

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
AD-HOC SENIOR PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ASPAC)
MEETING MINUTES
February 12, 2018

Committee Members Present:

- Jackie Bachman, Citizen Member (Senior Program Patron / ASPAC Chair)
- Marion Moore, Citizen Member (Senior Program Yoga Instructor / ASPAC Vice Chair)
- Anne Bellegia, OLLI Representative (Volunteer Member)
- Peggy Byrnes, Citizen Member (Senior Program Patron)
- Rob Casserly, Citizen Member (SOU, OLLI Program Manager)
- Katharine Danner, Ashland At Home Representative
- Mike Gardiner, APRC Commissioner
- Jim Lewis, APRC Commissioner
- Laura O'Bryon, RVCOG Representative
- Mary Russell-Miller, Citizen Member (SOU Faculty Member)
- Stef Seffinger, Ashland City Councilor

Facilitator Present:

- Jon Lange, Jon Lange Consulting

Staff Members Present:

- Michael Black, APRC Director
- Rachel Dials, APRC Recreation Superintendent
- Susan Dyssegard, APRC Executive Assistant

Committee and Staff Members Absent:

- None

I. Opening and Reminders (Lange, 2 minutes)

Facilitator Jon Lange called the meeting to order at 3:15pm at Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main Street in Ashland. He reminded everyone to speak into their microphones and pointed to the ground rules posted in the meeting room.

II. Approval of Minutes (Bachman, 5 minutes)

MOTION: Lewis moved / Bellegia seconded approval of the minutes as presented.

The vote was all yes

III. Public Input (20 minutes)

Jocelyn Sanford, 2687 Mickelsen Way in Ashland, Oregon, a mother of three and a physical therapist who worked with seniors and as a youth water polo coach, said the Senior Center's recent association with a rebuilt pool was unfortunate as they were not the same issue. Displaying copies of the *Ashland Daily Tidings* from several years past, in which efforts to rebuild the pool were highlighted, she expressed disappointment that the pool project was now being derailed by a small group; mainly Ashland SOS (Support Our Seniors). She said Ashland needed both a Senior Center and an upgraded community swimming pool. She spoke in support of the current Parks Commissioners and APRC and said she would not support the recall effort of three commissioners.

John Weston, 997 Oneida Circle in Ashland, said he was a 40-year resident and worked as an Ashland High School teacher for over 30 years. With regard to the impending special election for the recall of three Parks Commissioners, Weston said he knew the individuals to be hardworking, caring men who took care of Ashland's parks and made good decisions. The recall instigators had shared misinformation with community members; examples were provided, which he felt were misrepresentations of the truth. He expressed willingness to offer his time and energy to defeat the recall.

Geri Mathewson, 640 Beach Street in Ashland, a resident since 1980, shared an anecdote about visiting the YMCA pool and circle swimming with a 13-year-old girl named Amelia. Mathewson asked for support for the rebuild of the Daniel Meyer Pool so young swimmers like Amelia could continue their sport at the high school level and beyond. She said water was a healing source for swimmers of all ages and she reminded the commissioners about the importance of teaching swimming, noting that the Daniel Meyer Pool was a community resource established as a memorial for a young man who died in a drowning incident. Mathewson said she did not support the recall effort.

Rebecca Kay, 2350 Ranch Road in Ashland, a resident since 2010, spoke out against the recall and expressed fury with those in the community who singled out Parks Commissioners, which she said tore at the fabric of the community. She said the Parks Commissioners and APRC did a fantastic job of providing services for seniors and citizens of all ages. Based on their distribution of misinformation, she wanted to see the Ashland SOS group pay for the recall rather than Ashland taxpayers. When the special election was over and the commissioners were retained in their current elected positions, she hoped to have a sit-down at the Senior Center to explain how the refurbished pool / rebuild project would play out.

IV. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda (All)

Bellegia said background information was being collected into a binder and would be passed along to the new permanent staff once they were in place. She invited ASPAC members to contribute items for the binder.

V. Senior Program Progress Report (Information) (Dials, 3 minutes)

Dials said the Senior Center continued to operate Monday through Friday from 8:30am to 3:30pm. She provided a brief report on the programs, classes, staffing and services at the center located at 1699 Homes Avenue. She said a part-time office worker was hired to assist on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday afternoons and new volunteer assistants were being trained. A Macintosh tutor was on board to provide assistance once a week, in addition to the PC instructor already in place. Additional programs and services were also described.

VI. The National Standards of Excellence as Framework for Recommendations (Information) (Bachman, 2 minutes)

Bachman spoke briefly about how ASPAC was using The National Standards of Excellence as a framework for moving forward. She reviewed the nine categories and said agenda items were linked to them and all nine standards would be touched upon before ASPAC's work was completed. This would ensure a framework for a successful Senior Program based on key criteria. She said some of the criteria had been prioritized to a higher level and would be addressed more comprehensively: Program and Job Descriptions and the Community Assessment. Other categories would be addressed by the new Senior Services staff.

VII. Subcommittee / Staff Progress Reports (Subcommittee Chairs)

A. Job and Program Description / Separate Division APRC Approval Process / #4 Standard: Administration and Human Resources (Information) (Black, 5 min)

Black said he had been working with Human Resources and Legal on the draft job description, using the recommendations as guidelines and for the sake of consistency. He said senior services in Ashland were the focus

and the goal was to enhance those services within the community. He said the program was much bigger than managing a center. APCR would be coordinating with RVCOG and others to provide outreach for the benefit of Ashland seniors. The position was being recommended at the Superintendent level to attract someone of the same caliber as Recreation Superintendent Dials, able to run a program out of multiple locations and capable of serving on local, regional and state boards for the benefit of the community. The job description had been modified to bring it in line with other APCR job descriptions. Black invited ASPAC to review the current draft document as well as future versions, as the job description progressed through to completion.

Discussion

Bellegia said she was thrilled to hear about the higher-level position as many trends were coming toward Ashland with regard to aging. By hiring someone at that level, someone able to engage with the many stakeholders interested in aging services, APCR would be addressing a very important population sector: the senior community.

Byrnes asked whether the current program description was the same as the one provided to the Parks Commission at their January 22 regular business meeting. She noted the importance of posting the recommendations for the position and the program, as approved by the Parks Commissioners, for the public to see. Black said there were no additional amendments to the documents that were provided by ASPAC to the Commissioners on January 22. Bachman reminded the group that APCR agreed to add the bulleted goal of "social services outreach or referral to outreach services" as well as "information and referral services" to the documents. Black said he hoped the new Senior Services Superintendent would take the program description as a starting point for working with the future standing advisory board. In the job description, under "Communications and Community Outreach," Seffinger asked for a minor change to the document, from "Establish collaborative working relationships with.... elected officials" to "Establish collaborative working relationships with.... Ashland City Council and City commissions."

B. Community Assessment / #1 Standard: Purpose and Planning (Information) (Moore / Bellegia, 12 min)

Moore said she and Bellegia prepared some Powerpoint slides about the community survey results. She reminded all in attendance that the Community Assessment Subcommittee consisted of Russell-Miller, Byrnes, Bellegia and herself. She said the community needs assessment had many sources: previous surveys, listening session input, public input at ASPAC meetings and discussions with community members. The survey was made available to the community from January 10 through 27 and included 17 questions, two of which were open ended and only one that was required. 744 survey responses were typed into Survey Monkey.

Bellegia said the first six questions were about respondents' gender, age, fellow residents within the home, employment status, household income and ZIP code. The reason income was questioned was to determine the level of poverty among the senior population in Ashland. The one required question was whether or not respondents had visited the center in the past two years. In terms of services utilized at the center, 419 indicated their use of recreation / social services and 290 mentioned social services / health. Those reporting that they had not visited the center said the reasons included having no need for the services and not knowing anyone at the center. With regard to the most important elements at the center, a warm and welcoming environment was at the top of the list followed by knowledgeable staff. When asked about prioritization of additional programs or services, top of the list was planning for long-term care and outdoor activities. When asked about frequency of use of APCR programs in the past two years, the use of Ashland's parks, hiking trails and the Ashland Senior Center were top-listed. Looking at other community resources, it was noted that many were used by respondents, including the library, YMCA, OLLI and churches. In terms of receiving other social services, agencies providing services were listed as RVCOG (Senior and Disability Services or ADRC), Ashland At Home and places of worship. Many respondents indicated that they weren't in need of services.

Moore said next steps for the survey included filtering the data, categorizing verbatim responses to open-ended questions and writing a final report to the Ashland Parks Commission.

Discussion

O'Bryon thanked the subcommittee for their good work.

C. Standing Advisory Committee Application and Appointment Process / #3 Standard: Governance (Action) (Bachman / Dials, 5 min)

Bachman introduced the topic of the Senior Program Advisory Committee (SPAC) and its application and appointment process. With ASPAC duties concluding in March, it was hoped that a seamless transition could occur from ASPAC to SPAC. Dials said the application would be the same one used for other City commissions and committees. Dials spoke about the purpose of SPAC: to advise APRC on matters related to the Ashland Senior Program and to coordinate with the APRC Director and Senior Services Superintendent on matters related to the general operations, quality, promotions and programming of the Ashland Senior Program. With regard to the committee's makeup, Dials said it would be made up of program participant representatives and community partner representatives (no more than five total, minimum of two per category), one APRC Commissioner and one City Council Liaison, for a total of seven members. Staff support would include the APRC Director and the new Senior Services Superintendent. SPAC member terms would be three years, with no member serving more than two consecutive terms. When asked what constituted a community partner, Dials clarified that it would be someone from RVCOG or SOU / OLLI or Ashland At Home: local community organizations connected with the senior population. When asked about voting members on SPAC, Black said all seven members would be voting members; staff would not vote. It was stated that members needed to be Ashland residents within City limits, as with other commissions, committees and City Council. Dials spoke about the development of future bylaws and a program mission, then reviewed the application process:

1. Present the process to ASPAC for approval and recommendation to the Commissioners, February 26, 2018 (Action)
2. Pending approval by the Parks Commission, the SPAC application process would be open and publicized February 28 through March 28 (four weeks)
3. Applications reviewed March 28 through April 4 (one week)
4. Commissioners to vote on the SPAC appointments at the April 16 APRC Study Session or at the April 23 Regular Business Meeting
5. Create SPAC bylaws with APRC staff and Commissioner approval

Byrnes asked why this process would be conducted before a new Superintendent was hired. Bachman responded that it would allow SPAC to become more cohesive and communicative in advance of that hire. She said there was a large amount of homework for SPAC to do before the new fiscal year on July 1. Several other questions were asked by committee members and answered by Bachman and Dials.

Motion: Danner moved / O'Bryon seconded approval of accepting the formation of a standing Senior Program Advisory Committee, which would parallel the establishment of other City commissions with regard to setup details, residency and term limits.

The vote was all yes

VIII. Senior Program Staffing Recommendations / #4 Standard: Administration and Human Resources (Action) Bachman, all members, 10 minutes)

Bachman provided the history of the Senior Program's transfer from the City to APRC in 2007 and said the City was financially stressed then while APRC was well funded. At the time of transfer, and every year since, no funding had been provided by the City for the operations of the Senior Program. Since the transfer, Ashland's senior population has increased steadily, with those aged 50+ outpacing the county, state and national levels. Based on the recent survey, it was clear that Ashland citizens wanted and needed appropriate services to remain independent and to have access to social services support when necessary. To provide adequate services and a higher level of staffing, the Ashland Senior Program would require more ongoing funding in the APRC Senior Program Budget for

Personnel. The current approved Senior Program Budget for Personnel in 2018-19 was \$151,000, including salary and benefits for one Senior Program Manager and one part-time office support staff. This meant that there would not be any coverage of the center when the manager was facilitating referral and outreach for participants, nor while attending meetings and networking with county and community organizations or while performing other duties as assigned. In order to hire an experienced Senior Services Superintendent as well as a full-time coordinator and part-time office support staff (a total of 2.75 FTE), it would cost approximately \$232,000 (PERS Tier 3 benefits) to \$262,000 (PERS Tier 1 benefits). In summary, Bachman stated that an approximate additional \$100,000 would be needed to fund the Senior Program at an appropriate level to provide knowledgeable staff, especially a highly skilled and compassionate Senior Services Superintendent. In addition, staff training in the area of facilitation of referral and outreach would need to be included in the budget. Bachman asked for support in the form of a motion for these recommendations.

Discussion

When asked about past staffing levels, Black said the highest past staffing level at the Senior Program was 2.25 FTE. Gardiner pointed out that there was no large pot of money in the APRC budget to cover this additional proposed cost in the middle of a biennium. The Commissioners and staff would need to remove or reallocate currently budgeted items to accommodate extra funding for the Senior Program, with the hope that Parks Commissioners approved the proposed budget amendments.

Motion: Danner moved / Bellegia seconded approval of recommending an additional minimum of \$100,000 to hire an experienced Senior Services Superintendent and additional staff (2.75 FTE total) to provide the necessary programs and services for the community's seniors.

The vote was all yes

IX. Budget Discussion and Recommendation / #7 Standard: Fiscal and Asset Responsibility (Action) (Black, 20 min)

Black spoke about the cost of employees for the new Senior Services Program, including salary and benefits (Personnel Services). He said there was a big difference between PERS Tier 1 and 3, with Tier 1 described as a very rich benefit. In answer to a question by Byrnes about the recent higher annual costs for materials and services, Black said APRC staff had been working on a true cost accounting for all APRC categories, including materials and services (placing costs into correct categories). He said costs had been mis-categorized in the past; i.e., APRC Administration had paid for items not within their division and so on. Black said this new detailed system was being implemented for each facility and park location. Black talked about budget changes for Personnel (an increase of \$117K) and Materials (an increase of \$8.7K) and said the total budget increase was projected as approximately \$126,000. In terms of a funding strategy, Black said Senior Program increases could be absorbed by APRC, within its existing and approved biennial budget, by searching for efficiencies. The impact on the existing budget would be reductions and cutbacks in other APRC categories to accommodate the increase in the Senior Services Program.

Discussion

When asked by Bachman about a \$5.9M budget deficit over the next few years, as discovered and recently reported, Black said the report was unfortunately incorrect. Finance Department staff turnover during the BN 17-19 budget planning cycle caused some incorrect projections to occur, and those incorrect projections were published in the budget book City-wide, not just for APRC. Finance was correcting the budget book and taking it to Council for approval. With regard to fully funding the changes to Senior Services Personnel, Black said those costs could come out of the General Fund for the first year. In the next biennium, APRC would have a better idea of what could be counted on for revenues but for FY 18-19, 100% of the increase in funding would come from the General Fund, made possible through reductions and cutbacks in the current budget. He said APRC staff would go out and find the funding but the budget amendment was not yet approved. He spoke hopefully about ASPAC's recommendations seeing the light of day and benefiting Ashland citizens. When asked by Seffinger about a timeframe, Black said APRC would have an opportunity to approve the recommendations in March and they would go before Council in April or May. Byrnes said

most of the additional funding was earmarked for staffing, mainly for the Superintendent position. She suggested thinking more modestly about funding for that position to allow for a higher Coordinator salary. Black said APRC staffed at the level of Superintendent, then Coordinator, then assistant. He said the Senior Services Coordinator would be at the center most of the time and would have a great deal of responsibility, similar to other APRC Coordinators and with a similar salary. Bellegia said creating a separate division with a stable funding source would ensure future success of the program. Danner thanked staff for their work in locating funding for these positions.

Motion: Bellegia moved / Danner seconded approval for increasing the Senior Services Program budget in the next fiscal year, up to \$309,000.

The vote was all yes

X. ASPAC Draft Recommendations, by Standards of Excellence, 1-9 (Information; Possible Action) (Bachman, all members, 20 min)

Bachman said the committee was now at the point of looking at draft recommendations from ASPAC to the Parks Commissioners. The nine Standards of Excellence were used as a template for the ASPAC recommendations and feedback had been coming in from all ASPAC members, especially the subcommittees in their work. She said if there were disagreements that couldn't be resolved about any of the recommendations, any ASPAC member could write a minority report.

Bachman reiterated that the one major goal of ASPAC was to provide recommendations about the Senior Program to APRC. She reminded the committee that the recommendations were developed through public input, listening sessions, ASPAC members' expertise, staff input and by searching out best practices and standards of excellence.

Byrnes spoke about the value of the recommendations; however, she said they might have been approached in a prioritized manner rather than putting them out at one time and requesting feedback. Bellegia said these would be the recommendations provided to the new Senior Services Superintendent and she would rather not prioritize the list but have the Superintendent assign levels of priority. Moore said one of her highest priorities was to keep the Senior Program operating out of the current Senior Center located at 1699 Homes Avenue. Gardiner said the recommendations would serve as a roadmap / guideline for the new Superintendent. Danner said there would be an advisory committee whose responsibility it would be to hold the Superintendent accountable to move the recommendations forward. Lewis said the commissioners would look for direction from the APRC Director about implementing the recommendations. Gardiner said the group could review the list and highlight areas important to ASPAC; this would assist the commissioners in their evaluation of the recommendations. Bachman suggested moving through the list and posting a "P" next to prioritized items; then, at the next meeting in March, the group could review the list of prioritized items and make any adjustments.

The committee reviewed the first recommendation, Purpose and Planning, and the letters listed below. Minor amendments were made to some of the points, as follows:

- a. Create a *collaborative* vision for *the future of the Ashland Senior Services Program that aligns with APRC and City Council goals* for the future of the *program*.
- b. Revisit Mission Statement, with new Program Description in mind, to determine need for revisions
- c. Develop Planning Document with Goals, Objectives, and Action Plan that align with the Vision and Mission Statement
- d. Review the results of *public input* and the Community Needs Survey and evaluate feasibility of adopting frequently suggested ideas.
- e. Produce an annual report of accomplishments, based on the planning document (moved to 6-b: Evaluation).

Motion: Russell-Miller moved / Lewis seconded approval of items 1-b, c and d as amended.

The vote was all yes

Lange pointed out that the meeting time had been exhausted; Bachman said this was a good point to break away. She asked ASPAC members to study the recommendations and come back to the March 12 meeting ready for a thorough discussion. She suggested that members send her their feedback, via email, in preparation for the March 12 meeting.

XI. Items from Committee – Round Table (Information, 20 minutes)

There was none

XII. Next Meeting Dates and Location (Bachman, 2 minutes)

- March 12 from 3:15 to 5:15 pm – Council Chambers

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Dyssegard, Executive Assistant
Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission