

**MINUTES FOR THE ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Wednesday, July 26, 2017**  
**Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Marni Koopman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners Mark Weir, Risa Buck, Roxane Biegel-Coryell, Jamie Rosenthal, Bryan Sohl, James McGinnis, and David Sommer were present. Staff member Adam Hanks was present. Commissioner David Sommer was late. Commissioner Cara Cruickshank and Council Liaison Traci Darrow were absent.

**2. Announcements**

The next commission meeting will be August 23, 2017.

Group discussed the upcoming meeting calendar and agreed to combine the November and December meetings into one meeting on December 13<sup>th</sup>.

**3. Public Forum**

Huelz Gutchen – stated that changes happening soon to energy production and use need to be fully studied. They have already caused lots of upheaval and concern. He stated if we use ½ as much electricity as we currently do, that's equal to adding twice as many solar panels. This means efficiency is more important than generation. BPA gives us lots of efficiency rebates and if we reduced more BPA would be excited. If we install a little solar, though, they would be upset and will charge us more. This is due to the contract we signed years ago. He stated we don't actually get any of our electrons from the Bonneville dam, that the sources are all from an old program created in the 1940s and 1950s, before solar panels. BPA is now looking into solar but it needs to be studied more to see how it evolves. He stated that contracts can be re-written.

Sohl asked for clarification on BPA contracts. Hanks gave information on the issues related to large-scale solar production. The contract concerns don't apply for small-scale installations. Buck asked if this means small-scale is a way to achieve the 10x20 ordinance. Hanks gave information about some possible smaller-scale options.

Group agreed to move new business to earlier in the agenda, as Sohl must depart early.

**4. New Business**

*Climate & Energy Action Plan Update* – Sohl gave an update on the discussion from the Council meeting. He stated that Council decided to do an ad hoc committee, rather than a full-committee at this time. Hanks gave additional details of the Council decision and the next steps. Sohl gave an overview of the discussion Council had regarding goals and targets. Group discussed their feelings about the decision.

**5. Reports/ Presentations/ Updates**

*Recology Quarterly Update* – Rosenthal gave an update of recent and upcoming Recology activities including:

- They are focusing on preventing, “wishful recycling” - i.e. things which cannot be recycled but frequently are placed in recycle bins.
- The Household Hazardous Waste event, which went from 506 vehicles in 2016 to 584 in 2017. There were 62,000 pounds of waste.
- She reminded the group that for the Household Hazardous Waste event, the waste haulers pay \$125 per car but only charge \$5 per car. This is why the event can’t occur on a more frequent basis.
- The Firewise Clean-up Day went well, with about 100 vehicles attending. They are working to find ways to increase participation next year.
- On 4<sup>th</sup> of July Recology introduced “Buddy Blue”, their recycling mascot. The parade was a fun introduction to Buddy and they hope it’s a useful learning tool.
- Also on 4<sup>th</sup> of July they provided 44 clear-stream bins. A few of the redeemable bags were taken, but they were overall impressed by the low levels of contamination in the bins.
- The first “Lend Me a Plate” program went well. They will continue with a “soft” opening of the program over the next few months.
- Planning for the Bear Creek Salmon Festival is underway.

*City Conservation Programs and Operations* – Hanks stated that there isn’t much of an update other than the 10x20 project, which he covered earlier in the meeting. McGinnis asked if there are any discussions on land swaps or purchases with SO Land Conservancy to achieve both solar installation and trail easements? Hanks gave an update on some of the options to achieve 10x20 through smaller-scale projects, which seems to have more potential and higher co-benefits. Additionally, mixing trail easements with the wastewater treatment plan needs (that the property was originally purchased for) seem to be a good mix.

Group discussed ways in which the City could partner with commercial buildings to install solar throughout town.

Koopman wondered if the group had any interest in creating a statement in support of using the Imperatrice property for purposes other than a solar farm.

**Weir/Sohl m/s to create a statement asking that the City Council support both the Southern Oregon Land Conservancy and the Parks Commission in moving forward with conserving the Imperatrice property for natural resources and recreational purposes. Discussion:** Weir stated that his intent is to try and put a flag in the sand that conservation of this space should take priority. He wants to support SO Land Conservancy and their recognition of what is on that site (species-wise) as well as the value of open space to the Ashland community. Sohl stated that he has mixed feelings about the whole thing. On the one hand, any power generation has tradeoffs and consequences and we need to pick our poison. On the other, he agrees that there are many more degraded locations that should be used first. Ultimately he thinks there is value in using a portion of the property for solar and preserve the rest.

Buck wondered if there was a chance to use the site as a solar demonstration site, rather than a full solar park, though understands that’s probably too costly. She thinks there must be a way to balance all the multiple uses of the space. Hanks informed her that a solar demonstration is being

considered closer to the wastewater treatment plant, which would be more accessible by the public.

Koopman stated that she was struck by the aerial photo of the property and how much connectivity could be provided by the property. She also wants serious consideration of the high-value species which need to be protected. The best practice in climate adaptation is to not do any additional damage to natural resources. McGinnis stated that he is also concerned with the co-benefits provided by the property. He understands the desire to have solar panels to show the world that we're doing something but doesn't think that using this property is economically viable. Additionally, we need to remember that the land was purchased for wastewater treatment plant needs and if they had been using it as originally intended then it wouldn't be available now for any of the uses we're now debating. Beigel-Coryell stated that she agrees that other options are more viable.

Rosenthal stated that she's curious to know what are the potential negative effects of solar on an area. Weir gave details on the amount of concrete needed, wear and tear on roads, climate change for species whose habitat would change with the new shade, and environmental damage in other countries who produce the solar panels. Sommer stated he agrees with Weir about the negative effects, and would add that replacement cycles of solar are rather daunting, even without taking into account potential damage or vandalism costs.

**Voice Vote: 8 ayes, 1 nay. Motion Passes.**

*Commissioner Sohl departed at 7:10 p.m.*

*Water Subcommittee* – Buck stated they met with grey water installer, Karen Taylor, who will be doing an installation on September 30<sup>th</sup> for education purposes. City Water Conservation staff will help organize publicizing and certificates for continuing education. They are hoping to focus on having contractors attend the installation.

*Council Update* – Hanks apologized for not bringing this up at the last meeting, but the annual presentation by the commission to Council is scheduled for August 15. He drafted an update for Koopman and Buck to edit and present.

## **6. Old Business**

*Sneak Preview Column* – Group discussion potential article topics and agreed to the following:

- September – Laundry to Landscape article, possibly written by staff member Julie Smitherman
- October – Storm Drains, by Cruickshank (she should tee-up the November article)
- November – Leaf Bag program, by Rosenthal
- December – CEAP ordinances (the big picture on where we are), by McGinnis
- January – possibly an article about conservation successes at the ASD, by Sommer

*Conservation Commission Goal Setting* – Koopman stated that the group should probably set goals for next year. Group generally agreed to use the next meeting as their goal setting session. They also agreed to send any proposed goals to Koopman to kick-off the discussion.

**7. Wrap Up**

Meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Diana Shiplet  
Executive Assistant

**CITY OF  
ASHLAND**  
**ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
**August 8, 2017**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Roger Pearce called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

**Commissioners Present:**

Troy Brown, Jr.  
Michael Dawkins  
Debbie Miller  
Melanie Mindlin  
Haywood Norton  
Roger Pearce  
Lynn Thompson

**Staff Present:**

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director  
Derek Severson, Senior Planner  
Dana Smith, Executive Assistant

**Absent Members:**

None

**Council Liaison:**

Dennis Slattery, absent

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Community Development Director Bill Molnar announced staff would attend a study session with the Council in September regarding the cottage housing ordinance. A commissioner would attend the meeting as well.

Chair Pearce announced the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) issued the decision in the McMonagle vs. Ashland appeal. LUBA overturned and remanded the City's decision. Mr. Molnar would forward copies to the Commission.

**AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES**

Commissioner Mindlin noted the Wildfire Mitigation Commission would address the wildfire mitigation ordinance soon.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. Approval of Minutes**

1. July 11, 2017 Regular Meeting.
2. July 25, 2017 Study Session.

Commissioners Dawkins/Norton m/s to approve the July 11, 2017 meeting minutes. **Voice Vote: ALL AYES.** Motion passed. Commissioners Brown and Thompson abstained.

Commissioners Mindlin/Thompson m/s to approve the July 25, 2017 Study Session minutes. **Voice Vote: ALL AYES.** Motion passed.

**PUBLIC FORUM** - None

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. Adoption of Findings for PA-2017-01059, 1068 East Main Street.**

Senior Planner Derek Severson explained staff formulated the Findings for open space on page 7 and 8 so the condition was a response to the plans and not a statement of precedent. The Commission wanted to look at it further in a study session.

At Chair Pearce's suggestion, the Commission agreed to the following changes to the Findings:

- Page 4, change **Section 2. Conclusory Findings** to **Section 2. Findings and Conclusions**.
- Page 8, change the first sentence in the last paragraph from **"The Planning Commission finds that the use of the term "open space" appears to be used inconsistently throughout the Land Use Ordinance,"** to **"The Planning Commission finds that the term "open space" appears to be used in different contexts in different sections of the Land Use Ordinance."**

**Commissioners Thompson/Dawkins m/s to approve the Findings for PA-2017-01059, 1068 East Main Street.**

**DISCUSSION:** The Commission declared no ex parte regarding the matter. **Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.**

## **TYPE II PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **A. PLANNING ACTION: PA-2017-01199**

**SUBJECT PROPERTY: 707 Helman Street**

**OWNER/APPLICANT: PDK Properties**

**DESCRIPTION: A request for preliminary subdivision plat approval to create an eight-lot subdivision for the property located at 707 Helman Street. The application also includes a request for an Exception to Street Standards to install curbside sidewalks along the full frontage of the property where city Street Standards would typically require that a park row planting strip with street trees be installed between the curb and sidewalk. The application also includes a Tree Removal Permit to remove one significant tree (#33) an 18-inch diameter Ponderosa Pine. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: Single-Family Residential; ZONING: R-1-5; ASSESSOR'S MAP: 39 1E 04BC; TAX LOT #: 100.**

Commissioner Pearce read aloud the public hearing procedures for land use hearings.

### **Ex Parte Contact**

Commissioners Dawkins, Thompson, Pearce, and Norton declared site visits. Commissioners Brown and Mindlin drove past the site. Commissioner Miller attended the site visit and drove past the site on several occasions. No ex parte contact was reported.

### **Staff Report**

Senior Planner Derek Severson explained this was a Preliminary Subdivision Pat Approval that would create an eight lot subdivision. The application was being processed under the subdivision chapter instead of the performance standards options. It looked at whether the proposal met the dimensional requirements of the zoning and access in utilities, not the base densities and open space requirements. There was also an exception to the street standards to install five-foot curbside sidewalks along the frontage of the property, instead of having a seven foot parkrow between the curb and sidewalk. A tree removal permit was issued to remove a Ponderosa Pine tree.

The subject property was at the corner of Randy Street and Laurel Street despite the Helman address. It was 1.14 acres or approximately 49,901 square feet with a 1,971 square foot house slated for demolition. The current driveway circulated through the property. The applicants wanted to remove 41 trees on the property. In residential zones, only significant trees required a tree removal permit.

The applicant requested a sidewalk exception due to the slope at the edge of Laurel Street that wrapped around Randy Street. A park row would push sidewalk improvements 12 feet back from the curb into the hillside. Having a five-foot sidewalk would lessen the amount of retaining wall needed for installation.

The Building Department approved the house demolition pending Commission approval of the redevelopment plan. The application included a drainage and draining plan with storm drainage detention on site. The utility plan was included. The applicants added solar envelopes illustrating potential eave heights and the setback needed to comply with Solar Standard A in the solar ordinance.

The Tree Commission supported the tree removal request. They wanted a tree protection plan to ensure the trees on neighboring properties were protected particularly during the bioswale installation. The Tree Commission also wanted street trees planted behind the sidewalk if there was not a park row. Another request would maintain the trees in perpetuity in lieu of street trees in a park row. The Commission hoped landscaping for the eight lots would mitigate the removal of the 41 trees.

Staff supported the request. The project would develop eight new earth advantage platinum homes, sidewalks, and limited driveways to two. The project benefited the neighborhood and met the approval criteria with the conditions recommended in the report.

### **Questions of Staff**

Staff was asked if widening the sidewalk at the corner across from the school to create a refuge area was considered. Mr. Severson Derek responded they had not discussed widening that area.

Mr. Severson explained a curb cut with a truncated dome was the thermal plastic piece installed at the curb cut of a crosswalk for ADA access and blind people. This would go in at the southwest corner where the sidewalk crossed to the school.

### **Applicant's Presentation**

**Amy Gunter/Kyle Taylor**/Ms. Gunter explained the property was at the northeast corner of Randy Street and Laurel Street. The 707 Helman Street address was remnant from a larger track when the property was Cherry Knoll Dairy. The knoll consisted of sandstone and granite soils, with rock not far below. A survey slide of the property showed the trees, the existing structure, powerlines and existing driveway. The plan addressed storm drainage down to the square footage of each structure. One change removed the tapered flare at the Randy Street side of the driveway. They did solar envelopes for each lot due to the topography of the site.

Certain lots would have onsite detention for storm water that would drain to Laurel Street and others would drain to Randy Street. The Tree Commission expressed concern for a small deciduous tree located on a neighboring property where lots 3 and 4 came together. An existing six-foot-tall fence protected the tree and eliminated the need for additional protective fencing. Engineering for the bioswale was not developed to the point of knowing if it would require excavation or retaining walls and fill.

Street trees were planted to shade the street. Due to the property's topography, street trees would be planted several feet above the actual street. A landscape architect will work with the property owner on each building permit to address the street tree planting standard.

They would install a 14-foot standard residential street light at the intersection of Laurel Street and Randy Street. Some of the hill would be scraped off to address the grades.

Ms. Gunter spoke against widening the sidewalk at Randy Street to create a refuge for children to cross to the school. A mid-block crossing was dangerous and a crosswalk at that location would not be approved. Widening the sidewalk at Randy Street would require public pedestrian easements or right of way dedication as well as additional retaining walls.

The front yard setback for lot 6 was on Laurel Street. It was 15 feet with a side yard setback of 10 feet. Lot 7 had 15

feet due to the bioswale and potentially two front yards. The official setback was 10-foot.

Sidewalks would be installed prior to the survey plat. Typically, street trees went in the park row and were planted during the street improvements. In this circumstance, the street trees would be in the front yard area. Due to construction disturbing the trees, the applicants were requesting to have trees planted and irrigated on each lot prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for each unit. That allowed the owner to pick their own trees and possibly plant more.

Commissioner Dawkins wanted to add a requirement that street trees were planted sooner, were consistent, and closer to the sidewalk. The applicant could use small caliber trees.

Community Development Director Bill Molnar explained generally sidewalks with a park row were often in the right of way and trees were planted at the same time and water metered. These street trees would be on the private property of each home. Irrigation was an issue. The Commission could require the applicant's to initially install a common meter to irrigate the trees and have it removed once the homes were built. Another issue was grading the sites for each home. He was not sure they could identify space for a street tree or know how grading would affect the tree.

Mr. Taylor addressed the continuous bioswale and explained there will be joint access and private easements granted for the facility. Ms. Gunter added they will have mutual access easements and maintenance agreements. Owners will purchase an agreement requiring them to keep the street trees alive, and maintain the bioswales and driveways.

#### **Public Testimony**

**William Zentner II/134 Cypress Circle/**He did not have a problem with the development. He wanted to know if there was a grading setback from the property line or if the developers could create up to the property line. Would blasting be involved to remove the rock? He opposed the taller street light. These were proposed single story homes but lot 2 and 3 had 7-foot grade drops between the driveway and the back of the house. He wanted to verify the sidewalk wrapped around the entire property. If the existing fence was replaced, would it be a privacy fence or an open one? What types of street trees would be planted and was there a specification? He wanted to know about fence protection while the common swale was under construction. Also, how close would the grading come to the property line.

#### **Applicant's Rebuttal**

Ms. Gunter explained blasting was not allowed in the city. She was not aware of a grading setback requirement. There will be daylight basements on the backside of both homes on lots 2 and 3. By code they were single story structures and the basement would adhere to basement code. The subdivision would use 6.5-foot privacy fencing with possible deer wire. Street tree placement could dictate grading and possibly require small tree protection fences. The timing of planting the trees could also inhibit construction and storing materials on the property. On Laurel Street, the trees would be near the houses on top of the hill.

Commissioner Dawkins commented on street tree placement. If there was not a park row, the tree had to be close enough to the sidewalk to shade the street. Putting the trees up on the slope made them ineffective for street shading. Trees could grow on steep slopes.

Commissioner Mindlin wanted to know the standard on how far back from the sidewalk a tree could be planted to be considered a street tree. The Findings could reference the requirement or the Commission could set one for the project. Mr. Severson thought the slope was rock and it might be difficult to plant unless they used tree wells and had the tree either behind the sidewalk or on top of the retaining wall.

Mr. Molnar addressed the sidewalk refuge and explained the standard for a sidewalk on a residential street was 5-6 feet and the planting strip was 7-8 feet. The Planning Commission had the authority to choose within that range. The standard also allowed for seating in park rows in residential areas. He recommended involving the Public Works

Department for having a crossing from the potential refuge. Mr. Severson added the Public Works Department was hesitant to encourage mid-block crossings but might support one at the intersection of Laurel and Randy. Commissioner Norton did not think the Public Works Department would support a crossing at the location of the refuge if there was on street parking. It was mid-block and on a curve. He would have issues with a crossing there as well.

### **Deliberations & Decision**

Commissioner Brown spoke to **IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 6. k.** regarding street trees. He understood the issues and agreed with Commissioner Dawkins that a tree that far away may not serve the purpose. A temporary watering system could resolve some of the problems. He wanted the landscape architect to review planting street trees on the slope. Commissioner Mindlin wanted to set a standard for tree placement. Mr. Molnar explained the code required one tree for every 30 feet of street frontage. Trees behind the sidewalk could not be closer than 2 feet to the actual sidewalk. Commissioner Miller did not want the street trees to interfere with the construction. Chair Pearce agreed with Commissioner Brown and thought street trees should be planted prior to final approval. Commissioner Dawkins suggested requiring the street trees to be 3-5 feet from the sidewalk. He did not think they would interfere with the construction. Commissioner Brown added the canopy at 15 years must shade the sidewalk.

**Commissioners Dawkins/Brown m/s to approve PA-2017-01199 with the additional language to 6.k. that the trees will be no more than 5 feet from the sidewalk and must be trees that will shade the sidewalk.**

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Dawkins liked that the project would build energy efficient units. Commissioner Brown, initially wanted 6-foot sidewalks, but all the other sidewalks were 5 feet and there was no reason to make it wider. He also liked the project.

Commissioner Thompson read #2. In the Tree Commission Findings from August 3, 2017 and thought it should be omitted. She also questioned whether the last sentence in #2 **“These trees shall be maintained in perpetuity in lieu of street trees within the park row planting strip,”** was necessary since it was covered in **IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 6. k.** Commissioner Brown thought it was necessary and that it should go into the overall documentation. Commissioner Thompson suggested adding it to **6.k.** Commissioner Mindlin thought they should adopt the Tree Commission Findings with the Planning Commission modification. Commissioner Thompson suggested in addition to omitting #2 in the Tree Commission Findings, they should add the last sentence to **IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 6. j.** as part of the CC&Rs maintenance of street trees.

Commissioner Dawkins agreed to amend the main motion and delete the first sentence of Section 2 in the Tree Commission recommendation of August 3, 2017 and add the second sentence to **IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 6. j.**

Commissioner Mindlin addressed the last sentence in #2 of the Tree Commission Findings and suggested changing **“These trees shall be maintained in perpetuity in lieu of street trees within the park row planting strip,”** to **“These trees shall be maintained in perpetuity as street trees.”** The Commission agreed to add it to section **6. j.** under **IV. Conclusions and Recommendations.** Commissioner Dawkins accepted the amendment as part of the of main motion. **Roll Call Vote on amended motion: Commissioners Norton, Miller, Dawkins, Brown, Pearce, Thompson, and Mindlin, YES. Motion passed.**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

*Submitted by,  
Dana Smith, Executive Assistant*

**ASHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
**July 20, 2017**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Graf called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

**Commissioners Present:** Joe Graf, Sue Newberry, David Young, Corinne Vièville, and Kat Smith

**Commissioners Absent:** Dominic Barth

**Council Liaison Present:** None

**Council Liaison Absent:** Mike Morris, and Rich Rosenthal

**SOU Liaison Absent:** Janelle Wilson

**Staff Present:** Mike Faught, Scott Fleury, Tami DeMille-Campos, and Tara Kiewel

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Public Works Director Mike Faught announced Team Ashland is scheduled for August 24, 2017 and staff will be presenting during the scheduled commission meeting. Fleury summarized the Team Ashland Program, which gives a group of involved citizens the opportunity to learn more about how city departments and divisions operate.

Graf suggested moving the August meeting to August 23, 2017 at 4:00 pm. The commission agreed.

DeMille-Campos introduced Tara Kiewel, Public Works administrative assistant who would assume administrative duties for the commission.

Graf announced that Council will discuss the parking plan at the July 31, 2017 study session and the regular meeting August 1, 2017.

Graf welcomed new Commissioner Kat Smith. Smith shared that her background is in outdoor recreation and transportation options. She worked for Rogue Valley Transit Department (RVTD) and was a bicycle safety instructor with the Bicycle Transportation Alliance. She has a degree in outdoor recreation and a masters in social work and is currently working as a mental health counselor in the area.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Approval of Minutes:** June 22, 2017

**Commissioners Newberry/Young m/s to approve minutes as amended.**

**All ayes. Minutes approved.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Future Agenda Building**

Fleury noted thinking about future agenda topics would give staff time to prepare and research topics.

Fleury suggested a possible future agenda item would be inviting the new Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 3 Active Transportation Liaison, Jenna Stanke Marmon to give a presentation about future programs.

Newberry asked for clarification on the process of agenda building and establishing priorities. Fleury suggested discussing priorities after the goal setting session in September. Additionally, the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update will require work for the next 18 months.

Newberry expressed concern about the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps being built, both retrofits and new construction, and wanted this added to the agenda. Faught suggest having Brad Barber present about current ADA requirements, standards, and process.

Newberry's Future Agenda items included:

- 1.) Funding capacity for Nevada Street Bridge
- 2.) Siskiyou Blvd. access management
- 3.) Crosswalks and markings at uncontrolled crosswalks
- 4.) Traffic calming
- 5.) Bike parking
- 6.) Chip seal program
- 7.) Commission's role in planning and training for new commission members
- 8.) Goals per municipal code
- 9.) Bike path – old business follow up

Young wanted to view the finalized RFP for the TSP update. Young took issue with the fact that he had tried unsuccessfully to request the RFP on the website. Fleury said a draft was sent to the commission and that he will send the finalized RFP.

Smith wanted to add bike and pedestrian safety to the agenda.

### **PUBLIC FORUM**

Louise Shawkat, 870 Cambridge/Expressed concern about the idling of vehicles near schools.

Smith noted the 4J school district in Eugene had a good policy regarding this issue that the commission may want to review.

### **TASK LIST**

#### **Discuss current action item list**

#### **Hersey/Wimer Signal**

Newberry noted that the Hersey/Wimer signal and the road diet update to Council have been moved to September.

#### **Super Sharrows**

Faught explained that Kittelson & Associates, Inc. had finished their design update and the recommendation to retime signals through downtown was not feasible. Fleury added that it was also recommended to install a stop sign at Oak and E. Main which would allow a safe transition for bicycles. Faught discussed the super sharrow options including painting the lane entirely green or just the sharrows. The project has been approved and funded for \$100,000. Graf asked about the recommendation regarding loading zones and Faught said the study recommended restricting loading zone times.

#### **TSP update**

Fleury stated that responses would close August 1, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. and he will work on the grading packet that will go to the grading team. It will take two or three weeks to get through the grading process depending on the number of responses received.

#### **Sidewalk clearance and vegetation maintenance**

Newberry inquired if the brochures are in the lobby of the Community Development building. DeMille-Campos explained that staff is working on them. Young shared that he called code enforcement for bushes on Oak St. and that it was cleaned up, but he still has concerns about this issue. Young asked to put this as issue as a future agenda item.

Newberry inquired about ODOT's intersection design at Tolman and Siskiyou Blvd. She would like to add this item to the task list. Fleury said that the city had done some internal survey and design work, but it would be up to the commission to recommend.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

### **FOLLOW UP ITEMS**

#### **Nevada Bridge Extension Project**

Faught shared that Council decided to follow the recommendation of the commission and not build the vehicle or multi-modal bridge and directed staff to submit a grant transfer for the Independent Way Project. Council would like to hear about two options, the bicycle /pedestrian /emergency twenty-foot bridge for an estimated \$3.8 million, and the twelve-foot pedestrian bridge for an estimated \$2.4 million. Faught said based on feedback he was working on the assumption that Council wants to see one of these bridges go in. Fees were going to be used for the Independent Way Project and if the grant money can be transferred the fees would go to the Nevada Bridge Extension Project.

Faught explained Nevada Bridge Extension Project funding was a total of \$6.49 million plus \$4.94 million with the realignment of "S" curves. Of the funding \$1.2 million was System Development Charges (SDC), \$3 million in fees, and the rest was grants. Without grants and SDC monies \$2.4 million is left for the project. Faught said he is working with a consultant to get clarification if SCD money can still be used for this project. Graf asked what the fees were. Faught explained the fees are street fees, gas tax, and some food and beverage tax, and that all of the fees have been allocated to projects.

Viëville asked about the timeline for the grant. Faught explained he had been encouraged to get it in right away. In the grant application staff will explain that the city is still interested in building a bike/pedestrian facility at East Nevada and that we are simply switching the grant funding to another project. Faught thought that it would be presented at the Aug. or Sept. meeting.

Young stated that it seems that the Independent Way Project is more competitive for the grant. Faught agreed and said the City doesn't want to lose the grant money and picked a competitive project. The policy is that we get to pitch a new project, but it is not guaranteed we will get the grant.

Viëville asked if the Nevada Bridge is still a priority and if this takes away money from other projects on the list. Faught said the Nevada Bridge is in the budget and the TSP update is the opportunity to reprioritize projects.

Graf asked for clarification regarding the grant and if the Nevada Bridge Extension Project grant is shifting to the Independent Way Project. Faught said this was the case and explained that the Council gave him clear indication that they wanted to build the Nevada Bridge.

Newberry said she found it unusual that the Council didn't ask the commission for input after the Nevada Project changed from a vehicle bridge to a bicycle/pedestrian and whether this the best use of the \$2.4 million.

#### **Street Painting Permit Process**

Smith updated the commission on what was presented at the July 18, 2017 Council meeting where Councilor Morris had asked about the type paint that would be used and was concerned that it may be slick for bicyclists when wet. Fleury had responded that Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) suggests we add crushed walnut to the paint and Miller Paint will do that. It was approved by Council.

#### **Zagster Bike Share Program**

Fleury updated the commission about the July 18, 2017 Council meeting discussion where Councilor Rosenthal had asked why we were funding 5 bikes when we have 2 racks that can hold more. Andrea Napoli, Rogue Valley Council

of Governments (RVCOG) will be managing the project explained to Council that ODOT will be funding 20 bikes and there will be adequate bikes in the system. Council supported the project.

Fleury said one station will be installed at Siskiyou/Clay St. and either Lithia Way or in front of the Library are being considered for the second location. RVTD will have a station at the plaza, SOU is supporting one station, and Asante will possibly support a station. Young mentioned that one will be at the YMCA parking lot. Fleury expected the stations will be installed in the next 2-3 weeks and he will forward the road bike share flyer to the commission.

Newberry asked if we have any bike maps available. Young stated that he thought the Zagster App connects to a map that shows the stations. Faught suggested that we could work with the chamber to create a bike map. Fleury said that RVTD has a robust marketing campaign and will be promoting the program to their users. Young noted that at the last meeting Andrea had mentioned that the one hidden location in Ashland was outperforming all the other stations which tells us about the demand.

Vièville asked how much room the stations take up and if there is one installed at the library where it would be. Fleury explained that there are 8, 9, or 10 rack stations. The 10 rack is 24'x8' and reduce the size by 2.5' for each rack that is removed. Fleury said the possible library install area was below the bus stop by 50ft. Young asked if the median across from the Library had been considered. Fleury had considered that area. Faught stated that this would have to be to run by the Parks Dept. Smith asked if the stations are normally covered. Fleury said the stations are not covered and do not require a concrete pad. They just need to be placed on a level rock pad.

### **Gresham Residential Parking Permit**

Fleury is working on the staff report along with commission's recommendation that will be taken to Council.

### **Iowa St. Safety Audit and Analysis**

Fleury updated that he is waiting for Kim Parducci to do walking audit.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

#### **Transportation HB 2017-10**

Fleury explained the bill increased gas tax money, general funding, and Safe Routes to School grants. In addition, ODOT Region 3 received money for the seismic triage program. Faught mentioned the increase is about \$400,000 per biennium. Faught noted that RVTD received a funding increase and there is opportunity for an express route and a hub and suggested bringing RVTD to the August meeting to discuss.

Newberry inquired about Connect Oregon and asked if there was any potential for grant money there. Faught mentioned these grants are difficult to obtain and larger communities' tend to be awarded these grants. Smith asked about the Safe Routes to School and Faught stated these are the kind on grants we should go after. Newberry mentioned she has an interest in improving the links to transit stops. Faught said he would like to discuss this with Newberry and Smith to get more details.

### **Action Summary**

#### **Accident Report**

Officer MacLennan went over the accident report, and the commission discussed a few accidents.

Smith inquired if it would be a helpful, educational opportunity for APD to have Ray Thomas present about bike and pedestrian safety. Officer MacLennan stated APD has quarterly training and that he has these books as reference.

Newberry asked if we have ever had bike officers in Ashland. Officer MacLennan said that APD had bike patrols in the past, and they currently have two Electric bikes and one Segway.

Vièville mentioned that there are trucks unloading at bus stops and then the busses aren't stopping. Officer MacLennan said to contact Diamond Parking with that issue.

## Making an Impact Newsletter (June)

None

### COMMISSION OPEN DISCUSSION

Newberry inquired about a map that shows jurisdiction for ODOT, County, and City. She mentioned the lights in downtown are not timed for 20mph. Fleury said staff was looking into it and mentioned it to ODOT.

Young mentioned that the commission still has one vacancy and questioned how to proceed. Fleury said the vacancy is posted on the City website, and it was announced at Council. Fleury went on to mention that if the Commissioners know of anyone that would be interested they should be encouraged to apply.

Smith asked if there were any plans to address safety with bike lanes on Lithia Way and acknowledged that she was not aware of all of the downtown plans. Faught explained this was part of the super sharrow project. Graf mentioned that there is currently no downtown committee.

Graf departed from the agenda and took a public question.

Louise Shawkat, 870 Cambridge

Louise asked if there was concern that this commission may go away now that Council is looking at Commissions and the direction they want to go in. Faught explained that there was mentioned in a study session about possibly changing the structure, but it was a suggestion.

Young asked if the commission was aware of the committee that was looking into moving City Hall and discussed that Briscoe School may be an option. Young went on to say that there is an option to removing some of the park and making parking for city employees at Briscoe. Young expressed concern that the commission should be represented if a parking plan is involved. Fleury briefly described the charge of the ad hoc City Hall Advisory Committee and that they are in process of creating criteria to rate several different City Hall options. The directives are to look at the space needs for a 2030 timeframe and to ensure seismic stability of a building for city employees. Fleury told the Commission that there are several options which include Briscoe School, the current City Hall building, the Community Development Building, and also a possible new building at Lithia/Pioneer parking lot. Fleury said the committee is currently weighing all the criteria and establishing the weighting value to recommend to Council by August 31, 2017.

### FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Next Meeting Date: August 23, 2017

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Tara Kiewel*

*Public Works Administrative Assistant*