moved trees from the forest to the mills. The Deschutes River, for much of the 20th century,
moved both logs and water into Bend. The river functioned as transportation and storage for the two timber mills on the riverbanks south of town (figures 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6). The recreational resources of the hinterland also needed a hub in the city.

After the Shevlin Hixon mill closed in 1950, Brooks Scanlon had sole use of the river. The river’s importance to the mill’s operation is hard to overestimate. The river to the south of town had long been the region’s economic center. Before it closed, the Shevlin Hixon mill on the west side pulled logs out of the river on three long ramps. Brooks Scanlon’s own powerhouse, crane shed, storage lots, and the sawmills themselves filled the east side of the river with the machinery necessary for transforming the region’s ponderosa pine trees into timber, siding, boxes, and for a short time during the 1960s, furniture. A dam spanned the river itself, designed to still the water behind it for log storage and to catch debris from those logs so that it wouldn’t drift into town and through Drake Park. The river itself, clogged with logs in the spring following the winter cutting season, served as a critical piece of infrastructure for the two mills, storing the freshly cut timber before milling while keeping it from drying prematurely.

Figure 6.4 Shevlin-Hixon Lumber Company in Bend, OR, ca 1926
Figure 6.5 The Shevlin Hixon Mill and the Deschutes River, 1950 Oregon Historical Society

Figure 6.6 The Brooks Scanlon Mill and the Deschutes River, 1950. Pine Echoes.
Under pressure from the state Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in 1973 however, the company had to make plans to reduce the amount of detritus in the river. The company’s permit to use the river stipulated “all debris from logs must be removed from the river. The only plan acceptable to the state would be for the company to get totally out of the river” (Hollern, 1973). The company spent almost a year trying to find a way to operate that would keep logs and wood debris out of the river. One option involved re-routing the river to create a new stream channel and a holding pond. Another involved converting the sawmill to cut dry logs instead of wet logs. In the end, the company found a way to keep the logs wet through an elaborate sprinkler system (Hollern, 2008). In many cases, urban rivers became sinks for industrial waste, providing a mechanism for the dilution of pollutants and allowing natural processes to break down waste material. “Using powerful new quantitative representations of natural processes, sanitary experts refined this concept through the growing theory and practice of ‘stream sanitization’” (Keeling 2005, p.34). A river’s capacity to restore and break down waste “came to be regarded as a resource—like forests or fisheries—that could be quantitatively measured and rationally exploited” (Keeling, 2005, p. 34, see also Tarr, 1984; Tarr, 2002). The river was not simply a sink for waste, but a resource crucial to the manufacturing process. For Brooks Scanlon, the river’s import lay not in the removal of waste, but its capacity as a storage site and means of transit for raw materials.

The river, clogged by timber and in constant motion, seemed the opposite of the mill-site itself, tree-less, industrial, and expansive. *Pine Echoes*, the company’s internal monthly magazine, once ran an extended joke about the travails of running a typical mill
in the Pacific Northwest.

What is a sawmill? A sawmill is a poorly arranged collection of inadequate and obsolete machinery used to convert logs into sawdust and slabs. It is constantly submerged in a series of cataclysmic disasters of fluctuating intensity...There are four basic types of sawmills and I name them in order of their most flagrant stupidity. 1) New mills under construction--Nothing good can be said of this group. 2) Those who made enough credits during the summer run to cold deck enough logs to run all winter in order to pay for them. 3) Those who ran all summer and expect to run in the winter on logs hauled over a “winter road” which they will never pay for. 4) Those who say to hell with it and take up truck farming (Hosmer, 1950, p. 14).

By the late 1970s, Brooks Scanlon had become dangerously close to falling into the fourth category. When Brooks Scanlon purchased the Shevlin Hixon mill and timber lands in 1950, they quickly closed the plant and demolished most of the buildings. The land across the river from the still busy Brooks Scanlon mill laid primarily empty and quiet, void of even the dead trees that had filled it for the first half of the century. Brooks Scanlon, reinvigorated by the Shevlin Hixon timber lands and a lack of competition redoubled its own timber and milling operations putting more stress on the timberlands despite the loss of their major competitor. A third smokestack was added to the iconic powerhouse even as the company struggled to find equipment that could process smaller and smaller logs (Brooks, 1968).

Timber availability declined throughout the 1970s and finally, a lack of sizable
timber nearby and low prices for lumber forced Brooks Scanlon to sell their interests to
Diamond International in 1980 (Hitt 1980). A two page spread in the middle of the paper
detailed the history of the Mill and celebrated Brooks Scanlon’s contributions to the
community (Sittom, 1980). The paper did not mention the timber shortage or the
decreasing market for timber overall. On the same page the Bulletin did, however, feature
a quarter page ad hyping the recreational advantages of the town and the newspaper’s
upcoming special issue on that topic. The mill site would change ownership, but it would
still be years before the infrastructure that once supported the mill would support the new
tourism economy. Almost immediately, Diamond faced the same kinds of pressures that
forced Brooks Scanlon to sell them the mill and timberlands in the first place. “The wood
products industry has its own version of the suicide squeeze, that daring old baseball play
that sent a runner streaking for home hoping the batter would be able to bunt the ball. But
in the wood products squeeze, home plate is nowhere in sight. On one end, lumber mills
are paying higher prices for smaller trees. On the other, the builders who purchase the
lumber are finding few buyers able to afford their new houses” (Boyer 1981).

Diamond International closed one of the mills in 1983 and managed to keep a
second mill open until 1994. Crown Pacific argued that new policies to protect the
spotted owl caused the plant’s demise, but the record of timber harvest in the region
shows a long history of over-production (Dewey, 2008). The warnings of the chief
forester in 1937 had finally come to fruition. The Bulletin’s editors wrote poetically about
how it might be “politically correct” to say good riddance to the mill, the over-harvesting,
and the industrial pollution, and yet the closure will “leave some of us thinking
nostalgically of the old days, when men were men, when loggers were kings of the woods, when the mill smell of fresh wood smoke was on the morning air and meant good paying jobs, and when the mill whistle told us when to start our working day. Lots of us will miss it” (Some of us will miss the mill, 1993). The mill’s closure did indeed signal the end of an era for Bend, but with the number of new residents that had arrived since Brooks Scanlon sold the mill, there weren’t so many left who remembered the days of a local thriving timber industry.

Brooks Scanlon had a history of minor labor disputes, and the idea for the mill’s transformation from a space of production to one of consumption is said to have come during the last one. The story goes that the dream of the Old Mill District began with a bit of illegal fishing. Reflecting on the beginnings of his vision for a new Mill District, Bill Smith remembered working as a night watchman during the strike of 1973, twenty years before the mill permanently closed. He remembered wishing he could illicitly throw a fishing line into the stretch of river that separated the quiet, but crowded Brooks Scanlon mill-site and the empty, abandoned Shevlin Hixon site. Then he realized that it might be perfect. “It dawned on me that I was the night watchman… And the only person who could catch me was me...It was a pretty spot, and I thought, ‘wouldn’t it be great if we could develop it’” (Quoted in Raff, 2009, p. 14)?

When the plant did close in 1994, it reverted to the state it was in during the two-month strike. It remained empty, locked, and quiet. The millsite itself sat as an abandoned industrial site, overgrown and quiet. The Deschutes River, once the key storage facility and conduit for logs ready to be milled, still flowed over the dam and then through the
city. But the logs were gone, leaving only the accumulated debris associated with 80 years of intensive use. Its banks showed the degradation of industrial production (Bellemore 2009).

Bill Smith took the opportunity presented by the mill closure to make his riverside dream a reality, convincing nine other investors to help him purchase the property under the umbrella of his newly formed “Bill Smith Properties” group. Just after Crown Pacific announced the pending closure. He hired the California architectural firm KenKay to design the new buildings to the site with an eye towards recapturing two miles of the river, which had been closed off to public access for 80 years. Yet many in Bend were ambiguous about the new development. In the midst of another recession exacerbated by the closing of the mill, many were skeptical of the California influence or feared the large retail development would feature large chain stores and take business away from the down-town (Bauhofer 2008; Hulse & Holtzman 2008). Perhaps most importantly, the magnitude of the undertaking raised eyebrows (Hollern 2008, Gramlich 2008).

The project would represent a complete transformation of the landscape south of downtown. Dust made the 250 acres of the Brooks Scanlon mill-site hazy on all but the calmest days. KenKay remembered the challenge they faced. “All the trees were gone, and the river was completely destroyed” (Raff, 2009). The first step of the project was to landscape the entire site, even the areas that were to be rebuilt. Second, Smith was convinced that the three smokestacks, so loathed by nearby residents, should remain the most visible feature on the landscape, providing a material marker and brand for the site (Hollern, 2008). Engineers and workers set about securing the towers in a way that would
keep the smokestacks upright atop the powerhouse without limiting the amount of available retail space on the ground (Deschutes County Historical Landmark Commission, 2006). Workers first destroyed many of the existing and decaying mill structures and replaced them with buildings that echoed the area’s industrial history, but held the potential for movie theaters, stores, art galleries, and restaurants (Harvey, 2005). While the Loews Theater would be the newly minted Mill District’s first major occupant, outdoor recreation outfitter REI would take up residence beneath the smokestacks in the remodeled powerhouse in 2005. Supporting the decision to open an REI in a town of Bend’s size, Sally Jewel, REI’s CEO, noted “Bend's recreation index was off the charts. This is truly a destination area for outdoor recreation and a shopping hub for Central Oregon” (Sowa, 2005).

Smith recognized that while the smokestacks would be the most visible feature of the landscape, the Deschutes River itself would be the key feature for visitors of the site. To make sure that the river held that position as a draw and as a connector to the downtown area, Smith swapped land with the city to allow them to prevent a new road along the river and maintain a parkway throughout the mill-site (Chalfant 2008). The banks of the river, now landscaped with native plants, paved trails, public access points above and below the mill site and miles of trail through the recovered brownfield, functioned as a public park, despite its private ownership.

Anchored by the REI flagship store and the movie theater, the Old Mill District’s commercial core does evokes the architecture of the mill, yet significantly reconfigures the area’s relationship to the river. The river, once the key infrastructure for moving and
storing logs, has become, along with the smokestacks, one of the defining amenities of the place. North of the commercial zone, new condos, shops, and restaurants bridge the commercial center to the old residential boundary. Across the river from the commercial Hub, the Les Schwab Amphitheater adds a cultural component to the development. Additionally, the old Shevlin Hixon property now houses another defining feature of Bend, the Deschutes Brewery. The new Old Mill District evokes the timber days of the county without the sawdust, logs in the creek, or smoke coming out of the smokestacks. In 2002 the project won the EPA’s Region 10 Phoenix Award recognizing brownfield redevelopment. In particular the EPA cited the conversion of the river as it flows through the site (Environmental Protection Agency, 2002). During the summer the river is filled with folks in tubes and inflatable mattresses drifting down in the current to the dam, where they exit the river and take a free shuttle upstream to do it again. The loudest noises come from rock concerts at the amphitheater and cheers for those completing the annual Pole, Pedal, Paddle race from the summit of Mt. Bachelor to the heart of the Mill District. Today the smokestacks looming over the REI have become a key symbol of the town’s history and the shopping and entertainment district are at the center of Bend’s identity as a recreational and tourist center.

On one hand, the critical infrastructure that maintained the plant--the railroads, the cranes, and the fencing that enclosed the site itself--has been removed. With the exception of the powerhouse and its distinctive smokestacks, the buildings that marked the mill district as an industrial site and the timber yards have long vanished from the landscape. They have been replaced by parking lots and by buildings that echo the
structures of the past, echoes that are retooled for commercial consumption (figure 6.7).

At its core however, the original timber infrastructure has remained similar, and has maintained its importance to the site. The transformed and now recreational river, and the
iconic smokestacks evoke the town’s timber history even as it promotes recreation, consumption, and leisure. It might be easy to consider the Old Mill District’s relationship to its history as simply another example of “one of the many instances that a rich and varied local heritage is selected, simplified and sanitized for rapid and easy tourist consumption” (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2004, p. 219). But they also build upon that history as they build upon the infrastructure and the relationship to the resource hinterland that runs throughout the region’s history. The restored banks of the river that serve as a park also serve to provide a material link to the ecologies of the forest and an urbane retail and entertainment space for those recreating in the mountains. The tourist city encompasses both the urban core and the countryside through the region’s infrastructure and capital development. The value of nature had been measured in board feet, in timber stacked to dry on the timber yards. Today, the value of nature lies in its capacity to bring people in, to keep them there, and to add an aesthetic that supports a cultural landscape of consumption built upon previous productive grounds.

The new cultural landscape of the Old Mill District is as steeped in the natural processes of production as the Old Mill had been before it was shuttered. The infrastructure of transportation and storage continues to move and store people and goods. Sun seekers, shoppers, and concert goers now occupy the space once filled by logs waiting for milling and the finished lumber. The “ethic of place” in Bend is one that draws upon the town’s timber history, one that is geared to the countryside, the city, and the routes between them. The ethic of place is evidenced by Bend’s “recreation index,” Silver’s reflections, Luke Smith’s attraction to the shifting snowdrifts on Mt. Bachelor,
the consistent appeals to the small town feel and recreational opportunities in planning and visioning documents, and the emphasis on massive community recreational events that tie the city to the woods and deserts around them. The means for that focus has shifted from timber production and tree fiber to views, recreational opportunities and the tourists they bring in. The infrastructure of work and play continues to depend upon the natural resources of the region, now centered upon consumption rather than production, on play instead of work (figure 6.8).

Figure 6.8. An old bandsaw from the mill now functions as art on the walkway between the shops and the river. (photo by flickr user Ilya Gorenburg)
Conclusion

“The heart of Central Oregon's economy is founded upon the natural resources in the area. Local forest products, agriculture, and tourism firms depend upon the timber, land, water, and the general environment of the area. The economic well-being of central Oregon depends upon the protection and development of these resources. Historically, the development of these resources has been the foundation for growth of the local economy. (Annual Report and Program Projection, 1980, p. 22)

During the 1990s Bend’s identity revolved around the ski resorts, golf courses, and other types of outdoor recreation. It also gained a reputation as a wealthy enclave, a place of fabulous scenery and fabulous wealth. The same conditions for which people were willing to make financial sacrifices--the view, access to recreational opportunities--were also the conditions that drew more and more people into the region. With more people came more housing development, more wealth, and sudden rise in the cost of real-estate. The assessment by The Economist in 2007, that “fabulous scenery attracts people with fabulous amounts of money” (Booming Bend, 2007, p. 31) is a dramatic reversal from the “poverty with a view” that people remember from the 1980s. This reversal is integral to the region’s emergence as the “recreation capital of Oregon” and the shifting production of recreational space in the region. Hal Rothman (1998) writes that across the West “tourism has also become a growing and increasingly important part of the economy, an endeavor well positioned to capitalize on any trend in American society or culture… As American society passed from its obsessions with the consumption of things into a growing preoccupation with status, tourism, exclusively defined, became a more important indicator of standing” (p. 399-400). The Old Mill District and Mt. Bachelor reflect those trends and demonstrate the ways that a region’s natural amenities, mixed
with capital, become resources, geared towards recreation and deeply embedded in the cultural landscape. At the same time the increased use and development of those amenities threatened to destroy their very value. Just as the ORRRC had to address the problem of overpopulated parks and campgrounds, residents and developers in Central Oregon continue to contend with the cultural changes and material degradation of the environment resulting from increased tourist and recreational use.

Central Oregon boosters began deploying the phrase “the Recreation Capital of Oregon” in the early 1990s as part of a push to sell recreation homes in the area. *U.S. News and World Report* called the city a “hat trick” for folks looking for an affordable wonderland, one of a dozen “vacation home markets on the rise but not out of reach.”

One of the fastest growing new vacation-home spots offers a combination of sun, skiing and water. Bend, Ore., is located along the banks of the trout-filled Deschutes River and the western border of central Oregon's high plateau. Although Alpine and Nordic skiing are only a short drive away at Mount Bachelor, the real draw is Bend's sunny days, 85-degree temperatures and affordable homes. The median price for a new three-bedroom house is 75,000. But it may not be that low for long. With resort developers discovering the area, prices have risen an average of 35 percent in the past 12 months, compared with a still healthy 15 percent increase along Oregon's rainy coast. (Thompson, 1990)

The new home developments, in resort communities like Black Butte Ranch, in the city, and in subdivided ranch and agricultural land, housed the majority of new residents. The
commercial redevelopment of the Old Mill District and the ongoing expansion of Mt. Bachelor helped establish Bend as an urbane community and as a winter sports hub, but it was primarily the real-estate development, centered around golf courses, second homes, and new home subdivisions in the city that brought economic growth to the county following the collapse of the region’s timber industry. The ski area and the shopping center brought significant symbolic capital to the region but initially plated only minor roles economically. Real estate development and the transformation of land into property and wealth changed the economic fortunes of the region and the expansion of amenity driven development.

According to City Councilman and former planner Mark Gramlich, the 1990s were “the go-go years” in which the city council pursued a growth-at all costs policy. The result, according to Gramlich, has challenged the small town feel he experienced when he first moved here. “That small town feel is still here, but now we have the suburbs. 99% of the projects here are single family homes” (2008). Land that had been used as farms or ranching was subdivided and transformed into new ranchettes and vacation homes. Oregon’s land use planning laws focused the growth within the urban growth boundary, but a series of maps developed by Headwaters Economics as part of a study determining the economic impacts of a proposed wilderness area near the town show a sudden rise in development on nearly all of the private land in the county (See Figure 6.9). According to the report, “public lands are all that is holding back development of open space” (Headwaters Economics, 2007, p.23).
Figure 6.9 Amenity development has subdivided much of the privately owned land in Deschutes County. (Headwaters Economics 2007)
The spatial expansion of the city quite literally pushed the city into the country in Deschutes County, but it also moved people into closer proximity to the recreational resources in the hinterland. It placed new pressures upon them and demanded infrastructure expansion to accommodate the people who lived there. Roads, water pipes and sewer systems supported the expansion of capital in the high desert the same way that new parking lots, shopping centers, ski lifts, and roads supported capital developments at Mt. Bachelor and the Old Mill District.

William Robbins (1999) has argued that “With the decline of the old primary products economy and with its still vast open spaces, the West-more than any other section of the country-has become the spatial investment arena for the affluent, the rich, and the super-rich” (285). In Deschutes county, the challenge, of course, would be to maintain the character of the town, the sense of place that people valued and the quality of the amenities in the face of development, to maintain the sense of place in the midst of the onslaught of investment and growth. The region would need to negotiate the contradictions involved in maintaining the recreational value of the landscape with the degradation associated with its use. David Harvey (1996) has written that place construction is now complicitous (directly or indirectly) with the universalisms of money, commodity, capital, and exchange without in any way challenging the alienation. The instanciation of social relations through specific forms of environmental transformation here comes into play to make the production of place a moment in the consolidation of a capitalist inspired regime of social relations, institutions and political-
economic practices. (314).

The infrastructure necessary for specific productions of place reveals the processes of capital at work through the transformation of the recreational resources in the hinterland, the subdivision of open space on the urban fringe, and the expansion of a commercial core in the heart of the city. At a broader scale, Samuel Hays (1987) discusses a fundamental shift in how Americans have considered the natural world, its value and conservation. “The coming conflicts between conservation and environment were rooted in different objectives: efficiency in the development of material commodities or amenities to enhance the quality of life” (p. 22). Ultimately though, the amenities to enhance the quality of life have become resources, produced and conserved similarly to the “material commodities” of timber, copper, or water. The means to engage in the quality of life, when it comes to outdoor recreation and nature tourism, depends upon producing a recreational resource space that links the city and the country. “By looking underneath and outside the modern city, and the modern home, by excavating the opaque flows and networks that weave together the natural, the urban, and the domestic, we can consider the perceived distinction between these spaces” (Kaika, 2005, p. 9). This infrastructure reconfigures but doesn’t reinvent existing resource infrastructure in order to capitalize on the views and experiences of the recreational landscape. The perceived distinction between the city and the countryside further erode in the exurban expansion of the city and hazards such expansion presents, notably fire, as discussed in the next chapter.

At each stage, the material landscape and the representations of the spaces of play
produced new opportunities for capital expansion and reconfigured the valuation of resources. Yet these new spaces of play also presented new challenges in dealing with environmental conditions that posed threats to the steady capitalization of recreational resources and the transformation of natural amenities, the river, the slopes, the forest, to natural resources through new infrastructural developments.

The challenge for the twenty-first century would be to reconcile the increased population, wealth, and capital associated with these new recreational resources with the cultural values of the town as they are linked to the forest. How does one preserve the character and ecological integrity of amenity landscapes even as they are further used and developed? How do these new resources, and the people who come for them create a community worth living in and how would new development interact with the existing ecologies of the urban fringe? People now come to Bend not just to visit, but to live. The recreational resource spaces inside the city and well out in the countryside have brought new people into the city, people who have chosen to build their houses on the urban fringe, a landscape prone to fire. Lois Wagner keeps her eye on the ponderosa trees that surround her home. She keeps a suitcase packed “with pictures of her children and favorite paintings, always ready to sling it into a trunk if flames head toward her home” (Wagner, 2004).
CHAPTER 7:

FIREFREE: PLANNING NATURE’S TRESPASS

If you don’t have a forest, there’s no place to recreate. they go there because of the setting and the experience and the sense of place attachment. If everything is dead and ugly and falling down, or if everything is black because of a fire and everything is burned out and the wildlife’s gone, we won’t have any visitors. (Christiansen, 2008)

The Recreation Program Manager of the Deschutes National Forest, Mark Christiansen (2008), likes to talk about fire. “It has a direct relationship to the social side to what the public is seeking,” he told me. Wildfire poses a threat not only to the recreational resources managed by the Forest Service and enjoyed by Bend residents and tourists, but increasing, due to the region’s exurban expansion, to residents own investments, property, and lives.

In late August 1996, Don Landberg snuck across police lines to get to his house on the south side of Bend. He had been forced to evacuate his home in the face of the Skeleton Fire, a fast moving wildfire blown by high winds from the south to the north, straight toward the city. When the fire entered the neighborhood, Mr. Landberg remained in his house, and with the help of local firefighters, succeeded in protecting the structure. Others in the neighborhood weren’t so lucky. The fire eventually burned 17,000 acres of land, destroying 19 homes and 13 outbuildings (Hurt, 1996). The Skeleton Fire wasn’t the deadliest, largest, or most destructive fire in the history of Central Oregon, that distinction belonged to the Awbrey Butte Fire in 1990, but the luxury homes in the SunDance subdivision that the fire destroyed gave insurance companies cause for
Soon after the fire, representatives from the insurance company, SafeCo, called Bend’s Fire Marshall, Gary Marshall, and offered to buy the city a new fire truck. Marshall turned them down. In Marshall’s assessment, the community didn’t need a new fire truck, a Band-Aid to deal with injuries after the fact. They needed to reconsider the city’s response to fire on the wildland urban interface (WUI) and the nature of development on the urban fringe (FireFree, 2008). Marshall’s assessment rested upon a recognition that more emergency response would be insufficient to deal with the increased threat of fire on the urban fringe. “When you have a subdivision with 250 homes and 200 foot flames moving toward it, one more piece of equipment isn’t going to save very much,” Marshall recalled (quoted in Jaffe, 2001, p. 130). Instead, Marshall proposed a public education program to help local residents understand the risks of wildfire and their options for protecting their own property. Marshall hoped that individual responsibility, linked with peer pressure and community spirit could accomplish what another piece of equipment couldn’t (Kruger et al, 2003, p. 13).

For Marshall, the education program was critical because “Fire science is the easy part, social science is the hard part” (Marshall, 2010, p. 20). The social science had to contend with new residents and their lack of knowledge regarding the region’s fire history and ecology, with diverse understandings of rural living and connections to local institutions. Environmental advocate Paul Dewey was more blunt. “That’s what pisses me off now. People don’t realize that fire is part of the natural ecosystem. It’s a forest. It’s gonna burn” (Dewey, 2008). Teaching new rural residents about the risks of wildfire and
what they could do to protect their homes enabled new kinds of regulation. “Regulation always demands new knowledge,” argues Arun Agrawal (2005). “But the production of new knowledges is intimately connected to the shaping of practices and human subjectivities in relation to the environment. Since politics always implies interactions and negotiations, it also signifies the mutual constitution of fields of action related to regulation and practice” (p. 226). The emergence of Bend as “the Recreation Capital of Oregon” reconfigured the material relationship between real estate, fire, and trees on the urban fringe. Marshall understood that the only way to respond to that threat was to teach homeowners about the material conditions in which they lived and how they could control those conditions. Without that knowledge, the legal regulations and institutions responsible for fire control would be quite literally outrun by the flames.

The homes threatened by these fires were the new homes in what had been the countryside around Bend, the middle landscapes previously used as farms and ranches, but now built more densely as New Western retreats. The resorts on Century Drive, Mount Bachelor, and Black Butte Ranch represent significant recreational resource developments in the woods. The Old Mill District demonstrates how capital investment can produce an urban link to recreational opportunities and transform urban natural amenities into natural resources. The exurban middle landscapes offer an individual and emotional consumption of amenities, amenities tied to the control of private property and the specific ecological conditions of the land. The recreational resources on the urban fringe were capitalized upon in response to new desires to live closer to the natural world.

“Natural amenities associated with one’s home could be purchased privately in the form
of specific tracts of land with attractive surroundings. Home builders and real-estate dealers marketed houses to respond to new values” (Hays, 1987, p. 91).

The new cultural values of amenity development led to significant changes in the material landscape. Wildfires in the National Forest pose considerable risk to the recreational resources of the mountains and the desert and to the prized viewsheds surrounding Bend. Increasingly, however, the amenity development associated with the New West and the demand for recreation takes place in places most at risk for wildfire. Wildfires in privatized, commercialized, and developed rural sites pose further risk as they move across the landscape and across boundaries, destroying expensive homes, resorts, golf courses, and lives along the way. The amenities of the countryside, the trees, creeks, and views associated with a piece of property, come at a price beyond simply the price of the property. Stephen Pyne (2001) examines the dichotomies of undeveloped forests and urban landscapes:

Those were the polar extremes: too much and too little. Lightly inhabited lands suddenly opened up to fire and newly inhabited lands abruptly closed to it. But among the spectrum of problems that lay between them was one in which these two extremes closed as industrialized societies rammed cities and wildlands together. Bureaucrats labeled it the wildland urban interface. (2001, p. 178-179)

Within the WUI, planning considerations concerning fire are complicated by distinctions between public and private land, between natural resource lands and residential lands, between different options for preventing and fighting fire, and where the responsibility
for fire protection lies. Mr. Landberg paid the price of living near the forest, in the WUI, a price linked to the capriciousness of a mobile, and sometimes hazardous, nature.

Addressing those hazards, and the risks they pose to capital investment, requires dependence upon institutions of environmental governance, land management, cooperation among a variety of different civic agencies and increased action by rural residents themselves. It is a problem that has dominated much of the discussion of land management on the public lands. “The fire community has latched most fiercely to the question of fire and the urban fringe, that ecological omelet of wildland and exurban fragments, a variously named fractal geometry of fire. America is recolonizing its countryside but doing so with exurban outmigration, crafting a landscape to satisfy urban ambition and esthetics. The compound is proving metastable, easily provoked into explosion” (Pyne, 2004, p. 60). The recolonization of Deschutes county has meant more homes, golf courses, and roads in a countryside previously dominated by alfalfa farms, ranches, and most importantly logging operations. The ponderosa and juniper landscapes of the colonization is particularly prone to fire, fire that doesn’t read maps, attend committee meetings, or help people rebuild after a neighborhood is destroyed.

In lieu of new equipment for the Fire Department to better combat wildfire in the newly, and expensively, developed fringe, Marshall teamed with the insurance company SafeCo to start a program designed to educate home owners about the dangers of wildfire on the urban fringe and how they might protect their homes without having to cross police lines and stand in front of the flames with a garden hose. "Project Wildfire," and its subsidiary program “FireFree,” are collaborations between local residents, the Bend Fire
Department, the Deschutes County Department of Forestry, the BLM, the Forest Service and other local non-profit groups (figure 7.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deschutes County</th>
<th>Oregon Office of State Fire Marshal</th>
<th>Deschutes County Rural Fire Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deschutes National Forest - USFS Redmond District No. 2</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Forestry</td>
<td>Jefferson County Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>La Pine Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Central Oregon Fire Prevention Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunriver Fire Department</td>
<td>Keep Oregon Green</td>
<td>Sisters-Camp Sherman Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Southeast Bend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Bend Radio Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschutes River Woods HOA</td>
<td>Combined Communications</td>
<td>Awbrey Butte Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Broadcasting</td>
<td>City of Bend Fire Department</td>
<td>Every Idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponderosa Pines HOA</td>
<td>Redmond Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Sunriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awbrey Glen HOA</td>
<td>Tillicum Village HOA</td>
<td>Woodside Ranch HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeCo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1 Partner organizations and agencies of Project Wildfire and FireFree.

SafeCo, the insurance company that offered to buy the city a truck, has provided significant funding for the program. As such, Project Wildfire represents precisely the kind of governmental, private, and corporate cooperation described by Durant, O’Leary, and Fiorino (2004) when they write:

getViewed worldwide as ways to leverage scarce resources and to avoid litigation, ENR [Environment, Natural Resource] partnerships within, between, and among public, private, and non-profit actors are increasing dramatically in number around the world...Part and parcel of reconnecting with stakeholders in the United States in the hope of building a results-based sense of common purpose is yet another new governance idea that focuses more on communities. (p. 16)

The common sense of purpose would, ideally, help to protect residents from wildfire,
shield insurance companies from crippling insurance claims, and allow a more careful
delegation of the city’s emergency services. At the same time, the program reveals
tensions between private property, public regulations, and community education within
the path of an environmental hazard with the capacity to destroy investments, property,
and lives. A critical resource geography of wildfire and exurban amenity development
requires a slight, but significant shift in focus away from the commodity, from the
resource itself, to the embedded hazards associated with the geographies of resources and
their production. Fire destroys resources. As a hazard it is potentially ruinous to the
investments, infrastructure and lives even as it is an integral part of valuable amenity
landscapes. Whereas critical resource geography has typically focussed on the production
of resources, their materiality, and the institutions that govern their production, a critical
resource geography of amenity landscapes needs to deal with their potential destruction
by wildfire and the institutions in place to prevent such destruction. The management of
fire, the institutional arrangements around that management, and the capital processes
(insurance policies, emergency services, etc) associated with wildfire protection address
the risks to capital that fire might pose. The amenity development and recreational
resources of Bend’s urban fringe and the resorts in Deshutes County’s Ponderosa forests
and juniper forests stand in the way of fire as it moves across the landscape, boundaries,
management plans, and distinctions between public and private property.

Wildfire: A moving target
Fire has long been a concern in Central Oregon and throughout the United States among
natural resource managers. Fire protection during the timber era revolved around direct
protection of the natural resources. The trees that potentially fueled wildfire were also the
wood fiber that fueled the local economy. The various fire protection programs of the twentieth century contributed to the overabundance of fuels in Deschutes County today. Stephen Pyne cites four major eras in the history of fire policy, each of which attempted to deal with a specific type of problem fire. The first, *frontier fires*, represent the problems associated with fire between 1910, when a nationwide fire policy was implemented, and 1930. The dangerous fires of this era were the light fires set by frontier settlers to clear agricultural lands and timber companies who believed that these fires would reduce fuel loads and fire hazards. The problem, however, was that these fires might become large and out of control fires, spreading quickly through the sparsely populated lands. To combat these fires, the Forest Service attempted to develop a broad statistical system for fire control and conducted extensive research to consider the relationship between forestry and wildfire. *Backcountry fires* emerged as a problem around 1930 as the Forest Service acquired more land and looked for ways to actively conserve the timber resources on that land. The Civilian Conservation Corps provided considerable labor for fighting fires which enabled the Forest Service to “conduct an experiment on a continental scale” (Pyne, 1981, p. 72). With crews on the ground throughout the country, the Forest Service adopted an “out by 10 am policy” in which any fire that was spotted should be extinguished by ten the next morning. Following World War II, the labor intensive firefighting practices gave way to mechanized firefighting. The policy doctrine of this era was “conflagration control” and featured a rapid initial attack of the fire and extensive efforts to confine the fire before it could grow in size and intensity. Bulldozers, airplanes, and other mechanized equipment helped with this process
of containment and supplanted much of the labor that had been necessary during the interwar years. Increasingly, wildfire in this era “moved the Forest Service out of the backcountry and into the urban fringe” (Pyne, 1982, p. 74).

The legacy of these strategies to aggressively contain and extinguish fire has been one of fuel buildup and significant disruption of natural fire regimes. Efforts by the Forest Service to protect wood fiber for industrial uses was critically important to the people in Deschutes County. In Bend, “keeping the forest from going up in flames fostered a sense of community cooperation, provided additional employment during the fire season, and brought revenue to the local treasury” (Robbins, 2004, p. 158). Despite the best efforts of fire ecologists and foresters to protect timber resources from fire, “the best of intentions brought about the worst of outcomes” (Langston, 1995, p. 296). The material effect of these efforts was to increase the risk for catastrophic fire. “After 80 years of fire suppression, the forest is a very different place” (Langston, 1995, p. 260). Stephen Pyne (1982) describes the material relationship between fire and the forest in his classic treatment of the issue, *Fire in America*.

As a fire breaks down available fuel, it releases heat and nutrients. The heat may kill many organisms, consume others, and reshape a microclimate by allowing more sunlight wind, and so forth. Many organisms adapt against this wave of heat by developing thick bark, storing food in tuberous roots, or resprouting after a few passes. Others, like certain insects with infrared sensors, seek out the heat. Some plants seem to encourage properties that promote fire, thereby driving off less
tolerant competitors...In a similar manner, the breakdown of biochemical compounds causes organisms to die out or depart from a burn, while others seize on the simpler compounds for the promotion of their own growth. (34)

The fuel buildup resultant from aggressive efforts to extinguish all fire disrupts the natural fire cycle, the breakdown of fuel and nutrients and the propagation of those organisms that depend upon fire. “Because of the diseased and dead trees and the thick accumulation of debris on the ground, fires now burn with great intensity” (Robbins, 2001, p. 272). The ponderosa and juniper forests of Central Oregon, like all fire prone ecosystems are “self reproducing. The type of plants that grow on a burn determines the nature of the fuel complex which determines the intensity and frequency of the next fire and its future biological effects” (Pyne, 1982, p. 124). The ongoing suppression efforts have led to greater risk of catastrophic fire in the future as it transformed the fuel complex from one adapted to high frequency, low intensity fires toward one favoring far more substantial conflagrations.

For Brooks Scanlon, the risk of fire on their own lands and on their timber leases in the National Forest was a direct threat to their investments. The company encouraged residents and tourists to the region to use their lands for recreational purposes, but cautioned them about fire. “Enjoy our forests, but protect them and enjoy them,” the company encouraged tourists. “Remember that most forest fires are caused by recreationalists, not by men who work or live in the woods” (Brooks Scanlon, 1965, p. 2). The relationship between recreational users of the forest and industrial users found a
focus point in the threat of fire. Massive fires destroy many of the characteristics that
recreational users find valuable in the forest and destroy directly the value of the trees
that might be logged by timber companies. At the same time, both activities increase the
threat of fire in the woods. Brooks Scanlon reported in their in-house publication the
history of human caused fires in the 1950s (figure 7.2). Smokers and recreationalists
caused the bulk of the human caused fires in Oregon, but in 1958, lightening caused an
additional 1024 fires, more than all human causes combined. The timber resources in
Central Oregon overlapped the recreational resources of the region for much of the
twentieth century. Both activities increased the risk of fire in the region at the same time
that fire threatened, indeed fed directly upon, the resources those activities relied upon.
The exurban residential development of the 1990s would put new investments and second
homes in harm’s way. Forest fire burns fuel. A century of fire suppression designed to
protect both recreational and timber resources has led to a massive buildup of surplus
fuel. Increasingly, fire in Central Oregon doesn’t just burn grasses and brush, but leaps to
the crown of the ponderosas themselves, increasing the heat, danger, and spread of the
fire. With new homes built within fire prone landscapes, wildfire also burns houses. The
more homes that are built in an area, the more demand there is for fire control and
suppression to protect property and lives. The fire cycle that the ponderosa forest depends
upon is further disrupted, again increasing the risk for catastrophe.
FireFree attempted to build on the community cooperation described by Robbins and hoped to foster to help keep the forest from going up in flames. At the same time, however, rather than protecting Brooks Scanlon’s material resources, the new fire prevention program helped homeowners protect their own property and the shared recreational resources of the countryside. Historically, wildfire planning and mitigation has focused on the backcountry and on industrial timberlands, either publicly or privately owned (Smith, Vissage, Darr, & Sheffield, 1997, p. 33). As fires pose more and more risk to urban areas, however, the wildfire equation becomes dominated by the struggle to protect structures rather than natural resources. The exurban expansion into rural, fire-prone areas of the American West has taxed already stretched land management agencies as they face new, and newsworthy, dangers. “We do not know how much development is at risk,” writes William Travis (2007), “but it almost doesn’t matter. As long as homes spread, and thinly, into forest zones, the demand for fire suppression will also spread” (p. 213).
126. Wildfire planning, prevention, management and mitigation on the urban fringe depends upon a carefully managed relationship between federal land management agencies, urban governments, property owners, and environmental organizations who all have quite different mandates, political persuasions, and resources (Pyne, 2004, p. 61).

**Fire In Central Oregon**
The High Desert of Central Oregon, under the rain shadow of the Cascades, faces a steady risk of wildfire. The ponderosa forests bordering Bend on the west have historically seen fast burning, low intensity ground fires with a return interval of 11-15 years. These fires clear away underbrush, but rarely reach the high branches. The juniper forests to the city’s east and north burn less frequently and with greater intensity than the ponderosa, but tend not to generate the massive conflagrations present in many pine regions in the West. A century of fire suppression, however, has increased the risk of catastrophic fire in both ecosystems. The increased underbrush and fuel push flames higher into the crowns, increasing the intensity of the fire and threatening more homes in the WUI (Bork, 1984; Lighthall, 2006). Wildfire in the urban fringe has been a threat to the community for many years, but did not become a critical issue until the speedy expansion of resorts and subdivisions in the 1990s (figure 7.3). The Awbrey Hall and Skeleton Fires exposed the threat to homes in Central Oregon, ranking as the 2nd and 3rd most costly fires in Oregon during the 1990s (Aycock, 2002, p. 7), and the 2002 Cache Creek Fire nearly destroyed much of Black Butte Ranch (Kauffman, 2006).

The expansion of the city during the last twenty years has pushed developments further into the countryside placing more houses, outbuildings, and other structures at risk from wildfire (figures 7.4, 7.5, 7.6), threatening the investment and development upon...
which Bend’s amenity-based economy depends. The 1996 Skeleton Fire, which threatened some of the new developments, provided the immediate impetus for the creation of Project Wildfire, while the 1990 Awbrey Hall fire continues to dominate discussions about fire in the Bend area (Lighthall, 2008).

Figure 7.3. Core Growth Areas, 1970-2005. Growth areas in Central Oregon demonstrate continued expansion of urban areas into fire prone regions. (Headwaters Economics, 2007)
Figure 7.4. Wildland-Urban Interface areas in Central Oregon. (Aycock, 2002)

Figure 7.5. Elevated Catastrophic Wildfire Risk in Central Oregon. (Aycock, 2002)
Figure 7.6 Historic Fire starts in Central Oregon, Including the Awbrey Hall Fire and the Skeleton Fire.
Awbrey Hall, 1990: “The town was surrounded by flames” (Lerten, 2010)
The Awbrey Hall Fire raced across Bend’s west side in August 1990. The fire spread through the new exclusive development as it skirted the western edge of the city, threatening the city’s core and the new resorts on Century Drive (figure 7.7). The fire eventually destroyed 22 homes and spanned two major highways, including Century Drive. Two thousand homes were evacuated in the face of the coming flames sending at least 2,800 people looking for shelter (Associated Press, 1990). The blaze was started by an abandoned campfire on the edge of the city (Awbrey Hall Fire takes a heavy toll, 1990) and was only suppressed through the work of 1,600 firefighters and support crews and the deployment of a dozen airplanes, another dozen helicopters, 122 fire engines and 70 bulldozers. In total, the response cost more than $2 million and destroyed more than $5 million worth of property (Robbins, 2001). When the smoke cleared over the high desert, it was clear that wildfire in Central Oregon was no longer a rural problem, an issue for the Forest Service or the timber companies. Rather, wildfire had entered the city just as the city continued its expansion into the country. The boundaries between the country and the city were again

Figure 7.7 Map of Awbrey Hall Fire area and Bend. Times shown along path are 4-5 August, 1990. (Saltenberger, 1993, p. 20)
blurred by a mobile nature. Bend was learning a lesson that many communities in the American West would learn at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries: “Escalating fire-fighting costs are closely associated with dramatic increases in low-density housing development in amenity-rich areas such as along lakes, seashores, forests, national parks, and other protected areas” (Pope, 2009, p. 14). The low density housing on the urban fringe, the kind of housing exposed to risk during the Awbrey Hall Fire illustrated the necessity of incorporating wildfire issues into urban planning programs and again revealed further ties between the country and the city.

After the fire was over, many blamed restrictive homeowner association covenants for increasing the danger and the damage. The wood shake roofs, often mandated by HOAs, were singled out as particularly dangerous (Austin, 1996; The lessons of Awbrey Hall, 2000). Almost immediately state lawmakers started looking for ways to encourage the use of fire resistant building materials, especially on roofs (Milstein & Walth, 2002). The Awbrey Hall Fire indicated that much of the onus for fire prevention would need to fall upon individual property owners. Looking back at the fire however, it was also clear that urban planning decisions could reduce the risk. For example, in order to fight wildfire as it moves across the landscape, firefighting crews would need access to it. “We need good roads to get to those homes -- not narrow, winding routes that can only be traveled by a mini-car,” said Pete Hansen, Bend’s fire chief at the time. “If we're going to provide quick response, we need to be able to get in where we can do our work” (quoted in Shotwell, 1990). The Awbrey Hall Fire became the standard by which fires on the WUI in Central Oregon would be measured and judged for the next 20 years. After each new
fire posed a threat to a subdivision, resort, or neighborhood in the region, commenters would look back on Awbrey Hall to note the city’s vulnerability to fire and to see if any lessons had been learned (see, for example, Austin, 1996, Lerten, 2010).

*The Skeleton Fires, 1996: “It was a total loss of common sense.” (Robertson, 1996)*

The Awbrey Hall Fire moved relatively slowly across the butte on the north side of town. The Skeleton Fire in 1996, by contrast, did most of its damage in just a couple of hours, providing residents and emergency crews little time to respond to the situation. Further, the winds threatened to drive the fire right through the center of the city. The fire, and the threat it posed to the city, further exposed deficiencies in the region’s wild fire plans and the ways it understood fire on the urban fringe. It did burn through the exclusive Sundance subdivision, a collection of two acre properties containing large, expensive homes. All told, the Skeleton Fire destroyed 19 homes and 15,000 acres before the 600 firefighters working the fire contained and left it to burn itself out on the neighboring BLM land (Tomlinson 1996). “Because the homeowners left much of the landscaping to nature--juniper trees and sagebrush--the fire spread quickly and easily” (Hill & Tomlinson, 1996). Keith Clinton from the National Forest also blamed the vegetation and the homeowners. “With trees and brush around the home, there’s no defensible space” (quoted in Hill & Tomlinson, 1996a). Jerry Fisher was less subtle. “It was a total loss of common sense,” he lamented. “If you are going to build in the middle of the woods, at least take the precaution, at your own expense, to clear out vegetation near your home” (quoted in Robertson, 1996).

The vegetation around houses, in particular houses built in the middle of fire prone areas, provide the critical fuel that means the difference between a fire that burns around
The Skeleton Fire provided a painful object lesson in what it takes to protect a home from fire (Lighthall, 2008). It challenged people to think about what responsibilities home owners had in protecting themselves and what emergency agencies could and could not do. The challenge was one of education and convincing people to take actions for the public good on their private property. The potential role of the government was limited. George Reed, the community development coordinator for Deschutes County stated it simply. “People don’t want government telling them what to do with their homes. But this is a reminder that maybe we need to look into the way homes are built as a problem” (Austin, 1996).

The Skeleton Fire challenged planners and officials to find ways to educate and encourage homeowners on the urban fringe to think about taking precautionary measures on their property. The FireFree Program emerged from these discussions. FireFree, at its core, represented an effort to deal with those deficiencies and to acknowledge the ways that increased development on the urban fringe and in rural areas in the county presented new wildfire risks. “Maybe it’s a blessing in disguise,” thought Douglas Martinez. “When you have possessions, sometimes you don’t do the things you want” (Quoted in Hill and Tomblinson, 1996b).

**FireFree: “Protect Your Home, Protect your own.”**
The FireFree program, on its own, functions primarily as a homeowner education program focused on helping residents create a defensible space around their homes, thus reducing the risk that the buildings are destroyed in a wildfire. Senate Bill 360 (discussed below) provides a tool to convince homeowners to provide defensible space on their property, but little enforcement mechanism. Workshops, pamphlets, individual meetings,
and a series of dramatic videos encourage homeowners to remove yard debris and clear
flammable vegetation around their houses. One pamphlet (figure 7.8) offers ten handy
tips as a way to "protect your own," including reducing brush, clearing woodpiles,
keeping address signs visible, and keeping a 72-hour evacuation kit handy (Lighthall,
2007). Their annual newsletter recalls the damage of previous fires, explains homeowner
responsibilities, and discusses ways that homeowners can address wildfire on their
property. Additionally, the program helps owners consider the construction process itself,
promoting fire resistant materials. The educational components of FireFree, along with
community events designed to raise awareness of the risk of wildfire, aims to link
residents with local, state, and national fire prevention programs and agencies and help
them protect their own property (Lighthall, 2008).

Figure 7.7 10 tips, one reason (Lighthall, 2007)
The success of FireFree is a result primarily of its capacity to broaden and institutionalize knowledge about "defensible spaces" around structures in areas prone to wildfire. "Defensible space," the FireFree program notes, "can be created in one weekend and be easily maintained" (FireFree, 2008). The 30-foot buffer around any structures of the home provides a landscape at lower risk to fire, produced at the expense and through the work of the homeowner. Increased growth on the urban fringe has led to increased threat to those homes from wildfire. But the people moving in from out of the area lack knowledge of the region’s fire history and the threat posed by fire. So, seemingly after every dangerous fire, fire officials are left wondering what they can do to educate homeowners in fire prone neighborhoods. Kate Lighthall, the FireFree Program Coordinator laments the problem. “As soon as I think we’ve got a fairly aware society here, a new class comes in” (quoted in Millstein and Learn, 2007). To help educate residents about wildfire, Lighthall held regular meetings with homeowners. She called them “kindergarten meetings.” “I always brought dinner. That was important, ‘Come over for free dinner, we’ll talk about fire.’ We have to teach people over and over again… There’s two things that can happen. The ember showers will fall onto your property and either they will ignite something or they won’t. They fall on the ground and light ground fuels. They light your deck, your shingles, your swingset, your furniture, and all the stuff you leave around. That’s the defensible space” (Lighthall, 2008). The long-term objective of FireFree is to institutionalize, and indeed, to naturalize defensible space and the effort necessary to maintain it.

The threat from wildfire to homes spans public and private property. While FireFree
aims to convince homeowners to take steps on their private property, the public lands of
the Forest Service and the BLM pose significant dangers as well. Fires that start or move
through public land pose a threat to private land, and vice versa. The ideal solution for
fuel reduction on the public lands is through controlled burns. The problem of wildfire on
the public lands is largely a matter of scale. “For the Forest Service, 4,000 acres is a big
prescribed fire. Nature burns that in five minutes” (Milstein & Walth, 2002). Budgets for
controlled burns and fire suppression in the national forests have grown, but they have
not kept pace with growing needs. Under the Healthy Forest Restoration Act,
communities must ask “what are your priorities, what are your values, what is the most
important for you in terms of treatment on federal lands” (Lighthall, 2008). After the
Cache Mountain Fire in 2002, Hal Salwasser from the Oregon School of Forestry and
former Forest Service Chief, lamented the problem of fuel treatment. “The biggest
problem is you can’t treat enough of this land quickly enough. We know where the
highest priorities are. The problem is the highest priorities are burning” (quoted in
Milstein & Walth, 2002). The urban planning paradigm that divided development into
density models, zones, and traffic patterns ran up against the ecological complexity and
porous boundaries of the forest. To protect the city, the Forest Service thins through
logging, mowing, and prescribed burns as much as it can (Christiansen, 2008). Much of
this thinning was accomplished through prescribed burns, careful operations designed to
remove underbrush, ladder fuels, and other combustible materials in areas where logging
operations are undesirable or impossible. Burning however, requires its own risks and
expenses, both financial and political.
Prescribed burns are intended to mimic the natural fire ecology of the ponderosa forests of the area; controlled, low-intensity burns remove underbrush, shrubs around trees, and the low branches that act as ladders up the tree to the crown. These operations are conducted with a great deal of care, but they do occasionally escape control. For example, a prescribed burn in Utah during the summer of 2003 cost over $3 million to put out and put the entire prescribed burn program in Utah in jeopardy (Brunson & Evans, 2005). Alternative methods, primarily mowing and, in some cases, selective logging, can serve as a mechanism to broadcast the seeds of the very plant species they are trying to reduce. Further, the machinery can compact soil and habitat, and has difficulty accessing much of the terrain that requires burning (Forest Service, 2008). Controlled burns can reduce the fuels on more ground, more cost effectively, with more desirable ecological results. Yet the Forest Service often has difficulty following through with planned burns.

Though the fear of escaped fire is a concern for residents, more often fuel reduction activities on public lands are constrained by weather conditions, in particular a desire to keep the smoke from any controlled burns from drifting into the town. Citing health concerns and a diminishment of the view associated with the smoke, the town and county strictly control the days that the Forest Service is allowed to conduct controlled burns. In one study, diminished air quality was the greatest concern for residents near prescribed burns (Winter, Vogt, & Fried, 2002). One respondent replied, "The smoke pollution can be kind of nasty if it's a big enough burn" (Winter et al., 2002, p. 18). The smoke, while dangerous for those with respiratory conditions, poses a significantly smaller threat to
individual homeowners than escaped burns, or the out of control wildfires those burns are
designed to prevent. Yet the lack of visibility, the necessary closure of roads and trails in
the proximity of burns, and the highly visible, if poorly understood residual burn marks
do more to make burns politically difficult. Prescribed burns however, despite these
political challenges, are the Forests Service’s preferred method of fuel reduction on
public lands.

On private lands, homeowners are left to their own devices, which rarely include
diesel canisters and fire trucks. The FireFree program provides a list of contractors who
can help reduce fuels on their privately owned lands to reduce the threat to their own
buildings and catastrophic wildfire. A few of those contractors are certified to manage
burns, but the liability costs for such activities are often prohibitively expensive (Forest
Service, 2008). Instead, these contractors use mechanical means to simulate the effects of
burns: mowing, trimming, and removing old or dead trees. Further, these contractors help
the homeowners self certify their property under the conditions of the state law (Senate
Bill 360, discussed below). The self-certification process, given the complexity of
wildfire processes and the financial impacts of wildfire, is remarkably simple.
Homeowners are asked to simply perform the work and then self certify their compliance
(Oregon Department of Forestry, 2006). For their work, and the paperwork associated
with that work, the homeowner is declared to be in compliance with Senate Bill 360. No
further inspection or follow-up is necessary, though property owners do need to re-certify
their property every ten years.

**Senate Bill 360: Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Protection Act**
The production of knowledge and institutionalization of practice behind FireFree is
backed by the legislative processes and a rescaling of fire prevention responsibility through legal means. The importance and insight of FireFree as a means of urban environmental governance and a tool of environmental planning is more apparent in relationship to Oregon's wildfire responsibility law, the "Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Protection Act" or Senate Bill 360. The law provides a legal stick to back the educational carrot of the bulk of FireFree's programs and materials by legislating homeowner responsibility and outlining the risks associated with failing to meet them. Senate Bill 360 was signed into law in 1997, the year after the devastating Skeleton Fire. In order to address the problem of the "increased risks of catastrophic damage by fire events" (Oregon Revised Statutes, 1997), the law put the onus of fire prevention squarely on the shoulders of property owners on the urban-wildland interface. "In dealing with the forestland-urban interface situation, major and long term solutions will involve local actions and efforts by property owners," the bill states. It then goes on to list the responsibilities and consequences of inaction faced by land owners:

- Establish a fuel break around structures
- Improve driveway access for fire trucks
- Remove tree branches near chimneys
- Remove dead branches overhanging a roof
- Move firewood away from structures, or cover it
- Remove flammables from under decks and stairways
- Create fuel breaks along roadsides and property lines (Oregon Revised Statutes 1997)
Like the recreational patchwork landscape, planning for wildfire and Senate Bill 360 required a simplification of the fire landscape on the urban fringe. Areas were categorized for potential risk from wildfire corresponding with their variance from their natural fire regime and the potential risk that would pose. The law effectively enacted a series of provisions that filled a gap in the jurisdictional responsibility for preventing the spread of catastrophic wildfire onto land owners. The responsibility for filling that gap, and policing their responsibility, fell on the home owners themselves. Specifically, the new law required owners to self-certify the adequacy of defensible space around their homes. If they failed to submit their certifications, land owners could be held responsible for the damage from fires that started on their land or extra costs that might be due to homeowner negligence. Further, emergency responders could not be compelled to spend time and resources protecting property for land owners who were not in compliance with Senate Bill 360 (Ballou, 2005).

The self-certification process and the presence of punitive action only in cases where negligence caused greater damage somewhere else significantly limited opposition from property rights advocates, though some complained about the size of the fine and the perceived top-down style of the bill. “We are over-taxed and over-ruled… [We] do not appreciate Salem and Portland running us” (Lorna White, quoted in Bradburn, 2011). For the most part thought, residents saw the need for increased homeowner education and responsibility and the self certification process was generally seen as a reasonable solution, ultimately placing homeowners in positions of responsibility for the safety of their own property. Unlike the property issues at play in the negotiation of the deer
ranges, Senate Bill 360 to limit what property owners could do with their own land. Instead the bill and the programs that emerged from it focused on education and voluntary compliance measures geared towards helping people protect investments and the lifestyle that brought them to Bend. That lifestyle is ably captured in Visit Bend’s (2007) promotional publication "Bend: Unleash Yourself":

Jake was here for one reason only, the outdoors. And Bend's predominantly sunny weather helped his cause once again today. An early morning of fly-fishing yielded to a ride along the scenic Deschutes River into downtown. So far, the only downside of the trip seemed to be squeezing everything in. With options like whitewater rafting, horseback riding, and golfing at one of the area’s more than 25 golf courses, there wasn't enough time in the day. But the beauty of this ride would do. Especially now that the view was suddenly getting better. As they rounded the turn, they passed a couple of intriguing hikers. Jake paraded past with his tail held considerably higher than usual. (p. 6) (figure 7.9)

Figure 7.9. Jake is pretty happy to pass an "intriguing" pair of hikers on the banks of the Deshutes River. (Visit Bend 2007, p. 6)
The brochure failed to mention just how Jake would ride the horses and that he wouldn't be allowed anywhere near any of the 25 golf courses. Yet, the opportunities for recreation do not only provide a focal point for residents of the town and a means to rally them around a common goal, but they also shape the advertised image of the town, the means through which they can be a tourist destination, and new home for many. This, as recreational tourism often does, presents the classic paradox of balancing environmental conservation with growth and development. How does increased tourism and use degrade the tourist experience and the difficulty? (Bend Metro Park and Recreation District, 2008; King, 2009).

_Cache Mountain: 2002 “This is war. The homeland is not safe if you live near the forests in the Intermountain West.” (Governor Kitzhaber, quoted in Bishop, 2002)_

Figure 7.10. Residents and guests started their day golfing, and ended it by evacuating in the face of the Cache Mountain Fire. (Project Wildfire, 2008, p. 10)

“Many of the residents and visitors who left via smoke inundated US 20 started the day golfing, swimming and horseback riding. By late Sunday afternoon the stiff, erratic winds had doubled the size of the five-day-old Cache Mountain blaze to 3,700 acres and pushed it into the northwest corner of [Black Butte Ranch]” (Quinn & Larabee, 2002). When the Cache Mountain Fire threatened to burn through Black Butte Ranch in 2002, it would
represent a test of the educational programs of Project Wildfire and Fire Free. Black Butte Ranch is an icon of exurban development in Deschutes County and a center of wealth in the area. The homes of Black Butte Ranch sit on the former timberlands of Brooks Scanlon in the ponderosa forest adapted to high frequency, low intensity fires. The Cache Mountain Fire, however was an intense blaze. The fire grew quickly and fire crews responded with drastic measures, using the swimming pools in front of the lodge to refill the water buckets beneath the helicopters (Quinn & Larabee, 2002).

The Cache Mountain Fire would burn two homes in Black Butte Ranch. The homes caught fire, investigators said, when the wood shingles caught fire in a thicket. Firefighters were forced to retreat from the blaze. “We went to the homes we could save,” the Black Butte Ranch Fire chief said (Larabee & Nokes, 2002). Firefighters managed to save the homes of those that had kept adequate defensible space around their structures and had followed the guidelines laid down by the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (Nokes, Lundgren, & Quinn, 2002).

Wildfire, environmental governance and amenity landscapes
The Wildland Urban Interface acts not only as the intersection between the city and the country at risk for wildfire, fighting wildfires on the WUI also puts rural and urban public safety and land management agencies side by side, demands that governance operate across scale, and requires that institutions and people typically involved in rural land management (agriculture, forestry, etc) sit at the table with urban planners to discuss questions of infrastructure and urban planning. "Increased human settlement in fire-prone areas presents a social dilemma because wildland fire is physically dangerous for human life and property, but people’s knowledge of the problem varies and perceptions of the
risks and the impacts are defined differently by residents, fire managers, policymakers, and communities" (Brooks, 2006, p. 3). Wildfire on the urban fringe exposes the challenges of environmental governance in the face of non-human and active nature. A critical resource geography of amenity development in the fire prone West needs to address the governance issues and particular socio-economic contexts of wildfire risks on the urban fringe and the history that has materially changed the vulnerability to fire. For example, the 10 AM policy, which encouraged fire crews to extinguish all fires before 10 in the morning, led to a build up of fuels, making catastrophic fire more likely (Carle, 2002, p. 52). Contemporary efforts to reduce the risk of fire on the urban fringe must also address the cultural landscape of wildfire. "Social arrangements in developed countries appear to facilitate residential development and the security of privileged groups in highly valued areas that are subject to high magnitude biophysical hazards" (Collins, 2008, p. 23). In more simple terms, expensive homes on the urban fringe are at high risk for deadly, and even more expensive fire.

Deeply engrained social institutions that compound the effects of wildfire response pose complications for successful environmental governance and can exacerbate existing tensions between landowners' private property rights and regulatory programs. Mobile natures produced an “ecological commons: a mobile nature that in moving across boundaries complicated the fundamental order of the grid by joining fragmented parcels—even privately owned parcels—into a larger whole” (Fiege, 2005, p. 27). Tensions emerge at each level of the process as planners, resource managers and politicians aim to "create policies and institutions to reduce the risk of wildland fire to lives, property, and
the environment, while also restoring and maintaining the ecological role of wildland fire in fire-prone landscapes" (Brummel, 2010, p. 3). These tensions, and the difficulty in assessing and responding to the problem of wildfire, can lead to significant conflict. But, like the irrigated landscapes of Idaho at the turn of the 20th century, it also leads to specific forms of cooperation. "Conflict was not an end in itself for irrigators; throughout this period [1880-1920] water users sought to establish--or reestablish--the cooperation that made for stable irrigated agriculture" (Fiege, 1999, p. 84).

Wildfire demands these institutions of governance and cooperation because it reveals a mismatch between natural and human processes. In the words of Fiege, this mismatch represents a “significant, but overlooked problem in the history of land use in the American West: the incompatibility of human boundaries and forms of mobile nature--water, soil, and organisms—that those boundaries could not contain” (Fiege, 2005, p. 25). Fire, like the weeds discussed by Fiege (2005), the birds discussed by Wilson (2010, p. 110-111), or the deer discussed in chapter six, moves. As it does so, it challenges the cohesion of borders between property and jurisdiction. The challenge is greater when the threat is posed to absent property owners unwilling or unable to treat fuel on their land. The production of recreational resources, including the subdivisions and resorts on Bend’s urban fringe, functions in the context of nature’s movement and its ecological and geographic specificity. The ponderosa and juniper forests of Central Oregon present a fire commons, linking people, property, and resources together in attempts to address the problem of wildfire.

As wildfire "burns through boundaries" (Brummel, 2010, p. 8) and requires
cooperation across jurisdictions, scales, and in both the public and private sector, wildfire cannot be addressed simply on its own, but must be addressed on concert with broader ecological conditions of the forests, ecological conditions that may also be mobile. Fire prone landscapes then present not just a fire commons, but a broader catastrophic commons. Within the catastrophic commons, the ingredients of disaster are shared across property boundaries and disaster itself moves through them. A fire that starts in a neighbor’s property, for example, without sufficient fuel treatment easily crowns, and spreads across the landscape, places everyone at risk.

Ecological commons usually imply that people come together to address a common ecological problem. in the case of wildfire on the urban fringe, however, these people are retirees, second home owners, or people without a knowledge of the risks of fire. Research concerning the environmental governance of commons tends to focus on resource management and sustainability (Mansfield, 2004; Bakker, 2007). Wildfire, however, like other "commons" problems such as global warming, ozone depletion, and the potential for nuclear meltdowns, demands a reconsideration not only of the boundaries that incompletely enclose the disasters and their causes, but also the relationship between geographically fixed land owners and dispersed risks. "No longer must public managers see resource appropriators as individuals who are trapped hopeless in a tragedy of the commons, but rather as individuals who are and must be active problem solvers" (Durant et al., 2004). The FireFree program, in conjunction with state legislative action pertaining to homeowner responsibility and changing priorities for fire management at the federal level recognized homeowners themselves as the central actors
in limiting damage from wildfire. The homeowner education programs and regulations designed to encourage property owners to recognize the risk of fire and how to address it represents, in Fire Marshall Gary Marshall’s words, the “social science” of fire management. It represents an understanding of “the kinds of institutions and regulatory practices that exist in a mutually productive relationship with social and ecological practices and can be seen as the historical expressions of contingent political relationships” (Agrawal, 2005, p. 229). The social science of wild fire on the urban fringe is part of the process of producing new environmental knowledges and subjectivities among those living and vacationing in fire prone landscapes.

In Oregon, the state’s land use planning laws served as a model for the wildfire law, forcing cities and counties at risk for wildfire to devise their own management plans to deal with the problems. The multi-scalar effort placed emphasis on local control, coordination between public and private stakeholders, and collaboration across scales of government. All of these efforts were fundamentally important to protecting the resources of the forests, the views, investments, property and lives at the heart of recreational amenity development in the New West. The federal government's recent passage of the Healthy Forest Initiative adds another scale reinforcing the state’s existing commitments to force communities to develop plans to fight wildfire on the fringe. The most recent plan emerged from three public meetings and input from representatives from the City of Bend Fire Department, Deschutes County Rural Fire Protection District #2, Oregon Department of Forestry, the USDA Forest Service, the USDI Bureau of Land Management, and Deschutes County, Greater Bend Area Community Wildfire (Lighthall,
The plan adds a layer of scalar complexity by linking compliance with the Oregon wildfire law to the Healthy Forest Initiative. The local plan that emerged from these state and federal mandates opened by listing the plan's six primary purposes:

- Protect lives and property from wildland fires;
- Instill a sense of personal responsibility for taking preventive actions regarding wildland fire;
- Increase public understanding of living in a fire-adapted ecosystem;
- Increase the community’s ability to prepare for, respond to and recover from wildland fires;
- Restore fire-adapted ecosystems; and
- Improve the fire resilience of the landscape while protecting other social, economic and ecological values. (Lighthall, 2006).

Wildfire is the highest priority natural hazard for the county, rated according to probability of occurrence and vulnerability (Deschutes County Community Development Department, 2010).

The issues involved in risk reduction associated with wildfire are the same as those deeply involved in the processes of urban planning: emergency response, the provisioning of water, street access, and debris removal. While a great deal of urban planning in Central Oregon centers on the zoning requirements necessary to manage growth, those zoning requirements in turn necessitate a broad array of infrastructure developments to support them, an understanding of the ecosystems at play and an active involvement in the treatment of private land. Gary Marshall, the man who declined to
accept the gift of a truck from SafeCo, has said "when we look at these fires we have one foot on the porch and one in the forest" (City Edition, 2008).

Protecting resources against the nature of fire. More and more houses continue to be built in the area. Planning with “one foot on the porch and one in the forest” means that local fire departments and homeowners must also be concerned about fire prevention activities on the public lands. It means paying attention to both the material conditions of the forest and the “social science” of educating and convincing new residents to take measures to understand fire risks and protect their own homes. The large amount of federally managed land in the county is ecologically dependent upon high frequency, low intensity fires. The value of the property on its borders requires a multi-scalar approach to land management. To be effective in reducing the risk associated with wildfire, this approach needs to cross property and jurisdictional boundaries as easily as fire does. Project Wildfire and FireFree serve to stitch together another patchwork landscape to manage the movement of fire. This patchwork landscape, made up of ecological and political fragments and managed across property boundaries, agencies, firms, and cultural values, provides the fuel for wildfire, which moves through it all. Like fire itself, wildfire planning must be able to easily cross boundaries. In response to fire’s propensity to skip across the landscape, fire management must become a collaboration not just across scales and agency boundaries, but also across urban and rural boundaries, and boundaries between public and private property. To effectively reduce the risk of urban wildfire, mitigation plans have to follow fire across the boundaries, or cross ahead of it.

The management of mobile natures amid fixed human boundaries pose sticky
questions for governance. Like deer on their way to winter feeding grounds, fire moves through the landscape oblivious to human boundaries but keenly influenced by human activities on the land. Vegetation control, fire suppression regimes, highways, and anthropogenic global warming radically alter the size, intensity, and frequency of wildfire in a particular place. The mobility of fire across fixed political geographies, in this case between public, private, state and federal lands, complicates governance not only by demanding cooperation among agencies, but in forcing owners of discrete private property to think in terms of the material conditions of the landscape, including the kinds and amount of fuels near structures, the placement and width of roads, and the ways that natural fuels are removed from the forest. This requires the construction of new kinds of environmental knowledge linked to a system of environmental governance. FireFree, Senate Bill 360 and the responsibilities of homeowners to reduce fuels on their property represents the production of an “environmental subject” (Agrawal, 2005). That subjectivity is built through FireFree’s education programs and based upon a knowledge constructed by a simplification of natural processes, of cartographic representations of wildfire risk and geographic formulas related to distance from the home and from the city.

In 2007 another fire threatened Awbrey Butte. This time, most of the homeowners had created defensible spaces around their homes. Much of the underbrush had been removed, and water and roads were more readily available to combat the growing fire. Homeowners worked alongside fire fighters to build firebreaks to hold back the flames. The fire remained small and despite the presence of more homes in the area, losses were
considerably smaller. The flames only damaged one home (Awbrey Butte brush fire contained, 2007). The 2007 Awbrey Butte fire would seem to inspire confidence in dealing with future fires on Bend's urban fringe and in the countryside of Deschutes County. The risk is becoming greater, rendering planning decisions more critical and raising questions about planning programs that depend upon community education and voluntary involvement. Planning with one foot on the porch and one in the forest means thinking not only about interagency management and scalar governance, but considering both the natural properties of environmental phenomena and the ways those phenomena interact with human boundaries, whether those boundaries are ideological, political, or commercial. Urban environmental governance is not merely a question of the urban, or of the environmental, but provides another avenue to query the complex ways that nature is embedded within the city and the intimate ecological relationships between the city and the countryside.

The fire history of the Deschutes patchwork landscape is one in which the movement of fire and the ecological conditions of both "normal" and catastrophic fire have guided choices about the relationship between regulations, property management, emergency services, and the maintenance of natural resources--both timber and recreation. The fire history overlaps with the cultural history of more and more people seeking to live in the woods, of a shift in environmental politics towards one that “stems from a desire to improve personal, family, and community life” (Hays 1987, p. 5). The amenity and exurban development of the New West is built on this desire and in the path of the flames. Wildfire threatens the economic conditions of the New West, the resources
and investments necessary for its continuance even as it is braided into the processes of its most prized ecosystems. The institutional arrangements surrounding the prevention and suppression of wildfire protect those economic conditions, responding to local ecology and weather. At the same time, those regulatory institutions and environmental subjectivities continue to alter the material conditions of the fire landscape.

Ultimately, the recent history of fire management has shifted responsibility for both the management of fuels, and the oversight associated with fuel reduction onto individuals and public-private relationships at the local level. Pyne (2004) describes this as a fourth wave of fire management, which is “underway but still finding its sea legs, appears destined to focus on modifying landscape fuels” (p. 63). This is precisely the goal of the FireFree Program, to provide a mechanism to help landowners do their own landscape modification, to place responsibility upon exurban landowners to not only capitalize on the amenities of their property, but also address the natural conditions that threaten them. FireFree, ideally, provides a way for exurban landowners, those most at risk from catastrophic wildfire, to bear the responsibility for that risk. In Pyne’s view, the underlying story is in this governance, and ultimately in the natural conditions of fire. “America has gone from a fire flush country to a fire starved one” (Pyne, 2004, p. 68). With continued expansion of the city and a growing population moving into fire prone areas the necessity for more fire management becomes apparent. Forest Service Spokesman Norm Hesseldahl put it more succinctly after the Skeleton Fire. “There’s still a helluva lot of fire to fight” (quoted in Hill and Tomlinson 1996a).

The recreational resources on the urban fringe remain linked to the environmental
processes that pre-existed them and have in turn, been altered by it. Amenity
development in Bend has reproduced resource space in the region in ways that build upon
existing resource programs, including the necessity of preventing wildfire and mitigating
its risks. The processes of development and mitigation are critical components of the
production of space, the relationship between the city and the countryside, and the
recreational resources of the region.
CONCLUSION

NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE "RECREATION CAPITAL OF OREGON"

The expansion of the urban fringe into the fire-prone deserts and forests was among the most clear signs of the real-estate boom associated with the region's amenities. Like many of the resource booms in the history of the American West, it was quickly followed by an equally dramatic bust. People still came to the city to play, but the end of the real-estate boom is apparent in the home prices and for sale signs scattered throughout the region. It was visible on the streets traversed by 108 pro-cyclists and almost 400 amateurs who gathered on July 13th, 2008 for the final stage 2nd Annual Cascades Cycling Classic (Cascade Cycling Classic, 2008). Two days previously they raced around downtown Bend. The day before they had raced up to the Mt. Bachelor Parking lot, back down the hill to town and finally up Pilot Butte. The final stage covered a seventeen-mile route around the northwest end of town featuring a climb up Awbrey Butte. The route took them through the same neighborhood developed by Brooks Resources as their first project in town, which was also nearly devastated by the Awbrey Hall fire in 1990 and again in 2007. It was the same butte that wilderness advocate Scott Silver built his home on in 1988 to border the wild desert. The professional cyclists climbed that hill five times over the course of the race. Each time Chris Horner, a Bend native and teammate of Lance Armstrong, passed the houses still in danger from wildfire—each of them expensive, each with stunning views of the Central Cascades—he also passed "for sale" signs near many of the homes' driveways. If they sold, many would sell for far lower than they had been worth just a year or two before.
In 2007, Bend was named the most overpriced market in the United States (Christie, 2006). The annual median price of a single-family home price was $353,000 (double the median price from just four years previous). By March of 2010, that annual median price had fallen to just $204,000. “At first we were at the top of the list for fastest appreciation. Then things peaked and we instantly went to the top of the list for depreciation,” said Sheree MacRitchie, President of the Central Oregon Association of Realtors (quoted in Bjork, 2010).

The dramatic increase in home prices during the late 1990s and 2000s was a response to Bend’s increasing exposure as a recreational hub in the New West. The spike in home prices and construction proved critical to Bend’s growth, providing jobs for people in construction, landscaping, and other services jobs. The "recreation capital of Oregon" then, owes much of its economic capacity to the actual production of the landscape. Home construction, ownership, and real estate prices are indeed closely linked to the production of specific kinds of landscapes within Bend, on its fringe, and in the countryside throughout Deschutes Country.

When Anne and I looked out over the recreational landscapes of the county from the top of Mt. Bachelor, we saw the sublime landscapes of the Three Sisters Wilderness, the palimpsests of ranches turned to ranchettes, the pastoral golf course subdivisions of the evocatively named Broken Top and the pastoral Riverhouse, the exclusive Pronghorn and the now defunct Lord of the Rings themed Shire. We saw the urban development of the city, the new homes on Awbrey Butte, the converted mill district, and the strip malls on the new edge of town. Looking over the desert, we saw the efforts of recreational
planners, developers, politicians, and construction workers like Anne's husband. The landscape emerged from maps, from visions, from abstract categorizations, investment of massive amounts of capital and labor. It also remained grounded in ecological processes, including fire, deer migration and the steady process of the Deschutes River moving downhill through the valley. Looking at the mountains, forests, creeks and rivers we saw the resource behind the real estate boom in Bend.

When I started this project, I wanted to understand my own mixed feelings about the view from Mt. Bachelor. I wanted to know how I could share Anne’s awe for the landscape, her expression of “perfect,” yet also understand the production of that perfection, what it masked. I wanted to understand what linked the volcanic peaks of the Three Sisters to the Old Mill District, the timberlands of Deschutes County to the golf courses. I set out to understand the consumption of these landscapes and the production of recreation resources. The following sections review the insights we might gain from the history of recreational resource development in Deschutes County.

*History matters to the geography of amenity landscapes.* The amenity landscapes of Deschutes County are built upon existing landscapes. They are, in many cases built by the same group of people involved in prior resource activity. Brooks Scanlon, as the value and availability of timber declined, became Brooks Resources. Brooks Resources and Bill Smith’s own development company, Bill Smith Properties, have become the largest developer in the region, responsible not only for Black Butte Ranch, but also resorts closer to Bend and the Old Mill District. The Forest Service, once charged with insuring a
long term supply of timber, now spends most of its time in the region managing recreational resources and reducing wildfire fuels to keep second homes from burning.

Further, the changes in the landscape resulting from resource activity has supported recreational activity on the same lands. Logged Ponderosa forests exhibit exactly the kinds of characteristics that people value for recreational homes. Logging roads and abandoned railroads rights of way make ideal mountain biking, cross-country skiing or snowmobile trails. Century Drive and the Deschutes River, also developed to support timber extraction, now are hubs for recreational activity in the region. The historic timber landscape has become the recreational landscape of today.

Finally, the knowledge produced for timber production and conservation provides the basis for recreation management today. The ORRRC extended resource conservation understandings of space into the recreational sphere. The model for recreational resource inventory and development produced through the ORRRC has carried on in state and local recreational planning and in the ways firms capitalize on their property. The production of recreational resources in the New West is a reproduction of resource space.

Much critical resource geography and contemporary work on amenity development has glossed over their contextual and historically contingent histories. In this dissertation I have drawn out some of that history to demonstrate how contemporary workings of capital, resource production, and the materiality of the resource itself emerges from historical contexts, developments, and trends. The production of recreational landscapes, the infrastructure, the relationships between the country and the city, and the inter-agency management practices that maintain it depend upon precise tools of land management,
the same tools that initially governed resource extraction and conservation. Government agencies like the Forest Service and the BLM and local planning boards, firms like Brooks Resources, individuals like Scott Silver, and programs like FireFree and the ORRRC negotiate the production and the consumption of the landscape. To do this they need to balance broad demands from diverse stakeholders.

*Natural amenities do not automatically become recreational resources. Rather, they must be produced through the production of knowledge and the production of space, and through the development of resource infrastructure.* Joe Penfold, when he argued for the importance of a national recreational resource inventory, reframed the natural landscapes used by recreationalists. By considering these landscapes resources, accountable, abstractable, and simplifiable, he set the stage for their production, conservation, and their capitalization. That production necessitated that they be made legible. The tables, surveys, and charts of the ORRRC reports were echoed in state recreational planning documents, Brooks Scanlon’s own land use assessment, and in the resource elements put forward by the city in the debate over the deer ranges. The production of knowledge behind the recreational resources of Bend’s hinterland occurs across scales, firms, and agencies, and so the common language of statistics helps ease the challenges associated with the multi-scalar management.

Production of recreational resources depends upon a production of space that harmonizes representations of space, spaces of representation, and spatial practices. The symbolic value of wilderness, the rural pastoral, or the spiritual renewal associated with
recreational activities becomes part of tourists’ and recreationalists’ spatial practice. The management of the material components of that practice is based in technical, scientific knowledge and management of those resources. Together, the production of recreational space supports both direct commercial development of outdoor recreation, leisure homes, and resorts, and indirect capitalization through developments such as the Old Mill District.

As natural resource managers, including those involved in outdoor recreation and urban planning for resort communities, establish boundaries and develop resource infrastructure based on statistical representations of the landscape, they produce the space necessary for resource production. The production of recreational resources reflect the region’s resource histories as well as visions and plans for its future. The importance of the Deschutes River for both the lumber production at Brooks Scanlon mill and leisure activities in the Old Mill District provides one example. The production of recreational resources draws on a particular spirit of place that simultaneously values access to recreational resources and, as Hollern realized in regards to Black Butte Ranch and Healy noted in the development of Mt. Bachelor, a small-town feel. Resource geographies are also cultural geographies and environmental history, imbued with questions of place and the material conditions of resources. In the end, "Recreation Capital" represents more than simply a marketing slogan for the region. In the production of space associated with recreational resources, cultural values and visions for recreation on the natural landscape meet economic development.
Recreational resources are situated resources. They are embedded within and built upon existing cultural, natural, economic, and political landscapes. The geographical conditions of recreational resources matter in the processes and institutions of their management, development, and conservation. Unlike timber, natural gas, or other mineral resources, recreational resources are geographically fixed. They cannot be extracted from their existing landscapes and moved to a market for sale. Their situatedness implies a deeper connection to existing local cultural and political geographies and to the geographic conditions that make them viable as resources. The amount of sunshine, slope, or the degree of perceived naturalness play a significant part in the value of these landscapes, their capacity to be used and developed, even as that use and development exposes them to potential degradation. Finally, the natural conditions themselves matter. The slope, wind, and amount of snow on Mt. Bachelor, the propensity for fire to burn through rural subdivisions in Deschutes County, or the perceived natural landscapes that surround the city all contribute to how, why, and how effectively recreational resources can be capitalized upon.

The relationship between the production and the consumption of recreational resources themselves, the landscapes, campsites, trails, and ski runs, exposes a geographically fixed resource process, a process in which people move while the resource seems to stay still. The situated natures of natural resources require a more critical assessment of not only their own natural characteristics, as critical resource geographers have noted, but also to the environmental and cultural conditions of the landscapes in which they are found. Their production and consumption is bound up in
local institutions and the contextual histories of communities. Our understanding of recreational resources must account for the ways that their value is based largely upon their geographic, material and aesthetic contexts as they are produced and consumed in place.

Cultural histories also matter. In the 1970s, outdoor recreation and tourism assumed a more central place in the region’s identity and economy. Residents of Bend found themselves impacted by larger debates concerning the relationship between environmentalism, timber production on the public lands, nature tourism, local economic well-being and the shifting cultural landscape. “Nature tourism differentiates our experiences of the natural world, with several consequences,” writes Alexander Wilson (1992).

The most obvious is that this differentiation makes it easier to buy and sell nature as a product. It also means more people can enjoy natural areas. It means that it’s now more difficult to experience nature as a whole, as the total environment that for centuries and centuries has been our home—which is, after all, a very different kind of space from a “recreational resource.” (p. 28)

Cultural components, argues Wilson, play an important role the production and consumption of recreational resources. In Lefebvre’s terms, this interplay exists at the boundaries between representational space, representations of space and spatial practice. The city and the countryside are implicated in the production and consumption of this “very different kind of space.” The space is produced through planning and regulatory
programs, capital intensive infrastructure development, and the “ethic of place” discussed by Matthew Klingle (2007, p. 6).

*While recreational resources are geographically situated, the movements of nature (deer, fire, water) complicate efforts to draw boundaries around and through resource landscapes.* The production of resource space places economic, natural, and cultural geographies in contact. Resource geographies are also cultural geographies and environmental histories. In the continuous negotiation of development and the maintenance of a “small town” community, people draw, debate, and contest boundaries between the city and the countryside, the public good and private property. The material movements of deer, fire, snow, and water challenge the legitimacy and authority of all these line drawings, simplifications, and political maneuverings and encourage the creation of new institutions to address the challenges they pose. The ecological conditions of the landscape cannot be ignored. They become integral aspects of the production of recreational resources, and further demand a hybrid approach to both the practical concerns and theoretical questions of resource governance.

Despite the abstraction and simplification necessary for their production, the situated natures of recreational resources complicate their management and conservation. Specific fire regimes, for example, shape the kind of institutional and private responses to threats from wildfire. The migratory habits of the deer in the Deschutes County deer ranges exposed challenges to just how the land use planning program would overlap
existing private, public, and ecological territories. The hybrid landscapes of natural resources are both bureaucratic abstractions and locally specific actions.

Yet the ways that recreational resources support capital activities exposes the ways that nature (deer or fire, for example) move through them, over porous political boundaries. Again, this highlights the role of institutions in negotiating these mobile natures with fixed capital investment, in negotiating contact between the country and the city. The production of recreational resources is the production of a resource space, a space built upon representations of lifestyles and the ecological and geographic conditions of the landscape. In the case of recreational resources this involved an explicit production of recreational space, landscapes that became resources for Bend and Deschutes County. The space was defined through boundary drawing and governmental determination, as well as through abstraction, quantification, and simplifying the land through land use designations. In regards to wilderness, Kevin Marsh (Marsh, 2007) writes that "to acknowledge wilderness as a form of land use--one with its own consumer ethos of outdoor recreation--does not diminish from the aesthetic beauty and biodiversity of many of these lands but reinforces the importance of the lines around them" (152). These lines however do not only determine what is included in the wilderness, but also exclude activities and other land uses, the same way that the UGB does not only contain the city, but also, to some degree, poses a barrier to the countryside. The lines, the people and groups who draw them, and the quantification that support them are only part of the process through which recreational landscapes become resources.
The resource relationships between the city and the countryside are persistent but they change over time. Bend's Urban Growth Boundary might draw a political line that separates the city from the countryside and that line has very real impacts on development, urban density, and the ecological landscapes on the urban fringe. The country and the city in Central Oregon, however, are not so easily separated. The city and the country come together through the production of resources, whether those resources are ponderosa pines transformed into 2x4s or wood paneling, the shade over a campground on the edge of a creek, or an unbroken canopy that Scott and Wendy Silver can look at from their home on Awbrey Butte. The roads, trails, river, and in some cases the lands themselves that supported the timber economy of Central Oregon are now essential to the development of outdoor recreation.

The connective infrastructure between the country and the city which once moved goods to the city for processing and shipping to outside markets now moves people into the city for leisure and out into the forests and mountains for outdoor recreation. Bend no longer brings raw materials in from its hinterland for processing, transportation and shipment somewhere else. It brings people in, caters to their needs, and sends them off to rural resorts, golf courses, ski areas, or hiking trails. It provides places for them to buy gear for their excursions out into the woods and their shopping, entertainment, dining and drinking needs in the city.

The tourists who come to Bend and the people who buy houses are also components of the development of recreational resources. The recreational resources are produced through the labor of those that build the trails and roads, those that maintain the
ski lifts and help people rent the right snowboard. They are produced by foresters who manage the landscape in ways that maximizes the potential for a variety of different uses. But they are also produced in committee rooms, in planners’ offices, in the conference room at the Central Oregon Environmental Center. They are produced through the manipulation of capital for resort development, for retail hubs, for urban parks that provide a site to ground the identity of the city. The city and the country come together and spill into each other. The region's natural resources act as reservoirs for that spillage. They also act as cauldrons. Fueled by the heat of capital investment, development, and aesthetic and ostentatious consumption, the recreational resources of Deschutes County link the city and the country through natural processes and through capital processes. They are linked through their history and through the ways that resource spaces in the countryside have been used and created in relation to the city.

The importance of recreational resources for development in the New West is historically contingent upon larger historical shifts, following WWII, in how people value nature. The trees necessary for timber production remained a critical component of the recreational value of the recreational landscapes that surround Bend. As recreational resources, however, those trees are needed in the forest. Their potential to burn and start houses on fire needs to be limited. They need to stay green to give the impression of a healthy forest. As wood fiber, trees were valuable for their capacity to be removed from the forest and transformed to lumber in the town’s mill. The shift in that value, and in the ways Americans produced, valued and consumed the natural world was part of a more
broad change in the ways Americans experienced the natural world. Samuel Hays writes that

throughout these twists and turns of environmental politics two broad forces were at work. One was the new values that emerged in the years after World War II, deeply rooted in the changing demography, improved standards of health and living, and enhanced levels of human aspiration. Environmental politics involves the working out of these historic changes in what people sought to think, be, and do. The other was the private and public apparatus that constituted the organizational society--the managerial institutions devised to shape the social and political order according to leaders' views of what was desirable and, in so doing, to discipline the lives of others. (Hays, 1998, p. 377)

Hays’ commentary on environmental politics and the shifting institutional battles undergird the cultural shifts associated with how we understand and value nature that Nicholas, Bapis, and Harvey (2003) argue makes the New West distinctive. The value of Bend's countryside, once measured in board feet, came to be measured in the quality of the view, the amount of hiking trails, the quality of fishing, and the ease of movement from the city to the country. Once prized as amenities, as important ingredients in what made Deschutes County unique, the recreational opportunities of the countryside became critically important to the economic livelihood of the town. The trees in the forest became more important economically than the timber in the mill. Capitalizing on those resources
required additional development to the city’s infrastructure and revamped the resource relationship between the country and the city.

Recreational resources, whether trails, ski-resorts, campgrounds, or viewsheds, are rarely consumed in their use. While fishing and hunting limits reduce the number of animals that are taken out of the area, and recreational activities can have significant impact on the environment, making it undesirable for other uses, the challenge of conserving recreational resources is the challenge of prolonging their use and negotiating competing demands for their ongoing desirability. Recreational resources, as natural resources, are consumed through the experience of them. Their consumption is an embodied and aesthetic. Further, the resources are marshaled for other commercial exploits. When I asked Don Bauhofer, the developer of the Leed Silver Certified Tetherow golf development, how many golf courses Bend could support, he told me flatly “about half as many as we have.” He told me this as he was building two new golf courses just off Century Drive at the beginning of the economic downturn. “I have to build them. Otherwise people don’t buy houses….And, they count as open space and wildlife habitat” under the Comprehensive Plan rules. (2008). Like Bauhofer’s golf course that doesn't get used but increases the value of homes in Tetherow, the presence of recreational resources support more traditional capital endeavors.

The value of recreational resources are closely tied to cultural trends concerning outdoor recreation, environmentalism, and how we can (or think we should) experience the natural world. Cultural shifts in how people found value in the land reconfigured
priorities for federal land management agencies in Deschutes County. Firms also found ways to capitalize on a new interest in living close to the land with easy access to the trails, lakes and streams in the countryside. The recreational space produced as a resource for Deschutes County was not simply a matter of setting aside land for recreational opportunities, but of developing new institutions to govern the mobility of animals, fire and viewsheds. The cultural shifts throughout America that led to repeated pronouncements of a crisis in outdoor recreation did more than simply put added pressure on the landscapes required for recreational activity. It also increased the legitimacy of protecting those lands, of treating them as resources for local communities and conserving them as such.

When Anne and I sat on top of Mt. Bachelor in 2008 we looked out over the country and the cities of Deschutes County. It was easy to look past the resource geographies and histories of the region and gaze in awe at the landscape around us. This is the other mystery of recreational resources, the very invisibility of their production. Critical resource geography has tended to focus on highly visible and visibly destructive resource productions and offer contemporary accounts of resource production. Adding a historical component to this work allows us to see how changing cultural and geographic contexts have reframed resource production. Recreational resources not only provide an "uncooperative commodity" in their geographical situation and the independent movement of components like deer or fire, but also in the ways that the material processes of production are masked through the obscuring properties of the cultural landscape.
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