



# Council Business Meeting Agenda

## ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL CALLED BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Monday, April 13, 2026  
Council Chambers, 1175 E Main Street

---

Live stream via RVTV Prime at [rvtv.sou.edu](http://rvtv.sou.edu) or broadcast on Spectrum 180.

Public comment is welcome on public forum topics and agenda items. To **speak electronically** during the meeting or to submit **written comments** in advance, please complete the online [Public Comment Form](#) by 10 a.m. the day of the meeting.

### 2:30p.m. Special Called Business Meeting

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
  - a. Land Acknowledgement\*\*
- II. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- III. **ROLL CALL**
- IV. **PUBLIC FORUM**
- V. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
  - a. Proposed Approach to Camping Framework and Location
- VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

*If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Alissa Kolodzinski at [recorder@ashlandoregon.gov](mailto:recorder@ashlandoregon.gov) or 541.488.5307 (TTY phone number 1.800.735.2900). Notification at least three business days before the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.*

\* 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)]

#### \*\* **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

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.





# Council Business Meeting Agenda

\*\*\*Agendas and minutes for City of Ashland Council, Commission and Committee meetings may be found at the City website, [ashlandoregon.gov](http://ashlandoregon.gov).





# Council Business Meeting

Date: April 13, 2026

<b>Agenda Item</b>	Proposed Approach to Camping Framework and Location
<b>Department</b>	City Manager's Office
<b>From</b>	

## TIME ESTIMATE

### CATEGORY

Staff Direction - provide direction to staff on the body's desired next steps.

### SUMMARY

Special meeting called at the request of Councilor Bloom.

## POLICIES, PLANS & GOALS SUPPORTED

### BACKGROUND AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Information for consideration per APD:

- The current geographical location of the night lawn places it directly adjacent to three separate city facilities; the police department, the Grove and the public works compound.
- Members of the public and civilian staff not trained for negative encounters.
- The current City exit lawn time is 7:30 a.m. This routine, daily, translates into 9 a.m. clear out time. If we change that to 10, let's recognize that it really means 11 or 11:30. This will fall to the police department to manage, as there is no one else to do it. It was suggested that if we say 10, then we mean 10. With no one assigned to enforce this and based on prior behavior, we know, not so much speculate, but know, that this will be stretched to significantly beyond 10.
- Then allowing them back at 3 realistically only gives the space a few hours of vacancy.
- It was pointed out by a homeless advocate that a more appropriate time to return might be 4:30, if the Council wants to allow greater occupancy. This time allows children coming home from school maximum occupancy of the sidewalks and crosswalks without unnecessarily complicating the situation.
- Management of items continues to be an issue.

## FISCAL IMPACTS

## SUGGESTED ACTIONS, MOTIONS, AND/OR OPTIONS

### REFERENCES & ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Approach to Camping Framework and Location by Councilor Bloom



## **Proposed Five-Meeting Study Session Series**

**Submitted by: Councilor Dylan Bloom**

### **Meeting 1**

#### **Purpose, Policy Role, and Model Options**

**Target date:** May 18, 2026

#### **Purpose**

The goal of the first meeting would be to establish the policy foundation for the conversation. Before discussing site options, council should decide what problem the city is actually trying to solve and what role a camping space is meant to play in Ashland's broader homelessness response.

#### **Key questions for council**

- What is the intended purpose of the camping space?
- Is it primarily for legal compliance, emergency overnight refuge, stabilization, transition to shelter or housing, neighborhood management, or some combination?
- Is the current dusk-to-dawn lawn model sufficient, or does council want to consider a more structured model?
- What general types of models should Ashland evaluate further?

#### **My contribution**

I would prepare and circulate a discussion memo that:

- outlines why I believe the current model is increasingly untenable
- explains why policy design should come before site selection
- summarizes broad model options used in other communities
- frames the threshold policy questions for council

#### **Advocate input placeholder**

At this meeting, I would also provide a summary of advocate perspectives on purpose, goals, and preferred model types.

**Placeholder: advocate input to be added once gathered.**

### **Staff participation requested**

- **City Manager** — to speak to organizational capacity, city priorities, and how this discussion fits within broader council work.
- **City Attorney** — to answer threshold legal questions and identify any legal guardrails at the outset.
- **Dan Cano, Executive Director of OHRA** — to provide operational perspective on homelessness response and the realities of the current service environment.
- **Police Chief or Deputy Operations Chief** — to answer questions about current enforcement realities, public safety issues, and operational concerns tied to the existing model.

### **What would be needed from staff**

- Basic factual confirmation of the current operating model
- Clarification of any legal or practical guardrails council should understand at the outset
- Minimal support in scheduling and agenda placement

### **Desired outcome**

Council identifies the core purpose of the camping space and narrows the general model or models that should be explored further.

## **Meeting 2**

### **Rules, Operations, Facilities, and Overflow**

**Target date:** June 1, 2026

### **Purpose**

Once council has discussed the policy purpose and general model, the next step is to determine how such a space would actually function. This meeting would move from conceptual discussion into operating expectations.

### **Key questions for council**

- What rules should apply to the site?
- What hours of operation should be considered?

- What standards should govern behavior, possessions, sanitation, pets, smoking, prohibited conduct, and reentry after exclusion?
- What facilities are necessary for any acceptable model?
- Should overflow capacity exist, and if so, under what circumstances?
- What level of management, supervision, or operator involvement is required?

### **My contribution**

I would prepare a second discussion memo that:

- outlines possible operating frameworks
- compares low-, medium-, and higher-management models
- discusses facility needs and core infrastructure expectations
- lays out options for overflow and contingencies
- identifies the practical differences between a minimally managed camping area and a more structured managed site

### **Advocate input placeholder**

At this meeting, I would also provide a summary of advocate perspectives on rules, accessibility, barriers to entry, safety expectations, and necessary facilities or services.

**Placeholder: advocate input to be added once gathered.**

### **Staff participation requested**

- **City Manager** — to help council understand administrative feasibility and policy alignment.
- **City Attorney** — to answer questions about rule structures, exclusion processes, and legal defensibility.
- **Dan Cano, Executive Director of OHRA** — to provide practical input on what rules and site conditions are realistic from a provider and user perspective.
- **Police Chief or Deputy Operations Chief** — to answer questions regarding enforcement, rule violations, exclusions, and safety concerns.
- **Public Works** — to answer questions about sanitation, waste, water, lighting, maintenance, and other basic infrastructure issues.

### **What would be needed from staff**

- Factual or practical feedback on feasibility of basic operating concepts
- Clarification on any obvious administrative, sanitation, enforcement, or implementation constraints
- No large standalone report assumed

### **Desired outcome**

Council narrows what it considers to be an acceptable operating framework, including rules, facilities, level of management, and overflow approach.

### **Meeting 3**

#### **Location Criteria, Neighborhood Engagement, and Transition Framework**

**Target date:** June 15, 2026

#### **Purpose**

This meeting would not be about choosing a specific site. It would instead establish the standards by which any potential site should later be evaluated. In my view, that discussion has to come before a candidate-location conversation.

#### **Key questions for council**

- What characteristics should any acceptable location have?
- How should proximity to services, transit, infrastructure, sensitive uses, and existing shelter resources be weighed?
- Should one site or multiple smaller sites be preferred?
- What neighborhood engagement process should apply before any future siting decision?
- How should transition from the current model be handled if council chooses to move in a different direction?
- What performance measures should be used to assess whether a future site is working?

#### **My contribution**

I would prepare a third discussion memo that:

- proposes siting criteria
- outlines possible neighborhood engagement principles
- discusses transition approaches from the current model
- recommends potential performance measures and accountability expectations

### **Advocate input placeholder**

At this meeting, I would also provide a summary of advocate perspectives on equitable siting, neighborhood concerns, service access, and transition from the current model.

**Placeholder: advocate input to be added once gathered.**

### **Staff participation requested**

- **City Manager** — to help frame implementation realities and coordination across departments.
- **Deputy City Manager** — to answer operational and interdepartmental coordination questions as the discussion becomes more implementation-focused.
- **City Attorney** — to advise on legal issues related to siting, transition, and procedural fairness.
- **Dan Cano, Executive Director of OHRA** — to provide service-provider perspective on access, transition, and what siting criteria support actual use and success.
- **Police Chief or Deputy Operations Chief** — to answer public safety and enforcement questions tied to siting and transition.
- **Public Works** — to address questions about physical infrastructure, serviceability, and site-readiness considerations.
- **Community Development** — to answer questions about land-use context, proximity to sensitive uses, and any planning or development constraints.

### **What would be needed from staff**

- Limited practical feedback on implementation constraints tied to siting or transition
- Clarification of any major considerations council should be aware of before moving into specific location options

### **Desired outcome**

Council establishes the criteria that should govern future site review, the expectations for neighborhood engagement, and the broad framework for transition.

## **Meeting 4**

### **Candidate Locations and Site Comparison**

**Target date:** August 3, 2026 preferred; July 20 or August 17 as alternates depending on schedule availability. July 20 currently shows a tentative Strategic Plan draft review, while August 3 and August 17 appear open.

### **Purpose**

This would be the first meeting focused on actual site options. By this point, council would already have discussed policy purpose, operations, and siting criteria. That would allow the location discussion to be grounded in a framework rather than treated as a free-floating political debate.

### **Key questions for council**

- What candidate locations should be considered?
- Which locations appear clearly unsuitable based on the criteria already discussed?
- Which locations warrant further review?
- Is there interest in a single preferred site, multiple smaller sites, a phased approach, or a temporary and long-term pairing?
- Are there sites council would want ruled out?

### **My contribution**

I would prepare a fourth discussion memo that:

- identifies candidate sites or site categories for discussion
- compares them against the location criteria discussed in Meeting 3
- outlines tradeoffs for each option
- identifies likely transition implications for each candidate location

### **Advocate input placeholder**

At this meeting, I would also provide a summary of advocate perspectives on candidate sites, site suitability, access concerns, and concerns or support related to specific locations.

**Placeholder: advocate input to be added once gathered.**

### **Staff participation requested**

- **City Manager** — to help frame how any future site decision would fit with city capacity and broader policy direction.
- **Deputy City Manager** — to answer implementation and coordination questions as council reviews specific options.
- **City Attorney** — to address legal questions related to site control, authority, and implementation.
- **Dan Cano, Executive Director of OHRA** — to provide provider perspective on site suitability, accessibility, and practical functionality.
- **Police Chief or Deputy Operations Chief** — to answer questions about public safety implications, operational concerns, and enforcement realities tied to candidate locations.
- **Public Works** — to answer questions about infrastructure availability, maintenance needs, utilities, and physical limitations.
- **Community Development** — to address land-use, adjacency, and site-compatibility questions.
- **APRC Commission Chair** — to provide input if park property, park-adjacent land, or park system impacts are part of the discussion.

### **What would be needed from staff**

- Factual clarification regarding city control, infrastructure limitations, or other known constraints associated with potential sites
- Minimal implementation feedback where needed
- No expectation of a staff-led siting report unless council later directs one

### **Desired outcome**

Council narrows or identifies the site options it wants to consider further and provides clear feedback on which options appear most viable.

## **Meeting 5**

### **Final Recommendations and Potential Staff Direction**

**Target date:** August 17, 2026 preferred; later date if needed for spacing and synthesis. August 17 currently appears open on the study session schedule.

### **Purpose**

This final meeting would bring the prior discussions together into one consolidated framework. The purpose would be to determine whether council wishes to direct any formal next steps and, if so, what those should be.

### **Key questions for council**

- Based on the prior study sessions, what model appears most appropriate for Ashland?
- What operating framework should accompany it?
- What site or site options remain under consideration?
- Does council want to pursue a pilot, a formal policy framework, an ordinance, a resolution, additional analysis, or no action at this time?
- What specific direction, if any, should be given to staff?

### **My contribution**

I would prepare a final consolidated memo that:

- summarizes the prior four meetings
- identifies where council appears aligned and where questions remain
- proposes a recommended framework
- outlines possible next-step options for council consideration

### **Advocate input placeholder**

At this meeting, I would also provide a summary of advocate perspectives on the overall package, final concerns, and recommended next steps.

**Placeholder: advocate input to be added once gathered.**

### **Staff participation requested**

- **City Manager** — to discuss organizational readiness and the implications of any direction council may give.
- **Deputy City Manager** — to answer implementation and coordination questions tied to next steps.
- **City Attorney** — to advise on the legal path forward for any formal direction, ordinance, or resolution.
- **Dan Cano, Executive Director of OHRA** — to provide final provider perspective on the practicality of the full framework under discussion.
- **Police Chief or Deputy Operations Chief** — to answer final questions related to safety, enforcement, and operational sustainability.
- **Public Works** — to speak to infrastructure, maintenance, and implementation implications.
- **Community Development** — to address any siting, planning, or development-related follow-up questions.
- **APRC Commission Chair** — to provide input if the preferred framework affects park property, adjacent uses, or APCR interests.
- **Finance Director** — to answer questions regarding cost, fiscal implications, potential pilot expenses, or ongoing funding needs.

### **What would be needed from staff**

This is the point at which staff involvement may become more substantive, depending on council direction. Possible staff asks at that stage could include:

- legal or operational review of a preferred path
- preparation of implementation options
- drafting of ordinance or resolution language if directed
- preparation of a more formal site-analysis process if directed
- return with cost or administrative implications of a preferred framework

### **Desired outcome**

Council concludes the study-session process with a clear understanding of whether it wants to direct formal next steps and what those next steps should be.

## **Summary of Staff Needs Across the Process**

Because I expect to do most of the preparatory work on this item, I do not envision a staff-heavy process on the front end. What I would need from staff is more limited and targeted.

### **Early-stage staff support**

- Agenda scheduling and coordination
- Factual verification of current operating conditions
- Clarification of legal, operational, or administrative guardrails
- Limited feasibility feedback where council discussion would benefit from it

### **Later-stage staff support, only if council chooses to proceed**

- Review of a preferred policy direction
- Assistance with formal implementation options
- Drafting support for ordinance, resolution, or process documents
- Site-specific administrative or operational analysis if directed

From my perspective, this issue is too important and too complex to approach in a compressed or reactive manner. A staged study-session process would allow council to work through the issue in the proper sequence:

1. Define the purpose
2. Define how the model would function
3. Define what standards should govern siting
4. Review actual location options
5. Consider final recommendations and any formal direction

That approach gives council a better chance of having a constructive discussion and reduces the risk of debating locations before we have defined what we are actually trying to create.