

City of Ashland  
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION  
TRAIL MASTER PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 7, 2018

**PRESENT:**       **Parks Commissioners:** Jim Lewis  
                  **APRC Director:** Michael Black  
                  **Additional Committee Members:** Luke Brady, Stephen Jensen, Jeffrey McFarland, Jim McGinnis  
                  **City and APCR Staff:** Jason Minica, Forestry supervisor; GIS Analyst Lea Richards  
                  **APRC Minute-taker:** Susan Dyssegard, Assistant Betsy Manuel

**ABSENT:**       Chis Chambers, David Chapman, Mike Gardiner

**I.       CALL TO ORDER**

Acting Chair Jensen called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR.

**II.      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*a. Minutes of June 29, 2018 and July 13, 2018*

**Motion:** Lewis moved to approve the Minutes of June 29, 2018, and July 13, 2018, as presented. McFarland seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**III.     PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & GUEST SPEAKERS**

*a. Open Forum*

**Egon Dubois** of 381 W. Nevada St. in Ashland was called forward.

Dubois thanked everyone for their work on the Trails Master Plan. He asked questions about the Plan with regard to concerns from a cyclist's point of view. He said the maps seemed to focus on depictions of creek corridors in Ashland, basically following creek drainages as they traversed the City. He asked about the practicalities of traveling the routes and wondered how walkers, bikers or runners would find their way. He talked about the need for signage and updated maps that could be posted / accessed along the routes. Dubois expressed concern about portions of trails that follow Ashland roads and said bike lanes, even with clear signage, were not always safe.

Richards stated that the routes he was referring to came from the City's Transportation Master Plan. Lewis explained the difference between the Transportation Master Plan and the Trails Master Plan, indicating that the Trails Master Plan was focused primarily on walking, biking and hiking trails that traveled through public lands. The Plan details a "wish list" of possible future trails that could be developed through acquisition of easements across private properties and within public lands. Lewis explained that the goal was to provide an alternative to traveling on the roadways.

Dubois commented that he was interested in marking the trails so that directions would be clear and easy to follow as well as intuitive. He questioned allowances for vehicles such as electric bikes on the trails – and how best to keep users safe. He asked those present to consider limiting motorized access to the trails.

Jensen noted that the Trails Committee had an extensive conversation about electric bikes within the context of the Trails Master Plan – with the awareness that the original Trails Master Plan created in 2006 had not foreseen the

development of electric bike assists and the need to manage the use. Black relayed that the Oregon Department of Transportation had also been working on how best to integrate electric bikes. He noted that when electric bikes travel from a bike lane to a slower-moving pedestrian sidewalk it becomes problematic. Black talked about the need for regulations while acknowledging that electric bikes encourage people to travel by alternative routes – providing options to traditional modes of transportation.

Lewis agreed, reiterating that ten+ years ago when the original Master Plan was written, electric bikes were not yet on the horizon and Segways were almost unknown. Black stated that even with clear signage outlining uses, people were apt to travel according to preference.

In response to a comment from Dubois, McFarland noted that there were currently two ways to travel through Ashland and on to Medford via Ashland's Central Bike Path or the Creek to Crest Trail. He explained the development process that created the routes – noting that they were developed in collaboration with the City's Safety Engineer in conjunction with other City Departments. He stated that the routes were thought to be the best possible avenues at the time.

Black added that the facilities located in the public right of way were not addressed in the Trails Master Plan. He recommended that Dubois continue to express his safety concerns for those areas with the Transportation Commission, Ashland Public Works and others. He said routes were engineered and developed for safety, but pathways were considered either safe or unsafe depending upon each traveler's point of view. Black talked about directional maps, noting that mapping was a much bigger question than could be addressed through the Trails Master Plan.

***b. Review Additional Public Input Since Last Meeting***

There was none.

**IV. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA**

There were none.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was none.

**NEW BUSINESS**

***a. Review Mularz Edits (Mularz via phone)***

Format editor Mularz commented that the Trails Master Plan would most likely be utilized online and, because of that, additional color had been added and larger images were formatted. A 2-column format was used to create a spacious feel while packing in content. Changes were also made to narratives, making them more inviting and facilitating textual flow.

Lewis asked about the text on the cover page for each Chapter. Mularz said they were text placeholders but that area could show lead-in text about the chapter and include photo captions. Jensen suggested that an enticing sentence be carried forward from the Chapter – highlighting the topic and drawing attention to the content to follow. Mularz agreed to do so, stating that the caption would be predicated upon the preferences of the Trails Master Plan Committee.

Jensen talked about ways to integrate the maps and asked for member feedback. McGinnis replied that two maps would be helpful – one that could be viewed on the computer and the other that would be formatted for use on smart phones. He explained that georeferencing would be helpful in the field. He clarified that one column works

best for cell phones whereas two columns work well on computers. Mularz agreed, stating that hyperlinks within the document might be utilized for that purpose. He suggested that the initial document be reviewed and corrected as a first step, with additional formatting for smart phone use taking place thereafter.

Richards noted that the City of Ashland website had been updated and was responsive in that it could sense what device was accessing the information and format the information appropriately. She asked about the possibility of duplicating that technology for the Trails Master Plan. Jensen suggested postponing decisions about each type of use until the initial document was completed. He talked about a truncated version that could assist people in the field, primarily with reviewing maps. In response to a question by Jensen, Mularz stated that a hyperlink could access a map within the document, thereby eliminating the need to toggle back and forth.

Jensen emphasized the beauty of the photos in the draft document. He asked about captions for the pictures and acknowledgements of photographers. Mularz advised a multi-disciplinary approach for the photos, using captions where appropriate or pulling quotes from the copy when the photo introduced a chapter. He cautioned against having too many pieces of information competing for the readers' attention. Black suggested referencing the topography so that features could be identified.

Jensen talked about the procedures for making changes. It was agreed that one person would be appointed by the Committee to act as a conduit between Committee members and the format editor. Mularz agreed, stating that a summary of any corrections would be helpful with notations as to where the language should be inserted or changed. He expressed a concern about formatting the actual document, as editing should not include moving the design and text around. Brandy stated that the document was essentially finished and proposed changes would be minor. It was agreed that the information would be replayed to Mularz via APRC point person Susan Dyssegard.

Jensen asked about a timeline for completion. Mularz noted that the bulk of the production could be completed within the week, with some back and forth for captions and corrections. Refinements would take another week or two.

Mularz asked about placement of acknowledgements and partnerships as well as the best location for the Executive Summary. Jensen relayed his preference to place the Executive Summary at the beginning of the document. Richards said that, in her opinion, Executive Summaries were often at the beginning of documents, with acknowledgments typically at the end. Jensen inquired about acknowledgements for the Committee in terms of whether the Trails Master Plan authors should be included. Richards noted that the original Master Plan began with a title page that referred to a cooperative effort without listing individuals. Black differentiated between the special acknowledgment of individuals and a general statement explaining that work by the Trails Master Plan Committee had made the update possible. He suggested looking for a prototype prior to making a final decision so that common usage could be identified and copied for consistency.

McGinnis suggested, for ease of access, that the Executive Summary refer to the Trails Master Plan Committee with a hyperlink to the acknowledgments where individuals were named. Black noted that in his opinion, the list of those spearheading the Plan should be at the beginning of the document, with acknowledgments for ancillary groups appearing at the end.

Jensen asked committee members to send their corrections to him first. Once confirmed by Jensen, changes would be routed to Dyssegard who would collaborate with format editor Mularz for incorporation into the document. Dyssegard stated that hard copy changes could be made on the document, then scanned and sent to Mularz. McGinnis agreed, noting his preference for visual instruction rather than a memorandum detailing page, paragraph and changes therein.

A discussion about the timing for next steps ensued. There was consensus for a final meeting on October 5, 2018. After further conversation, it was agreed that - to avoid process redundancies - the version leading up to that meeting would be edited by Dyssegard and sent along to Jensen and Mularz, with follow-up edits provided by Committee members.

**b. *TID Trail Closure Between Walker and Terrace (McGinnis)***

McGinnis noted that he had met with homeowners who were building in the Paradise area along the TID ditch. He stated that there was a concern about the ditch closure and how it would impact the developing neighborhood. He reported that the homeowner envisioned a walkway with benches along the ditch, explaining that his property line was two to five feet from the TID ditch. McGinnis stated that property owners in the area must work together to remedy the situation – as the properties were outside City boundaries. McFarland noted that an agreement had been reached with the property owners many years ago but the Bureau of Reclamation would not agree to a trail in that area.

Brandy noted that one property owner there had been confrontational and plans for a wildlife refuge were not feasible. Black stated that a prescriptive easement could be a solution but the City was constrained because of its location. He talked about offering to purchase an easement as an alternative. McGinnis agreed, relaying that an easement would benefit the homeowner by ensuring more control, given that the alternative would be to build a trail around or just outside the disputed property.

**c. *Ashland Pond Trail Update***

Black announced that a portion of the trail leading to Ashland Pond had been blocked. He shared the background, noting that APRC could build access to the Pond on bordering property but that offering to purchase an easement for a trail already in existence was more appropriate.

Black note that after much discussion, the homeowner agreed to allow temporary access until a final agreement could be reached. Lewis noted that in this case, the alternative would be to build a walkway around the property – an added expense for APRC – and that purchasing an easement might be less expensive.

Black agreed, stating that the homeowner’s concern stemmed from a long-ago re-routing of the bike path. The contention was the noise that the new pathway generated. Black noted that there were different ways to mitigate the situation and he would continue to work with the property owner on a more agreeable solution.

**d. *Roundtable Discussion***

There was none.

**VII. UPCOMING MEETING DATE**

October 5, 2018 @ The Siskiyou Room—51 Winburn Way -10:00 a.m.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT – 10:30 a.m.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Minute-Taker

These Minutes are not a verbatim record. The narrative has been condensed and paraphrased at times to reflect the discussions and decisions made. Ashland Parks and Recreation Committee meetings are digitally recorded; meeting recordings are available upon request.