

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

July 23, 2018

Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main Street

7:00 p.m.

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF MINUTES
 - a. Lithia Park Master Plan Meeting—June 15, 2018
 - b. Regular Meeting—June 25, 2018
- III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
 - a. Open Forum
- IV. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA
- V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. Bike Polo Special Event Amplification Request (Action)
 - b. S-PAC Committee Member Approval (Action)
- VII. SUBCOMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS
 - a. Subcommittee Updates (Information)
- VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS
- IX. UPCOMING MEETING DATES
 - a. S-PAC Meeting—August 13, 2018
 - Ashland Senior Center, 1699 Homes Avenue—5:30 p.m.
 - b. Study Session—August 20, 2018
 - The Grove, Otte-Peterson Room, 1195 E. Main Street—5:30 p.m.
 - c. Regular Meeting—August 27, 2018
 - Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main Street—7:00 p.m.
- X. EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660 (2)(e)
- XI. ADJOURNMENT

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
LITHIA PARK MASTER PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
June 15, 2018

PRESENT: **Parks Commissioners:** Rick Landt, Matt Miller
APRC Staff: Director Michael Black, Interim Parks Superintendent Jeffrey McFarland; Administrative Analyst Betsy Harshman
MIG Consultants: MIG Principal Melissa Erikson, Water Resources Specialist David Gorman, Landscape Architect Kerry KenCairn, Project Manager Laurie Matthews, MIG Principal Dennis Meyer, MIG Principal Lauren Schmitt, Fisheries Biologist Jack Williams
STAKEHOLDER: JoAnne Eggers

ABSENT: None

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Landt called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR.

II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

a. *Discuss Meeting Purpose*

Landt introduced representatives from MIG, including local representatives Kerry KenCairn and Jack Williams. He stated that the purpose of the meeting would be to review highlights from Design Week in preparation for eventual conversion into a Master Plan for Lithia Park. Black added that the meeting would wrap up Design Week and was not intended as a venue for decision making.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were none.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & GUEST SPEAKERS

a. *Open Forum*

Roger Ramsey of 1410 Woodland Dr. Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Ramsey talked about his vision for trails in Lithia Park and connectivity to the surrounding watershed. Ramsey reviewed the challenges of multi-use trails, particularly for mountain bikers wishing to access the downtown area from the watershed. He stated that the primary connection was via Winburn Way in Lithia Park or East 4th Street. Ramsey explained that both approaches were problematic, suggesting that alternatives be addressed as a part of the Master Plan under the category of circulation.

As a possible solution, Ramsey proposed that the east side of Lithia Park be utilized as a trail that would extend from the Loop Road to Lithia Park. He stated that the trail could be gently engineered for use by children and would create a use for a portion of the Park that is currently undeveloped. Ramsey stated that Ashland's mountain bike community would provide volunteers for all aspects of such a project.

Kerry KenCairn of 147 Central Ave. Ashland, OR. was called forward.

KenCairn provided a testimonial about the mountain bike community, noting that their involvement during Design Week had been impressive.

V. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. *Review Design Week Process to Date - Laurie Matthews*

Matthews noted that the feedback obtained during Design Week had provided many helpful insights and ideas that would aid in the development of a preferred concept or concepts.

In response to a question by Landt, Matthews stated that elements that are viewed with consensus would be presented as an option, while elements that are more diverse might be presented with a set of options. She indicated that it would be unlikely that more than two options would be developed. Schmitt added that it might happen that there is a preferred option for the short term and a different one for the long term. She stated that the plan would be crafted with enough flexibility that once future unknowns become less abstract, amendments of the Master Plan could be accommodated. Black agreed, noting that the plans for the short term might not be the final direction for projects that are slated for the longer term.

Matthews commented that based upon previous feedback it had become clear that there was interest in large ideas where further study would be needed. Schmitt noted as an example, that repurposing the maintenance yard, stating that the concept would require additional thought. The final recommendation might be one that hasn't yet been discussed. Schmitt indicated that the size and scope of the Park might be best addressed with a broad brush while certain areas would require a specific focus based upon the choices made.

Black stated that in his opinion, nothing should be excluded from review. As an example, the Master Plan presents an opportunity to address the shop and office areas of the Park. He stated that feedback was very diverse – for a range of uses. He talked about the Administration Building, highlighting the many iterations that the building had seen throughout the Park's history. He emphasized the dilemma that is presented when comparing one era versus another for historic renovations.

Black noted that the Master Plan presented an opportunity to meet additional needs for Ashland's residents such as more space for community gathering places. He stated that utilizing the existing buildings more fully or re-purposing the buildings could be more valuable than creating more open Park spaces. In response to a question by Matthews, he stated that the maintenance office could be re-purposed and incorporated into a large outdoor open space to accommodate the community. Black emphasized that he was not advocating for a certain option – rather, he wanted to encourage the exploration of alternatives.

Matthews stated that feedback from the community included discussion about access to the Park in that area – and the possibility of the area to act as another connection point or node within the Park. Black replied affirmatively, stating that there were places that could be enhanced for civic uses without being detrimental to the Park's ambiance. He stated that APRC's presence in the Park should be incidental to finding ways to deliver informational services.

He noted that there would be a number of new policies that would be developed based upon recommendations in the Master Plan. If, for example additional public gathering places are planned, then new policies would need to be developed for issues such as crowd management and/or the use of alcohol in the Park would be needed.

b. Feedback from APRC Lithia Park Master Plan Committee Members

Landt relayed his preference for the existing gradation of the Park – as it moves from an urban environment at its downtown entrance into a more natural and less developed environment further into the Park.

Landt stated that he would question a “node” or public gathering space at the current administration location. He stated that there were only two ways to reach the location by vehicle – Granite Street and Winburn Way. Both streets are congested and added pressure could be problematic.

Landt talked about the eastside slope and its’ sensitivity to changes in the climate. Native plants do not thrive there and other ideas for vegetation in the area would be helpful. He asked the MIG consultants to look at the Grants Pass Parkway – for its single zone plantings. Landt advocated for similar plantings, stating that the vegetation seems to thrive without irrigation.

Landt drew attention to the policies that APRC has in place that impact the parks. He asked that the proposed Master Plan be consistent with policy’s that manage vendors, noise, light, and dogs in the parks or that the proposal presents a strong rationale against those policies. Landt noted that storm water management continues to be a concern. He thanked the consultants for their focus in that regard.

Landt asked about an interface with plans that might change the Japanese Garden. Matthews stated that the garden would be incorporated into the overall plan – with special attention to circulation within the park and the interaction with Winburn Way. Meyer added that a series of small terraced garden rooms could include the Japanese Garden.

Miller asked about a unifying theme that would integrate the gardens. Matthews replied that the gardens all have a “garden-esque” quality that while unique to each garden would provide cohesion between the gardens. Black explained that in this case the “themes” would not be the same or repeated in each garden – rather the common element would be how they are situated in each space and interface with the trails throughout. Mathews agreed, stating that they were intended to be design spaces. She stated that the potential use and function could also be part of the relationship to one another without jeopardizing the distinct character that each area has.

Black talked about the Japanese Garden and the garden’s potential as representative of a culture. Improvements would center upon circulation within and accessibility as well as the garden’s authenticity. Matthews noted that the goal would be to respect the legacy that the garden represents but recognize that a plan for the garden should include development for today as well as for its future.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

a. Open Forum

JoAnne Eggers of 221 Granite St. Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Eggers applauded the Design Week process, highlighting public engagement as key to the development of the Master Plan. She stated that one of the takeaways of the week’s activities was that Lithia Park could not be all things to all people. Eggers noted that it became clear for example, that Lithia Park was not a suitable venue for gatherings where alcohol could be served.

Eggers stated that very little public input had been received regarding special features such as the Japanese Garden and the Perozzi Fountain. She cautioned against committing resources for the maintenance and upkeep of special features without taking into consideration the outsized budgetary impact that such a focus would need.

Eggers suggested that other issues such as accessibility be given priority.

Mike Gardiner of 349 Orange, Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Gardiner noted that the Lithia Park Master Plan would cover a 100-year time-span. He asked whether the plan would periodically be updated - stating that in his experience, Master Plans are periodically reviewed. Landt replied that in his opinion, the purpose of a long-term plan would be to give guidance so that future actions could be integrated in a systematic way. He stated that it made sense to review the plan periodically. Gardiner indicated that periodic reviews also facilitate amendments to the plan based upon changing conditions.

Black noted that discussion about the 100-year time frame during Design Week clarified the intent that the 100-year trajectory would be carried forward when the actual decision-making might be applicable for the next 20 years. He advocated for periodic reviews to ensure that the Park's capital improvement priorities are met and maintenance strategies are reflective of the times and conditions present. He stated that APRC should have a policy in place that mandates periodic reviews.

Landt explained that in his opinion, the Master Plan was a roadmap for the future and should it become apparent that change is necessary, a rationale has to be developed that would justify a new direction. If done in that way, change becomes a conscious decision that includes a public process.

Michael Dawkins, President of the Ashland Garden Club was called on for comments.

He stated that one of the Garden Club's traditional responsibilities was to care for a Rose Garden in Lithia Park. He expressed the hope that the Garden Club could partner with APRC and once again establish a rose garden in the Park. He noted that plans for such a garden call for roses that represent the original plantings to contemporary roses that are recognized each year.

ADDITIONAL INPUT

APRC staff member **Betsy Harshman** commented that the Master Plan team included experts on climate change. She stated that the Master Plan would incorporate that knowledge into a plan for the future.

David Gorman, a water resources specialist from Ecological Engineering and Master Plan team member, commented that the maintenance facility could be re-purposed without compromising restoration of the riparian zone in that area.

Jack Williams, Master Plan team member and fisheries biologist, agreed that the Master Plan would provide guidance for the future as well a blueprint for getting there. He stated that there might be a series of steps to take over time that will lead to results further into the future. He talked about circulation throughout the Park and future transportation changes that would impact the thoroughfare that currently travels through the Park. The Master Plan would outline a starting point with a series of steps or actions to begin with and ideas or values that could be translated into actions for future improvements. He stated that all of the steps or actions were dependent upon funding, capabilities, and other appropriate steps.

In response to a question by Gardiner, Black noted that the City's Comprehensive Plan would not include the details of the Master Plan. Gardiner also asked about a sidewalk on Winburn Way – stating that a sidewalk along the route had been a high priority for APRC. Gardiner noted that plans for a sidewalk had been postponed pending the outcome of the Master Plan. Matthews confirmed that several options were under consideration. Schmitt explained that one-way access was a possibility - limited access another. Limited access would allow shuttle busses and other types of delivery services but not everyday drivers. She stressed that regardless of how it is achieved, there have been three speeds of traffic since the Park's inception – slow (walking), medium (bicycles) and fast (vehicular). Schmitt noted that public comment had indicated that over time the fastest

speeds have become dominant and that residents would like to ensure that Winburn Way facilitates pedestrian traffic.

Ramsey pointed out the dry underused area of the park on the east side could become a follow-the-contours up-trail (multi-use) with connectivity to other trails in the watershed. He advocated for a separate return trail, stating that if that were to happen, it would take much of the cyclist traffic off of Winburn Way.

There followed a brief discussion about the feasibility of such a trail. Black noted that the trails in Lithia Park could provide an option for cyclists but access to the roads for cyclists would remain. Landt noted that consideration should be given to the number of existing trails that travel from the creek to motorways. He stated that some of those paths cause erosion and that simply adding trails might not be the best option. Schmitt agreed, stating that the development of trails must take into account a number of complex factors – whether the soils would support a trail - what the impacts would be and other factors.

Eggers advocated for the large ideas that would become part of the 100-year vision. She stated that regardless of what the future would bring, humans with similar needs would remain.

Black applauded the charette process that MIG had initiated with Design Week. He reported that public feedback had been complimentary, with people engaging in the process. Black stated that Design Week was an excellent example of how things should work. In response to a question, he stated that those who participated were satisfied that they had been heard – but that it was human nature to wait and react to plans once they are presented. Black stated that he would expect more public input and engagement once the preferred alternatives are introduced.

Landt stated that there was still work to be done and members of the public who haven't yet been heard. He talked about Winburn Way and the possible solutions that might be chosen – including ways to introduce simple traffic calming devices that would slow people down. He suggested that the least controversial approaches should be considered. Matthews added that accessibility was also a priority and that thought should be given as to how best to access the Park based upon people's needs.

Schmitt noted that a desired trajectory for Winburn Way might be initiated with a series of steps toward a desirable future outcome. She stated that simple solutions might work best until they are outgrown. When that occurs, it could become the trigger for the next series of steps. She stated that future transportation changes might dictate a change in direction – but that the immediate goal should be how best to accommodate the three speeds of traffic. Gorman agreed, stating that one rationale for crafting a 100-year plan is to initiate changes gradually with a series of interim steps.

Landt noted that one important aspect of the Master Plan should be to limit plans that add to the necessity for additional maintenance. He suggested that the approach with regard to landscaping within the Park should reflect a sensitivity to the level of effort that is needed to maintain the landscaping. There followed a brief discussion about that choice points that could be offered.

Matthews summarized the next steps – noting that there would be additional scrutiny of the data that had been collected. The goal would be to present a preferred option for some elements of the Park and/or refine several preferred alternatives depending upon the complexity of the solutions proposed. Matthews emphasized a process that would culminate in an additional public process in the October to November time-frame.

KenCairn suggested updating the Facebook page periodically so that people could continue to comment or track development of the ideas presented during Design Week. Schmitt proposed a series of photographs depicting elements of the Park that are under review. Black agreed to remain in contact and stated that he would alert the Subcommittee if further discussion was needed. He noted that the Subcommittee would review the preferred options prior to additional public engagement.

Accolades and thankyou's were exchanged. Black noted staff member Betsy Harshman had worked behind the scenes to ensure a smooth process.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – 11:00 a.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Assistant
Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission

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 Subcommittee meetings are digitally recorded and available upon request.

City of Ashland
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Minutes
June 25, 2018

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

Absent: 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 OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF MINUTES

- Real Estate Subcommittee Meeting, May 9, 2018—acknowledged
- Trails Master Plan Update Committee, June 1, 2018—acknowledged
- S-PAC Committee, June 4, 2018—acknowledged
- Lithia Park Master Plan, June 13, 2018—acknowledged

Study Session May 14, 2018

Motion: Landt moved to approve the Minutes of May 14, 2018, as presented. Miller seconded.
The vote was all yes.

Regular Meeting May 21, 2018

Motion: Landt moved to approve the Minutes of May 21, 2018, as presented. Miller seconded.
The vote was four yes, with Commissioner Gardiner abstaining

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- *Open Forum*

Dennis Miller, 1140 Siskiyou Blvd. Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Miller talked about safety issues when traveling, based upon his recent experiences during a vacation. He advocated for extra care when faced with posted height restrictions, particularly if traveling with a vehicle featuring a bicycle or luggage rack. In addition, he suggested that care be taken to ensure that straps holding bicycles onto car-top bike carriers be double-checked for security.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- a. *IPM Policy (Action)*

McFarland stated that he and Commissioner Landt had proposed a series of edits to the policy—predominantly grammatical errors. He talked about the chapter on pesticide safety and the rationale for duplicating instructions for posting requirements for pesticide use. He noted that the APCR maintenance staff used the policy for direction.

McFarland proposed an amendment to the policy that explained what to do with old or unusable pesticides – stating that APCR has two dedicated pesticide cages for secured storage of old or unusable pesticides. Those pesticides remain secured in the cages until permanently disposed of through the City's hazardous material collection process.

McFarland stated that the policy currently restricted pesticide use from Memorial Day to Labor Day. He noted that the Commissioners previously authorized an exemption for the spraying of wasps or yellow jackets when such use was warranted for safety purposes. McFarland indicated that the restriction about not using pesticides from Memorial Day to Labor Day was in conflict with the actual practices of APRC and he proposed striking that from the policy. He noted that APRC maintenance staff used very little or no synthetic pesticides or herbicides per policy guidelines.

Commissioner Discussion

Landt suggested a motion that would approve the changes and incorporate the comments, tracked changes and edits currently under discussion.

Lewis advocated for the changes as presented. He stated that he was appreciative of the format used to document the edits - commenting that it was easier to track.

Motion: Landt moved to approve the revised IPM Policy including the tracked changes, comments one and two on page four of the policy and striking the 2011 revision that stated there would be no spraying of pesticides in any Ashland park from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Lewis seconded.

Commissioner Discussion

Landt explained that policy provisions prohibiting pesticide use from Memorial Day to Labor Day was no longer valid because of the allowance for spraying of yellow jackets and wasps for safety purposes. He noted that the provision would be applicable as a method of last resort.

There followed a brief discussion about Commissioner approval of the changes and comments presented prior to preparation of a clean copy.

Motion: Landt moved to approve the revised IPM Policy, including the tracked changes, comments one and two on page four of the Policy and add a note striking the 2011 revision that stated there would be no spraying of pesticides in any Ashland park from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Lewis seconded

The vote was all yes.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Grove Shower Request from Ashland Community Resource Center (ACRC) (Information/Action)

Dials introduced Leigh Madsen, ACRC Director and facilitator of the shower and laundry program. She stated that a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) had originally been granted in 2014 that allowed a mobile unit with showers and laundry facilities to provide the service at several Ashland locations. At that time, permission was granted by the City of Ashland to use the parking lot behind The Grove as one of the approved locations.

Dials noted that the goal of the CUP was to support the homeless with hygiene services and although approved, the Grove location had never been utilized. She explained that a new request had been received by Madsen on behalf of the Ashland Community Resource Center. Dials reported that the Ashland Planning Department had since alerted staff that the original CUP was no longer valid. She recommended postponement of any action until the CUP had been updated or re-issued.

In response to a question by Heller, Dials noted concerns about the location. She stated that she would be willing to proceed on a trial basis and that a potential agreement might include additional parameters. Dials indicated that accommodation would entail operational changes and limitations as to specific times and days of the week.

Leigh Madsen was called forward.

Madsen talked about the mandate to count the homeless each year. He stated that in 2013, volunteers counted approximately 150 homeless people in Ashland. At that time, it became apparent that the highest unmet needs were options for showers and laundry facilities. Madsen stated that those services were an important step toward the health and well-being of those in need.

Madsen talked about ACRC and its mission to help people become self-sufficient. He stated that in 2017, 30 people were able to find employment and housing in Ashland.

Madsen reflected that needs for showers and laundry services extended to people working in Ashland's service industries. He stated that in ten months of 2017, the United Methodist Church served over 890 people. Madsen indicated that a significant number of those people worked in Ashland but did not have shower or laundry facilities available to them.

Madsen acknowledged that many of those using the shower trailer were not easy to serve. He stated that if approved, he would participate in the setup of the trailer at the Grove – initially staying on site to make sure everything worked. Madsen commented that in the four years of providing similar services at United Methodist, there had been no serious events or injuries. He applauded Dials' willingness to move forward at The Grove location on a trial basis.

Madsen talked about the advantages the new trailer provided. He stated that the first day of operation would be July 12, 2018 – beginning with an unveiling ceremony. APRC Commissioners would be receiving invitations to attend.

In response to a comment by Lewis about mitigations, Madsen relayed that he connected with the neighbors near each location to explain the service and provide contact information should there be an issue or concern. He stated that shower users signed an agreement outlining expectations and, if not met, non-compliers were asked to leave. Madsen explained that three volunteers provided assistance at the site – one overseeing showers, one overseeing laundry facilities and one attending to general housekeeping.

Lewis asked about procedures for The Grove site. Madsen provided assurance that the neighbors would be contacted and the mission explained. The onsite program administrator would be accountable and could address issues or concerns as needed.

There followed a brief discussion about the CUP, the location and various logistics challenges. In response to a question by Gardiner, Madsen discussed the average number of participants. He estimated that approximately 15 to 20 people would utilize The Grove location.

Gardiner inquired about an APRC budgetary impact. Black replied that utility costs would be difficult to calculate and were deemed negligible. Madsen stated that APRC would be compensated for providing a 220 outlet.

In response to a question by Heller, Madsen noted that the trailer had air conditioning and heaters and could operate year-round. He anticipated no "down days" due to weather. Heller also asked about hikers on the PCT and whether they could use the facility. Madsen replied that there were no restrictions with regard to people using the facility other than behaving responsibly.

Questions about potential damage and insurance claims were discussed. Madsen noted that the new trailer was smaller than the previous one but would provide two showers and three laundry pairs. The trailer was 18 ft. in length. Madsen indicated that the trailer had been built without wooden materials that could be subject to deterioration.

Commissioner Discussion

Gardiner suggested that approval of the request be postponed until a qualified request with a properly permitted CUP could be obtained.

Black highlighted a couple of options, stating that the Planning Department would want to know that APRC, as the "defacto" property owners, would support the CUP. If the Commissioners' preference was to wait until the Planning Department established requirements for the CUP, support for moving forward could be approved at that time. Alternatively, if the information remained the same and APRC staff continued to work out the parameters with Madsen, then support for the CUP could be affirmed immediately.

Heller confirmed that Dials was recommending that the request be subject to a short-term trial. Dials noted that there were a number of factors to take into consideration. She stated that limiting the shower and laundry service to Saturday mornings would assist staff in minimizing the impact on The Grove. She indicated that there would not be public access to The Grove while the laundry and shower services were onsite. Saturday morning recreation classes would be canceled so the building could be locked. She expressed concern about using the Garfield Park restroom facilities, stating that in her opinion, a walk across the road to the restrooms could become a safety matter. Black suggested that those concerns be presented for possible mitigation to the Planning Department.

In response to a question by Gardiner, Madsen said the United Methodist Church location permitted use of the restroom facilities while the Food Bank no longer did. He advocated for utilizing restroom services at Garfield Park.

Landt shared his thoughts regarding moving forward or delaying the request. He stated that there was not enough information available to reach a decision and approval should be predicated upon the parameters established by the CUP. Landt suggested a middle ground – such as a straw poll – to indicate whether the Commissioners would be willing to support the request with certain conditions once they were identified.

Black suggested that Dials be appointed as a liaison between APRC, the Ashland Planning Department and Madsen. He intimated that the group would be tasked with developing ways to offer the program while ensuring public safety and addressing security concerns.

Landt suggested that the program be approved with parameters that would work for staff. He acknowledged that closure of The Grove when the service was offered would reduce revenue, noting that finding a way to grant the request remained worthwhile. He encouraged the appointment of a staff liaison who would be tasked with moving forward.

Lewis agreed, noting that other services such as meals in the parks were problematic at times, but important enough to continue offering. He advocated for the appointment of Dials to work with all parties in finding a way to approve the request. He agreed with proceeding on a trial basis, suggesting that the Commissioners preapprove the project conceptually. Lewis also noted that there was a review process associated with the CUP that could be a built-in safeguard.

Gardiner called for a motion that would cover approval on a trial basis without provisions for restrooms. He stated that the motion would appoint Dials as staff liaison and authorize her to bring back the request for final approval once the issues and concerns were addressed. In response to a question by Landt, Gardiner stated that there would be no restrooms available at The Grove.

Madsen also agreed, stating that there was a similar agreement with Ashland's Food Bank. He said the clientele were not always easy to serve, but in the four years the program had been offered at the Church, there had been no serious fights or injuries.

Madsen stated that he was appreciative of Dials' willingness to work things out. He highlighted the mission to get people off the street and into productive jobs and housing. The program benefited those in need while also benefiting the City of Ashland and its residents.

Motion – Landt moved to provisionally approve use of The Grove grounds for showers and laundry services as presented above. Final approval would be contingent upon approval of the CUP and a subsequent approval of Memorandum of Understanding initiated by staff for a six-month trial basis. If issues arose during the six-month trial, the Commissioners would consider amendments to the MOU or revocation. Heller seconded.

Commissioner Discussion:

Gardiner asked about the six-month timeline – suggesting an annual timeframe instead. Landt agreed given that the motion outlined provisions for reconsideration at any time. He accepted the annual timeline as a friendly amendment.

Black suggested postponement of the timeline until the CUP had been granted and a MOU presented. Landt replied that the provisional approval could be amended to reflect different circumstances if needed.

Heller advocated for a timeframe of six months, indicating that the shorter timeline should be sufficient to assess continuation of the program. He stated that he was supportive of the project and its goals.

Gardiner reiterated that the motion would reflect a timeframe of one year unless staff recommended something different.

Motion: Landt moved to provisionally approve use of The Grove grounds for showers and laundry as presented above. Final approval would be contingent upon approval of the CUP and a subsequent approval of Memorandum of Understanding initiated by staff for a trial basis of one year. If issues arose during that period, the Commissioners would consider amendments to the MOU or revocation. Heller seconded.

The vote was all yes.

b. Formation of the Pool Ad-Hoc Committee (Action)

Black stated that APRC had been working on a potential solution to accommodate the need for additional pool services due to the closure of the SOU pool several years ago. APRC had since opened the Daniel Meyer Pool for high school swim team practices during the school year and water polo teams during the shoulder seasons.

Black proposed the establishment of an Ad-hoc Pool Advisory Subcommittee to review and evaluate the feasibility of a re-build of the Daniel Meyer Pool, and to explore potential funding sources for doing so. He suggested that the Subcommittee include himself and Commissioners Mike Gardiner and Matt Miller along with Finance Director Mark Welch and Recreation Superintendent Rachel Dials or Recreation Manager Flora. He proposed that up to eight members of the public be appointed to the Subcommittee as well.

Black recommended that the Ad-hoc Pool Advisory Subcommittee be tasked with evaluation of the feasibility of planning and funding the Daniel Meyer re-build. He stated that the Subcommittee would prepare a recommendation for Commissioner review of a plan for the future of the pool and potential funding sources as well.

Public Input

Rebecca Kay of 2350 Ranch Road, Ashland, OR. was called forward.

Kay agreed with the establishment of the Ad-hoc Subcommittee, suggesting that potential members of the public represent as many user groups and interested people as possible. She stated that it was not well known that the pool was being used during the winter, intimating that greater awareness might broaden the number of users.

In response to a question by Landt, Black explained that typically Commissioners were assigned to Subcommittees annually. He referred to the precedent regarding Ad-hoc subcommittees such as the RFP Ad-hoc Subcommittee created for the Performance Audit and Ad-hoc Committee for evaluation of Senior Services. Black stated that authorizing the creation of the Ad-hoc Pool Advisory Subcommittee by vote of the Commissioners showed the intent behind the action and alerted the public via noticing.

Gardiner added that it would remain up to the Subcommittee Chair to appoint the members.

Motion: Lewis moved to approve the Director's proposal to create the Daniel Meyer Pool Ad-hoc Pool Advisory Subcommittee as detailed in the staff report dated June 20, 2018. Heller seconded.

The vote was all yes.

c. COLA Review (Action)

Black reported that the Commissioners adopted a Policy in 2014 that directed the Director to base each year's cost of living adjustment (COLA) on the March Consumer Price Index (CPI-W). Employee wages could increase between 1% and 5%. Black stated that the March 2018 CPI-W was 2.8%. He recommended that the increase be approved for that amount even though the increase was larger than anticipated. Black relayed that a budgetary surplus would cover the 2.8% dictated by the APRC COLA Policy.

Black noted that discussions with the City of Ashland Finance Director and Human Resources Director were supportive but they asked that the Commissioners review the policy for future changes because the index had indicated close to 3% increases for the past several years.

Commissioner Discussion

In response to a question by Heller, Black stated that the budgeted amount for the biennium was 2%.

Landt noted that the approximate mid-point between the 1% to 5% outlined in the policy was 3%. He relayed that he continued to be a proponent of parameters ranging from 0% to 5%. If that were the case, then the mid-point would be 2.5%. Landt highlighted the conundrum of increasing inflation equating to increased COLA adjustments that did not give workers a boost by increasing their buying power. Landt advocated for a realistic cost of living gauge rather than a negotiated contract.

Gardiner asked that the issue be placed in the "parking lot" so as not to be forgotten.

Motion: Landt moved to approve a 2.8% increase for APRC staff salaries for the fiscal year 2019. Lewis seconded.

Commissioner Discussion

Landt explained the rationale for accommodating the percentage even though the budgeted amount was less. He noted that Black's memo stated that there was room in the budget to do so.

Motion: Landt moved to approve a 2.8% increase for APRC staff salaries for the fiscal year 2019. Lewis seconded.

The vote was all yes.

d. Q3 Budget Update (Information and Action)

Black presented the quarterly financial update provided by the City of Ashland's Finance Director as well as APRC's financial data through May 31, 2018. He stated that APRC's financial statement would become a part of the City's third quarter report.

Black reviewed the information, noting that as of May 31, 2018, APRC was at 82% for the fiscal year. He indicated that this was approximately 8% less than it would be if the intent was to utilize 100% of the budget. He stated that because staff had pursued strategies that resulted in significant savings, there would be money to fund projects and expenditures approved by the Commissioners for the next fiscal year.

Black noted that revenue was at 88%, a little lower than the projected 91%. He stated that funds had yet to be collected from the City as payment for maintenance work provided by APRC. In addition, there were a couple of areas that underperformed. He said Superintendent Dials would research and evaluate those areas to determine if the underperformers should be taken into account for the next biennium budget.

Black recommended approval of the 3rd quarter budget update.

Commissioner Discussion

Landt stated that he would prefer to acknowledge the financial report rather than approve. Black agreed, noting that there was technically nothing to approve.

Motion: I move to acknowledge the Quarterly Financial Report from the Director of APRC that the City Finance Director has presented. Miller seconded.

Commissioner Discussion

Heller asked about the recreational programs that were at 67% of budget. Black replied that most of the revenue shortfall was due to extraordinary expenses for the Senior Program. He explained that one of the strategies that were implemented was to provide a portion of the funding for recreational programs offered at the Senior Center.

Motion: Landt moved to acknowledge the Q3 Financial Report from the Director of APRC and as outlined by the City of Ashland Finance Director. Miller seconded.

The vote was all yes.

SUBCOMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

a. Lithia Park Design Week Update (Information)

Black reported that Design Week was an activity-based series of meetings and work sessions that was similar to the charette process. The consultants from MIG provided an opportunity for APRC staff and the public to work with the design team on a fast-paced design process that would evolve into a Master Plan for Lithia Park. Public participation was encouraged, resulting in significant input from interested citizens. Conceptual ideas were explored beginning with a visioning process and continuing with work sessions that were open to the public. Black stated that a number of user groups participated in addition to people who were new to APRC who expressed innovative views. The Lithia Park Master Plan Subcommittee met at the conclusion of Design Week to wrap up the week. The Subcommittee was able to give some final thoughts and direction to the consultants. Black stated that the consultants would then compile the information and prepare a plan that would offer a series of preferred alternatives for the Park for further review.

Miller stated that he had enjoyed the process and was impressed by the ideas and input, describing the week's work as "joyful chaos."

Landt noted that during the first part of the process, people seemed resistant to the potential for change. As Design Week progressed, the message began to focus on identifying the essence of Lithia Park. Once that was captured, the essence was treated with the utmost respect by the consultants. He acknowledged that most Ashlanders were attached to Lithia Park and were reluctant to lose what was considered special about it. Landt stated that he was optimistic about the final plan because of the thoughtful way the consultants listened.

Heller asked if there would be continued opportunities to provide input. Gardiner replied that the public comment period remained open either on the website or through APRC.

b. Subcommittee Updates (Information)

• Bear Creek Greenway Extension Open House

Black reported that APRC, Ashland Public Works and the Bear Creek Greenway Foundation previously agreed to hire a consultant to look at alternative routes for extending the Bear Creek Greenway from the Dog Park to North Mountain Park and beyond. Options were presented at a public open forum on Thursday, June 21, at North Mountain Park Nature Center.

Black thanked Susan Dyssegard for creating community awareness about the project. He stated that because of the extensive publicity, the Bear Creek Greenway Foundation meeting to discuss alternative plans was well attended with ample public comment received.

• Trails Master Plan Update Subcommittee

McFarland noted that the Subcommittee was one meeting away from finalization of the meeting process and there were just two chapters left to approve. He said members of the Trails Subcommittee had reviewed and re-written existing chapters that were a part of the original Master Plan published in 2006. Two new chapters were added and edited by the group. Once all of the edits were approved by the Subcommittee, and the maps and photos inserted, the entire document would be forwarded to consultant Mark Mularz for format editing.

McFarland outlined the next steps – indicating that once Mularz had formatted the document, the completed package would be presented to APRC for approval by the Commissioners. Once that was done, the document would be reviewed by the Ashland Planning Department and Ashland City Council.

McFarland stated that there would be additional public hearings as the document wound down toward adoption. Those wishing to see the document in advance of adoption could view the 2006 original Trails Master Plan and track changes.

ITEMS FOR COMMISSIONERS

• *Agenda Distributions*

Landt asked about agenda packets, asking whether the Commissioners preferred receiving the entire packet or a version that separated the topics for individual assessment. It was agreed by consensus that individual agenda items were preferred.

• *McFarland Retirement*

Black touted McFarland's 35 years of service with Ashland Parks. He stated that his contributions to the trails system, forest management, parks design and more were difficult to measure. Black noted that McFarland's contributions to Ashland Parks would have a lasting impact.

Black extended an invitation for McFarland's retirement party scheduled on Tuesday, July 3, 2018, at The Grove from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Landt paid tribute – describing McFarland’s contributions as quality work. He highlighted McFarland’s approach to his work with the words “he cared.”

Gardiner emphasized McFarland's contributions as a park historian – noting that people would identify his work as the source document for all things related to APRC.

McFarland thanked the Commissioners and staff.

UPCOMING MEETING DATES

- Trails Master Plan Update Committee, June 29, 2018 @ 51 Winburn Way—9:00 a.m.
- Study Session, July 16, 2018 @ The Grove, 1195 E. Main—5:30 p.m.
- Regular Meeting, July 23, 2018 @ Council Chambers, 1175 E. Main—7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

By consensus, Gardiner adjourned into executive session at 8:45 p.m.

- *Executive Sessions: ORS 192.660 (2)(e) and (2) (h)*

ADJOURNMENT OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

By consensus, Gardiner adjourned out of the executive sessions at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Manuel, Assistant
Ashland Parks and Recreation Commission

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; the recordings are available upon request.

ASHLAND PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

340 S PIONEER STREET • ASHLAND, OREGON 97520

COMMISSIONERS:

Mike Gardiner
Joel Heller
Rick Landt
Jim Lewis
Matt Miller



Michael A. Black, AICP
Director

541.488.5340
AshlandParksandRec.org
parksinfo@ashland.or.us

PARKS COMMISSIONER STAFF REPORT

To: Ashland Parks and Recreation Commissioners
From: Rachel Dials, Recreation Superintendent
Date: July 18, 2018
Subject: Bike Polo Special Event Request (Action)

Background

Eric Michener, Rogue Valley Bike Polo organizer, is back to make a special event request for the 3rd Annual Jefferson Joust. This bike polo event is proposed for Saturday and Sunday, September 1st and 2nd. The request includes:

- Exclusive use of Tennis Courts #5 & #6 from August 31st through September 3rd, 2018 – setup and tear down as well as the actual event. The actual event will only be held on court #5. Court #6 will be used for hauling of equipment, registering teams and on/off court access.
- Megaphone and music amplification in a park area

According to current park rules:

- Amplification is not allowed in any parks except for the Lithia Park Bandshell.

Eric Michener will be on hand to give a brief overview of the event and answer any questions you may have.

Possible Motion

I move for approval of the Special Event request for the 3rd Annual Jefferson Joust planned for September as proposed along with amplification that will be limited to 10am to 6pm.

Attachment

- 2018 Special Event Request



Special Event Request Form

IF FORM IS NOT COMPLETELY FILLED OUT IT WILL BE RETURNED TO YOU

Applicant Name Daryl Witmore
Organization Regue Valley Bike Polo
Mailing Address _____

Email _____
Phone _____
Date(s) of Event Sept 1, 2 - 2018
Hour(s) of Event 9am - 11pm
(in your estimate of hours, please include set-up and take-down time)

A \$25 application fee is due at the time of submission

Type of Event: Please provide a specific, detailed description of the event. Include site plans, maps and any special requirements. Special requirements include portable toilets, trash cans, amplification, how the event is being promoted, and potential impacts on turf or trails. Attach additional pages as needed.

Bike Polo Tournament on court 5 with staging on court 6. Table set-up, extra trash & recycling. No impact to turf or trails.

Please check all that will apply to your event:

- Staking anything into the ground
- Running chutes
- Finish line arches
- Generators
- Canopies
- Tents
- Electricity

Will your event require a street closure? Yes ___ No

Please note that almost all street closures require you to fill out a *City of Ashland* Special Event Form.

Which streets? _____ Times of closure: _____

There must be two volunteers at each closure area for the duration of the street closure. Please initial your understanding of this requirement _____

Will your event require amplification? Yes ___ No If yes, it will require prior approval by the Parks & Recreation

Commission if the proposal specifies using a park area other than the Lithia Park Bandshell. The amplification limit is 1.5 hours, no louder than 75 decibels, and ending by 8:00pm.

Are you requesting booths in Lithia Park? Yes ___ No If yes, submit the Bandshell site plan and view attached policy. You can have booths in the Bandshell Parking area and on either side of Winburn Way (cannot use both sides to allow emergency access).

How many booths? _____ The maximum is 25 booths no larger than 10x10.

What types of booths? (information/food/artisan) _____

What hours will the booths be open? _____

Will money be exchanged at the booths? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, how much? _____

Is a percentage of money from vendor booths supporting this event? Yes ___ No ___

Needs P.C. Approval



Special Event Request Form

How many people will participate? 60

Is this event a fundraiser? NO If yes, who will benefit? _____

Is the organization responsible for coordinating the event a 501(c)(3)? NO

If yes, please include the tax ID number _____

Is there a fee associated with the event? NO If yes, how much? _____

Note: Selling in City of Ashland Parks is prohibited. Donations are allowed.

Please describe your plan for recycling during the event and clean up during and after the event
The organizer is responsible for the removal of all garbage, litter, and debris created by the event that does not fit into the trash cans provided. Removal of debris, temporary containers and general park clean-up around the event area should occur immediately after the actual event and be completed within the scheduled permit time.

Extra cans for recycling will be provided as well as trash. Clean-up will occur Sunday night with dis-assembly of boards on Monday

Requirements for Bathrooms Event organizer is responsible for providing portable toilets if they estimate there will be more than 200 people in attendance. Please describe your plan.

less than 200 people

Plan for Potable Water There is no potable water available. This means the event organizer is responsible for bringing in any drinking water for the event. Please describe your plan.

We will have water coolers and 5gal containers for water.

Plan for Grey Water What is your plan to contain and dispose of grey water off-site?

No grey water will be produced

[Signature]
Applicant Signature

7/13/18
Date

OFFICE USE ONLY	
Total Fee <u>\$25⁰⁰</u>	PAID Check <u>1516</u> Cash _____ Credit Card _____
Date Paid <u>7/13/18</u>	EVENT IS: Approved _____ Denied _____ Date _____

ASHLAND PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

340 S PIONEER STREET • ASHLAND, OREGON 97520

COMMISSIONERS:

Mike Gardiner
Joel Heller
Rick Landt
Jim Lewis
Matt Miller



Michael A. Black, AICP
Director

541.488.5340
AshlandParksandRec.org
parksinfo@ashland.or.us

PARKS COMMISSIONER STAFF REPORT

TO: Ashland Parks and Recreation Commissioners
FROM: Michael Black, Director
DATE: July 19, 2018
SUBJECT: S-PAC Member Approval (Action)

On February 26, 2018, the Commissioners approved by motion APRC Policy 102, "FORMATION of the SENIOR SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE of ASHLAND." In that document, the makeup of the advisory committee was determined to be as follows:

"The total membership of program participant representatives and community partner representatives should be no more than five (5) members, total. There should be a minimum of 2, maximum of 3, program participant members, and the same minimum of 2, maximum of 3, community partner members of the SSACA.

In addition, there should be one (1) APRC Commissioner, and one (1) City Council Liaison, for a total of seven (7) members."

The application process for S-PAC members took place from February 28 - March 28 of this year. The following applicants applied for positions on the committee and were approved by Commissioner motion on April 23:

1. Mary Russell-Miller – *Community Partner*
2. Michael Hersh – *Participant Member*
3. Robert Casserly – *Community Partner*
4. Sandra (Sandy) Theis – *Participant Member*

Ideally, the total membership of S-PAC would be five participant / community partner members.

Staff has learned that one additional person has requested participation on S-PAC: Anne Bellegia. Anne was a valuable member of ASPAC throughout its existence and has a broad background working with seniors. Since she lives in Ashland, she could be considered either a participant member or a community partner. If appointed, Anne could begin serving a 1.5-year term or a 2-year term immediately, as determined by the Commissioners.

Recommendation

Staff is recommending that the Commissioners take action on this item at their July 23, 2018, business meeting.

Possible Motion

I move to approve the appointment of Anne Bellegia to a Community Partner or Participant Member position on S-PAC for a term length of 1.5 or 2 years.

Attachments:

- Bellegia S-PAC Application (redacted)
- APRC Policy 102, *FORMATION of the SENIOR SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE of ASHLAND*

CITY OF
ASHLAND

**APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO
CITY COMMISSION/COMMITTEE**

Please type or print answers to the following questions and submit to the City Recorder at City Hall, 20 E Main Street, or email melissa.huhtala@ashland.or.us. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the City Recorder at 488-5307. **Attach additional sheets if necessary.**

Name Anne Bellegia

Requesting to serve on: S-PAC (Commission/Committee)

Address [REDACTED]

Occupation Retired Healthcare Phone: Home Cell
Communications Consultant Work [REDACTED]
Email _____
Fax _____

1. Education Background

What schools have you attended? Pennsylvania State University
What degrees do you hold? B.A. Science

What additional training or education have you had that would apply to this position?
Hospice Volunteer training (Asante)

2. Related Experience

What prior ~~work~~ ^{volunteer} experience have you had that would help you if you were appointed to this position?
ASPAC member, RRCOG Senior Advisory Council,
OLLI Communications + Community Outreach, Oregon
SB 21 Steering Committee on Long Term Care

Do you feel it would be advantageous for you to have further training in this field, such as attending conferences or seminars? Why? Not necessary but
always welcome



3. Interests

Why are you applying for this position? To facilitate the success of the Senior Services Superintendent and implementation of ASPAC recommendations

4. Availability

Are you available to attend special meetings, in addition to the regularly scheduled meetings? Do you prefer day or evening meetings? Yes slight preference for evenings but available during the day

5. Additional Information

How long have you lived in this community? 12 years

Please use the space below to summarize any additional qualifications you have for this position

Strategic Planning skills, established relationships with stakeholders in the community

6-1-18
Date

Anne Bellogia
Signature





**Ashland Parks and
Recreation Commission**

COMMISSION POLICY

TITLE FORMATION of the SENIOR SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE of ASHLAND	PAGE 1 of 2	POLICY No. 102
EFFECTIVE DATE	REVISED DATE	N/A

APPROVED BY COMMISSIONER ACTION

February 26, 2018; Agenda Item: IV.(b.) Recommendation from ASPAC to Form a Standing Senior Program Advisory Committee

The Charter of the City of Ashland, **Article XIX – “Park Commission,”** gives the Ashland Parks and Recreation Commissioners the “*power to formulate and adopt rules and regulations for their government.*” This authority allows Commissioners to adopt rules and policies through the public process in order to provide organization, aide in decision making and to provide regulation for park and facility uses in order to achieve the goals of the APRC and protect people, the environment and assets and to ensure fair and equal use of parks by all users.

Additionally, RESOLUTION NO. 2007-14 of the City of Ashland specifically states that:

“SECTION 2. The Parks and Recreation Department shall hereafter be responsible for facilitation of all senior programs and activities for the City of Ashland.”

And:

“SECTION 3. Parks and Recreation will have the authority to create an advisory committee for the senior program, if necessary.”

PURPOSE

On 2/26/2018 the Commissioners of APRC found that it was necessary to form an advisory committee and approved the formation of the aforementioned under the following policy.

The Senior Services Advisory Committee of Ashland’s (SSACA) purpose is to advise the Ashland Parks and Recreation Commissioners on matters related to the Ashland Senior Services Program and to coordinate with the APRC Director and Senior Services Superintendent.

TITLE : FORMATION of the SENIOR SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE of ASHLAND	Page 2 of 2	POLICY No. 102
---	-------------	-----------------------

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Committee Make-up

The total membership of program participant representatives and community partner representatives should be no more than five (5) members, total. There should be a minimum of 2, maximum of 3, program participant members, and the same minimum of 2, maximum of 3, community partner members of the SSACA.

In addition, there should be one (1) APRC Commissioner, and one (1) City Council Liaison, for a total of seven (7) Members.

Staff Support

The Senior Services Superintendent and/or APRC Director will attend and assist in the planning advertising and management of the SSACA meetings.

Term Limits

The term of each SSACA member will be three (3) years, with no member serving more than two (2) consecutive terms.

Bylaws and Program Mission

Once the SSACA Members are appointed by the Commissioners, they will create SSACA Bylaws in collaboration with APRC staff and approval of the Parks Commissioners at a regular business meeting. The SSACA may also choose to develop a strategic plan and revise their mission and vision statement concurrent with the adopted goals of the Commissioners.

Approved: _____ Date: _____
Mike Gardiner, APRC Chair

Approved, as to form: _____ Date: _____
Dave Lohman, City Attorney