City of Sherwood Oregon

*Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge*

# CITY COUNCIL MEETING PACKET

**FOR**

## Tuesday, December 1, 2026

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

### 5:15 pm City Council Work Session

### 7:00 pm City Council Regular Meeting

### City Council Executive Session

**(Following the 7:00 pm Regular City Council Meeting)**
**(ORS 192.660(2)(h), Pending Litigation; (2)(f), Exempt Public Records; and (2)(i), Performance Evaluation)**

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

City of Sherwood Oregon

*Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge*

**AGENDA**

**SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL**
**December 1, 2026**

**5:15 pm City Council Work Session**

**7:00 pm City Council Regular Session**

**City Council Executive Session**
**(Following the 7:00pm Regular City Council Meeting)**
**(ORS 192.660(2)(h), Pending Litigation; (2)(f), Exempt Public Records; and (2)(i), Performance Evaluation**

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

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

## 5:15 PM CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

1. **YMCA Update**
   (Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager) (5:15 pm)
2. **City Boards & Commissions Chairs Annual Meeting**
   (Craig Sheldon, City Manager) (6:00 pm)
3. **Axon Contract Renewal Discussion**
   (Ty Hanlon, Police Chief)

## 7:00 PM CITY COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL**
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
5. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   - **A. Approval of November 17, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes** (Sylvia Murphy, City Recorder)
   - **B. Resolution 2026-072, Appointing Jenny Quirie to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board**
     (Maiya Martin Burbank, Senior Center Manager)
   - **C. Resolution 2026-073, Reappointing Cliff Taylor to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board**
     (Maiya Martin Burbank, Senior Center Manager)
   - **D. Resolution 2026-074, Reappointing Jen Myers to the Sherwood Senior Center Advisory Board**
     (Maiya Martin Burbank, Senior Center Manager)
   - **E. Resolution 2026-075, Authorizing the City Manager to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Clean Water Services for Erosion Control Services**
     (Rich Sattler, Public Works Director)
   - **F. Resolution 2026-076, Supporting Reforms to Oregon Public Meetings Law**
     (Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager)
6. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**
7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. **Ordinance 2026-007, Establishing a Commercial Public Safety Fee and Adding Section 3.50 to the Sherwood Municipal Code** *(Second Hearing)* (David Bodway, Finance Director)

**8. CITY MANAGER REPORT**

**9. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**10. ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

A. **ORS 192.660 (2)(h), Pending Litigation; and (2)(i), Performance Evaluations**

**11. ADJOURN**

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

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

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

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

**SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**
**22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or**
**November 17, 2026**

**WORK SESSION**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Council President Young called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Council President Kim Young, Councilors Keith Mays, Renee Brouse, Taylor Giles, and Dan Standke. Mayor Tim Rosener and Councilor Doug Scott were absent.

3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, IT Director Brad Crawford, City Attorney Ryan Adams, Paralegal Josh Cook, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Police Captain Corey Jentzsch, Public Works Director Rich Sattler, Finance Director David Bodway, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, City Engineer Jason Waters, Center for the Arts Manager Chanda Hall, Project Manager Joy Chang, Human Resources Director Lydia McEvoy, Deputy City Recorder Colleen Resch, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

   **OTHERS PRESENT:** Phil Worth with Kittleson and Associates.

   **TRAFFIC SAFETY BOARD MEMBERS:** Tony Bevel, Richard Amicci, and Lisa Patterson.

4. **TOPICS:**

   **Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update**

   TSP Project Manager Joy Chang introduced Phil Worth and provided a presentation (see record, Exhibit A). Mr. Worth described the presentation as a briefing on draft work. He said no action or decision was requested. He explained that the work to date had inventoried the pedestrian, bicycle, transit and motor vehicle networks, assessed existing conditions, and forecasted growth in households and jobs. He stated these steps produced a list of needs and associated solutions that would later be converted into numbered projects. He noted for comparison, the 2014 TSP contained 112 projects, and this update was well above that. He recapped the recent and current community engagement outreach efforts. Ms. Chang responded to councilor comments regarding outreach and said that the Citizen Advisory Committee included representatives of the Parks Board, the Senior Center, and the Youth Advisory Board. She added that notices had been placed in city utility bills and that the engagement plan could be strengthened during the roughly six months remaining. Discussion followed and Ms. Chang noted the outreach suggestions and said she would re-evaluate the public engagement plan.

   Mr. Worth explained that a low stress transportation network had become foundational to the update. He said the current goal for the TSP was a Level of Traffic Stress 2 (LTS 2) for both pedestrian and bicycle facilities. He commented on proposed solutions to achieve a LTS 2 and said the pedestrian network assumed

sidewalks on both sides of every street, with trails and shared-use paths included. He noted most of the city already met this standard, and the dashed lines on the map (Figure 2 in the presentation) marked gaps and barriers to this goal. Mr. Worth said twelve crossing locations were flagged for improvement, and two locations were added to the map after the packet was distributed. Ms. Chang noted that the Brookman Trail connectivity alternatives study and the potential railroad overpass would be reflected in the plan as their outcomes became known. Mr. Worth said the bicycle network was intended to connect all neighborhoods and key destinations rather than provide a facility on every street and stated it had more gaps to close than the pedestrian network to achieve a LTS 2.

Mr. Worth proposed treating safety projects as a distinct project type, in recognition of the city's commitment to becoming a zero-fatality community. He said five years of ODOT crash data were studied, and the identified solutions included additional roundabouts, mostly at intersections rather than along corridors. He noted transit improvements depend largely on TriMet, whose long-term plans include improvements to Routes 94 and 97 if funding were found. He said street extensions were now called multimodal network improvements so that they account for sidewalks and bike lanes as well as vehicle lanes. He stated the few intersection capacity needs were on the highway and were being addressed with ODOT. He commented on freight improvements and noted the freight map reflected ODOT and Washington County freight routes and was judged an adequate network. Councilor Mays asked whether ODOT was receptive to coordination, and Mr. Worth said throughput on the highway remained ODOT's primary priority along with safety. He also described Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) strategies, such as coordinated signals, and noted that Union Pacific typically responded to proposals for new rail crossings by asking which crossings the city would close. He discussed the project schedule and next steps.

Councilor Giles said that filling sidewalk gaps should be weighed by the safety benefit gained, and Mr. Worth confirmed that the evaluation and prioritization process was intended to deliver this. He added that transportation-disadvantaged areas and the Town Center designation would be elevated in prioritization.

Council expressed support for a joint work session with the Planning Commission after the project prioritization step (Task 7) and before the adoption hearings. Ms. Chang agreed to schedule one. She explained that the TSP was proceeding in two phases because Sherwood West still requires comprehensive planning and zoning, and that the new state mandates were still being worked through. Ms. Chang reported that the online interactive mapping input was reported to have a level of activity similar to the first round, which drew over 200 entries. She said public engagement closed Friday, November 20. She stated staff would return to Council in February or March with an initial evaluation and prioritization of projects, and a draft TSP was anticipated in April, with adoption in mid to late spring.

Council President Young addressed the next item on the agenda.

**Safe Streets Sherwood Discussion and Sherwood Traffic Safety Board Roundtable**

Council President Young welcomed the Traffic Safety Board (TSB) members and explained that the roundtables with each board and commission were intended to align with Council goals ahead of the board chairs' final meeting next month and early-year Council goal setting. Ms. Chang presented the Safe Streets program, which responded to the 2026-2027 Council goal to analyze and explore lowering residential speed limits. She said the project team consists of Police, Engineering, Legal and Public Works staff. She noted urban SDK data indicated that Sherwood roadways were generally operating safely, and staff had consulted ODOT on the city's options for setting and changing speed limits. She said staff reviewed speed reduction programs in Tigard, Lake Oswego, Eugene and Portland. She commented on Woodburn and said they took

the question to voters who chose not to pursue it. She stated Portland completed its reduction from 25 to 20 mph in 2019, and a Portland State University study published in October 2020 analyzed 214,000 data points at 58 locations. She said the study found lower percentages of drivers exceeding 25, 30 and 35 mph, but it could not conclude that the limit change itself caused the change in driving speeds. She commented that the authors of the study noted that even small speed reductions could have large safety benefits for pedestrians. Councilor Giles observed that the share of drivers exceeding 25 mph fell only from about 24 percent to 23.6 percent. He said the more important question was whether crashes became less severe, and he questioned the value of reducing limits where few people drove at high speeds. Ms. Chang reported that the TSB unanimously supported reducing speeds in Old Town and continuing to discuss and evaluate residential/neighborhood districts. Councilor Standke asked for TSB member feedback on the recommendation. TSB member Lawrence O'Keefe was unable to attend and submitted email comments (see record, Exhibit C). TSB member Richard Amicci noted the board was divided on speed reduction in residential areas. He said Chair Wuertz found studies from Massachusetts and France showing only a slight downward shift in speeds. Mr. Amicci also reported that community members he spoke with, including parents of school-age children, often perceived the potential speed reduction as a revenue generator, particularly amid discussion of speed cameras. He said he supported more community outreach and continued discussion concerning reducing residential speeds. He noted the Police Department's funding needs and a possible future public vote on a utility fee and concluded that proceeding in residential areas could hurt the department in the short term. Discussion followed regarding public outreach ideas. Councilor Giles said that if limits were to be reduced, the focus should be on areas where drivers travel 35 to 40 mph. TSB member Lisa Patterson noted that research showed fewer high-end speeders after a reduction. She commented on the "20 is plenty" campaign and community education, rather than enforcement, was where behavior change comes from. Councilor Giles asked whether a voluntary campaign using yard signs and a "Slow Down Sherwood" month, possibly involving the Sherwood Youth Advisory Board, could be conducted without changing the posted limit. Council President Young cautioned that signs showing 20 beside a posted 25 could confuse drivers. Ms. Chang said she would check whether a campaign would be permitted by ODOT and whether it could qualify for Safe Routes to School funding, since it was a program rather than a physical improvement. Council expressed agreement with the board's recommendation to proceed with evaluating a speed reduction in the Old Town business district only. Council also agreed to continue discussion and evaluation of residential neighborhood streets pending additional analysis and public engagement. Councilor Mays suggested that individual narrow, high-risk streets, such as Dewey, might merit targeted treatment. Council President Young asked staff to consider what a public engagement campaign for residential areas would look like. Ms. Chang explained that some Old Town streets could be changed by statute without analysis, while others previously granted special speeds require ODOT review, which typically takes about two years. She reported that Tigard spent $17,000 on sign changes using staff labor, compared with an estimated $57,000 for a contractor. She estimated that Old Town would need about a dozen signs, at a modest cost. Staff comments were received regarding the city producing signage.

TSB member Tony Bevel commented on other traffic safety matters and board members raised the need for safer roads and pathways for bicyclists. Councilor Giles suggested more frequent street sweeping on main throughways and more reflective pavement paint. Mr. Sheldon said Tualatin Sherwood Road was swept twice monthly and the newer bike path monthly, and that GPS data could be pulled to verify. Mr. Amicci said the Police Advisory Board's goals for next year would include addressing the growing concern over e-bikes and noted the state's recent lowering of the e-bike age. Ms. Chang reported that a website had been generated where residents could suggest speed camera locations. Ms. Patterson described a safety action plan that would make the city more competitive for infrastructure and safety grants.

Council President Young addressed the next item on the agenda.

**Discuss Allocation of Percentages of Transient Lodging Tax (TLT) Dollars**

Finance Director David Bodway followed up on the July 7 Council work session. He said at that meeting Council determined to increase the TLT rate from 3 to 5 percent on January 1, 2027, and from 5 to 6 percent on January 1, 2028. He noted that a new state law, effective January 1, 2027, allows revenue to be split evenly, with 50 percent for general purposes and 50 percent for tourism and economic development. He said the current allocation sends 30 percent to the Center for the Arts, and the remaining 70 percent was split between the public art fund (33.3 percent) and the economic development promotion fund (66.6 percent). Mr. Bodway reviewed ideas raised in July for discretionary funds, including trails, the library and library signage, wayfinding, and support for the Chamber of Commerce. Council remained supportive of directing 50 percent of the TLT to the General Fund for the Center for the Arts. Councilor Giles asked whether conditions were attached to the added funding. Council members responded that the funds were intended to maintain existing services and reduce the draw on the General Fund, and that any excess revenue the center generated in the future would be welcomed. Councilor Mays advocated holding the public art fund at its current dollar level as the overall revenue grows and directing the excess through Council goal setting with input from the Cultural Arts Commission. Council President Young relayed that Councilor Scott, who was absent, advocated for a wayfinding program and history monuments. Mr. Bodway reported that the public art fund balance was about $110,000 as of October 31. He added that doubling the rate would leave roughly $37,300 in additional discretionary funds if the other allocations stayed the same. Council President Young and Councilor Brouse proposed setting aside about $10,000 for the Chamber of Commerce under economic development and promotion, evaluated annually. Councilor Mays agreed. Councilor Giles discussed whether medallions and wayfinding fit within the Public Art Fund or should be treated as a separate tourism item, with Councilor Giles preferring to preserve the existing level of public art. Discussion followed regarding other possible uses of TLT funds which included maintenance of the Morback House, which was currently paid from the General Fund, and the Old Town study and façade programs.

Mr. Bodway summarized that the Center for the Arts allocation and the art fund would be held at current levels and the additional amount of about $37,300 would remain unallocated, potentially in contingency, until Council decided at its goal-setting session how to divide it among the Chamber, the historical society, wayfinding and economic development promotion. He said the allocation would be finalized through the budget process, with changes taking effect with the July 1 budget. Mr. Bodway said he would summarize the discussion and send it to Council.

Council President Young adjourned the work session at 7:08 pm.

## REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Council President Young called the meeting to order at 7:17 pm.

2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Council President Kim Young, Councilors Keith Mays, Renee Brouse, Taylor Giles, and Dan Standke. Mayor Rosener and Councilor Doug Scott were absent.

3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, IT Director Brad Crawford, City Attorney Ryan Adams, Paralegal Josh Cook, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Public Works Director Rich Sattler, Finance Director David Bodway, Human Resources Director Lydia McEvoy, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR MAYS TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 5:0. ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR. (MAYOR ROSENER AND COUNCILOR SCOTT WERE ABSENT).**

Council President Young addressed the next item on the agenda.

**5. CONSENT AGENDA:**

**A. Approval of October 6, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes**
**B. Approval of October 20, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes**
**C. Approval of November 3, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes**
**D. Resolution 2026-068, Appointing Kyle Green to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board**
**E. Resolution 2026-069, Appointing Steve Munsterman to the Sherwood Budget Committee**
**F. Resolution 2026-070, Reappointing Lana Painter to the Sherwood Budget Committee**
**G. Resolution 2026-071, Reappointing Thomas Sherwood to the Sherwood Budget Committee**

**MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR MAYS. MOTION PASSED 5:0. ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR. (MAYOR ROSENER AND COUNCILOR SCOTT WERE ABSENT).**

Council President Young addressed the next item on the agenda.

**6. CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

None. Council President Young addressed the next agenda item.

**7. CITY MANAGER REPORT:**

Mr. Sheldon reported that the city applied for a grant for $166,450 through the Business Oregon Regional Infrastructure Grant, which had 165 applicants, for the Columbia Street extension. He thanked Community Development Director Eric Rutledge and his team for their efforts.

**8. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Councilor Mays reported on the Cultural Arts Commission meeting and provided updates on the Cannery restroom wrap and the pedestrian bridge medallions. He said there would be a one night only performance by Jason Robert Brown and Friends, a three-time Tony Award winner, on December 14 at the Center for the Arts.

Councilor Standke reported on the Traffic Safety Board meeting and said there was a new mobile speed camera interactive website, on the city website, for the public to submit suggested locations. He said the TSB would discuss e-bikes in the future. He reported on the Sherwood School Board and Library Advisory Board and provided updates. He read a statement regarding the protest activities in Old Town. *Several residents have expressed concerns that interactions between protesters and members of the public may become more confrontational, whether or not everyone agrees with the characterization, I think it's important that we continue to support public safety and the constitutional right to peacefully assemble and express different*

*views. I plan on being in Old Town on Saturday, not as an organizer or participant in any particular message but to observe and help ensure that our public spaces remain welcoming, safe, and respectful for everyone. Peaceful protest is a fundamental American right and harassment, intimidation, or interference with others is not. I've also seen comments asking why people are protesting national issues when there are challenges right here is Sherwood, Oregon. I think that's a fair question. As a Councilor, I try to do my best to stay informed about what's happening in our community, but I know I don't know everything. In fact, many times the first time I hear about an issue is because the resident sends an email, comes to these meetings for public comment, or I just ask them how is it going for you in Sherwood. That's how we get our information and learn about concerns that matter to people that we serve. Public demonstrations can serve a similar purpose. They're one of the ways that people communicate, that they believe something deserves attention and that they want change. Whether that issue involves government accountability, transparency, ethics, conflicts of interest, national security, or something else entirely, people are exercising their right to make their voices heard. Sometimes I hear people ask why are they focused on issues or these issues when there's so many other problems. To me I see that as, you know, like seeing someone wear a pink ribbon for breast cancer awareness and asking why they don't care about every other form of cancer. Most of us understand that's not the point of the ribbon. It simply means that at that moment that particular issue is important to them. In the same way, people who are speaking out on one issue are not necessarily ignoring every other challenge facing our city, state, or country. They're focusing on an issue that they find to believe needs attention right now. Rather than assuming the worst about one another, I'd encourage people to talk to each other, preferably in person. Ask question, learn why someone is out there. Listen to what their concerns are. You may not agree, and obviously that's okay. But understanding one another is almost always more productive than talking past one another. We are a stronger community when people are engaged, when they participate, and when they feel comfortable bringing concerns forward whether that's through Council meetings, volunteering in the community or exercising their First Amendment right. My hope is that everyone involved this Saturday conducts themselves in a way that reflects the values we want our community to be known for. We don't have to agree. In fact, on this Council, we don't even all agree on everything but during our difficult discussions, we listen, we ask questions, and we engage in good faith. We treat one another with dignity and respect and at the end of the day we're still neighbors. So, disagreement is inevitable, respect is a choice. Let's choose respect and continue these conversations.*

Councilor Brouse thanked Councilor Standke for his comments. She reported that the Chamber of Commerce annual lunch was scheduled for December 4.

Councilor Giles reported on Planning Commission work session regarding the TSP and tree code updates.

Council President Young reported that she attended the monthly Chamber breakfast at Back Nine. She said she attended the Veteran's Day event at the Center for the Arts. She reported on the CBGD meeting and discussed the challenges of building affordable housing.

## 9. ADJOURN

Council President Young adjourned the meeting at 7:36 pm.

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Tim Rosener, Mayor

**City Council Meeting Date:** December 1, 2026

**Agenda Item:** Consent Agenda

**TO:** Sherwood City Council

**FROM:** Maiya Martin Burbank, Senior Center Manager
Through: Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager and Craig Sheldon, City Manager

**SUBJECT: Resolution 2026-072, Appointing Jenny Quirie to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board**

---

**Issue:**
Should the Council appoint Jenny Quirie to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board?

**Background:**
A vacancy exists on the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board due to a resignation. The term of office for this vacancy expires in June 2029. The City advertised the vacancy, along with three others, and received one (1) application. Jenny Quirie submitted an application for consideration of appointment and was interviewed by the interview panel. The interview panel consisted of Board Chair Caz Thomson, City Council Board Liaison Renee Brouse, and Staff Liaison Maiya Martin Burbank. The interview panel unanimously recommended appointment of Jenny Quire to fill the vacancy. The mayor has recommended this appointment to Council. In accordance with City Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of City Council by resolution.

**Financial Impacts:**
There are no financial impacts from this proposed action.

**Recommendation:**
Staff respectfully recommends City Council's adoption of Resolution 2026-072, Appointing Jenny Quirie to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board.

**RESOLUTION 2026-072**

**APPOINTING JENNY QUIRIE TO THE SHERWOOD SENIOR ADVISORY BOARD**

**WHEREAS**, a vacancy exists on the Senior Advisory Board in Position 9 due to resignation; and

**WHEREAS,** the term of office for this position expires in June 2029; and

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

**WHEREAS**, Jenny Quirie applied to be appointed and was interviewed by Board Chair Caz Thomson, Council Liaison Renee Brouse, and Staff Liaison Maiya Martin Burbank; and

**WHEREAS**, the interview panel considered all of the applicants and recommended to the Mayor that Jenny Quirie be appointed to fill the vacancy; and

**WHEREAS,** the Mayor has recommended to Council that Jenny Quirie be appointed; and

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

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

**Section 1**. The Sherwood City Council hereby appoints Jenny Quirie to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board in position 9 for a term expiring at the end of June 2029.

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

**Duly passed by the City Council this 1st day of December, 2026.**

_____
Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

**City Council Meeting Date:** December 1, 2026

**Agenda Item:** Consent Agenda

**TO:** Sherwood City Council

**FROM:** Maiya Martin Burbank, Senior Center Manager
Through: Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager and Craig Sheldon, City Manager

**SUBJECT: Resolution 2026-073, Reappointing Cliff Taylor to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board**

---

**Issue:**
Should the Council reappoint Cliff Taylor to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board?

**Background:**
A vacancy exists on the Senior Advisory Board due to term expiration of position 8. The term of office for this vacancy expired in June 2026. The city advertised the vacancy along with three others and received one application. Cliff Taylor indicated that he would like consideration for reappointment for this board position, for which he served a partial term. The Board Chair, Council Board Liaison, and Staff Liaison unanimously recommend reappointment of Cliff Taylor to fill the vacancy. The mayor has recommended this appointment to Council. In accordance with City Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of City Council by resolution.

**Financial Impacts:**
There are no financial impacts from this proposed action.

**Recommendation:**
Staff respectfully recommends City Council's adoption of Resolution 2026-073, Reappointing Cliff Taylor to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board.




## RESOLUTION 2026-073

## REAPPOINTING CLIFF TAYLOR TO THE SHERWOOD SENIOR ADVISORY BOARD

**WHEREAS,** Cliff Taylor has held Position 8 on the Senior Advisory Board; and

**WHEREAS,** the term was a partial term which expired on June 30, 2026, and he is seeking reappointment; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor has recommended to City Council that Cliff Taylor be reappointed; and

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

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

**Section 1.** The Sherwood City Council hereby reappoints Cliff Taylor to Position 8 of the Senior Advisory Board for a term expiring at the end of June 2029.

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

**Duly passed by the City Council this 1st day of December, 2026.**

_____
Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

**City Council Meeting Date:** December 1, 2026

**Agenda Item:** Consent Agenda

**TO:** Sherwood City Council

**FROM:** Maiya Martin Burbank, Senior Center Manager
Through: Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager and Craig Sheldon, City Manager

**SUBJECT: Resolution 2026-074, Reappointing Jen Myers to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board**

---

**Issue:**
Should the Council reappoint Jen Myers to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board?

**Background:**
A vacancy exists on the Senior Advisory Board due to term expiration of position 7. The term of office for this vacancy expired in June 2026. The city advertised the vacancy along with three others and received one application. Jen Myers indicated that she would like consideration for reappointment for this board position. The Board Chair, Council Board Liaison, and Staff Liaison unanimously recommend reappointment of Jen Myers to fill the vacancy. The mayor has recommended this appointment to Council. In accordance with City Council Rules of Procedure, all such appointments are subject to the approval of City Council by resolution.

**Financial Impacts:**
There are no financial impacts from this proposed action.

**Recommendation:**
Staff respectfully recommends City Council's adoption of Resolution 2026-074, Reappointing Jen Myers to the Sherwood Senior Advisory Board.




# RESOLUTION 2026-074

## REAPPOINTING JEN MYERS TO THE SHERWOOD SENIOR ADVISORY BOARD

**WHEREAS,** Jen Myers has held Position 7 on the Senior Advisory Board; and

**WHEREAS,** the term expired on June 30, 2026, and she is seeking reappointment; and

**WHEREAS**, the mayor has recommended to City Council that Jen Myers be reappointed; and

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

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

**Section 1.** The Sherwood City Council hereby reappoints Jen Myers to Position 7 of the Senior Advisory Board for a term expiring at the end of June 2029.

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

**Duly passed by the City Council this 1st day of December, 2026.**

_____
Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

**City Council Meeting Date:** December 1, 2026

**Agenda Item:** Consent Agenda

**TO:** Sherwood City Council

**FROM:** Rich Sattler, Public Works Director
Through: Craig Sheldon, City Manager and Ryan Adams, City Attorney

**SUBJECT:** **Resolution 2026-075, Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Clean Water Services for Erosion Control Services**

---

**Issue:** Shall the City Council authorize the City Manager to enter an IGA with Clean Water Services (CWS) for Erosion Control Services?

**Background:** For the past six (6) years, City of Sherwood staff have been performing Erosion Control inspections. Prior, the City used an engineering consultant firm hired to perform these required services. Recently, one of our Engineering Technicians whose duties were to provide private development inspection and erosion control inspections, resigned their position. We evaluated the position duties, taking into account current development trends and existing staffing workload and determined that partnering with CWS to provide Erosion Control Services was the most cost-effective approach for the city. CWS currently provides Erosion Control Services for our neighboring cities of Tigard and Tualatin.

CWS (District) has the primary responsibility for managing the Erosion Control Inspection Program as defined in the District Resolution and Order 07-2 Design and Construction Standards and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permits related to construction activities.

The city collects erosion control fees, reviews erosion control plans submitted with developments or building proposals, issues erosion control permits, and forwards approved plans and permits to the District.

Under this agreement, the city will pay the District the actual cost incurred by the District to provide services included in this agreement. These costs may include inspector staff, permit technicians, program management, vehicle usage and other costs associated with the District providing Erosion Control Services. These costs are included in the erosion control inspection fee paid for by the developer.

**Financial Impacts:** The city will be implementing CWS's fee schedule to cover the costs for the District to inspect measures installed to control erosion and adherence to erosion control rules during construction; therefore, there will be no financial impact to the City.

**Recommendation:** Staff respectfully recommends City Council approval of Resolution 2026-075, authorizing the City Manager to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Clean Water Services for Erosion Control Services.




**RESOLUTION 2026-075**

**AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT (IGA) WITH CLEAN WATER SERVICES FOR EROSION CONTROL SERVICES**

**WHEREAS,** the City of Sherwood has a need to provide erosion control services within our Erosion Control Inspection Program; and

**WHEREAS,** ORS 190.003-190.110 encourages intergovernmental cooperation and authorizes local government to delegate to other agencies the authority to perform their respective function(s) as necessary; and

**WHEREAS,** to optimize City staff resources and continue with the required Erosion Control Inspection Program, the City would like Clean Water Services to perform erosion control services within City limits; and

**WHEREAS,** this agreement requires the City to collect erosion control fees, review the erosion control plans submitted with the development or building proposal, issue erosion control permits and promptly forward approved plans and permits to Clean Water Services for approval;

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

**Section 1.** The City Manager is authorized to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Clean Water Services (District) as shown in the attached Exhibit A.

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

**Duly passed by the City Council this 1st day of December, 2026.**

_____
Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR
EROSION CONTROL INSPECTION**

THIS AGREEMENT dated effective [January 4, 2027], is between CLEAN WATER SERVICES (District) and CITY OF SHERWOOD (City), pursuant to the authority granted in ORS Chapter 451.

RECITALS

1. ORS 190.003 – 190.110 encourages intergovernmental cooperation and authorizes local governments to delegate to each other authority to perform their respective functions as necessary.

2. To optimize City staff resources and implementation of the Erosion Control Inspection Program (Program), City would like the District to administer the Program within City jurisdiction.

AGREEMENT

A. DISTRICT OBLIGATIONS

District agrees to:

1. Assume primary responsibility for managing the Program as defined in District Resolution and Order (R&O) 26-25 (Design and Construction Standards), as amended from time to time, and NPDES stormwater permits relating to construction activities. This shall include timely inspection of properties to determine compliance with erosion control rules and regulations, enforcement to correct violations, and review of erosion plan revisions.

2. District will provide a written summary of work accomplished monthly within the City through this Agreement. The report will be delivered to the City no later than the 20th of each month showing performance for the preceding month. The report shall include, at a minimum, the number of inspections performed, permits closed or finalized, violations identified and the status of correction, and hours billed by position or equivalent detail supporting the invoice.

3. District will invoice the City through this Agreement. The invoiced amount will include hourly personnel costs and expenses, as shown in Exhibit A to this Agreement. The invoice will be delivered to the City no later than the 20th of each month. The Public Works Director or designee and the District's General Manager or designee may modify Exhibit A by mutual agreement prior to April 30th for services performed in the upcoming fiscal year.

B. CITY OBLIGATIONS

City agrees to:

1. Adopt and maintain, by City Council resolution, an erosion control fee schedule that is consistent with the District's then-current schedule of Rates and Charges or otherwise sufficient to recover the estimated costs of services under this Agreement. Collect the fees so adopted, review the erosion control plans submitted with the development or building proposal, issue erosion control permits, and promptly forward approved plans and permits to District. City retains all fees collected under its adopted schedule. Those fees are intended to fund the payments due to District under Section B.6. City shall account for fee revenue and Program costs in a manner that permits annual reconciliation. Any surplus or shortfall is the City's.

2. Withhold approval of all "foundation" building inspections until receiving District's written approval of the erosion control techniques being in place.

3. Cooperate with District in its enforcement efforts. This Agreement does not limit City's ability to pursue enforcement actions independent of District. In addition, City may continue enforcement actions already under way as of the date of this Agreement.

4. Promptly inform District of any erosion control violations of which City becomes aware.

5. Provide a list of active Erosion Control permits, that have been issued as of the date of this Agreement.

6. Submit Erosion Control permits in a form acceptable to the District.

7. City will pay District 100 percent of the actual costs District incurs to provide the services in Section A of the Agreement within 30 days of District's invoice for those costs. These costs, as specified in Exhibit A, may include but are not limited to: Payment of these costs is funded by the erosion control fees retained by City under Section B.1.
    a. Inspector staff labor costs
    b. Permit technician labor costs
    c. Program Management
    d. Vehicle usage
    e. Other exceptional costs with prior approval from the City

C. GENERAL TERMS

1. Laws and Regulations. City and District agree to abide by all applicable laws and regulations.

2. Term of this Agreement. This Agreement will take effect [January 4, 2027] and will automatically renew annually for a period of ten years. The Agreement may be terminated upon written notice by either party prior to February 1 of any year with the termination being effective the following July 1.

3. Amendment of Agreement. City and District may amend this Agreement from time to time, by mutual written agreement.

4. Integration. This document constitutes the entire agreement between the parties on the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous written or oral understandings, representations or communications of every kind on the subject. No course of dealing between the parties and no usage of trade shall be relevant to supplement any term used in this Agreement. Acceptance or acquiescence in a course of performance rendered under this Agreement shall not be relevant to determine the meaning of this Agreement and no waiver by a party of any right under this Agreement shall prejudice the waiving party's exercise of the right in the future.

5. Indemnification. Within the limits of the Oregon Tort Claims Act, codified at ORS 30.260 through 30.300, each of the parties shall indemnify and defend the other and their officers, employees, agents, and representatives from and against all claims, demands, penalties, and causes of action of any kind or character relating to or arising from this Agreement (including the cost of defense thereof, including attorney fees) in favor of any person on account of personal injury, death,

damage to property, or violation of law, which arises out of, or results from, the negligent or other legally culpable acts or omissions of the indemnitor, its employees, agents, contractors or representatives.

6. Resolution of Disputes. If any dispute out of this Agreement cannot be resolved by the project managers from each party, the City Manager and District's General Manager will attempt to resolve the issue. If the City Manager and District's General Manager are not able to resolve the dispute, the parties will submit the matter to mediation, each party paying its own costs and sharing equally in common costs. If the dispute is not resolved in mediation, the parties will submit the matter to arbitration. The decision of the arbitrator shall be final, binding and conclusive upon the parties and subject to appeal only as otherwise provided in Oregon law.

7. Interpretation of Agreement.

   A. This Agreement shall not be construed for or against any party by reason of the authorship or alleged authorship of any provision.

   B. The paragraph headings contained in this Agreement are for ease of reference only and shall not be used in construing or interpreting this Agreement.

8. Severability/Survival. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are held illegal, invalid or unenforceable, the enforceability of the remaining provisions shall not be impaired.

9. Choice of Law/Venue. This Agreement and all rights, obligations and disputes arising out of the Agreement shall be governed by Oregon law. All disputes and litigation arising out of this Agreement shall be decided by the state courts in Oregon. Venue for all disputes and litigation shall be in Washington County, Oregon.

CLEAN WATER SERVICES

By: _____
General Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM

_____
District Counsel

CITY OF SHERWOOD

By: _____
City Manager

Attest:

By: _____
City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM

By: _____
City Attorney

**EXHIBIT A**

District will charge City the following personnel costs and expenses for work performed pursuant to this Agreement starting [January 4, 2027]:

| **PERSONNEL RATES** | |
|---|---|
| **Position Title** | **Hourly Rate** |
| Inspection Supervisor | $90.21 |
| Inspector Tech 2 | $77.01 |
| Permit Tech 2 | $69.86 |
| Development Services Program Manager | $127.01 |

| **EXPENSE RATES** | |
|---|---|
| **Expense Type** | **Rate and Unit** |
| Vehicle Usage | IRS Mileage Rate per mile |
| Other Expenses | At cost with prior approval of City |

**City Council Meeting Date:** December 1, 2026

**Agenda Item:** Consent Agenda

**TO:** Sherwood City Council

**FROM:** Kristen Switzer, Assistant City Manager
Through: Craig Sheldon, City Manager and Ryan Adams, City Attorney

**SUBJECT: Resolution 2026-076, Supporting Reforms to the Oregon Public Meetings Law**

---

**Issue:**
Shall the City Council adopt a resolution supporting legislative reforms to the Oregon Public Meetings Law?

**Background:**
The Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS Chapter 192) establishes requirements intended to ensure transparency and public access to the decision-making processes of governing bodies. The City of Sherwood is committed to conducting public business in an open and transparent manner and recognizes the importance of maintaining public trust.

Concerns have been raised by local governments regarding the interpretation and application of certain provisions of the law, particularly those related to serial communications, individual liability for administrative errors, and the complaint and investigation process.

The current interpretation and enforcement of these provisions can create challenges for elected officials and staff in carrying out their responsibilities and engaging with constituents, community partners, and other public officials. The proposed resolution supports efforts to clarify and improve the Oregon Public Meetings Law while maintaining its fundamental purpose of ensuring transparency and accountability.

Specifically, the resolution calls for reforms that would:

1. Clarify the complaint and investigation process to ensure that complaints without merit can be promptly dismissed while legitimate concerns receive appropriate review.
2. Place responsibility for administrative errors on the public body rather than individual officials.
3. Clarify the application of restrictions on serial communications to recognize the operational realities of local government and avoid unnecessarily discouraging engagement with constituents, partners, and volunteers.
4. Encourage the Oregon Legislature to consider amendments supported by local government organizations and partners.

Adoption of the resolution would demonstrate the City Council's support for reforms to the Oregon Public Meetings Law that balance transparency and accountability with the practical needs of local government.

**Financial Impact:**
There are no direct financial impacts associated with adoption of the resolution.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution 2026-076, Supporting Reforms to the Oregon Public Meetings Law.

**RESOLUTION 2026-076**

**SUPPORTING REFORMS TO THE OREGON PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW**

**WHEREAS**, the City Council of the City of Sherwood is a governing body subject to the Oregon Public Meetings Law pursuant to ORS Chapter 192 and Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 199, Division 50; and

**WHEREAS**, the Oregon Government Ethics Commission is the state agency authorized to provide oversight and enforcement of the Oregon Public Meetings Law with authority to enact administrative rules; and

**WHEREAS,** while the City Council strives to conduct the business of the City in a fully transparent manner, the current interpretations and applications of the Public Meetings Law hinder the operational realities of the City, its staff, and its officials; and

**WHEREAS,** the current state of the Oregon Public Meetings Law may discourage the City Council from engaging with peers, partners, and constituents out of fear of facing an unwarranted or unfounded Public Meetings Law violation.

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

**Section 1**. The Oregon Public Meetings Law requires clarification and modification to the complaint and investigation process to ensure frivolous complaints are quickly dismissed, while valid complaints are investigated.

**Section 2**. Liability for administrative error violations of the Oregon Public Meetings Law should be borne by the public body and not individual officials.

**Section 3**. The application and interpretation of laws and rules prohibiting serial communications must incorporate the operational realities of local government and not discourage engagement with partners, constituents, or volunteers.

**Section 4**. The City Council of Sherwood, Oregon, calls upon the Oregon Legislature to support amendments to the Oregon Public Meetings Law supported by local government entities and partners.

**Section 5**. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

**Duly passed by the City Council this 1st day of December 2026.**

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

**City Council Meeting Date:** December 1, 2026

**Agenda Item:** Public Hearing *(2nd Reading)*

**TO:** Sherwood City Council

**FROM:** David Bodway, Finance Director
Through: Craig Sheldon, City Manager and Ryan Adams, City Attorney

**SUBJECT:** **Ordinance 2026-007, Establishing a Commercial Public Safety Fee and Adding Section 3.50 to the Sherwood Municipal Code**

---

**Issue:**
Shall the City Council adopt an ordinance establishing a Commercial Public Safety Fee on non-residential (commercial) properties within the City of Sherwood to provide dedicated funding for police services?

**Background**
On September 1, 2026, this ordinance was scheduled on the City Council agenda for the second public hearing. At that meeting the City Council voted to remove the ordinance from the agenda to allow for further review. Those reviews have occurred and the ordinance is now coming back to the City Council for a second hearing and consideration of adoption.

The City of Sherwood, like many Oregon municipalities, faces ongoing challenges in funding public safety services due to the limitations on property tax revenues. Police service costs continue to rise with personnel, equipment, and operational needs, while the City's ability to increase general fund property tax revenue is constrained.

Numerous Oregon cities have adopted public safety fees (often billed on utility accounts) as a lawful mechanism to provide stable, dedicated funding for police and related services. These fees are structured as fees for services that benefit developed property rather than as property taxes.

The City of Keizer adopted Ordinance No. 2017-775 in July 2017, establishing a Police Services Fee. That ordinance provides a clear, court-tested model: findings regarding the benefits of police services; definitions of residential and non-residential units; imposition of the fee; rates set by resolution for flexibility; a dedicated fund restricted to police uses; and collection through the existing utility billing system. Keizer later refined commercial charges using an Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) methodology tied to impervious surface.

Staff recommends that Sherwood adopt a similar enabling ordinance limited to commercial (non-residential) properties only. This approach focuses the new fee on business properties that generate significant demand for police services while avoiding an additional charge on residential utility customers at this time. The proposed ordinance closely tracks the structure and language of Keizer's ordinance, adapted for a commercial-only fee and for consistency with Sherwood's existing utility billing practices and

Municipal Code style.

Key features of the proposed ordinance include:

- Purpose findings emphasizing the benefits of police services to commercial properties and the need for stable funding;
- Definitions of “Commercial Unit,” “Premise,” and related terms;
- Establishment of the fee solely on commercial/non-residential developed property;
- Authority for the City Council to set the amount (and methodology, including per-unit or ESU-based) by resolution;
- Creation of a dedicated Commercial Public Safety Fund restricted to police services;
- Billing and collection through the City’s existing utility billing system for commercial accounts, with standard delinquency, adjustment, and appeal procedures.

If the ordinance is adopted, staff will bring a companion resolution establishing the initial rate structure and any preferred methodology (flat per commercial unit or ESU-based) for Council consideration. The ordinance itself does not set a dollar amount, preserving flexibility for annual review during the budget process.

**Proposed Amendment to Municipal Code**
The proposed ordinance would add a new section 3.50 to the Sherwood Municipal Code, a version of which is provided as Attachment A to this staff report.

**Financial Impacts:**
Adoption of the enabling ordinance itself has no immediate fiscal impact beyond codification costs. Revenue generation will depend on the rate and methodology subsequently adopted by resolution. Revenue would be deposited into a restricted fund and used exclusively for police services (personnel, equipment, vehicles, and related operational costs). Implementation will utilize existing utility billing infrastructure, minimizing additional administrative expense.

**Recommendation:**
Staff respectfully recommends that the City Council hold the required public hearing(s), conduct the second reading as required by the City Charter, and adopt Ordinance 2026-007, Establishing a Commercial Public Safety Fee and Adding Section 3.50 to the Sherwood Municipal Code.

**Attachment:**
Attachment A, Proposed code language.

## Exhibit A

## Sherwood Municipal Code Section 3.50

## Chapter 3.50—Commercial Public Safety Fee

### 3.50.010. Purpose of Commercial Public Safety Fee.

The purpose of the Commercial Public Safety Fee is to provide funding for police services. Police services safeguard, facilitate, and encourage the health, safety, and welfare of the residents and enterprises of the City of Sherwood. Stable and reliable police services provide a multitude of economic and social benefits to the public, including, but not limited to:

A. Protection of life and property;

B. Reduction in the incidence of crime;

C. Dependable response by law enforcement; and

D. Promotion of business and economic activity within the City.

The City Council finds and determines the necessity of this Commercial Public Safety Fee to provide a funding mechanism to help pay for the benefits of police services and to maintain an acceptable level of service.

### 3.50.020. Definitions.

For purposes of Sherwood Municipal Code section 3.50, the following terms are defined as follows:

A. Commercial Unit. A Premise or a portion of a Premise not used primarily for personal, domestic accommodation in independent living facilities. A Commercial Unit includes, but is not limited to, governmental (except as exempted herein), not-for-profit, business, commercial, industrial, and institutional enterprises. Each portion of a Commercial Unit that has permanent provisions for distinct and defined access to an individual enterprise shall be considered a separate Commercial Unit. Enterprises that provide senior living, assisted living, nursing care, and similar services exclusively shall be considered Commercial Units. Multi-family residential properties, condominiums, and mobile home parks used primarily for residential occupancy are not Commercial Units under this Ordinance. For purposes of this section, Commercial Unit also includes irrigations accounts. Irrigation accounts are those utility billing accounts for water used for outdoor irrigation purposes. It may be served by a dedicated irrigation meter or by a shared water service, and charges are assessed according to the utility's billing rates and policies. Irrigation accounts shall not be construed to include any account serving a residential property.

B. Equivalent Service Unit or ESU. One Equivalent Service Unit equals 2,640 square feet of impervious surface area, consistent with the City’s stormwater utility methodology. The number

of ESUs for a Commercial Unit shall be calculated by dividing the total impervious surface area of the Premise (or the portion attributable to the Commercial Unit) by 2,640 and rounding to the nearest tenth (0.1), subject to any minimum or maximum established by resolution. Where impervious surface data is not readily available, the City may use an alternative reasonable estimate or the ESU count already assigned to the account for stormwater billing purposes.

C. Premise. A parcel or portion of a parcel of land within the corporate limits of the City of Sherwood that receives a direct or indirect benefit from police services. It is presumed that a Premise receives a direct or indirect benefit from police services if the Premise is developed. A Premise is presumed to be developed if served by water, stormwater, or wastewater utility, or if it has improvements, including but not limited to buildings, parking lots, or outdoor storage.

D. Person Responsible. The customer responsible for payment of the City utility account serving the Premise, or, for Premises without utility service, the property owner as shown in the county tax records.

**3.50.030. Establishment of Commercial Public Safety Fee.**

A. Except as exempted below, a Commercial Public Safety Fee is hereby established and imposed upon all Commercial Units within the City of Sherwood.

B. Premises owned by the City of Sherwood that are property-tax exempt are exempt from the payment of any Commercial Public Safety Fee. Premises owned by the Sherwood School District are exempt from this fee provided that, and only for so long as, the Sherwood School District contributes no less than fifty percent (50%) of the fully loaded cost of the School Resource Officers assigned by the Sherwood Police Department.

C. The Commercial Public Safety Fee shall be calculated on an Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) basis, or such other methodology as the City Council may establish by resolution. The City Council may by resolution establish different rates for categories of commercial accounts (including but not limited to Industrial and Manufacturing versus other commercial), minimum charges, and maximum caps on the number of ESUs or the total fee.

D. The obligation to pay the Commercial Public Safety Fee is a personal obligation of the Person Responsible. No lien shall attach to any Premise solely because of nonpayment of the Commercial Public Safety Fee.

E. All developed commercial property receives a direct or indirect benefit from police services. Unless specifically exempted, the Commercial Public Safety Fee applies to commercial utility accounts, including those that serve local, state, and federal governments (except City-owned tax-exempt property), and to accounts that serve Premises entitled to an exemption from or deferral of ad valorem property taxes, as well as commercial Premises not connected to utility services.

F. The Commercial Public Safety Fee described herein is not subject to the property tax limitations of Article XI, Sections 11 and 11b of the Oregon Constitution and is not a fee imposed on property or property owners by fact of ownership.

**3.50.040. Amount of Commercial Public Safety Fee.**

The amount of the Commercial Public Safety Fee, any category-based rate differentials, any minimum charge, any maximum cap on ESUs or total fee, and any related methodology shall be set by City Council resolution. In addition, the Council may set by resolution fees for extra services required in collecting delinquent customer accounts for the Commercial Public Safety Fee.

**3.50.050. Dedicated Funds.**

A. There shall be a Commercial Public Safety Fund. All Commercial Public Safety Fee revenues imposed and collected under this Ordinance shall be deposited in the Commercial Public Safety Fund.

B. Money in the Commercial Public Safety Fund shall be used for the purposes of City police services as determined each year during the budget process. The Commercial Public Safety Fee shall not be used for any other governmental or proprietary functions of the City. Any revenues in excess of actual expenses as identified in the budget process shall be carried forward to the next year's budget.

**3.50.060. Billing.**

A. The Person Responsible is responsible for payment of the Commercial Public Safety Fee. For non-utility Premises, the property owner as set forth in the county tax records shall be the Person Responsible.

B. The City shall collect the Commercial Public Safety Fee by adding the fee to the utility bill of each commercial customer in the City of Sherwood. For non-utility accounts, the billing shall be mailed to the property owner's address as set forth in the county property records, unless such owner requests the billing be sent to a different address.

C. If a Premise has more than one utility account, the Commercial Public Safety Fee for the Premise shall be calculated based on the total number of ESUs (or applicable methodology) attributable to the Commercial Units on the Premise. The ESUs may be combined into one account or allocated to each account.

D. Charges for water, wastewater, stormwater, street-related fees, the Commercial Public Safety Fee, and any other authorized charges may be billed on the same utility bill. If full payment of a utility billing is not made, payment shall be applied in the order established by City policy or resolution.

**3.50.070. Payment Due Date.**

The Commercial Public Safety Fee shall be due on the same date as the utility bill. For non-utility accounts, the due date shall be the date specified on the bill, consistent with ordinary utility billing practices.

**3.50.080. Adjustment of Accounts and Appeals.**

A. Customers who believe their Commercial Public Safety Fee, as applied to their Premise, is not within the intent of this Ordinance may request, in writing, a review of their fee by the Finance Director or designee. The Finance Director or designee may initiate a review of a customer's fee.

i. If a customer's charge is reduced as a result of this review, the corrected fee shall begin with the next billing and a credit or refund shall be made retroactively, not to exceed one year from the last billing.

ii. If a customer's charge is increased as a result of this review, the corrected fee shall begin with the next billing and the customer may be billed for the increase retroactively, not to exceed one year from the last billing.

B. If an existing customer has not been billed for the Commercial Public Safety Fee, the fee shall begin with the next billing and the customer may be billed retroactively, not to exceed one year.

C. Customers not satisfied with the results of the review by the Finance Director or designee may appeal that decision in writing to the City Manager within fourteen (14) calendar days. The City Manager's decision shall be final, subject only to writ of review under ORS 34.010 to 34.100.

**3.50.090. Delinquency.**

A. A Commercial Public Safety Fee is delinquent if payment in full is not received on or before the due date.

B. If a customer's utility account is delinquent for the Commercial Public Safety Fee only, the City may not discontinue water services billed on that account solely for that reason. However, the City may refuse to restore water service to the Premise if the delinquent charges and other costs incurred are not paid, consistent with applicable law and City policy.

C. Delinquent amounts owing may be collected by any lawful means, including but not limited to referral or assignment to a collection agency.

**3.50.100. Severability.**

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this section is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions.

**3.50.110. Effective Date.**

This Ordinance shall take effect on January 1, 2027, and shall continue thereafter until repealed. The Commercial Public Safety Fee authorized by this Ordinance shall first appear on utility bills for periods beginning on or after January 1, 2027, or as otherwise provided in the initial rate-setting resolution.

**ORDINANCE 2026-007**

**ESTABLISHING A COMMERCIAL PUBLIC SAFETY FEE AND ADDING CHAPTER 3.50 TO THE SHERWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE**

**WHEREAS**, the City of Sherwood maintains a Police Department dedicated to protecting the public and providing essential public safety services; and

**WHEREAS,** the City Council has determined that sustained funding is necessary to maintain adequate levels of police services in light of rising costs and the limitations on property tax revenues under Oregon law; and

**WHEREAS,** police services are available to and benefit every developed commercial property within the City; and

**WHEREAS,** the City has authority under its Charter and Oregon law to impose fees for services that provide a direct or indirect benefit to property and to the public; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council finds that a fee imposed on commercial properties will provide a stable funding mechanism to support police services without constituting a tax on property or property owners by reason of ownership; and

**WHEREAS**, the fee is a charge for services, is reasonably related to the benefits conferred on commercial property and is not imposed by reason of property ownership.

**WHEREAS**, the City Council held a public hearing to solicit comments regarding the proposed fee; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council finds it in the best interest of the community to establish a Commercial Public Safety Fee;

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

**Section 1.** Sherwood Municipal Code Chapter 3.50, et. seq, is hereby created, adopted, and added to the Sherwood Municipal Code as set forth in the attached Exhibit A.

**Section 2.** Staff is directed to take all necessary and reasonable steps to promulgate Sherwood Municipal Code as set forth in the attached Exhibit A.

**Section 3.** This Ordinance is and shall be effective 30 days after its adoption by the City Council.

**Duly passed by the City Council on the 1st day of December, 2026.**

Tim Rosener, Mayor _____ Date _____

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

| | AYE | NAY |
|---|---|---|
| Giles | ____ | ____ |
| Scott | ____ | ____ |
| Mays | ____ | ____ |
| Standke | ____ | ____ |
| Brouse | ____ | ____ |
| Young | ____ | ____ |
| Rosener | ____ | ____ |

## Exhibit A

## Sherwood Municipal Code Section 3.50

## Chapter 3.50—Commercial Public Safety Fee

### 3.50.010. Purpose of Commercial Public Safety Fee.

The purpose of the Commercial Public Safety Fee is to provide funding for police services. Police services safeguard, facilitate, and encourage the health, safety, and welfare of the residents and enterprises of the City of Sherwood. Stable and reliable police services provide a multitude of economic and social benefits to the public, including, but not limited to:

A. Protection of life and property;

B. Reduction in the incidence of crime;

C. Dependable response by law enforcement; and

D. Promotion of business and economic activity within the City.

The City Council finds and determines the necessity of this Commercial Public Safety Fee to provide a funding mechanism to help pay for the benefits of police services and to maintain an acceptable level of service.

### 3.50.020. Definitions.

For purposes of Sherwood Municipal Code section 3.50, the following terms are defined as follows:

A. Commercial Unit. A Premise or a portion of a Premise not used primarily for personal, domestic accommodation in independent living facilities. A Commercial Unit includes, but is not limited to, governmental (except as exempted herein), not-for-profit, business, commercial, industrial, and institutional enterprises. Each portion of a Commercial Unit that has permanent provisions for distinct and defined access to an individual enterprise shall be considered a separate Commercial Unit. Enterprises that provide senior living, assisted living, nursing care, and similar services exclusively shall be considered Commercial Units. Multi-family residential properties, condominiums, and mobile home parks used primarily for residential occupancy are not Commercial Units under this Ordinance. For purposes of this section, Commercial Unit also includes irrigations accounts. Irrigation accounts are those utility billing accounts for water used for outdoor irrigation purposes. It may be served by a dedicated irrigation meter or by a shared water service, and charges are assessed according to the utility's billing rates and policies. Irrigation accounts shall not be construed to include any account serving a residential property.

B. Equivalent Service Unit or ESU. One Equivalent Service Unit equals 2,640 square feet of impervious surface area, consistent with the City’s stormwater utility methodology. The number

of ESUs for a Commercial Unit shall be calculated by dividing the total impervious surface area of the Premise (or the portion attributable to the Commercial Unit) by 2,640 and rounding to the nearest tenth (0.1), subject to any minimum or maximum established by resolution. Where impervious surface data is not readily available, the City may use an alternative reasonable estimate or the ESU count already assigned to the account for stormwater billing purposes.

C. Premise. A parcel or portion of a parcel of land within the corporate limits of the City of Sherwood that receives a direct or indirect benefit from police services. It is presumed that a Premise receives a direct or indirect benefit from police services if the Premise is developed. A Premise is presumed to be developed if served by water, stormwater, or wastewater utility, or if it has improvements, including but not limited to buildings, parking lots, or outdoor storage.

D. Person Responsible. The customer responsible for payment of the City utility account serving the Premise, or, for Premises without utility service, the property owner as shown in the county tax records.

**3.50.030. Establishment of Commercial Public Safety Fee.**

A. Except as exempted below, a Commercial Public Safety Fee is hereby established and imposed upon all Commercial Units within the City of Sherwood.

B. Premises owned by the City of Sherwood that are property-tax exempt are exempt from the payment of any Commercial Public Safety Fee. Premises owned by the Sherwood School District are exempt from this fee provided that, and only for so long as, the Sherwood School District contributes no less than fifty percent (50%) of the fully loaded cost of the School Resource Officers assigned by the Sherwood Police Department.

C. The Commercial Public Safety Fee shall be calculated on an Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) basis, or such other methodology as the City Council may establish by resolution. The City Council may by resolution establish different rates for categories of commercial accounts (including but not limited to Industrial and Manufacturing versus other commercial), minimum charges, and maximum caps on the number of ESUs or the total fee.

D. The obligation to pay the Commercial Public Safety Fee is a personal obligation of the Person Responsible. No lien shall attach to any Premise solely because of nonpayment of the Commercial Public Safety Fee.

E. All developed commercial property receives a direct or indirect benefit from police services. Unless specifically exempted, the Commercial Public Safety Fee applies to commercial utility accounts, including those that serve local, state, and federal governments (except City-owned tax-exempt property), and to accounts that serve Premises entitled to an exemption from or deferral of ad valorem property taxes, as well as commercial Premises not connected to utility services.

F. The Commercial Public Safety Fee described herein is not subject to the property tax limitations of Article XI, Sections 11 and 11b of the Oregon Constitution and is not a fee imposed on property or property owners by fact of ownership.

**3.50.040. Amount of Commercial Public Safety Fee.**

The amount of the Commercial Public Safety Fee, any category-based rate differentials, any minimum charge, any maximum cap on ESUs or total fee, and any related methodology shall be set by City Council resolution. In addition, the Council may set by resolution fees for extra services required in collecting delinquent customer accounts for the Commercial Public Safety Fee.

**3.50.050. Dedicated Funds.**

A. There shall be a Commercial Public Safety Fund. All Commercial Public Safety Fee revenues imposed and collected under this Ordinance shall be deposited in the Commercial Public Safety Fund.

B. Money in the Commercial Public Safety Fund shall be used for the purposes of City police services as determined each year during the budget process. The Commercial Public Safety Fee shall not be used for any other governmental or proprietary functions of the City. Any revenues in excess of actual expenses as identified in the budget process shall be carried forward to the next year's budget.

**3.50.060. Billing.**

A. The Person Responsible is responsible for payment of the Commercial Public Safety Fee. For non-utility Premises, the property owner as set forth in the county tax records shall be the Person Responsible.

B. The City shall collect the Commercial Public Safety Fee by adding the fee to the utility bill of each commercial customer in the City of Sherwood. For non-utility accounts, the billing shall be mailed to the property owner's address as set forth in the county property records, unless such owner requests the billing be sent to a different address.

C. If a Premise has more than one utility account, the Commercial Public Safety Fee for the Premise shall be calculated based on the total number of ESUs (or applicable methodology) attributable to the Commercial Units on the Premise. The ESUs may be combined into one account or allocated to each account.

D. Charges for water, wastewater, stormwater, street-related fees, the Commercial Public Safety Fee, and any other authorized charges may be billed on the same utility bill. If full payment of a utility billing is not made, payment shall be applied in the order established by City policy or resolution.

**3.50.070. Payment Due Date.**

The Commercial Public Safety Fee shall be due on the same date as the utility bill. For non-utility accounts, the due date shall be the date specified on the bill, consistent with ordinary utility billing practices.

**3.50.080. Adjustment of Accounts and Appeals.**

A. Customers who believe their Commercial Public Safety Fee, as applied to their Premise, is not within the intent of this Ordinance may request, in writing, a review of their fee by the Finance Director or designee. The Finance Director or designee may initiate a review of a customer's fee.

i. If a customer's charge is reduced as a result of this review, the corrected fee shall begin with the next billing and a credit or refund shall be made retroactively, not to exceed one year from the last billing.

ii. If a customer's charge is increased as a result of this review, the corrected fee shall begin with the next billing and the customer may be billed for the increase retroactively, not to exceed one year from the last billing.

B. If an existing customer has not been billed for the Commercial Public Safety Fee, the fee shall begin with the next billing and the customer may be billed retroactively, not to exceed one year.

C. Customers not satisfied with the results of the review by the Finance Director or designee may appeal that decision in writing to the City Manager within fourteen (14) calendar days. The City Manager's decision shall be final, subject only to writ of review under ORS 34.010 to 34.100.

**3.50.090. Delinquency.**

A. A Commercial Public Safety Fee is delinquent if payment in full is not received on or before the due date.

B. If a customer's utility account is delinquent for the Commercial Public Safety Fee only, the City may not discontinue water services billed on that account solely for that reason. However, the City may refuse to restore water service to the Premise if the delinquent charges and other costs incurred are not paid, consistent with applicable law and City policy.

C. Delinquent amounts owing may be collected by any lawful means, including but not limited to referral or assignment to a collection agency.

**3.50.100. Severability.**

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this section is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions.

**3.50.110. Effective Date.**

This Ordinance shall take effect on January 1, 2027, and shall continue thereafter until repealed. The Commercial Public Safety Fee authorized by this Ordinance shall first appear on utility bills for periods beginning on or after January 1, 2027, or as otherwise provided in the initial rate-setting resolution.