



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
October 20, 2015

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Clark called the meeting to order at 5:50 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Krisanna Clark, Council President Sally Robinson, Councilors Dan King Linda Henderson, Jennifer Kuiper, Jennifer Harris, and Councilor Renee Brouse via conference call.
3. **STAFF AND LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:** City Attorney Josh Soper. City Manager Joseph Gall joined the meeting at approximately 6:35 pm.
4. **TOPICS:**
 - A. **ORS 192.660(2)(i), Performance Evaluation of Public Officials.** City Manager annual performance evaluation.

5. ADJOURN

Mayor Clark adjourned the Executive Session at 6:58 pm and convened to a regular session.

Record Note: The scheduled work session was not held due to time.

REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Clark called the meeting to order at 7:08 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Clark, Council President Robinson, Councilors Linda Henderson, Jennifer Kuiper, Jennifer Harris and Dan King. Councilor Renee Brouse via conference call.
3. **STAFF AND LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:** City Manager Joseph Gall, Assistant City Manager Tom Pessemier, City Attorney Josh Soper, Police Chief Jeff Groth, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager Brad Kilby, Senior Planner Michelle Miller, Department Program Coordinator Kirsten Allen, Administrative Assistant Colleen Resch and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

Mayor Clark addressed the Approval of the Agenda and stated she received a request to amend the agenda to allow the public hearing to occur before Item 7, New Business. With no objections from the Council, she asked for a motion.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION TO AMEND: FROM MAYOR CLARK TO AMEND THE AGENDA, PUBLIC HEARING NUMBER 9 TO RIGHT BEFORE NUMBER 7, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR HARRIS. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCILOR BROUSE VIA CONFERENCE CALL).

MOTION AS AMENDED: FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT ROBINSON TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED, SECONDED BY MAYOR CLARK. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCILOR BROUSE VIA CONFERENCE CALL).

Mayor Clark addressed the next item on the agenda.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

- A. Approval of September 15, 2015 City Council Meeting Minutes**
- B. Resolution 2015-076, Appointing Roni Zettlemyer to the Cultural Arts Commission**
- C. Resolution 2015-077, Appointing Skye Boughey to the Cultural Arts Commission**
- D. Resolution 2015-078, Authorizing the City Manager to execute a Contract with FCS Group for updating City Transportation System Development Charge (SDC) Methodology and Rates, and other Street Fees**
- E. Resolution 2015-079, Appointing Amy Kutzkey to the Budget Committee**

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR KUIPER TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR HENDERSON. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCILOR BROUSE VIA CONFERENCE CALL).

Mayor Clark addressed the next item on the agenda.

6. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Eagle Scout Recognition

Mayor Clark recognized and congratulated Benjamin LaFave for obtaining the rank of Eagle Scout. He was not present and Mayor Clark indicated the certificate would be mailed.

B. Clean Water Services – State of the District Update

City Manager Gall stated that Clean Water Service (CWS) will provide a general overview of the district which will be beneficial for the new Councilors and the citizens to understand how CWS operates and how they are funded.

CWS Government and Public Affairs Manager Mark Jockers and CWS Deputy General Manager Diane Taniguchi-Dennis provided a presentation (see record, Exhibit A) regarding investing in clean water and provided the Council with handouts regarding clean water facts (see record, Exhibit B). Mr. Jockers provided a background on the history of the district as well as the budgeting process and the challenges going forward. He said currently CWS serves more than 560,000 residents of urban Washington County, has 12 partner cities, cleans 60 million gallons of water a day, provides a high level of treatment, has a

close working relationship with Washington County and has a budget of \$64.6 million for operations and \$66 million for capital. He discussed the three core business areas, which consist of resource recovery, surface water management and water supply. He referred to the challenges CWS faces and the importance of using innovation and partnerships.

Ms. Taniguchi-Dennis stated the financial strategies include keeping rate increases reasonable and predictable, ensuring capacity to issue debt on favorable terms, establishing and maintaining healthy financial reserves and following sound financial policies. Mr. Jockers stated that in the last 20 years the number of employees has been reduced per population served by a third while continually taking on new initiatives. Ms. Taniguchi-Dennis discussed the need for investing and repairing the aged infrastructure, protecting and restoring the watershed, optimizing assets, and planning for growth and recovering resources.

Mr. Jockers discussed the current rates and fees and how they compare across the region. He said there was a 3.65% combined sanitary sewer and surface water management increase on July 1. He said 83% of the sanitary sewer rates go to CWS for treatment, interceptors, pump stations and industrial permitting and source control. He stated 17% of the sanitary sewer rates go to the City for the maintenance and investment in the local sewer. He noted the surface water management fee rate is split with 25% going to CWS for the regional program and administration and 75% going to the City for local drainage and water quality program. He said there was a 4.1% increase in the sanity SDC this year. He stated the standard fee for sanity sewer and surface water management is \$48.04 and under the IGAs with the seven major cities each city has the prerogative to add local surcharges to meet the local needs. He compared the local surcharges, provided comparable rates throughout the region and discussed the 10 year rate history.

Councilor Henderson clarified that the SDC charge was increased to \$5,100 and asked what the fee was before the increase. Mr. Jockers replied \$4,900, which represents the 4.1% increase. Councilor Henderson asked if CWS has considered providing the opportunity to pay the SDC charges over payments on a case by case basis. Ms. Taniguchi-Dennis said CWS currently provides financing for single family residential and the Board has discussed doing the same for small businesses.

Councilor Kuiper ask for a copy of the presentation and City Manager Gall said he would have it posted on the City website.

Councilor Henderson asked if there are municipalities that are direct billed. Mr. Jockers said CWS directly bills around 50% of the customers.

Mayor Clark asked if there is qualification for direct billing. Ms. Taniguchi-Dennis said they consider the agreement with the banks and the IGAs with the smaller communities.

Councilor Henderson noted that Sherwood is highly invested in the Tualatin River. Mayor Clark stated as well as the "One Tree for All" program provided by CWS.

Mayor Clark thanked CWS and addressed the next agenda item.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Ordinance 2015-007 Amending Title 6 of the Municipal Code and Division II of the Zoning and Community Development Code and Chapter 6 of the Municipal Code as it relates to the regulation of backyard chickens

Senior Planner Michelle Miller provided a presentation (see record, Exhibit C) and stated the purpose of the hearing is to have a second reading of the proposed ordinance, present the proposed revised code amendments to the Municipal Development Code on chickens, and take public testimony. She noted the first reading was September 15 and provisions were initiated to add a new section to the municipal code on chickens, which allow for a certain number of chickens, based on the lot size, no roosters and described certain enclosure location limitations. She said in addition, there were procedures that an applicant would have to obtain a license and agree to certain requirements and written notices to property owners abutting the license holders' property. She said the proposed language includes penalties for infractions or violations of this section and classified as a Class C violation. She said additionally there was a change in the Zoning and Development Code, which includes adding a footnote reference to Chapter 6.03. She referred to the deliberations at the September 15 hearing said the proposed changes include enlarging the minimum lot size allowed to 7,000 square feet, clarifying the neighbor notification requirements with specific information to be included with the notification, and specifying that multiple violations of the ordinance could result in a revocation of the chicken license. She said based on the deliberations from the September 15 hearing staff made additional recommendations which include making a chicken license valid for five years, adding a penalty provision for someone that does not obtain a license before attempting to raise chickens, and that would be a Class A violation, and it also includes someone who had chickens illegally before this ordinance goes into effect, removing "Backyard" from the title of the chapter, and adding a provision that entitles the City Manager to adopt rules that implement Chapter 6. She said the Council packet also includes a draft chicken license application, and a draft letter to neighbors notifying them that one of their neighbors has received a license to raise chickens. She stated that staff recommends a license application fee of \$50. She said the alternatives before Council include accepting the Planning Commission recommendation and not approve the ordinance, approving the ordinance as written, approving the ordinance with changes or sending the issue back to the Planning Commission for further review.

Council President Robinson referred to the proposed application for raising chickens and said there is onus on the applicant to provide the name and address of their neighbors and said that may not be reliable for enforcement purposes. Ms. Miller said that would be a starting point and then it would likely be verified with the GIS system.

Council President Robinson said she does not agree with the revocation only lasting one year and asked what the rationale behind that was. Ms. Miller said if there were two violations the revocation would be a year to see if the situation could be remedied. Council President Robinson said the language states that each violation shall constitute a separate violation and each day the violation is committed or permitted to continue constitutes a separate violation. She said her understanding is that code enforcement would give notice and asked if the violators would then have the opportunity to cure or remedy the violation before they are deemed in violation. Ms. Miller said those would all be tools for the code enforcement officer to warn them and give them the opportunity for remedy. She said if the remedy did not occur based on the severity, the officer could cite them. Council President Robinson stated the language that each day the violation is committed constitutes a separate violation is not clear regarding when the daily violation fine commences.

Council President Robinson asked if the recommendations from Council at the previous hearing was to add 5 hens or was it to just possibly increase it. Ms. Miller said that she reviewed the meeting minutes and it seems unclear as to what Council recommended. She commented on Councilor Robinson's concerns about the language being unclear and provided examples of how the language provides code enforcement flexibility. Council President Robinson asked if staff did not think it was necessary to specify from what day the violation is committed. City Attorney Soper recommended not changing the language to maintain the maximum flexibility and discretion with code enforcement.

Council President Robinson asked if staff considered a clause that stated how long an existing chicken holder has to be compliant. She said it may be helpful to provide a time limit.

Councilor Kuiper said if the ordinance is adopted the residents with chickens should have a grace period to be compliant. Ms. Miller said that is Council's discretion.

Mayor Clark commented on code enforcement having flexibility and asked if they would address those residents that already owned chickens. Mr. Soper said the Council could put a specific grace period in the code.

City Manager Gall suggested that if the ordinance passes Council could for example give 30 days for compliance to meet the requirements. Mayor Clark asked if that needs to be added to the ordinance. Mr. Gall said the Council could provide direction to the City Manager to adopt rules to implement the program.

Assistant City Manager Tom Pessemier states that Section 5 gives an effective date of 30 days after passage of the ordinance.

Mr. Gall stated the ordinance does not need to be modified and Council can give direction to staff to provide a reasonable amount of time for residents to comply.

Councilor Harris asked what is the percentage of lots in Sherwood that are 5,000 square feet versus 7,000 square feet versus 10,000 square feet. Ms. Miller said there are approximately 2,400 lots that are 7,000 square feet or larger out of approximately 6,500 tax lots but some are commercial and different uses.

Mayor Clark opened the public hearing.

Naomi Belov Sherwood resident approached the Council and reiterated her comments from the first public hearing regarding neighboring towns that have ordinances allowing backyard chickens. She said she is looking forward to Sherwood figuring this out.

Carole Miller Sherwood resident came forward and provided a scenario of soil being contaminated with chicken feces and the rain washing it into neighbor's yards. She commented that Salmonella germs thrive in the intestines of chickens and the CDC estimates over 1 million illnesses and approximately 450 deaths occur in the US every year due to Salmonella. She said the CDC warns us to not let children younger than 5, older adults, pregnant women and people with weak immune systems to handle or touch chickens. She stated the Council has a duty to protect Sherwood residents. She stated that it's essential that the written notice to neighbors include facts about the diseases chickens spread. She noted that to protect the Council from future lawsuits, the City should require the neighbors to sign authorization

acknowledging they have read the attached warnings. She said the neighbors must have the right to veto chickens next door. She commented on the cost of code enforcement, sending notices and handling complaints. She commented on the lack of publicity and the survey that represented only 3% of Sherwood's 19,000 residents. She said in other states the backyard chicken fad is fading and animal shelters are being flooded with discarded chickens.

Amy Zents Sherwood resident approached the Council and said there is an education role in chicken ownership and it can help children make the connection between what they are eating and where it comes from. She said there is a problem with obesity in children and helping children understand where healthy foods come from and how to make healthy choices is important.

Tony Bevel Sherwood resident came forward and commented that we all have diseases. He said he went to Oregon State University and met with Professor James Hermes who is the Head Advisor Extension Poultry Specialist. He said Mr. Hermes noted the biggest problem with City Councils is they vote from their own personal prejudice. He said Mr. Hermes stated this can be remedied with the proper management of chickens and good parameters. He referred to common sense and the proposal to reduce the fee from \$4,000 to \$50. He read Mr. Hermes conclusion: "Diplomacy and cooperation with neighbors can help avoid conflicts. If you have chickens in an urban environment, follow these suggestions and you can reduce complaints and have a long and happy relationship with your neighbors. Happy neighbors mean that chickens will remain and animals that can be raised successfully and legally in urban environments."

Nadia Belov Sherwood resident approached the Council in support of chickens and reiterated her comments from the first public hearing. She has experience with raising chickens and commented on knowing where your food comes from. She commented on the fear of diseases and agreed with Mr. Bevel that we all have diseases. She referred to using common sense and washing your hands. She said don't live in fear and the benefits outweigh the negatives.

With no further testimony, Mayor Clark closed the public hearing.

Record note: email from Matthew Young (see record, Exhibit D) and handout from Tony Bevel entered into the record (see record, Exhibit E).

Council President Robinson said she agrees the \$4,000 fee is not reasonable and does not agree that any chicken should be allowed on lots smaller than 10,000 square feet. She does not agree that 5 chickens should be allowed on any lot. She said staff added 5 chickens without direction from Council and there has been no evidence received or a real need for 5 chickens on 10,000 square feet lots. She said if this ordinance passes she would want a 30 day grace period for compliance and revocation of a license should be the same as how long the license is good for which would be 5 years in this case.

Councilor Harris said she is opposed to the proposed square footage requirement but in favor of chickens. She calculated that 7,000 square feet lots represent approximately 38-40% of the homes in Sherwood and she would be a proponent of 4 chickens on 7,000 square feet lot. She referred to an email that reminded Council that they talked about increasing the number of chickens from 3 to 4 if they increased the lot size as well.

Councilor Kuiper stated that email was just a statement that Councilor Harris made that she thought that if the minimum lot size is increased the number of hens allowed should increase from 3 to 4 and there were not any comments from the other Councilors after that statement was made. She stated she is not a proponent of less than 7,000 square feet lot size and 3 hens are fine and possibly 4. She said her biggest issue is education of the applicants and the permit should include an informational handout for the care and keeping of chickens and notification to neighbors of diseases.

Councilor Henderson thanked Mr. Bevel for the information, which stated that in urban settings livestock-type animals do not receive the same reception from neighbors and City authorities as do domestic pets like dogs and cats and chickens are regulated in urban settings because not everyone enjoys chickens. She asked staff about comments on the safe disposal of animal waste and suggested that be part of the education piece. She referred to the guidelines and suggestions in the handout with regard to appearance and property values and proper landscaping which can provide screening and muffle sound. She referred to coops not being more than 4 feet high with 6 feet fences. She referred to Councilor Harris's comments and said based on the recommendation of 3 hens on lots over 7,000 square feet she has a fundamental problem that it exempts 63% of the constituents from having a chicken. She referred to a regressive tax, a tax that heavily may be burdened upon those people that have small incomes or living at the poverty level, and said this is the opposite, we are basically only allowing the wealthy, and said if you can afford a 7,000 square feet lot or 10,000 square feet lot, you either probably moved here 20 years ago or you live in some very small development where their lots are 10,000 square feet. She said she doesn't believe the Council has ever drafted an ordinance that put anybody at a disadvantage based on lot size, with the exception of maybe setbacks. She said she can't in good faith vote for an ordinance that would exempt 63% of the people that live here, because they could not afford a larger lot size.

Councilor Kuiper asked where the 63% came from.

Councilor Henderson said there are 6,500 total tax lots and 2,400 are 7,000 square feet or greater.

Councilor Kuiper said not all the remaining lots are 5,000 or less. Discussion followed regarding the approximate number of lots that will be allowed to have chickens. Staff added the numbers don't include vacant lots. Ms. Miller said there is also an exemption for, it has to be a single family detached home and we have some homes that are attached and fall well below the 5000.

Councilor Kuiper asked how many lots are 5000 square foot lots and Michelle replied she did not have that information and offered to go gather it.

Councilor Henderson said she agreed with the citizen comments from Carole Miller that we have an obligation to protect the life, health and safety of our citizens and part of the education component should include information or resources on safe handling of chickens, waste or feed. In addition, they acknowledge that those are byproducts of having waste in your backyard.

Ms. Miller commented that other jurisdictions have the same issues and have speakers with expertise come and educate the population.

Councilor Kuiper said with the current setback we have now, how difficult would it be for a 5000 square foot lot with a home on it to adhere to those setbacks.

Ms. Miller replied she had an earlier slide showing the 5000 square foot lot and how that could work and said it would be somewhat onerous but it is possible.

Mayor Clark asked Councilor Henderson, what she is hearing is, the ordinance as it is, she could not support and asked if she would like to make a motion to see if she has support from the Council to amend the ordinance to an ordinance that she could support?

Councilor Henderson said she still has questions. She said under licenses, license to be renewed for 5 years, she believes this is too long and recommended 3 years and said the life of a laying chicken is about 18 months. She said she believes this is a good time to ensure that people are still actively caring for their chickens. She said maybe it is a checklist that is sent. She said she is not in favor of using Code Compliance to do this and believes there are a lot of better things they could be spending their time on instead of inspecting chicken coops, not something they are experts on. She said maybe the renewal could be less costly or laborious.

Councilor Henderson said her concern is we are excluding and doesn't believe we have ever had an ordinance that we were directly excluding members of our community from participating in a permitted activity. She said it may not be direct, but is a contributing factor based on income.

Mayor Clark replied she is not disagreeing and asked if there is a motion to support that argument.

Councilor Henderson asked if we have heard from everybody.

Councilor Harris said she would like speak to that and said even with the 5000, we are still going to have a large majority of Sherwood that is constricted by their HOA's. She said keeping that in mind for people who are apprehensive for going down to 5000 square feet.

Councilor Kuiper stated her confliction is the duty to protect human health and the size of the lot. She gave a scenario and said we have a 3-5 year old child next to a 5000 square foot lot that has chickens and asked if a 7000 square foot lot was any more protective than a 5000 square foot lot, and this is a conflict that she is dealing with. She asked where is the balance of being protective of human health and allowing citizens to have chickens.

Mayor Clark asked Michelle Miller to address the setback and explain. Michelle referred to the 10 feet and 25 feet from the property line and said a chicken enclosure would need to be at least 10 feet from a side yard or a rear yard and then from any adjacent property structure, it would have to be 25 feet from another dwelling unit.

Councilor Kuiper stated she understands and realizes there will be many HOA's that there CC and R's will preclude chicken ownership anyway.

Councilor Henderson referred to written comments received which said a City ordinance would trump an HOA and said this is not correct. Comments from the Council were received that this is incorrect, an ordinance would not trump an HOA. Mayor Clark asked the City attorney if this was correct.

City Attorney Soper replied we would allow chickens under our code so as far as we are concerned they are allowed. If the HOA wants to restrict it, then they are not allowed to have them in that HOA's jurisdiction.

Councilor Henderson said the HOA could set up their own fees and fines if you have chickens, Mayor Clark replied they could as they are their own jurisdiction.

Councilor Brouse stated this is a very conflictive decision the Council has to make and thanked the public for their attendance and sharing their thoughts and comments. She said as a Council member, the people she has spoken to have all been against and said it is a very difficult decision being an emergency preparedness individual that raising chickens could be an opportunity for that. She said taking into consideration what Councilors Henderson and Kuiper are saying, she asked if there was any way the Council could send this back to planning.

Mayor Clark replied she is not interested in kicking the can and asked other Council members. No comments were received in favor.

Mayor Clark said she believes a decision can be made and said what her problem with this subject is, this subject has been kicked so many times that people have chickens, they exist in the City. She said for her this is not an issue of whether or not she wants chickens, she does not. She said she doesn't have a problem with personal liberties of others as long as they don't infringe on her. She said how this works is, there are parameters around how that doesn't infringe on me. She said she is a proponent of the 5000 square foot, did not like it going to 7000 square feet, and liked the comment of how it causes an inequity if someone cannot afford a lot that is larger. She said she would entertain a motion to change that and said the big thing for her is that this is about having parameters in place for something that is already happening. She said it's kind of the same issue as the dog park and said we will have a dog park very soon and we have always had a dog park, it's called the high school football field. She spoke of parameters of use and said chickens currently exist in Sherwood and the idea of a \$4000 fee is ridiculous. She said she is a proponent of chickens because she loves the idea of us living in a community where we work together and have civil liberties that don't impact one another and we are not forcing people to break the law because we won't make parameters of use for something that is happening anyway. She said she believes in addressing the issues that are already here and moving forward.

Councilor Harris said as far as diseases and children, she believes it's pretty clear that our dogs and cats, their feces and the way we handle them, in our faces and our beds, we are just at risk with our dogs and cats as we are with chickens. She said there are parameters in place whether it is Washington County Animal Control through code enforcement and our neighbors to manage this. She said research she has done indicates zero deaths in the last four year from backyard chickens and there have been a lot of deaths from dogs. She said the fear of people dying from chickens is a small amount and one is more likely to die walking home, statistically. She said to use that as a fear and a reason not to do this, when we clearly have a strong support for chickens is, for her, showing where our priorities are with our citizens.

Councilor Kuiper stated there is a difference between reality and perception and what we need to be managing here is not just a reality that dogs and cats can make you sick, but the perception as well. She said there is a perception among many of the public about chickens and what she is suggesting is that we

have some sort of fact sheet, informational, for chicken ownerships when they come in to get a permit. She said it is more of managing perception, than acknowledging reality. She commented regarding the \$4000 fee and asked if this is because it is a conditional use permit. Staff confirmed.

Councilor Kuiper stated the fee wasn't an arbitrary \$4000 fee to keep people from owning chickens, it was a permit fee because chicken ownership in Sherwood is actually allowed, but is allowed under a "conditional use permit", this means there is no real mechanism to have chickens and this is why we are looking at the ordinance now. She said because of this it falls under a conditional use permit and there is a fee associated with that and it happens to be \$4000.

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director clarified the \$50 fee that is proposed if this were to pass, we would have to come back with a resolution to amend the Fee Schedule to add this as a permit.

Mayor Clark stated by not addressing it, it falls into a category of a catch-all and it doesn't belong there.

Councilor Harris said she loves the idea of a fact sheet, and classes on chickens and any other kind of classes. She said the Library has experts come in all the time to talk about different things. She commented regarding our world changing and people not wanting industrialized food and said everyone knows it's not as healthy or nutritious as growing and raising your own. She said it is a change and commented regarding our society changing. She said she would support a 5000 square foot amendment knowing that not every house is 5000 square feet. She said in her and Councilor Robinson's neighborhood the HOA doesn't allow them. She said she likes the idea of having the information.

Councilor King stated his issue is the enforcement side and follow through with the enforcement officer.

Councilor Harris asked Police Chief Groth if they get a lot of calls regarding animals and how much time an officer spends on this. Chief Groth replied, he would not say a lot, but they get a fair amount of animal complaints on a yearly basis and the vast majority of them are probably related to barking dogs or other nuisances created by dogs.

Councilor Harris said some of the things we are talking about are already being done and we have a code enforcement officer that is managing animals from time to time. A comment was received this is during the week and Councilor Harris asked Chief Groth what is done on weekends. He stated a police officer would respond. Councilor Harris stated we can always call Animal Control. Chief Groth said you can, but there are limitations based on their hours and what they will intervene with. He said they are not going to enforce local ordinances related to animals, they will enforce state statute and county ordinances. Councilor Harris stated she assumes if someone is calling Animal Control it is because the animals are really bad. Chief Groth stated either there is some serious neglect or some type of abuse issue and we need their expertise or it involves the need for a shelter if we picked up a stray animal or some aspect of licensing or quarantine or if someone was bitten. He said for barking, we handle the vast majority of those and somebody could call animal control but it will be hit or miss whether they get someone out there. He said they will likely be told depending on the number they call, to get a hold of us.

Councilor King elaborated and said he at times thinks in the process of trying to pass an ordinance and how enforceable it is and how reasonable it is. He said we know we have chickens, and at this point how is that going to change. He said we could make modifications to the ordinance. He commented on enforcement taking up a fair amount of code enforcements time.

Councilor Harris asked Chief Groth if he has spoken to the Code Enforcement Officer. He said there has been plenty of discussion and planning staff has been great with communicating. He said there is a bit of anxiety as it is an unknown. He said he can tell the Council there will be an impact, he just doesn't know what it will be until we get there. He said it will be enforced and from our perspective, ordinances exist for a reason and the Council expectations and the communities expectations are that ordinances will be enforced.

Councilor Harris stated, Chief Groth came from the City of Tualatin and they have chickens and asked if they experienced a high number of chicken complaints. He replied he has no experience with chickens and is not sure when their ordinance was passed and believes it was probably after he came to Sherwood. Staff confirmed the Tualatin ordinance was passed after Chief Groth came to Sherwood.

Councilor Harris commented regarding Chief Groth hearing about or chatting about chickens in his field of work with other municipalities and they having problems with chickens. He stated chickens have not been the topic of conversations. City Manager Gall stated in talking with other City managers that have chicken ordinances, it doesn't rise to the level of it being an issue.

Council President Robinson asked City Attorney Soper, if the Council passes this ordinance and there are dogs next door to the chicken that come in and the chicken causes the dogs to constantly bark, which ordinance are you going to enforce or what ordinance would prevail if by existence of the chickens they are making the dogs bark constantly. Mr. Soper replied unless they are violating a provision of the chicken ordinance, and it doesn't sound like they would be, the person who would be violating the ordinance is the person who is allowing their dogs to bark. She asked how fair is that, that a chicken owner can out-do all three dog owners that are around it.

Councilor Harris commented that her neighbor's dog barks every time her kids are in the backyard and said you are not allowed to let your dog bark for long periods of time regardless of what it is barking at. She said if the dog is barking this is a problem with the dog, not the chicken or kid.

Councilor Robinson said she respectfully disagrees, and said if you have a chicken up against the fence your dog is going to bark. Comments were received regarding "supervised chickens" and them running freely.

Councilor Henderson commented regarding a similar scenario with an acquaintance and their neighbor having chickens and the dog of the acquaintance constantly pacing. She said this was a consideration for moving. She quoted language from the proposed ordinance that said, "chickens must be kept in an enclosed structure unless under direct supervision". She asked how many people are going to let their chickens out and stand and watch them. She said this sentence is ludicrous, chickens are not going to be supervised.

Mayor Clark stated she thinks the language is reasonable and City Attorney Soper said just like with cats, it happens, but the language is there to allow us to enforce it when it becomes a problem.

Councilor Henderson said overwhelmingly the constituents she has spoken to, about 100 people, do not want chickens. She said we have a number of HOA's in town and they have outlawed chickens for a reason. She referred to the largest HOA in the state, the Woodhaven HOA and said they have disallowed

chickens. She said she thinks that is a key indication of what people want from our community with some of the smaller lots in Woodhaven. She said this definitely influences her decision when she thinks about lot size and everybody who lives here.

Councilor Harris said alcohol used to be illegal, cannabis used to be illegal and the HOA did not just outlaw chickens, they have been disallowed since the HOA was started. She said she thinks things are changing and there was a time when people thought it was crazy to have a chicken and eat an egg from your backyard. She said that perception and that desire is changing. She said she has heard about hundreds of people not wanting chickens but has not seen any against, other than 3 emails and 2 people that came and voiced that concern. She said if there are a lot of anti-chicken people, she would like to hear from them.

Councilor Robinson referred to emails the Council has received asking them to deny.

Mayor Clark stated she personally doesn't like economic inequality of changing it from 5-7 (5000 square feet to 7000 square feet). She stated the following motion:

MOTION TO AMEND: FROM MAYOR CLARK, ON 6.03.020, NUMBER OF CHICKEN LICENSE, PART A, UP TO 3 HENS ARE ALLOWED ON PROPERTIES AT LEAST, 7000 AND MY MOTION IS TO MOVE IT BACK TO 5000 SQUARE FEET IN SIZE. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR HARRIS. MOTION PASSED 4:3 (CLARK, HARRIS, KUIPER AND BROUSE VOTING IN FAVOR. ROBINSON, KING AND HENDERSON WERE OPPOSED.)

Mayor Clark stated the motion carries and it is changed to 5000.

Councilor Harris interjected and asked about a motion to include an informational packet as suggested by Councilor Kuiper. Julia Hajduk replied staff has heard the Council and said as we prepare the application materials, if this passes, we will include educational elements both in the application packet as well as the letters to the property owners. She said she likes the idea of coordinating classes through the library.

Mayor Clark referred to material provided by the OSU professor.

MOTION AS AMENDED: COUNCILOR HARRIS MOVED TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2015-007 AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY MAYOR CLARK.

Prior to calling for a vote Council President Robinson asked if the Council could have discussion and Mayor Clark indicated the Council has already had discussion.

VOTE: MOTION FAILED 4:3 (BROUSE, KING, HENDERSON AND ROBINSON WERE OPPOSED. CLARK, HARRIS AND KUIPER VOTING IN FAVOR).

Councilor Harris asked what she can do now to have it removed from the special permit, to take chickens out of that category.

City Manager Gall clarified, and asked if she was referring to not having chickens under the conditional use permit and the \$4000 fee. He said this is a larger process that could not be done tonight and would be a code amendment and other things. Julia Hajduk added, right now it's a conditional use because it's

the raising of animals other than household pets and believes what Councilor Harris wants is an amendment to the code to clarify that chickens are not in that category and then, without having any provisions for chickens, there would have to be some sort of a process.

City Manager Gall added it would have to go to the planning commission and ultimately the Council.

Councilor Harris said she would like to look at the “household pet” category so we make sure that only animals listed are being used and if it’s inclusive or we need to add pets in there or remove.

Mayor Clark stated staff will go forward on that.

Mayor Clark recessed at 9:05 pm and reconvened at 9:14 pm. Mayor Clark addressed the next agenda item.

8. CITIZEN COMMENTS

John Hoover, General Manager of Jersey Mike’s came forward and stated he is here for signage, flag signs and not being allowed to have them. He said as a manager and a previous owner, flag signs bring in customers. He said he removed his flag signs when the police told him they weren’t allowed, yet he sees them around town. He said he wants to get this changed and said they are not an eyesore and are better looking than the small plastic ones which get ruined and are then not picked up. He said the flags are \$300 and if they are ruined we will get new ones. He would like to get this changed to allow flag signs.

Eugene Stewart Sherwood property owner, said he has an office on Barbur Blvd. and he received notice from the City about increasing density again. He said the traffic on Barbur is as heavy as it was before they put I-5 in. He said one of the problems is we go into the City to go to work and as they allow this density to keep building up, it’s becoming more difficult to travel, it’s less than 10 miles and it’s 30-45 minutes just to get to work. He said if you ride a bus, it doubles the time and the buses don’t help. He said something that will help, if we are not going to improve our roads to handle the traffic, is we need to create more opportunities for people to work closer to where they live. He said that was one of the goals originally to provide 50% of the jobs locally for our citizens. He said so often we go along and change zoning from commercial to residential and we don’t change to keep the balance up anyplace else. He said our inventory is out of date, it’s from the 80’s and needs to be brought up to date and you need to know your numbers, so when you make a decision to change from commercial to residential you’re not creating an imbalance that is going to make it worse for the citizens of this town. He said you need to look at part 1 of the comprehensive planning and revise it, it has not been revised since we originally adopted it in 1977. He said we need to stop ignoring it, step up and correct it.

Peter De Paoli stated he is the pastor of Rushing Wind Fellowship and said they are the displaced church out of the YMCA from the decisions that have been made. He said he appreciates that Mayor Clark came and talked to the ministers on Thursday and said she spoke of being a problem solver. He said he wanted to bring forward a few problems to see if there were solutions. He said he is concerned because across the street at the arts building there is a 501c3 coffee shop that is affiliated with a church and that is a City building and yet we are in the YMCA, which is also a City building but we are no longer able to meet there. He said it was mentioned to have the ministers go to the police station to meet there, as they were also asked to leave, but this is also a City run building. He said he is confused about it being ok to meet there but not at the YMCA. He said he is on the Board at the YMCA and the agreement he read in

Section 6, states: this facility is to be used and operated only as a full branch of the operator, which is the YMCA, continuously through the term of the agreement for the purpose of providing a public benefit for the residents of the City and surrounding area, including social and recreational health and fitness. He said he is wondering if they are of a social benefit to the community? He referred to the Christian mission of the YMCA and said it says they are to have Christian principles of love, respect, honesty, responsibility and service into the practice through the programs that build a healthy spirit, mind and body, and not just an exercise facility. He said he thinks we do that to and this was a concern of his that they add to this. He said in Section 6 of the agreement it says the Y, the operator, is to have full control over all programs in there. He said he believes they meet the purpose and mission of the YMCA and is aware that other churches are meeting at Y's around the country. He said he is confused and would like to see if there is a solution to this. He said he doesn't think when the YMCA was asked to be the operator of the building, it was just for physical fitness, it's a full orb, a hub of the community and he sees them as a part of that. He referred to a church and free speech and said is this part of free speech and said he knows free speech extends to the City and allowing religious groups equal access to renting facilities just like anybody else that is willing to rent. He asked what's the solution and said he did not want to see Sherwood's not being able to be spelled with a C.

Mayor Clark asked City Manager Gall to comment. Mr. Gall stated there were a number of sections that were cited that are the wrong sections of the contract, Section 33 of the contract is the section that has been interpreted that is currently out of line. He said this is with the consultation of the City Attorney. He said this church never got permission, went through the process to get permission to use that space. He said they have been in there for over a year, the City owns the building and the YMCA has been collecting a monthly fee and they don't own the building. He said we have issues with the contract.

Councilor Harris confirmed this church was leasing from the tenant and not the owner. Mr. Gall replied that is correct.

Mr. Gall said we have a situation and we are working with the Y. He said Mr. De Paoli should have contacted him instead of coming here and he, along with the City Attorney would be happy to explain why the contract does not allow the use as it currently exists, that includes the small number of users. He referred to a letter that details 3-4 groups that under the current contract, are not allowed. He said we would like to fix this with the YMCA.

Councilor Harris asked Mr. Gall to clarify if this is because they are Christian. Mr. Gall stated is has nothing to do with religion, it's about Section 33 of the contract. He asked City Attorney Soper to comment as this was his interpretation as City Attorney in terms of looking at the contract.

City Attorney Soper stated, Section 6 that the gentlemen was discussing, the general provision in the contract and a general rule in interpreting contracts is the more specific provision is the controlling provision. He said in this case, the more specific provision is Section 33, which governs the uses of the facility by entities other than the YMCA themselves. He said under the guidelines in that section, it is clear that the uses of the facility have to be, social, recreational, health and fitness programs, but they also have to be for the general purpose of providing a community recreation center. He said the determination we made was based on whether these uses are consistent with a recreation center. He said there are a number of uses we determined were not recreation center type uses, some of those uses were by religious groups and at least one was not. He said it had nothing to do with the groups that were using the facility, if they were religious groups or not.

Mayor Clark thanked staff for the clarification and said staff can get back to Mr. De Paoli on his questions.

Mayor Clark stated she has one more citizen comment on an agenda item and as the Council does not take comments on agenda items, she is more than happy to accept comments but will take them after the Council deliberates.

Mayor Clark addressed the next agenda item.

9. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Resolution 2015-081 Approving amendments to City Council Rules pertaining to Agenda Headings

City Manager Gall stated if the Council was to pass this resolution it would amend the Council Rules. He said the Council Rules currently defines your order of business. He said the major topics on the agenda are outlined in the Council Rules and in order to modify those or add an item, the Council would need to change their rules and this is done through a resolution. He said this is a request that Mayor Clark made and she would like to have the Council consider adding an invocation at the beginning of regular business meetings. He said he will let the Mayor explain her rationale for this and City Attorney Soper is prepared to speak on the legality of invocations at public meetings. He said there was a 2014 US Supreme Court case that dealt with this that Councilors may have questions on.

Mayor Clark stated she asked for the invocation to be added, not for the reasons she has heard in social media of being reactionary. She said she is glad that the Reverend came forward to discuss some of the issues we have been having with the use of the YMCA facility, which has an operating agreement, as it is a City building. She said it has a different function than all of our other City buildings that are run by the City. She said all of our City buildings are open to all, but the YMCA has an operating agreement. She said one cannot work out at the YMCA unless you have a membership and pay the YMCA. She said when we found out the YMCA was subleasing to a church, which did not fit, then a bunch of other groups who also did not fit the use, some Christian some not, she received a lot of calls from ministers and they asked what was going on. She stated they said they felt displaced and she then met with the ministers group and got a strong feeling that there was a disconnect. She said she felt it was time to honor all groups and to bring brevity to Council that we have enjoyed since she was sworn in, which she doesn't believe is because of her. She said we have had respect at the Council and she would like to keep that going and would like to keep the Council as a place where people can come up to the mic and give testimony about what they feel about any subject. She said she wants the Council to be a place where everybody is welcome and a place of calm discussion. She said she has been known to say it is 100% possible to disagree without being disagreeable. She said she thinks an invocation can provide that. She said this is not a religious indictment, and said she reached out to other mayors and spoke of the disconnect and the minister group being upset that they are moving from one location and we have an equally comfortable location, (Police department, Fire department, Library, Center for the Arts, Senior Center) that they can meet and pray and talk about issues in Sherwood and serve their community. She asked why there is such a great response to that and why there is an uprising of onward Christian soldiers. She said she wants everyone to take a breath before we talk about things and say we are here to build community, here for everybody. She said the Mayor from Redmond told her they have had an invocation for a very long time. She said it gives everybody an opportunity to be involved in the Council in

a way that can be fun. She said it's something where you can have a moment to bring something forward and have everybody think about. She said you can read from the reader's digest if you want. She said City Attorney Soper provided information from 2014 that this issue was talked about and it was talked about because invocations are done at the state legislator, at the state senate, it's done in many bodies of government. She said in the US Supreme Court in the town of Greece v. Galloway it states, "*lends gravity to public business, reminds lawmakers to transcend petty differences in pursuit of higher purpose, and expresses a common aspiration to a just and peaceful society.*" She said isn't that what we are here for? She said she has always said, from her first address as Mayor, we are going to talk about stuff and talk about stuff that is uncomfortable at times. She said it might make people uncomfortable sometimes, but doesn't mean we run each other down the rail or to become ugly about it. She said we can simply state, it is a great option, this is how I feel and what I believe, and be respectful about it. She said she thinks personally that an invocation can be a reminder of that. She said we are all here for everybody, because we love Sherwood and a lot of the emotion comes out because of that. She said she thinks a moment of silence, which is another option, will reflect on that. She said we are lucky to be here in this town, in the US and have the option to come together and make great policy to move the City forward and this is why she brought this forward.

She said the Council will be discussing their Council Rules in the future as there is room to work on the rules. She said they will be talking about the rules in January at the Council retreat. She said this was something extra, not to appease, as she is not interested in appeasing people, she is interested in including people.

Councilor Harris said she likes the language, "*lends gravity to public business, reminds lawmakers to transcend petty differences in pursuit of higher purpose, and expresses a common aspiration to a just and peaceful society*", and said she thinks we should just read this comment for every Council meeting.

Mayor Clark agreed with the idea.

Councilor Kuiper said in the interest of all that is good, invoking good feelings, calm and mutual respect, she likes the idea of a positive word or maybe a quote of interest could be presented. She said she would be in favor of this. She said even the quote as previously mentioned, or a quote from a famous or thoughtful person.

Councilor Harris stated she is a strong believer of separation of church and state, and is having a difficult time with this. She said she considers herself a Christian and thinks the idea of it could be a nice idea, but it's not the right place and she is not opposed to a moment of silence and if someone chooses to pray they could do that. She said she would not be opposed to this or a thought of affirmation. She said she is not 100% comfortable with a prayer before a meeting.

Councilor Kuiper stated she is uncomfortable with the language and definition of "invocation" and said she is also a big believer of separation of church and state. She said, but, looking at another option that would provide the same effect, before a meeting begins and having an affirmation or positive quote would result in the same.

Mayor Clark stated the division between church and state is "the church", and said in this description under 3.b (referring to Exhibit 2 of staff report), it is stated very clearly, "*the invocation shall not be used to proselytize or advance anyone, or to disparage any other, faith or belief.*"

City Attorney Soper stated “invocation” is just a word that has traditionally been used for this, and believes Congress, the Legislature and the Supreme Court used it in this case. He said there is no reason we couldn’t use a different term if the Council prefers. He said he is aware that some definitions of invocations have some type of religious meaning. He said if you look at different dictionaries and definitions, there are many that don’t involve religious affiliation with the term. He read from Marion Webster’s Dictionary, “*the act or process of petitioning for help or support*”, and “*a prayer in treaty*” are two definitions.

Councilor Henderson asked if a script is used in Salem, or if they randomly invite somebody to come and give the invocation.

Mr. Soper stated he did not know what procedure was used. Mayor Clark replied she has been to swearing in’s and has never seen a script.

Councilor Harris stated some of the Council members were in Bend at a conference and they started out with an invocation and she was immediately on guard as she felt it was a government meeting and it should not have been there. She said the room had 500+ people, and a pastor from Hillsboro gave the invocation and she was great. She said the invocation consisted of, “I wish you well, I hope that everyone makes good choices and comes up with wonderful ideas and we could really use a little rain, enjoy your meeting”. She said we can’t guarantee that this will happen in this situation, but if that was the parameters we set, she would be fine with that. Councilor Harris said the speaker was a pastor and her job was irrelevant to her, but what was said was uplifting and started the meeting off on the right foot. She said this is not what she is concerned about, there are a lot of other areas one could be concerned about, it’s the people that are trying to forward their church or their cause, whether it’s a good cause or not. She asked, how would that work, can we stop them in the middle of their invocation?

City Attorney Soper said prior to the Supreme Court case, there were a lot of entities that had invocations that had a guideline that said, it must be a non-sectarian invocation and the idea there was that this was going to avoid some of the first amendment establishment of religion issues. He said the Supreme Court said this actually does the opposite, that you’re controlling what people are allowed to say in their invocations. He said instead, what they say is, if you have a Christian minister get up, they can deliver a Christian prayer and others can deliver a prayer that is consistent with their religion, and if you have someone that is not religious, they can deliver a statement that has no religious affiliation. He said the City Council should not be policing the content of the speech to that degree.

Councilor Harris asked how does that work if somebody tries to use it as their soapbox? Mr. Soper replied if it gets to the point that they are proselytizing or attacking other religious groups, then he believes we would just not invite them to come back.

Mayor Clark stated she thinks it would probably work similar to our public comments, that one is allowed to publically comment about whatever they want. She said she is guessing there would be parameters about how much time is allowed for the invocation. City Attorney Soper said, the language states, “brief comments.”

Mayor Clark stated she does not like the idea of exclusivity and said we have exclusiveness types of things that make people feel detached from one another. She said it would be great if everyone felt

welcome here. She said Estacada just began doing this as well as Bandon and Redmond. She said this is something that is occurring in cities around us in Oregon and appears to be working well. She said she spoke with the Redmond Mayor and they have been doing this for years and said all different types of groups have come in and it has been great, interesting and fun to see different perspectives.

Council President Robinson stated as a lawyer in the room, she strongly believes in separation of church and state and thinks that this violates that concept for her. She said she thinks an invocation is most notably associated with religion and her concern is that we offend some people and it may actually do the opposite of what the Mayor is trying to do. She said she sees some issues with the guidelines that are recommended which also contributes to her interpretation, that this is religion based, and that is, by the City reaching out to local faith communities. She said a short moment of silence in most people's minds has been associated with religion or prayer. She said she thinks at this time she is not inclined to support a resolution of this nature, however she would like to reconsider the issue when we do a Council retreat in January and talk more of the revisions to our Council Rules and adopt maybe some different things that we can do in our meetings. She said most notably for her she is thinking of her experience with Rotary, here in town, where we have a thought of the day, and that thought of the day is nowhere near any religious connotation at all. She confirmed with City Manager Gall that this is still done. She said it is nice and it doesn't violate the concept that she is concerned about.

City Manager Gall stated it's a very nice part and starts off their rotary meetings. He said they have a rotation process and it's amazing that you always learn something.

Councilor King said he would like some time to think about it and asked if the Council can address this at their next meeting after having a few weeks to think about it.

Mayor Clark said she did not have a problem with that and is always open to giving people time. She asked the Council how they feel. She confirmed with staff that the Council did not need to act on the resolution tonight and she was fine with this discussion being the first Council discussion on the issue.

Councilor Harris agreed with the idea and said personally the agenda title did not lead her to believe what it really was and she had to drill down into the packet to understand what they were talking about and believes this could be true for some of our citizens. Council comments were received about allowing more time to talk about it.

City Manager Gall said the Council's next business meeting is November 17 and said the Council will probably not have a business meeting on November 3. Mayor Clark said this gives the Council a bit of time.

Councilor Henderson said she has her own thoughts and said the Council can table the resolution and revisit it this year or during the Goal Setting Session. Mayor Clark was in agreement to table and asked to receive public comments.

Sean Garland Sherwood resident came forward and said he is against this and believes it's an unnecessary solution to a nonexistent problem. He said he sent an email to the Council earlier today and Mayor Clark responded. He said quoting from the US Supreme Court decision, "lends gravity to public business and reminds lawmakers to transcend petty differences." He said he doesn't see this as being a problem with this Council right now. He said he has attended a fair amount of Council meeting since this

new Council and thinks the Council is doing great. He said in comparison to the last Council, the civility on this Council, considering that he knows there are personal differences amongst the Council members, he thinks they are doing great. He said he is not sure why this would be brought to the Council and asked if there is a thought to bring this to other public boards as well. He said he is a member of the Police Advisory Board and said they don't have any type of civility issues and said they actually have a minister on the board and religion has not been mentioned once in their meetings. He commented regarding a quote from the Mayor in her response to his email, that she is dedicated to making sure that *everyone feels welcome and a part of our great City of Sherwood and tolerance of others we believe would be a giant step forward towards that goal*. He said he agrees with this and doesn't see this as being a problem. He said if you can't promote cooperation and work towards a common goal without having an invocation as part of the City Council meeting then maybe the City Council isn't the best place for you, if that invocation is required. He commented regarding feeling welcomed and said we have a packed house and have had people young and old come up without hesitation. He said in his conversations with citizens, they are not comfortable coming here to speak on this topic and don't feel comfortable expressing their views on religion. He said we will all agree that religion is a divisive topic. He said he is an atheist and is not shy about this and is a nice guy. He said he doesn't have a religious belief but this doesn't mean that he is against religious beliefs. He commented regarding not minding if Council members pray at home or in a conference room before, but where he does have an issue is when he feels that religion creeps into schools and government and this feels like it is getting close. He referred to comments made by Council President Robinson about reaching out to civic leaders. He commented regarding inclusivity and all of us being together here, but not all being religious. He said talking about inclusivity, the Council will exclude a few people by adding an invocation. He commented regarding the disconnect that is being felt from the ministers, he said they have a place to connect with people, they have churches.

Mayor Clark confirmed with Councilor Brouse that she was fine holding her comments until the Council brought back the discussion. Mayor Clark said the Council is tabling it and made the following motion.

MOTION: FROM MAYOR CLARK TO TABLE RESOLUTION 2015-081 TO A DATE UNCERTAIN, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR HARRIS. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

10. CITY MANAGER REPORT

City Manager Gall stated he did not have a report and offered to answer Council questions.

Mayor Clark addressed the next agenda item.

11. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilor King reported Sherwood Main Street was putting on a Halloween event on Saturday the 31 and it starts at 3 pm in Sherwood Old Town. He said we have the November election coming up and stated his opinion is noted in the Archer, voting for the expansion. He referred to associations in the City (HOA's) and said to send him an email.

Record Note: Councilor King left the meeting at 10:00 pm.

Mayor Clark said she has a Sherwood Mayor's face book page, Sherwoodmayorkrisannaclark, and said she posts everything she is working on and doing and encouraged people to like her page. She reported

the Chamber of Commerce had an awesome Onion Festival and many Councilors served. She thanked the many people that worked very hard during this event.

She reported she and three Councilors (Harris, Kuiper and Brouse) attended the League of Oregon Cities Conference in Bend and said it was fabulous. She briefly reported on the conference events. She reported last weekend was the Washington County Open Arts Studio and said we have three great artists in Sherwood that were highlighted and said this is a testament to the talent and visual arts talent we have in Sherwood. She said she will be leaving to attend the Emerging Leaders Conference at Edgefield and will be attending the National League of Cities Conference in Nashville. She reminded everyone that November 3 is Election Day and encouraged people to vote.

Councilor Harris reported the Library Levy is on the ballot and said 21% of our library budget comes from the levy and encouraged people to vote. She reported Trick or Treating as mentioned by Councilor King will be in Old Town. She reported on library-scheduled events. She reported the Library had for the 2015 fiscal year 251,536 total visits, over 3000 open public hours, 367,124 check-outs including digital check-outs. She reported regarding volunteers and said over 2294 total hours were volunteered and said this boosted the library workforce by 1.2 FTE. She said there were over 467 programs done at the library and all these numbers are on target to increase. She reported on events at the Arts Center and said the first term of arts classes are underway, and the average cost per class is \$50 and said the new course catalog is expected to come out mid-December for winter and spring classes. She reported on the VPA Peter Pan event that had over 1400 people in attendance at four separate performances. She reported the Arts Center is booked on weekends through February with the exception of 3-4 weekends. She commended the Center's staff for working on the booked events. She reported on upcoming events at the Arts Center.

Mayor Clark added she attended a Career Day at Middleton Elementary and Governor Robert's was there as the main speaker. She shared a story of a communicating she received from a dad regarding his daughter.

Councilor Kuiper reported the official opening of the new Dog Park is Saturday November 14. She reported November 11 is a Veteran's Day Ceremony at the Arts Center with Mayor Clark and Senator Thatcher scheduled to speak. She reported on the Halloween event on Old Town and said there will also be games starting at 3 pm.

Council President Robinson reported that at the recent Planning Commission meeting they approved a new high school construction project, the building of a new home in Old Town. She said the location is near the roundabout and said the students are already working on the project. She reported the next planning commission meeting is October 27 and is a work session to discuss industrial land use classifications.

Councilor Henderson stated last week she attended the Community Development Block Grant Policy Advisory Board Meeting at the North Plains Senior Center. She reported they are getting ready to receive applications for a number of programs and capital projects. She said Sherwood will be hosting next month's meeting at the Sherwood Center for the Arts, with a scheduled tour to help promote the center. She reported on the Coloring between the Wines event, the history, and its organizers.

Councilor Brouse reported on the recent Sherwood School District Board meeting and said there are three vacancies on their budget committee. She said they adopted their Strategic Plan for 2015-2016 and

it is available on their website. She said November 4 they will have a work session to discuss capacity issues. She reported she attended the Water Consortium meeting and they will be adopting their budget at their next meeting. She said October 24 at Red Robin is the Fall Tip a Cop event and said the Sherwood Chamber has a new website.

Julia Hajduk reminded the Council there is a Sherwood West Open House this coming Thursday at the Arts Center.

Mayor Clark asked for a motion to adjourn.

12. ADJOURN

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR HARRIS TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY MAYOR CLARK. MOTION PASSED 6:0, ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCILOR BROUSE VIA CONFERENCE CALL). COUNCILOR KING WAS ABSENT.

Mayor Clark adjourned the meeting at 10:17 pm.

Submitted by:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Krisanna Clark, Mayor