

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
TRAIL MASTER PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 29, 2017

PRESENT: **Parks Commissioners:** Jim Lewis, Mike Gardiner
 Additional Committee Members: Luke Brandy, David Chapman, Torsten Heycke, Stephen Jensen, Jim McGinnis
 City and APRC Staff: Director Michael Black; APRC Interim Parks Superintendent Jeffrey McFarland; GIS Analyst Lea Richards
 APRC Minute-taker: Betsy Manuel

ABSENT: Chief-Forestry Resource Chis Chambers; Forestry Supervisor Jason Minica

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Chapman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. December 15, 2017

Motion: Lewis moved for approval of Minutes for December 15, 2017 as presented. Heycke seconded and the motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & GUEST SPEAKERS

There were none.

V. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

• *Writing Assignments for the Trails Master Plan Document*

Jensen suggested completion of the writing assignments for the Trails Master Plan as an additional Agenda item.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

• *Update on Using Google Docs*

McFarland stated that after working with Eric Bruhn, the City's database administrator, Google Docs was prepared for the task of editing the Trail Master Plan document. He noted that the City's IT department would be considered the owner of the Master Plan document. McFarland explained that each Committee member would receive an invitation to set up a link to the Google Docs site that would house the document. Committee members with City emails would be asked to contact Bruhn for assistance in setting up a login. Those with existing Gmail accounts would be able to access the document with their own password.

Heycke stated that there were privacy concerns for those using their own Gmail accounts. Jensen suggested that public access could be limited, with the designation of the editable document as proprietary information. McFarland agreed to look further into ways to preserve the privacy of Committee members.

McFarland stated that he had uploaded the document, dividing it into chapters for individual editors. He stated that the editable version would lack pictures and possibly other formatting. He demonstrated a view of the original document, noting that there was a version of the original document that was not editable. He suggested that it could be used as a tool when considering a change in the language.

The folder holding the draft language would be monitored by McFarland, who would also place the name of the person assigned to a chapter on the Chapter title. He noted that some chapters would be written by an individual member and some chapters would include two people.

The editable document had the capacity to track and save the changes. In response to a question by Gardiner, Heycke noted that the program automatically saved the document. McFarland relayed that when he gave permission for a member to edit a chapter, he would do so using the share button.

There followed a question and answer session as people explored the capabilities of Google Docs. McFarland noted that once members were assigned to a particular chapter, they would not be able to change the assignment without going through McFarland for the appropriate permission. This process will also apply when the rough draft was completed and was sent to the two final editors. Once their review was completed, the document would be discussed by the Committee in a public meeting and adopted. McFarland indicated that as long as there were no more than three members working on the document at the same time, the work would be in compliance with public meeting laws. He reiterated that four Committee members constituted a quorum.

Lewis asked about tracking to distinguish changes to the document from the original text. There followed a discussion about the recordkeeping involved in recording changes. Heycke noted that once the owner had accepted the document changes, it would be recorded as history. The history section would document the person or persons who created the changes. Once the document was accepted by the administrator then the editor's contributions were no longer highlighted.

It was agreed that the document should be viewable by all members and that the editing privileges would be limited to the person or persons assigned. Lewis indicated that it would be helpful to see everyone's changes as well.

Jensen distinguished between content editing and flow editing. He said his responsibilities as a final editor would be to consider whether the flow of the sentences or paragraphs worked or if the language should be modified for clarity. He stated that often those types of changes included punctuation as well as sentence construction and they could be so common that the document was not readily readable. Jensen highlighted that the final editor would be taking care to preserve the content as submitted.

Heycke noted that the "all changes saved in drive" button would preserve the changes. There followed discussion about the process and how it would work. It was agreed that chapters with more than one editor would list one as primary so that the final editors could review and send back without exceeding the three-person rule. McFarland added that if the editors could not agree, then the document changes should be discussed in a properly noticed meeting.

Differences between the original Master Plan and the updated version were discussed in the context of work completed by the consultant. It was noted that the current update would be underwritten by Committee members rather than the consultant taking on the responsibility of editing the document.

McFarland talked about the intensive process of acceptance into the City's Comprehensive Plan, stating that the public, City planners and the State of Oregon would weigh in – creating the potential for continued changes that would facilitate adoption of the Master Plan into the Comp Plan.

Richards asked about the process for submitting maps. She commented that drafts of the maps should be forwarded on to chapter editors for feedback. McFarland noted that maps as well as pictures should be forwarded to him for uploading into the document. Questions remained about the treatment of PDFs in the editing process.

Chapter Assignments

Jensen agreed to be responsible for the following chapters:

- Acknowledgment & Partnerships
- Executive Summary
- Trails Master Plan Process
- Trails Master Plan Vision, Goals and Objectives
- History

Brandy was assigned:

- Regional Trails
- Plan Sourcing Documents
- Cascade Foothills

Heycke agreed to be responsible for the following chapters:

- Trail Safety and Etiquette
- Glossary
- Eastside
- Westside

McFarland, Black and Goldman would work on:

- Implementation and Phasing
- Coordination with the City Comprehensive Plan
- Fauna

Chapman agreed to be responsible for the following chapters:

- Executive Summary
- Wright's Creek
- Cascade Foothills

Lewis agreed to be responsible for the following chapter:

- Ashland Creek Trail Corridor

Richards agreed to be responsible for:

- Maps

Discussion

Jensen shared a section from the Trail Master Plan Vision, Goals and Objectives that detailed the intent to tie the Trail Master Plan to the City's performance measures. He asked about the process for incorporating the document and the process that planners undertook to flag relevant components. Gardiner stated that adoption into the Comp Plan would bookmark plans for implementation, and that a number of processes would include consideration of the Master Plan. He indicated that the Parks and Rec Trail Master Plan functioned as a list of goals for trail connections and expansions and it was expected that planners would consider the potential for trails in areas where there were plans for development. Lewis agreed, stating that APRC also considered planning actions that came to them for comment. He noted that the more people aware of this document, the more relevant it became.

McFarland noted that City of Ashland Planner Brandon Goldman would contribute to chapters that had future plans for development, such as the Croman Mill site. He highlighted the benefits of partnering with organizations with stake in the trails system, noting the collaborative relationship with AWTA.

McFarland summarized the handout titled Google Docs/Document Writing and Editing Protocol – stressing one-way communications would ensure that no debate or deliberation took place. He noted the written restrictions for “serial meetings” that could be construed through discussions with more than two people – even if conducted one at a time.

VIII. UPCOMING MEETING DATES

January 12, 2017 @ 10:00 a.m. @ the Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR [later cancelled]

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Minute-Taker
Trail Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission

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 Commission Subcommittee meetings are digitally recorded and are available upon online.