

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Pool ad-Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes
November 7, 2018

ATTENDEES

Present: Community Committee Members Risa Buck, Marc Heller, Mike Hitsky, Rebecca Kay and Jocelyn Sanford; Commissioners Gardiner and Miller; Director Black; Recreation Superintendent Dials; Senior Services Superintendent Glatt; Parks Superintendent Oxendine; Recreation Manager Flora; City of Ashland Finance Director Mark Welch

Absent: None

I. CALL TO ORDER

Director Black called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. at The Grove, 1195 E. Main Street.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – A motion was made to accept the minutes as written and it was seconded.

Vote: All Yes

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND GUEST SPEAKERS

Citizen Michael Carew introduced himself as a master's swimmer and member of the community. Carew stated that he was disappointed not to be on the committee due to his application being lost by Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission staff.

Citizen Geri Mathison said she appreciated everyone's interest in talking about the pool. She said the pool needed work and a pool cover was an important feature in addition to a way for seniors to access it in an easier manner. Mathison said the entire community needed a pool.

IV. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

Black asked if anyone had deletions or additions to the proposed agenda; there were none.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE

VI. NEW BUSINESS

a) Elect Chair and Vice Chair (APRC Director)

Black said everyone would have the opportunity to nominate themselves or someone else. Matt Miller was nominated as the Pool as-Hoc Committee Chair; he accepted the nomination.

Motion: A motion was made for Matt Miller to be the Chair of the Pool as-Hoc Committee / the motion was seconded.

Vote: All Yes

The second order of business was to elect a Vice Chair; Rebecca Kay was nominated and the nomination was seconded. No further nominations were forthcoming, nor was there any discussion.

Motion: A motion was made for Rebecca Kay to serve as the Vice Chair of the Pool ad-Hoc Committee; the motion was seconded.

Vote: All Yes

b) Review Proposed Subcommittee Timeline (APRC Director)

Black said he sent out a memo outlining a timeline for the work of the subcommittee. He suggested going into March with the first phase to allow time for holding meetings, having follow-up meetings, conducting a survey, getting the information from the surveys and having a final meeting to present the findings to the public. Black said as of now they would have one meeting a month. It was recommended at the last meeting that they reach out to professionals; it was asked whether this could be completed by March. Black said if they were not doing a full feasibility analysis, it would likely not take longer than six months. With the traffic analysis, if they were not drastically changing their use which they were not, then they were looking at a professional engineer stating in a letter that the current demand for parking during peak hours would change from one time to another. Black said he was confident that this analysis could be done without conducting a full RFP. Black said they could get a couple of quotes and it might cost around \$5,000-\$8,000 to do this study. Black stated that this was the outreach phase and it was important to get the message into the community and do it correctly. He said he was looking at March for when a recommendation could be made. He said Phase II would be an in-depth analysis. Black suggested that Phase II could begin and the group could start looking at the survey and getting ideas. Black said in Phase III they needed to start evaluating how funding might be proposed and what the possible cost could be.

c) Review Report from Feasibility Analysis Subcommittee (APRC Director & Subcommittee)

Rebecca Kay stated that the Needs Analysis Subcommittee met and decided to follow the model established by the ad-Hoc Senior Program Advisory Committee (ASPAC). Kay said that model included holding several open houses, listening sessions, creating a survey and posting the link in various social media sites and on the APRC website. She said the subcommittee also looked at the existing pool studies conducted in 2007 and 2008 by the City of Medford and the 2013 study about the Daniel Meyer Pool and its equipment. Todd Lantry said that the 2007 study was done by a consulting firm that plans out pools and handles feasibility studies. Lantry said the City of Medford commissioned the study as their facilities were aging. A follow-up report done in 2008 by Remi Northwest cost the City of Medford \$15,000. Lantry said that since those were completed, nothing much had changed in the valley except for two pools being decommissioned – the Hawthorne pool and the SOU pool. The subcommittee felt the study was still pertinent as it was only ten years old. Lantry said getting the feedback from the community was very important and they needed to follow the model used by the Senior Program and have interactive sessions. Lantry said that the subcommittee's recommendation was to not do a full feasibility study. Kay said the Medford studies did not include soliciting input from the public and that was something the subcommittee wanted. Kay said that a parking and traffic study was needed as well as looking at the bathrooms. Kay said that once they could gather all those needs together, hopefully by the end of March, they could submit it to the design committee. Black said that the showers were a building code issue and, depending on the size of the pool, they would have to look at the traffic for a conditional use permit expansion for the City. Risa Buck said when it came to getting feedback from the community, she hoped more than social media could be used and non-

swimmers could also be included in the process. Matt Miller asked a question regarding pool survey questions. Lantry said they could contact a Statistics class at SOU and see if they would have enough time to create the survey and have it out before the timeline in March. Flora said that they had worked with the SOU research center and that in the past SOU has been willing to help them devise the method of questioning, so it might continue to be a possibility. Gardiner asked if there would be other cities with survey templates; Black said that they would glean off what other people had done. Sanford asked who would fill out the surveys as some people might work in Ashland but live in Medford. Black said there was usually a question asking if you were a resident and that way you could separate resident responses from nonresident responses as both were valuable. Lantry said that open-ended questions should also be included in the survey. Black commented that the important thing was to move this forward. Lantry said that as long as the ad hoc committee and staff would approve their findings on the recent reports and since there was not a need to do a full-on feasibility study then they would need to meet again to formulate when the open houses and interactive sessions would happen as well as getting the surveys going. Lantry said they would need help with the surveys and he asked whether dedicated time could be established within the meetings for these efforts. Lantry said they would need to meet prior to the next ad hoc committee meeting to do the working sessions. With no further comment, Miller moved the meeting on to the next agenda item.

d) Review List of Current and Future Stakeholder (APRC Director)

Black reviewed the current stakeholder list and said he was hoping they could establish a more complete list of current and future stakeholders. Buck said she wanted to add the YMCA to the list. Sanford said she was thinking of Special Olympics, Ashland Yoga, Scuba, Standup Paddle, Kayaking, Boat Safety, Aquatic Therapy, The Sharks Swim Team and Southern Oregon Water Polo. It was suggested that they tap into the realms of triathlete groups, bike riding groups and long distance running groups. Miller said two additional groups could be CrossFit Ashland and the Ashland Rowing Club. Others mentioned included Scouts USA and the Jackson County Public Health Dept. Lantry asked if Asante was mentioned and it was said that potentially Asante and Providence could be considered as well as the Red Cross. Flora said Star Guard Elite and Star Fish Elite would be good groups to include. Black said they would want to create a couple of lists: one for the School District, SOU and others, with the other list for those advised of meetings, invited to meetings and kept abreast of the progress of the Committee. Black said by the next meeting they would talk about setting up an additional stakeholder meeting when doing the outreach. Risa said they needed to consider that citizens of Ashland were also stakeholders. Black said the community was always a stakeholder. Gardiner asked if they needed to include City Council; Black agreed that they should. Black asked if they wanted to include Talent City Council. It was stated that it made sense due to a higher density of kids. Black said he believed City of Phoenix might be a stakeholder but at a different level. Black said the list was always open as the subcommittee thought of people. The Ashland Chamber of Commerce was added to the list as suggested by Gardiner. Miller asked if there were any other ideas for stakeholders and with no further discussion, he moved the committee to the next agenda item.

e) Form Outreach Subcommittee (APRC Director)

Black said the topic of an Outreach Subcommittee came up at the request of the group but action was not needed at this time. Black said outreach would be important in terms of notifying the community about the work underway. Buck said the Needs Analysis Feasibility group consisted of four members and they would be heading up the effort to schedule and organize open houses, listening sessions and survey creation. She said they needed more help with all that. It was stated that it would be good to form an Outreach Subcommittee to meet, brainstorm and come up with a plan. Black said he felt that

they needed more staffing on the current group instead of creating another group. He said they could have a maximum of four members on the subcommittee and they currently had just two. Kay asked who wanted to join the subcommittee and Heller and Buck volunteered to serve as members of the Outreach and Feasibility Subcommittee.

f) Roundtable Discussion (All)

Black said another Subcommittee could be the Planning Subcommittee and it could be formed in the future.

Motion: A motion was made to establish a Site Analysis and Planning Subcommittee / the motion was seconded.

Vote: All Yes

It was decided that the Site Analysis and Planning Subcommittee members would consist of Hitsky, Simms and Sanford, with Black and Oxendine serving as staff liaisons.

IV. SET FUTURE MEETING DATE

The next meeting date was set for December 5, 2018, 3:30 p.m., location TBD.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Wysocki, Temp Office Assistant
Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission