1	CITY OF YACHATS
2 3 4	PARKS AND COMMONS COMMISSION April 20, 2017
5 6 7	<u>Minutes</u>
7 9 10 11 12 13 14	The April 20, 2017 meeting of the Parks and Commons Commission was called to order by Chair John Moore at 3:00 pm in Room 3 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: John Moore, Dean Shrock, Michael Hempen, Scott Gordon, Ruth Bass, Derek Ojeda. Absent: none. Staff present: City Manager Joan Davies, Clerk Kimmie Jackson, Facilities Manager Leon Sterner. Council Present: Greg Scott. Audience: 8.
15 16	I. <b>Minutes</b> Commissioner Gordon moved to approve minutes for March 16, 2017 meeting: Aye – 5; No –
17 18	0; Abstain – Ojeda (not present)
19 20 21 22	Moore announced the City Council has appointed him to act as temporary chair of the Public Works and Streets Commission for a term not to exceed one year. He noted City policy is that a person can only serve on one commission, and the council made an exemption in this case.
23 24	II. Reports A. Commons User Support Manager
25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	<ul> <li>Facilities Manager Sterner summarized:</li> <li>1. New Carpeting has been installed in Room 1 and the hallways</li> <li>2. Sterner, the Friends of the Commons Chair Rose Valentine, and Manager Davies worked to update the "by donation" events in the commons. The new system will enable user numbers tracking and distribute payment directly to the Friends. Participants will sign an insurance waiver on an annual basis. Moore asked clarification on the previous process, and Sterner stated noted donations previously were taken to City Hall without user numbers.</li> </ul>
33 34 35 36 37 38	<ol> <li>He is in the process of getting an office cabinet to secure expensive equipment.</li> <li>The friends got a grant from Trust Management for tables and folding chairs. He is working out the details of what gets stored in the Commons versus 501 Building. Sterner's goal is to no longer need to roll chairs and tables back and forth between the two buildings.</li> <li>B. Trails Committee</li> </ol>
39	Trails Committee Lead JoAnne Kittel reported:
40 41	1. View the Future will pay for concrete pad for an interpretive sign the Ya'Xaik Trail. The Trials Committee plans to have the sign installed in May.
42 43 44	<ol> <li>Recent sunshine enabled trails and YIPS to work be very productive.</li> <li>There was a meeting with View the Future on establishing a 35-acre conversation on both sides of the Yachats River by purchasing the Evans-Benz property. Plans include a river</li> </ol>

45 trail and a kayak launch.

4. The 6<sup>th</sup> Annual National Trails Day is June 3, 2017 in conjunction with the State Parks and 1 2 National Forrest Service. The event will start earlier to not conflict with Yachats Pride. 3 5. They are still researching the Ridge Trail. A recent State Supreme Court decision nullifying 4 the recreational immunity clause has created uncertainty about getting easements 5 across private property. They are working with the Yachats Fire Department who seeks 6 an evacuation route that would be at lower elevations. 7 6. Twelve volunteers will get first aid training donated by the Yachats Fire Department. 8 9 C. Friends of the Commons 10 Friends Chair Rose Valentine reported: 11 1. The Friends are having retreat in May to discuss their five-year goals and plans. Valentine 12 asked commissioners if they have similar plan document the Friends could use to enable 13 better coordination. Sterner stated he has observed joint goal setting every two years. 14 Councilor Scott noted the existence of a Commons Master Plan, which is generated for 15 CIP purposes. 16 2. The Friends has received a grant from Trust Management in Waldport for \$3500 for the 17 replacement of dangerous round tables, purchase of café tables for Commons, and 18 purchase of chairs for the 501 Building. 19 3. The Friends are sponsoring a Village Mixer on May 11, 2017. 20 4. The next meeting is June 13, 2017, as their retreat will stand as their May meeting. 21 22 The commission discussed the necessity of a Commission member attending Friends Board 23 meetings and whether a single person is needed for continuity. Board Member Shelly Shrock 24 argued having a Commission member at the Board meetings is important. There was 25 consensus that they would not establish a single person to this role. Moore suggested they get 26 volunteers for the next three meetings then reassess the need. The following volunteered: 27 Hempen - June 13; Ojeda – July 11; Gordon – August 8; Shrock - September 12. 28 29 **III.** Business 30 A. Election of Vice-Chair 31 Moore read the duties of vice-chair. Moore emphasized he would do meeting prep in the event 32 he could not be present. Ojeda volunteered to serve. 33 34 Motion to nominate Ojeda as Vice-Chair: Aye - 6, No - 0. 35 36 **B. New Member Application** 37 The Commission interviewed Linda Johnson for Commission vacancy. Johnson stated she has 38 been in Yachats for two years and wanted to get more involved. She lives in Koho. Her 39 management experience included working with diverse types. Ojeda noted his positive 40 experiences in interacting with Johnson and hearing about her daily hikes. 41 42 Gordon moved to forward Johnson's nomination to the City Council for appointment: Aye – 6, 43 No - 0.44

1 2	Moore instructed Johnson go to a Council meeting for official appointment.		
3	C. Fee Structure for The Commons, 501 Building, and Picnic Shelter		
4	1. The Issue		
5			
6	and remain objective and fair.		
7			
8	Manager Davies summarized the issue that City Hall staff face is one of conflicting numbers and		
9	inputs on rental rate fees. At present, City Hall gets foot traffic by interested parties, Sterner		
10	facilitates conversations on room and equipment needs, and Clerk Jackson generates contracts		
11	for users to sign. There is also a set of fees on the online system. There are multiple documents		
12	with payer categories and fee amounts (included in meeting packet). With the addition of the		
13	501 Building as a rental space, Sterner drafted a list of fees, but that list has not been officially		
14	enacted.		
15			
16	Davies identified the following areas in need of codification given that current descriptions are		
17	not clear:		
18	- What are the classifications for events?		
19	- Who is requesting the facility?		
20	- How much do they pay?		
21	Device weterd two issues from the end of the section the wetter of Managara during of the device of the		
22	Davies noted two issues further complicating the matter: a Memorandum of Understanding		
23 24	between the Friends and Polly Plumb Productions, and YYFAP paying rent for the basement space when there is a written statement that YYFAP is exempt from fees. Davies pointed to		
24 25	Resolution 208 from 1991 as the original legal policy.		
23 26	Resolution 208 nom 1991 as the original legal policy.		
20	Davies reported there has been confusion over when and where to pay the fees. She urged the		
28	contractual agreement to pay up front either a deposit or the full amount be enforced. Davies		
29			
30			
31	The City raised approximately \$21,000 in fees last year and could expect that amount to be		
32	reduced by \$5,000-6,000 due to the change in "By Donation" event payments.		
33			
34	Moore noted the commission was surprised by the number of waivers granted for rentals.		
35			
36	2. Use Categories to Specify Rates		
37	Moore read the category use descriptions as written in the packet document indicated by "Use		
38	by Donation" near the top and page 8 at the bottom right. Moore noted the fifth bullet under		
39	Community Use needed work and asked for other areas of confusion.		
40			
41	Davies presented examples of events that do not easily fit a category enumerate above:		
42	a. Fundraising event for Angie Deriberprey's school		
43	b. Funeral event: Is it always "private" or "community" in certain situations (Davies,		
44	Sterner). Kittel noted she was given community rate for her husband's service but		

<ul> <li>these events can collect donations to defray rental costs.</li> <li>c. Private seminar for 20 people pays high rate versus revenue-generating Quilt Show does not pay rent.</li> <li>Jackson noted in the past the City Recorder retained the discretion to categorize events.</li> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were:         <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Moire noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his unders</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>not pay rent.</li> <li>Jackson noted in the past the City Recorder retained the discretion to categorize events.</li> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were: <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> </ul> Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse	
<ul> <li>Jackson noted in the past the City Recorder retained the discretion to categorize events.</li> <li>Jackson noted in the past the City Recorder retained the discretion to categorize events.</li> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were: <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> </ul> Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse	
<ul> <li>Jackson noted in the past the City Recorder retained the discretion to categorize events.</li> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were: <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> </ul> Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.	
<ul> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were: <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were: <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Waivers Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2. Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>Questions and issue raised in discussion were: <ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in</li> <li>each renter's situation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will <ul> <li>(eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> </ul> 3. Waivers Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.  Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse	
<ul> <li>a. Sterner explained through an example of a memorial that there are many nuances in each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> <li><b>3. Waivers</b></li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>each renter's situation.</li> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will (eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> <li><b>3. Waivers</b></li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>b. Should View the Future be exempt from fees? Noting they do raise funds that will</li> <li>(eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>(eventually) benefit the City. (Kittel, D Shrock, Scott)</li> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>c. Are people who rent the Picnic Shelter penalized because others use it for free? (Davies)</li> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are</li> <li>other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D</li> <li>Shrock)</li> </ul> 23. Waivers 23. Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific 29. groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2. 27 28. Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the 29. Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on 30. raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. 31. Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support 33. Waintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse	
<ul> <li>d. How should the Commission factor in "heartfelt" uses? (D Shrock)</li> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are</li> <li>other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D</li> <li>Shrock)</li> </ul> 21 23. Waivers 23 Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific 24 groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2. 27 28 Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the 29 Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on 30 raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. 31 32 32 34 35 35 36 36 37 38 38 39 30 30 30 30 30 31 31 32 32 32 34 34 35 36 36 37 38 38 38 39 30 30 30 30 31 31 32 31 32 32 34 34 35 35 36 36 36 37 37 38 38 38 39 30 30 30 30 31 31 31 32 32 34 34 35 35 36 36 36 37 37 38 38 38 39 30	
<ul> <li>e. Community Rate #7 and Private Rate #2 differ by one word. (Davies)</li> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are</li> <li>other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D</li> <li>Shrock)</li> </ul> 23 Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific 29 groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the 20 support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the 21 Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2. 23 Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the 29 Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on 30 raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. 31 Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support 32 Sterner stated his understanding of mission facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse	
<ul> <li>f. Including exceptions in category definitions would create gray areas. (Anderson)</li> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are</li> <li>other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D</li> <li>Shrock)</li> </ul> <b>3. Waivers</b> Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2. Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2. Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support	
<ul> <li>g. Should the City be the one to assume responsibility for hosting an event when there are other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D Shrock)</li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>other available facilities in Yachats? (D Shrock)</li> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D</li> <li>Shrock)</li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific</li> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>h. Certain groups that benefit the City so warrant exception, such as View the Future. (D</li> <li>Shrock)</li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific</li> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Shrock)</li> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific</li> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific</li> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3. Waivers</li> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific</li> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Moore noted in 1991 the City passed Resolution 208 that stipulated exceptions for specific</li> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>groups (Criterion 1) and for groups which "have the expressed purpose of raising funds for the</li> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>support or renovation of a City-owned property" (Criterion 2). Moore stated the Friends of the</li> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Commons is the only organization he is aware of that meets Criterion 2.</li> <li>Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>27</li> <li>28 Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>29 Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>30 raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>31</li> <li>32 Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>33 maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>28 Moore read the Friends' mission statement as posted on their website. Scott suggested the</li> <li>29 Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>30 raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>31</li> <li>32 Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>33 maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Trails Committee might fall under this category. Scott argued View the Future focuses on</li> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>raising monies to acquire land that would become City property so it would meet Criterion 2.</li> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32 Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>33 maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Sterner stated his understanding of mission of Friends to be twofold: (1) Raise funds to support</li> <li>maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse</li> </ul>	
33 maintenance and improvements in the Commons facility, and (2) Support culturally diverse	
35	
36 Moore noted from Criterion 3 on Resolution 208 that the Friends should provide an accounting	
37 report to the City.	
38	
39 4. Memorandum of Understanding	
40 Moore read portions of the MOU between Polly Plumb Productions and the Friends. Moore did	
41 not believe there is an authority for the Friends to waive fees for another organization. Moore	
42 read the mission of PPP noting they do great work but are not created to raise funds for the	
<ul> <li>43 Commons.</li> <li>44</li> </ul>	

1 D Shrock was concerned about the precedent this MOU sets. He noted that the arrangement 2 for PPP to pay the Friends an unspecified amount the end of the year essentially is covering any 3 losses they may encounter during the year. He argued any organization should pay based on 4 the times they use the facilities, not just the times they make a profit during an event. D Shrock 5 suggested there are ways to accommodate events that do not generate expected incomes, 6 specifically citing the Newport Health Center which charges 10% of gross revenues with a cap. 7 Moore added that this MOU enables other groups to get exceptions if they work under PPP. Jackson added that some have tried to use an exempt organization's name to get waivers 8 9 without that person having any official relationship with the exempt organization. 10 11 Moore summarized there is some unfairness in the existing system that needs a remedy. 12 Moore asked who, if any, should receive a waiver noting that 16 years ago the City granted one 13 exception. D Shrock believed they should be very selective on waivers. Gordon referred back 14 to the 1991 ordinance stipulating putting money back into City property and believed Trails and 15 View the Future would fall into this exception. Bass did not see a basis upon which the Friends 16 could grant PPP a waiver, and did not recall the waiver being discussed in a PPP board meeting. 17 5. Other Considerations 18 19 Ojeda suggested an option to use grants to defray costs to deserving groups. Ojeda noted that 20 if they were to track these grants throughout the year, they could better understand the lost 21 revenue from such exceptions. Davies expressed favor for an option of rewarding rather than 22 taking, noting that the City does have a grant fund for events that generate business for 23 Yachats. Hempen expressed favor with the scholarship and/or grant idea. 24 25 Davies noted that many events do generate business for shops, restaurants, and hotels. She 26 also noted that the City has not received any donations in the eleven months she has worked. 27 Anderson cautioned against using "benefit to the community" as a criteria for setting rates as it 28 is an inherently squishy construct that could be abused by a skillful marketer. Kittel noted that 29 View the Future has paid for their events and room usage with the exception of their first 30 event. 31 32 Scott argued the Little Log Church falls under the Parks and Commons. 33 34 Moore suggested the Commission have a special session on to set rates. The Commission set 35 Monday, April 24, 2017 at 1 pm for a special work session. 36 37 D Shrock asked Anderson to suggest "use categories" examples based on her marketing 38 experience. Anderson will provide an abbreviated report by the work session. 39 40 D. Commission Rules – Duties of Chair and Duties of Members 41 Postponed to next regular meeting 42 43 44 E. Ballfield Update

- 1 Since the last email update, Moore learned there is a need for aerating the field to enable the
- 2 grass to grow back. Moore reported Dave Baldwin, Head Smelt, believes the backstop has a
- 3 sound frame and just needs the upper fencing replaced.

4

IV. Other Business	
A. From the Commission	on – none
B. From the floor – nor	ne
With no further business to disc	cuss at this time, Moore adjourned the meeting at 4:34 pm.
Chair W. John Moore	Date
Minutes prepared by H.H. Ande	erson, April 23, 2017