

ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING DRAFT MINUTES

Tuesday, December 7, 2021

Held Electronically; View on Channel 9 or Channels 180 and 181 (Charter Communications) or live stream via rvtv.sou.edu select RVTV Prime.

Written and oral testimony will be accepted for public input. For written testimony, email public-testimony@ashland.or.us using the subject line: Ashland City Council Public Testimony.

For oral testimony, fill out a Speaker Request Form at ashland.or.us/speakerrequest and return to the City Recorder. The deadline for submitting written testimony or speaker request forms will be on Monday, December 6th at 10 a.m. and must comply with Council Rules to be accepted.

Note: Items on the Agenda not considered due to time constraints are automatically continued to the next regularly scheduled Council meeting (AMC 2.04.030. (D)(3).

6:00 PM REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Akins called the Council Business Meeting to order at 6:00 PM

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Councilor Hyatt led the pledge.

III. ROLL CALL

Councilors' Graham, Hyatt, Moran, DuQuenne, Seffinger and Jensen were present.

IV. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Akins read the Land Acknowledgment (*see attachment*).

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Study Session Meeting of November 15, 2021
2. Business Meeting of November 16, 2021

Hyatt/Moran moved to approve the minutes. Discussion: None. All Ayes. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS & AWARDS

1. Planning Commission Annual Report
Planning Commission Chair Haywood Norton gave the annual presentation.

2. Social Equity and Racial Justice Resolution Review
Councilor Graham went over a PowerPoint (*see attached*).

Items discussed were:

- Tasks that have been completed or are in a holding pattern
- Tasks that are still underway

- Recommendation

Council gave Staff recommendation to what was presented.

VII. MINUTES OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND COMMITTEES

<u>Airport</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Conservation & Climate Outreach</u>
<u>Historic</u>	<u>Housing and Human Svcs.</u>	<u>Parks & Recreation</u>
<u>Forest Lands</u>	<u>Climate Policy</u>	<u>Community Center & Pioneer Hall Ad Hoc</u>
<u>Planning</u>	<u>Public Arts</u>	<u>Social Equity & Racial Justice</u>
<u>Transportation</u>	<u>Tree</u>	<u>Wildfire Safety</u>

VIII. PUBLIC FORUM

Business from the audience not included on the agenda. The Mayor will set time limits to enable all people wishing to speak to complete their testimony. [15 minutes maximum]

IX. CITY MANAGER REPORT

Interim City Manager Gary Milliman gave a brief Manager Report. He announced that the Council will have a Special Meeting on Friday, December 10th at 5:30 PM to discuss the appointment of a new City Manager.

X. CONSENT AGENDA

1. City Manager Pro-Tem Agreement Amendment
2. Approval for Public Works Vehicle Purchase

Moran pulled this item. He questioned the resale and where would the money go. Public Works Director Scott Fleury spoke that a second authorization will come back to Council for surplus.

3. Approval of IGA with Oregon Department of Transportation Accessibility Improvements

DuQuenne pulled this item.

DuQuenne/Moran moved that from this day forward the staff will no longer add any item on the consent agenda with more than a dollar amount of \$25,000. Discussion: DuQuenne spoke to the importance of discussion with items like this. City Attorney Katrina Brown explained that there was a Resolution adopted stating that anything under \$100,000 should not be on the Consent Agenda. She explained that Staff would need to bring back a new Resolution. Graham questioned what the standard practice is. Milliman answered that the current practice is standard. Moran spoke in support of the motion. **Roll Call Vote: Seffinger, Hyatt, Jensen and Graham: NO. Moran and Hyatt: YES. Motion fails 2/4.**

4. Continuum of Care Coordinated Letter of Interest for the League of Oregon Cities Pilot Project Grant

Mayor Akins asked for this item to be removed due to more work needing to be done.

Housing Program Specialist Linda Reid explained the process.

Council discussed the proposal.

Continuum of Care Coordinator gave an overview of the funding.

5. Approval of Russ Sanders to the Airport Commission
6. Approval of Kate Kennedy to the Conservation & Climate Outreach Commission
7. Approval of Bryan Sohl to the Climate Policy Commission

Councilor Seffinger pulled this item. She spoke in support of Bryan Sohl.

Seffinger/DuQuenne moved to approve Items 1, 5 & 6. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: Graham, Hyatt, Seffinger, Jensen, DuQuenne, and Moran: YES. Motion passed unanimously

Jensen/Graham moved to approve Consent Agenda Items 2,3,4,7. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: Hyatt, Graham, Jensen, Moran, DuQuenne and Seffinger: YES. Motion passed unanimously.

XI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Persons wishing to speak are to submit a “speaker request form” prior to the commencement of the public hearing. Public hearings conclude at 8:00 p.m. and are continued to a future date to be set by the Council, unless the Council, by a two-thirds vote of those present, extends the hearing(s) until up to 9:30 p.m. at which time the Council shall set a date for continuance and shall proceed with the balance of the agenda.

1. Public Hearing and First Reading Annexation Code Amendments

Mayor Akins opened the Public Hearing at 6:50 PM

Public Input:

Eric Navickas – Ashland - Spoke regarding the annexations. Spoke that these proposed amendments are not ok. He spoke regarding the safety and suggested the Council move in another direction with these ordinance changes. He urged Council to vote no on these changes.

Community Development Director. Bill Molnar and Planning Manager Maria Harris gave a Staff report and presented a PowerPoint (*see attached*).

Items discussed were:

- Project Objectives
- Annexation Criteria – Prior to 1995
- Focus Areas for Code Amendments
- Exceptions and Variances
- Purpose of Street Design Standards
- Public Facility/Transportation Improvements

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- Terminology
- Other
- Affordable Units
- Next Steps
- Project Information

Council discussed the requirements.

Council discussed affordable housing.

Graham/Jensen moved I move to approve first reading of Ordinance 3204, which is titled, An ordinance amending chapters 18.4.6, 18.5.8 and 18.61 of the Ashland Land Use Ordinance regarding annexations and to move the ordinance to second reading at the December 21, 2021 meeting. With the following change that we strike the term reasonably from the phrase “reasonably safe” throughout the ordinance. Discussion: Graham spoke that this is good work. She spoke that there is no need to say “reasonably” going forward. Jensen that this has been careful and good work. He spoke in support of the motion. DuQuenne questioned if quarter of a mile is just common language for pedestrians.

DuQuenne/Moran moved to amend the motion to read “The standards are reworded to require specific improvements bordering and within the annexed area, as well as connecting an annexed area to likely bicycle or pedestrian destinations within 1 mile of the annexed area.” Discussion: Moran spoke that the quarter mile seems to be restrictive and spoke in support of the motion. Graham spoke in concerns of what one mile looks like. She spoke in support to keep ¼ mile. Council discussed pedestrians crossing the street and the milage.

Mayor Akins Closed the Public Hearing at 7:42 PM

Roll Call Vote on the Amendment: Hyatt, Graham, Seffinger and Jensen: NO. Councilor DuQuenne and Moran: YES. Motion failed 2/4.

Roll Call Vote to the primary Motion: Hyatt, Graham, Jensen, DuQuenne, Seffinger and Hyatt: YES. Motion passed unanimously.

XII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Status Report on Pioneer Hall and Community Center

Milliman gave a brief Staff report. He spoke that it was inconclusive on whether to invite Mr. Sandler to make a presentation to Council.

Jensen spoke that there have been many emails regarding the Sandler issue. He spoke the volume of these emails is due to comments made by the Mayor on “Next Door”

Jensen read comments verbatim (*see attached*).

Jensen questioned where the \$1,000 figure come from? Mayor spoke that it was in an original proposal. She spoke that there is no RFP yet.

Council discussed why Mr. Sandler was brought forward in this topic and discussed whether to have Mr. Sandler come to Council.

Hyatt spoke to the importance of early learning.

Fleury gave an overview regarding opening the building.

Council discussed options regarding opening the Community Center.

Graham spoke that she is dismayed by this conversation and could be squashing peoples desires to bring forward new ideas to solve issues at the City.

Moran/DuQuenne moved to not move forward with a conversation with Mr. Sandler regarding the Community Center. Discussion: Moran spoke that he disagrees with Graham regarding missed opportunities to fix the building. Graham stated a Point of Order stating that Moran is directing his comments directed to her and saying things that are not true. Mayor spoke that it is not a proper point of order. Moran spoke that there has been a high price tag assessed in order to make the building useable and that is not true. Hyatt spoke that the motion indicates that she brought a proposal for the building forward and spoke she did no such thing. She explained she brought forward a question if this Council wanted to invite Mr. Sandler to Council for a conversation.

Jensen spoke that the fiduciary responsibly of Council when a citizen comes forward with a proposal it should be listened to. He spoke that if not Council is not acting responsible. He spoke that when the Mayor orchestrates a community uprising on this matter it is not helpful. He spoke that it is a sad day when Hyatt brings forward something in good faith and it is shot down.

Mayor Akins spoke that she did not orchestrate anything. She spoke that she wrote a post and let the Community know about something and how she feels about it and let them respond. She spoke that no one should be ashamed on stating how they feel. She spoke that a 20 year lease is too long for a private individual and these buildings belong to the Community. She spoke that this is no disrespect to Mr. Sandler. She spoke that she has the right to say what she wants.

Seffinger spoke in concern that some facts presented were not true. She spoke that the buildings are not desirable because they do not have ADA accessibility. She spoke to the importance to sticking to the facts.

Roll Call Vote: Jensen, DuQuenne, Seffinger, Moran and Hyatt: YES. Graham: NO.

Motion passed 5-1.

XIII. NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

1. Ashland Public Schools Fee Adjustment

Milliman gave a brief Staff Report.

Community Development Director Bill Molnar gave some background information.

Finance Director Alison Chan gave a brief Staff Report.

Jill Franko – Elected member of the Ashland School District gave Council some background

information and spoke regarding fees.

Samuel Bogdanova Superintendent of Ashland School District Superintendent went over a PowerPoint presentation (*see attached*). Items discussed were:

- Fee Concerns
- The Ask
- What does \$2 Million mean to Schools
- The Currency of Classrooms
- Other Currencies for our Kids and Schools
- Pictures of Walker School & Helman Elementary School

Ms. Franko discussed delays on getting permits and because of that the cost went up by \$4 Million.

Steve Mitzel of Ashland School District gave a brief background regarding the approval process.

Council discussed options.

Council discussed permit fees.

Graham/Hyatt moved to postpone this discussion until the first Business Meeting in January to give Staff can analyze the proposal, so that we can determine the impact of that request and to bring back a recommendation to Council. Discussion: Graham spoke that it is clear that there is not enough information needed to make a decision at this point and the importance to have all information before a decision is made. Hyatt spoke in agreement with Graham. She thanked all who came forward from the Ashland School District. Moran spoke that he would support the motion. He spoke that there are a couple of fee structures that need to be highlighted such as the SDC Fees. He spoke to the importance of focusing on outcomes. Jensen proposed to make an amendment. City Attorney Katrina Brown spoke that the motion is to postpone indefinitely and that is not amendable. Graham spoke that she did not intend for this to be indefinitely. Brown explained that this is an item that needs a date certain or indefinitely. Graham questioned Staff how long they think this will take to bring back to Council. Finance Director Alison Chan suggested the first Business in January. Jensen spoke to bring back Parks Commission to bring back the Parks involvement on the \$4 million increase in expenditures. Milliman suggested having a meeting with City Staff, Parks Commissioner and School Staff at the Study Session the day before the Business Meeting which would be January 3rd. Council agreed. **Roll Call Vote: DuQuenne, Jensen, Hyatt, Graham, Moran and Seffinger: YES. Motion passed unanimously.**

2. Contract with SOU for Community Survey

Council moved this item to the end of the Agenda due to time constraints (*this item will be on the next Council Agenda*).

3. Fire Department Consolidation Study

Milliman gave a brief Staff report.

Graham/Moran moved to authorize the Mayor to execute an intergovernmental agreement with Portland State University, Center for Public Service, to perform a Fire and EMS service consolidation study for the City of Ashland and Jackson County Fire District #5 at a cost not to exceed \$38,000. Discussion: Graham spoke that to the importance of this analysis. Moran spoke that this achieves goals that has been set and spoke in support of the motion. Jensen questioned the outcomes of these analyses. Milliman spoke that there have been success and non-success. DuQuenne questioned if this will come back to Council in June and if could come back earlier in April or May. Milliman spoke that they cannot complete before June. He spoke they will have a preliminary report by April. **Roll Call Vote: Jensen, DuQuenne, Seffinger, Graham, Moran and Hyatt: YES. Motion passed unanimously.**

4. Police Consolidation Study and MOU Amendment
Milliman gave a brief Staff Report.

Jensen/Graham moved to authorize the City Manager Pro Tem to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Talent for funding a comprehensive study of consolidation of police services and to sign the amendment to the agreement with the City of Talent. Discussion: Graham spoke to the importance of this motion. Milliman spoke that the update agreement with the City of Talent will be on the next Agenda. **Roll call vote: DuQuenne, Graham, Hyatt, Jensen, Seffinger and Jensen: YES. Motion passed unanimously.**

XIV. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND CONTRACTS

XV. OTHER BUSINESS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS/REPORTS FROM COUNCIL LIAISONS

XVI. ADJOURNMENT OF BUSINESS MEETING

Moran/DuQuenne moved to adjourn. Voice Vote: All Ayes.

The Council Business Meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:

City Recorder Melissa Huhtala

Attest:

Mayor Akins

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Manager's office at (541) 488-6002 (TTY phone number 1-800-735-2900). Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title I).

Land Acknowledgement (shorter version)

We acknowledge and honor the aboriginal people on whose ancestral homelands we work—the Ikirakutsum Band of the Shasta Nation, as well as the diverse and vibrant Native communities who make their home here today. We honor the first stewards in the Rogue Valley and the lands we love and depend on: Tribes with ancestral lands in and surrounding the geography of the Ashland Watershed include the original past, present and future indigenous inhabitants of the Shasta, Takelma, and Athabaskan people. We also recognize and acknowledge the Shasta village of K'wakhakha—“Where the Crow lights”—that is now the Ashland City Plaza.

Social Equity and Racial Justice Resolution

ACTION ITEM TRACKING – UPDATED DECEMBER 7, 2021

Tasks that have been completed or are in a holding pattern:

Item Section 1.A. Designate Social Equity and Racial Justice as a Value Service in the City of Ashland's strategic planning process, which will provide an opportunity for focused and sustained attention within the City's planning, management, and policy structure.

Section 1.B. Proclaim Juneteenth as an annual day of municipal commemoration and partner with communities of color and other local organizations to celebrate African American/Black culture on this day annually.

Section 1.D. Work in the near term as a "Committee of the Whole" to move these efforts forward by assigning tasks outlined in this resolution to individual staff and councilors and reporting back to Council on a regular basis while a more formal process and timeline is developed that includes regular progress reports to Council.

Section 2.C. Display Black Lives Matter signs at City-owned locations to offer visible and immediate support for racial justice advocates in our community.

Section 2.D. Continue and enhance our support of the annual celebration of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday.

Tasks that have been completed or are in a holding pattern:

Section 2.H. Determine the feasibility of a mural project to provide a mode of artistic expression of our community's commitment to making meaningful, visible, and ongoing progress on issues of social equity and racial justice.

Section 2.I. Request a proactive review of the policies that pertain to the standard process of investigating incidents where deadly force is used in Jackson County.

Section 2.J. Review recruiting/hiring practices to address implicit bias with input from leaders of local diversity, equity, and inclusion programs. (Requested assistance from SERJ Commission)

Section 2.K. Renew the effort with Indigenous leaders in the community to find a solution to the renaming of Dead Indian Memorial Road.

Develop Commission on Race and Social Equity

Tasks that are still underway:

Section 1.C. Advocate at the state and federal levels for policy reform that includes: a searchable database of officers sanctioned for excessive use of force and other misconduct; a national data collection program to determine the number of people killed or injured by police officers tracked by race, gender, age, and other demographic characteristics; limiting the transfer of military equipment to local jurisdictions; providing more extensive training for police officers regarding de-escalation, intrinsic bias, and procedural justice; and assisting people with mental health or addiction issues who have interactions with law enforcement.

Section 2.A. Support the Ashland Police Department in taking a more active role in on-campus conversations about racial justice at Southern Oregon University and in developing engagement events to help local residents understand APD's policies regarding use of force and other relevant issues.

Section 2.B. Strengthen our cultural competency and intrinsic bias training program for members of the City Council and City Staff.

Tasks that are still underway:

Section 2.E. Connect with Southern Oregon University and its students to better understand the experience of all college students, but particularly students of color, in the City of Ashland as a first step toward improving that experience.

Section 2.F. Work with community partners to develop training, incident response, and community acknowledgement programs that help residents and business owners address the long-term, systemic root causes of inequality and racial injustice and celebrate progress. (Recommendation to Commission)

Section 2.G. Work with Jackson County and neighboring communities to develop a program that will provide trained mental health professionals for instances where the Ashland Police Department is called upon to serve the needs of people who are suffering from mental health issues and/or addiction.

Section 2L: Periodically provide updates on local legal cases with social equity and racial justice implications

Recommendation:

Council revisits the remaining tasks of the resolution quarterly beginning in March, 2022 after the update from the SERJ Commission presentation regarding its annual workplan.

Council requests that the SERJ Commission, also help with advocating at the state and federal levels for policy reform by tracking legislative issues and bringing them to Council's attention.

All other active tasks in this resolution that are not assigned to the SERJ Commission are put on hiatus until we revisit the list in March to give staff the time to address our staffing shortages and settle in with our new city manager.

16-November-2021

Madame Mayor and Members of the City Council

Three years ago I appeared before Council, along with others, and offered my time and expertise to craft a community-based solution to the reported issues that had led the city to close both the Pioneer Log Cabin and the Winburn Way Community Center. Council, and staff, ignored that request, claiming that the City was obligated by state law to follow contracting processes, RFPs etc. and couldn't just work with community members.

Let's be honest and point out that the closure of those buildings and the city's lack of interest in solving the issues around them had more to do with some of the council and the then-Mayor being interested in drumming up support for what I have called the Deferred Maintenance Bond. Council, based on what can only be characterized as "thin air," allocated a million dollars to repair these buildings, largely in search of round numbers and an effort to pad funding for a new city hall. Before that bond was put forward, I again offered to help the city find a lower cost solution and I, again, was rebuffed. The voters wisely rejected the bond by nearly 70%.

You and staff then ignored the buildings for over a year, finally coming back with a proposal of \$830,000 (the \$170K reduced cost never being explained) to do the same work. Based entirely on the swing vote of Council Seffinger, you rejected that contract award. Staff threw up its hands and put it off to council to craft a solution, apparently being unable to offer anything that didn't involve hiring out the project themselves.

Council did craft a solution. Councilors Seffinger and Moran invited me, local architect Chris Brown and local builder Gil Livni, to form an "Ad Hoc" Committee, a committee being the only mechanism that met the city's rigid contracting processes, to find "the lowest-cost solution" to reopen the buildings. All six of you voted to support that process, three of you having run out of other options.

The Ad Hoc discovered, as I am sure anyone that had bothered knew all along, that the major "structural issue" at the Winburn Way was essentially a lie and that the Pioneer Log Cabin was actually open, despite not one nickel having been spent to solve the issues that resulted in it being shuttered three years earlier. At Winburn Way, yes, the north wall was out of plane, but it hadn't moved since that issue was repaired over three decades ago. The issue with the snow load was somewhat spurious, but even it too could be addressed with an internal moment frame, if some face-saving expenditure was needed.

Despite the Ad Hoc's efforts, saving you \$80,000 in design costs, and more than \$600,000 in construction, it still required a tie-breaking vote by the Mayor to approve the Ad Hoc recommendations and direct staff to proceed. Councilors Hyatt, Jensen and Graham, apparently, couldn't support saving money and actually reopening these buildings quickly as they had directed the Ad Hoc to pursue.

Neither, apparently, could staff. Again retreating behind process, contracting moved at glacial speed. The City was incapable of even removing the built-up leaf debris behind the building without cumbersome process. The Building Department, despite its statements during the Ad Hoc and a complete lack of paperwork as to why the building was actually closed, again

became concerned about the roof (despite the code-compliant solution to address that), and the Planning Department decided that building a short retaining wall and concrete pad to maintain separation between dirt/debris and the wooden foundation was subject to review under Ashland's Hillside Ordinance. Your public works department apparently forgot that the reason for the wall was not to stabilize the hillside, but rather to keep debris from directly contacting the building and make seasonal leaf removal easier. And that's not to mention resurgent concerns about improved ability to put on plays or a commercial kitchen from the Parks Department, who forgot to budget anything to actually manage these structures in 2022.

Now, having continued to drag your feet, some councilors, apparently, are in support of simply off-loading all responsibility for these buildings to a friendly developer who proposes to solve all your problems and take over management for twenty years. This strange proposal is of sufficient interest to your staff that it has risen to council level virtually overnight.

What the heck is wrong with you?

What happened your vaunted process, the contracting constraints against community support, the RPFs, and state law? Is seems the city is only capable of moving quickly when it involves shunting responsibility?

This developer may be well intentioned but has zero track record in sensitive restoration effort. Who decided that a day care center is the proper use for the building? What happens to the numerous community users that have waited for the return of this much valued meeting space while the city has twiddled its thumbs? How can you even momentarily consider this proposal without following some process beyond a "Hey, we've got a live one on the phone?" Will you be following similar paths for other city-owned properties?

I am frustrated that I wasted my time trying to help the city solve this problem in a simple and economical manner. I thought we had an opportunity to set a new precedent for community participation in cost-effective solutions to city issues. Clearly you are not interested in that (well, unless you can entirely avoid any management responsibility for the next 20 years in the process). Clearly your staff has better things to do that work expeditiously to reopen these buildings. Are you truly so incapable of managing a simple problem like reopening a beloved community-owned building that never should have been closed in the first place unless a pretend White Knight arrives to take the decision out of your hands?

This is a dumb proposal. It fails your own stated processes; it's probably counter to the current property zoning (I doubt anyone has even checked) and it's just plain bad for the community. It should never have made it to council level. You should reject it out of hand. The city has more than ample funding in the bank to fix these buildings. You have a plan to do so, even if staff is going require that plan go through the Hillside Ordinance just because it can. Stop dragging your feet and do what a majority of you have already agreed to do.

/George Kramer

Project Objectives



1. Address issues in appeal to LUBA
2. Provide clear standards for the evaluation of needed housing
 - 2021-2041 Housing Capacity Analysis
 - 2019 Housing Implementation Strategy
3. Provide clarity and responsiveness in Ashland's development process

Annexation Criteria – Prior to 1995



18.108.190 Annexation.

A. The following Findings shall be required for approval of an annexation to the City:

1. That the land is within the City's Urban Growth Boundary.
2. That the proposed zoning and project are in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.
3. That the land is currently contiguous with the present city limits.
4. That public services are available or can be made available to the site.
5. That a public need for additional land, as defined in the City's Comprehensive Plan, can be demonstrated.

Focus Areas for Code Amendments



1. Process for exceptions and variances to annexation standards
2. Consistency in terminology
3. Measurable standards for public utilities and transportation connections and improvements
4. Other

Exceptions and Variances



- City Council may grant exceptions and variances to the annexation standards
- Flexibility added to Exception to the Street Standards

Purpose of Street Design Standards



1. Purpose. This section contains standards for street connectivity and design as well as cross sections for street improvements. The standards are intended to provide multiple transportation options, focus on a safe environment for all users, design streets as public spaces, and enhance the livability of neighborhoods, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Facility/Transportation Improvements



- Clarification added that City Council may require additional public facility improvements and grant exceptions and variances to annexation standards
- Requirements for transportation improvements reworded for clarity
 - Specify requirements bordering and in annexed area
 - Likely connections to destinations within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities



- “safe and accessible” requirement for bicycle and pedestrian facilities (page 6-7)
- revised language for bicycle and pedestrian facilities
 - reasonably safe and accessible
 - according to safety analysis and standards of governing jurisdiction

Terminology



- “Annexed area” replaces property, site, parcel, etc.
- Definition of “lot” revised to include lots and parcel
- New definitions – adjacent, contiguous, parcel and tract

Other



- Requires concurrent planning application for development of annexed area except for City-initiated annexations

Affordable Units



- Number of affordable units required with an annexation amended to be rounded up rather than rounded down (page 10)

Next Steps



- **Dec 14** Planning Commission Review of Findings
- **Dec 21** 2nd Reading & Adoption of Findings

Project Information



www.ashland.or.us/annexationcodeupdate

City Council has received an unusual volume of email traffic in the past few days pursuant to the Sandler Proposal for re-opening the Comm Ctr. This volume of email traffic was precipitated by comments made on Nxt Door by Mayor Akins. Several of the emails actually thanked Mayor Akins for publicly opposing this proposal. I will now read the mayor's comment posted on Next Door and then I have several clarifying questions to ask.

“This is on the city council agenda for Tuesday:

Consider motion to pause the current engineering design work on the Community Center building and retaining wall pending a full review of the proposal for leasing and rehabilitating the building as proposed by Allan Sander”

Why?

Why would the residents of Ashland who have cared for these two public buildings give them away in a private lease to a person who would only pay \$1,000 per month for twenty years? Where did the \$1000/mo come from. Not seen in any of the supporting documents.

There are so few places for the public to gather. The city has the money and the plan. The council voted months ago to follow the ad hoc committee recommendations— but nothing's happened.

- Our city building inspector, who was not consulted in the AdHoc Committee analysis and recommendation, was unequivocal in his position that he could not approve re-opening the building until he had a current, engineered assessment on the structural safety of the building.
- Our COA attorney agreed and very pointedly submitted a cautionary letter to City Council strongly advising against re-opening the Community Center due to demonstrable liability concerns.
- City staff attempted mightily and repeatedly for several weeks to contact the AdHoc Committee's consulting engineer for followup work. He has disappeared, MIA, AWOL....no contact, no response, nothing.
- City staff then offered an RFP for the essential design work to re-open the building across the entire state of Oregon through the Oregon Buys www site. The results were due today. Not a single offering came back. Not one.
- COA staff has completed the cleanup behind the building as recommended by the AdHoc Committee. A Geotech engineer has been engaged to assess the stability of the hillside pursuant to our "Hillside Ordinance"
- Staff is not slow walking this project. City Council is not ignoring the AdHoc Committee suggestions that were adopted.
- Please help us understand your "nothing's happened" comment. What more could have happened?