

**SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**  
**22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or**  
**January 17, 2023**

**WORK SESSION**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener (left at 6:50 pm), Councilors Kim Young, Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, and Dan Standke. Council President Keith Mays participated remotely.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, IT Director Brad Crawford, Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman, Program Analyst Kathy McWilliams, Senior Planner Joy Chang, Interim City Attorney Alan Rappleyea, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Lead Utility Billing Technician Sarah Lopez, Records Technician Katie Corgan, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
4. **TOPICS:**

**A. Sherwood Concept Plan Re-Look Update**

Planning Manager Erika Palmer presented the "Sherwood West Concept Plan Update" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit A) and provided an overview of the presentation. Mayor Rosener clarified that the Sherwood West Concept Plan was a required step for both Metro and the State, which required cities to plan for what an area could look like in the future. He stated that the Concept Plan was not a plan to start building immediately and commented that the city was many years away from that stage. He reported that the city had already completed a Sherwood West Concept Plan in 2016, and Council had determined that the plan was too focused on residential and asked that staff revise and improve the plan. He continued that concept plans were created to help inform future planning. Ms. Palmer provided background on the project and explained that the current Preliminary Concept Plan was accepted by Council via Resolution 2016-009 and focused primarily on housing; supporting local employment uses; and parks, open spaces, and public land. She explained that it was intended to inform future decision-making, but it did not provide concept plan level specificity. She outlined that the 2016 preliminary plan did not fully meet all the Metro Title 11 concept plan requirements, whereas the new Sherwood West Concept Plan will meet those requirements if Council asks for a UGB expansion. Councilor Young asked if the Preliminary Concept Plan did not meet the Title 11 requirements because those requirements were added after the Preliminary Concept Plan was completed? Ms. Palmer replied that the Title 11 requirements were in place in 2016. She stated that the Sherwood West Concept Plan Re-Look would reflect both the community's and the city's vision for Sherwood's future growth and would address new opportunities for employment and economic growth, new land use and growth patterns, new and updated transportation plans, and new State rules related to housing. She recapped that the Sherwood West Re-Look Project began in spring 2021 and staff had anticipated that the project



would have been completed by the early fall 2022, but the CAC had raised important questions that needed to be addressed before the project could move forward. Mayor Rosener commented that the goals and mandates of HB 2001 had also made the project more complicated. Planning Manager Palmer reported that Sherwood West had a total area of 1,291 acres, 126 properties, 110 property owners, and an average property size of 9.8 acres. She recapped that CAC meetings 1-5 had addressed: the vision, goals, and evaluation criteria; the Public Engagement Plan; economic opportunities and challenges; development trends; a review of housing policy implications; transportation; and an online open house survey and review of received feedback. She clarified that the TAC was comprised of city partners from different agencies and the CAC was comprised of 15 Sherwood residents and residents who lived in Sherwood West. She reported that they had conducted over 20 stakeholder interviews that included local wineries, healthcare representatives, and business park developers to determine what the development trends were. Ms. Palmer outlined the six plan concepts for Sherwood West as: Mixed Employment Areas, Chicken Creek Greenway, Active Transportation, Neighborhood Form, Street Connectivity, and Elwert Road Design Concept. She recapped that meetings 6-11 focused on creating a buildable lands inventory to determine a baseline of net buildable acres within the plan area. She explained that this allowed them to conceptualize those acres into different land use designations for different population densities. After that, they completed an analysis of the Housing Metrics Based on Middle Housing Assumptions of 10%, 15%, and 20%. She commented that this was the first concept plan in the Metro region since HB 2001, and staff felt it was important to determine what impacts HB 2001 could have on the area. Mayor Rosener provided informational background on HB 2001. Planning Manager Palmer commented that the CAC had been very innovative in their plan designations and stated that they had a plan designation for middle housing and cottage cluster housing. She explained that creating individualized zones solely for middle housing or cottage clusters allowed cities to develop their own Development Code for those zones which provided cities more options to address missing middle housing. She outlined that CAC meetings 6-11 reviewed a proposed north/south connector road, a review of the jobs-to-housing ratio, a review of the available Master Planning tools for residential and mixed-use areas, trails and open spaces, and a land use alternative mapping activity at an in person and online open house. Councilor Young asked if Ms. Palmer felt that the open house had a good mix of current Sherwood residents and Sherwood West residents? Ms. Palmer replied that there was a good cross-section of participants both in person and online. Council President Mays asked for further clarification on what Ms. Palmer meant by a "good balance" of participants and asked for a specific number. Planning Manager Palmer replied that she did not have that figure available to her at the moment, but she would provide Council with that information after the meeting. She recapped that after the open house, they provided a tour of Sherwood West to developers and informed them of what the CAC had in mind for the area. She provided an overview of the received feedback from the in-person and online open houses. She reported that there was support for additional employment uses in Sherwood West, particularly in the northern area and additional employment uses along Highway 99W, including the Hospitality Zone. She reported that open house feedback also included a desire for a balance of uses, there was continued support of open spaces and connections to trails, and there was large support for Cottage Cluster housing types. Councilor Giles asked if there were different types of cottage clusters that offered different sizes? Discussion occurred regarding the need to be careful when creating flexibility in the Development Code because developers would typically build as large as they could to make the most money. Ms. Palmer outlined that the residents of the Eastview neighborhood did not support the idea of a north/south connector road. She provided an overview of the concept plan maps on pages 15-18 of the presentation and noted that two changes had been made to the map on page 16 of the presentation since it had been emailed to Council previously. She stated that the northern area of Sherwood West would be focused on employment and would have a mix of housing north of Chicken Creek. Planning Manager Palmer stated that at the most recent CAC meeting, the two changes to the map noted earlier were made. She explained that at the November CAC meeting, some residents had expressed an interest in creating a



residential buffer in the upper left corner of the northern section of Sherwood West. She said that the CAC and TAC had reviewed the suggestion and determined that employment uses had less impacts than residential neighborhoods, and the CAC recommended that the area delineated for middle housing be changed back to employment use. She explained their reasoning was that there were minimal impacts to residential uses when industrial uses were adjacent to each other and noted that there would be a large buffer area within the Development Code to further lessen those impacts. Mayor Rosener noted that the term "industrial" did not fully reflect what that area would be used for, and Economic Development Manager Coleman commented that the term "technology park" or "innovation park" were more appropriate terms. Councilor Young asked how having the two abutting uses would have less of an impact on residents? Councilor Scott commented that the abutting residential properties were more farm-like than typical residential and explained that if it remained an employment area, there would be additional buffer because there would be parking spaces, trees, fencing, etc. He commented that it would be much less impactful compared to having 50 houses with 100 cars and traffic if it were middle housing instead. Economic Development Manager Coleman noted that keeping the area zoned for employment would also result in less residents complaining to the city about the potential impacts from abutting an industrial zone. Community Development Director Rutledge added that it was also common for residents to complain when farm uses were adjacent to residential and commented that the thought was that farmland was more compatible with employment land. Councilor Scott added that the CAC was also concerned about if the residential pocket was maintained, it was somewhat "orphaned" from other services such as city parks. Council President Mays stated that he agreed with the decision to remove the residential pocket from the area. Councilor Giles asked if the employment area would also include restaurants and lunch places to help offset the need for the employees of that area to leave for lunch? Council President Mays commented that the land that was designated as a potential middle housing area could do mixed use instead to provide restaurant and shopping options for that area. Planning Manager Palmer outlined that the park that was in the south portion of the northern section of the map on page 16 had been changed to medium-density residential. She explained that the medium-density residential area in the southwest corner of the northern section of the map would now be a park. She explained that the switch occurred because the area that was originally designated as a park was close to water and sewer services, and it made more sense to make that area residential. Councilor Young asked what specifically was meant by "buffers" when it came to the employment area to the north? Ms. Palmer replied that buffers typically referred to setbacks for employment uses. Councilor Young asked if that was already in the city's Development Code? Ms. Palmer replied that it would need to be added along with many other things in order to implement the Sherwood West Concept Plan. She addressed the middle section of the map on page 16 and explained that the far west district was the lowest density area of Sherwood West and stated that some cottage clusters would be located in this area, along with two neighborhood parks. She stated that the west sub-area of the middle section of the map would have a 15-20 acre community park, mixed use and middle housing to the west of the high school, a mixture of cottage clusters and middle-density housing along SW Elwert Road, and lower-density housing in the hillier southwest corner of the middle portion of the map. Ms. Palmer noted that both the large community park in the middle portion of the map and the park in the northern portion of the map would integrate with the Chicken Creek greenway. Discussion regarding the future parks occurred and Councilor Scott commented that the city still needed to purchase the land for those parks, so their exact locations may change. Planning Manager Palmer addressed the southwest district of the map on page 16 and explained that a Hospitality Zone would be located in this area and explained that potential uses included wine uses and hotel uses. She recapped that mixed use and multifamily would be located in the zone south of Kruger and north of Chapman, a mix of housing and lower-density would be located in the hilltops, and some multi-family and small commercial would be located along Highway 99W. Council President Mays asked if it were possible to move away from "medium," "high," or "low" density zoning qualifiers and instead use lot sizes? He explained that the city did not control what the density would be, the city could only control the lot sizes. Ms. Palmer replied that once the land was brought into the UGB,



another comprehensive planning process would occur that would reflect zoning on every parcel, with every residential parcel having its own lot size. Council President Mays commented that overall, he liked the plan and asked that more employment uses be added to the plan as it was further refined. Ms. Palmer provided an overview of the trails, parks, and open space map on page 17 of the presentation. She noted that all of the trails were very interconnected and integrated with the existing boundaries of Sherwood as well as the wildlife refuge. Mayor Rosener commented he appreciated that there were trails on both sides of the Chicken Creek greenway. Ms. Palmer provided an overview of the streets map on page 18 of the presentation and explained that both concepts from the 2016 Preliminary Concept Plan were carried over, which included rerouting Elwert with two roundabouts and leaving Elwert Road as a straight road. She clarified that additional studies would be needed to determine which Elwert alignment was best for the city. She outlined that the CAC and the TAC had put in a north/south connector road and explained that the connector road would be shown in the final Concept Plan, but it would also have its own separate map within the plan. She explained that this was done to provide more context on how it was a conceptual road, and the best and final alignment was to be determined at a later date. Mayor Rosener explained the intent of the north/south connector road and stated that Yamhill County was experiencing huge population growth, which resulted in more people using Highway 99W and Elwert Road to commute to work. He continued that there was still a lot of work to do, but the city needed to "get a conceptual pin in the map" as the city began its conversations with the County and Metro. He asked that the proposed connector road shown in the "Future" map on page 20 of the presentation be expanded to Scholls-Sherwood Road because that demonstrated the actual purpose of the road, to connect those two areas. Ms. Palmer addressed the Planned Area Streets and explained that all streets would be upgraded to comply with city urban standards and Scholls-Sherwood Road, Elwert Road, Edy Road (east of Elwert), and Chapman Road would have one travel lane in each direction with center turn lanes. She noted that the pedestrian overcrossing near Sunset, the grade separated north of Brookman-Chapman Road, Elwert Road Re-alignment, and the North-south connector road were also included in the Planned Area Streets Map. She remarked that the Elwert Road Re-alignment concept needed to be refined and the North-south connector road needed to be studied further. Ms. Palmer recapped the transportation recommendations for Sherwood West as: adopt a design concept for Elwert Road for 3-lane arterial with bike lanes and sidewalks, further study for the re-alignment of Elwert Road in order to pick best route and layout, upgrade Edy Road from Elwert Road to Borchers Drive as 3-lane collector, upgrade Scholls-Sherwood Road to 3-lane arterial as development occurred, upgrade Edy Road west of Chicken Creek to 2-lane collector, and keep the north-south connector in the plan as a concept for future study. She addressed the employment and housing metrics for the relook and explained that they calculated the jobs metrics by taking the total acreage of all the land use and planned land use designations, provided them each with an estimated jobs per acre, with the results being the total jobs figure. She explained that the Jobs-Housing ratio was between 1.4 and 1.2 depending on the percentage of middle housing that was created. She stated that anything above a 1.0 for a Jobs-Housing ratio was very good. She addressed housing metrics on page 25 of the presentation and explained that they took all the residential designations for residential housing, including the total amount of acres in each, and they estimated the density range for each middle housing percentage scenario. She provided an overview of the figures and commented that the Sherwood West Concept Plan Re-Look was heavily focused on open space and trails and noted that almost 50% of the area was designated as parks and open spaces. She recapped the next steps and timeline and reported that the TAC and CAC would meet in February and March, public hearings on the Concept Plan would occur in the spring, after which the CAC would make a recommendation to the Planning Commission, who would then give a recommendation to Council. She outlined the timeline for a UGB expansion proposal on page 28 of the presentation. Council President Mays commented that he like more jobs to be added to the area, but he generally supported the plan. He commented that he liked the parks, open spaces, and the Hospitality Zone.



## **B. Sherwood Utility Billing Update**

Public Works Director Craig Sheldon introduced Program Analyst Kathy McWilliams and Lead Utility Billing Technician Sarah Lopez and referred to the email he sent to Council prior to the meeting regarding the utility billing update (see record, Exhibit B). He explained that if Council wished to continue to have the individual charges broken down on the bill, it would make the utility bill three pages long and would cost .12 cents per page, roughly a cost of \$4,000-5,000 to the city per year for customers who received a paper bill. Program Analyst McWilliams presented the "Utility Bill" PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit B) and recapped the changes between the current utility bill and the proposed new utility bill. She stated that changes included adding the Clean Water Services (CWS) and Sherwood Broadband logos, adding a Sherwood Broadband QR Code, combining the Sanitary and Surface Water base charges for CWS and City of Sherwood, combining the consumption charges for Sanitary and Surface Water for CWS and City of Sherwood, reformatting the charges and subtotals into columns, relocating the consumption graph to the top left column, relocating the memo/notice box to the left column, adding an explanation of the CWS partnership, and keeping the CWS right-of-way fees separate. Ms. McWilliams explained that historically, the city had displayed the line items for the utility charges in order to be as transparent as possible with customers. She explained that moving forward, they recommended combining those line items so that everything fit into the bill and the bill remained a single page. Council President Mays referred to Public Works Director Sheldon's earlier comment regarding the potential for a three-page utility bill and commented that he did not want a three-page bill. Ms. McWilliams provided an overview of what the current utility bill looked like on pages 3-4 of the presentation and commented that there was room to fit Sherwood Broadband charges on the current utility bill. She stated that the new utility bill would continue to show any past due notifications instead of sending out a past due notice, which would help save money. She noted that the back of the current utility bill outlined the detailed definitions of the utility charges for anyone seeking more information. Councilor Giles asked if having that information on the bill was a legal requirement, or could the city have a URL or QR code instead? Mayor Rosener commented that not everyone had internet access and Ms. McWilliams commented that they had included the information because they had the space to do so. Mr. Sheldon commented that it was common to have definitions on the backs of utility bills. Lead Utility Billing Technician Lopez commented that having the definitions listed on the back was useful for when people called the office seeking more information on their utility bill. Ms. McWilliams provided an overview of the new utility bill layout on page 5 of the presentation and explained that what was shown was not the final version of the bill, but it gave the general idea of what the new utility bill would look like. Councilor Young commented that she liked how the current bill showed the different line items for each charge so she knew where her money went, and she would prefer to keep that information and added that she did not want a three-page bill. Ms. McWilliams replied that one option was to separate the top section of the bill into two different sections, one for City of Sherwood and one for CWS. Mayor Rosener commented that instead of doing two separate sections, there could be two different charge columns. Ms. McWilliams replied that the consultants were also looking into different layouts to try and keep the charges separated. She explained that the QR code at the top of the bill went to the Sherwood Broadband page and stated that she hoped that an online bill pay QR code could also be added in the future. Council President Mays referred to the new utility bill section that referred to the "Customer Number" and asked where the Customer Number was located on the bill? Ms. McWilliams replied that the city did not have a Customer Number and she needed to remove that phrase. Council President Mays referred to the text on the back of the current bill slide and noted that it noted "City of Hillsboro" instead of City of Sherwood and needed to be changed. Ms. McWilliams replied that she believed that the current City of Sherwood utility bill did not reference the City of Hillsboro and explained that what was shown was due to a mix-up between the old bill and the new bill layout. Council President Mays



commented that he felt that there was value in providing definitions on the back of the bill and discussion occurred. Discussion occurred regarding the possibility of providing an incentive to move residents to paperless billing. Councilor Young confirmed that the current City of Sherwood utility bill did not reference the City of Hillsboro. Ms. McWilliams provided an overview of the new Sherwood Broadband bill for non-residents on page 7 of the presentation. Councilor Giles commented that he liked the new utility bill layout and stated it was easier to read. Councilor Young commented that she was fine with the new layout, but she wanted to split-out the CWS and City of Sherwood charges without creating a three-page bill. Councilor Scott commented that keeping the new utility bill to a two-page bill was essential, but he also wanted to have the charges split-out. Council President Mays asked if an explanation of what the Water and Sewer Funds could be spent on would be helpful to include in the bill? City Manager Campbell replied that that information should be included on the back page of the bill. Council President Mays asked Council to confirm that when they were asking for the charges to be separated, they were asking that the City of Sherwood base sewer fee be separated from the CWS fee. Councilor Young replied that was correct and discussion occurred. Ms. McWilliams commented that if the two charges were not separated out, those charges were still broken out in the system, and anyone who wanted more information could call Public Works. She commented that having less line items on the bill helped to make people not feel as "nickel and dimed." Council President Mays asked if Council wanted the two charges together or broken out? Councilor Brouse replied that keeping it to a two-page bill was the most important part to her and she would defer to whichever approach staff or the consultants recommended. Councilor Standke replied that he liked the new layout and he felt that there was room for a second column to be added to allow for the fees to be separated out while keeping the bill to a single piece of paper. Ms. Lopez commented that the city could also send out an informational mailer to residents alerting them to the upcoming changes and information about how to call in if they had any questions. Councilor Giles commented that the URL could also direct customers to that information as well. Councilor Giles commented that from a user experience, the new utility bill layout was an improvement. Council President Mays commented that he agreed and that he supported the idea of adding a URL that provided more information to customers. Ms. McWilliams asked for clarification on if she was to split-out the charges. Councilor Young replied that Council preferred to split the charges out but keeping it to a two-page bill was more important. Discussion regarding the possibility of providing an incentive to encourage residents to move to paperless billing occurred.

## **5. ADJOURN:**

Council President Mays adjourned the work session at 7:02 pm and convened a 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, Councilors Kim Young, Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, and Dan Standke. Council President Keith Mays participated remotely.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, Interim City Attorney Alan Rappleyea, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Finance Director David



Bodway, Asset Management Specialist David Janusz, HR Manager Lydia McEvoy, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 7:0; ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

**5. CONSENT AGENDA:**

- A. Approval of January 3, 2023 City Council Meeting Minutes**
- B. Approval of January 7, 2023 City Council Meeting Minutes**
- C. Resolution 2023-007, Adopting Rules of Procedure for City Council**
- D. Resolution 2023-008, Appointing the Budget Officer for Fiscal Year 2023-24**
- E. Resolution 2023-009, Appointment of City Council Liaison Assignments**
- F. Resolution 2023-010, Appointing Sean Garland to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board**

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR SCOTT TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 7:0; ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

**6. CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

There were no citizen comments and Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

**7. NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. Resolution 2023-011, Assessing Sidewalk Construction Costs on Various Sherwood Properties and Directing the City Recorder to Enter Such Assessments in the City's Lien Docket**

Asset Management Specialist David Janusz explained that Section 12.08 of the Sherwood Municipal Code stated that the City of Sherwood assigned the responsibility of sidewalk maintenance and repair to the abutting property owners. He stated that the Sidewalk Repair Assistance Program was approved by Council in 2011 and explained that the program intended to assist property owners with the logistics, coordination, and cost of repairing or replacing damaged sidewalks. He outlined that the program assisted homeowners by scheduling and performing all the work required to repair a sidewalk hazard, with the city sharing 50% of the overall cost of the repair, and the homeowner sharing the other half of the total cost. He reported that in 2012, the Public Works Department had completed an inspection of all city sidewalks and had identified approximately 1,700 sidewalk deficiencies. He reported that over the course of the next four years, the city had systematically worked to address those deficiencies by reaching out to residents and had successfully addressed all known tripping hazards. Mr. Janusz outlined that the city would complete its second complete pass through the city in January. He reported that in October 2020, Public Works notified 307 residents who had evident sidewalk hazards. He explained that those residents were invited to participate in the Sidewalk Repair Program or to perform their own repairs within 120 days. He outlined that those who chose to participate in the program agreed to the proposed scope of work and had signed an agreement to receive the benefits of the program. He explained that participating residents also agreed to remit their portion of the balance within 12 months.



He reported that work was completed in the spring, and bills were issued on June 15, 2021, with a due date of June 15, 2022. He explained that over the next 12 months, monthly statements were mailed to the homeowners who carried a balance as well as several more monthly statements which allowed the homeowners additional time to pay their balance. Mr. Janusz stated that Chapter 12.08.090 of the Municipal Code stated that any unpaid balances shall be recorded in the docket of city liens and shall bear interest at the rate of 9% per annum from 10 days after date of entry in the lien docket. He stated that property owners were made aware of these potential actions through two separate notifications mailed in October 2022 and December 2022. He reported that there were two property owners who had participated in the program and had not yet compensated the city for the repairs completed on their behalf. He stated that the addresses were: 17610 SW Dodson Drive and 17680 SW Elder View Drive. He outlined that staff recommended placing a lien on the properties identified in the proposed resolution to recoup the costs associated with the Sidewalk Repair Assistance Program. He explained that upon the approval of the resolution, the city would extend a final 10 days to the homeowners to remit the balance. He stated that after 10 days, any unpaid balances would then be recorded as a lien upon the property. Mr. Janusz added that while not required, the city had notified the property owners to inform them of the reading of the proposed resolution at this meeting and commented that Council may want to consider hearing potential objections from the homeowners. He explained that the presentation of the resolution also served as a hearing for the homeowners to share their comments. He asked if Council wished to receive any comments from the homeowners who had been billed but had not yet paid? Councilor Young commented that she was open to hearing comments from the homeowners if they were present at the meeting. No comments from the homeowners were received and Mr. Janusz asked for questions from Council. Councilor Young referred to the property located at 17610 SW Dodson Drive, and noted that in the contract, the homeowner had initialed every available option of: opt in, opt out, and reserve the right to opt out and asked how the city knew how to proceed with that property? Mr. Janusz explained that part of the sidewalk repair process required that residents who wished to participate in the program return their signed contracts to him. He explained that he then provided the list of participating addresses to the contractor so the repairs could be completed within the 120-day timeframe. He outlined that the city offered residents several methods for returning the signed contracts and explained that by the time the address in question had returned their contract, it was nearing the end of the window to opt into the program. He explained he had repeatedly reached out to the homeowner to return her form because he felt that the repairs could not proceed until he had received her signed contract. He continued that it may not have been clear that the homeowner was to only choose one option, but he inferred that she wished to participate in the program based on previous email and phone conversations he had had with the homeowner. Councilor Scott asked what other methods besides mailing invoices and reminders, had the city done to try and reach the homeowners? Mr. Janusz replied that in addition to the initial bill and monthly statements, the city had sent two letters indicating that the lien process would move forward without remittance and the Utility Billing Manager had also called and left voice messages, but the homeowners had not responded. Councilor Young clarified that if the proposed resolution were approved, the property owners would have an additional 10 days to pay their balance before the lien process would move forward. Mr. Janusz replied that was correct and explained that on the 11<sup>th</sup> day, paperwork would be drawn up to place the balance onto the docket and a notice to the homeowner would be sent in the mail. Councilor Young asked if the city would again try to reach out to the property owners in that 10-day grace period? Mr. Janusz replied that they would do so. Mayor Rosener asked if there had been any verbal communication with the homeowners? Mr. Janusz replied that the city had been unable to reach them over the phone and the homeowners had not replied to the city's voicemails alerting them to the issue. Mayor Rosener asked if the city was certain that the homes were still occupied? Mr. Janusz replied that the utility bills indicated



that the homes were occupied. Mayor Rosener asked if the city could send someone out to the properties to try and make contact? Mr. Janusz replied that staff could do so.

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2023-011, ASSESSING SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION COSTS ON VARIOUS SHERWOOD PROPERTIES AND DIRECTING THE CITY RECORDER TO ENTER SUCH ASSESSMENTS IN THE CITY'S LIEN DOCKET. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 7:0; ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

Councilor Giles asked if residents could report sidewalk hazards to the Sidewalk Repair Assistance Program? Mr. Janusz replied that the program was not an "on demand" program and instead worked by going through neighborhood by neighborhood to address hazards. He explained that administering the program this way helped to minimize overhead with the contractors because they could consolidate their efforts, which in turn helped keep the costs for the program very manageable. Mayor Rosener commented that it was much cheaper for residents to participate in the program than to try and organize the repair on their own.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

#### **8. CITY MANAGER REPORT:**

City Manager Keith Campbell reported that the Oregon Business Recovery Center would soon release grants up to \$10,000 per qualifying small businesses within the City of Sherwood zip code. He reported that the grants would be available starting January 31, 2023 and stated that he expected the grants to be competitive and encouraged residents with small businesses in Sherwood to apply. He reported that the Sherwood Police Department was partnering with the Kids S.A.F.E. Foundation to provide free firearm safety classes for children. He stated that the class would be held January 21<sup>st</sup> at the Sherwood Police Department. Mayor Rosener commented he appreciated that the Sherwood Police Department was partnering with the Kids S.A.F.E. Foundation to provide free firearm safety classes for children and encouraged parents to have their children attend the training. Police Chief Ty Hanlon replied that the classes had been extremely popular and commented that it would be an ongoing program.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

#### **9. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Councilor Giles gave his kudos to the Cultural Arts Commission's Lunar New Year celebration and encouraged residents to attend the event next year. He reported that the Sherwood Foundation for the Arts' presentation of "The Rocky Horror Picture Show" would run from January 20-22 and January 27-29.

Councilor Scott reported that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board would meet in February. He reported that he attended the Sherwood West CAC meeting last week.

Councilor Brouse reported that she was unable to attend the Senior Advisory Board meeting last week. She reported that there was a Housing Advisory Committee meeting on January 20<sup>th</sup>.

Councilor Young reported that the Sherwood Foundation for the Arts' presentation of "The Rocky Horror Picture Show" would run from January 20-22 and January 27-29. She reported that Sherwood High



School's production of "Romeo and Juliet" would run from February 2-4 and stated tickets could be bought online. She reported that she would participate in the Sherwood Education Foundation's upcoming "Sip and Spell" event. She reported that the Police Advisory Board would meet on January 19<sup>th</sup>. She spoke on Council's recent goal setting work session and commented that she was pleased with the continued progress the city had made in achieving those goals.

Council President Mays reported that WCCCA was moving into their new building. He reported the Cultural Arts Commission would meet on January 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Mayor Rosener reported that he participated in a Washington County jail tour with other Washington County mayors and explained that the county was looking to complete necessary repairs and upgrades to their facility. He reported that the number of DAs per resident in Washington County was very low compared to other counties and stated that the county was working with the state to address some of the DA staffing shortages. He reported he met with Washington County mayors and the County Chair.


City Manager Campbell informed Council that this would be Interim City Attorney Rappleyea's last meeting and thanked Mr. Rappleyea for his service. Mr. Rappleyea provided Council an overview of his exit timeline.


Councilor Young commented regarding the process for how materials were selected for the Sherwood Public Library and explained that materials were not selected by the Library Advisory Board. She stated that the Library Materials Policy was available on the city's website.

#### 10. ADJOURN:

Mayor Rosener adjourned the regular session at 7:35 pm.

Attest:

  
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

  
Tim Rosener, Mayor