

**MINUTES** of a regular meeting of the Parks Commission held Thursday, January 10, 2008 at 2:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers are as follows:

**PRESENT:** Steve Guggisberg  
Patricia Holohan  
Brian King, Chair  
Kristin Saukel, Vice Chair  
Tina Sray  
Jon Harrison, Council Liaison

**ABSENT:** Dennis Bolt  
Manny Szwabowski, Student  
Mick Gallagher, Council Liaison

**STAFF:** Gary Van Dorst, Quality of Life Interim Director  
Rick Cross, QOL Operations Manager  
Janet Sherman, Senior Administrative Assistant

#### **CALL TO ORDER – ATTENDANCE**

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. Chairperson King thanked last year's Student Commissioner, Lauren Mudge for her work during the past year.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On motion of Commissioner Guggisberg, seconded by Commissioner Sray, the minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 2007 were unanimously approved as submitted.

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

##### **A. Street Tree Committee Update**

Rick Cross gave a status update on the project to plant 1,000 trees. West Coast Arborists sent letters to approximately 1200 residents in two zones. As soon as the reply cards are received from those who desire and agree to care for a tree, the planting will begin.

##### **B. Recreation Advisory Commission Update**

Dave Eason informed the Commissioners there would be a fund-raising dinner on January 19 to benefit the special needs program of RBY. Under that program, RBY pays the cost of participation for all children with special needs. Martha Green's Eating Room donates the food for the dinner, the Police Department serves the food, and the proceeds of \$25 per dinner go to the RBY special needs program.

For the last several meetings the Recreation Advisory Commission has been discussing raising funds for some maintenance issues, such as resurfacing the tennis courts at Ford Park. The Recreation Advisory Commission is also considering participating in a fundraiser with a group from the University of Redlands that puts on a running, swimming, and bicycling event.

**C. Park Liaisons Update**

Commissioners reported on their assigned parks (see attached list).

**CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**A. QOL Director's Update**

Quality of Life Director, Gary Van Dorst, reported that we have been asked to place the discussion of Ed Hales Park on hold, pending some further research and study by staff. We anticipate bringing this matter back before the Commission at a future time when all of the stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide meaningful input into the process. He gave the Commission his commitment to keep them apprised and said he had not forgotten their direction to represent them regarding the urban square concept.

**B. Information on a policy for the naming of new public/park facilities.**

Mr. Van Dorst explained it was his understanding that this policy was brought before Council during a discussion of the renaming of one of the local parks several years ago. The City Council took no action at that time. This draft copy has been provided for the input of the Commissioners. Mr. Van Dorst will modify the policy accordingly, take it to the City Manager, and possibly meet with one or two Councilmembers to get their feedback so that when we do return to Council we will have something we believe the Council will support. This action is being taken because the City is currently looking at naming three new parks.

**Public Space and Facility Naming Process**

- a) Commissioner Sray asked what was meant by "appropriate board or commission." Mr. Van Dorst replied that determination would be made by staff.

**Criteria for Naming Parks and Facilities**

- a) Commissioner Sray asked why a priority should be given to the location or theme rather than someone that donates \$5 million, for example. She felt the word "priority" should be deleted.
- b) Chairperson King pointed out that two parks that are now coming on line were built by developers that contributed more than 51% of the cost and there is no exclusion for someone that contributes in lieu of parks fees. Mr. Van Dorst said he would include a provision that no one who builds a public park as a means of satisfying a requirement should be eligible to have a park named after him or her. Commissioner Sray said she thought consideration could be given to dedicating or

naming a facility after a living person if they contributed significantly to the quality of life in the City via monetary donations. Chairperson King stated he would rather follow the State policy of not naming anything after a living person. Commissioner Saukel explained that the committee that originally developed this naming policy did a lot of research on this topic before specifying that individuals being considered must be deceased for at least three years. Commissioner Holohan was in favor of naming a facility after someone who is alive that makes a substantial contribution.

There was discussion regarding connecting the two sentences in this section with “and” or “or.” There was also discussion about removing the words “or business” from the first sentence in this section. Chairperson King felt it should not be policy to name a park after a business—but Council could override that. Commissioners Guggisberg and Sray were in favor of allowing a facility to be named after a business. Commissioner Saukel was in favor of being incredibly flexible.

#### **Renaming of a Public Space or Facility**

- a) Commissioner Sray asked if there should be some flexibility to rename a park if someone wanted to donate or adopt a park. Mr. Van Dorst asked, “What condition or set of circumstances would make a park that already has a name eligible to be renamed?” He then asked for input from the Commission and there was none.

Mayor Harrison stated the Commission does not need to make a decision. They are just providing staff with some direction on ultimate policy language. He asked what, if anything, this Commission felt should be modified, added, or deleted so we can finally get it to the Council to take action.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

None.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

##### **A. Discussion and Possible Action – Redlands Conservancy Trails Maintenance Agreement.**

Director Van Dorst requested the Commission’s endorsement of the plans to move forward in executing an agreement with the Redlands Conservancy for the maintenance of City trails. This is an opportunity for the Commission to provide input on the general content of the draft agreement, not to review specific contract language. The sections on liability and indemnification are there as placeholders and the entire draft agreement needs to be reviewed by the City Attorney. This is a great partnership for our community. The Redlands Conservancy is offering to maintain trails that the City does not have the resources to maintain. Knowing of at least one concern regarding volunteer forms, Mr.

Van Dorst stated he would work with the City Attorney and Risk Management section to provide for a volunteer form that is friendly, readable and succinct.

Chairperson King liked the "Request for Parks Commission Action," stated this report was new to the Commission, and requested to see it more often because it makes it a lot easier to understand the topic under consideration by the Commission. Director Van Dorst explained it is the model for the Council report and makes it easy for him to take this matter to Council. The other Commissioners were in agreement with Chairperson King stating it was the first time they had received such a report and it was nice to have.

Chairperson King pointed out that on the first page of the agreement, under the third "Whereas," the last part included the wording, "that exists on City or County-owned property..." He said it did not include easements or anything like that and the majority of these trails are not on City-owned property. Also at the bottom of the page where it says "QOL Director," Quality of Life probably should be spelled out, at least the first time.

Commissioner Guggisberg commented that the wording of Section 2.H, "Indemnify the City of Redlands and private property owners," should be addressed along with whether these trails are dedicated or designated. Mr. Van Dorst explained this item is really a placeholder and he would be working with the City Attorney and Risk Manager on the final wording. He stated he did include a clause (Section 1.D) under City obligations that requires the City to determine whether all of the appropriate easements and ownerships are in place before the maintenance begins. Commissioner Guggisberg said that in conjunction with the draft naming policy prohibiting the use of a person's name if they have been deceased less than three years, Section 2.K.2, Teddy's Trail does refer to an individual. Commissioner Holohan said this is an example of what we have been trying to state as a policy and asked to put a hold on the name of that trail. Chairperson King stated that all the trails involve naming, if the Commission was going to get into that. Mr. Van Dorst explained that we are starting with the common names of these trails and there is certainly no intent to do anything else here. Commissioner Guggisberg said he felt good with the other names because they were geographical areas. Further discussion ensued as to whether the names were simply reference for this contract or would be permanent names on signs. Sherli Leonard clarified that only the trail number will appear on the trail signs and that most of the trail names are traditional. The brochure lists both the trail number and the trail name. Mr. Van Dorst said he did not want to hold up this agreement while we debate the naming policy. He saw the names as common usage names. An exception is Teddy's trail, which Ms. Leonard explained was formerly known as Hermit's trail. It traverses Teddy Banta's former property.

Commissioner Sray asked if there were any recourse if there was a failure to perform as agreed. Mr. Van Dorst stated he wrote a deficiencies and remedy section (Section 1.F). Commissioner Sray asked what would happen if the deficiency were not remedied. Mr. Van Dorst replied there are a couple of different remedy periods and the City has recourse to either breach or modify the agreement. No doubt, the City Attorney has something better in terms of remedies and deficiencies, but Mr. Van Dorst's goal was to get down the content at this point. Commissioner Sray asked whether Section 1.C.1

("Sponsors names...are not approved for display on way-finding signage.") would also apply to identification signage. Mr. Van Dorst stated that only two types of signs are addressed in this document—trailhead and way-finding signs. Commissioner Sray said she assumed the Conservancy pays for any improvements on the trails. Mr. Van Dorst said it depends on what is meant by an improvement. Commissioner Sray asked who is responsible for closing a trail, such as when a washout occurs. Mr. Van Dorst stated that is not covered in the agreement, but he could add something. Commissioner Sray asked if we should be concerned with a timeframe for closures. Mr. Van Dorst said language could be added to inspect the trail immediately following significant rain or wind events. Commissioner Sray asked if a timeframe is spelled out for the removal of graffiti. Commissioner King stated he was comfortable with the wording of Section 2.G which says, "Clean and repair or replace signs as they become defaced or missing, no less than once monthly." Rick Cross stated that graffiti should be removed immediately or it will just get worse. Commissioner Sray asked why Section 2.K, which talks about implementation of the trails maintenance, discusses brochures. Mr. Van Dorst said this section includes the opening of the trails, installation of the signage, and creation of the brochures. Commissioner Sray asked whether the agreement says anywhere that the ownership of improvements reverts to the City if the agreement is terminated for any reason. Mr. Van Dorst said that was not included, but he could add it.

Commissioner Guggisberg asked if we should expand on the definition of what constitutes maintenance, repair, and construction. Mr. Van Dorst said he could provide some detail for what maintenance involves. Commissioners King and Saukel requested to change Section 1.C.1. to say, "Sponsors names...are not approved for display on *any* signage." Mr. Van Dorst requested that the project be identified on the brochures as a "City of Redlands and Redlands Conservancy project."

Commissioner Saukel expressed concern about the fourth bullet point on the Request for Parks Commission Action that says, "Signage would be restricted in number to one per trail head and necessary way-finding signs and signage content is defined." She said she did not find the number of signs defined anywhere in the document. Mr. Van Dorst said his feeling was the number of signs would be whatever they need to be and that could change over time. Commissioner Saukel stated she was opposed to way-finding signs on the City streets because we have City street name signs that can tell people where to turn and the map shows way-finding signs on City street easements. Sherli Leonard stated the main concern is probably the trail along Garden Street and Mariposa Drive. For clarity for the user, Ms. Leonard felt a sign was needed there. She further stated the Conservancy was expecting to get to that trail in June and perhaps some of the Commissioners could walk that trail with her and advise where way-finding signs are needed. Commissioner King requested that the agreement specify that any signs placed in the City right-of-way must follow City standards. Mr. Van Dorst said he would add language that says signs in a street right-of-way would require review and approval and would meet the City standard.

In reference to Section 2.E, Commissioner Saukel asked how debris would be hauled away. Ms. Leonard replied pack animals would be used. Commissioner Saukel asked

about prohibiting the use of chemicals, such as Roundup. Mr. Van Dorst said that could be addressed. Commissioner Saukel was also concerned about improper pruning/trimming of trees along the trails. Rick Cross said that if a tree is hanging over a City easement, it is legal to trim the part that is hanging over the trail easement.

Regarding Section 2.I, Commissioner Saukel asked how volunteers can “indemnify the City.” Mr. Van Dorst stated he has seen that language on many waiver forms. Commissioner Sray asked him to site an example. Mr. Van Dorst explained the Commissioners should think of this as a waiver of liability, the language was his, and it would be reviewed by the City Attorney. Commissioner Saukel stated she would not sign the waiver of liability form of which she had a copy. Mr. Van Dorst said several hundred people have signed that form without objection. Commissioner Saukel said they clearly did not read it before signing. Commissioner Sray asked if City staff is going to review or check on the maintenance performed under the agreement. Mr. Van Dorst replied that City staff is going to monitor the terms of the contract. Commissioner Sray asked if it would be too cumbersome to have some kind of a maintenance log. Ms. Leonard said that was a good idea and would help the Conservancy keep track of volunteer hours. Mr. Van Dorst said that is not something he would put into the contract, but as an administrative idea, he was in agreement. Commissioner Guggisberg suggested adding a written trails report to the Parks Commission agenda under the “Committee Reports” section.

Chairperson King moved to recommend to the City Council the approval of an agreement between the City of Redlands and the Redlands Conservancy for the maintenance of public trails with the revisions that were discussed today. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Guggisberg. Chairperson King asked if there were any other comments before taking a vote. Commissioner Sray asked if the Commission would have an opportunity to review the changes. Chairperson King said he did not believe this agreement was coming back to the Commission again—the changes would be incorporated and then it would go to the City Manager and City Attorney. Ms. Leonard asked if wording should be included in the agreement for development of new trails, if the occasion arises. Mr. Van Dorst stated he would include these comments. Chairperson King called for the vote and the motion carried with four AYE votes by Commissioners Guggisberg, King, Saukel and Sray. Commissioner Holohan excused herself from the meeting prior to the vote.

## **CONTINUED PARK MASTER PLAN WORKSHOP**

- A. Development of a recommendation for a list of facilities to be included in parks.**
- 1) Continued discussion on existing parks – Review existing amenities and recommend any potential modifications to the facilities and uses included in the existing park facilities.**
  - 2) Future park sites – Review possible future park sites based on the General Plan and recommend any potential facilities to be included in these park sites.**

- 3) **Future park sites – Review possible additional park locations to be included in the General Plan update including general size, type and amenities to be included in the facility.**

Chairperson King reported the subcommittee did not meet during the holidays, but they would pick a date today to meet sometime this month.

#### **PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS**

None.

#### **POSSIBLE AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING**

- Park Master Plan workshop
- Trails Report (monthly item)
- RBY banner proposal (refer to handout) – Craig Kundig
- RBY lighting proposal (refer to handout) – Craig Kundig
- Volunteer resolution
- Overview of the Brown Act as it pertains to the Parks Commission - City Attorney

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Parks Commission will be held at **2:30 p.m., Thursday, February 14, 2008** in the City Council Chambers, 35 Cajon Street, Suite 2, Redlands.

**JANET SHERMAN**

Senior Administrative Assistant

## **Park Liaison Reports**

### **January 10, 2008**

Brookside Park – Commissioner Guggisberg reported that with the recent heavy rains the two lower parking lot drains that drain out into the soccer fields are an absolute disaster. Something needs to be done to level out the drains. The concession booth or building still needs some roof repairs. Between water that is inside, and/or a sink that is leaking, and the previous condition of the walls, it is hard to say if the roof is leaking or not. There is a lot of plaster damage. There are a couple of dead trees in the southeast corner of the park. The drainage in the upper parking lot continues to be poor, causing problems whenever it rains.

Caroline Park – Commissioner Holohan reported there were a lot of trash and beer cans, which she cleaned up, in the park on her Sunday morning visit. Perhaps a patrol on Saturday night is in order to see what is going on in the park. The circular driveway as you drive in from Sunset looked spectacular and Commissioner Holohan expressed her thanks to all the volunteers who work on that. There are some weeds in the back on the Poppy Street side. Commissioner Holohan asked whether a resolution had ever been done to thank the volunteers formally for their hard work at Caroline and Prospect Parks. Quality of Life Director Van Dorst asked Commissioner Holohan to provide him with some background information and said he would be glad to draft a proclamation.

Community Park – Nothing reported.

Crafton Park – Commissioner Sray reported the park is looking very good. The restroom needs some kind of deep cleaning inside, especially the lavatories and toilets. The ceiling is covered with spit wads. There is graffiti on the concession stand window. The turf looks good. The picnic tables have some graffiti scratched into their tops, but otherwise look to be in good shape. The barbecues are still missing and there is a concern about liability issues resulting from the remaining posts. Rick Cross said he thought the issue of the posts was already handled and he will see that action is taken.

Ed Hales Park – Nothing reported.

Fire Demonstration Garden – Nothing reported.

Ford Park – Commissioner Saukel reported the park looks good. There is trash in the parking lot, but that is usually short-lived.

Franklin Park – Commissioner Saukel reported the park looks good.

Jennie Davis Park – Nothing reported.

Prospect Park – Commissioner Saukel reported the park looks much better and thanked staff. There was new graffiti on the island at the corner of Cajon Street. Somebody sandblasted the graffiti off the curb, but did not remove the graffiti on the sidewalk. There is a big hole washed out in the grass in the island where a sprinkler might have been stolen. Many of the glass panes

## Park Liaison Reports

January 10, 2008

Page 2

have been broken out of the older tall lights inside the park—including one near the overlooks, one by the restrooms, and one on the brown arbor that is wrapped with wisteria and may be a fire hazard. There is a light buried in the bamboo and, if the light is hot, it may be a fire hazard. There are many people in the park all night and perhaps if the lights stayed on later it would deter some of that activity. Apparently, the lights go out at 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. There was a bunch of trash and electronic equipment in the parking lot this morning. Jim Bueermann apparently is now having his staff meetings at the Carriage House. Perhaps the police cars will deter the truants. Rick Cross said there was a break-in at the restrooms. The door was broken down and everything was stolen—lawnmowers, edgers, blowers, and everything that was in there. We are now looking at security lights for the restrooms. Commissioner Saukel said the track teams painted new white arrows everywhere since last month and are leaving the gates down. She asked if anyone had contacted the coaches and Rick Cross stated he has left messages, but has not spoken to any of them yet.

Smiley Park – Commissioner Guggisberg reported there is still a dead tree just south of the Verizon building that should be evaluated.

Sylvan Park – Chairperson King noticed a lot of sand in the zanja from the recent rains. On today's visit he observed benches being replaced and, for the first time, saw children lawn bowling. The graffiti situation was much better—what was there in the past is almost completely gone. Chairperson King asked if there was a schedule yet for the removal of the trees in the Section A picnic area. Rick Cross replied there was no schedule yet because the trees need to be evaluated first.

Texonia Park – Nothing reported.