

IMPORTANT: Any citizen may orally address the Parks Commission on non-agenda items during the Public Forum. Any citizen may submit written comments to the Commission on any item on the Agenda, unless it is the subject of a public hearing and the record is closed. Time permitting, the Presiding Officer may allow oral testimony. If you wish to speak, please out the Speaker Request Form located near the entrance to the Council Chambers. The chair will recognize you and inform you as to the amount of time allotted to you, if any. The time granted will be dependent to some extent on the nature of the item under discussion, the number of people who wish to speak, and the length of the agenda.



AGENDA FOR REGULAR MEETING

ASHLAND PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION October 24, 2016 Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main Street

6:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660 (2)(e)

7:00 p.m. or thereafter

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - a. Study Session—September 19, 2016
 - b. Regular Meeting—September 26, 2016
- III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
 - a. Open Forum
- IV. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA
- V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
 - a. Study Session Start Time Adjustment (Action)
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. Trail Master Plan Committee Formation (Action)
 - b. Subcommittee Creation: Senior Center and Lithia Park Master Plan (Action)
- VII. SUBCOMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS
- VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS
- IX. UPCOMING MEETING DATES
 - a. Study Session—November 21, 2016
 - The Grove, 1195 E. Main Street—7:00 p.m.
 - b. Regular Meeting—November 28, 2016
 - Council Chambers, 1175 E. Street—7:00 p.m.
- X. ADJOURNMENT

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION
Minutes
September 19, 2016

ATTENDEES

Present: Commissioners Gardiner, Landt, Lewis, Miller; Director Black; Superintendent Dickens and Dials; Executive Assistant Dyssegard; Assistant Manuel

Absent: Commissioner Shaw; City Council Liaison Mayor Stromberg

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gardiner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at The Grove, 1195 E. Main Street

PUBLIC INPUT

There was none.

CIP UPDATE

Black stated that the City Administrator recently requested from all departments and APRC a year-to-date update on capital improvement projects (CIP), with particular emphasis on financial status as approved by Ashland City Council. Each update was to include monies spent and any changes or deviations as well as outstanding fund balances per project. The updates would be reviewed by the Citizens' Budget Committee.

Black noted that the APRC report had been well received. Questions related to unspent funds were asked. Black explained that some projects slated for 2015/2016 were somewhat delayed due to time spent facilitating the Performance Audit, the recruitment and hiring of a project manager to manage APRC projects and unforeseen structural issues requiring attention. Black stated that projects currently underway and those waiting to begin would be addressed at an accelerated pace during the second half of 2016.

Black reviewed CIP financial details, noting that project totals were budgeted at \$3,817,890 for the biennium. Offsetting resources included \$1,374,867 from Food and Beverage Tax revenues, \$607,340 from Systems Development Charges, \$285,638 from Critical Maintenance funding and \$1,550,045 from Municipal Bonds.

Monies spent for projects YTD totaled \$471,947. Black stated that approximately \$2,123,082 remained for current projects or projected projects in the current biennium. He said some funds were transferred to pay for a critical public safety issue caused by a failure of the Beach Creek pedestrian bridge at North Mountain Park. This resulted in a postponement of lower priority projects pending alternative funding sources.

The Beach Creek pedestrian bridge was financed by reducing fund balances in the Lithia Park asphalt project, the Daniel Meyer Pool solar panel replacement fund, the relocation of the Garfield Park sand volleyball project and others for a total of \$115,430.

Black said funding changes came from money left over from completed projects as well as the removal of projects that did not meet the criteria for a capital project, such as building and maintenance upgrades and YMCA Park

upgrades. Other changes came from projects listed on the Unfunded Projects List – those that did not have funding available. He noted that he had made the administrative decision to proceed with the project for the sake of public safety.

Landt stated that because the changes resulted in a significant change to the CIP, the emergency action for the Beach Creek pedestrian bridge should have been reviewed and approved by the Commission; Black agreed.

Lewis questioned whether contingencies contained in project fund balances were removed from project totals. Black replied that the cancelled projects were unfunded in that there were no funds identified to complete the projects. Asphalt projects would be postponed until the next biennium, at which time they would become top priorities. When asked by Gardiner if all transferred funds went to the Beach Creek bridge project, Black replied that the transferred funds had become a pool of available funds for projects not listed in the 2016/2017 CIP.

It was agreed by consensus that the Beach Creek pedestrian bridge project would be reviewed, with corresponding changes to the biennium budget formalized at the September 26 APRC business meeting. Eleven current or upcoming projects would also be reviewed at that time.

Dickens highlighted five successfully completed projects to date. He noted that the CIP included \$27,000 for a bike skills park, which he felt was sufficient for a beginning-level bike skills course. Project details such as the park's location could be included in upcoming discussions about the project.

Dickens said the Beach Creek project was in the final stages of construction and the sidewalks damaged by construction were being repaired. He noted the substantial cracks in the asphalt paths nearby (not related to the project) would be repaired with the assistance of Public Works.

Dickens highlighted other details about the project and explained that the culverts would stand for fifty years. Dickens noted that a landscaping plan was underway that included plantings to control erosion on the hillside. He reported that Bee City USA was advising APRC about including pollinator-friendly plants for irrigated areas.

There followed Commissioner discussion about final bids for the Garfield Park project and questions about Ashland Creek Park Phase II. Dickens indicated that Ashland Creek Phase II was the result of a need for a larger storm drain in the street. He stated that the City had required it at the time and put it in at their expense. The City expected APRC to repay them for the work as funds became available.

Landt suggested a review of the established goals for the biennium with a focus on the top five projects. He referred to prior discussions about the profusion of small projects and the establishment of larger top priorities. He highlighted the Lithia Park Master Plan as an example, stating that it was an essential project and while it wasn't possible to complete in the near future, good progress could be made.

Black emphasized that he supported reaching goals. He stated that the strategy was to do as much as possible until it became clear that some projects would have to be postponed. Black highlighted small projects that would take little time versus other small projects that would be time consuming. He stated that internal priorities were established accordingly.

Landt stated that the focus should remain on the top five projects and care must be given to not let smaller projects get in the way. It was agreed that the review of projects would include input from APRC as to the sequence of priorities. Dickens reflected that unexpected emergencies such as Clubhouse renovations and the Beach Creek pedestrian bridge generally resulted in slower progress on established projects.

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF COLAS

Black reviewed the decision made by APRC to assign a 1.5% COLA and a .5% “catch-up” adjustment for fiscal year 2016/2017. Recently compiled historical data documented background information regarding APRC and City COLAs. Black noted that a median was established based upon comparable units and comparisons between City of Ashland employees and APRC employees. Two bargaining units within the City were removed from the calculation because they operated under no-strike contracts that were negotiated differently from employees who belonged to unionized bargaining units. The adjusted median was 1.75% for the year. Cumulative totals averaged over five years totaled 19.24% for comparative units and 15.47% for APRC.

There followed a brief discussion about calculations for comparable COLAs and ways to extrapolate data that would work for the largest category of workers. Black stated that it was important to note that the calculations were based on factual data and were not arbitrary. Landt suggested that a more meaningful comparison would be looking at like wages and salaries for departments within the City. He noted that COLAs were a device to account for inflation while salaries and wages were generally more responsive to the marketplace. Black agreed, stating that a marketplace salary and wages survey was appropriate every five or six years.

Lewis noted that management should be taken out of the equation when researching differences between City employees and APRC employees. He referred to prior administrations where staff asked for concessions directly from the Commissioners. Black responded that as the Director, he represented APRC staff and it was his responsibility to bring forward staff requests to the Commissioners when appropriate. He emphasized that because of the non-union status of APRC staff, no specific financial contracts applied to APRC employees and no negotiations would take place. Rather, requests were reviewed internally with Commissioner oversight for any budgetary decisions.

Miller stated that he would appreciate actual salary numbers for City laborers and APRC laborers for the sake of comparison. Black explained that COLAs were not the proper vehicle for establishing a commensurate rate, but wages and salaries were.

Lewis stated that in past years, APRC employees occasionally received no cost-of-living adjustments in years when City employees received COLAs. He noted that the COLA had become problematic because inflation was actually negative yet employees still expected and received a positive adjustment. Lewis acknowledged that arriving at a satisfactory balance was somewhat subjective. Gardiner observed that adjusting salaries was more appropriate than using the COLA metric as a catchup tool.

STAFF UPDATES

Possible Donation

Black stated that he was approached by relatives of landscape architect John McLaren about a possible donation. McLaren's grandfather had created a bust of John and because of his connection to Ashland Parks and Recreation, the family wished to donate the bust to APRC. Black indicated that he was appreciative of the offer and would consider the acquisition if accommodations for the bust could be found. Black noted that the donation had been originally declined in 1996 because of its size and fragility. He suggested that it be held in storage until such time as

a museum was developed for the Parks system. Dickens agreed, stating that a museum was a possibility given the large number of historic artifacts available in Ashland.

Renovation of Daniel Meyer Pool

Dials reported that the pool had been drained and pool tiles repaired. She noted that it was now ready for the winter season beginning with the 2016-17 Masters Swim program slated to begin in November. In response to a question by Gardiner, she stated that the water polo club had chosen not to use the facilities during the winter.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

North Mountain Park

Landt called attention to curb damage occurring at North Mountain Park. He stated that large trucks had been delivering materials, forcing other vehicles to go over the curb to get around them. He suggested the addition of an apron to create additional space. Dickens replied that a curb cut was needed. He surmised that the trucks were delivering wood chips.

Bee City USA

Gardner reported that Bee City USA Subcommittee members were advising Parks regarding a pollinator project that would be incorporated into landscaping at North Mountain Park. He stated that their ideas were detailed.

Landt urged staff to ask about maintenance responsibilities. He suggested restraint when incorporating vegetation that would need ongoing maintenance unless volunteers were willing to extend that care. Dickens replied that the priority was plantings that helped control erosion.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Assistant

These Minutes are not a verbatim record. The narrative has been summarized to reflect the discussions made. Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission Study Sessions, Special Meetings and Regular Meetings are digitally recorded and available upon request.

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Minutes
September 26, 2016

ATTENDEES

Present: Commissioners Gardiner, Landt, Lewis, Miller, Shaw; Director Black; Superintendent Dials; Executive Assistant Dyssegard; Assistant Manuel

Absent: Superintendent Dickens; City Council Liaison Mayor Stromberg

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gardiner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Study Session – July 18, 2016

Motion: Shaw moved to approve the Minutes for July 18, 2016, as presented. Miller seconded.
The vote was all yes.

Regular Meeting – July 25, 2016

Motion: Shaw moved to approve the Minutes for July 25, 2016, as presented. Landt seconded.
The vote was all yes.

Study Session – August 15, 2016

Motion: Miller moved to approve the Minutes for August 15, 2016, as presented. Lewis seconded.
The vote was all yes, with Shaw abstaining as he was not present at the meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

• *Open Forum*

Rogue Valley Bike Polo representatives **Eric Michener and Daryl Witmore** of 142 Willow, Ashland were called forward.

Michener thanked the Commissioners for allowing a bike polo tournament to be held at Hunter Park over Labor Day weekend. He reported that fourteen teams participated, coming from as far away as San Francisco, CA, and Seattle, WA. He stated that the Club was careful to meet the conditions for approval; quieting after 8:00 p.m. and shutting down the games at 10:00 p.m. both Saturday and Sunday.

Michener noted that clean-up went well, generating positive public comments. He submitted an email with commentary about the care taken. An excerpt from the email is as follows: "...I watched with interest the Labor Day weekend bicycle polo competition at Hunter Park and the disciplined attention the hosts gave to returning the premises to its previous condition. These people showed that even aggressive, physically challenging athletes can demonstrate true civic responsibility..."

Finally Michener submitted a letter for the record, asking that the Commissioners consider construction of a multi-sport court that would accommodate the cyclists and other "non-net" sports.

Don Ferguson of 438 and 440 Helman St., Ashland was called forward.

Ferguson relayed that the Ferguson property extended across Ashland Creek on the south side of Ashland Creek Park, with both banks of the creek his responsibility. He said the adjacent property is owned by the City of Ashland and is currently unimproved, creating an inviting space for itinerant campers. Because there are no restroom or garbage facilities, the camping area is unsanitary and unsightly.

Ferguson said he filed complaints with the Ashland Police Department who visited the site during daytime hours when campers were not present. He stated that campers had challenged his contention that part of the land was private property and he asked that APRC assist him in finding a solution for the matter. He suggested a collaboration to clearly mark the boundaries between Ashland Creek Park land and the Ferguson property.

Landt confirmed that staff would assist Mr. Ferguson in his efforts to mitigate the situation.

ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Agenda items CIP Updates and Project Updates were combined under the heading **NEW BUSINESS**.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

- ***Performance Audit Approval (Action)***

Black reviewed Audit timelines and described the process that included stakeholder interviews, an intensive data gathering process and an evaluation process. Opportunities within APRC and best practices among peers were evaluated with the overarching goal of increased efficiencies and enhanced high levels of service. A draft version of the recommendations was prepared and went through several iterations, with the APRC Advisory Committee vetting the document in addition to the Commissioners. After review, the document was presented to the Commissioners for final approval after corrections. To maintain contextual consistency, the term *APRC* was used to denote the entire organization, while the term the *Commissioners* referred to the elected body. The term *Commission* refers to administrative actions taken by staff with oversight by the Commissioners.

Black highlighted the high level of service that APRC currently provides, noting that the number of acres of land (over 800 acres) and the amount of open space, forestland, and developed parkland was extraordinary. Finding peer communities was a challenge for the auditors, who were unable to find peer communities in Oregon but found a number of similar communities outside the state. Benchmarks were extrapolated based upon best practices in organizational structure, governance and finance.

Administrative Division:

Black reported on suggested improvements for Administration. Changes to the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) were recommended that would include line items for repair and replacement of existing equipment and structures. One best practice was to create a fund dedicated to keeping existing assets in top condition and/or using money set aside to replace them when appropriate.

Streamlining policies and procedures for each unit were considered apropos. Joint use agreements were recommended to allow for community collaborations when multiple agencies were needed to provide regional as well as local needs.

The study suggested the establishment of a brand for APRC. Black commented that the APRC brand was already established but extra exposure would be beneficial.

The Audit report detailed the creation of a Golf Operations Unit with a senior management position that would provide supervisory management for all aspects of the unit, including budgetary responsibilities, grounds maintenance and Clubhouse services.

Recreation Division:

Recommendations included instituting a comprehensive plan to identify community needs, streamline internal operations and provide for increased customer feedback. An evaluation of all recreational programs was advised to better understand the needs of the community. Forming an advisory group was also a best practice for increased focus on recreation-related issues. It was also suggested that cost recovery for programs offered could be improved. Additional programs could be developed to better address the needs of the underserved.

Parks Division:

For Parks, a shift in emphasis was counseled, changing from a focus on acquisitions and new facilities to the development of a strong maintenance program. Maintenance standards could be formalized for greater consistency and building a detailed inventory of parks and open spaces would assist APRC to better track and manage APRC properties.

Audit recommendations included focusing on increased numbers of volunteers and the addition of seasonal staff for peak times. It was noted that the number of acres per employee was greater than the norm. Instead of hiring additional staff, it was recommended that the temporary budget be increased to accommodate extra seasonal workers.

Golf Operations Division:

Adding a senior management position and combining golf course maintenance with business activities such as running the Clubhouse and providing budgetary oversight were suggested as ways to develop better communication and increased efficiencies. Strategic planning would help to move the municipal golf course forward. Grounds upkeep was considered the key to success at the golf course.

General Commentary:

Black highlighted APRC's strengths as detailed by the auditors. APRC's focus on goals would assist APRC to move the organization forward. The auditors praised the working relationship between the City of Ashland and APRC. They noted the expertise of APRC managers (stating that the infrastructure was in place to move the organization forward). The programs and services offered by APRC were judged to be very important to the community.

Black presented a table depicting the implementation process. Priorities were quantified and divided into categories entitled Critical, Necessary, and Desirable. He stated that some critical items were not listed as top priorities due to budgetary constraints or established priorities. Black introduced a tracking form that grouped like actions together – with 32 groups or project recommendations that needed to be developed. He differentiated between ongoing priorities and those that could be accomplished while conducting business as usual. Those items with fiscal impacts would most likely have to wait until the budget could be adjusted accordingly.

Motion: Landt moved to adopt the Performance Audit Report as presented and the prioritization recommended by staff and the Advisory Committee. Shaw seconded.

Discussion among Commissioners:

Lewis confirmed that the draft report would become final when adopted by the Commissioners.

Landt stated that the Commissioners had hoped that implementation of the Performance Audit recommendations would result in a cost savings for the organization. He noted that in his opinion, very little cost savings would be realized in the short term. He commented that there was a potential for savings in the long term because of streamlined operations and other efficiencies.

Shaw expressed appreciation for the work of the Advisory Committee. He anticipated additional goals based on the Audit report and stated that he was pleased with the ideas and best practices presented. Shaw noted that a deferred maintenance plan would be helpful as APRC set money aside to address the repair and replacement of assets.

Motion: Landt moved to adopt the Performance Audit Report as presented and the prioritization recommended by staff and Advisory Committee. Shaw seconded.

The vote was all yes

- ***Garfield Park Bids Review (Action)***

Project Manager Jason Minica presented the Master Plan and Site Plan for the Garfield Park improvements. He stated that the plans included a CSSB Shelter, a new Splash Pad structure, picnic shelters and improvements to the volleyball court and basketball court. He detailed the cost estimates, noting that the Splash Pad would cost an estimated \$503,000, the basketball court approximately \$54,100, the shelters \$63,500, the bike shelter and miscellaneous improvements \$106,000 and contingencies and mobilization fees \$94,458 for a grand total of \$821,058. Although several companies expressed interest, there was only one bid from Vitus Construction, who weighed in at \$817,564.

Minica recommended approval of the bid from Vitus Construction.

Discussion among Commissioners

In response to a question by Gardiner, Black indicated that staff was comfortable working with Vitus and that staff had been pleased with their past work in the Ashland parks system.

Landt corrected the record, noting that the Garfield Park Master Plan had been approved in September of 2015. He stated that he had voted against the plan at the time because of concerns that had since been ameliorated. He noted that the site plan had not been reviewed by the Commissioners, but that he (Landt) had since reviewed the site plan and had come to an agreement with staff about some minor changes. He advocated for the resulting site plan.

Motion: Landt moved to approve the bid from Vitus Construction for the Garfield Park improvements.

Discussion

Gardiner asked about a timeframe for the project. Minica replied that Vitus had not yet committed to a start date, but the company would guarantee that the Garfield Park project would be completed by the end of April. Minica further stated that a timeline would be prepared once the start time has been agreed upon.

Black stated that the bid would be presented to the City Council due to the size of the procurement.

Motion: Landt recommended approval of the bid by Vitus Construction to the City Council. Lewis seconded.

Black observed that the Commissioners were not a recommending body – that the motion could be approved. City Council would formalize the Commissioners' approval.

Motion: Landt moved to approve the bid from Vitus Construction for the Garfield Park improvements. Lewis seconded

The vote was all yes

Shaw asked whether the bid included the park walkways. Minica explained that the walkways bordering the restrooms and those in the general area of construction would be improved. Those that were closer to North Main would be handled separately at another time.

- ***CIP Update***

Black detailed the CIP project list, emphasizing the priorities and status—what had been completed, what had been postponed and what had been canceled. He stated that the top four priorities were as follows:

- The Garfield Water Play Replacement (in progress)
- The Second Dog Park Construction (in progress)
- The Lithia Park Master Plan (in progress)
- Trails and Open Space Comprehensive Plan Update (beginning stages)

Black indicated that the Trails Master Plan update project would be chaired by Jeff McFarland who would work with an Advisory Subcommittee. Recruitment for the Advisory Subcommittee would begin next month.

Black stated that the next four items on the CIP project list could be prioritized in a different order at the will of the Commissioners. Project totals for all work including postponed and cancelled projects, as well as those to be completed in the current biennium, totaled \$3,817,890. Black stated that although the numbers had been adjusted to include unforeseen repairs for the Beach Creek pedestrian bridge and Golf Course Clubhouse repairs, the bottom line remained at \$3,817,890.

Landt suggested two motions to validate and confirm the money transfers (to pay for the emergency repairs listed above) and to approve the priorities as listed.

Motion: Landt moved to approve the transfer of funds between projects within the CIP. Shaw seconded.

The vote was all yes

Discussion among Commissioners:

Shaw was appreciative of the organized chart and the designations therein.

Gardiner stated that the established priorities had been evaluated by staff. He noted that those projects not included in the top eight priorities were clearly designated as either completed, postponed or cancelled.

Landt suggested that the Commissioners communicate to staff that the focus should be almost exclusively on the top four listed and that work on other projects could be undertaken only if it would not impede progress on the designated priorities.

Lewis differentiated between small projects and those requiring more time and resources, such as the Lithia Park Master Plan. He noted that Minica was involved with all of the projects requiring construction. He stated that even with a vote to direct staff to concentrate on the top four priorities, there remained enough flexibility to transfer

attention to a lower priority if it did not mean time away from the top priorities. Minica agreed, stating that there were natural breaks in the pace of construction when next steps were delayed while waiting for information or materials. He stated that in times like those, prep work for lower priorities could keep the momentum going.

Shaw relayed that, in his opinion, no motion would be needed to approve priorities that were already identified by staff. He expressed confidence in Director Black's leadership and in staff's ability to concentrate on the priorities listed.

Landt stated that it would be supportive of staff to approve a motion that directed their focus to the top four projects. He commented that there were normally so many fires to work on day to day, that losing sight of the big picture would be understandable. Landt stressed the importance of completing or making good progress on the top priorities prior to the conclusion of the biennium. He reiterated his opinion that a clear directive in the form of a motion could be helpful to staff in their efforts to maintain focus on the priorities.

Black clarified that Minica's priorities were the top two, the third priority was assigned to the Director and the fourth was assigned to the Trails and Open Space Manager, Jeffrey McFarland.

Motion: Landt moved that the CIP priorities be the first four projects listed. Additional projects (such as projects listed as numbers five through eight) could be worked on if they did not take usable time away from the first four priorities. Lewis seconded.

Discussion

Gardiner indicated that he agreed with Shaw in that the motion was an abundance of caution. That said, he stated that he would vote for the motion because it confirmed the priorities as discussed. Miller agreed, stating that the priorities stood as listed.

Lewis summarized the discussion as "prioritization of the priority list." He explained that the intent of the motion was to recommend a clear direction to staff.

Black stated that the priority list would be useful because it was so close to the end of the biennium. He explained that an approved vote would support staff by reducing the priorities to a more manageable list and affirming the direction staff was taking.

Shaw agreed with the priorities but reiterated his belief that the motion would be constraining. He stated a concern about second-guessing or micromanaging staff. He noted that he would support a motion that simply concurred with the priorities listed.

Motion: Landt moved that the CIP priorities be the first four listed on the priorities list and that items five through eight be worked on if they did not detract from top priority projects. Lewis seconded.

The vote was 4 yes, 1 no (Shaw)

The motion passed.

Black relayed that internal work plans were not normally decided in this way; however, because of the finite period of time remaining in the biennium, it would help ensure good progress or completion of planned APRC projects.

- ***Project Updates***

Minica reported on the status of the projects as follows:

Oak Knoll Clubhouse Project

Clubhouse repairs were projected to cost \$90,000. The project would be completed slightly under budget with final costs coming in at \$89,434. There were some unforeseen costs, including a fire sprinkler that was found to be leaking water (then repaired) and ceiling deck lighting (added).

Garfield Park Summary

The budget for this project was \$850,000, which was approved and issued as a bond. Vitus Construction was the low bidder coming in at \$815,756.46. The scope of work includes a full splash pad replacement, hardscape improvements such as picnic areas, full volleyball concrete enclosure, full basketball court replacement including posts and backboards, three new shade shelters, sidewalk extension for enhanced pedestrian circulation and various landscape enhancements including irrigation.

Hunter Park Summary

Minica referred to a completed neighborhood survey, noting that people had expressed a desire for a new toddler playground for young children ages one through five. When Hunter Park becomes a priority, details will be reviewed by the Commissioners.

Second Dog Park Summary

An engineering survey has been completed and the plan has been presented to the Ashland Planning Department for approval. Construction is slated for spring 2017.

Grove Pioneer Summary

This project has been completed, allowing APRC to move the main office to a more centrally located area that better serves Ashland citizens.

Pool House Renovation Summary

This project has also been completed and includes new paint inside and out, a new roof, new insulation and new boiler. These repairs and upgrades will facilitate use year around.

Oak Knoll Cart Path Summary

McFarland stated that the paths have been engineered and roughed in. The completed pathways are now level and ready for asphalt.

North Mountain Culvert Project Summary

McFarland noted that the North Mountain Park Culvert project was 90% completed. The trail was reopened on September 20 and the structural work was in place, including an overflow channel engineered to hold large amounts of storm water runoff. Irrigation work was underway in preparation for the plantings to control erosion.

McFarland stated that the Bee City USA Subcommittee was considering a project in the area that could result in additional plantings.

Shaw commented that he had received commentary about the impressive quality of the work. McFarland noted that the environmental impacts were especially sensitive and that he was pleased to present a letter of acceptance from the geotechnical firm that provided the engineering.

SUBCOMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

- ***Financial Update Q4 (Information)***

Black introduced the financial report prepared by the City of Ashland's Finance Director each quarter. He stated that APRC ended fiscal year 2015/2016 under budget by 1.7%. He stated that he was pleased with the results given the demands upon the APRC Budget.

- ***Goals Update (Information)***

Black presented an update of APRC goals, stating that it represented the progress made to date on APRC's Strategic Plan.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Gardiner opened up discussion regarding a change in the regularly scheduled time for APRC Study Sessions. He suggested changing the starting time from 7:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., noting that APRC staff normally finished the work day at 5:00 p.m. and were required to stay onsite for after-hours study sessions.

Landt stated that he personally preferred the 7:00 p.m. meeting time but recognized that the time would be more supportive of staff. He surmised that the public impact would be minimal as most public commentary was disseminated at the APRC monthly business meeting.

Landt suggested implementing the change as of January 2017. He proposed a one-year trial period with a review when the trial expired. Miller stated that there was a precedent set as the City Council and other agencies, which also met at 5:30 p.m. Lewis indicated a willingness to try the new timeframe. Gardiner agreed to bring the matter back to a Business Meeting for adoption.

- ***ORPA 2016***

Black announced that Trails and Open Space Supervisor Jeffrey McFarland was the winner of this year's Outstanding Asset Management Award through Oregon Recreation and Parks Association (ORPA). He recognized Susan Dyssegard for her efforts to secure the nomination and said McFarland would receive the award at the annual ORPA Conference in November. Black stated that he was appreciative of his staff and their good work.

- ***Ashland Creek Park***

Shaw reported that he saw there was a police presence at Ashland Creek Park that morning. He asked if the police were there in response to the illegal campers in the area.

Black replied that the Ashland City Council had directed more resources toward the issue. He stated that an additional officer had been assigned to increase patrols at the City's parks and other problematic areas. He indicated that the patrol would update the Commissioners on a regular basis about their activities.

There followed a brief discussion about ways to mitigate the impact of illegal camping on adjacent properties.

UPCOMING MEETING DATES

Study Session	October 17, 2016	@	The Grove 1195 E. Main Street -- 7:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting	October 24, 2016	@	Council Chambers 1175 E. Main Street -- 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Assistant

These Minutes are not a verbatim record. The narrative has been condensed and paraphrased at times to reflect the discussions and decisions made. Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission Study Sessions and Regular meetings are digitally recorded and are available upon online.

ASHLAND PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

340 S. PIONEER STREET • ASHLAND, OREGON 97520

COMMISSIONERS:

Mike Gardiner
Rick Landt
Jim Lewis
Matt Miller
Vanston Shaw



Michael A. Black, AICP
Director

TEL: 541.488.5340
FAX: 541.488.5314
parksinfo@ashland.or.us

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission

FROM: Mike Gardiner, Parks Commission Chair

DATE: October 19, 2016

SUBJECT: Permanent Adjustment of Study Session Start Time (Action)

After discussing this idea with staff and other Parks Commissioners I would like to request an adjustment of our monthly Study Sessions (3rd Monday of the month) to begin at 5:30pm beginning in January 2017. There are benefits to an earlier start, mainly for staff. Other City of Ashland commissions meet earlier and City Council regularly holds Study Sessions earlier in the evenings to accommodate both staff and Councilors.

Commissioners expressed support for this proposal at the September 26 business meeting and the matter is now a proposed action item.

ASHLAND PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

340 S. PIONEER STREET • ASHLAND, OREGON 97520

COMMISSIONERS:

Mike Gardiner
Rick Landt
Jim Lewis
Matt Miller
Vanston Shaw



Michael A. Black, AICP
Director

TEL: 541.488.5340
FAX: 541.488.5314
parksinfo@ashland.or.us

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission

FROM: Jeffrey McFarland, APRC Open Space and Outer Parks Supervisor

DATE: October 24, 2016

SUBJECT: Trail Master Plan Committee Formation (Action)

On October 24, 2016, the Commission will review proposed members for a Trail Master Plan Update Committee. The committee will assist the Commission in fulfilling its goal of updating the Parks and Trails Master Plan Document, expected to occur every 10 years. After the process of updating the document is finished, the revised document will be presented to the Ashland Parks Commission and Ashland City Council for approval, with formal adoption occurring as part of the City of Ashland Transportation Plan.

Page two of this document outlines the authority and responsibilities of the committee and the roles that each category will fulfill, including staff and the City.

Possible motion: *That the Parks and Trails Master Plan Updating Committee be created to assist the Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission in reviewing and updating the Parks and Trails Master Plan Document and that the Chair be given permission to appoint the members of the committee as outlined in the attached document.*

Parks and Trails Master Plan Updating Committee

Purpose

To assist the Commissioners in fulfilling their goal of performing an update of the Parks and Trails Master Plan document every ten years. This will include updating of vision, goals, narrative, maps, specs and the possible creation/addition of new chapters as needed.

Duties

The Parks and Trails Master Plan Update Committee (the “*Committee*”) shall have the responsibility to review and update the current (approved 2006) Parks and Trails Master Plan. It is a listed goal in the Parks and Trails Master Plan to update the document every ten years. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the original document, identifying and performing needed updates, and working with City staff to create the newly updated document before making a recommendation to the Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission to approve the updated document.

Appointment and Term

The Committee shall be appointed by the Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission and shall serve for the term of the updating process to be completed, or until the final updated document is approved by the Commission.

Composition / Proposed Members

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | APRC Commission Chair | Mike Gardiner |
| 2. | APRC Commissioner | Jim Lewis |
| 3. | Ashland Forest Lands Commissioner | Luke Brandy |
| 4. | Ashland Forest Lands Commissioner | Stephen Jensen |
| 5. | Conservation Commissioner | Jim McGinnis |
| 6. | City Councilor | TBD by Mayor of Ashland |
| 7. | Member of Public | Torsten Heycke |
| 8. | Member of Public | David Chapman |

Staff Liaisons

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|
| 1. | APRC Director | Michael Black |
| 2. | APRC Executive Assistant | Susan Dyssegard |
| 3. | APRC Open Space and Outer Parks Supervisor | Jeffrey McFarland |
| 4. | Ashland GIS Specialist | Lea Richards |
| 5. | Ashland Fire Department Forestry Div. Chief | Chris Chambers |

ASHLAND PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

340 S. PIONEER STREET • ASHLAND, OREGON 97520

COMMISSIONERS:

Mike Gardiner
Rick Landt
Jim Lewis
Matt Miller
Vanston Shaw



Michael A. Black, AICP
Director

TEL: 541.488.5340
FAX: 541.488.5314
parksinfo@ashland.or.us

STAFF REPORT

TO: Ashland Parks and Recreation Commissioners
FROM: Michael Black
DATE: October 18, 2016
SUBJECT: Creation of Sub-committees (Action)

BACKGROUND

Parks staff and the Chair of the Parks Commission have identified a need to start two new sub-committees to provide oversight and guidance to staff with two specific projects, which are:

1. Ashland Parks and Recreation Senior Program
2. Lithia Park Master Plan

PURPOSE

Staff has identified the following purposes for the creation of the sub-committees:

1. Ashland Parks and Recreation Senior Program
 - a. Purpose: to review the programs and activities of the Senior Program, to determine best practices for the center based on the desired outcomes of the Commissioners of APRC and to create goals and objectives for implementing those outcomes.
2. Lithia Park Master Plan Sub-committee
 - a. Purpose: to review the proposed RFP, scope of work and timeline for the master plan of Lithia Park and to assist staff in reviewing RFP responses in order to select the appropriate team to perform the work to create a master plan. Additionally, the sub-committee will assist staff and consultants by providing an advisory board for the duration of the master plan process.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commissioners create the two sub-committees described above with the following make-up:

1. Ashland Parks and Recreation Senior Program Sub-committee Members:
 - a. Commission Chair Mike Gardiner and Commissioner Jim Lewis
2. Lithia Parks Master Plan Sub-committee Members:
 - a. Commissioner Rick Landt and Commissioner Matt Miller

SUGGESTED ACTION

Senior Program:

Possible motion: *That the Senior Program Sub-committee be formed to oversee the evaluation of the Senior Program, to establish best practices, set goals and oversee the implementation of any changes to the program.*

Lithia Park:

Possible motion: *That the Lithia Park Master Plan Sub-committee be formed to oversee the process of creating an RFP and scope of work for the Lithia Park Master Plan and to provide continuing oversight of the master plan process.*

