

MINUTES FOR STUDY SESSION
ASHLAND PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
October 2, 2024
Electronic Meeting via Zoom – 6:00 PM

Present: Commissioners Bachman (Chair), Landt (Vice Chair), Lewis, Adams, Seffinger, Staff, Acting City Attorney McGeary, Director Houston, Senior Services Superintendent Mettler, Parks Superintendent Caldwell, Executive Assistant Mero

Absent: Deputy Director Dials

I. CALL TO ORDER

Bachman called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Bachman asked permission of the other Commissioners to alter the order of Items for Study moving items VI. and VII. to III. and IV.

II. PUBLIC FORUM

None

III. ADVISORY COMMITTEES DRAFT POLICY – DETERMINE WHERE THE MAKEUP OF THE COMMITTEES SHOULD BE: BYLAWS, RESOLUTION OR POLICY ON COMMITTEES

Acting City Attorney McGeary reviewed elements of proposed ordinance 3244 on establishing uniformity for committees. The ordinance is still being drafted. The ordinance will not apply to the Commission. It will apply to APRC's advisory and management committees. The Commissioners and staff will determine the makeup of APRC committees.

Questions/Discussion

Will liaisons from Council/Commission be allowed to be voting members? No – they will be ex-officio nonvoting members only.

Term limits will threaten the institutional knowledge/expertise of long-term committee members (examples: Historical Committee, Forest Lands Committee). Why will there be term limits for committee members when there are no term limits for Council/Commission members? The idea is to avoid habitual sameness and welcome new ideas. After terming out, a committee member can again serve on the same committee after taking a break of two years.

Can a person serve on more than one committee concurrently? Yes, they may serve on two.

Having committees work only on what the Commissioners tell them to is unacceptable. Members of committees who have expertise and passion for the purpose of the committee's existence should be able to bring ideas to the group. Response: that flexibility would be included in the charge the APRC gives to the committees. Suggested that a committee wanting to introduce a recommendation outside of their charge could bring it to the APRC for consideration.

Bachman suggested returning to the agenda item at the end of the items for discussion.

IV. PROPOSED ORDINANCE CHAPTER 2.28.600 PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT CREATION

Commission Chair Bachman

Bachman is opposed to use of the term 'Dual Reporting' and the phrases "report to" and "the Director shall be directly accountable to the City Manager" (CM) used in 2.28.630 Accountability and Supervisory Structure section of the proposed ordinance. This was not in the framework the small group (Mayor Graham, Councilor Hyatt, Commissioners Bachman and Adams) drafted. Suggested changing the wording. Believes that a person should only have one boss. Can not support the document as is.

McGeary clarified that the CM has operational control over compliance and City-wide operations while the Commissioners retain their authority over Parks strategies and direction. Emphasis is on coordination and collaboration between the CM and Commission. The Parks Director is tasked with receiving guidance and information from both.

Bachman reiterated that the Parks Director must not be directly supervised by the CM.

Questions/Discussion

It sounded like the City Attorney was making a policy argument which is up to the elected bodies, not the attorney. Unless the attorney has a legal reason for not doing so, he should stick to the framework provided by the small working group. The framework sets the expectation that the elected bodies will work together.

A request was made that McGeary explain why some parts of the framework were omitted from the proposed ordinance. Willingness on McGeary's part to make additional versions. He requested suggested language changes be sent to him and welcomed all feedback.

V. PROS PLAN – SCOPE OF WORK REVIEW Director Houston [Presentation](#)

Houston reviewed the elements of the PROS Plan, with additional information on what work will be done by staff versus consultants.

Questions/Discussion:

What is the difference between the PROS plan and the system-wide master plan (Commissioner goal #7 BN 23-25)? The PROS plan would be the foundational document for that master plan.

A good plan, with an aggressive timeline.

VI. EAST MAIN ST PARK – DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS Director Houston [Presentation](#)

Houston gave an overview of the current funding levels, requirements (land-use and grant), and phasing priorities for the project.

Questions/Discussion:

A request was made to see the sport court called out specifically in the phasing and to move the walking trails up in the phasing. The trails will benefit the dense neighborhood adjacent to the park (and help keep people off the grass, reducing damage).

Was the \$4.2 ML reference for Phase 1? No, for the entire project.

Recommended to include underground work for EV charging in Phase I.

Will pump track be finished in the first phase? Yes. Will it be useable while the other phases are being built? Yes.

VII. CIP – PROCESS CONFIRMATION Director Houston [Presentation](#)

Houston: A Capital Improvement Plan is a short-range plan that identifies capital projects and equivalent purchases and provides a schedule and financing or funding options.

Questions/Discussion:

Who does the scoring of potential projects? Mainly Director Houston and Superintendent Caldwell. They would create the draft, which would then be presented to Commissioners for approval.

What about economic impacts? What we do in the parks impacts the entire City. Should show how a project benefits the City budget as well as park users.

What about previous CIP high priority projects that haven't been completed? They will be put in the mix. Every two years the list will be reviewed, and projects reprioritized.

Request for a list of capital projects currently on the list to be sent to Commissioners Bachman and Landt so that they can add to it any older projects that might be missing, then discuss with the whole Commission to begin prioritization. Would like to have an 'agreed to' backlog list. Houston agreed to get them a spreadsheet.

Bachman returned to previous item:

VIII. ADVISORY COMMITTEES DRAFT POLICY – DETERMINE WHERE THE MAKEUP OF THE COMMITTEES SHOULD BE: BYLAWS, RESOLUTION OR POLICY ON COMMITTEES

Bachman asked Houston what he wants from the Commissioners on this item.

Houston: In how many documents do we want to identify the make-up of an Advisory Committee?

The Commission will form a committee by resolution identifying the number of members and providing direction to the committee on what items the Department would like advice. Staff will create the initial by-laws that will identify member groups for adoption by the Commission. Staff will update the advisory committee policy omitting the committees' make-up and listing only the Department's committees.

Committee Chairs can ask for changes to the by-laws. The changes would need to be approved by the Commission.

Questions/Discussion:

While citizen input is critical, Commissioners need to be aware of how much staff time it takes to run an advisory committee.

IX. LOOKAHEAD REVIEW

Houston highlighted upcoming items from the Lookahead.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Bachman adjourned the meeting at 7:51 PM

Respectfully submitted, Nancy A. Mero, APRC Executive Assistant.