A RESOLUTION INITIATING ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF SHERWOOD OF APPROXIMATELY 260 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY ON HIGHWAY 99W AND WILSONVILLE ROAD AND REQUESTING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION APPROVE THE ANNEXATION.

WHEREAS, The City is authorized by ORS 199.490(2) to initiate an annexation upon receiving consent in writing from more than half of the owners of land in the territory proposed to be annexed who also own more than half of the land and real property therein representing more than half of the assessed value of all real property in the territory proposed to be annexed;

WHEREAS, the Council has received the necessary consents signed by certain owners of land along State Highway 99 W and Wilsonville Road, in sufficient numbers to meet the triple majority annexation requirements listed in the preceding recital;

WHEREAS, the land proposed for annexation is 260.89 acres in area and is adjacent to and contiguous with the present City limits of the City of Sherwood;

WHEREAS, the land proposed for annexation is serviceable by City utilities and other services and the annexation is in the best interests of the City and consistent with adopted municipal policies of urban growth and development;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:
Section 1. Initiation. That the proposed annexation of 260.89 acres, more or less, along State Highway 99 W and Wilsonville Road is approved by the City with the boundaries described in Exhibit " A " and depicted in Exhibit " B " attached hereto.

Section 2. Approval. That the Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission approve the proposed annexation as expeditiously as possible.

Section 3. Transmittal. That the City Recorder file certified copies of the statements of consent and this Resolution with the Boundary Conmission.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL THIS 23 DAY OF Octoker, 1985.


ATTEST:


## PMALGBC FORM \#6

## boundary change data sheet

1. EXISTING CONDITIONS IN AREA TO BE ANNEXED
A. Land Area: Acres_260.89_or Square Miles
B. General description of territory. (Include topographic features such as slopes, vegetation, drainage basins, floodplain areas, which are pertinent to this proposal).
The area south of Hwy. 99r includes the Cedar Creek floodplain, designated on the Comp. Plan as a $250^{\prime}$ wide Greenway. The remaind of land is flat. North of Hwy. 99N the land is essentially flat with a low hill near the center of the piece.
C. Describe land uses on surrounding parcels. Use tax lots as reference points.

North: Farm land or large lot residential
NW: Sherwood High School, residential and vacant
East: The city limits, including a minor amount of commercial on Hwy.99W; residential on large and subdivided lots; High School, vac
South: Mostly pasture and farmland, large lot residential and an
industrial use in the SW section
West: Farmland or large lot residential
D. Existing Land Use:

Number of single family units_ 20 Number of multi-family units_ 0
Number commercial structures_2 Number industrial structures_
Public facilities or other uses Sherwood Elks Lodge
What is the current use of the land proposed to be annexed:
The majority is residential on large parcels. Also, the Sherwood Elks Lodge, Ungers Trading Post and a nursery
E. Total current year Assessed Valuation $\$ 1,937,700.00$
F. Total existing population_Approximately 54
II. REASON FOR BOUNDARY CHANGE
A. ORS 199.462 of the Boundary Commission Act states: 'When reviewing a boundary change, a boundary commission shall consider economic, denographic, and sociological projections pertinent to the proposal, and past and prospective physical developments of land that would directly or indirectly be affected by the proposed boundary change." Considering these points, please provide the reasons the proposed boundary change should be made. Please be very specific. Use additional pages if necessary. (This information is often quoted in the Staff Report, so be thorough and complete)
The subject property is in the Sherwood/Metro UGB and is planned for and
committed to future urban use. The property owners want to preserve that urban status by annexing to the city. Approximately half of the owners are currently paying into the Cedar Creek IID for the extension of an $8^{\prime \prime}$ sewer

Continued from Page 1 -- II. A.
...line and a 14" water line. The lines will be further extended in conjunction with future urban development.

Continued from Page 3 -- IV. A. 1.

- 24" sewer line crosses Hwy. 99W and extends north along Rock Creek about $1800^{\prime}$ north of the proposed annexed area's northern boundary
- No special storm drain system other than roadside ditches and highway culverts. A Storm Drainage Plan has been prepared but not yet implemented.

Continued from Page 4 -- IV. A. 2.
...dependent upon when development plans commence and the L.I.D. process is initiated.
B. If the property to be served is entirely or substantially undeveloped, what are the plans for future development: Be specific. Describe type (residential, industrial, commercial, etc.), density, etc.
The area is substantially undeveloped. In compliance with the Sherwood comp. Plan, most of the area is designated for low-density residential develomment. Cedar Creek cuts through the southern section and is designated Greenway.

## III. LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. Is the subject territory to be developed at this time? No
B. Generally describe the anticipated development (building types, facilities, number of units). Specific development types, density and facilities have not been determined.
$\qquad$
C. If no development is planned at this time, will approval of this proposal increase the development potential of the property? Yes If so, please indicate in terms of allowable uses, number of units). The urban development potential does not exist until City Services are available, at which time low to medium-density residential densities are planned, according to both the City's and County's comprehensive Plans.
D. Does the proposed development comply with applicable regional, county or city comprehensive plans? Please describe. Yes, the City of Sherwood and Washington County have designated this land as inside the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and planned for low to medium-density residential use.
E. What is the zoning on the territory to be served?

Residential
F. Please indicate all permits and/or approvals from a City, County, or Regional Government which will be needed for the proposed development. If already granted, please indicate date of approval and identifying number:

| Approval | Project File \# | Date of Approval | Future Requiremen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metro UGB Amendment | No proposed deve | pment plans on an | of the subject |
| City or County Plan Amendment | parcels |  |  |
| Pre-Application Hearing <br> (City or County) |  |  |  |
| Zone Change (City or County) |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Subdivision Approv | 1 |  |  |
| Final Plat Approval |  |  |  |
| Land Partition |  |  |  |
| Conditional Use |  |  |  |
| Variance |  |  |  |
| Sub-Surface Sewage Disposal |  |  |  |
| Building Permit |  |  |  |

Please submit copies of proceedings relating to any of the above permits or approvals which are pertinent to the annexation.
G. Can the proposed development be accomplished under current county zoning?

Yes
No $\qquad$ (No proposed development)

If No,---has a zone change been sought from the county either formally or informally.

Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Please describe outcome of zone change request if answer to previous question was Yes.
H. Is the proposed development compatible with the city's comprehensive land use plan for the area?
(No proposed development)
Yes__ No__ City has no Plan for the area $\qquad$
as the proposed development been discussed either formally or informally with any of the following? (Please indicate)

City Planning Commission $\qquad$ City Planning Staff
City Council City Manager
Please describe the reaction to the proposed development from the persons or agencies indicated above.
I. If a city and/or county-sanctioned citizens' group exists in the area of the annexation, please list its name and the name and address of a contact person.

None

## IV. SERVICES AND UTILITIES

A. If the reason for the annexation is to obtain specific municipal services such as water service, sewerage service, fire protection, etc., please indicate the following:

1. Proximity of facilities (such as water mains, sewer laterals, storm drains, etc.) to the territory to be annexed. (Please indicate location of facilities--for example: $8^{\prime \prime}$ water main in Durham Rd. 500' from east edge of territory). Please indicate whose facilities they are and whether in fact these facilities will be the ones actually providing service to the area. If the facilities belong to another governmental entity, explain the agreement by which they will provide the service and what the city's policy is on subsequent withdrawal and/or compensation to the other unit.
City of Sherwood sewer and water services as follows:

- $8^{\prime \prime}$ sewer line extending $1600^{\prime}$ west of the termination of West Villa Rd. \& part of the Cedar Creek LID
- 14" water main extending 500' east of the termination of West Villa Rd. \& also part of the Cedar Creek LID
- $12^{\prime \prime}$ sewer line along Cedar Creek about $250^{\prime}$ from Southern Pacific Railway line
- $10^{\prime \prime}$ water main on Wilsonville Rd. extending to the Southern Pac. Railway line
- 12" water main crosses Flwy.99N 800 ' north of proposed annexation

2. The time at which services can be reasonably provided by the city or district. Sewer and water services are in reasonable proximity to the area. The timing of the extension of services is... (continued on separate page)
3. The estimated cost of extending such facilities and/or services and what is to be the method of financing. (Attach any supporting documents.) See attached Sherwood Sewer and Water Service Plans and estimated project costs
4. Availability of the desired service from any other unit of local government. (Please indicate the government.)
B. If the territory described in the proposal is presently included within the boundaries of any of the following types of governmental units, please so indicate by stating the name or names of the governmental units involved:

City $\qquad$ Rural Fire Dist. Tualatin Fire Dist. County Service Dist. Washington Co. Sanitary District Unified Sewerage Agency Hwy. Lighting Dist. $\qquad$ Water District City of Sherwood
Grade School Dist. Sherwood 88J Drainage District City of Sherwood
High School Dist. $\qquad$ Diking District Park $\&$ Rec. Dist. City of Sherwood
C. If any of the above units are presently servicing the territory (for instance, are residences in the territory hooked up to a public sewer or water system), please so describe. $\qquad$
$\qquad$

APPLICANT'S NAME Petitioners and City of Sherwood

| MAILING ADDRESS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { City Hall } \\ & \text { PO Box } 167 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sherwood OR 97140 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Work) } \\ & \text { (Res.) } \end{aligned}$ |
| TELEPHONE NUMBER | 625-5522 |  |
| REPRESENTING: |  |  |

PMALGBC FORM $\frac{\mu}{n} 9$
CERTIFICATION OF PROPERTY OWNERS
(Triple-Majority Method)
(Applicable for Annexations to Cities Only)

I hereby certify that the attached petition for annexation of the territory described therein to the City of $\qquad$ contains the names of at least a majority of the property owners...who own at least a majority of the land area...which constitutes at least a majority of the assessed value of the territory to be annexed.

NAME $\qquad$
TITLE $\qquad$
DEPARTMENT $\qquad$
COUNTY OF $\qquad$
DATE: $\qquad$

PMALGBC FORM \#4
CERTIFICATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP

I hereby certify that the description of the property included within the attached petition (located on Assessor's Map $\qquad$ ) has been checked by me and it is a true and exact description of the property under consideration, and the description corresponds to the attached map indicating the property under consideration.

NAME $\qquad$
TITLE $\qquad$
DEPARTMENT $\qquad$
COUNTY OF $\qquad$

DATE: $\qquad$

## PMALGBC FORM \#14

TRIPLE MAJORITY WORK SHEET
Please list all properties included in the proposal.
(If needed, use separate sheet for additional properties).

| Property | Name of Owner | Acres | Assessed | Signed | Petitio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Tax Lot \#s) | Name of Owner | Acres | Value | Yes | No |
| $\begin{array}{\|rr\|} \hline 2 S & 131 \mathrm{~A}: \\ & 2200 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Hazel B. Beeler | 11.45 | 54,200 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|rr\|} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} & 1 \\ & 31 \mathrm{~B}: \\ & 500 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Milfred Kenneth Hosler | 35.33 | 154,200 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|r\|r\|} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} \text { I } 31 \mathrm{~B}: \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Sherwood Elks Lodge | 14.65 | 125,500 | X |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} & 131 \mathrm{~B}: \\ & 601 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Sherwood Elks Lodge | 4.05 | Non-Assessa | able $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} 2 \mathrm{~S} & 31 \mathrm{~B}: \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Nellie Elwert <br> c/o U.S. National Bank | 5.98 | 12,700 | $\times$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 25131 B: \\ 800 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Kenneth Shannon | 6.76 | 116,900 | X |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} 131 \mathrm{~B} \\ & 900 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. George Stanfield | 5.96 | 91,500 | $\times$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \mathrm{~S} 131 \mathrm{~B}: \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrse Allen W, Williams | 2.00 | 91,900 | $x$ |  |
| 2S 131B: <br>  <br>  | Nellie Elwert c/o U.S. National Bank | 12.57 | 5,300 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \mathrm{~S} 131 \mathrm{~B}: \\ \\ \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Nellie Elwert c/o U.S. National Bank | 5.21 | 112,300 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} 2 \mathrm{~S} 131 \mathrm{~B}: \\ & 1102 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Nellie Elwert c/o U.S. National Bank | 1.85 | 55,400 | $\times$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rrr} 2 S & 1 & 31 B: \\ & 1201 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Neal Schroetke | 10.10 | 34,600 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} 2 S & 1310: \\ & 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Alfred Horne | 4.82 | 70,700 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} 1 \mathrm{3lC:} \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. O.E. Sumpter | 13.30 | 102,900 | $\times$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} 1 & 31 \mathrm{C} \\ & 102 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Ace R. Harris, Jr. | 11.20 | 74,500 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} 2 \mathrm{~S} & 1 \\ & 31 \mathrm{C} \\ & 103 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr, \& Mrs, William E. Keys | 9.77 | 80,504 | $x$ |  |
| TOTALS: |  | 155.0 | 1,183,104 |  |  |

## SUMMARY

total number of onnerships* in the proposal 21
NURBER OF OINERSHIPS* SIGNED FOR
PERCENTAGE OF OLNERSHIPS* SIGNED FOR
TOTAL ACREAGE IN PROPOSAL 260.89 acres

ACREAGE SIGNED FOR
PERCENTAGE OF ACREAGE SICNED FOR
TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE IN PROPOSAL \$1,937,700.00
ASSESSED VALUE SIGNED FOR \$
PERCENTAGE OF ASSESSED VALUE SIGNED FOR
If one person owns two or more tax lots they are counted as only a single ownership.

## TRIPLE MAJORITY WORK SHEET

Please list all properties included in the proposal.
(If needed, use separate sheet for additional properties).

| Property |  | Acres | Assessed | Signed Petition |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Designation Tax Lot \#S | Name of Owner | Acres | Value | Yes | No |
| 2S 1 31C: <br> 200 | Robert C. Luton | 39.79 | 208,300 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 S & 131 \mathrm{C} \\ & 300 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Charles W. Gribble | . 56 | 4,500 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} 2 S ~ 1 ~ 31 C: \\ & 400 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Boyd Timbre1 | 2.92 | 100,900 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \hline 2 S & 1 & 31 C: \\ & 401 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Charles W. Gribble | 1.59 | 54,500 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} \text { 1 31C: } \\ & 500 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Terry C. Trapp | . 48 | 3,800 | $x$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{cc} 2 \mathrm{~S} & 1 \\ & 31 \mathrm{C}: \\ & 600 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. I. Miles Eaton | . 83 | 51.800 |  |  |
| $2 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{1} 31 \mathrm{D}:$ 100 | Mr . \& Mrs. Robert Bousquet | 9.74 | 98,000 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} \text { 1 31D: } \\ & 300 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Margaret S Ritchen | 18.91 | 68,300 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} \hline 2 \mathrm{~S} & 1 & 31 \mathrm{D}: \\ & & 400 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Charles S._Kennerly | 2.77 | 74,300 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{rrr} 2 S & 1 & 31 D: \\ & & 401 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Charles S. Kennerly | 4.81 | 20,600 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \hline 2 S & 1 \\ & 31 \mathrm{D}: \\ & 402 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Charles S. Kennerly | 4.97 | 700 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \mathrm{~S} 130 \mathrm{C}: \\ \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mr. \& Mrs. Basil Dmytryshyn | 11.52 | 68.900 | X |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS: | Page Two Total gRand total | $\begin{aligned} & 105.89 \\ & 260.89 \end{aligned}$ | 754,600 $1,937,700$ |  |  |



## TABLE VII-2

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS¹


1. Based on April, 1979, dollars
2. Includes allocation for engineering, construction inspection, and contingency.

* Arrows refer to proposed facilities in the area
requested for annexation


# TABLE VII-5 <br> FUTURE STORAGE REQUIREMENTS 

| YEAR | REQUIRED STORAGE (MG) |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1979 | 1.2 |
| 1985 | 2.4 |
| 1993 | 4.2 |
| 2000 | 5.2 |

## TABLE VII-6 PRIORITY 1, ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

LOC ATION AND/OR LINE NUMBER

LOW PRESSURE ZONE

- Groundwater Study
- Complete loop from Well No. 4 to six corners

A34
A36

- Well Monitoring Program
- Construct New Well \& Pump
- Replace lines in downtown area which are less than 6 inches in size

HIGH PRESSURE ZONE

- Increase capacity of pump station TOTAL

SIZE
(INCHES)

## QUANTITY

 (FEET)cost
,

| - | - | $\$$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 12 | 550 | 10,000 |
| 10 | 2650 | 29,400 |
| - | - | 133,900 |
| - | - | $*$ |
| - | - | 95,000 |
| - |  | $\$ 313,300$ |

[^0]
# CITY OF SHERWOOO <br> WATER 

TABLE VII-7
PRIORITY 2, ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

LOCATION AND/OR LINE NUMBER
LOW PRESSURE ZONE
S.W. 3rd St. (A1)

NW. Park St. (A2)
NE. First St. and N.E.
Oregon St. (A3 \& A5)
A4
Lincoln Street (A6)
Oregon Street (A7)
A8
A9
A10
Tualatin-Sherwood Rd. (A11 \& A12)
East Edy Rd. (A13 \& A14)
A15
A16
S.W. Murdock Rd. (A16 and A18)

East Willamette (A17)
A19
A20
Sunset Blvd. East of Sherwood Blvd. (A24)
Sherwood Blvd. South of Sunset (A25)
Sunset Blvd. West of Sherwood Blvd. (A26)
$\times \mathrm{A} 27$
A28
A29
Pacific Highway (Meinecke Rd.
to the S.W.) A 30
Meinecke Rd. (A31)
A32
A33
A35
A37
A38
Edy Rd. (A39 and A40)
HIGH PRESSURE ZONE
Pine St. South of Sunset Blvd. (A22)
Sunset Blvd. East of Pine (A21)
A23
TOTAL
$\underset{\text { (FEET) }}{\text { QUANTITY }} \operatorname{cost}$
500 \$ 23.000

750
1750
300
1000
1000
1300
1850
2400
1100
4600
2250
1700
1550
1550
1150
350
1750
1300
1050
1350
1250
1300
1900
1900
$\begin{array}{rr}2500 & 115,200 \\ 800 & 36,850 \\ 550 & 25,300 \\ 1050 & 48,400 \\ 1250 & 66,800 \\ 750 & 40,100 \\ 1600 & k 80,850 \\ 3600 & 181,950\end{array}$

1250
650
600
57,600
29,850
27,650
$\$ 2,623,050$

TABLE VII-8
PRIORITY 3, ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

| LOCATION AND/OR LINE NUMBER | SIZE <br> (INCHES) | QUANTITY <br> (FEET) |  | $\operatorname{cost}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOW PRESSURE ZONE |  |  |  |  |
| Reservoirs |  | 1 | \$ | 310,000 |
| 2.0 MG on Haide Rd. | - | 1 |  | 210,000 |
| 1.2 MG on Division | 8 | 3500 |  | 161,200 |
| B1 |  |  |  |  |
| Growth Boundary; B2, B3 \& B5) | 12 | 1600 |  | 85,500 |
|  | $\rightarrow 10$ | 3800 |  | 192,100 |
|  | 8 | 1250 |  | 57,600 |
| B4 | 8 | 2700 |  | 124,400 |
| B6 | 8 | 1300 |  | 59,900 |
| $\begin{array}{r}87 \\ \hline 88\end{array}$ | 8 | 1400 |  | 64,500 |
| $\rightarrow 88$ | 10 | 900 |  | 45,500 |
| $\rightarrow \mathrm{B9}$ | 8 | 1450 |  | 66,800 |
| $\rightarrow$ Middleton-Millers Ferry Rd. |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\rightarrow$ Middleton-Millers Ferry Rd. <br> (Pacific Hwy to Haide Rd B11) | 12 | 2500 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 101,750 \\ & 137,500 \end{aligned}$ |
| (Pacific Hwy. to Haide Rd, B11) | 18 | 2050 |  |  |
| Haide Rd. (B12) | 14 | 1350 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 77,950 \\ & 77,450 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\rightarrow \mathrm{H} 13$ | 12 | $550 ' 1440$ 29,431 |  |  |
| $\rightarrow$ B14 | 10 | 1250 |  | 63.200 |
| B15 | 8 | 1600 |  | 73,700 |
| B16 | 8 | 1350 |  | 62,200 |
| B17 | 8 | 1250 |  | 57,600 |
| B18 | 10 | 1250 |  | 63.200 |
| Edy Rd. West of City Limits (B19) | 10 | 1350 |  | 68,200 |
| B20 | 8 | 3300 |  | 152,000 |
| Scholls-Sherwood Rd. (B21) | 8 | 2000 |  | 92.150 |
| B22 | 10 | 1300 |  | 65.700 |
| B23 | 10 | 1850 |  | 93,500 |
| B24 | 10 | 2100 |  | 106.100 |
| Edy. Rd. (B26, B28, B29) | 10 | 2300 |  | 115,200 |
|  | 12 | 2450 |  | 130,900 |
|  | 12 | 2600 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 138,900 \\ 96,150 \end{array}$ |
| B27 | 12 | 1800 |  |  |
| B32 | 12 | 2000 |  | 106.800 |
| ${ }_{\text {B33 }}$ (B34) | 12 | 1800 |  | 96,150 |
| Tualatin Sherwood Rd. (B34) | 8 | 2950 |  | 135,900 |
| B35 | 8 | 1250 |  | 57,600 |
| B36 |  |  |  |  |
| HIGH PRESSURE ZONE |  |  |  |  |
| Pump Station at Haide Rd. | - | 1 |  | 35,000 |
| Expand Pump Sta. at Division | - | 1 |  | 30,000 |
| Replace 8 inch line in Division with 10 inch line | 1350 | 70,000 |  |  |
| Replace 8 inch line in Pine St. with 10 inch line | 10 | 1250 |  | 64,800 |
| B37 | 10 | 950 |  | 49,250 |
| B38 | 8 | 2550 |  | 117,500 |
| 839 | 8 | 1250 |  | 57,600 |
| B40 | 8 | 2600 |  | 119,800 |
| B41 | 10 | 1250 |  | 64,800 |
| B42 | 8 | 700 |  | 32.250 |
| Sunset Blvd. (B43) | 8 | 700 |  | 32,250 |
| TOTAL |  |  | \$ 4 | ,220,550 |




City
of
Sherwood, Oregon

## S.W. SHERWOOD ANNEXATION

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Exhibit ' $A$ "
A parcel of land situated in Sections 30 and 31 , Township 2 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, Washington County, Oregon more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the northwesterly right-ofway line of $S . W$. Pacific Highway and the northerly line of Section 31, T2S, R1W, W.M.; thence westerly along said northerly line 1280 feet, more or less, to the southeasterly corner of that tract of land described by deed recorded in Book 1053 at Page 385, Washington County Deed Records; thence northerly, leaving said northerly line, 426.73 feet, more or less along the easterly line of said tract of land to the northeasterly corner thereof; thence westerly along the northerly line of said tract of land 1060 feet, more or less to the most northerly northwest corner of said tract of land; thence southerly along the most easterly westerly line of said tract of land 234.55 feet, more or less, to the interior ell of said tract of land; thence westerly along the most southerly northerly line of said tract of land 233 feet, more or less, to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of s.W. Elwert Road; thence southerly along the said easterly right-of-way line, crossing said S.W. Pacific Highway, and along the easterly right-of-way line of Old Highway 994119 feet, more or less to the intersection with the northerly right-of-way line of S.W. Wilsonville Road; thence easterly along the said northerly right-of-way line 4,156 feet, more or less, to the southeasterly corner of that tract of land described by deed recorded as Fee No. 79-44578, Washington County Deed Records; thence leaving the said northerly right-of-way line, northerly along the easterly line of said tract of land 275 feet, more or less, to the southeasterly right-of-way line of the Southern Pacific Railroad; thence northeasterly and easterly along the said southeasterly right-of-way line 2045 feet, more or less to the intersection with the west line of said Section 31; thence northerly along said west line 645 feet, more or less, to the northerly right-of-way line of West Villa Road; thence westerly 290 feet, more or less to a point; thence southerly, crossing said West Villa Road 20 feet, more or less, to the northeasterly corner of that tract of land described by deed recorded as Fee No. 84-9323, Washington County Deed Records; thence continuing southerly along the easterly line of said tract of land 412 feet, more or less, to the southeasterly corner thereof; thence westerly along the southerly line of said tract of land 216.72 feet, more or less, to the southwesterly corner thereof: thence northerly along the westerly line of said tract of land, 412 feet, more or less, to the northwesterly corner thereof, said point being also on the southerly right-of-way line of said west Villa Road; thence continuing northerly, 40 feet, more or less, to a point on the said northerly right-of-way line of West Villa Road; thence westerly along the said northerly right-of-way line 820 feet, more or less, to the northwesterly terminus of said West Villa Road; thence southerly along the westerly terminus of said West Villa Road and along the westerly line of that tract of land described by deed recorded in Book 268 at Page 585, Washington County Deed Records, 452 feet, more or less, to the southwesterly corner thereof; thence westerly along the southerly lines of those tracts of land described by deeds recorded as Fee No.s 81-41775 and 81-20150, Washington County Deed Records, 1320 feet, more or less, to the center of said Section 31 ; thence continuing westerly along the southerly line of that tract of land described by deed recorded in Book 682 at Page 453, Washington County Deed Records, 200 feet, to a point; thence northerly, leaving said southerly line, 790 feet, more or less, to a point on the northerly line of said tract of land, said point being westerly 200 feet, more or less, from the northeasterly corner thereof; thence westerly along the said northerly line 1710.5 feet, more or less, to a point on the southeasterly right-ofway line of said S.w. Pacific Highway; thence northeasterly along the said southeasterly right-of-way line, 2700 feet, more or less to a point; thence westerly 270 feet, more or less, crossing said S.W. Pacific Highway to the point of l.a.rimmin..

## PMALGBC FORM \#8

PETITION FOR ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF Sherwood $\qquad$ , OREGON

TO: The Council of the City of $\qquad$ , Oregon

We, the undersigned property owners of the area described below, hereby petition for, and give our consent to, annexation of the area to the City of Sherwood . If approved by the city, we further request that this petition be forwarded to the Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission for the necessary procedures as prescribed by ORS 199.490 (2).

The property to be annexed is described as follows: (Insert Legal Description here OR attach it as Exhibit ' A ')

See Exhibit " $A$ "

PETITION SIGNERS


## (PMALGBC FORM \#8 - Page 2)

## PETITION SIGNERS (Continued)

(Note: This petition may be signed by qualified persons, even tho: $:$ : they may not know their tax lot numbers.)

| Signature of Legal Owner (s) | Address | Tax Lot Numbers |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lot |  | Se |  |  |
| "r.5cinn heckun | Rt. 3, Box 257 <br> Sherwood, Oregon | 1102 | B | 31 | 2 S |  |
| Than oferent | 9835 S.W. 90th <br> Portland, Oregon | 1.201 | B | 31 | 2 S |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Rt. 5, Box 60A } \\ \text { Shervood. Oregon } \end{array}$ | 100 | C 31 |  | 2S.-1 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rt. 5, Box } 60 \mathrm{~A} \\ & \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \end{aligned}$ | 100 |  | C : 31 | 2S -1 |  |
| The keind dermpare | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Rt. 5, Box 59B } \\ \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 101 | $c$ | 31 | 25 |  |
|  | Rt. 5, Box 59B Sherwood, Oregon | 101 | C | 31 | 2 S |  |
| $A x C R d t c r i$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { Rt. } 5, \text { Box } 60 \mathrm{~A} \\ \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \end{array}\right\|$ | 102 | c | 31 | 2S |  |
| $\operatorname{tin} a(\operatorname{la} / \text { una }$ | Rt. 5, Box 60A Sherwood, Oregon | 102 | c | 31 | 2 S |  |
| $2 \text { ciehom \& Xex, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rt. 5, Box } 59 \mathrm{~A} \\ & \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \end{aligned}$ | 103 | C | 31 | 2S $\quad 1$ |  |
| Kutuleem S.Kun | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { Rt. 5, Box 59A } \\ \text { Shervood, Oregon } \end{array}\right\|$ | 103 | 1. | 31 | 2 S |  |
| Wrater las | $\begin{aligned} & 15300 \text { S.W. } 116 \mathrm{th} \\ & \text { Tigard, Oregon } \end{aligned}$ | 200 | 1 C |  | 2S |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rt. 3, Lox } 247 \\ & \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 300 | 1 c | 31 | 2 S |  |
| $\text { Cliuo } m \text { ItribRE }$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Rt. 3, Box } 247 \\ \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 300 | C | 31 | 25 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Rt} \text {. 5, Box } 6 \mathrm{IA-1} \\ & \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \end{aligned}$ | 400 | C | 31 | 2 S |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rt. 5, Box } 61 \mathrm{~A}-1 \\ & \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 400 | C | 31 | 2 S | 1 |
| Lemerbsloldrub6\% | Rt. 3, Box 247 Sherwood, Oregon | 401 | c | 31 | 2S |  |
| fime oIm. Rurffex | Rt. 3, Box 247 Sherwood, Oregon | 401 | $1 \mathrm{c}$ | 31 | 2 S | 1 |
| Toma C Incon | $\begin{array}{ll} 5238 \text { S.E. } & 53 \mathrm{rd} \\ \text { Portland, } & \text { Oregon } \end{array}$ | $500$ | ${ }^{1} \cdot$ | 31 | 2 S | 1 |
| ర | Rt. 5, Box 61 Sherwood, Oregon | 600 | C | 31 | 2 S | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | Rt. 5, Box 61 Sherwood, Oregon | 600 | . C | 31. | 2 S |  |
|  | P.O. Box 109 Sherwood, oregon | 100 | D | 31 | 2 S | 1 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { P.0. Box } 109 \\ \text { Sherwood, Oregon } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100 | 10 | 31 | 2 S |  |
|  | Rt. 5, Box 57 Sherwood, Oregon | 300 | D | $31$ | 2 S | 1 |

(PMALGBC FORM 8 - Page 2)
PETITION SIGNERS (Continued)
(Note: This petition may be signed by qualified persons, even thoss: they may not know their tax lot numbers.)

| Sigature of Legal Omerer (s) $^{\text {a }}$ | Address |  | ${ }_{\text {rax Let }}^{\text {a }}$ | Tot Sumber | 为 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 400 |  |  | $\mathrm{I}_{25} \mathrm{I}$ |
|  | Stioumod. | 400 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 401 |  |  |  |
|  | Steme | 402 |  |  |  |
| Stumation |  | 02 |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Faxit pusty |  | 602 |  | C 30 | 25 |
|  |  | 602 |  |  | 25.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | I |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |
|  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | i | ! |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | , |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    * Cost cannot be determined until completion of groundwater study.

