

**MINUTES**  
**ASHLAND PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION**  
**Current Parks, Conservation, and Maintenance Subcommittee**  
**April 15, 2019**  
**APRC Admin Building, 340 S. Pioneer**

Present: Commissioners Lewis, Bell; Superintendent Oxendine; Tech II Godard; Assistant Sullivan

**CALL TO ORDER**

Bell called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. Current Parks, Conservation, and Maintenance Subcommittee – March 5, 2019

Amend number 4 to say will Oxendine will present this issue at the meeting rather than Lewis being charged with the item.

Moved by Lewis to accept as amended above. Seconded by Bell.

All voted yes

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

b. Open Forum

**Joanne Eggers of Ashland** emphasized the importance of park maintenance. Eggers stated she is interested in seeing the plaques memorials policy updates and that plaques should be retired so as not to fill up the parks with plaques, rocks and other memorials.

**Larry Cooper of Ashland** stated he is here to discuss #8 (Sponsorship or larger projects and renovations) on the agenda and asked that it be moved up for discussion at the start of unfinished business.

**ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Oxendine provided a limited needs item list that can be included during item 3 (Current "Limited Needs" List – How this fits with Parks Standards). See attachment I

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**8) Sponsorship or larger projects and renovations.**

This item was moved to the top of the agenda at the request of Larry Cooper. Discussion included the following items.

- A time limit of 10 years should be included in the policy update for smaller memorial projects, such as benches.
- There is a desire to set up a process that can be followed when large donations are offered to APRC
- All donations should start at the Current Parks, Conservation, and Maintenance Subcommittee. Larger donations could then be referred out of the subcommittee to follow the process for large donations
  - This process needs to be outlined and eventually adopted by the full Commission
  - The process should ensure there is an opportunity for public engagement
- Bell recommended that Director Black play a large role in the process and reiterated the importance of public participation when large donations are offered
- This committee would directly handle more routine memorial requests and follow established policies
- A menu of costs for specific memorial items should be created
- Lewis recommended that the process could be brought before the full Commission during a Study Session and allow full public participation. Lewis stated that once the minutes for this subcommittee meeting are presented to the full Commission, he could act to put this on the agenda of a Study Session meeting.

**Larry Cooper of Ashland** – Pleased of subcommittee taking the action of differentiating typical memorial requests and large donor proposals. APRC should recognize that the ultimate boss, financier, owner are the citizens at Ashland. Many people do not show up at subcommittee meetings, but people care about the issues. Cooper expressed concern about the impact on the donor as the process unraveled, in regard to the Japanese Garden. Cooper also emphasized the need for proactive community outreach for large scale projects to allow for full participation with opportunities for robust discussions.

**Joanne Eggers of Ashland** stated that public Input should occur early in the process and include the proper city committees. All projects should come through this subcommittee, which could provide general input on large projects and move them to the next step of a public process. Agents guiding a proposed donor should not act as an advocate for the project.

### **c. Signs, Plaques, and Memorials Business**

The following discussion was relevant to the following agenda items:

- 1) **Parks standards and memorial standards**
- 2) **Review and Suggest Updates to Signs, Plaques & Memorials Policy**
- 3) **Current “Limited Needs” List – How this fits with Parks Standards**
- 6) **Ten-year lifespan on memorials**
- 7) **Historical database of memorials and GIS map guided walk**

The discussion included the following items:

- There is concern that too many memorials placed in parks could have a negative impact on the parks system
- Godard is preparing a list of potential/desired memorial sites within four small parks
- Four small parks are currently being reviewed including Scenic Park
- The inventory will eventually be input into a GIS
- An inventory of Lithia Park will need to take place in the future to identify the number of memorials currently in the park. This is taking place later due to the time it would take to inventory the park
- Oxendine proposed the following process when typical memorial requests are made to APRC
  - Provide the current policy language
  - Provide access to potential locations and types of memorials
  - A price list will also be made available
    - In order to move forward with this process, it will be necessary to establish parks standards for the various types of memorial items that will be made available (e.g. benches)
- Goddard & Oxendine have started compiling options that could be adopted as a Parks Standard Items. See Attachment II for an example of a bench that could be provided as an option for Park Standards
- All Parks Standards items should be timeliness and made of durable materials
- Once the timeframe of the memorial ends, all functional items should remain in place and be made available for new memorials to be placed
- Oxendine proposed that once the timeframe of the memorial ends, the plaque would then be placed on a memorial wall that could be located in a single location within the parks system
- There is a desire to move away from non-functional memorials (e.g. rocks and pedestals)
- It is unclear how much money memorials bring into APRC. It is possible that the program does not pay for itself. This is mainly due to the maintenance requirements of wood benches and tables, which is why the standards seek to transition from wood to steel
- The Parks Standards list will also include items that could provide benefit to users, but that will not be utilized for the memorial program (e.g. BBQ Pits)

Lewis clarified that the Current Parks, Conservation, and Maintenance Subcommittee should review a draft plan for the Parks Standards as well as proposed updates to the Signs, Memorials and Plaques Policy. Once reviewed, the plan could then be forwarded to the full Commission for public hearings.

#### **4) Hunter Park Memorial Request in Honor of Michael Morehead**

Oxendine will handle this issue will handle this issue

## 5) Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Logo and Sign

Discussion on the semantics of what is included on these signs need to be explored further. Oxendine provided the golf course with a sign from the xerces society. Oxendine will send the language on this sign to subcommittee members for review. The subcommittee can officially adopt utilizing this language for APRC signs at the next meeting.

## NEW BUSINESS

- **Dogs in the Parks Signs:** Oxendine discussed multiple requests to review the No Dogs signs in Lithia Park
  - There are 17 No Dogs signs in Lithia Park
  - People bringing dogs into Lithia Parks seems to be an enforcement issues, rather than a sign issue
- **Potential Guidelines for Xero Waste Policy:** Lewis discussed this as a future agenda item and passed out possible guidelines that could be reviewed. See Attachment III.
- **America Dipper Interpretive Signs:** Oxendine explained this is a project with the Rogue Valley Audubon. The signs have been completed and will be installed in Lithia Park.
- **Future Long-Term Maintenance Costs:** Bell introduced the topic for general discussion. The discussion included the following items:
  - The design of new parks should seek to reduce maintenance costs
  - Potentially review system to identify parks that could be maintained at a lower level
  - Ashland citizens have historically supported the parks system
  - New acquisitions of land could further impact the APRC budget

## SET NEXT MEETING DATE / TIME / PLACE

The next meeting will be held on June 10<sup>th</sup> – 2 pm

**ADJOURNMENT** – 4:11p.m.

# Attachment I

## A.P.R.C. Parks Standards

- Drinking Fountains
- Bottle Filling Stations
- Benches
- Tables
- Trash Receptacles
- Playgrounds
- Picnic Shelters
- Signage
- Plaques
- Barbeques
- Bridges



Renaissance 2807 Bench with Intermediate Frame & Armrest close

[TimberForm](#)

Renaissance [Benches with backs](#)

[HOME](#) > [SITE FURNISHINGS](#) > [RENAISSANCE](#) > [BENCHES WITH BACKS](#)

- [About Us](#)
- [Our Products](#)
- [LEED Information](#)
- [Catalog](#)
- [Prices/Information?](#)
- [Contact Us](#)

[Benches with backs](#)

[Seating with backrests](#)

[Seats without backs](#)

[Seating without backrests](#)

[Containers](#)

[Litter & Recycling Receptacles, Planters, etc](#)

[Tables & Chairs](#)

[Picnic, Park & Game Tables](#)

[Other Site Complements](#)

[Bollards, Ash Posts, Drinking Fountains, Signs](#)

[Design Families](#)

[Product Design Families](#)

More Renaissance Products: |

[Benches with backs](#) |

[Seats without backs](#) |

[Containers](#) |

[Tables & Chairs](#) |

[Show All Renaissance](#) |

[Photo Gallery](#)

Click on any image below to view or download larger image.

# Attachment III

## Potential guidelines for zero waste policy

Southern Oregon Master Recyclers in Action (soma.org)

Lend Me a Plate (soma.org)

Discussion of purchasing practice policy

Discussion of extracted carbon reduction through Parks maintenance and design

Employee review of Valdez Principles

Discussion of establishing a composting system for Parks Dept.

Discussion of replacement of park benches, tables and seating constructed of non-plastic recyclable materials

APRC has taken a leadership role in policies involving trees, pollinators, pest management.

We need to take on a leadership role in zero waste and carbon reduction as well.

Discuss policy changes that don't involve large un-funded expenditures.