



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

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>

September 21, 2021

WORK SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the work session to order at 6:00 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Doug Scott, Kim Young, Sean Garland, Renee Brouse, and Russell Griffin.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Pro Tem Kristen Switzer, City Attorney Josh Soper, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Finance Director David Bodway, Police Chief Jeff Groth, HR Manager Christina Jones, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, Senior Planner Joy Chang, Civil Engineer Jason Waters, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

4. TOPICS

A. Oregon Street Design Update

Civil Engineer Jason Waters presented the Oregon Street Improvements webpage (see record, Exhibit A) and recapped that the City had hired Kittleson and Associates to complete the design plans and that the project will, "improve, modernize, and widen SW Oregon Street between SW Langer Farms Parkway and the roundabout at SW Murdock Road" as well as provide retroactive storm treatment for the entire upstream basin towards Snyder Park. He reported that the project design was currently at 60% and provided an overview of the deliverables to date. He reported that another work session would be held in January 2022 to discuss a right-of-way resolution. He stated that construction was partially funded and the 60% engineer's opinion of probable cost for budgeting purposes was \$6 million for a fully loaded CIP construction phase budget. Mr. Waters presented the "Project Manager's 60% Design Summary" document (see record, Exhibit B) and addressed Goal 1 of "Complete or incorporate a large-scale regional storm retrofit project" and explained that the project would provide stormwater treatment for the road widening projects and the upstream residential areas. He stated they were exploring partnerships with CWS so the City could take care of the nearby developable lands. He addressed Goal 2 of "Keep project costs low to offset rise/uncertainty in construction costs" and explained that one of their recommendations provided in the traffic report was to not provide a center turn median along the unconstrained and undeveloped frontage which ran east/west. He explained that that was recommended because there were constrained areas along the railroad tracks and wetlands up to the east end, which would add additional costs and the traffic study stated that left turn lanes were not warranted into the industrial lands. He provided an overview of Goals 3-8 on

page 1-2 of Exhibit B. Councilor Garland asked if the sidewalk along Oregon Street would extend all the way out to the roundabout and connect to Murdock? Mr. Water's replied that was correct. Councilor Garland asked if there were any concerns regarding not putting in a center turn lane when the future Public Works facility was constructed along Oregon Street? Civil Engineer Waters replied that they would complete an overview of off street pull outs at that location, but he felt that there was enough room for large trucks to access the future Public Works facility. He added that reviewing large vehicle accessibility would be explored more fully through the Business Oregon grant and a future Council work session. Mayor Mays confirmed that the project would not be advancing to 80% or 90% at this point? Community Development Director Julia Hajduk replied that was correct and added that at this point in the project they were refining, reviewing, and compiling feedback over the next several months. She stated that no decisions about the project would be made at this meeting.

B. Residential Design Standards

Senior Planner Joy Chang presented the "Residential Design and New Housing Choices" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit C) and stated that the intent of the Residential Design Standards was to have homes that looked high-quality and retained the overall small-town feel of Sherwood. She reported that in order to assist in reviewing the design standards, staff had drafted two residential design checklists for Council to consider. She stated that the two checklist options had been emailed to Council prior to the meeting (see record, Exhibit D). She explained that both checklists had three required standards of: Entry Location and Orientation, Garages and Off-Street Parking Areas, and Windows or Entrance Doors (15%). She stated in the original Residential Design Standards checklist there were five additional elements that were required including three items from Element 4A (Porches, Entries, and other Offsets, Roof Elements, and Window Elements) and two additional items from element 4B (Building materials and other elements) for a total of eight design elements. In the Second Option, there would be the three required standards and five additional elements from a list that consisted of: porches, entries and other offsets, roof element, window element, garage element, and building materials for a total of eight design elements. She explained that the menu of options in the Second Option checklist provided for more flexibility in regard to the developer being able to choose design elements. Ms. Chang reported that the Planning Commission preferred the original Residential Design Checklist and reported that the Planning Commission had asked for Council input regarding considering one or two elements from the subcategories instead of requiring one element from each subcategory in order to create more flexibility. She stated that the main difference between the two checklist options was that the second option allowed for lots of flexibility where the development community could pick from a menu list of the five options in addition to the original three that were required. She addressed Example 1, 2, and 3 on page 7-9 of the presentation and explained that the homes shown in the presentation were homes that had been developed and gone through the building permitting process in 2016 and 2017. Councilor Scott asked how the example home shown on page 9 of the presentation met the 60% standard? Ms. Chang replied that the lot width itself was 50 and the elevations of the garage width is 30. Councilor Scott commented that he thought the calculation was based on the width of the building not the width of the lot. Ms. Chang reread the standard and confirmed she had misread the standard and that Councilor Scott was correct, and the example shown on page 9 did not meet the garage standard. She provided an overview of the Secondary Elevations—Sides standards on page 11 of the presentation and reported that the Planning Commission had settled on requiring 10% standard for window and door openings for secondary elevations and included trim and shutters. She stated that further discussion was needed from Council to determine if there would be additional design elements that would be required for secondary elevations. She provided an overview of the Secondary Elevations—Rear standards on page 12 of the presentation and reported that the Planning Commission had settled on a 10% standard. Council President

Rosener asked how it was determined whether the side of a house was viewable by the public right-of-way? Ms. Chang replied that it was considered viewable if the house was adjacent to a public right-of-way and commented that public access ways were also included in that determination. Council President Rosener asked if that applied to a house located in a cul-de-sac? Ms. Chang replied that it would. Councilor Scott interjected that he did not think it would apply to houses in a cul-de-sac because the lot line would not abut the public right-of-way. He continued that the discussion at the Planning Commission level had been how it would only apply if a road, sidewalk, trail, or accessway ran along a lot line, and it would not apply to a cul-de-sac scenario. Ms. Chang stated that it would depend on how the cul-de-sac was laid out. Councilor Scott commented that it depended on how the code was written instead and added that the Planning Commission could discuss the issue further. Ms. Chang commented that the Residential Design Standards would go before the Planning Commission before their hearing on October 12th. Senior Planner Chang asked for questions or discussion from Council. Councilor Griffin commented he liked the 15% window coverage on the front and commented on the differences between the visual appeal of the front of the house on page 8 compared to the back of the house. Mayor Mays commented that he supported the Planning Commission's support of the original checklist and that he also liked the 15% front, 15% in the rear if it was a double frontage lot, and 10% on the side if it was along a public right-of-way. Councilor Scott clarified that the recommendation was 10% in the back if it was facing, not 15%. Ms. Chang replied that was correct and added that it would be considered a secondary elevation so it would be 10% for both the side and the rear. Councilor Griffin commented he liked the original Planning Commission recommendation. Councilor Brouse commented she liked the opportunity to build in flexibility and was in favor of the second checklist. Councilor Young commented she was in favor of the original checklist. Councilor Griffin asked what the Planning Commission's thoughts were on the second checklist? Senior Planner Chang replied that the Planning Commission suggested that to try and add more flexibility, and to help address what the development community was asking for, was to instead only ask for one from A, B, or C, or two from A, B, or C that they could choose from and then the remaining 3-4 elements could come from any of the choices instead of asking one from each of the subgroups. Community Development Director Hajduk clarified that the second checklist was created through the course of the conversation with the Planning Commission. Councilor Scott interjected that his recollection was that the second checklist came from staff, not the Planning Commission after which the Planning Commission discussed both checklists. Ms. Chang explained that at a previous discussion with the Planning Commission, they had asked if it was possible to base the elements on percentages and staff had determined that some of the elements could not be calculated in percentages. She added that public feedback had been received that indicated a desire for more flexibility to the standards, so staff had created the second checklist option to provide that flexibility. Mayor Mays asked how to legislate against "cookie cutter" homes in new developments? Senior Planner Chang replied that Sherwood had a standard for housing variety for new developments. She added that the Residential Design Standards would be implemented at the time that developers submitted their building permits, so with every building permit there would be a checklist attached to it. She commented that there would be different standards for townhomes and cottage clusters. She recapped that she had heard that the majority of Council preferred the original checklist as recommended by the Planning Commission. Council President Rosener, Councilor Garland, and Councilor Scott stated they were in favor of the original checklist. Councilor Griffin commented he liked the original checklist because it would help create housing variety. Council President Rosener asked that it be made clear that design details need to be visible from the street and clearly define what design details were. Senior Planner Chang asked Council if Sherwood should require additional design elements added to the secondary elevations? Mayor Mays asked Ms. Chang her opinion on the question. She replied that since it was a secondary element, and there was already a 10% window, door, trim and shutter, she did not feel that additional requirements were necessary for the side or rear. Councilor Scott commented that he wanted to see either trim or shutters added to the requirements since it was likely that

developers would be adding those elements to get to the 10%. Councilor Griffin asked if Ms. Chang thought 5% would be more appropriate? Ms. Chang replied that staff had originally recommended 5% but the Planning Commission had moved forward with 10%. Councilor Scott put forward the idea that the percentage could be lowered to 7.5% if shutters, or trim, or a bay window be required elements. Mayor Mays commented he liked Councilor Scott's idea of requiring shutters or trim as a secondary element and having that count towards the 10% total glazing. Councilor Young commented she liked that idea.

Senior Planner Chang addressed Development Standard Landscaping – Minimum and recapped that Council had requested that the Planning Commission further evaluate this standard and the Planning Commission recommended minimum landscaping standards for the front yard only, instead of total lot area. She provided front yard examples on pages 16-17 of the presentation. Mayor Mays asked what percentage the Planning Commission was recommending? Ms. Chang replied that the Planning Commission did not have a percentage, but they suggested that only the front yard be considered. Ms. Chang asked for feedback from Council on what was considered “landscaping materials.” She explained that as the code was currently written, native evergreen or deciduous trees and shrubs, evergreen ground cover, perennial plantings, were considered landscaping materials but bark, rock, and concrete pavers were not cited in the code. She outlined the potential standards as: provide one percentage requirement e.g., 40%, provide a range of percentages e.g., 40-50%, or not provide a percentage, but require everything excluding x, y, z. Councilor Scott commented that he was happy to see standard option 3 and that he felt that it should be limited to the driveway and walkways and everything else had to be greenscape. Mayor Mays commented he liked the idea of only regulating the front and then having the Planning Commission further refine it and that he felt that the third option was reasonable. Council President Rosener interjected that swales should be included in the exclusions. Councilor Scott commented that the standards would only apply to new developments or significant remodels. Councilor Young asked if there was any fear that people would make their pedestrian pathways much wider or take up more of their front yard since they were excluded? Mayor Mays commented that that could be solved with code language and clear definitions and asked that it be delineated in the code that concrete pavers and rock were not greenscape. Senior Planner Chang asked if river rock would be considered landscaping? Councilor Scott commented that he felt that bark and river rock were landscaping and that someone extending their driveway with pavers was a different story. Councilors Garland and Young commented that they both felt that bark and river rock counted as landscaping. Community Development Director Hajduk summarized that Council wished to make it clear that things you could park a car on would not be considered landscaping materials.

Senior Planner Chang addressed Development Standard Garage – Functionality and stated that the Sherwood Building Official had identified that minimum or maximum garage sizes are not in the building code themselves, but designers used common construction standards when planning the size of garages. She provided garage dimension examples on pages 21-23 of the presentation. Mayor Mays asked what the Planning Commission's thoughts were. Ms. Chang replied that the Planning Commission was fine with those dimensions and there had not been any changes suggested by the Planning Commission. Community Development Director Hajduk clarified that she recalled that the Planning Commission had seen a range of dimensions, but staff had removed the range to just state the minimum. She gave the example that a two car garage originally had a width range of 18-20 feet, and staff had edited it to simply say a minimum width of 18 feet instead. She clarified that the table shown on page 24 of the presentation had the same information the Planning Commission had reviewed, only without the ranges. Ms. Chang addressed a previous Council comment that garages had to function as a parking space and explained that the sentence of, “The vehicle parking area(s) shall be functional. Furnaces, stairs, etc. shall not be located within the garage designated parking areas,” had been added to provide clarity to the code. Councilor Scott

commented that the garage dimension minimums seemed okay to him. Council President Rosener asked that "parking area" be clearly defined.

Senior Planner Chang addressed Process Adjustments and Variances and recapped that Council had asked the Planning Commission to consider allowing Adjustments but not to allow for Variances. She reported that the Planning Commission had completed their review and recommended allowing for both types of modifications but possibly lowering the percentage and change instead of not allowing Variances. She explained that 10% of the standard was typical for Adjustments, and the Planning Commission was recommending changing it to allow for 5% instead. For Variances, up to 20% was typical and the Planning Commission was recommending only allowing 10%. Ms. Chang voiced that staff was also asking Council to consider impacts to irregular shaped lots or environmental constraints sites as those were typically the ones that Adjustments and Variances were requested for. Mayor Mays stated he still preferred to not alter key things like side yards and rear yards. Councilor Young asked if Adjustments and Variances were on a case-by-case basis and were approved by staff? Senior Planner Chang replied that yes, typically Class B Variances were reviewed by staff. She added that a Class A Variance was above the 20% threshold and the Planning Commission would review those requests. Councilor Scott stated that a Class B Variance would require a public notice and the Adjustment does not. Ms. Chang replied that was correct. Mayor Mays recommended he would support following the Planning Commission's recommendation but not making the rear yard or interior side yard eligible. He clarified that he was supportive of exterior side yard Variances. Council President Rosener asked how rear yards were measured when lot lines were not parallel to the house? Ms. Chang explained that there was a definition of how to measure an irregular lot. Community Development Director Hajduk explained that if it was a triangle there was a line that was 10 feet long and that became the rear lot line and then you measured your rear setback from that. Councilor Scott added that line had to be parallel to the front yard. Councilor Griffin commented he supported the Planning Commission's recommendation to bring the percentages down and that he was not in favor of adjusting side yards. Councilor Griffin asked if this would ever apply to all the lots in a development or only the last lot to be developed? Councilor Scott clarified that there could be a request that asks for a Variance on every lot. Councilor Young asked how often did they predict people would request for Adjustments and Variances? Ms. Hajduk replied that the City already allowed Adjustments and Variances and that the City did not typically get many requests. She clarified that the question was whether or not the City should continue to allow for them with the design standards and with the incoming infill, and that the concern was that more requests would come in over time because of the possibility of more infill. Council President Rosener commented that that was his view on it as well and due to the effects of HB 2001, he expected to see much more infill and it was important to preserve the character of the neighborhoods. Councilor Scott stated that his suggestion was that Council cut the percentages in half and make side yard adjustments not eligible. Councilors Griffin and Young stated they liked that suggestion. Mayor Mays stated he would like to exclude rear side yards as well. Councilor Scott commented he was fine with leaving the flexibility on rear. Council President Rosener and Councilor Griffin stated their agreement with Councilor Scott. Council President Rosener added that he would remove the reference to irregular lots since the 10 foot parallel line calculation Ms. Hajduk had described addressed that. Councilor Scott added that another alternative could be to make it a higher level variance that requires a public hearing. Council President Rosener stated that once the rules were in place the property value would be based on the number of lots with those rules and it would already be built in, so he was not worried about it. Councilor Scott commented that if it gets to the point where parcels are not developed because of the rules, then Council can decide to relax the rules in the future, and he would rather relax the rules down the line than end up with bad results because the rules were not strong enough to start with. Councilor Griffin commented that the City of Tualatin's Residential Design Standards stated that their rear glazing requirement on a single family home was 12% and 10% if

the house had a residential wall design element above the minimum. Their side corner lot facing the public street was 8%, or 6% if it had a wall design element. Senior Planner Chang recapped Council's feedback as: reducing Adjustments to 5%, reducing Class B Variance to 10%, and not allowing any Adjustments or Variance to side yards. Council agreed that that was their feedback.

Ms. Chang addressed Council's other previous feedback of adding the use of the word "family" to related housing type descriptions as well as adding a Council call up review option. She explained that new language had been added to define "family" as, "Any number of individuals living together regardless of familial or non-familial relationship." She stated that City Attorney Soper had helped draft the definition. Council stated their approval of the definition. Senior Planner Chang provided an overview of the proposed code amendment to add the Council review option on page 31 of the presentation and stated that City Attorney Soper had drafted the language. She recapped the three items that needed further input from Council as: Roadway Width to allow for off-site parking, Onsite Swales, and review what can be done in a Residential PUD. Mayor Mays asked why the PUD element could not be a part of the Residential Design Standards update? Ms. Chang explained that PUDs had a process that required architectural pattern books and had their own particular design elements that were tied to them and when a building permit came in with a PUD, they were subject to those elements that were approved based on the architectural pattern book. Community Development Director Hajduk clarified that what they were referring to was the setbacks and lot sizes for the Residential PUD, and what needed to be done was for staff to draft something for the Planning Commission to review that compiled Council's feedback. Councilor Scott stated he did not want to do that because he felt it would slow the process down and he wished to get the Residential Design Standards passed as soon as possible so they could go into effect as soon as possible. Mayor Mays asked Community Development Director Hajduk how doing so would pause the process? Ms. Hajduk replied that she could look into whether or not there was a simple short-term solution because they were not talking about revising the whole.... Mayor Mays interjected that no, they were talking about doing it in a very simple, quick way like they had done everything else to this point. Council President Rosener clarified that what they were trying to accomplish was that they did not want the PUD process to be used as an end run around the Residential Design Standards. Ms. Hajduk commented that if what staff proposed for the PUD would cause delays, then Council could discuss setting it aside and drafting something for the short-term to address the concerns that were brought up at this meeting. Senior Planner Chang addressed Community Comments and next steps on pages 33-34 and reported that they had received community comments from the development community and the general public. She recapped that the development community felt that the Residential Design Standards were too prescriptive and requested additional flexibility. She reported that there were questions tied to land use vesting rights and that comments from the general public had been received that stated that they felt that the additional design rules were arbitrary and based on tastes and instead should be based on scientific reasons for a healthier environment. Senior Planner Chang reported that the Planning Commission's first hearing on the Residential Design Standards updates would be held on October 26th and a second hearing, if necessary, would be held November 9th. If there was no second hearing for the Planning Commission, then Council would hold their first public hearing on the Residential Design Standards on November 16th and December 7th was scheduled for the second hearing. Council thanked Ms. Chang for her presentation.

5. ADJOURN:

Mayor Mays adjourned the work session at 7:22 pm and convened a regular session.

REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Kim Young, Sean Garland, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, and Russell Griffin.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Pro Tem Kristen Switzer, City Attorney Josh Soper, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Finance Director David Bodway, Police Chief Jeff Groth, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, HR Manager Christina Jones, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

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

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

5. **CONSENT AGENDA:**

- A. Approval of September 7, 2021 City Council Meeting Minutes
- B. Resolution 2021-086 Authorizing City Manager or City Manager Pro Tem to Purchase Materials and Supplies for Sherwood Broadband
- C. Resolution 2021-087 Appointing Jennifer Casler to the Sherwood Cultural Arts Commission
- D. Resolution 2021-088 Authorizing the City Manager Pro Tem to execute a construction contract for the Division Street and Mansfield Street Grind and Inlay Project

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT ROSENER. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

6. **CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

The City Recorder reported that there were no citizen comments.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item. The City Recorder read the public hearings statement and reported that no public testimony had been received for the ordinance.

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. Ordinance 2021-008 Amending sections of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code to modify standards for residential uses in Commercial Land Use Districts (*Second Reading*)

Planning Manager Erika Palmer presented the "Multi-Family in Commercial Land Use Districts Development Code Update" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit E) and recapped the questions Council had

raised at the first hearing as: the proposed language was not clear that parking is prohibited on the ground floor, the ceiling height measurement could be more clearly defined, and it was necessary to state that there are no limitations on the number of internal stairwells, only external stairwells. Mayor Mays commented that he did not agree with the work staff had completed regarding internal stairwells. She explained that staff had taken Council's feedback and revised the proposed language to make the standards clearer. She provided an overview of the proposed language changes on page 3 of the presentation. She reported that after speaking to Building Official Scott McKie, the ceiling height in the proposal was reduced from 14 feet to 12 feet and that in addition to the height change, the standard had been reworded to better reflect the building code. Council President Rosener asked that more language be added that made it clear what the standards were and to remove ambiguity around where measurements should be taken from. City Attorney Josh Soper explained that the language they had drafted stated that the measurements were to be taken from, "the lowest point of the surface of the ceiling" in order to account for things like visible beams. Council President Rosener commented that the feedback Council had provided regarding internal stairwells was different than what was reflected in the draft language. He explained that his concern was that if there were housing units that had a second floor and each one had its own stairwell, that would use up a lot of square footage on the first floor regardless of whether or not it was outside or inside. City Attorney Soper explained that he had drafted the language based on the misunderstanding that Council wanted to regulate stairwells based on whether or not they were outside accessible versus internal. He continued, that if the intention was to regulate based on whether or not they were accessible from the first floor or not, Council could amend Section 7 to read, "a building with multi-family housing is limited to two stairwells that can be entered from the ground floor of the building. There are no limits on the number of stairwells that are not able to be entered from the ground floor except as otherwise provided by this code." Mayor Mays and Council President Rosener stated that they liked the proposed language change by City Attorney Soper. Discussion regarding potential interpretations of the language occurred. Mayor Mays closed the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked for discussion or motion to amend the proposal.

MOTION: FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT ROSENER TO AMEND ITEM 5 IN EXHIBIT B OF THE ORDINANCE TO READ "THE MINIMUM CEILING HEIGHT SHALL BE 12 FEET MEASURED FROM THE FINISHED FLOOR TO THE LOWEST POINT OF THE SURFACE OF THE CEILING." SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO AMEND ITEM 7 IN EXHIBIT B OF THE ORDINANCE WITH THE LANGUAGE PRESENTED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY. SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT ROSENER. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2021-008 AMENDING SECTIONS OF THE SHERWOOD ZONING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE TO MODIFY STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USES IN COMMERCIAL LAND USE DISTRICTS AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

8. CITY MANAGER REPORT:

City Manager Pro Tem Kristen Switzer asked Community Development Director Julia Hajduk to speak on the traffic issues around the new high school. Ms. Hajduk recapped that there had been many traffic issues

associated with the opening of the new high school, including traffic backing up into the roundabout and Highway 99W in the first few days of the school year. She reported that the Police Department was working closely with the school district to address the immediate needs and were continuing to address those concerns. Ms. Hajduk commented that the school district staff had observed the problems that were occurring in the first few days of the school year and had made some minor modifications that had some significant impacts including emailing the parents instructions on how to drop off students because students were getting dropped off too early in the queue which caused traffic to back up. Other modifications included having staff assist in directing drop off traffic and new signage. She reported that Police Chief Jeff Groth, City Engineer Bob Galati, Police Captain Carlson, and herself and district staff had visited the high school this morning to observe the drop off traffic. She explained that they observed a few more issues that they could address to improve things and reported that the district was bringing in their traffic consultant later this week to review the traffic issues. She stated that the biggest issue was that parents continued to drop off their students too early in the queue as well as some traffic signal timing issues. She reported that the police were also going to deploy officers to different locations to help address some of the issues that they observed. Other potential improvements included adding alternate drop-off locations and fixing signal timing issues. Council President Rosener commented that this issue was happening region-wide and the issue was that parents did not want their children riding the bus during a pandemic. Community Development Director Hajduk replied that she had spoken with the person in charge of bussing and she had reported that they had not had to eliminate routes due to driver shortages thus far. Mayor Mays asked if they were also reviewing ways to alleviate the traffic bottlenecks that led to drivers cutting through residential neighborhoods. Ms. Hajduk replied that that was part of what they were looking at, but she felt that if they could improve the flow of traffic into the high school and as people learned the drop off instructions then many of the problems would resolve themselves. Mayor Mays asked if the traffic flow issues at the high school occurred more in the morning or in the afternoon? Ms. Hajduk replied that the school reported that their on-site issues were profoundly worse in the afternoon, but the impacts to the community were not as extreme in the afternoon. Council President Rosener asked Chief Groth for an estimate of how many students were walking to school and crossing Highway 99W. Chief Groth commented that compared to the population of the school, it was not very many, but it was a fair number of students at the Highway 99W crossing.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

9. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilor Garland reported that he sat in on the Police Advisory Board where they heard a presentation on use of force from Washington County District Attorney Kevin Barton. He thanked the Sherwood Police Department for the work they have done with the school since school had begun as well as Sherwood teachers, staff, and administration for their hard work to address traffic and bussing routes.

Councilor Young reported that she attended the CDBG grant meeting on September 16th. She reported she would attend the next YMCA Board of Managers meeting.

Council President Rosener thanked the school district for their work during the new school year and commented he was impressed with how nimble the busses had been to adapt to changes. He thanked City Manager Pro Tem Kristen Switzer and staff for their hard work. He reported he would attend the Greater Portland Inc Small Cities Consortium on September 22nd. He reported he was meeting with Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington on September 22nd.

Councilor Griffin reported that the Robin Hood Festival Association Winter Festival would be held December 4th from 4:00 pm-6:15 pm.

Mayor Mays reported he attended the Washington County Mayors meeting where they heard a presentation from Sheriff Pat Garrett and District Attorney Kevin Barton on the Washington County Family Peace Center. He reported he attended the Washington County Coordinating Committee meeting where they heard a presentation on the Major Transportation Improvement Program in Washington County.

10. ADJOURN:

Mayor Mays adjourned the regular session at 8:09 pm.

Attest:


Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder


Keith Mays, Mayor