

City of Ashland  
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION  
Minutes  
November 20, 2017

**ATTENDEES**

**Present:** Commissioners Gardiner, Heller, Landt, Lewis, Miller; Director Black; Recreation Superintendent Dials, Interim Parks Superintendent McFarland; Executive Assistant Dyssegard; Assistant Manuel

**Absent:** City Council Liaison Mayor Stromberg

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Gardiner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at The Grove 1195 E. Main.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

There was none.

**COMMUNITY GARDEN AND COST RECOVERY DISCUSSION (INFORMATION)**

- **Overview**

Dials introduced Nature Center Manager Libby Van Wyhe, and Nature Center Coordinator Jen Aguayo, noting that they would be discussing one of the programs that the Nature Center oversees - the Community Gardens. She stated that the annual program review included analysis of the associated cost recovery program. Dials noted that the topic had been properly noticed, including signs in all of the Community Gardens and in emails to the registered gardeners.

Dials highlighted Ashland's four gardens – explaining that there were ten plots at Garden Way Park, ten plots at Scenic Park, twelve plots at Clay Street Park and forty-five (45) plots at Ashland Creek Park. Garden plots varied in size, with small plots measuring 4 X 12 and the largest plots measuring 20 x 20.

Aguayo stated that as Coordinator for the gardens, her duties included communication, addressing any concerns or disputes, acting as a liaison between Parks staff and the gardeners themselves and providing contact lists, maps, and supplies as needed. She indicated that there was a waiting list for some of the gardens.

Aguayo contrasted the small wait lists for the majority of gardens with the list for Ashland Creek Park that was approximately 50 people long.

Aguayo stated that her duties associated with the gardens included training garden managers, managing contracts between APRC and the volunteers and tracking the number of volunteer hours. Gardiners were required to spend at least four hours per week caring for their gardens. Aguayo said community garden agreements clearly outlined expectations regarding the upkeep of each individual plot.

Lewis asked whether gardeners were required to reside within Ashland; Aguayo replied that there was no such restriction. Dials reported that people were encouraged to pick a garden spot located within a quarter mile of their residences – even though there was no requirement to do so.

Gardiner asked about the role of garden manager. Aguayo referred to the unique culture of each of the garden areas, stating that there was at least one manager per garden. Organizational structure was said to vary from

garden to garden – from one manager in charge to management by committee. For their efforts, garden managers were offered either a free garden plot or a partial garden plot, depending upon the number of managers per garden.

- **Cost Recovery Review**

Dials said Commissioners began reviewing all fees and charges associated with the APRC system in 2008. Current community garden fees were charged per square foot, with the costs fluctuating from \$29.00 to \$75.00 annually. In 2013, garden fees were increased. Since that time, staff had discovered pricing inequities. Dials detailed fees from Ashland Creek Park garden plots (\$.24 per sq. ft.) up to Garden Way Park garden plots (\$.60 per square ft.). As plot sizes changed, so did the charges, with little uniformity throughout the system.

Landt asked about low-income applicants and whether gardeners were able to acquire a plot without paying the fee. Dials replied that scholarships were available through the Ashland Parks Foundation and was given the same opportunity to apply.

In response to a question by Landt, Aguayo described the work of Parks Technicians relative to the gardens: emptying garbage, fixing fence posts and general maintenance. For the two larger gardens, that might include bringing in a dump truck to remove debris. VanWyhe stated that the workers also kept the pathways and common areas free of debris. Water was turned on in the spring and off before winter, depending upon the weather.

Dials reported actual revenues and expenses, noting that cost recovery for 2016/2017 was approximately 18%, with APRC subsidizing \$15,641.39 for that period. Revenues were \$3,542.00 collectively during that timeframe, with operating expenses of \$1,519.00. In response to a question by Gardiner, Dials noted that the expenses did not include construction costs. The Nature Center managed the Community Garden budget, including personnel. The Coordinator for the program spent approximately 10% of her time on the gardens at a cost of \$9,011.25. The Nature Center Office Assistant worked approximately 3% of her time on the gardens at a value of @4,202.91. The Park Technician who helped with maintenance was budgeted for three hours per week (\$6,45.23).

Dials noted that a comparative analysis was used to provide a perspective regarding cost recovery norms. She stated that full cost recovery, as an example, would be approximately \$1.40 per square ft. Ashland's average for the year was approximately \$.45 per square ft. Dials asked that the Commissioners discuss a set fee per square ft. and give direction as to whether the fees should be capped. She suggested a tiered approach to reach \$.60 per square ft. for all gardens.

There followed a brief discussion about creating an equitable, affordable solution. Dials asked for guidance from the Commissioners in advance of garden contracts renewals in January 2018.

## **PUBLIC INPUT**

**Carol Carlson** of 509 N. Mountain Ave, Ashland OR. was called forward.

Carlson noted that according to her research, most community gardens did not calculate fees per square ft.; rather, fees were assessed per member. Utility expenses seemed to be the only exception. She proposed that all members be charged a base rate that would cover maintenance and staff expenses as well as charging a fee per square ft. For example, if the base rate was \$30 and space rent for a 20 x 20 was \$50, then the total fee would be \$80.00. In this way, the costs are equitable.

Lewis inquired further into results using the proposed fee schedule. Carlson replied that it would increase fees slightly. She stated that personnel costs could be decreased by assigning more tasks to garden volunteers. She

stated that in her experience, most volunteers were willing to work more than the hours required of them. Most would be willing and capable of taking on some duties currently completed by staff.

**Cathy Stash** of 133 Orange Ave. Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Stash highlighted the four-hour per week requirement, stating that not all garden plots required the same amount of care. She indicated that moving to a full cost recovery model would not be acceptable. Stash asked about other APRC programs and the rate of subsidy for those, such as the Ice Rink and Golf Course.

**Ann Cramer** of Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Cramer commented that the Clay Street plots seemed to cost more than the others. She stated that there were significant differences between the locations. At Ashland Creek Park, for example, wooden frames and amended soils were provided by members, when they were provided by APRC at other locations. Stash talked about the advantages of framed beds that contained the soil – making the gravel pathways easier to maintain. She highlighted efforts by volunteers to conserve water.

Cramer indicated that as a garden manager, she was called upon to mediate disputes, orient and train newcomers, and conduct monthly inspections. She stated that Ashland Creek Park gardeners provided a total of 180 volunteer hours - enough time to maintain the gardens and weed the Park's grounds. She indicated that volunteers would be willing to perform other functions to save staff time.

**Patrick Marcus** of 111 South 2<sup>nd</sup> St. Ashland OR. was called forward.

Marcus noted that the Ashland Creek Park garden began as an experimental garden many years ago. Now, with 45 garden plots, there was an economy of scale that could not be equated to other locations. In addition, there were unique expenses due to the number of plots. He suggested that an analysis should include those underlying components.

Marcus stated that the Ashland Creek Park gardens started before other locations were developed. A concept plan evolved and lessons were learned and applied to other gardens. He talked about hosting training events, orientation events and other similar opportunities.

Marcus stated that there was a point where a garden was no longer cost effective. He intimated that people participated because of the intrinsic joy of gardening. Marcus suggested the gardens are a service provided for the citizens of Ashland and, as such, should remain at reasonable cost rather than with a cost net zero situation.

#### Commissioner Discussion

Landt thanked staff for bringing the matter to the Commissioners' attention, given the inequity involved. He relayed that APRC tried to be as fair as possible in all program and service offerings. He noted that no APRC program returned 100% cost recovery. Heavily subsidized services included important responsibilities to teach children to swim and provide a senior program with access to caregiving services. Landt contrasted those vital services with the purely recreational, noting that the Oak Knoll Golf Course, for example, returned between 50% and 80% in cost recovery, depending upon the weather year. He stated that in his opinion, the community garden was an opportunity that could support a reasonable rate of cost recovery.

Heller stated that although everyone might prefer that APRC offer programs at no cost, every program was reviewed for cost recovery.

Lewis stated that when the Community Garden program began, it provided a recreational service that resonated with Ashland residents. The gardens appealed to a broad spectrum of people – from children to seniors, including those confined to wheelchairs. An educational component complemented the gardens, including a special children's garden in Ashland Creek Park. He stated that the gardens were a valued amenity and the intent of a review for cost recovery was not to recover the full cost of the services provided; rather, it was an exercise in balancing continuously rising costs with APRC's mandate to provide premier recreational services in a responsible manner.

Miller agreed with Landt, noting that recognizing the need for vital services as well as recreational services factored into the need for cost recovery. In this case there was an inequity that could be addressed. He indicated that the idea for a base rate and a user fee seemed to be a sensible way to address both issues. He applauded the suggestion that asking more of the garden volunteers would be a way to cut expenses.

Gardiner stated that an 18% cost recovery rate seemed low in comparison to other programs. He noted that feedback from staff regarding a realistic reduction of staff time would be helpful. If the expenses went down, the rate of cost recovery would go up. Gardiner emphasized that if it became apparent that the fees had to increase, the projected increase would be applied over a period of years so the changes were incremental.

Gardiner indicated that in his opinion, the user fee per square ft. should be the same for all locations. Landt stated that while there were some economies of scale depending upon the garden, the differences were not substantial. He talked about the cost to create Ashland Creek Park (\$100,000), stating that it was probably the most expensive of the gardens to build; the Rolls Royce of APRC gardens. That said, he noted that cost recovery was not predicated upon the cost to build the facilities; rather, cost recovery was based upon expenses.

Lewis acknowledged the costs absorbed by gardeners at Ashland Creek Park – noting that his own garden was not cost effective either. He stated that in his opinion, it was important to address the inequities. Landt noted that the inequities included plots costing \$.60 per square ft. while the plots at Ashland Creek Park were \$.29 per square ft. The longest waiting list was at Ashland Creek Park. Landt stated that \$.60 per square ft. cost seemed more in line with the cost recovery charges for other APRC programs.

VanWyhe stated that large expenses such as irrigation and other construction costs, offset by APRC, were not reflected in the Nature Center Budget. Black stated that there was always some overlap of expenditures that were outside the budgets of all APRC programs.

Miller commented that if the recovery rate were set at \$.60 per square ft. it would be comparable at 45% to other APRC programs and would seem to be equitable. He cautioned against setting the price so high that people had difficulty participating.

Landt stated that it made sense to establish a cost recovery rate similar to other programs. Landt reiterated concerns about affordability while noting that there was a mechanism in place where scholarships could be obtained through the Ashland Parks Foundation.

Lewis emphasized the focus on a reasonable fee that could be applied in increments and that reducing operating expenses could significantly affect the outcome. He recommended that once implemented, the impact should be reviewed annually. Lewis indicated that a large increase – even if applied incrementally - could become problematic, taking away the value of the community use. He advocated for careful evaluation.

Miller noted other recovery rates, including the Golf Course, with rates of 50% to 80% for cost recovery, and the Daniel Meyer Pool at approximately 45%. He said it would seem that the gardens at 18% should be evaluated and adjusted.

Aguayo pointed out that the gardens provided benefits that reached the entire community. She stated that the number of scholarships might be limited, leaving some potential gardeners without funding.

Black stated that the Commissioners were supportive of the gardens and budgeted accordingly. He explained that cost recovery stretched APRC's \$2.09 in tax funding (per \$1,000 of assessed property value) across all APRC programs. Revenues from cost recoveries could be used to bolster vital services and create new programs. Black indicated that there was an appropriate cost recovery percentage for every APRC program, as determined by the Commissioners, that allowed APRC to stretch its funding to encompass the greatest number of programs and services.

Landt noted that with some of the gardens being charged \$.60 per square ft. and others a lesser amount, staff had brought the inequity forward as a matter of fairness. There was no indication that the \$.60 price per square ft. was excessive. If a price increase became a burden for some and the Foundation could not accommodate those people, the Commissioners would again review the issue. He stated that the inequity must be addressed and it made sense that a significant increase would entail incremental steps over two or three years. Landt did not agree with an annual review, only that a review would take place if there was a substantial change. With the goal set, and incremental steps taken, then the process would move forward.

Heller advocated for a review of several options as proposed by staff.

McFarland commented that the APRC budget for operations increased 9% per year for utilities – including water used for irrigating the gardens. The cost of hauling debris did not rise this year but might in future years.

Lewis highlighted the proposed \$3.5 million dollars for a new pool. He stated that APRC would not be able to recover the funds used for construction and that cost recovery for that as well as the gardens relied on the intrinsic value of the service – something that was difficult to quantify. Lewis suggested that a fair price, increased incrementally, seemed to be appropriate. He supported the intent to resolve the inequity, with the caveat that he would prefer something less than a 45% cost recovery ratio. Lewis noted that costs continually rose, and cost recovery should be reasonable and balanced.

Dials stated that staff would propose incremental steps for various options to get to an equitable cost recovery goal, beginning with \$.60 per square ft. Lewis asked that consideration also be given to Carlson's idea of a base rate per member along with a fee per square ft. Gardiner asked that the evaluation include ideas about reducing personnel costs and the adjustments necessary for increasing utility costs. Miller talked about his preference for a base fee plus a fee per square ft. He stated that in his opinion, the current 18% cost recovery seemed to be low compared to other APRC programs.

### **POOL UPDATE DISCUSSION (*Information*)**

Black noted the previous presentation about the expenses and funding for a competitive pool. He stated that the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) was reaching capacity because of increasing construction costs. The cost of building the pool as proposed was approximately \$3.2 to 3.5 million. The actual cost to construct a new pool – versus one that upgrades the existing pool and adds new elements – would be approximately \$7.5 to \$10 million.

Black stated that there was a recognized need for a year-round, competition-style, regional swimming pool. APRC had an opportunity to create one at a discounted rate utilizing the space currently housing the Daniel Mayer Pool. Most of the infrastructure would remain in place with the exception of the pool itself – i.e. the bath house and other structures. He indicated that using the bathhouse and restrooms at Hunter Park would facilitate competitive swim meets without the need to build new facilities.

Black talked about the HVAC system and the higher-than-usual contingency for the project, indicating that there were still some unknowns. Construction costs were rising and the timing for a bond issue to pay for the project was uncertain. He stated that in spite of reports to the contrary, the pool would fit within the area of the existing property and would not affect adjacent structures. Black noted that the numbers might change once a plan was approved, but current cost estimates were as close to actual costs as possible. In response to a question by Heller, Black indicated that the design work would be more detailed prior to securing a bond, but that a bid for services would not take place until after the bond was approved.

Landt commented that he understood the need for a competitive pool but asked for assurance that no current programs would be compromised. Black replied that an evaluation was completed to that effect. He stated that a more accurate summation of the project would be that APRC was building a community pool that could function as a competitive pool as needed. He stated that all uses of the pool would be preserved. Miller stated that the new pool had the capability to provide multiple types of users concurrently.

There followed further discussion about the different kinds of uses and the increased capacity for multiple uses. Miller stated that the pool would work for water polo as well as for small children learning to swim in shallow water. In response to a question by Lewis about the cover – Miller stated that the proposed cover was the same as one that was working well in Hood River – a windy city located in the Columbia Gorge.

Black relayed that the school districts would be asked to contribute 24% of the annual operational budget. Other users would contribute 13% and APRC would be at 63%. The numbers were put together by the pool company. He stated that additional personnel would be needed for the larger pool but the initial hours of operation would remain as they were now – approximately 180 days per year. The estimated budget for operating the pool was \$306,000 annually if the current schedule was maintained. The cost represented all operational expenses including personnel. Black indicated that current expenses were approximately \$160,000, with costs recovery at about 50%.

Heller asked about a commitment from the school districts. Black explained that all materials would be managed by APRC including those chemicals used by other groups. To accommodate the extra responsibility, APRC would add an oversight and management fee of 15% - something to which the School District would have to agree in addition to their share of operating costs. Personnel costs were adjusted with the understanding that user groups would provide their own personnel during their time on site. This management fee would be charged in proportion to the percentages outlined. Black noted that the School District and other user groups would be required to budget for operating expenses and the remuneration would offset APRC's operational costs per user.

Black commented that the Phoenix/Talent School District had considered building their own pool, but at \$10 million they decided against it. Consequently, the District contracted with APRC for use of the Daniel Meyer pool for their swim team. Black stated that without firm commitments from the school districts, APRC would not move forward with the proposed pool. He noted that the expenses for the new pool would result in an increase in expenses for both school districts. Phoenix/Talent would be paying more than they currently were for use of Ashland's pool as would the Ashland School District. This would need to be approved by their School Boards, and there were no

guarantees that the schools would commit to the extra costs long-term. Without commitments from the partners, the project would not move forward.

Black stated that partnering with the Ashland School District on a bond issue would provide the public with an understanding of the collaboration between governmental entities – a positive in today’s world. On the other hand, Ashland residents would have more equity in the project because the capital costs for construction would be shouldered by Ashland residents. Black suggested that the Commissioners consider whether those who use the facility who are outside Ashland’s boundaries should pay a premium for using the Ashland facility.

There followed a brief discussion about the commitments needed to build and maintain the proposed pool. Agreements would be for ten years or more.

**Pat Turner** of 2120 Greenmeadows Way, Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Turner presented written testimony - the highlights of which are described as follows:

Turner referred to the October 23, 2017, presentation regarding replacement of the Daniel Meyer recreational pool with a competitive pool. She detailed a series of efforts to collaborate with SOU and the YMCA to obtain partners for the project – asking about the outcome of those talks. Turner noted that at a joint meeting with the Ashland City Council, Mayor Stromberg commented that the pool project should include a feasibility study and a public forum to build a consensus for a new pool. She reported comments about the project from Councilpersons Rosenthal, Voisin and March. Commissioner Landt stated that it was possible that the maintenance costs could be more than the debt service for a bond and that a competitive pool would not maximize revenue.

Turner stated that the idea of replacing the Daniel Meyer Pool with a competition pool was, in her opinion, not well received by residents. She noted that a competition pool would serve specific users and could preclude some of the important recreational aspects of a recreational pool such as teaching children to swim. Turner questioned the calculated water costs.

Turner talked briefly about the Ashland School District’s School Bond Committee dilemma regarding a decision to include funding for a \$3.5 million pool. She stated that there was a concern that doing so might jeopardize the school bond to the detriment of the District’s needs. Referencing the upset caused by the Senior Program controversy, Turner requested that APRC slow deliberations and take steps to ensure public input.

**Todd Lantry** of 11158 Corp Ranch Rd. Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Lantry stated that he was the swim coach for Ashland High School and a Rogue Valley Masters swimmer. He acknowledged the concern that a competitive pool would benefit specific users, but noted that the facility would engage people who were not currently served.

Lantry noted that the proposed pool was more flexible than the current pool and would accommodate more uses than were currently offered. Revenue could be enhanced if swimmers could host competitions, attracting people from other states to the area. The new pool would be more user friendly for seniors with limited mobility because it would be easier to get in to. The close proximity to the Senior Center would facilitate additional activities for seniors. Lantry highlighted the recreational component that included the adjacent Hunter Park.

Lantry advocated for a School District bond, noting that the financing would be serviced by people outside City limits as well as by Ashland residents.

**Jocelyn Sanford** of 2687 Mickelson Way, Ashland OR. was called forward.

Sanford stated that as a mother of three, a physical therapist, a masters swimmer and a volunteer coach for the boys and girls water polo teams, she strongly supported the Daniel Meyer Pool re-build, which she described as a multi-use, multigenerational facility. She listed a myriad of purposes that the pool could accommodate, including those for recreational uses, therapeutic uses, educational uses and competitive uses.

#### Commissioner Discussion

Black stated that he would like guidance from the Commissioners regarding the direction of the pool project – the conceptual design of the pool and the anticipated funding sources. He noted that he had provided an update of the project to date. Black emphasized that the key to moving forward would be agreements with the School Districts regarding a commitment to pay a percentage of the operating costs (as discussed) and approval to piggyback the School District bond request with \$3.5 million for the proposed project.

Black noted that if the bond was not approved, there would still be a need to do a major overhaul of the existing pool at some point during the next 10 years.

Gardiner noted that the process for this project had included negotiations with the YMCA. The YMCA decided against a partnership for the project. APRC had discussed the opportunity to build a regional pool with stakeholders that included the City of Ashland, SOU and the YMCA. He proposed a joint meeting with the Ashland School District to further discuss the pool as well as the purchase of the Briscoe and Lincoln Elementary School properties.

Landt noted that if the project did not move forward, the existing pool would need to be replaced at a cost of approximately \$2 million or more depending upon inflation. He indicated that in his opinion, a renovation would not ensure additional utility.

Landt stated that the label “competitive pool” was misleading, suggesting that it be characterized as a “recreational/competitive” pool. Lewis added that the pool situation had been discussed for years and replacing the pool at this time would reset the clock for an estimated 30 years. The community needed a pool and the proximity of the pool to so many recreational amenities, centrally located, enhanced the community aspect for the next several generations.

Miller stated that the pool as planned would serve far more people than it did today. In addition, there would be a warm, shallow pool that would provide a therapeutic option that wasn’t there previously, and a deep portion for new uses such as water polo and competitive events. The shallow portion that was part of the recreational pool would continue to be used for swim lessons and children’s play. Miller stated that the pool would need extensive renovations in the not-too-distant future, and the upgrades would better serve the community.

Black noted that the impact for the Senior Center should be positive - with increased water options and easier access. He explained that water estimates for the new pool were quoted to APRC by the City of Ashland. The estimate was the cost to supply the pool annually with water – including calculations of a half-inch per day to account for evaporation.

Heller suggested articulating the vision for the new pool in the Park Views. He stated that it was time to make the case in support of the pool and to clarify the public’s perception that it would be a *competitive pool only* while it would actually facilitate *enhanced recreational uses* as well.

In response to a question by Heller, Black stated that Medford had identified the need for a pool – particularly a large regional pool that would serve the Valley. He indicated that, currently, there were no solid plans for a regional pool in the Rogue Valley. He noted that even if a regional pool were built, the Daniel Mayer Pool would still need to be upgraded to meet the needs of the Ashland community.

### **BEACH CREEK UPDATE (Information)**

McFarland presented a detailed report of the Beach Creek repairs completed to date – including actual costs for materials. He stated that the budgeted amount for repairs was \$75,000. Actual expenses were at \$18,935.30, leaving a balance of \$56,06461. McFarland explained that the engineer provided plans for the improvements at no cost, as did the contractor.

McFarland reviewed the final repairs slated for the fall of 2018 and explained, step by step, the technical work needed for completion. The total estimated cost for supplementary bank grading, rock and restoration at the upstream site and repair of the bank and safeguards for the bridge footings were at \$20,075 - \$27,075. With a 25% contingency, costs would be at \$25,093.25 - \$33,848.75. McFarland stated that the work would be completed in-house. He explained plans to lift the bridge to reinforce the footings. He emphasized that a thorough review had been completed that included consultation with experts in the field. In response to a question by Heller, McFarland highlighted the expertise of Parks staff based on a previous project. He explained that there was a back-up plan as well, should conditions on the ground warrant a different approach.

McFarland noted that repairs to the North Mountain Park asphalt path and sidewalk, including crack seal and concrete with a contingency of 25%, would be \$1,966.32. In response to a comment by Landt about the timing for the project, McFarland stated that the money would be set aside until the Beach Creek project was fully completed in 2018.

**Motion:** Landt moved to transfer \$21,000 from the Beech Creek project to purchase bear-resistant trash cans for Lithia Park. Miller seconded.

### Discussion

Landt stated that he supported the motion but felt that he should relay his concerns. He explained that he was of the opinion that the degradation of Beach Creek below the bridge had occurred when the original bridge was installed. When the pipe was put in place, it changed the hydraulics and began the process of erosion. At that time, construction was done without a full understanding of the impacts. Landt indicated that in his opinion, APRC was responsible for creating that situation. He noted that there was still a section of creek below the bridge that was degraded and the \$21,000 surplus could be used for improvements in that area. Landt stated that he would vote for the transfer of funds but would advocate that funding for a fix be included in the next budget.

**Motion:** Landt moved to transfer \$21,000 from the Beach Creek project to purchase bear-resistant trash cans for Lithia Park. Miller seconded.

The vote was all yes.

### **STAFF UPDATES**

- ***Oak Knoll Golf Course***

McFarland stated that rat problems were increasing at the Oak Knoll Golf Course shop. He noted that there was no rat-proof container to store grass seed and that was attracting the vermin. McFarland explained that a steel container would cost approximately \$4,000. In response to a question by Landt, he relayed that there were six full pallets of seed.

Landt asked about managing the inventory so that excess seed was not stored at the facility. Black noted that staff would be working on a solution and the update was informational only.

- ***Ashland Rotary Centennial Ice Rink Opening***

Dials stated that opening night at the Ice Rink was well attended (approximately 125 people). The new ice rink trailer was well designed and appreciated by staff. Black stated his appreciation for the trailer's donor, the Ashland Rotary.

- ***Joint Meeting with Ashland School Board***

Gardiner asked for a consensus to continue to pursue a joint session with the Ashland School District. There followed a brief discussion about scheduling the meeting. It was agreed that Gardiner would further pursue a meeting date that would accommodate the School Board.

### **ADJOURNMENT INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

By consensus, Gardiner adjourned into Executive Session pursuant to ORS. 192.660 (2) (h) at 9:48 p.m.

### **ADJOURNMENT OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION**

By consensus, Gardiner adjourned out of executive session at 10:15 p.m.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Assistant

*These Notes 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 Commission Study Sessions and Regular meetings are digitally recorded and are available upon online.*