



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

CITY COUNCIL MEETING PACKET

FOR

Tuesday, May 6, 2025

**Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon**

~~5:30~~ 6:00 pm City Council Work Session

7:00 pm City Council Regular Meeting

**City Council Executive Session
(ORS 192.660(2)(d), Labor Negotiator Consultations)
(Following the 7:00 pm Regular Meeting)**

This meeting will be live streamed at
<https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofSherwood>



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

5:30-6:00 PM CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

1. Family Justice Center (Craig Sheldon, City Manager)
- ~~2. WA County Cooperative Library Services (WCCLS)
Funding Allocation Proposals
(Adrienne Doman Calkins, Library Manager)~~
- ~~3.2. Update on Building and Business License Fees
(Eric Rutledge, Community Development Director)~~

7:00 PM REGULAR CITY COUNCIL SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ROLL CALL
4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
5. CONSENT AGENDA
 - A. Approval of April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes (Sylvia Murphy, City Recorder)
 - B. Approval of April 15, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes (Sylvia Murphy, City Recorder)
 - C. Resolution 2025-021, Appointing Farrah Burke to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board (Maiya Martin Burbank, Adult Community Center Manager)
 - D. Resolution 2025-022, Reappoint Sean Garland to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board (Adrienne Doman Calkins, Library Manager)
 - E. Resolution 2025-023, Appointing the Local Citizen Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee for the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update (Joy Chang, Project Manager)
 - F. Resolution 2025-024, Reappointing Matthew Kaufman to the Sherwood Budget Committee (David Bodway, Finance Director)
 - G. Resolution 2025-025, Authorizing the City Manager to Sign a One-Year Extension to the On-Call Building Plan Review and Inspection Services Contract with Clair Company (Jared Bradbury, Building Official)
6. CITIZEN COMMENTS
7. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. Recognition of Eagle Scout Award Recipient (Mayor Tim Rosener)
 - B. Proclamation, Proclaiming May 18-24, 2025 as National Public Works Week (Mayor Tim Rosener)

AGENDA

**SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL
May 6, 2025**

5:30-6:00 pm City Council Work Session

7:00 pm City Council Regular Session

**City Council Executive Session
(ORS 192.660(2)(d), Labor Negotiator
Consultations
(Following the 7:00pm Regular Meeting)**

**Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140**

**This meeting will be live streamed at
<https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofSherwood>**

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Ordinance 2025-002, Changing the Traffic Safety Committee to a Board and Amending Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.087 (Second Hearing)** (Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney)
- B. Ordinance 2025-003, Amending Sherwood Municipal Code Chapter 2.08 Creating a Youth Advisory Board (Second Hearing)** (Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney)

9. CITY MANAGER REPORT

10. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

11. ADJOURN to EXECUTIVE SESSION

12. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- A. ORS 192.660(2)(d), Labor Negotiator Consultations** (Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney)

13. ADJOURN

How to Provide Citizen Comments and Public Hearing Testimony: Citizen comments and public hearing testimony may be provided in person, in writing, or by telephone. Written comments must be submitted at least 24 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting start time by e-mail to Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov and must clearly state either (1) that it is intended as a general Citizen Comment for this meeting or (2) if it is intended as testimony for a public hearing, the specific public hearing topic for which it is intended. To provide comment by phone during the live meeting, please e-mail or call the City Recorder at Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov or 503-625-4246 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting start time in order to receive the phone dial-in instructions. Per Council Rules Ch. 2 Section (V)(D)(5), Citizen Comments, "Speakers shall identify themselves by their names and by their city of residence." Anonymous comments will not be accepted into the meeting record.

How to Find out What's on the Council Schedule: City Council meeting materials and agenda are posted to the City web page at www.sherwoodoregon.gov, generally by the Thursday prior to a Council meeting. When possible, Council agendas are also posted at the Sherwood Library/City Hall and the Sherwood Post Office.

To Schedule a Presentation to the Council: If you would like to schedule a presentation to the City Council, please submit your name, phone number, the subject of your presentation and the date you wish to appear to the City Recorder, 503-625-4246 or Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov

ADA Accommodations: If you require an ADA accommodation for this public meeting, please contact the City Recorder's Office at (503) 625-4246 or Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting time. Assisted Listening Devices available on site.



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
April 1, 2025

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Council President Kim Young, Councilors Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, Keith Mays, Doug Scott and Dan Standke.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia, IT Director Brad Crawford, IT Manager Richard McCord, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Economic Development Manager Erik Adair, HR Director Lydia McEvoy, Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler, City Engineer Jason Waters, Finance Director David Bodway, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

4. **TOPICS:**

A. Tannery Site Cleanup Project Update

City Engineer Jason Waters presented a PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit A) and stated in addition to providing the Council with an update, the meeting also served as a public meeting for community involvement planning. Jason stated that several projects were included in the cleanup project, to include information on a sewer project, a regional storm facility street improvement and site preparation. He stated staff were working with the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) to see if the city could include some of the other projects with the cleanup. John ~~xx-Kuiper~~ with WSP Consulting referred to page one of the exhibit and identified the locations of the wastewater lagoons, wetlands and Rock Creek. He showed the location of the former Frontier Leather Tannery site and the split hide landfill. He stated that the cleanup included metals, hides contaminated with chromium and lead that were buried on site and stated there were wastewater treatment lagoons that have contaminated sediments. He stated at the site outside of the berms there were breaches that made it into the Rock Creek floodplain. He said there are approximately 30,000 cubic yards of contaminated hides, soil, and sediment that needed to be hauled away. John confirmed the treatment lagoons were created by Frontier Leather and were not city facilities. Councilor Mays asked if the lead was from the lead recycling battery plant and John stated that was not an issue and this was chromium and hides and they were not a human health risk they were eco risks. John explained community involvement and stated that part of what needs to be done is part of the EPA grant and having a community involvement plan and that is what has perpetrated this and stated the EPA approved the community involvement plan. He explained the CIP priorities on page 2. He stated the community involvement plan was available on SharePoint and explained Priority Actions through social media, the city's website, flyers, work sessions, direct community activities, and community partner engagement. He explained the timeline on page 3. Mayor Rosener asked regarding the future public works facility and the city's public outreach efforts, and if this

information would be included. John confirmed. John explained the information on page 4 and stated that the tannery cleanup was one of six projects in the area that shared a nexus and said cleanup of the tannery is key to allowing the other projects to move forward. City Engineer Waters reminded that the city received an EPA grant in 2017 that had community involvement and visioning and said this project included visioning for the public works facility. He stated the listed projects overlapped with the cleanup site therefore you couldn't complete them without the cleanup. Mr. Waters referred to the project list on page 4 and explained their disposition. He stated that staff was hoping to complete the Oregon Street Improvements, the Regional Stormwater Facility and the CWS (Clean Water Services) Sewer line project with the cleanup project. Mr. Waters referred to the map on page 5 and identified the site for the future public works facility, Oregon Street improvement location and the locations of the swales for storm treatment, a potential regional facility that could be a natural stream or have the look of a natural facility and not a fenced swale. He identified the current location of the CWS Sanitary Sewer line and the relocation area and said staff would be looking at an access road over the line and potentially a trail. Councilor Mays asked regarding the depth of the line and Mr. Waters replied deep but accessible and indicated 1-2 manholes could be 25 feet deep and the others around 10 feet deep. Councilor Mays asked regarding powerlines and Mr. Waters confirmed the location of an overhead powerline and indicated other lines would be underground and said staff was working with PGE and considering the environmentally sensitive areas. Councilor Giles asked regarding a path and connectivity and Mr. Waters said there were challenges but it was being investigated. John addressed Cleanup Steps and Timeframe on page 6 and said they have met with DEQ and the EPA and everyone is on the same page. He said the community involvement plan was complete and this was part of that process. He stated they were required to put together a Sampling and an Analysis Plan for PFAS and said sampling will be provided by the end of this month. He stated they were getting an archeology firm under contract as required to allow for monitoring and this should happen by the end of the month. He explained next steps of getting a remedial action plan together, project design, and various permits and following this work would be bid documents and contractor selection shortly after 2026. He said they hoped to be doing the excavation of the contaminated media by summer of 2026 and stated that dumping drier soil was a cost savings. He stated the next steps were site restoration, planning and community outreach. Mr. Waters added that they are working very closely with the Rock Creek Phase B Team and they will be participating in meetings with CWS. Mr. Waters spoke of overlapping projects to allow for efficiencies. John referred to page 7 and stated the green areas on the map were areas that will be excavated and said after soil sampling is done, the map will be refined. He said the green areas are the upland areas with mostly hides and the blue areas on the map identify the contaminated sediment areas. Mr. Waters added that it will be an irritative process with permitting and said DSL (Department of State Lands) will have a lot of say about the mitigation and the final look. He said staff will be coming back to the council on a quarterly basis with updates on the project. Councilor Giles asked regarding the site of the future public works facility and Mr. Waters said the site is about 10 acres, and said that DSL could identify a different developable site. Council President Young commented regarding conversations in past years about a partial or full cleanup and Mr. Waters replied a full cleanup will be done as the grant amount of \$5 million allowed for it. City Manager Sheldon commented regarding the sewer line and having four years with the grant and potentially having to dig twice. Councilor Standke asked where the dirt was going, and Mr. Waters replied to the Hillsboro landfill and possibly other landfills. John added unless we find surprises in the soil, it will go to the Hillsboro landfill. Mayor Rosener thanked the presenters and addressed the next agenda item.

B. Sherwood Chamber of Commerce – 2025 Business Plan

Farrah Burke Sherwood Chamber CEO/Executive Director and Chamber Board Member Martin Rakers presented a PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit B). Ms. Burke recapped what the Chamber does

and briefly identified the Board members. She explained the work that is being done of rebuilding and visiting neighboring chambers, looking at best practices and reenvisioning the chamber concept. She stated she feels Sherwood's chamber has a solid foundation with the community. She recapped 2025 Goals of consistent and smooth networking, marketing, communications and events, continuing to operationally uplift and modernize the chamber and partner with the city on economic development. She highlighted achievements that included more engagement in marketing efforts, conducting two networking events per month that indicates growth in attendance, and an increase in membership which was now 167 members. She commented regarding the chamber's current efforts of operational uplift and reducing monthly expenses, looking at daily office space rentals and looking at a move to the downtown area, cloud based management of documents and they will be launching a new website soon and said they have created two new committees for membership and events. She recapped the success of award luncheons, which was a change from the previous evening galas. She stated she received a lot of feedback from their membership which helped determine the changes. She recapped the 2025 Roadmap and upcoming events to include the launch of a new Cruisin' site, the launch of a new Chamber website, the Gold Tournament and the annual Chamber Directory. She stated she was scheduling and planning for the calendar year events, ribbon cuttings and reopening's. She informed of two upcoming new businesses, Studson and The Hot Spot. She recapped their work on the new Chamber website and recapped Chamber involvement points to include the Sherwood Visitors Center and the benefits of the Center; visiting Chambers within the Washington County area and beyond to research best practices; working on the Chamber Directory; connecting the High School to community professionals and job shadowing to include bringing professionals into the High School; connecting with Sherwood Main Street Association and the Robin Hood Festival Association working towards improvements; revitalization of Old Town; attending Sherwood City Council meetings; connecting new businesses to location opportunities and connecting them to City processes. She recapped their finances for 2024 and spoke of opportunities for other revenue and stated many Chambers have alternative revenue streams that are not based on membership or events and said they are working on figuring this out. She provided examples of having multiple magazines and not just a directory, conducting travel trips, conducting Leadership Universities and said some Chambers were subsidized by their city. Council asked if the membership was tiered based on company size and Farrah confirmed and provided an example of the City of Tualatin's tiered membership and explained an opportunity with Sherwood for an automatic membership for a certain fee. Brief discussion occurred regarding the values of Chamber membership. Farrah spoke on the multi-chamber events which occur quarterly. Farrah recapped Chamber CEO salary and benefit information and their goal to reach an annual salary of \$75,000 by 2025 year's end. She recapped their ask of TLT (Transient Lodging Tax) funding for 2025; CEP (Community Enhancement Program) Grant application for Cruisin'; and city representation on their Board as they believe the city's input would be valuable. She recapped Fall 2025-2026 to include more diversified membership, having Ambassadors; membership software; Board recruitment for 2026; and alternate revenue sources. Council members expressed their appreciation for the information and transparency. Councilor Giles commented regarding additional signage during Cruisin' promoting local businesses and Farrah confirmed that conversations were being had and shared other ideas they were exploring and discussion occurred. Council comments were received regarding economic development and the opportunity to work with the city's Economic Development Manager. The Council thanked the Chamber for their presentation and Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

C. Housing Bill Updates

Mayor Rosener commented regarding the long session currently occurring in Salem and said the legislature was very busy working on about 5000 bills and commented regarding the city's preemption and local control of housing and land use. He stated the city is paying close attention to these and partnering with the League

of Oregon Cities and metropolitan mayors on the issues. He stated Community Development Director Eric Rutledge was doing an amazing job gathering information and helping with analyzing the bills, gathering feedback and getting back to the city's lobbyist, the LOC and the MMC. Community Development Director Eric Rutledge provided the council with materials (see record, Exhibit C) and presented a PowerPoint (see record, Exhibit D). Eric recapped the purpose of the work session was to inform the council and the residents of what's happening, discuss the impacts to existing city limits and neighborhoods and the city's planning areas, mainly Sherwood West, and discuss next steps and any actions the city can take. Eric stated the legislature was about halfway through the session and said there was a deadline and explained the 2025 Legislative Calendar with the session ending on June 29, 2025. Eric stated he would recap five bills today and said four will go in the direction of less local and being a rule in nature and the other was more of a tool. Eric stated the bills he will speak on will be the most impactful and there are others that staff will continue to track. Eric added that bills were changing quickly and today's presentation reflected the most current. Eric stated he is presenting information with staff's read of the bills and said we are not the authors. Eric addressed Senate Bill 974 and said there was an LOC meeting and the Home Builder's Association of Oregon was pushing for this bill and said it as a concern for us. He said it would require cities to waive standards for building design and orientation parking and landscaping for any housing development with 20 or more units. He said this is not density, it's units, and rolling back the standards that we have adopted. Comments were received regarding the 20 units and Eric stated any property of significant size or a multifamily property is going to reach 20 units very quickly. Council comments were received that it's unusual to get less than 20 units and this would include setbacks, and design standard materials. Eric confirmed there was another bill that impacted setbacks and said this one is building design and orientation, and Mayor Rosener added it included parking and parking landscaping. Eric continued and said the bill would set limits for the first time on the amount of time engineering has for their plan review. He explained that it would require quickly going through planning and getting land use review and then concurrently going through building and engineering review. He said currently there are no limits on engineering review, and this would set very quick limits. He explained the impacts to the city on page 3 of exhibit D as impacts to the city limits, impacts to Sherwood West and impacts to staffing and budget. He stated the engineering department will be looking at increased fees to make sure we get through these. Comments were received with an example of prior development and the developers approach and the potential for staff denial. Discussion followed reflecting on prior development and the tools staff has today within the city's fee schedule to charge for services. Eric stated the other concerning part of this bill is that it changed the definition for housing applications under the land use system and made anything related to housing, most applications related to housing and urban housing applications, a limited land use decision. He explained that means that there are limits on public input, public notice, the number of hearings that can be held, etc., it's basically an expedited land use review. Eric added that limited land use is typically a staff decision and not a hearings officer decision. He stated he was concerned that it would redefine PUDs (Planned Unit Developments) as a limited land use decision and stated his understanding is that a limited land use decision can only have one public hearing and that included in a potential appeal. He said it's not wise to have your hearing not be the appeal, we would want that to go before the Council, therefore the PUDs would have to be approved by staff with one public hearing. He stated this is a limited land use decision and there are some current applications that are limited land use decisions. Eric further clarified that some comprehensive plan amendments would also be a limited land use decision. Councilor Mays stated the nature of a PUD is that you get to write your own rules and commented regarding the state changing the standards. Eric confirmed this would bring PUDs into the limited land use decision process. Eric stated with all the reduced timeline provisions that are in multiple bills, we would either need to increase our fees, increase staff to be able to meet the deadlines or we use the staffing we have and be pressured, and it would fall to the consultants to get it right so that we can approve. Council discussion followed with the effects of this including bypassing the planning commission as

a decision will be appealed to the Council. Councilor Scott added that this will significantly decrease public input of the entire process and comments were received regarding decreasing the need for the planning commission. Eric added that many state bills since 2019 have been going in this direction with less discretion by the city and less public involvement. Mayor Rosener added that the impacts on master planning are unclear and said there is nothing here that exempts master planning. He said that once a bill gets to DLCD they will write regulations that will probably address that, and we will have no idea of what those would look like. Eric added that this concerns him as the implementor as it takes effect 91 days after the legislative session ends and there will be no time to do a legislative amendment for us to adopt the changes. Council members expressed concern, and Eric stated the bill is still alive and suggested we lean on our lobbyist. Mayor Rosener added that the city has come out against this as has the MMC. Council discussion followed. Eric addressed Senate Bill 6-1 and said the “dash 1” is an amendment and said this bill is going after the building program, and not planning or land use, and would require building departments to issue permits for middle-family and single-family residents within 45 days of a completed application. He stated Sherwood’s building department is on average at about 21 days to issue a permit. He stated it would require partner agencies, if they are commenting, to complete their review within 10 days, and said the really concerning part is, if the building department or partnering agency fail to make decision within that timeframe the permit is automatically approved. He added that in the dash 1 amendment there was nothing that would clarify or demonstrate where responsibility laid, with the jurisdiction or with the builder. Council comments were received regarding concerns over the application not meeting the code. Eric added concerns with who has the liability, the builder, the city? He further expressed the worst-case scenario of the homeowner acquiring a loan for the home that now doesn’t meet code. Councilor Young asked regarding the inspection process and capturing code issues through inspections. Eric stated if the plan is approved without meeting the code and the inspector catches that, that it continued to occupancy without meeting the code. Council discussion followed. Eric addressed House Bill 2138-2 and said this is the middle-housing bill that was last updated this afternoon and said it has been significantly scaled down since its release. He said the list is non inclusive and the bill would change the definition of a cottage cluster to include attached units, and currently cottage clusters are only detached. Eric said it would allow row-homes but would still require them to be small units. He added that they could be one and one-half stories. Eric added that it would not allow cities to require transportation impact analysis or offsite improvements for middle-housing developments under 12 units. He said that would apply to infill and redevelopment only. He said it would allow additional housing units on a site where affordability or accessible ownership requirements are met. He said our code currently states we are to have density limits on a site, but if the builder is able to deliver an affordable unit at a certain metric or an accessible unit, meaning ground-floor ADA, then those would be bonuses that are not part of that. Eric added that the bill is catered towards middle housing. He said another concern is that the bill would direct LCDC to undertake rule making that prohibits or restricts siting and design standards that prevent or discourage middle housing. Eric reminded the council of the city’s middle housing regulations and “reasonable” siting and design standards and said this would give LCDC the authority to say something is not “reasonable”. Eric added that there is also a provision that directs LCDC to review what is permissible discretionary criteria, which would play into the PUDs. Eric stated that currently, a developer can do a clear and objective path, meaning that our code is clear and objective or they can do the discretionary path, which is the PUDs. He said this would allow LCDC to determine what type of discretionary authority a city would have. Mayor Rosener commented regarding the improvements to this bill since its inception and said he still does not like it but does give credit for working with cities on the refinement. He said he believes they are trying to fix the problems that came from the variance bills from last year. Eric added, and HB 2001. Eric addressed House Bill 2258 and said this is also a governor sponsored bill and said this would allow the state to approve building plans, actual construction plans, and for those constructions plans on a specific lot, under what circumstances they can be built. Basically, they are trying to get preapproved plans and preapproved

sites. Eric confirmed this was for all types of homes. Eric stated this would supersede our design standards, parking standards, tree removal, etc., it would supersede basically everything. Eric provided an example of something being approved and said once approved it could be reproduced repeatedly, and the city would have to approve. Mayor Rosener provided an example of a developer getting eight designs approved and developing only those eight designs on a 200 acre site and the city would have little to no control. Council discussion followed regarding designs and size of homes and Eric replied he thought it was for lots that were up to 20,000 square feet. Mayor Rosener referred to conversations regarding “innovation zones” and discussion followed regarding affordability. Councilor Brouse asked for clarification on “LCDC may set conditions related to permit costs, impact analyses on public utilities or transportation, design standards and land use limitations”. Eric stated that LCDC can set how much the city can charge to permit a home, and they can dictate what we can study in terms of the impact of that home on the public infrastructure, and the design standards and other general land use. Eric added that this bill is interesting, and it could be fairly minimal but he doesn’t know how much it is used and the impact. He said it could have a significant impact and provided the example of a developer platting a subdivision and creating lots that a home can go on, in theory they replicate and our ability to bring in our own code and fees, we would not be able to. Council comments were received regarding not knowing the impact on the city’s utilities. Eric said we have a lot of questions and asked at what point does this bill supersede our authority, is it only at the building permit phase or at the land use phase. Eric stated worst case scenario, this would be applied at the land use phase, and LCDC conditions related to permit costs, impacts on public facilities etc., applies at that stage. He said this is most concerning and he does not know if this is the intent, but it’s something the city needs to pay attention too. Mayor Rosener added that the way it is written, LCDC can pretty much do what they want in terms of impact analysis. Discussion followed. Eric addressed House Bill 3031 and said this is for funding of infrastructure for housing, and it funds transportation, water, wastewater storm, and said there is a density requirement. He said any of the funding he’s seen in the last two years, there’s always been a density requirement and it’s usually 17 units per acre. He said for Sherwood, that would make only our high-density zone eligible. He said we are at 16 to 24 units per acre for high density, and meet affordability requirements. Discussion occurred regarding affordability and Eric stated it’s usually 120% of median family income for the region. Council asked if this was a grant or application process and Eric stated it was a competitive program. Mayor Rosner added that it would be a competitive program run by Business Oregon and they are allocating \$100 million from lottery funds. Eric concluded and said that 25% of funds were to support jurisdictions with less than 30,000 residents. Discussion occurred regarding the 25% and not knowing specifically what the parameters were. Council discussion occurred regarding the legislation that the state has passed and is proposing and concerns with not allowing time to identify the impacts. Councilor Mays commented regarding the impact to housing within the last ten years being short term rentals, such as Air BnB’s and asked if Salem has done anything to try and understand the number of units within the state and their locations. Council discussion followed. Council President Young asked regarding the effects of this and Sherwood West and Mayor Rosener replied it’s a discussion we need to have. Eric stated in terms of the impact he believes the city is taking the right approach of assuming there is not going to be a carve out for master planning for Sherwood West. He said Sherwood West is going to be a new growth area and generally speaking if there are exceptions, it will apply to existing and any new development. He said the master planning is an interesting question and with BH2001 middle housing and our approach in Sherwood West is going to be very specific to some rule making that occurred after these bills are passed. He stated he recently spoke with the city’s land use attorney and said there is not a guarantee that there will be rule making for all of these and said usually it’s stated in the legislation that LCDC shall implement or undertake rule making that does these things. He said for many of these bills that language is not there. Councilor Scott asked regarding the appeal for Sherwood West and Eric stated we should hear back this month from DLCD on their position on Metro’s decision. Discussion followed. Mayor Rosener suggested having another work session to receive an

update and a subsequent meeting after the legislative session closes. Councilor Scott asked if the city had anything scheduled for Sherwood West planning before the bills were determined. Eric replied that staff was working on an IGA with Metro and an RFP for a consultant and our next step on Sherwood West was to implement an IGA with Metro for a grant to go out for an RFP. Councilor Scott asked regarding the timing of this work and suggested to not do anything until the bills are determined, followed by a Council meeting and then determining next steps. Eric added he thinks in regard to the industrial lands, it will need to move quickly after we figure out where this is, we can still do that.

5. ADJOURN

Mayor Rosener adjourned the work session at 7:08 pm and convened the regular session.

REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 7:12 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Council President Kim Young, Councilors Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, Keith Mays, Doug Scott and Dan Standke.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia, IT Director Brad Crawford, IT Manager Richard McCord, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Economic Development Manager Erik Adair, HR Director Lydia McEvoy, Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler, Finance Director David Bodway, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

Mayor Rosener addressed approval of the agenda and asked for a motion.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE TO ADOPT THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT KIM YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item and asked for a motion.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. **Approval of March 18, 2025, City Council Meeting Minutes**
- B. **Resolution 2025-018, Authorizing the City Manager to execute a construction contract for the Edy Road Grind and Inlay Project**

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT KIM YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Sherwood resident Nancy Taylor came forward and commented regarding Clean Water Services (CWS) and their recent news coverage regarding their expenditures. She asked if the Council was sending a letter or planned on meeting with CWS to ask them to conduct an audit and look at their rates. She referenced another printed article and suggested the Council read it as well. Mayor Rosener commented regarding conversations and an upcoming leadership meeting in Washington County as follow up to the CWS news.

Sherwood resident Sean Garland came forward and requested the Council put forward a proclamation proclaiming June as Pride Month. He provided the Council with a list of neighboring and regional cities that have proclaimed June as Pride month and urged the Council to do so. He stated the lack of a statement was a statement within itself.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

7. PRESENTATIONS

A. Arbor Day Proclamation

Mayor Rosener read the proclamation proclaiming April 25, 2025 as Arbor Day. Sherwood Volunteer Coordinator Tammy Steffens came forward and stated the city will be partnering with a Sherwood elementary school to plant trees, approximately 100 trees in a local swale. She stated the city also partners with AKS Surveying and Forestry. She informed the Council as soon as a planting location was determined she would let them know so that they can attend.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item, and the City Recorder read the public hearing statement.

8. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Ordinance 2025-001, Amending Sherwood Municipal Codes 8.04 and 10.08 and removing 9.60 regarding Ticketing and Towing Vehicles

Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia recapped the staff report and provided a presentation (see record, Exhibit E), and stated that the ordinance was a comprehensive review of the city's current municipal code, specific to parking and towing, and some strategic changes and updates based on changes in law. Mr. Tapia stated staff provided previous information and this presentation was only highlights of the public hearing update that he previously provided. He stated one of the features of the changes is a requirement that notifications to the registered owner, the driver of the vehicle, will get information of the vehicle's current location and the date and time of the potential tow. He stated another change was the city is responsible for making reasonable efforts to identify the owner of the vehicle. Mr. Tapia explained the driver's release requirements and hearings process on page two of the exhibit. Mr. Tapia explained Parking Restrictions on page three of the exhibit to include time and location. He referred to the Fee Schedule and said language was removed from the Municipal Code and now resides in the Fee Schedule. He explained prohibited practices and no parking in no-parking zones and explained when an immediate tow would be authorized. Mayor Rosener informed the public that the Council had previously received the information resulting in a brief presentation. Mayor Rosener asked for council questions, and none were received. Mayor Rosener

opened the public hearing to receive testimony, none were received and he closed the hearing. With no further Council discussion, Mayor Rosener asked for a motion.

MOTION: FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT KIM YOUNG TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2025-001 AMENDING SHERWOOD MUNICIPAL CODES 8.04 AND 10.08 AND REMOVING 9.60 REGARDING TICKETING AND TOWING VEHICLES, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

B. Resolution 2025-019 Amending section 3 of the City’s Schedule of Fees for Parking Violations and Police Services and establishing an effective date

Interim City Attorney Tapia presented a PowerPoint (see record, Exhibit F) and stated he previously provided the amendments in track changes and the presentation showed the final fees if the Council were to adopt. Mr. Tapia recapped a summary of the amendments on page two of the presentation.

Council President Young and Councilor Giles asked for clarification regarding the language of “staff hourly rate” and processing a records request. Mr. Tapia and the City Recorder provided an explanation of the city’s policy and processes. Mayor Rosener asked for other Council questions, with none received, he opened the public hearing. No public comments were received, and Mayor Rosener closed the public hearing and the following motion was stated.

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR KEITH MAYS TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2025-019, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

9. CITY MANAGER REPORT

City Manager Sheldon reported on the pedestrian bridge project. He thanked the HR Director for scheduling staff training, a management training course that had not been done in nearly ten years. Council asked questions regarding the type of training and Councilor Giles expressed support for future leadership training. Councilor Standke asked regarding beaver dam removal at Stella Olsen Park. Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler provided an explanation. Councilor Brouse asked regarding a leaning tree near a residential area and Mr. Sattler provided information on the removal of the tree. Council President Young commented regarding park restroom vandalization. Councilor Mays praised staff and the contractors for their work on the pedestrian bridge project.

10. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilor Giles reported that there was not a recent planning commission meeting. Councilor Brouse wished her daughter a happy birthday. Councilor Mays commented on project management and the Willamette Supply Group and expressed dissatisfaction with their project managers. Councilor Scott wished his wife a happy birthday and reported on an upcoming Parks and Recreation Advisory Board meeting and reported on the Boards prior topic discussions. Councilor Standke reported on the Library Advisory Board meeting and an upcoming library open house celebrating Library Week. He reported the time for the next regular

Library Board meeting has changed due to the State of the City address scheduled on the same day. He reported on the Sherwood School District Board meeting and their district transfers and stated there was a vacant position on the board. He reported on a recent ride-along he did with the Sherwood Police department. Council President Young reported on the recent work session and presentation from the Sherwood Chamber of Commerce and informed of upcoming chamber events. Mayor Rosener reported on an upcoming trip to Washington DC with City Manager Sheldon to try and secure funding for the city's sewer system. He reported on the upcoming State of the City address scheduled for April 16 and praised staff for their work on the pedestrian bridge project. Councilor Standke reminded of the upcoming Trash Palooza event.

11. ADJOURN

Mayor Rosener adjourned the meeting at 7:50 pm.

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Tim Rosener, Mayor



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
April 15, 2025

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 5:46 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Council President Kim Young, Councilors Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, and Doug Scott. Councilors Keith Mays and Dan Standke were absent.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia, IT Director Brad Crawford, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler, City Engineer Jason Waters, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
4. **TOPICS:**

A. 5 Year proposed CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) List

Mayor Rosener explained that the CIP was a plan that looked at projects 30-40 years in the future and stated that these projects are not necessarily funded.

Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler provided materials to the Council. He stated the materials consisted of a two-year proposed CIP (see record, Exhibit A), a five-year CIP for Engineering projects (see record, Exhibit B), and a five-year Public Works CIP list (see record, Exhibit C). Mayor Rosener added that projects were identified to be able to capture future grant funding. City Engineer Jason Waters recapped Exhibit A and provided an update on each listed project to include; current status, funding, contingency, bid status, relationship to other projects, grant opportunities, supply of materials, interagency partnerships, project service areas, and project completion timelines. The Council asked questions related to the projects listed on pages 1-3. Jason recapped proposed New Projects listed on page 4 to be included in the FY2025-27 budget. Rich Sattler added that these projects were funded out of the street capital fund. Jason identified the projects that were in the “study” phase and spoke of the unfunded project that was listed. Jason recapped the projects listed under Sanitary, Storm and Water and said staff were looking at possibly combining all the masterplan updates under one RFP (Request for Proposal). Jason reminded that the CIP is not a static document and as bids come in the numbers will change. Councilor Giles suggested a column identifying the public benefit of each project and discussion followed on the type of detail. Rich Sattler spoke on projects being identified in master plans and explained the city’s outreach efforts for specific projects. Discussion followed regarding the additional information and possibly having a key similar to the Council Goal Key, that identifies maintenance, etc. Rich addressed Exhibits B and C and stated the projects were listed on Exhibit A, but the difference was staff identified anticipated projects five years out. He stated that staff made some changes and looked at outside funding and added a Council Goal Key. He stated for projects that were past

five years, staff would continue to refine and bring that information back to the Council. Rich stated that staff would be bringing back legislation for consideration of Council adoption.

B. Washington County Commissioner Jason Snider

Commissioner Snider and Staff Assistant Bryn Thomas came forward. Commissioner Snider stated he wanted to connect with cities within his District 3, and hear concerns or things he can help advocate for from a county perspective. He said he is also able to provide the city with updates from the county and things they are working on. He said he would like to meet with the city once a year at a minimum, twice a year if the city would like or whenever the city makes a request. Commissioner Snider open the floor for questions. Councilor Giles asked regarding the WCCLS funding and a levy and a possible decrease in services. Mayor Rosener added he believed that currently it was a 40/60 split, what comes from the County General Fund and what comes from the levy. He stated the county hired a consultant to look at the levy and funding and said the consultant was recommending that the county set base level services. He said his concern was going to the voters and asking for a levy with the potential in decreased services. He said the city does not have the budget to absorb a hit. Councilor Scott spoke on the manner of the funds distribution and said that Sherwood has not received our fair share from the county. Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer added that the allocation formula was being looked at and information would be coming to the Council in a future work session and her understanding was the information would be available before the levy. Mayor Rosener informed Commissioner Snider that the city was doing a biennium budget this year and the city had a lot of concerns for what year two looked like. Commissioner Snider replied that he believed the intent was to define a base level of service that WCCLS and the County could help make happen and believed this is where the 45 hours is coming from and believed if the levy was sized differently that could expand, but expand county wide. He spoke of the County's general fund and said most of the general fund is spent on three things he's certain the city would not want to reduce: 1) Jail and Public Safety, 2) Libraries, and 3) MSTIP. Council asked if County revenues were decreasing, and Mr. Snider replied yes and said costs were increasing. He stated that the biggest thing that was changing this year was the expiration of the Intel SIP (Strategic Investment Plan), and in this budget alone that was a \$20 million annual general fund hit. He said he believes there was another company as well. He informed the Council that the County recently met and discussed this and said that meeting was recorded and encouraged the council to view the recording. He continued and said recruitment and retention of employees was another challenge the county was facing. He briefed the Council on the county PERS situation and said they can't compete. Councilor Young asked regarding the \$20 million and if those funds were being used for county operations and Mr. Snider confirmed and stated they have stopped doing that. He said he has learned over the past few years county financial practices that surprised him. He said the county did not have a capital improvement plan until two years ago. Discussion followed and Mayor Rosener spoke on the city's concerns and budget impacts. Mr. Snider informed the council that at today's county commissioners meeting they approved bonding \$150 million of MSTIP to complete projects. Mr. Snider and Mayor Rosner commented regarding interest rates. Mayor Rosener spoke of the importance of transparency with members of the public and messaging and said he has not heard of the messaging. Mr. Snider said he would communicate this with the commissioners and county library leaders. Discussion followed. Mr. Snider spoke of the council telling him what areas they were willing to cut, and council comments were received that public safety was not an area they supported cuts in nor roads. Councilor Scott added that these were his top two and spoke of base-line library services and optional services that the city did not have to offer, and said he was not speaking of reducing hours, he was speaking of reducing programs. He spoke of budget compression and said over the years, service levels would need to be reduced, and the alternative is passing levies. Mayor Rosener spoke of a study and said it was not just based on services or hours, it was based on services for other things and said if we are going to have to make cuts, we need the

flexibility to cut where we think it's appropriate for our community. Mr. Snider said in regard to libraries, the other assumption to make it work financially was to centralize the collection countywide. He said he knows this is not popular, but if we don't do that, we have a \$4.5-\$5 million hole a year to try and fill. Discussion followed. Mayor Rosener added that based on the study, he doesn't know how a centralized collection would solve the issues. Council President Young asked regarding MSTIP funds and hearing that those funds were being used by the county for things other than MSTIP. Mayor Rosener replied it did occur in the last two budget cycles. Mr. Snider said the money for this is part of the general levy and it's combined and said before Measure 5 and Measure 50 it was separate. He further explained the situation, the challenges and the realities. Discussion followed regarding levies and Mayor Rosener explained the history around the measures and levies. Mayor Rosener commented that it appears that each year the deficit is getting bigger and believes if we had bitten the bullet three years ago, we'd be in a better place. Mr. Snider replied that the county commission as a whole is tired of being on the trajectory that the mayor was describing and said they have been very clear with the county administrator that they want to be on a sustainable path. Discussion followed and Mr. Snider further explained that covid delayed ripping off the band-aid by a few years. Mr. Snider said there are very difficult decisions that are being made, and he has some insight into the budget and said there are entire functions that don't exist any longer. Mayor Rosener asked regarding county CIP and Mr. Snider said the commission addressed their CIP today in their work session and said the county's leadership team in IT, Land Use and Transportation, Fleet and Facilities addressed every line item very similar to how Sherwood has with its CIP, including items not funded. He spoke of the county aggressively seeking grants, particularly for parks. Councilor Giles commented regarding housing and his frustration in conversations with Metro and the county and said Sherwood's housing is not like Portland's and affordable housing is still needed. He spoke of the Sherwood West area and said we'd like to get young families and multi-generational families into smaller houses or age-in-place homes that can get people on the path of home-ownership. He spoke of keeping affordable housing in the Sherwood West area for the next 50 years. He said he is asking for county partnership for the middle-housing types of housing. Mr. Snider replied the county can partner and help and Council comments were received that the council has not aligned on a strategy. Discussion followed regarding future Sherwood planning. Mayor Rosener spoke of Sherwood West and the city's conditions of approval with Metro and spoke of SHS (Supportive Housing Services) and meeting with Metro and counties and said the conversations appear to be focused on turf and control and not talking about what the best programs might be. Mr. Snider replied that he was aware and said the county commission attending a recent Metro Council meeting and testified regarding SHS related topics. Mayor Rosener added that from his perspective, there are three counties operating independently and there was not a regional solution and said there are a lot of inefficiencies and we needed to get to a regional solution to give local flexibility so we can respond to local needs. Discussion followed regarding the issues within the three counties (Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas) discussing SHS with the Metro Council. Councilor Brouse commented regarding a public safety levy and Mr. Snider said there will be a replacement public safety levy on the same ballot as the WCCLS levy. Discussion followed regarding the taxing and service levels of the public safety levy and Mr. Snider confirmed it was an operating levy not a capital levy. Mr. Snider spoke of the Washington County jail and said more work needed to be done and how to fund it. Councilor Brouse commented regarding the WCCLS funding ratios and affordable housing and the high staffing levels in the county dept. that deals with affordable housing. Mr. Snider stated he appreciated the time with the Council and looked forward to another session in 6 months or sooner if needed.

5. ADJOURN

Mayor Rosener adjourned the work session at 7:02 pm and convened the regular session.

REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 7:08 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Council President Kim Young, Councilors Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, and Doug Scott. Councilors Keith Mays and Dan Standke were absent.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia, IT Director Brad Crawford, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, HR Director Lydia McEvoy, Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Mayor Rosener addressed approval of the agenda and asked for a motion.

MOTION TO AMEND: FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT KIM YOUNG TO REMOVE AGENDA ITEM NUMBERED 11, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 5:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR (MAYS AND STANDKE WERE ABSENT).

MOTION TO ADOPT AS AMENDED: MOTION FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT KIM YOUNG TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS AMENDED, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 5:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR (MAYS AND STANDKE WERE ABSENT).

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item and asked for a motion.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Resolution 2025-020, Authorizing the City Manager to execute a construction contract for the SW Arrow Street Extension Project

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR RENEE BROUSE TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT KIM YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 5:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR (MAYS AND STANDKE WERE ABSENT).

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

7. PRESENTATIONS

A. Proclamation, Proclaiming April 21-25, 2025 as National Community Development Block Grant Week.

Mayor Rosener asked Council President Young to speak about the program. Council President Young explained the program and its funding of public services and public facilities. She stated Sherwood had received approximately \$2,495,000., which included a recent \$280,000 grant to replace the siding and windows at the Sherwood Senior Center. Mayor Rosener read the proclamation and confirmed Council President Young had been on the committee for 8 years.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item, and the City Recorder read the public hearing statement.

8. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Ordinance 2025-002, Changing the Traffic Safety Committee to a Board and Amending Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.087

Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia presented a PowerPoint (see record, Exhibit D) and stated the purpose of the group will not change and the biggest difference was how it was organized as a subcommittee under the Police Advisory Board and the change to a Board will empower them and provide them with a Council Liaison. Councilor Giles asked if there was a change in their budget, and Mr. Tapia replied there were no changes. Mayor Rosener opened the public hearing to receive testimony, with none received he closed the public hearing. Councilor Scott commented that he was pleased to see the change and having the Board report directly to the Council. Councilor Brouse added that this aligns with the Council's goals. Council President Young referenced text that stated, "two of the Board members shall be members of the Police Advisory Board" and asked what if we could not secure two and further asked if the "shall" can be "may". Police Chief Hanlon added that he did not disagree with the change. Mayor Rosener conferred with the Council and no objections were received to make the amendment. Mayor Rosener asked Mr. Tapia to amend the ordinance and bring it back at the second hearing on May 6, 2025. Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

B. Ordinance 2025-003, Amending Sherwood Municipal Code Chapter 2.08 Creating a Youth Advisory Board

Interim City Attorney Tapia presented a PowerPoint (see record, Exhibit E) and stated it is in the Council interest in creating a new advisory group. He recapped the presentation and summarized the new board as comprised of seven high school-aged students from the Sherwood school district boundary, and did not need to be Sherwood high school students. He recapped the purpose of the Board and stated their terms were two-year staggered terms. He recapped the Board objectives as noted in the presentation. Brief Council discussion followed, and Mr. Tapia confirmed a Council liaison would be assigned. Mayor Rosener opened the public hearing to receive public comments, with none heard, he closed the public hearing. Council President Young referred to language of; "the board shall consist of seven members currently enrolled in grades ninth through twelfth of any school or home school program located within the boundary of the Sherwood School District". She stated she liked the language and asked if it could have a bit more teeth to and provide an example of the police advisory board that list specific member criteria, such as a business owner. She asked for a dedicated spot for students outside of the high school. Councilor Scott asked why should we tie it to any school? Discussion followed and Councilor Scott provided an example of a student in a private school outside of the school district and asked if they would not be eligible. Discussion followed. Councilor Scott added that he did not believe it should be tied to any school district, and said you either live in the city or you don't. Discussion followed. Mayor Rosener clarified and said there is city boundary versus school district boundary and said there was a lot of discussion held about this and his opinion was that it

needed to be the school district boundary and said his other suggestion was if you “lived” within the district. Councilor Young added to not reference school or home school and to have language that referenced the 9-12th grade age bracket and live within the boundary of the school district. Council agreed with the amendment and discussion followed regarding the selection criteria process. Mayor Rosener confirmed Mr. Tapia was clear on the proposed amendments for the next hearing. Council comments were received expressing pleasure with moving forward with the creation of this board. Mayor Rosener added that part of this program is taking kids back to the National League of Cities Congressional Conference.

9. CITY MANAGER REPORT

City Manager Sheldon reported on the upcoming TrashPalooza event, reported the Senior Leadership Team was working on the upcoming 2025-27 budget, and said the budget committee meetings have been rescheduled for May 22, May 29th and June 5th if needed. He reported the Volunteer Recognition was May 13th at the Sherwood Arts Center. He informed the Council that the city closed on a piece of property in the Sherwood West area, 8 acres for a future park. He provided an update on the pedestrian bridge project. He reported on his recent trip with Mayor Rosener to Washington DC seeking funds for the Tannery Site, funds for sewer infrastructure replacement and Sherwood Broadband. Mayor Rosener added that they met with Representative Salinas, Senator Merkley and Senator Wyden’s staff and recapped previous funding received by the city.

10. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilor Scott reported that the Parks Board did not meet this month and provided kudos to staff for closing on the park property. He cautioned with the nice weather to watch for cyclists and pedestrians and reminded these individuals to wear light colored clothing or reflectors. Councilor Brouse reported on her attendance at a recent Chamber of Commerce meeting, a meeting for the Old Town Strategic Plan and their discussions. She reported on Sherwood Main Street events and their work on a Strategic Plan to include a grant application for \$500,000. She confirmed they have not heard back on the grant award. She reported on the Water Consortium Committee meeting and her re-selection of chair to be voted on soon. She reported on the upcoming Cruisin’ Sherwood scheduled for June 21st. Councilor Giles reported that the Planning Commission did not meet and their next meeting is on the 25th. He reported on his recent attendance at the Sherwood School Board meeting, reported that the Sound of Music was performing this Friday and Saturday at the High School as well as next week. He congratulated the students listed on the recent Honor Roll. He mentioned the number of volunteers needed for Cruisin’ and commented regarding a recent Sherwood Chamber event. Council President Young reported on her attendance at a Region 1 Transportation meeting and shared information from that meeting. Mayor Rosener reported that he missed the recent WCCC meeting and reported on the Supportive Housing Service work group meeting and explained the program.

With no further business, Mayor Rosener adjourned the meeting.

11. ADJOURN

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Tim Rosener, Mayor

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Maiya Martin Burbank, Adult Community Center Manager
Through: Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: Resolution 2025-021, Appointing Farrah Burke to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board

Issue:

Should the Council appoint Farrah Burke to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board?

Background:

A vacancy exists on the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board due to resignation in position number 1. The term of office for this vacancy expires June 2027. The City advertised the vacancy and received one (1) application. Farrah Burke submitted an application for consideration of appointment and was interviewed by the interview panel. The interview panel consisting of Board Chair Caz Thomson, City Council Liaison Kieth Mays, and staff liaison Maiya Martin Burbank and unanimously recommended appointment of Farrah Burke to fill the vacancy. The mayor has recommended this appointment to the City Council. In accordance with City Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of City Council by resolution.

Financial Impacts:

There are no financial impacts from this proposed action.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends City Council's adoption of Resolution 2025-021, Appointing Farrah Burke to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board.



RESOLUTION 2025-021

APPOINTING FARRAH BURKE TO THE SHERWOOD SENIOR ADVISORY BOARD

WHEREAS, a vacancy exists on the Senior Advisory Board, position 1, due to resignation; and

WHEREAS, the term of office for this vacancy expires in June 2027; and

WHEREAS, the City advertised the vacancy on the City website, newspaper, social media, and fliers; and

WHEREAS, Farrah Burke applied to be appointed and was interviewed by Board Chair Caz Thomson, Council Liaison Kieth Mays, Staff Liaison Maiya Martin Burbank; and

WHEREAS, the interview panel considered all of the applicants and recommended to the Mayor that Farrah Burke be appointed to fill the vacancy; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor has recommended to Council that Farrah Burke be appointed; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of the City Council by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Sherwood City Council hereby appoints Farrah Burke to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board for a term expiring at the end of June 2027.

Section 2. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council this 6th day of May 2025.

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Agenda Item: Consent Agenda

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Adrienne Doman Calkins, Library Manager

Through: Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: Resolution 2025-022, Reappointing Sean Garland to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board

Issue:

Should the City Council reappoint Sean Garland to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board?

Background:

Sean Garland served a partial term in position 7, with a term expiration of June 2025. Sean is seeking reappointment. Sean also currently serves as the Chair of the Library Advisory Board.

The Library Manager Adrienne Doman Calkins and City Council Liaison Dan Standke recommended to Mayor Rosener that Sean should be reappointed to fill position 7 on the Library Advisory Board, with the expiration of June 2029. Library Advisory Board member terms are for four years, per the municipal code and ORS 357.465. The mayor has recommended this appointment to Council. In accordance with City Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of City Council by resolution.

Financial Impacts:

There are no financial impacts from this proposed action.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends City Council's adoption of Resolution 2025-022, reappointing Sean Garland to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board.



RESOLUTION 2025-022

REAPPOINTING SEAN GARLAND TO THE SHERWOOD LIBRARY ADVISORY BOARD

WHEREAS, Sean Garland currently holds position 7 on the Library Advisory Board and is the current Chair; and

WHEREAS, the term of office for this vacancy expires June 30, 2025, and Sean Garland is seeking reappointment; and

WHEREAS, the staff liaison and City Council Liaison recommended to the mayor that Sean Garland be reappointed; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor has recommended to City Council that Sean Garland be reappointed; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of the City Council by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Sherwood City Council hereby reappoints Sean Garland to position 7 of the Sherwood Library Advisory Board for a term expiring at the end of June 2029.

Section 2. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council this 6th day of May 2025.

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Joy Chang, TSP Update Project Manager

Through: Craig Sheldon, City Manager, Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney

SUBJECT: **Resolution 2025-023, Forming and appointing the members of a Citizen Advisory Committee and a Technical Advisory Committee for the Transportation System Plan Update**

Issue:

Shall City Council approve the establishment of, and appointment of members to, a Citizen Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee for the Transportation System Plan Update?

Background:

The City of Sherwood is initiating a comprehensive update to its Transportation System Plan (TSP) to address the City's evolving transportation needs, account for future growth, reflect new state and regional transportation goals, and incorporate emerging transportation technologies and best practices.

Community involvement and interagency collaboration are critical to the success of the TSP Update. Best practices in transportation planning emphasize the importance of incorporating both resident perspectives and technical expertise throughout the process.

To ensure a robust and inclusive planning process, staff recommends the establishment of two advisory bodies:

- A Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to provide input from a broad cross-section of the community; and
- A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) composed of representatives from key agency partners to provide technical expertise and interagency coordination.

Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC):

The CAC will serve as a public forum for reviewing draft materials, identifying community priorities, and making recommendations to City staff, consultants, and the City Council. Members have been selected to ensure diversity of backgrounds, transportation modes, and neighborhoods. The CAC will meet periodically throughout the TSP Update process.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):

The TAC will consist of staff from regional and state agencies and City departments with a role in transportation planning, funding, and project delivery. The TAC will provide technical review, ensure interagency coordination, and advise on the feasibility and implementation of proposed strategies. Both the CAC and TAC will operate in an advisory capacity only and will not have decision-making authority.

The City of Sherwood solicited CAC applications from interested citizens over the course of three weeks in February and March. The City posted a request for CAC applications on the City website and City social media platforms, posting public notice of the recruitment in five different locations throughout the city, and announced the opportunity to all City boards and commissions. City staff reached out to agency representatives with technical expertise in relevant areas to fill the TAC members.

City staff will provide administrative and technical support to both committees. Meetings of the CAC will be open to the public and subject to public meeting laws; TAC meetings may be conducted pursuant to interagency coordination protocols.

Financial Impacts:

There are no additional financial impacts as a result of approval of this resolution.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends City Council approval of Resolution 2025-023, forming and appointing the members of a Citizen Advisory Committee and a Technical Advisory Committee for the Transportation System Plan Update.



RESOLUTION 2025-023

FORMING AND APPOINTING THE MEMBERS OF A CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND A TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

WHEREAS, the City of Sherwood recognizes the importance of maintaining and improving a safe, efficient, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, and motorists; and

WHEREAS, the City is undertaking a comprehensive update to its Transportation System Plan (TSP) to reflect current and future needs, population growth, land use changes, and evolving transportation technologies and priorities; and

WHEREAS, public input is essential to ensuring that the updated Transportation System Plan reflects the values, priorities, and lived experiences of community members; and

WHEREAS, a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) can provide a vital link between the City, its residents, and stakeholder groups by offering guidance, feedback, and recommendations throughout the transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the CAC will reflect a diverse cross-section of the community, representing a broad range of geographic areas, demographics, travel modes, and transportation concerns; and

WHEREAS, technical input and interagency coordination are also essential to the success of the Transportation System Plan update; and

WHEREAS, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), composed of representatives from local, regional, and state agencies, will provide subject-matter expertise, ensure coordination across jurisdictions, and support the development of technically sound and implementable strategies; and

WHEREAS, the formation of both a CAC and a TAC aligns with the City's goals of transparency, collaboration, and inclusive, data-informed decision-making; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that establishing these advisory committees is in the public's interest and will contribute to a more inclusive, informed, and effective Transportation System Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, staff has recommended to Council the appointments outlined in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Council Rules, all such appointments are subject to the approval of the City Council by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) is hereby established. The TSP Update CAC shall provide community-based input and recommendations to City staff, consultants, and the City Council throughout the planning process. The TSP Update CAC shall be comprised of up to 15 people who need not be City residents except as specified below. The City shall strive to recruit and maintain a diverse cross-section of the community from the following groups:

- City residents
- Sherwood Planning Area residents (e.g. Sherwood West, Brookman)
- Planning Commission
- City Council
- Traffic Safety Board
- Youth Advisory Board
- Senior Advisory Board
- Sherwood School District

Section 2. Members of the TSP Update CAC shall serve on a voluntary basis and commit to attending regular meetings, reviewing materials, and providing constructive input throughout the duration of the Transportation System Plan update process.

Section 3. The Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is hereby established. The TSP Update TAC will review project materials and advise on technical issues throughout the project. The TSP Update TAC will be comprised of up to 18 people who need not be City residents. The City shall strive to recruit and maintain membership in the TSP Update TAC from the following groups:

- Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
- Washington County
- Clackamas County
- Metro
- Tri-Met
- Department of Land Conservation & Development
- City of Tualatin
- City of King City
- City of Tigard
- Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R)
- Portland & Western Railroad
- City Staff

Section 4. The TSP Update TAC shall provide technical guidance, ensure interagency coordination, and support the development of technically sound recommendations and implementation strategies for the Transportation System Plan.

Section 5. Both the TSP Update CAC and TAC shall serve in an advisory capacity only and shall not have decision-making authority.

Section 6. City staff shall provide administrative and technical support to both advisory committees. Meetings of the TSP Update CAC shall be open to the public and subject to applicable public meeting laws. The TSP Update TAC meetings may be conducted in accordance with interagency coordination protocols.

Section 7. The TSP Update CAC and TAC appointments described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, are hereby approved.

Section 8. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council this 6th day of May, 2025.

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Exhibit A

Citizen Advisory Committee Transportation System Plan Update	
Participants	Name
City resident at large	Alexander Whitaker
City resident at large	Lisa Patterson
City resident at large	James Booker
City resident at large	Shauna ONeil
Sherwood West resident at large	Hella Betts
Sherwood School District	Brady Strutz
Sherwood Traffic Safety Board	Jason Wuertz
Sherwood Planning Commissioner	Tyler Barnes
Sherwood City Councilor	To Be Determined (TBD)
Sherwood Mayor	Tim Rosener
Sherwood Youth Advisory Board	TBD
Sherwood Senior Advisory Board	TBD

TAC Roster Transportation System Plan	
Agency	Name
Sherwood Engineering	Jason Waters
Sherwood Public Works	Rich Sattler
Sherwood Community Services	Kristen Switzer
Sherwood Planning	Sean Conrad
Sherwood Police Department	Kris Asla
Washington County Land Use/Transportation	CJ Doxsee
Clackamas County	Jeff Owen
ODOT, Region 1	Glen Bolen / Melissa Gonzales-Gabriel
ODOT, Region 2	Brandon Williams
Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R)	Jason Arn
City of Tualatin Representative	Steve Koper
City of Tigard Representative	Tiffany Genrke
City of King City representatives	Mike Weston / Max Carter
Department of Land Conservation and Development	Laura Kelley
Tri-Met	Alex Page
Metro	André Lightsey-Walker
Portland & Western Railroad	TBD

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: David Bodway, Finance Director

Through: Craig Sheldon, City Manager and Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney

SUBJECT: Resolution 2025-024, Reappointing Matthew Kaufman to the Sherwood Budget Committee

Issue:

Shall the City Council reappoint Matthew Kaufman to the Sherwood Budget Committee?

Background:

A vacancy exists in Position 3 on the Sherwood Budget Committee. Matthew Kaufman has requested reappointment to the committee. The mayor has recommended this reappointment to Council. In accordance with City Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of City Council by resolution.

Note: Position numbers were established with the adoption of Resolution 2019-066 for the purpose of managing terms.

Financial Impacts:

There are no additional financial impacts as a result of approval of this resolution.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends City Council approval of Resolution 2025-024, reappointing Matthew Kaufman to the Sherwood Budget Committee.



RESOLUTION 2025-024

REAPPOINTING MATTHEW KAUFMAN TO THE SHERWOOD BUDGET COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, a vacancy exists within Position 3 on the Sherwood Budget Committee; and

WHEREAS, Matthew Kaufman has requested reappointment; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor has recommended to the City Council that Matthew Kaufman be reappointed; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of the City Council by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Sherwood City Council hereby reappoints Matthew Kaufman to Position 3 of the Sherwood Budget Committee for a term expiring at the end of June 2028.

Section 2. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council this 6th day of May, 2025.

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Agenda Item: Consent Agenda

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Jared Bradbury, Building Official
Through: Eric Rutledge, Community Development Director, Craig Sheldon, City Manager and Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney

SUBJECT: **Resolution 2025-025, Authorizing the City Manager to sign a One-Year Extension to the On-Call Building Plan Review and Inspection Services Contract with Clair Company**

Issue:

Shall the City Council authorize the City Manager to sign a one-year extension to the contract with Clair Company for on-call building plan review and inspection services?

Background:

In 2019, the City went through a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) for a 3-year contract for building plan review and inspection services. Clair Company was selected as the City's on-call firm, along with New World Plan Review LLC which is no longer in business. Council authorized one-year extensions of the contract since 2022 with the most current contract (authorized by Resolution 2024-028) expiring on May 21, 2025. Staff is proposing to extend their contract by an additional year until May 21, 2026. The Building Department has hired a Building Official who is qualified to conduct A-Level Structural and Fire Life Safety Reviews which is expected to reduce the amount of plans being routed to a third party. For this reason and to ensure the most competitive rates, it is likely staff will release an RFP for a new multi-year contract in summer or fall 2025.

Financial Impacts:

There are no immediate financial impacts associated with entering into on-call services contracts. As services are needed, fees associated with these services will be paid from a percentage of the building permit and plan review fees that are collected at the time of building permit application. The 2025-2027 budget includes funding for this service.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends City Council approval of Resolution 2025-025, Authorizing the City Manager to sign a one-year extension to the on-call building plan review and inspection services contract with Clair Company.

Attachments:

- A. Scope of Work
- B. Fee Schedule

Scope of Work

Consultant will serve, as needed, for building plan review and/or building inspection services for City at City's direction. These services may involve building, fire/life/safety, mechanical, fire sprinkler/alarm, and other associated plan review of commercial projects, on-site building inspections, and coordination with City, permit applicants, and project design professionals as needed.

~~Scott McKie~~, Building Official, will authorize specific projects through work orders with requisite approvals from the Sherwood Community Development Director or the Sherwood City Manager as necessary. City will determine the scope of specific projects on a case-by-case basis.

When an on-call need arises, City will contact the firm best matching City's needs based on the firms review time-line and qualifications. In the event that there are multiple qualified firms, the City will evaluate each project and determine which consultant will best meet the need, and issue a work order for the specified work.

Clair Company, Inc. – Rates (2025)

Clair proposes to provide inspection and plan review services based on the following schedule. We are happy to discuss other cost models which can be negotiated if desired by the City.

Inspections

We propose to provide inspection services on a time and materials basis, from our Corvallis office, with a 2-hour minimum.

Plan Review

Plan review services can be provided under a variety of cost models. Following the cost model that works best for most of our jurisdictional clients, we propose to offer plan review services for 65% of the plan review fees collected by the City for scopes of work assigned to Clair. The City would retain the remaining 35% of the plan review fees, and 100% of the permit fees. Clair charges for time and materials associated with plan reviews beyond first back check, review of construction document revisions, and deferred submittals. Typically, these fees will be billed to the City as a pass-through cost to the applicant to be paid at time of document pickup, and payable to the City for payment to Clair.

Services included in “in-scope plan review services” are as follows.

- Plan review services provided by certified plans examiners and technical support through first back check
- Administrative services for document control, etc. related to services listed above
- Accounting services including invoicing and cost tracking, and individual permit budget management
- Project management including overview of staff assignments, scheduling, and budget management
- Direct communication with project owner, permit applicant, design professional, contractor, other stakeholder agencies and City personnel
- Pickup and delivery of plans back to the City is included in the rates billed by Clair

Our proposed fee schedule for time and materials services, such as inspections and reviews beyond the first back check, is presented below. We are open to further review and refinement of certain rates and fees, as necessary to accommodate specific client needs or project conditions.

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Base Rate</u>
Project Manager / Program Administrator Support	\$ 125.00 / hr.
Residential Plans Examiner / Technical Support	\$ 95.00 / hr.
Commercial Plans Examiner / Technical Support	\$100.00 / hr.
Licensed Engineer / Structural Technical Support	\$120.00 / hr.
Inspector (all residential, commercial building/mech)	\$ 97.00 / hr.
Commercial Inspector (Electrical / Plumbing)	\$105.00 / hr.
Project Administration / Document Control	\$ 65.00 / hr.
Overtime, if applicable	1.5 x Base Rate
Direct overhead for Supplies and Services	Cost
Mileage	Current IRS Mileage Rate



Clair Company, Inc. – Rates (2025)

Our inspection cost rates have been updated to offset portal to portal travel costs for inspection assignments. We are happy to discuss a reduction in hourly rates associated with these services if the City chooses to negotiate travel cost reimbursement.

Clair is available to start work as soon as a contract is executed. We understand the work schedule for the required services will be the City's normal business hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Hours outside of this time may be needed for rare situations. The City will give notice of anticipated needs prior to 5:00 p.m. the prior business day, unless it is unavoidable due to unforeseen circumstances. We understand the City will pay a minimum of two (2) hours for any scheduled inspection work assignment and 15-minute increments over two (2) hours. City will pay a minimum of one (1) hour for any scheduled plan review.

We understand a City vehicle may be provided for inspections. If a vehicle is not available, the City will pay the current IRS mileage rate as defined at www.gsa.org for use of private or Clair vehicles. Travel within city limits will be capped at 22 miles per day per inspector. Daily mileage to and from portal locations will be negotiated and capped.





RESOLUTION 2025-025

**AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SIGN A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION TO THE ON-CALL
BUILDING PLAN REVIEW AND INSPECTION SERVICE CONTRACT
WITH CLAIR COMPANY**

WHEREAS, in 2019, the City conducted a formal request for proposals ("RFP") process and selected Clair Company for on-call building plan review and inspection services; and

WHEREAS, the RFP permits one-year extensions to the contract after the initial three year term; and

WHEREAS, since 2022, three one-year extensions to the contract have been granted, most recently via Resolution 2024-028; and

WHEREAS, Clair Company has provided timely and thorough plan reviews which has helped the City in achieving its economic development goals; and

WHEREAS, an additional one-year extension to the contract will ensure that there is no gap in service which could impact the City's ability to provide timely building permit reviews.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council accepts the Building Official's recommendation to extend the contract with Clair Company, Inc., for an additional year.

Section 2. The City Manager is hereby authorized to sign a one-year extension to the existing contract.

Section 3. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council this 6th day of May 2025.

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Agenda Item: Public Hearing (*Second Hearing*)

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney

SUBJECT: Ordinance 2025-002, Changing the Traffic Safety Committee to a Board and Amending Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.087

Issue:

Shall the City Council amend Sherwood's code to change the Traffic Safety Committee to the Traffic Safety Board?

Background:

Council met on December 17, 2024 in a work session with the Traffic Safety Committee to express support for the work that the committee does and to invite the committee to consider projects and recommendations that have an even larger scope than what is currently being considered. Council expressed interest in further empowering the committee.

The Traffic Safety Committee has operated under the administrative structure of the Sherwood Police Advisory Board. Although a council liaison is appointed to all city boards and commissions, the same has not been true for all committees. A council liaison acts as a direct line of communication with the Council by way of councilor announcements at the end of each public meeting. Because the Traffic Safety Committee has not been able to function separately from the Police Advisory Board and because the committee has not been assigned a council liaison, this proposed change would provide the tools needed for future growth. The proposed changes to the municipal code are attached to this staff report as Exhibit A.

Although other city boards and commissions are comprised of nine voting members, the Traffic Safety Committee has been effectively performing its duties with seven members. There is no legal requirement that a city board or commission must have nine members.

Financial Impacts:

There are no expected financial impacts with the adoption of this ordinance, other than the cost of codification.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends the City Council hold a public hearing for Ordinance 2025-002, Changing the Traffic Safety Committee to a Board and amending Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.087.

2.08.087 Traffic safety ~~committee~~board.

A. Purpose. The Sherwood Traffic Safety ~~Committee Board~~ is hereby established for the purpose of promoting traffic safety through investigation, study, and analysis of traffic safety programs; educating the community regarding traffic safety; reviewing and responding to traffic safety complaints; and advising the city council and city manager on traffic safety related issues.

B. Composition.

1. The committee shall consist of seven members.

2. ~~Up to~~ ~~Two~~ of the ~~committee board~~ members ~~shall~~ ~~may~~ be members of the police advisory board, selected by the police advisory board each year for one-year terms at the same time and in the same manner as the chair and vice-chair of the police advisory board.

3. The remaining five ~~committee board~~ members shall be Sherwood residents selected in accordance with this chapter.

C. Duties and responsibilities. The ~~committee board~~ shall:

1. Receive complaints from the community regarding traffic safety concerns in the city.

2. Investigate and review each complaint and consult with city staff and outside agencies as the ~~committee board~~ deems necessary in connection with its review.

3. Make recommendations, as the ~~committee board~~ deems necessary and appropriate, regarding solutions to complaints received. Recommendations shall be made to the person(s) with the authority to implement the recommended solution (e.g. police chief, city manager, city council).

4. Provide a response to each person who submits a traffic safety complaint to the ~~committee board~~.

~~5. In response to requests from the city manager or the city council, provide review and recommendations regarding other traffic safety related issues.~~

~~56.~~ Educate the community regarding traffic safety.

~~6. Undertake additional responsibilities relative to traffic safety as may be designated by the city council or request by the city administration.~~



ORDINANCE 2025-002

CHANGING THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE TO A BOARD AND AMENDING SHERWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE 2.08.087

WHEREAS, the Traffic Safety Committee serves an important safety function and provides a direct service to the citizens of Sherwood; and

WHEREAS, the Traffic Safety Committee has not had direct access to city council, as it is currently organized as a subdivision of the Police Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, if the Traffic Safety Committee were changed to a board, a council liaison would be appointed to serve as a non-voting member, as required by SMC 2.08.045(A); and

WHEREAS, council liaisons serve as a direct line of communication between citizen boards and the city council at public meetings;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.087, shall be amended as indicated in the attached Exhibit 1.

Section 2. **Effective Date:** This ordinance shall become effective July 1, 2025.

Duly passed by the City Council on May 6, 2025.

Attest:

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Date

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Giles	_____	_____
Scott	_____	_____
Mays	_____	_____
Standke	_____	_____
Brouse	_____	_____
Young	_____	_____
Rosener	_____	_____

AMENDMENT OF EXISTING CODE

2.08.087 Traffic safety board.

- A. Purpose. The Sherwood Traffic Safety Board is hereby established for the purpose of promoting traffic safety through investigation, study, and analysis of traffic safety programs; educating the community regarding traffic safety; reviewing and responding to traffic safety complaints; and advising the city council and city manager on traffic safety related issues.
- B. Composition.
1. The board shall consist of seven members.
 2. Up to two of the board members may be members of the police advisory board, selected by the police advisory board each year for one-year terms at the same time and in the same manner as the chair and vice-chair of the police advisory board.
 3. The remaining five board members shall be Sherwood residents selected in accordance with this chapter.
- C. Duties and responsibilities. The board shall:
1. Receive complaints from the community regarding traffic safety concerns in the city.
 2. Investigate and review each complaint and consult with city staff and outside agencies as the board deems necessary in connection with its review.
 3. Make recommendations, as the board deems necessary and appropriate, regarding solutions to complaints received. Recommendations shall be made to the person(s) with the authority to implement the recommended solution (e.g. police chief, city manager, city council).
 4. Provide a response to each person who submits a traffic safety complaint to the board.
 5. Educate the community regarding traffic safety.
 6. Undertake additional responsibilities relative to traffic safety as may be designated by the city council or request by the city administration.

Agenda Item: Public Hearing (*Second Hearing*)

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Sebastian Tapia, Interim City Attorney

**SUBJECT: Ordinance 2025-003, Amending Sherwood Municipal Code Chapter 2.08
Creating a Youth Advisory Board**

Issue:

Shall the City Council establish the Sherwood Youth Advisory Board as a City advisory board?

Background:

Sherwood City Council met for a Work Session on February 4, 2025 to discuss the creation of the Sherwood Youth Advisory Council (YAC), a proposed advisory group designed to give young residents a meaningful voice in local government and community projects.

The YAC was envisioned as a group of young advisors actively involved in city initiatives, providing input on issues that affect youth and collaborating with elected officials to shape policies for their generation. The group would engage in community projects, act as ambassadors for youth issues, and promote civic participation among peers.

This group would offer a direct platform for young voices in decision-making, increase awareness of youth issues in Sherwood, and foster volunteerism and leadership skills among its members.

Its objectives include:

- Promoting community projects to highlight youth issues
- Offering input on policies and programs affecting young residents
- Collaborating with city leaders and community organizations to boost civic engagement
- Developing future leaders committed to civic responsibility

Structurally, the Board will be comprised of seven members who will serve two-year terms, with monthly meetings suggested from September through June to set priorities for each academic year.

The Board is expected to drive a range of projects, with examples including organizing a Drug Take-Back Program, teen driver safety events, and citywide cleanups. Members will also have opportunities to tour city facilities, attend City Day at the State Capitol, and participate in events such as the Oregon Youth Summit and Sherwood's major community gatherings.

The establishment of this group is consistent with Council Goals, Pillar IV: Public Safety - to enhance the safety and security of Sherwood youth, as well as Pillar VI: Citizen Engagement - to engage youth in local government.

As proposed here, the group would be organized as a board, and pursuant to Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.045 would have a council member assigned as a council liaison. This would further Council's goal of providing this group a meaningful voice in local government and community projects.

Financial Impacts: There are no expected financial impacts with the adoption of this ordinance, other than the cost of codification.

Recommendation: Staff respectfully recommend the City Council hold a public hearing for Ordinance 2025-003, Amending Sherwood Municipal Code Chapter 2.08 Creating a Youth Advisory Board.



ORDINANCE 2025-003

AMENDING SHERWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 2.08 CREATING A YOUTH ADVISORY BOARD

WHEREAS, the Sherwood City Council met in a work session on February 4, 2025 to discuss the creation of a Youth Advisory Council; and

WHEREAS, the Sherwood City Council expressed an interest in giving young residents a meaningful voice in local government and community projects; and

WHEREAS, if the group were organized as a board, a council liaison would be appointed to serve as a non-voting member, as required by SMC 2.08.045(A), which will ensure that the perspective of the group is heard at the council level;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. After full and due consideration of the information presented at the public hearings, the City Council finds that a new code provision will be added as 2.08.095 as indicated in the attached Exhibit 1.

Section 2. This ordinance shall become effective on the 30th day after its enactment by the City Council and approval by the Mayor.

Duly passed by the City Council on May 6th, 2025.

Attest: _____
Tim Rosener, Mayor

_____ Date

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Giles	_____	_____
Scott	_____	_____
Mays	_____	_____
Standke	_____	_____
Brouse	_____	_____
Young	_____	_____
Rosener	_____	_____

NEW CODE PROVISION

2.08.095 Youth advisory board

- A. Purpose. The Sherwood Youth Advisory Board is hereby established for the purpose of educating, engaging and empowering young residents by providing a platform for meaningful involvement in local government and community initiatives.
- B. Composition. The Board shall consist of seven members who are enrolled in grades ninth to twelfth and are either Sherwood residents or attend school within the boundary of the Sherwood School District.
- C. Term of Office. For the first year following the formation of the Youth Advisory Board, the term of office for four members of the Youth advisory board shall be one year and the remaining three members shall be two years. For all subsequent appointments, the term of office will be two years.
- D. Duties and responsibilities. The Board shall:
1. Actively engage in city initiatives by providing input to the city on policies and programs affecting youth residents. Collaborate with city leaders and community organizations to boost civil engagement
 2. Serve as ambassadors for youth issues by promoting civic participation and encouraging peers to engage in local government and volunteer opportunities. Attend leadership events and other civic gatherings.
 3. Assist the city council and city administration in creating public policy on youth safety, transportation, health and wellness, and other needs.
 4. Regularly review, and advise the city council and city administration on specific programs and policies relative to youth services goals and objectives, including setting annual priorities and determining projects based on community needs.
 5. Establish and maintain coordinated and cooperative working relationships between residents, the business community, faith community, senior population, schools, other agencies, and the city government.
 6. Undertake additional responsibilities relative to youth services as may be designated by the city council or request by the city administration.