

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
SENIOR PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE (S-PAC)
MEETING MINUTES
June 4, 2018

Committee Members Present:

- Sandy Theis, Citizen Member (S-PAC Chair)
- Mike Hersh, Citizen Member (Senior Program Stakeholder & Volunteer / S-PAC Vice Chair)
- Rob Casserly, Citizen Member (SOU, OLLI Program Manager)
- Mary Russell-Miller, Citizen Member (SOU Faculty Member)
- Stef Seffinger, Ashland City Councilor
- Mike Gardiner, APRC Commissioner

Staff Members Present:

- Rachel Dials, APRC Recreation Superintendent
- Susan Dyssegard, APRC Executive Assistant
- Natalie Mettler, APRC Senior Program Assistant

Staff Member Absent:

- Michael Black, APRC Director

I. Opening (1 minute)

S-PAC Chair Sandy Theis called the meeting to order at 3:32pm at the Ashland Senior center, 1699 Homes Ave in Ashland.

II. Approval of Minutes – May 16, 2018 (all, 2 minutes)

Mike Hersh moved / Rob Casserly seconded approval of the May 16 S-PAC minutes as presented.
The vote was all yes.

III. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda (all, 1 minute)

Superintendent Rachel Dials requested an addition to the agenda: a brief discussion of the City Council study session on senior issues [June 4, 5:30pm]. All were in agreement about the addition.

IV. Public Input (5 minutes)

None.

V. Discuss Rotating Chair / Vice Chair Positions (all, 10 minutes)

APRC Commissioner Mike Gardiner opened the discussion, stating that he didn't like the idea of a rotating Chair, as that could make the running of meetings cumbersome. A better solution would be to impose term limits on the Chair position; Gardiner suggested a one-year limit. Casserly and Theis concurred, with Theis adding that a rotating Chair could be confusing. Councilor Stef Seffinger clarified that almost all City Commissions voted on their Chairs annually. Theis asked if S-PAC should follow those guidelines. Gardiner recommended doing so, adding that the parameters of the Chair's term would be covered in the S-PAC bylaws, still to be created. Theis

concluded it would be best for S-PAC to wait until the new Senior Services Division [SSD] Superintendent arrived to set Chair term policy, as well as bylaws, pointing out that this would be reflected in the current meeting minutes.

VI. Update on Senior Services Superintendent Division Interviews (Dials, 20 minutes)

Dials began by stating that she would talk in general terms and not discuss any of the candidates specifically. She invited others who were present at the interviews on June 1 to comment on their experiences. Dials reported that there were clear standouts in the interviews for the SSD Superintendent position. She said APRC was already looking to make a job offer this week or early next week, but would possibly conduct more extensive background checks than were usual for City employees. She predicted the new Superintendent would be on site in 1½ to two months.

Mary Russell-Miller said the interview process went well. She appreciated the opportunity for good discussion after each interview, felt that everything was covered well and felt good about how effectively the process ran. Hersh added his kudos to the hiring committee's quick work and adherence to established rules. He added that he was the volunteer courier who transported, earlier that day, a confidential packet of interview materials and notes to Human Resources in City Hall, so he could personally guarantee that no written leaks had occurred.

Gardiner said there were several good candidates and he felt positive about the forward progress of the hiring process. He expressed confidence about APRC Director Black's intention to offer the position to a qualified candidate in the near future.

VII. Addition to Agenda – Discussion on City Council Study Session on Senior Issues

Dials said she had recently spoken with Director Black about the upcoming City Council Study Session [June 4] and the agenda items entitled "Senior Issues Ad-Hoc Committee Discussion." She distributed packets, available online on the City of Ashland website, about this session, that included the following materials: APRC Commission Policy 102 [on the formation of S-PAC], Councilors Seffinger and Bachman's May 10, 2018 email to the City Council and APRC [recommending a joint coordinating meeting between the City and APRC], and Discussion Agenda for Council Study Session on Senior Issues Ad-Hoc Committee [see [S-PAC Docs](#)]. She summarized that this meeting would address whether Council should form its own Ad-Hoc Committee on senior issues, and if so, how such a body should align with S-PAC. Another matter was whether Council preferred to defer the formation of their own Ad-Hoc Committee until after S-PAC had the opportunity to hold a series of meetings, so as not to determine the full scope of S-PAC and the beneficial aspects of a Council-formed Ad-Hoc Committee. There would be no formal APRC representation at the Council Study Session that evening because APR staff were not aware of the meeting until June 1.

Gardiner volunteered to attend the Council Study Session and field any questions about APRC's role and involvement.

Seffinger gave some background about the Study Session, explaining that it was a sort of follow-up to a Council session on senior issues four years prior. She pointed out, in the packet Dials distributed, an email she had sent to Council and the Parks Commissioners recommending that they wait to decide about forming a Senior Ad-Hoc Committee until S-PAC was functioning and there was a clearer understanding of its role. She proposed a joint APRC-City Council meeting after the new Superintendent was hired so they could be included. She said the issues of concern to her when she initially brought up the need for a Committee on Senior Issues were matters

such as housing, long-term care, planning decisions, ADA accessibility [including sidewalks] and budget priorities. These types of senior issues didn't fall neatly into either Recreation or Social Services.

Theis asked Seffinger if she thought the decision to form a City Ad-Hoc Committee on Senior Issues would get postponed. Seffinger replied that that was her preference. It would be important to know the role of the SSD Superintendent and what functions weren't being directly addressed so that any Ad-Hoc or Committee would be coordinated together with S-PAC. She cautioned against forming any additional advisory body too soon, even though she has been pushing for this for four years. There were meetings held at that time, but no traction was gained.

Russell-Miller counseled against reinventing any more wheels. Gardiner agreed that they didn't want duplication with two groups working on related issues that could be consolidated. He added that it was great to explore the possibilities for addressing local senior issues, and that this might result in an expansion of the SSD Superintendent's role in the City. Seffinger added that she'd like to have a senior representative on every City Commission. She indicated a lack of traction on relevant issues, such as a universal design in housing planning. She also stated that people had already heard her voice on many of these issues and another voice was needed for broader representation. Hersh agreed but added that the SSD staff needed to be in place before any decision was made about a City Ad-Hoc Committee on Senior Issues. He suggested that the City Council appoint a representative to participate in the process of writing the S-PAC bylaws, to ensure that the Council's goals were also addressed. He asked about where to classify certain gray areas, such as sidewalks and senior mobility issues (using canes, walkers, wheelchairs and so on). Seffinger concurred on this sample issue, saying those were the kinds of issues she was addressing. She said the City Public Works Directory was currently working on ADA accessibility. In relation to transportation, she mentioned the idea of drop-off areas, particularly for Oregon Shakespeare Festival activities and other popular events.

VIII. Set Next Meeting Date (Dials, 5 minutes)

Dials recommended having S-PAC reconvene after July 4, as by then the new Superintendent would either be onsite or S-PAC would have a better idea of next steps. She pointed out that later in the month July could work for the next S-PAC meeting, as more would be known about the start date of the new Superintendent.

After brief discussion from S-PAC members and APRC staff about specific dates and availability, Dials suggested the last week in July for the next S-PAC meeting, and all agreed to July 30, 2018. The meeting would run from 3 – 5pm; longer than the usual hour allocated for S-PAC meetings, to allow ample time to work with the new Superintendent on crucial needs like creating bylaws.

IX. Items from S-PAC Members (all, 10 minutes)

Hersh asked about City rules and formats for bylaws. Dials responded that there was already a standard for bylaws for other City Commissions, and S-PAC would use those standards to draft bylaws with the new Superintendent. Hersh requested that examples of City bylaws be provided to all S-PAC members and the new Superintendent; Dials said she would email them to all. Hersh said the creation of bylaws should be high on the priority list for S-PAC, to which Gardiner agreed. Dials pointed out that the last set of S-PAC meeting minutes reflected this point, as Black had pointed out that bylaws were a top priority.

Theis asked if, at the next S-PAC meeting, S-PAC would actually work on drafting S-PAC bylaws. She cautioned that S-PAC was too big a group to effectively wordsmith bylaws. She hoped to see a smaller group begin the process of bylaw creation.

Dials again suggested sending sample bylaws from other City Commissions to S-PAC so S-PAC could have a general discussion about their bylaws at the next meeting. If the SSD Superintendent was in place by then, S-PAC could put together a working group for bylaws at that time. Theis added that the S-PAC members should look over the sample bylaws before the meeting so they could come prepared with suggestions. Dials added that S-PAC could also address goals and a work plan if the new Superintendent attended the upcoming meeting.

Hersh added that looking at sample bylaws would help S-PAC members decide if they wanted to commit to working on a Bylaws Subcommittee.

Theis asked whether the Bylaws Subcommittee would be open the public. She clarified that this was not about trying to be secretive, but that an open meeting would make a difference in how the subcommittee could deliberate and operate. Gardiner responded that if the subcommittee was not made up of a quorum, their meeting would not have to be open. Dials referred to the example of the past Ad-Hoc Senior Program Advisory Committee (ASPAC), which had smaller subcommittees that reported back to the main body, which was deemed acceptable.

Seffinger added that it could be helpful to look at bylaws for another city's senior group, perhaps Medford if they had one.

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:56pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Natalie Mettler, Senior Program Assistant
Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission