

MINUTES
ASHLAND PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION (APRC)
Trails Master Plan Review Subcommittee
April 14, 2022 – 11 a.m.
Electronic Meeting

Present:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: APRC Commissioner Rick Landt, APRC Commissioner Leslie Eldridge, City of Ashland Councilor Stephen Jensen, Ashland Forest Lands Commissioner Priscila Franco, Ashland Forest Lands Commissioner Luke Brandy, Jeffrey McFarland, Ashland Woodlands & Trails Association Torsten Heycke, David Chapman, Brooke Hansen, Rogue Valley Mountain Bike Association Member Casey Botts

APRC & CITY STAFF: APRC Director Michael A. Black, City of Ashland Fire Department Forestry Division Chief Chris Chambers, City of Ashland GIS Specialist Lea Richards, APRC Open Space Supervisor Jason Minica, APRC Executive Analyst Dorinda Cottle

Absent:

None

[View recording of meeting](#)

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- [Trails Master Plan Review Subcommittee, November 29, 2021](#)

Motion: Heycke moved to approve the Minutes from November 29, 2021, as presented. Eldridge seconded.

Vote: The vote was all yes.

- [Trails Master Plan Review Subcommittee, December 14, 2021](#)

Motion: Heycke moved to approve the Minutes from December 14, 2021, as presented. Eldridge seconded.

Vote: The vote was all yes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF MINUTES

- [Trails Master Plan Review Subcommittee Working Group for Wonder Trail Bail-Out, February 7, 2022](#)

Motion: Chapman moved to acknowledge the Minutes from February 7, 2022, as presented. Botts seconded.

Vote: The vote was all yes.

III. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

None

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

[Written comments](#)

Comments during the meeting – None

V. SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER CONTRACT/STATED VALUES AND CODE OF CONDUCT – Commissioner Landt read the following statement into the record:

- “We had a recent incident where statements were made on social media by a committee member that were disparaging to another Committee member and reflected poorly on APRC. I have addressed that behavior individually. At that time, we had no formal statement or rule about Committee members’ social behavior.

Clearly, everyone has a right to say whatever they want, but when one is a member of an APRC committee, I expect respectful, non-confrontational interaction between members and with the public, particularly when the topic is APRC Trails related to our work. Going forward, behavior by Committee members that is deemed disrespectful or that puts APRC in a negative light will be grounds for removal from this Committee.”

VI. WONDER TRAIL BAIL-OUT AND NEXT STEPS – Heycke presented the Wonder Trail Bail-Out Working Group Proposal for at least one and possibly two Downhill Bike Routes that descend to the south of the quarry, ending near the entrance into the quarry, [view proposal](#). Commissioner Eldridge clarified that it is not the responsibility of this subcommittee to have complete evaluation, and design, and guarantee the buildability of any trail. The goal is to propose concepts that have merit and support and pass each vetted proposal onto APRC. Chambers offered a point on process, and because the Wonder Trail Proposal is on City land and under the Forest Lands Commission (FLC), the FLC would probably want to review the proposal, not necessarily trail use or where they would go, but a review of resources and to make sure that they were used appropriately. Brandy asked for clarification of the role of the FLC review and if they would simply submit additional comments for APRC to consider? Landt and Eldridge offered that FLC would review, provide input or guidance, and then these recommendations would be sent to APRC.

- Following the presentation and discussion, Commissioner Landt made a motion:
Motion: “I move that the Trails Subcommittee forward our recommendation for the two bail-outs on Wonder Trail to the Forest Lands Commission for input and that once that input is received, the recommendations of the Trails Subcommittee and the Forest Lands Commission input be forwarded to APRC.” Brandy seconded.
Vote: The vote was all yes.

VII. ALICE IN WONDERLAND RE-ROUTE AND NEXT STEPS – Commissioner Eldridge presented the Alice in Wonderland Re-Route Working Group Proposal, [view proposal](#). This working group only evaluated the first component of the proposal, which includes the lower section of Alice in Wonderland and a single track up from the Ashland Loop Road to the Alice in Wonderland ridge, with access over to BTI and the potential to ride to the White Rabbit Parking Lot. The group also addressed the lowest section of Alice in Wonderland, the ‘gully.’

Eldridge stated that the group thought the best option would be to keep the existing trail footprint, and they felt the Alice gully could be restored to a rideable state. In addition, consider allowing uphill bike traffic on the east Bandersnatch trail, which is currently a pedestrian/equestrian trail.

Eldridge pointed out a potential problem with the unsanctioned section of Alice in Wonderland (upper section beyond the Alice in Wonderland Ridge) that crosses three parcels of private land (Eldridge clarified that APRC has easements for two of the three). The working group recommends that APRC and AWTA (Ashland Woodlands & Trails Association) refocus efforts on securing the easements necessary to make the Alice in Wonderland trail complete and free of conflict.

Botts stated there may need to be an order of operations with this proposal:

1. Rebuild the Alice in Wonderland gully
2. Designate east Bandersnatch as uphill bikes, peds and equestrian

Brandy proposed that if uphill bike traffic is allowed on east Bandersnatch that perhaps we rename it to avoid confusion with other sections of Bandersnatch that are not multiuse.

McFarland stated that when the gully is restored it needs to be clarified that this area will be for downhill bike traffic only. However, we could look at the possibility of the gully being an uphill connection too, if and when we get easements on the unsanctioned sections of Alice in Wonderland.

- Following the presentation and discussion, Councilor Jensen made a motion:
Motion: “I move for recommendation of items No. 1 and No. 4 in the working group proposal, for now.” Eldridge seconded.

Vote: The vote was nine (9) yes, one (1) no (Chapman).

VIII. IMPERATRICE UPDATE – There was not enough time for an update on this proposal. Commissioner Landt pointed out that the working group will need another site visit.

Action Items:

- Eldridge will help facilitate getting the Imperatrice Working Group together again

Note:

- Franco left the meeting at 12:24 p.m.
- Botts left the meeting at 12:33 p.m.

IX. ADJOURNMENT – Meeting Adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dorinda Cottle
APRC Executive Analyst