



## **SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or**

Pursuant to House Bill 4212 (2020), this meeting will be conducted electronically and will be live streamed at <https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofSherwood>

**March 15, 2022**

### **WORK SESSION**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the work session to order at 6:01 pm.
- 2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Doug Scott, Kim Young, Sean Garland, and Renee Brouse.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Josh Soper, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, Senior Planner Joy Chang, Records Technician Katie Corgan, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** DLCD representatives Bill Holmstrom, Evan Manvel, and Kevin Young. State Representative Courtney Neron.

### **4. TOPICS:**

#### **A. DLCD Rule Making Presentation**

Community Development Director Julia Hajduk explained that she created a presentation (see record, Exhibit A) to capture the concerns of the Council and staff about the proposed DLCD rulemaking. She recapped that the primary concern was that there was a lot of different rulemaking exercises occurring that staff and Council were concerned would create unintended consequences. There were also concerns that these efforts were not being coordinated with different departments at the state level and that the cities and counties had not been included in the formative stage of the process in a substantive way. She stated there were concerns that rulemaking entities did not understand that "one size does not fit all." She recapped the impacts of HB 2001 as: increased density, limited parking requirements, and no home rule authority. She recapped the impacts of the Climate Friendly Communities as: limited ability to provide for/require on street parking, the parking requirements lacked understanding of suburban communities, overestimating the "market" sensibility, and no home rule authority. She explained that the impacts from both HB 2001 and Climate Friendly Communities had resulted in two separate rulemaking processes that were being imposed on communities with seemingly little cross collaboration occurring. She explained that the consequences of the measures resulted in communities struggling to meet middle housing mandates with limited transit, limited ability to provide/require parking, disconnection with emergency service providers, and the limitation of community identity. Council President Rosener commented that the real issues around the new rules arose when it came to street layouts. Ms. Hajduk provided an overview of an example of the impacts of the new rules on an existing subdivision where middle

housing could be located. She explained that with the new rules, the subdivision could be comprised of 22 dwelling units with a total of five on-street parking spaces. Council President Rosener explained that the subdivision street was 28-feet wide, per the governor's executive order, and explained that per the fire district requirements, there could only be parking on one side of the street. He continued that when you combine those things with fire hydrant locations and driveway spacing in subdivisions that had triplexes and quadplexes, it limited on-street parking. He stated that Sherwood had 33% more cars per household than Portland and expressed that it was concerning for them to look at the density forecast for the next 3-5 years with these types of rules. He referred to the subdivision example on page 2 of the presentation and explained that the subdivision did not allow for people to park nearby due to its location along Highway 99W. He stated that it was these types of scenarios that needed to allow for planners to have some flexibility to manage good development. Mayor Mays stated that one of the strategies for dealing with HB 2001 was to require wider streets, but with the proposal of the 28-foot street width maximum, that would not be an option. He explained that parking on both sides of the street was not an option because parking on both sides of the street was not permitted in the fire district. He requested that the DLCD reconsider the proposal of the 28-foot street width maximum. He explained that Sherwood was a community of large families, which meant that those families eventually would likely have multiple cars. Council President Rosener stated that Sherwood had the highest student per household ratio of any city in the state by a significant margin. Mayor Mays asked the DLCD representatives if there was any possibility of adding in flexibility around the 28-foot width maximum rule? Mr. Holmstrom explained that they began their rulemaking process in September 2020, and they would hold their first formal public hearing on March 31<sup>st</sup> and the second public hearing on May 19-20<sup>th</sup>. He explained that in that two month period, changes to the proposed rules could be made. Mayor Mays commented that he felt that the proposed rules were "an attack on families" and explained that as mayor, the majority of citizen complaints that he heard was parking conflicts between neighbors, and he did not want to increase those conflicts. He commented that having neighborhoods with few on-street parking spots would prohibit neighborhoods from having friends or family over. Council President Rosener reported that Sherwood had approximately 9,200 residents who commuted outside of Sherwood for work and explained that Sherwood did not have good access to mass transit. Mr. Manvel explained that the DLCD's work was done at the direction of Governor Brown's climate change Executive Order 20-04 that stated that all state agencies needed to do more work to get back on track to what the Oregon legislation had adopted as Oregon's climate pollution reduction goals. He explained that the DLCD was selected to work with ODOT to reform Oregon's land use transportation planning rules and in doing so, think about equity in historically marginalized communities. Mr. Manvel reported that Oregon was far off track from meeting its climate pollution reduction goals and a serious course correction was needed. He reported that with the current trends, Oregon would miss its goal by four times by 2050. He explained that being off track from the goal was having real world effects on Oregonian's economies, livelihoods, homes and lives, and referred to home losses due to wildfires, deaths from extreme heat, and impacts on the shellfish industry. He addressed inequity and generational wealth and stated that land use and transportation had a long history of inequity and discrimination. He provided examples of deciding where to place transportation facilities, what neighborhoods were allowed to gain and pass on wealth through redlining and exclusionary zoning. He reported that the average white household had roughly 10 times the average wealth as the average Black household. Mr. Manvel explained that the DLCD rulemaking was focused on the eight metropolitan areas of Oregon where most transportation pollution happened. The areas were: Portland Metro, Salem-Keizer, Albany Area, Corvallis Area, Central Lane, Bend, Middle Rogue, and Rogue Valley. Mayor Mays asked if it was possible to remove Sherwood from the Portland Metro region? Councilor Scott stated that it was important to realize that the outer limits of the metro suburbs were very different than the inner core of Portland. He commented that historically, it has felt like the entire Portland Metro area was treated with a monolithic set of rules that applied to the entire area and did not consider the fact that the fringe areas outside of the Metro area were very different from a transportation and demographic perspective, and the one-size-fits-all rules was very challenging. Mr.

Holmstrom replied that the rulemaking changes were aimed at the eight metropolitan areas around the state and there were a wide variety of places in those areas and that he felt that the DLCD had tried to build in some flexibility for jurisdictions. Council President Rosener asked if the Climate Pollution Change chart shown on page 2 of the presentation took into consideration the expected adoption of electric cars over the next 20 years? Mr. Manvel replied that that was included in the chart. Mr. Manvel provided an overview of the DLCD's timeline on page 5 of the presentation and explained that they had a very diverse advisory committee guiding their rulemaking process and had endeavored to hear from a lot of different people. He stated that there were two categories of rulemaking: regional planning to meet pollution reduction targets and updated land use and transportation rules. He stated that the Metro area had accomplished the first goal with the passage of their Climate Smart Communities in 2014. He explained that the Climate Smart Strategy was adopted in 2014 and approved by LCDC in 2015 and was incorporated and monitored through the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Manvel outlined the six areas that the commission had directed them to focus their rule updating on and explained that they had been tasked with identifying climate-friendly areas where people could get around without having to drive/drive far to meet their daily needs and were mostly considered downtowns or neighborhood centers. Other areas of focus were: reforming parking management, supporting electric vehicle charging, providing high quality pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure, going beyond focus on motor vehicle congestion standards, and prioritizing and selecting projects that meet climate/equity outcomes. Mr. Young reported that Metro was pretty far along in implementing the Climate Smart Communities program by identifying the Region 2040 centers. He explained that the DLCD's proposed rules related to the Metro region included requiring Metro to establish a requirement for local government adoption of Region 2040 centers and land use regulations no later than December 31, 2024. Local governments that had yet to do so shall comply by December 31, 2025. Cities with populations over 10,000 were to report on affordable housing production, mitigation of displacement, and increasing housing choices within Region 2040 centers every six years and would be done in conjunction with the requirement for housing strategies from HB 2003. Mr. Young commented that Sherwood had already adopted the Region 2040 centers and land use regulations. Mr. Manvel provided an overview of downtown off-street parking in Corvallis and Old Town Sherwood on pages 10-11 of the presentation. He explained that the DLCD was concerned about parking because it was a big user of land in key areas that the DLCD wanted to be walkable and parking was often over-built. He reported that based on a DLCD study of parking in Albany, Oregon, an average of 30% of parking spots went unused. Council President Rosener asked how many cities were used in that study? Mr. Manvel replied that this study had been done in multiple cities, not just in Oregon, but also in King County, Washington. Council President Rosener stated that because the DLCD was talking about rulemaking, they could not use generic studies from around the country but needed to use studies done in the Portland Metro area. Councilor Scott asked if the study cited on page 11 of the presentation was multifamily? Mr. Manvel replied that was correct. Council President Rosener offered to give Mr. Manvel a tour of several multifamily areas in Sherwood that demonstrated the need for more parking. Mr. Manvel replied that when he had reached out to the City to determine if any parking studies had been done, staff had reported that they were not aware of any such studies. He stated that he did plan to come to Sherwood in April to complete a site visit in order to better understand the conditions on the ground. Community Development Director Hajduk explained that staff and Council heard complaints about parking issues not just in Old Town, but all over, including residential and asked that Mr. Manvel look at multiple locations during his site visit. Mr. Manvel replied that he would reach out to staff about good times to schedule a site visit and which sites to visit. He explained that the third reason the DLCD cared about parking reform was because it was a trade-off with housing and cited a study done in Eugene where a parking requirement precluded two housing units. He referred to Oregon's housing crisis and stated that it can "literally be a trade-off between housing people and housing cars." Councilor Scott asked where the other two residents would park in the cited Eugene scenario? Mr. Manvel replied that they would either park on-street or they would be a carless household and commented that about 1/6 of all households were carless according to ACS data. Several council members

stated they disagreed with that figure for Sherwood. Council President Rosener stated that Sherwood's carless percentage was around 1.2%. Mr. Manvel replied that that was more current data than he had, and that the data found that 25% of Sherwood's households had 3+ cars, 50% had 2 cars, and 25% had 0-1 car. Council President Rosener commented the Sherwood did not have the jobs or a transit system to support that many people without cars and offered to send Mr. Manvel the data. Mr. Manvel provided an overview of the DLC's draft rules and stated that the first rule implemented best practices from around Oregon for parking code details. The second rule allowed cities to choose a parking reform approach of: repeal parking mandates, reduce parking mandates for certain types of development in key areas and adopt fair parking policies, or further reduce parking mandates for types of development and in more areas. The third rule was that communities over 25,000 in population needed to do more parking management. Council President Rosener referred to the idea that if people wanted a car, they needed to pay for the parking and asked if that was an equitable solution considering transportation costs were the second largest cost for low-income families and Sherwood did not have functional mass transit. Mr. Manvel explained that people were already paying for parking via the costs of goods or in getting paid less because their employer is taking the cost of parking, and that the cost of parking was the same, but it was a matter of who was bearing that cost. He continued that low-income people were already paying for parking whether or not they were paying for it separately. Council President Rosener asked if Mr. Manvel was suggesting that the owner of an apartment building would lower their rental rates in a market environment because they were charging for parking? Mr. Manvel replied that that had been the experience in places that had unbundled parking throughout the country. He referred to an example in Minneapolis where apartment buildings without provided parking paid \$200 less in rent and commented that individual owners and markets would vary. Councilor Young asked if there were any examples from Oregon for rent reductions due to unbundled parking? Mr. Manvel replied that unbundling usually happens in larger cities and currently a unit without parking is cheaper than a unit with parking in various areas. Councilor Scott commented that there were various different reasons why units differed in price such as location, amenities, access to schools and parks, and asked if all of those things were factored into that study? Mr. Manvel replied that the rent for a unit in a building where you did not pay for parking was cheaper than when a parking space was included in the rent. Council President Rosener clarified that a building owner would charge market rate for the apartment and then charge more for parking if they were allowed to do so. He asked if there were studies that showed that rents went down when parking was unbundled? Mr. Manvel replied that the rule required fair market value of the parking spot and that he believed that the market worked. Council President Rosener commented that he also believed the market worked, but much of the development in Sherwood was being done by very large corporate developers that had investors, so their focus was not necessarily on the communities and that he was worried about trusting landlords and developers to do the right thing. Mr. Manvel continued his recap of the improved parking management rules and stated that there would be no mandated parking within a 1/2 mile of frequent transit (Line 94), mandates would be capped at one space per multifamily unit, there would be no mandates for units under 750 square feet units/single-room occupancy, and that there would be no mandates for affordable housing, shelters, facilities for people with disabilities, or childcare providers. He clarified that no parking mandates did not mean no parking provided and reported that there was data that showed that markets would provide parking even if there were no mandates. Council President Rosener referred to a recent example in Sherwood of a developer wanting to build an apartment complex that was not permitted in the original PUD and then wanting to do a density swap with someone else so that they did not have to provide as much parking. He explained that the problem was that that parking lot was already full the majority of the time and that allowing cities flexibility to add their own checks and balances would help prevent loophole situations from occurring. Mr. Manvel commented that the need to manage parking well was something that was not often discussed. He explained that it was the government's responsibility to think about how on-street parking is managed and if on-street parking was managed well, the people who provided the needed off-street parking will be able to sell and rent their units compared to those who do not. Mr. Manvel reported that in some places when parking was

deregulated, it resulted in more housing units being built because people could afford to build and provided examples from several US cities on pages 17-20 of the presentation. He recapped that managing parking was a nuanced issue and was location specific and needed to be managed in certain ways. He addressed electric vehicle charging and explained that the goal was to install conduit as large development was occurring and explained that the conduit would be plastic tubes in the ground to preserve the ability for future charging stations to be located in that area. Mr. Holmstrom addressed transportation planning and explained that the DLCD's transportation planning rules had existed for 30 years and local governments in Oregon had been doing coordinated land use and transportation planning for a long time. He explained that the DLCD did not want to do something new, but wanted to build on their successes of the past because they were aware that they had not been doing enough in terms of meeting their climate and equity goals. He recapped that the DLCD's transportation planning rules focused on planning for pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation networks in order to provide connected, safe, and complete networks. He stated that the DLCD's transportation planning rules would prioritize climate friendly areas, neighborhoods with underserved populations, and access to key destinations. Council President Rosener asked if the DLCD had given much thought to how local governments would pay for the types of necessary upgrades to the roads? He explained that currently, a city received SDCs from the developers and then road improvements happened, or the developer gets credit back because they made the improvements themselves and commented that even with that process, there were still long sections of road that would need to be improved that a city would have to pay for. He explained that Sherwood did not have a mechanism to go out and put sidewalks in, make the area safe, and make the road wider and asked if there had been any thought about other funding mechanisms or other ways of approaching those issues? Mr. Holmstrom replied that SDCs were outside of the authority of the DLCD and explained that the DLCD rules were written to give local jurisdictions flexibility in how they figured out how to finance their projects and referred to Washington County's MSTIP program. He continued that the DLCD's rules talked about how local governments needed to go through the process of making decisions about what the highest priority was once they had those funds and how to ensure that it was connected to land use. Council President Rosener replied that Sherwood was currently doing those things, but with the annexation changes and the way things were getting "chunked," the developers had more control over that pacing. Mr. Holmstrom replied that annexation law was outside of the DLCD's purview and commented that the annexation laws also impacted the DLCD. Mr. Holmstrom explained that the rules encouraged cities to select projects based on a variety of prioritization factors such as climate and equity. He explained that the DLCD was requiring cities to listen to their underserved communities and to ensure that the underserved citizens of their community were a part of any decision making. He explained that the rules also allowed for the community to select a range of other prioritization decision factors around access and safety and commented that it was up to individual cities to make those decisions about how they prioritized it, but at the end of the day they needed to be working toward meeting the overall climate goals. He explained that the DLCD had tried to provide local governments with flexibility on how to reach those goals. Mr. Holmstrom reported that the DLCD would measure success in the transportation system by looking at a variety of factors, not just moving cars, and commented that other factors could include safety, access, and pedestrian and/or bicycle modes of travel. He stated that the DLCD was working with ODOT on devising ways local governments could measure success. Mr. Manvel provided an overview of the timeline for Sherwood on page 26 of the presentation and reported that parking mandates did not apply for development near frequent transit and for limited development types after December 31, 2022. He explained that if the task of choosing a parking reform approach for other areas by March 31, 2023 was too brief, a work plan could be proposed to the commission. He reported that there was a provision in the draft rules that stated that the regional government (Metro) could offer up a proposed approach that would meet the same goals. He explained if Sherwood did not feel that the DLCD's rules were suitable, they could work with Metro to create a proposed alternative approach. Council President Rosener commented that Council would prefer to be able to offer up its own proposal instead of having to work with Metro. Mr. Manvel replied that option was not in the current draft

language. Council President Rosener asked what the process was to try to include it in the draft language? Mr. Manvel provided an overview of the DLCD rule making schedule and reported that the first public hearing would be held March 31-April 1, the adoption hearing would be held May 19-20, and there was an approximate effective date of June 22<sup>nd</sup>. He reported that those interested could submit written testimony to the commission via their website and stated that based on the concerns from both Council and staff, he would perform a site visit in order to determine if the draft plans needed to be adjusted as appropriate. He explained there had been travel restrictions in place due to the pandemic, but he was now able to travel to different locations in order to understand the sites on the ground. Community Development Director Hajduk asked if after performing the various site visits throughout the state, did they envision a scenario in which their rule making proposal would have multiple layers depending on location and makeup of communities in terms of the car to housing ratio? Mr. Manvel replied that he was open to ideas and explained that the DLCD was not trying to apply what may work in Portland to Sherwood. He explained that there was nuances to the rules that were based on transit frequency and some adjustments based on population and commented that they were happy to hear ideas for nuances from others. Councilor Scott commented that access to transit opportunities had to be a factor that was considered in the variability of the rules, and should include the consideration of if bus lines did not go to many locations. Mr. Manvel replied that the DLCD had striven to think about “the people who aren’t in the room” and explained that traditionally, land use planning decisions had been made with relatively affluent people who own more cars than the average in mind. Councilor Young commented that she appreciated that Mr. Manvel had explained that they were not trying to apply what worked in Portland to Sherwood because the recent rule making around housing and transportation had felt very one-size-fits-all.

## **5. ADJOURNED:**

Mayor Mays adjourned the work session at 7:04 pm.

## **REGULAR SESSION**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the meeting to order at 7:15 pm.

**2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Doug Scott, Kim Young, Sean Garland, and Renee Brouse.

**3. STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Josh Soper, Finance Director David Bodway, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, City Engineer Bob Galati, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Curt Vanderzanden Project Manager with KPFF, Craig Totten Lead Bridge Engineer with KPFF, Wes Shoger Landscape Architect with Green Works, and John Breshears with Architectural Applications.

## **4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 6:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

## **5. CONSENT AGENDA:**

- A. Approval of March 1, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes**
- B. Resolution 2022-016, Authorizing the City Manager to Purchase a Truck Mounted Sewer and Catch Basin Cleaner**
- C. Resolution 2022-017, Authorizing City Manager to enter into a contract with North Sky Communications, LLC for the construction of a portion of the Fiber to the Home Project for Sherwood Broadband**

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 6:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

## **6. CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

Jim Rose with the Sherwood School District came forward and spoke on the current pedestrian bridge design. He recapped that as the new high school was being designed, the community provided feedback that the new high school and site was to be a gateway to Sherwood West and that having an appropriate visual identity that fit Sherwood was important. He stated that the view from Highway 99W was important and that the current proposed alignment, the sightlines from the highway would be affected. He stated that the school district would like the twin girder option used to minimize the amount of mass and height of the bridge, which would lessen the amount the bridge that would obstruct the view of the new high school.

The City Recorder read aloud the comments submitted by Mary Novelli and stated that in 2019, her son and two friends were, "struck by an alleged speeding and drunk driver." She stated that she was a strong proponent for the safety and protection of all pedestrians in Sherwood. She referred to the recent vehicular accident that killed two young pedestrians in February 2022 and stated that it, "should not have and must not happen again." She thanked former City Manager Joe Gall for his help fixing the roundabouts, pedestrian crossings, and speed issues in Sherwood. She thanked the Traffic Safety Committee for their work thus far but commented that the committee needed to complete and continue their work. She stated that the Traffic Safety Committee projects of: installing proper street lighting, installing "slow speed zone" signs, installing flashing pedestrian lights and ground reflectors at all school zones, major traffic intersections, and blind spots on neighborhood roads, and lowering the permitted top speeds throughout the city. She commented that Sherwood and the state encourage people to walk, bike, and take public transportation to reduce traffic, but asked how doing so would be possible if Sherwood did not make it safe for pedestrians to walk everywhere? She stated that there was no reason why side roads within one mile of a school zone and neighborhoods that came off of a 45 mph highway should have anything above a maximum speed of 25 mph. She stated that speeds in roundabouts in those areas must be reduced to 15 mph and that "slow speed zone ahead" along with "proper and consistent traffic signage" was necessary for Sherwood and ODOT. She asked when the Traffic Safety Committee would resume their work and when their projects were projected to be completed?

Mayor Mays asked that Ms. Novelli's letter be forwarded to the Traffic Safety Committee.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

## **7. PRESENTATIONS:**

## **A. Sherwood Police Department Reaccreditation OAA Presentation**

Police Chief Ty Hanlon introduced Scott Hayes with the Executive Director of the Oregon Accreditation Alliance and stated that the Sherwood Police Department had earned their fourth certificate of law enforcement accreditation. Mr. Hayes recognized former Police Chief Jeff Groth for his time serving on the Oregon Accreditation Alliance board. Mr. Hayes stated that law enforcement was experiencing challenges with increased demands for police accountability and transparency and commented that accreditation was one step towards building community trust and legitimacy of the profession. He stated that accreditation was a monumental step for any agency and explained that the goals of accreditation were to support continued improvement of law enforcement services, to establish best practices through professional standards, to establish agency accountability and transparency, and to enhance management of overall operations. Mr. Hayes provided a history of the OAA and reported that the OAA provided accreditation services for 77 law enforcement and communication centers in Oregon and Alaska. He explained that there were 105 law enforcement standards that an agency must adhere to and show proof of compliance with, and were based on federal, national, and Oregon law best practices. He recognized Administrative Assistant Angie Hass for serving as the agency's accreditation manager.

Mayor Mays thanked Mr. Hayes for his presentation and stated that the City was proud of Chief Hanlon, former Police Chief Groth, and the entire Sherwood Police Department. He stated that maintaining the Sherwood Police Department's accreditation and continuing to have the highest standards for the department was an ongoing City Council goal. Chief Hanlon stated that he looked forward to continuing to work with the OAA and gave his thanks to Angie Hass for her work ensuring that the Sherwood Police Department stayed on track to meet those standards. Mayor Mays asked Mr. Hayes how many city police departments had achieved accreditation in Oregon? Mr. Hayes replied that eight communication centers had received their accreditation of the 77 centers that they served. He commented that the Oregon legislature had recently passed legislation that required accreditation for agencies with 35 officers or more.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

## **B. Pedestrian Bridge Update**

City Engineer Bob Galati reported that this presentation was a follow-up from a previous work session that had occurred prior to an open house for the project. He reported that this presentation would cover the data that was gathered from the open house as well as a design update. Curt Vanderzanden, Project Manager with KPFF, presented the "Sherwood Hwy 99W Pedestrian Bridge Project" presentation (see record, Exhibit C) and stated that they hoped to get further direction from Council prior to the next open house. He provided an overview of the online open house survey results and reported that 174 people participated and 74% said they would use the bridge as a pedestrian and 47% said they would use it as a bicyclist. He reported that 63% of the respondents lived on the south side of 99W in Sherwood, 15% lived on the north side of 99W, and 12% lived downtown. He reported that 56% of respondents "Like Very Much/Like" the Tall Arch option, 58% "Like Very Much/Like" the Bowstring Truss option, and 48% "Like Very Much/Like" the Twin Girder with Feature Railing option. He reported that 47% of respondents "Dislike Very Much /Dislike" the DaVinci Truss option and 53% "Dislike Very Much /Dislike" the Curved Triangular Section Truss. He stated that based on the survey results, the DaVinci Truss and Curved Triangular Section Truss options were removed from consideration. Councilor Young asked if it was possible to see what the bridges would actually look like in place before they decided on a style? Discussion occurred. Mr. Vanderzanden replied that they had not yet built a model to show what the bridge would look like in place, but that would be a part of the process shortly. He reported that 81%



of the respondents felt that it was very important or somewhat important that the bridge feel like a gateway to the community.

He addressed Alignment Option A1 and explained that this was the same option as in the previous work session except that they had shifted the bridge to be centered over the roundabout. He explained that in order to do this option, a pier would need to be installed in the center of the roundabout. He stated that Alignment Option A1 would require additional utility relocation work due to the installation of the pier, which would come with added costs. Community Development Director Hajduk asked Mr. Vanderzanden to speak on the nuances around being able to place the bridge above the roundabout. Mr. Vanderzanden explained that there was an existing sanitary sewer line at the location, but they had felt that they would be able to accommodate the pipe without doing damage. He spoke about the hinge point on the east side of the highway and explained that it was based on how far they needed to take the bridge in order to meet the required 4.5% slope for the pathway. Ms. Hajduk added that the limitations of the site made for few feasible alignment options for the bridge. Mr. Vanderzanden recapped that Council had asked that the hinge point on the east side be flared out to help prevent bottlenecks and stated that staff had done so. He added that staff had also looked into providing a connection from the hinge point down to the sidewalk on 99W to provide a direct connection to the trail system and had built that into all alignment options. A KPFF consultant referred to an earlier comment about the importance of the bridge not looking like an afterthought and commented that centering the bridge over the roundabout was imperative to ensuring the bridge did not look like an afterthought. Councilor Garland asked if there were any visibility concerns for the roundabout with a pier in the middle of it? Mr. Vanderzanden replied that the sight triangles for roundabouts were different than typical intersections and commented that the pier would not cause a sight obstruction for drivers using the roundabout. A councilor asked what the projected dimensions of the pier would be? KPFF structural engineer replied that they were not sure yet and commented that the pier may not be round. The councilor asked for an estimate of the probable general size. The structural engineer replied that the order of magnitude was in the order of 2.5-3 feet. City Engineer Galati explained that the roundabout was designed to be a straight through roundabout and therefore it was not "mounded up" and provided a complete line of sight. He added that the trees that were supposed to be planted in the roundabout had been removed and therefore adding a pier to the middle of the roundabout should not impact the sight distance. Wes Shoger addressed the Alignment A1 – East Landing option and reported that the feedback Council had provided at the previous work session of adding stairs and a wider maneuvering area had been added into the plans. He explained that the east landing was the project's most difficult landing due to the location of the YMCA building and stated that all of the options played towards the survey results for the preferred bridge types of arches or trusses. He provided an overview of Alignment A1 – East Landing option and explained that they had provided a walkway with a 5% slope, which was ADA accessible. Council President Rosener clarified that there were no current plans to expand the YMCA facility, but the City wanted to be mindful of possible future expansion of the facility when constructing the pedestrian bridge. Mr. Vanderzanden referred to previous comments from Council regarding the massing around the YMCA and explained that Mr. Shoger had reduced the massing and commented that a structured walkway was more likely than doing a mounting to keep the area as light as possible. Mr. Shoger addressed Alignment A1 – West Landing option and explained Council's request for stairs down to Kruger had been added to the plans. Mr. Breshears addressed Alignment A1 – Option 1 and recapped that he had taken the preferred range of structural types and put them into a more realistic model. He explained that the Tall Arch type was the most efficient bridge option which meant that it took the least weight of steel to span the 200 feet across the highway and was reflected in the projected costs. He addressed the Twin Girder portion of Alignment A1 – Option 1 and explained that the railings were required to be higher when they went over roads to serve as anti-throw/anti-climb barriers and commented that the railings did not have to be as high when they did not go over a roadway, so the Twin Girder portion of the bridge could have two different railing heights. He addressed Alignment A1 –

Option 2 and explained that it was similar to Alignment A1 – Option 1 but used a Bowstring Truss instead of a Tall Arch to span the highway. He explained that the Bowstring Truss used heavier diagonal members, which increased the cost compared to the Tall Arch. He addressed Alignment A1 – Option 3 and explained that it was similar to Alignment A1 – Option 1 and Option 2 but used Twin Girders for the main span. He stated that Alignment A1 – Option 3 required more height, which would impact the ramp length needed to get up the bridge and explained that Alignment A1 – Option 3 was not very viable with Alignment Option A2. He stated that Alignment A1 – Option 3 was the simplest and most straightforward bridge structure and strongly recommended emphasizing the art component of the bridge by engaging with the artists early in the process if this option was chosen. Councilor Scott commented that he felt that the Tall Arch or the Bow String option would not create sightline problems for the high school as the arch would span the highway portion of the bridge and the high school was in another direction off to the side, and asked if he was incorrect? Mr. Vanderzanden replied that he did not believe Councilor Scott was incorrect, but he was not positive and would need to review the plans. A KPFF consultant added that they would try to create some visuals to help and commented that generally speaking, Councilor Scott was correct. Councilor Brouse asked which option Jim Rose from the school district had wanted? Mr. Rose replied that what Councilor Scott said was correct and, “for us, having the Twin Girder from 99 to over is kind of the most important factor...the bridge, in general, is going to decrease your vision from driving on 99...the arch is probably not the biggest issue directly over 99, it’s kind of the rest of the structure that we’re interested in minimizing.” Mr. Vanderzanden addressed Alignment Option A2 and explained that it was a midpoint between Alternative B and Alternative A from the previous work session. He explained that Alignment Option A2 was created to take advantage of the stormwater facility south of the roundabout to allow for additional piers and shorter spans. He reported that Alignment Option A2 did not provide enough length to reach the necessary height requirements to accommodate a Twin Girder bridge type. Community Development Director Hajduk clarified that KPFF had initially created this option to avoid the utilities in the middle of the roundabout. Mr. Vanderzanden added that Alignment Option A2 was also created as a cost savings option since they could do better spacing on the supports as well as provide an opportunity to do a more “signature structure type.” Mr. Shoger addressed Alignment Option A2 – East Landing – Option 1 and explained that the alignment came a bit closer to the intersection but did not butt up to it. He stated that this option required more detailed planning to determine how to do the landing, and they had created two options. Option 1 was a ramp system that allowed you to pick up grading and Option 2 was a walkway with less than 5% slope. He stated that Alignment Option A2 – East Landing – Option 1 was similar to the A1 – East Landing option except it had a ramp system with landings. He reported that Alignment Option A2 – East Landing – Option 1 would also provide stairs. Mayor Mays asked what the ramp grade would be? Mr. Shoger replied that it would be a series of ramps with 7.5% grade for 30 feet, then a 2% landing of 5 feet, and then another ramp, etc. Discussion occurred. Mr. Shoger commented that he felt that a walkway was the more preferable option compared to the ramp system, but it was not a “deal breaker.” Mr. Vanderzanden commented that one of the downsides of a ramp system is the suitability for biking. He addressed Alignment Option A2 – East Landing – Option 2 and explained that this option aimed to provide enough ramp in order to be able to maintain a 4.5% walkway. Mr. Shoger interjected and explained that this option required a flatter walkway, so they had to make it longer and commented that this wrap around option was a safe option since it impeded people from traveling at high speeds down onto Sunset Boulevard. Mayor Mays commented he preferred this option. Mr. Shoger added that Alignment Option A2 – East Landing – Option 2 was slightly taller than the ramp system. Council President Rosener asked if the wrap around design would possibly discourage people from using it since it was not a direct route to the bridge? Mr. Vanderzanden replied that there would also be stairs to allow for more direct access to and from the bridge if people wanted. Council President Rosener added that he believed the City planned to close the crosswalk that went across Highway 99W when the bridge had been constructed. City Engineer Galati reminded that Highway 99W was a state highway and the crosswalk was a state facility and the state was the one to mandate what happened to the sidewalk regardless of if the

pedestrian bridge was built or not. He added that the state was unlikely to allow the City to close the sidewalk, but the City would still ask the state to close the sidewalk if it was Council's wish. Mr. Shoger addressed Alignment Option A2 – West Landing and explained that the landing was similar to the Alignment A1 – West Landing option. Mayor Mays asked if the switchback to go to Kruger was mostly a ramp with some stairs added at the end? Mr. Shoger replied that the red line shown on page 16 was a walkway that led up to stairs and commented that the location of the stairs could be more spread out. Mr. Breshears addressed Alignment A2 – Option 1 and explained that this alignment allowed them to take advantage of the stormwater facility in order to place more columns and therefore have shorter spans. He stated that this would result in a bridge with six spans that alternated going over roadways and greenspace. He stated that Alignment A2 – Option 1 took advantage of the structural efficiency of the Tall Arch and alternate right-side-up, right-side-down orientations of the arch over the six spans. He commented that all of the Tall Arch pieces could be pre-manufactured and was cost competitive. He stated that Alignment A2 – Option 2 was similar in design but pushed the main bridge span closer to the intersection and used Bowstring Trusses instead of Tall Arches. Discussion occurred. Mr. Shoger commented that both Alignment A2 options provided for a more visually interesting experience for bridge-users and stated that Alignment A2 was a unique design, and they had not been able find a similarly designed bridge in the US. Councilor Young commented Alignment A2 did not appeal to her. Discussion occurred. Mayor Mays commented he liked Alignment A2. Council asked that KPFF create a model of what Alignment A2 would look like that included the high school. Mr. Vanderzanden replied that they would produce something to capture that view. Mr. Breshears addressed Alignment A2 – Option 3 and explained that it was similar to the other two options but instead used a Tall Arch for the main span and then Twin Girders for the approach spans. He explained that the use of Twin Girders for the approach spans would allow for a continuous smooth curve compared to Options 1 and 2. A councilor asked if those could be pre-fabricated as well? Mr. Breshears replied that was an option. Mr. Vanderzanden provided an overview of the available bridge types that could be pre-manufactured. A KPFF consultant explained that they had reached out to a few bridge manufacturing companies for their pricing and explained that any of the noted bridge types would be pre-fabricated and could be lifted into place. Mayor Mays commented that it was important that the bridge be built elsewhere and then lifted into place. Council President Rosener asked if the survey had questions regarding bridge material preferences? Mr. Vanderzanden replied that the first survey did not have those types of questions, but they could be added to the second survey that would be put out shortly. City Engineer Galati commented that the maintenance costs for the lifespan of the bridge should also be calculated and included when discussing bridge material choices. Mayor Mays stated he was in favor of steel. Mr. Vanderzanden provided an overview of the Alternatives for Alignments A1 and A2 on page 21 of the presentation and explained that all of the presented options effectively addressed the safety concerns for pedestrians and bicyclists and all the options were ADA compliant. He added that Alignment Option A2 – East Landing – Option 1, may require additional work to meet ADA standards. He addressed the desirability of Alignments A1 and A2 and stated Alignment A1 included a few angles and was slightly longer than A2. Alignment A2 provided the most direct route, but only slightly less length than A1. He addressed the utility impacts of Alignments A1 and A2 and stated that both alignments would necessitate overhead utility adjustments, and A1 would also likely require water and gas relocations. He addressed the environmental impacts of Alignments A1 and A2 and stated that there were no anticipated wetland or significant recourse impacts for either alignment, but A2 would have some impact on the existing stormwater facility. Mr. Totten addressed the Alternatives for Alignments A1 and A2 table regarding bridge types on page 22 of the presentation and reported that the alignment lengths were very similar with A1 being 20 feet longer. He referred to the debate of “gateway versus signature” bridges and commented that he felt that all the bridge types had the potential to be a gateway structure, with the Twin Girder option being the plainest and commented the Twin Girder's visual impact could be improved with art. He spoke on signature bridges and commented that Tall Arch bridges were very common because they were very efficient and that he felt that a Tall Arch bridge could still be a signature bridge and referred to Alignment

A2 – Options 1 and 2 as an efficient bridge type that was also a signature bridge because of its “undulating” design and would be uniquely identifiable to Sherwood. He addressed the ROM construction costs and commented that the prices for each bridge type was fairly similarly priced at \$13-15 million. He explained that their cost estimates included a 40% contingency rate due to the uncertainty around construction costs and commented he could see the final number for the bridge being +/- 30% of the forecasted cost. He reported that the bridge was currently at 5-10% design and once it was at 30%, they would be able to calculate a more accurate contingency. Mr. Vanderzanden recapped the next steps and reported that a second virtual open house would be held March 23<sup>rd</sup>-April 1<sup>st</sup>, a preferred alternative would be selected on April 11<sup>th</sup>, and a complete 30% design/cost estimating would be complete by June 20<sup>th</sup>.

Community Development Director Julia Hajduk voiced that staff hoped to hear specifics as to what Council wanted included in the open house survey that would help to inform Council when picking the preferred alternative and ultimate design. Councilor Scott asked if Council wished to narrow down the configuration options before putting out the survey? Mayor Mays asked if Councilor Scott wished to eliminate one or two choices? Councilor Scott replied that he preferred to get rid of one or two. Mr. Vanderzanden commented that they would need two to three alternatives in order to complete a more detailed analysis so eventually the options needed to be narrowed down and commented that he recommended putting all six options in the second survey. Councilor Scott spoke on the landing options and stated he liked option A1 because it was a walkway and it did not “come aggressively around the corner” like in A2. Within A2 he liked the walkway, but he did not like the idea of having an 8% slope. He spoke on bridge types and stated he did not like the Twin Girder option for both the main span and the approaches because from a massing standpoint, it was a lot of length with no height perspective on it, and he would get rid of that option. He stated he liked the undulating design option. Council President Rosener stated he also liked the undulating design option and commented it would be hard for him to rule out a design option until he had seen the design videos. Mr. Vanderzanden replied that he would look into how to accomplish that without having to complete a bunch of digital modeling. Councilor Garland commented that he agreed that the Twin Girder option did look plain, but if the City worked with the Cultural Arts Commission, the design could be elevated. He stated that the view of the high school from the bridge was also important and should be considered and commented that the east side landing option that curved around provided a nice view of the school. He stated that he also liked the undulating design option and commented he wanted a signature bridge for Sherwood, not something that was plain. Councilor Young asked if it was possible to add example pictures of art on other Twin Girder bridges in the survey to help people visualize what it could look like? Discussion occurred. Councilor Young stated that the Twin Girder option was her least favorite. Councilor Brouse stated she liked A2, but not A2’s approaches and she preferred A1’s approaches. She stated she liked the “third one” and agreed with Councilor Young about the need to show examples of Twin Girder art in the survey. Mr. Vanderzanden replied that example pictures of Twin Girder art would be added to the survey. Councilor Scott asked Councilor Brouse if Alignment A2 – Option 3 was the “third one” she liked? Councilor Brouse replied that was correct. Councilor Scott commented that Alignment A2 – Option 3 would also provide a nice view of the high school from the bridge. Mayor Mays stated he was not interested in a Twin Girder bridge for both the span and the approaches. He stated the second alignment with the curve was great and he liked that it avoided utilities in the roundabout. He stated the undulating design had a “wow factor” and commented he liked “wow and efficiency.” Ms. Hajduk indicated that she was not hearing a desire from Council to remove the Twin Girder option. Councilor Scott and Mayor Mays stated they would take it out. Councilor Brouse stated she would get rid of A1 in its entirety. City Engineer Galati commented it would save a lot of time if Council wanted to take the options down to one alignment and explained the state’s permitting process. Council President Rosener asked school district representative Jim Rose for his thoughts on what alignment option the school district would prefer? Mr. Rose replied that A2 would be less impactful to the building and commented that KPFF had done a lot of work on the new high school and

offered any of the available computer data to assist with the 3D visualization. Mayor Mays commented with the added savings, he agreed with Councilor Brouse. Councilor Scott stated he would get rid of Alignment A1 – Option 3. Discussion occurred. Council agreed to remove Alignment A1 – Option 3. Mayor Mays asked if there was value in narrowing down the alignment options to one instead of two? Ms. Hajduk replied that the difference between A1 and A2 was that A2 had more of a visual impact on the YMCA. Mr. Vanderzanden recapped that he had heard the Council was not interested in a ramp system and wished to do a wraparound instead. Councilor Scott asked if a design that used both Tall Arches and Bowstring Arches to do the undulating design was an option? Discussion occurred. A KPFF consultant replied that they could play with aspect ratios of both types as they had different limitations and determine if the undulating design using both types was an option. Councilor Scott stated he was fine getting rid of A1. Council President Rosener agreed with Councilor Scott. Councilor Garland commented he was in favor of A2 and he was hesitant to cut the choices down but commented he was fine with getting rid of A1. Mr. Galati recapped the discussion and stated they would get rid of Alignment A1 and go with Alignment A2 for the open house and they would present different bridge options to get public input on the survey. Ms. Hajduk commented that getting rid of that alignment would help staff focus in on what that would look like. Mayor Mays asked if adding lights to the bridge was an option? Mr. Vanderzanden replied that was possible. Discussion occurred. Councilor Scott asked if all landing options by the YMCA had been explored? Mr. Vanderzanden replied that the YMCA landing was constrained by vertical constraints, rights-of-way constraints, and the YMCA facility and it was a really tight area to design for. Councilor Scott commented that instead of curving around the building, they could do a switchback instead. Mr. Vanderzanden replied that the issue with a switchback was that it would drive the landing back towards what was shown in Alternative B from the last work session. Councilor Garland thanked KPFF for adding Council's request for stairs and a flaring out the hinge point on the east side to encourage pedestrians to use the bridge instead of the crosswalk. Councilor Young asked City Engineer Galati when the City should begin to have conversations with the state about closing down the crossing? Mr. Galati replied that it should start as soon as possible. Council President Rosener asked if pedestrian traffic changed, would it change the timing of the lights? Mr. Galati replied that there may be some impact there because it was a high volume intersection. Discussion regarding the impact of recent construction on traffic volumes occurred. Mr. Galati explained that getting the crosswalks closed was a two pronged process. The first prong was to convince the technical staff at ODOT that it was acceptable to close the crosswalk and was something City staff could do. The second prong was the political, upper management directive policy side, and was something that would require work from Council. He commented that deciding on an alignment option would help speed the process along.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item. The City Recorder read the public hearing statement.

## **8. PUBLIC HEARING:**

### **A. Ordinance 2022-002, Amending multiple sections of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code relating to Marijuana Uses *(Second Hearing)***

Planning Manager Erika Palmer recapped that the first hearing on the proposed ordinance took place on March 1<sup>st</sup> and explained the ordinance consisted of general housekeeping amendments that had been recommended by the Planning Commission. She reported that no public comments had been submitted since the first hearing. Mayor Mays asked for public comment on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Mayor Mays closed the public hearing and asked for discussion or questions from Council.

### **MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2022-002 AMENDING MULTIPLE SECTIONS OF THE SHERWOOD ZONING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**CODE RELATING TO MARIJUANA USES. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 6:0. ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

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

**B. Ordinance 2022-003 Approving annexation of approximately 20.0 acres to the City of Sherwood Clean Water Services within the Tonquin Employment Area, comprised of five tax lots and an adjacent unnamed right-of-way (*First Hearing*)**

Mayor Mays asked the councilors to disclose any ex parte contact, bias, or conflicts of interest. Councilor Brouse stated that she was the Sherwood Chamber of Commerce Executive Director. The City Recorder asked if any audience member wished to challenge. None were received. Senior Planner Joy Chang presented the "Sherwood Commerce Center – Phase II Annexation Case File: LU 2021-024 AN" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit D) and reported that the applicant was seeking approval from the City to annex approximately 20 acres of land into the City of Sherwood and Clean Water Services boundaries. She reported that the applicant was requesting the annexation by utilizing the procedures outlined in SB 1573 or ORS 222.127, which did not require a vote by the City electorate but did require a petition signed by all affected property owners and met certain approval criteria. She stated that this was a Type V application and the City Council was the hearing authority. She reported that notice of the application was routed to affected agencies on February 22, 2022 and agency comments had been incorporated into the findings and exhibits of the staff report. She recapped that staff had identified a typographical error in Exhibit 1 to the Staff Report on page 70 of the Council packet. She stated that the sending agency notices date of July 9, 2019 should have been February 22, 2022 instead and the error did not change any of staff's findings. Ms. Chang reported that public notice of the application had been provided in accordance with local, regional, and state requirements, including mailed notice to property owners within 1,000 feet of the site. She reported that as of this evening, no written public comments were received on the application. She provided an overview of the site on page 4 of the presentation and explained that the subject property was comprised of five tax lots and was located southeast of SW Oregon Street and was adjacent to an unnamed roadway that connected to SW Tonquin Road to the west and the properties were within the Tonquin Employment Area. Senior Planner Chang reported that the project site was 19.76 acres of private property with 0.24 acres of right-of-way dedication, for a total of 20.0 acres. She outlined the state, regional, and local approval criteria on pages 6-9 of the presentation and reported that the site was located within the UGB and was contiguous to the City boundary line. Community Development Director Julia Hajduk clarified that the map shown on page 7 was incorrect, but the previous maps were correct. Ms. Chang reported that staff had reviewed the urban services and had determined that it was feasible to service the site and the site was within the Washington County ESPD, and once annexed the site would be withdrawn from the County's ESPD and Sherwood Police would service the site. She stated that the proposal was consistent with Urban Service, CWS, and TVF&R agreements and would also promote orderly facilities, affect urban services, and avoid duplication of services. She provided an overview of the local Comprehensive Plan and Tonquin Employment Area Plan approval criteria and reported that all of the Growth Management and Tonquin Employment Area criteria had been met for annexation. She stated that upon annexation into the City boundary, the Employment Industrial (EI) zoning designation would be applied. Ms. Chang stated that staff recommended the approval of the proposed ordinance and outlined the Council alternatives as: adopt the ordinance with a unanimous vote during the first public hearing, hold the first public hearing at this meeting and issue a decision after the second reading on April 5<sup>th</sup>, or hold the first public hearing on the ordinance and direct staff to revise findings that denied the annexation request. Mayor Mays asked for public comment on the proposed ordinance.

Applicant representative Colby Anderson with VLMK addressed Council and stated that he and his team was very excited to work with the City of Sherwood. He stated that this was Phase II of the Sherwood Commerce Center Property, with the Planning Commission approving Phase I in February 2022. He stated that the development would reinforce Phase I and commented he and the applicant were excited to help attract “great, high-paying jobs” in Sherwood. He asked that Council consider voting on the proposed ordinance at this meeting. Mayor Mays asked if Council had any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, Mayor Mays closed the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked for discussion or questions from Council for staff. Mayor Mays commented that it was great to have another annexation into the TEA. He asked if Council wished to vote on the ordinance at this meeting? Councilor Scott replied that he was comfortable voting on the ordinance at this meeting because the proposal met all of the necessary requirements. Councilor Young commented she was comfortable voting on the ordinance at this meeting for the same reasons as Councilor Scott.

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2022-003 APPROVING ANNEXATION OF APPROXIMATELY 20.0 ACRES TO THE CITY OF SHERWOOD CLEAN WATER SERVICES WITHIN THE TONQUIN EMPLOYMENT AREA, COMPRISED OF FIVE TAX LOTS AND AN ADJACENT UNNAMED RIGHT-OF-WAY. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 6:0. ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

#### **9. CITY MANAGER REPORT:**

City Manager Campbell asked Finance Director Bodway to report on an award the city recently received. Finance Director Bodway reported that the City had received the Distinguished Budget Award from the GFOA (Government Finance Officers Association) for its most recent past budget. He stated that this was not the first time Sherwood had received the award and he would continue to do the necessary work to be awarded again in the future.

#### **10. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Councilor Scott thanked Council President Rosener for attending the Planning Commission meeting last week in his place.

Councilor Garland commented it was great to be back and great to see everyone again.

Councilor Brouse reported that the Library Advisory Board would meet on March 16<sup>th</sup> and the Senior Advisory Board met last week where they continued their work on making Sherwood an age friendly city. She reported that the Senior Center needed volunteers to assist with providing meals and encouraged people to volunteer.

Councilor Young reported that CDBG member Jennie Proctor would be retiring after many years with the Community Development department at Washington County. She reported that the CDBG had begun the process to determine how to find a replacement for Ms. Proctor. She reported that the Police Advisory Board would meet on March 17<sup>th</sup> and commented that the Traffic Safety Committee met monthly and the Police Advisory Board received monthly updates from the board.

Council President Rosener reported he attended the Small City Consortium meeting where they heard a legislative update. He reported he attended the Planning Commission meeting where they reviewed a PUD application to build apartments and discussed housing choices.

Mayor Mays reported he attended the WCCC, LOC, and Metro Mayors meetings.

#### 11. ADJOURN:

Mayor Mays adjourned the regular session at 9:10 pm.

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Keith Mays, Mayor