



**City of Sherwood  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Sherwood Police Facility  
20495 SW Borchers Drive**

**February 15, 2005**

**Regular Meeting - 7:00 PM**

**A G E N D A**

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
2. **Consent Agenda - December 7, 2004 Minutes**
3. **Agenda Review**
4. **Brief Announcements**
5. **Community Comments** *are limited to items NOT on the printed Agenda.*
6. **Public Hearing**
  - A. **Transportation System Plan (PA 04-03):** Testimony will be taken on the proposed Transportation System Plan (October 2004 Draft). This is a new public hearing on a plan text and map amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. An addendum staff report will be presented. *(Kevin A. Cronin, Planning Supervisor, Planning Department)*
7. **Comments from Commission**
8. **Next Meeting** *(March 8, 2005)*

*NOTE: Regular meeting dates have been switched to 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesdays of each month. A work session on the TSP code implementation phase is scheduled for March 8.*
9. **Adjournment**

**AGENDA NOTE: The original hearing date for the TSP was scheduled for March 15, 2005. The Gazette (Archer) published this date in the February issue. Subsequently, the hearing was moved and re-noticed to February 15 to accommodate a scheduling conflict.**

# **APPROVED MINUTES**

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**February 15, 2005**

---

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

**Chair Adrian Emery called the Planning Commission hearing to order at 7:00 PM.**

**Commission Members present:**

Patrick Allen  
Dan Balza  
Kevin Henry  
Jean Lafayette

**Staff:**

Kevin Cronin, Senior Planner  
Pam Beery, City Attorney  
Rob Dixon, Community Development Director  
Gene Thomas, City Engineer  
Cynthia Butler, Administrative Assistant

**Commission Members absent:**

Matt Nolan

**2. Agenda Review**

**3. Consent Agenda- 12/7/04 Planning Commission Minutes**

Jean Lafayette moved the Planning Commission accept the December 7, 2004 Planning Commission minutes with no changes. Seconded by Chair Adrian Emery.

**Vote for Passage of Motion: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

**Chair Emery:** Asked if there was any change to the process in agenda this evening.

**Kevin Cronin:** Confirmed; Yes, one item to do now. Mr. Mayor -

**Mayor Mays:** Presented a plaque and commendation for public service to Commissioner Kevin Henry, who was attending his last Planning Commission session after serving 4 yrs. Kevin will continue to serve the community as a school board member and spend time with family.

**4. Brief Announcements**

**Kevin Cronin:** Received 4 apps to fill 2 vacancies – requested to extend date for applications – to be determined on date for extension. Will get back to PC by email. Interested parties can go to the City website and download the application. Kevin introduced the new Planning Administrative Assistant, Cynthia Butler.

**Patrick Allen:** 1 person expressed interest at the YMCA open house on 2/14/05.

**Kevin Cronin:** Will collect applications and return persons of interest to City Recorder. Kevin recognized that Gene Thomas was recently officially announced as City Engineer. Indicated copies of Part I were distributed to PC members, and the Statements of Economic Interest which PC members were requested to fill out and return to the City Recorder.

**Chair Emery:** Asked if there were any items from the public that did not appear on the Agenda. Citizen Susan Claus indicated she would like to address an issue.

## **5. Community Comments**

**Susan Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Hwy., Sherwood, OR 97140, addressed the Commission:**

Mrs. Claus read a letter she received on Feb. 1, 2005 from the City Attorney's office regarding a request from the City of Sherwood to adopt a formal process for future requests of documentation that Mrs. Claus may make from the City. The letter indicated requests need to be in writing and that the City Attorney's office would decide if the request could be met and what associated charges would be. Mrs. Claus objected to the letter as a "hostile" and "draconian" approach, which she did not understand and wanted a response on why the letter was sent.

**Chair Emery:** Indicated the Planning Commission did not have any knowledge of the letter nor a response at this time, but that they would look into it.

**Pam Beery:** Inquired if Mrs. Claus was unable to obtain any documents to prepare for tonight's meeting that she didn't have?

**Mrs. Claus:** No.

**Pam Beery:** Reiterated the last request the City received for documents from Mrs. Claus was for and Oct. report in 2004 and the next was a Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> staff report.

**Mrs. Claus:** Disagreed, and said there was an informal meeting with DKS she believed to be on Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> regarding Chapter 10..

**Pam Beery:** Inquired if Mrs. Claus had the documents for that meeting?

**Mrs. Claus:** No. She would like the minutes for that meeting a copies of any handouts.

**Pam Beery:** Said that since the PC did not participate in generating the letter and are not aware of some issues involved, and that it was not the forum to discuss the matter. Pam also stated if Mrs. Claus wanted to give testimony this evening she was welcome to do so, and that there will be another hearing with City Council she would have the opportunity to testify also. Pam reiterated that this was not an issue that the PC was prepared this evening to respond to.

**Mrs. Claus:** Said she appreciated what the City Attorney was saying, but that she has attended most of the TSP meetings and the dialog with the PC was important – that they should know if citizens are having trouble getting documents in time for a meeting.

**Pam Beery:** Agreed, and said that the chair has indicated that he would like a report from Kevin through the City Administration and that will be certainly be done.

**Mrs. Claus:** That's ok, but I would also like to request a continuance of this hearing stating she wasn't sure she had the documents that were generated in preparation of the meeting.

**Pam Beery:** Ok, Kevin Cronin will handle that request.

**R.J. Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Hwy., Sherwood, OR 97140, addressed the Commission:** Mr. Claus stated that it was his opinion the letter sent to his wife was part of a conspiracy to violate their civil rights and that it would not go unchallenged. Mr. Claus also stated that he believes the TSP plan is slanted to protect political interests.

**Patrick Allen:** Asked Kevin Cronin that when the administrative report is done for the PC to address how the 10-day requirement works with the 7-day cycle for staff reports. Asked whether there were any other community comments not on the agenda. There were none.

## 7. Public Hearing

**Chair Emery:** Began the public hearing of the TSP 04-03 and that this hearing was originally noted for March 15<sup>th</sup> and was moved due to a City Council conflict. The City Council has agreed to hold 2 more public hearings on the issue, March 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Patrick Allen read the hearings disclosure statement and asked that Commission members reveal any conflicts of interest, ex-parte contact or bias.

There were no Commissioner disclosures.

**Kevin Henry:** Several neighbors asked questions about TSP and responded & suggested that they tonight or one of the previous meetings.

**Jean Lafayette:** Had been approached with concerns and more extensions to be heard.

**Patrick Allen:** Had conversations with a number of people at the open house about what is in the plan.

**Chair Emery:** Contacted by a number of people particularly about Villa Rd., then directed comments for staff.

**Kevin Cronin:** Went over copies submitted to PC for mtg.; Memo Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> summarizes where we've been to date with all the materials in the record: including Oct. 2004 draft of TSP, memo draft policy regarding Chapter 6 dated 12/28; Chapter 10 finance memo dated Jan. 2005 w/edits noted and also emailed this afternoon; the amendment functional connectivity map (not a hard copy, but noted in the memo itself); a number of staff memos or reports, the original staff reports for PA 04-03 which is what this application is tonight, is dated Oct. 26<sup>th</sup>. There are also memos dated 9/20, 11/13, 11/30 and February already mentioned. There are also agency and public comments including a letter from ODOT.

Any questions from the emailed summary on the open house today? Overall the open house went well, 18 people signed in (seemed more than 18 people there). A lot of questions about Villa Rd. and Pine St. – mostly Villa Rd. and was hoping to have a discussion about the merits of Villa Rd. tonight. My recommendation hasn't changed at all from my original recommendation to approve this plan text and map amendment. We're looking at a transportation plan for the next 20 years, and the way you that is by using a state standard or guideline called Transportation Planning Rule that pretty much spells out what we have to do for transportation planning here in

the state of Oregon. We tried to stick to that pretty closely and I think we have a pretty good product right now. Obviously there are some issues around the connection issues as far as Villa Rd. and I think there are some misunderstandings about what TSP is supposed to do - and what certain things are happening with specific properties in town, so hopefully we can get some clarity around those especially for those folks that have shown up tonight.

I'd like to yield the rest of my time at the end of public testimony so that I can respond to the testimony. I think that would be the best use of staff's time and just to let you know I am not the only staff person here tonight – to my left is Pam Beery from the City Attorney's office, to my right Rob Dixon, Community Development Director, and Gene Thomas, City Engineer as well as Carl Springer from DKS Associates who is the consultant on this process, so we are all here as a resource, please use us.

**Chair Emery:** Does anyone have questions of staff?

**Jean Lafayette:** I have a question on the staff report for Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> – the connectivity map says the Sherwood School District has requested the neighborhood route designation identified in figure 8-1 and the connection on figure 8-8 be removed.

**Kevin Cronin:** Yes.

**Jean Lafayette:** Since the map includes the City of Sherwood – I would like to know which road it was you were referring to.

**Kevin Cronin:** I'm sorry let me put it on the map for you. It is the section we were talking about last night, the new connection on Meinecke.

**Jean Lafayette:** OK.

**Kevin Cronin:** [on map] Part of the Timber Crossing II subdivision – this piece of property right here [on map], a new street connection just above Woodhaven Drive, located next to the LDS facility right here. They made that request. I agreed with that because that local street would provide the connectivity we need for that particular part of town. I would add to that additional connectivity we could get by doing a real master plan for the high school property to get some better connections through that property as well..that is a separate process from the TSP, I just wanted to let you know about that.

**Jean Lafayette:** So for clarification right now there is an arrow with a dotted line and that is being removed –

**Kevin Cronin:** That's my recommendation –

**Jean Lafayette:** Because an application that was heard by the Hearings Officer provides a specific road alignment –

**Kevin Cronin:** The preliminary plat that has been heard by the Hearings Officer on January 31st, includes the connection, includes a local street.

**Jean Lafayette:** From Woodhaven direct to Meinecke?

**Kevin Cronin:** That's correct. I've not heard a notice of decision from Paul Norr, Hearings Officer yet, but obviously subject to his approval.

**Jean Lafayette:** Just for clarification, I think I know this because I was at the open house, the connectivity arrows that are on there are just a general idea – one gentleman approached me and said that the arrows are pointing right at the wetlands on his property, and my understanding is that they are a general idea and that they are site-specific once the application comes in, correct?

**Kevin Cronin:** Yes, they are general proximations.

**Patrick Allen:** I have a question, in Chapter 10 there are a number of financing strategies...is our role to simply recommend those range of strategies and then which ones get picked are is a question for Council?

**Kevin Cronin:** That's correct. As part of that recommendation there is a city-wide SDC that is within Chapter 10 and if you have questions about that I am sure Carl can try and answer those.

**Jean Lafayette:** I have one more question, we do have a piece-meal projects that we've worked through, our latest is from October on Chapter 10 from January on this and then in addition I've got other notes; 12<sup>th</sup> Street is going to be amended so there is a specific street connection, and then this is going to happen – is there going to be one final document connecting them being produced?

**Kevin Cronin:** Yes, that's right. Pending all the comments that we take, I work with a consultant to make sure those changes get made and the final publication is on file – I will discuss with you at a later date how we are going to be able to accomplish that, there will be a process to go with that.

**Jean Lafayette:** Will it be brought to the Commission prior as a complete document?

**Kevin Cronin:** My hope is that it will be brought to City Council, but again I need to work with a consultant on how we do that before we take a look at the budget.

**Jean Lafayette:** I follow all the changes, I'd actually like to have the document before the meeting because it will take a long time to compile all these notes into..because as you mentioned in your memo the original documents started 2003 so we have numbers that don't tie to final financing option and I would not feel comfortable going forward until we know that the numbers have been tied down and that everything connects.

**Kevin Cronin:** That's right. The March draft and October draft – we are taking the Oct. draft with revisions to Council for a final copy and that's the scope of work and contract we have with the consultant to do that.

**Jean Lafayette:** So there will be a final copy before the City Council meeting?

**Kevin Cronin:** That's my hope, but again that is something I have to work out with the consultant.

**Jean Lafayette:** Ok.

**Chair Emery:** Anything else? Ok, before I start calling up everybody a reminder to limit testimony to 5 minutes. If you want to submit written testimony in addition, please feel free - we will always accept written testimony so please keep that in mind, or any other exhibits you would like to submit. And with that we will open with Susan Claus.

### **Public Testimony**

**R.J. Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Hwy., Sherwood, OR 97140:**

The last time we were here we talked about the extensions off Meinecke and problem they are going to lead to in terms of litigation. And what we said we would do is supply you with the drawings so that you could begin to understand some of the problems. We've been luckier than that, we are now getting our first ability to sue if you extend - because we have one deal that has been broken apart - dealing with Broadhurst here [on map as exhibit to be submitted later] which we can show you. What happens, this is the McFall, Claus & Grove property - we own Grove, Susan and I own this [on map] that's Lloyd's, ok?.. and this is half Salisbury's and half Grove. This is Hadman's, ok? You can see the ideal extension is to bring to across here [on map], ok? What happened is we got an offer from Opus, one we didn't like that well. Exactly what you wanted. We agreed to it. Salisbury's were talking about it, Joe Barker sold the Hadley property to someone else other than Opus, it's under contract. So all of a sudden developing this in one piece so this might have been able to be done or not done, was blocked by Broadhurst. This is Joe's property, I don't know - that is definitely Connel and Broadhurst, this is Ken Shannon, this is Susan & ours, here's our home place, here's Williams. The original extension for Meieke Road was to go here - they are now proposing bringing this across Williams and then across us, and across Shannon to Broadhurst & Connel.

That's what we said we'd do and we've done it, but I can tell you that we have the first absolute indication that you're not going to put these pieces together as a puzzle. Because we have - I'm sure once you know Opus, and they were ready to go to almost any lengths here to develop this piece and they key piece, your realtor - the City's realtor, Broadhurst who works for you if you don't know it, check and find out how much you've paid - broke this whole thing apart with Hanley. That by the way is Connel's best friend and business partner. So, I'm telling you that anything you do there you going to have real difficulties with. But, there's not much you can say about it because as you can see anything you do there is running into parcels.

And the other thing you asked Jean, was - this is our home place and we have an offer from a motel now on this that we are looking at. What could happen here is you could run - you have to have an apron of 120 feet - Ken has 70, we have 50 and then we have about 600. The obvious thing would be to run the apron in here like this toward Broadhurst for the motel and come in with this apron here. This piece which Broadhurst and Connel own, when they took this up here, we owned part of this, they took this to Renaissance Homes and they signed a remonstrance and gave away their deeded interest to ODOT. That is how this piece got isolated. But, what I'll do is - I know I'm taking more time...



**Chair Emery:** Do you have also something you can do for the record?

**R.J. Clause:** That's what I was going to tell you – I have 3 of them made, but I didn't have time to draw on them, so if it's ok I'll give them to you sometime later?

**Chair Emery:** Ok. We'll keep the record open so you can give them to the City later.

**R.J. Clause:** Ok, thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you very much.

**Yvonne Holthouse, 16780 SW Stellar Drive, Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I live on Stellar Drive and am opposed to the extension, it would impact traffic and the road is too narrow.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you very much for coming.

**Reg Jerome, 16792 SW Stellar Drive, Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I am concerned about the quality of living erodes as we develop and we have fewer spaces that we can go to that are open, and there is one that is there – it doesn't have to be...we don't have to plan for it, we can walk our kids down into an area and don't have to watch out for cars because cars aren't allowed to come through. We can go in the summertime to the park, we can go Music on The Green, it just adds to the quality of life. I am perplexed why we would want to go in there and take that away. That's my main concern, that backing up into the arteries that will run into that area, one being Stellar and W. Villa and others – the streets in Woodhaven are very narrow, and just driving through there it is really an obstacle course. You have cars parked on both sides of the road, you have commercial vehicles that people park, and it's dangerous – and you have a lot of kids at play. It's a real safety issue. I applaud the parents because I drive through there and purposely keep it at 20MPH, and I know kids move out of the way when they play basketball and other things, but it's hard for them – where are they going to play? So my thing is why do we want to get rid of this area that is so much a part of our community and adds so much? It's just like with football games in the fall, we have cars parking there and there is really no room to get through anyway. One of our main reasons for coming into the Woodhaven area were the pathways, you could get off the street which is really important. So I am concerned about the quality of living and the safety of our kids around the community, so thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you for coming, we appreciate it.

**Scott McAuley, 490 W. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

This street and park thing was proposed years ago by the City, by Jon Bormet who met with a bunch of us property owners along Villa Rd. which has never been maintained by the City or the County, ever – and they proposed to us that they wanted to make this Stella Olson park thing, and wetlands and preserve it. Some of the houses on the other end on the Woodhaven side that had maintained the road for years, footed the bill for it and everything, they ended getting cut off when they put the park in – they shortened the road there and they had a letter from the City to the affect that states that road would not be reopened, and that Villa and the park land would not be reopened. That is to my knowledge been turned in already from Art and Donna Nanna ...

**Chair Emery:** I haven't seen it..

**Scott McAuley:** I've been informed that there is a this letter and that it does need to be checked out before you decide this. When the park was put in it was a good thing and it is for the entire community a plus. The fire department at that time said the streets were adequate for the fire, safety and health needs of Woodhaven. From what I understand the needs supposedly for this Villa Rd. project going through is the fire, safety and health – my comment on that is that if we need more fire protection down there I think we ought to recognize it and address it more frankly by putting in another fire station to serve the community adequately, and it would probably be a fraction of the cost of what the community proposed by going through the wetlands and eliminating the good things are the plusses of Sherwood. I have some petitions here from when we first were notified this last year we made up some petitions – there are 40 or 50 of them here and a lot of people who live here in Sherwood, with a few people from others towns that voiced their concerns and I would like turn those in and have them noted. These people are all in opposition of this thing, they live in Old Town, Woodhaven, all parts of Sherwood in particular, hundreds of names. This thing would go through my house and an adjoining house I own, and a neighbors house, at least 3 houses that would be directly affected by this – cutting into the tax base, the extension of the road and going through the park would probably cost multiple millions of dollars. So a fire station is what I recommend. Thank you very much for your time.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you.

**Eugene Bigham, 185 NW Park, Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I came here because everyone was for Old Town Sherwood and they are talking about with this extension taking out several homes that have been there since 1911, Scott's (McKully) has been there a little more than that...but the people in that part of town, we are Old Town also not just the businesses. Thank you very much.

**Larry Morrison, 16710 Stellar Dr., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

We live right on the corner of Stellar & Mill and many people are right about this. The part of the traffic going through there, we already have Dewey Rd. over there and the traffic is absolutely hazardous. The people over there can't hardly get out of their driveway. That's exactly what is going to happen on our side. The streets are wider over there, ours is so narrow. A fire truck can't even get down there. If there are 2 cars parked very close together on both sides of the street you couldn't get a fire truck through there anyway. Whoever planned that....

**Chair Emery:** Actually, I don't know if you are aware of it, but being a resident of Woodhaven - the Homeowner's Association was to make Stellar one side street parking only and for some reason they never followed through with that, and I don't know why that is. What was supposed to happen and what did happen were different, just so you know.

**Larry Morrison:** It's terribly narrow through there. All the streets are narrow, there are only a couple of streets that are very wide at all. And Stellar is one of the narrowest. As for the quality of life, that's the reason we moved back there, knowing that the road was never going to through. I think it's about 3 million dollars to finish that road down there. That's all I have to say. I hope you really look into this and use very good judgement on what people are saying here tonight.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you.

**Roger Button, 16705 SW Stellar Dr., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I'm Larry's neighbor. My wife and I moved to Sherwood 5-6 years ago and at that time there were plenty of properties to look at and decide where we wanted. We ended up in the property we did explicitly because we were told that was the end of the neighborhood, that there was a walking path to the park and Old Town. The road cut from Woodhaven to Meinecke was obviously one that was going through, we saw Dewey that was going to be going through and we took a good hard look and realized this is where we wanted to be. We wanted our kids to be in an area that was safe, no traffic and this really took us by surprise. I just want to reaffirm everything that everyone else has said here tonight, it baffles me why you want to go through with this process.

**Chair Emery:** Maybe I ought to say this presently – the engineering firm was hired to do this to give all options to us, it is more like an inventory not set in concrete or anything like that. It is an inventory of what changes are recommended. That doesn't necessarily mean that – when you say recommendations you need to look at all sides of that, what is monetary – what we are going to get most bang for our buck for and all that, and I just want to make you aware of, and I think I can speak for the entire Commission when I say it's down the list.

**Roger Button:** Ok, and the fact that there is a hearing is reassuring to us, obviously the amount of people here and the passion that's involved in the people that are here.

**Chair Emery:** We do appreciate that.

**Jean Lafayette:** I have a question, who told you that the road wasn't going to go through?

**Roger Button:** I went through my realtor who had the information that this would not go through, and that this area was gifted to the City or something like that at that point - but I understood that it would not go through and would remain a walking path.

**Jean Lafayette:** Sometimes realtors provide information that is not accurate. I'd recommend to anybody if they are buying property to contact the City directly, but I just wanted to know who told you because realtors don't always have the most information.

**Roger Button:** Sure, I understand that. Thank you.

**Charles Conniry, 16976 SW Cobbleston Dr., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

Thank you for taking the process seriously. I am one of the first people to move to Cobblestone Drive, I think I was the 2<sup>nd</sup> house that was built. Stupidly, I committed myself to that place without also realizing I was committing myself to living in a construction zone.

**Chair Emery:** If it's any consolation I was the 1<sup>st</sup> house in my neighborhood.

**Charles Conniry:** Were you? Oh no. I too am opposed to the extension and we have a lot of people running up and down Cobblestone Drive as it is, and I can just imagine that would become one of the thoroughfares if folks had access to Old Town from that side of Woodhaven. I am coming here with enlightened self-interest, the roads are narrow and there are lots of kids

out there and I for one do not want to see Cobblestone become another Dewey Drive. Most of us who moved into Woodhaven did so with the collective assumption that there would never be a road running through the wetlands. Faulty assumption that it is still I would like to see on behalf of the preservation of that particular part of Sherwood, I think it's consistent with the visionary leadership of your predecessors, and I think it would be acting in good faith to uphold their vision. It's clear that things are crazy, one thing that even the most visionary people couldn't have imagined 20 years ago is what Sherwood would look like today, that is for sure. I think that when it comes to progress we should look to other alternatives before we look at spoiling one of the few wetlands left in Sherwood. Thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you. Any questions? Thank you very much, we appreciate it.

**Krystal Nanna, 957 W. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR 97140:**

My in-laws are the ones who have access to the letter – we are trying to get hold of that. It was brought to the open house last summer, the letter was and a copy of it was taken at that point. But we will get you another one. My concern as living in the last home on Villa before you go onto the Old Town path is on Stella Olson night, on any summer night we probably have 50-100 people going by. Parents feel very comfortable with their kids being out on the road, we have a lot of younger kids who live in Woodhaven out on the sidewalks who are allowed by their parents to go on that road and down that street. One of the things we talk about so often is that we want to keep the City of Sherwood having that home town feel, and that was my childhood and if a child is allowed to be outside and walk on the streets, I think that will be gone in that area. It is easy access for everyone to the high school and if this goes through it will be the easiest to get to Target and the easiest way to out to the Highway, and will affect the quality of life. It does concern me, I've just had a ton of people ask me about this situation just saying that I didn't think it could happen on wetlands. That's my concern, I would just like to see us look at what we have and what we love about Sherwood.

**Chair Emery:** I appreciate that, any questions? Thanks for coming.

**Jean Lafayette:** Yes, when are your parents coming home?

**Krystal Nanna:** They should be home in March or April.

**Jean Lafayette:** Do you know the date of the letter?

**Krystal Nanna:** It's old.

**Jean Lafayette:** Is it from the Jon Bormet era?

**Krystal Nanna:** Yes, probably.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you very much, we appreciate it.

**Scott McAuley, 490 Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

May I comment on the statement said earlier?

**Chair Emery:** You need to come back to the microphone and state your name and address.

**Scott McAuley, 490 Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

When that land had been first taken over by the City, I want to once again this is where the thing all started – Nanna’s were part of the property owners at the other end of the space where it came into the Woodhaven end of it, and the road was cut off – all of us property owners had a meeting with Jon Bormet and I think it was Susan somebody that represented the Engineering Department, and even Mrs. Claus was there as she was one of the property owners across the street. As someone said there had been a property exchange, originally Villa Rd. had been thought about as a road going through into Woodhaven. Jon Bormet came to us and said we don’t want to do this. At that time if anyone along that road wanted to partition off their property like Lan Laws did, and they’d owned since 1950, they dedicated 5 feet of the road of their property along the entire frontage of their property and the property owners did, like the Nanna’s, Larry Baines, and there were some other properties down there too I think there was Bart Boscowicz down there – anyway, they had this property and he said we’re going to give you the property back if you want to, just giving us a letter stating that you want your property back, because right now we can’t do anything with it and if you have it back we can tax you on it.

So, I know for a fact that Mr. Claus got his property back and his developed – the City still has 5 feet of my property and they want to put this thing through the house, so this is what we’re saying is that the City that has taken over this privately owned street, but it was public access if you will, because there was houses all the way down we never told anyone it was private road you know...but when the City wanted to come through that’s how they gained ownership with this, but they said they would like to make it into the park and they said, “trust us”, quote, unquote. Jon Bormet, City Manager at that time who said yeah, ok we will and they did a good thing. We want to praise and say that we think their design and their plans for this was good, because they saw they didn’t want to have a freeway going through town in that direction. And once again the fire department said that it was adequate at that time. Thanks again.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you.

**Dan Feuz, 16908 W. Villa, Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I am definitely opposed of this – I agree with everybody with things said tonight. The traffic in summer is very heavy and for sports and other activities with kids down on the road. I don’t believe it’s going to help getting traffic through downtown Sherwood.

**Chair Emery:** Any questions? Thank you very much, we appreciate it.

**Janice Bahns, 940 W. Villa Rd. Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I am one of the houses right on the end of W. Villa Rd. and can just say historically when my mother initially sold part of the property to Woodhaven, the idea was that W. Villa Rd. as we knew it the street would be cut off and we would still have access from Sherwood to Woodhaven but not have access to the on ramp road. A change was made and the idea was given up and it was decided it would be preserved, and we completely agreed with it. The problem with W. Villa Rd. road where the preserve it, is of it floods and now there is a culvert in it helps. I also wanted to mention about the fire department and access to emergency vehicles & so forth. Sadly, on December 20<sup>th</sup> I needed to call 911 to have emergency vehicles come in to take my husband to the hospital and response for us was very fast to W. Villa Rd. even with having to

come all the way around. The fire truck was there in 6 minutes and the ambulance and all the emergency vehicles that followed were there within 9 minutes. It was about 10:30 in the morning and there wasn't a lot of cars parked and there are times when you can't get through, but access is a parking situation more than an other issue. So I think it's important that you know under our current conditions emergency vehicles were still able to respond in a timely manner, like I said 9 minutes for all vehicles to be there. And when I called 911 I did not give directions because I did not have time.

**Chair Emery:** Any questions? Thank you very much.

**Fred Wiedemann, 930 N. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR 97140:**

Janice is my aunt actually and we are all family in that neighborhood up there. I think as she mentioned we did participate or have discussions when the Woodhaven piece went in. It did sort of isolate us from the downtown which we were used to but there were some agreements made and we agreed to support Woodhaven, which is a little cumbersome for us – but I think about if Villa was opened up it would just make it cumbersome for everyone driving through Woodhaven, and it would make it cumbersome as like someone else mentioned, going through Dewey. It's also sort of ironic, I remember when there was talk of this before – you walk down the walking path and there are big signs up there that say “this area is protected under the migratory bird act” – well what would a road do to that? And how would that ruin this sort of pristine area? Those are my comments.

**Chair Emery:** Any questions? Thank you. Anyone else?

**Jared Rasmussen: 17174 W. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR 97140:**

I just moved there and feeling somewhat stupidly about 3 weeks ago. I had no idea, I thought I was moving into a new house in wonderful green space behind that continued into wetlands and then we get notification of a proposal to build this road. First of all, I don't understand why. If we need access to Old Town Sherwood let's give a reason why we need to go to Old Town Sherwood, I understand the restoration and so forth, but to me there's not a demand to go to Old Town Sherwood. Let's spend the money to fix that up and get that organized. Second of all, emergency vehicles that need to come in..a fire station could be built somewhere else at much less the cost. It doesn't deteriorate from our living, we don't distract from the habitat, we don't take away from our historic nature. To build a road through there after these comments, a flood of comments, I don't think you are doing anything right for the community. I would ask that they take that off the proposal soon as possible so you can give these people some peace of mind. I have 3 kids and have lived in Sherwood a couple years and I moved to Woodhaven because of the high quality of homes and the benefit of living in a safe, quiet community and a place to raise my family. There are plenty of other communities in Oregon that we could go to, I commute to work, and I chose to live in Sherwood because I believe in the community and I love the community, and I feel that putting this in is detriment to the value of not only my home that I just purchased, but everyone else around and create the thorough fare that we don't need. There are 5 access points to Old Town and I don't mind taking an extra 2 minutes to go around, it doesn't bother me at all. That's what I have to say, and I would definitely take some serious consideration and thought into this before we decide to go forward with anything like that. That's all I have to say and I represent my family as well. Thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Any questions? Thank you very much.

**Dave Klepinger, 17264 W. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

We are right on the corner of W. Villa before you get to Thompson and I have a 7 year old and a 14 year old, there are a lot of kids on that street who love to play. Going into that corner visibility is zero and I would be very concerned first of all of general traffic, and also opening up W. Villa would create a lot of traffic to the high school, I believe. There are a lot of high school kids that are driving through there exceeding the speed limit and not being terribly careful – but the bottom line I think is that opening up more traffic in that area would be a big hazard to the kids. The question I had was that you mentioned the high school and the proposed Meinecke route would be taken off, and something about another route you are proposing...

**Kevin Cronin:** I'll answer that question and these other questions at the end, I'll do that for you.

**Dave Klepinger:** Ok, thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you. Anyone else?

**Jill Friese, 22641 SW Pinehurst Ct., Sherwood OR 97140:**

I live near W. Villa and affected streets, and my husband and I walk to that area often because of the lack of traffic. We never walk on Dewey because it is dangerous, there are times you can't cross and have to wait. I would hate to have the road through Villa because it would devalue the entire neighborhood and community, and I just wanted to make the point that not just people living on W. Villa Rd. are concerned about this, it would impact all of us. Thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you very much, any questions?

**Kathy Wall, 17240 W. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I am opposed to the proposed plan because of the walking trails, the wetlands, the quiet neighborhood and for the kids to be out. Especially with the high school there, it's one reason for us to alleviate some of the traffic that goes through. It's going to be worse if we are going to draw the community and people are going to be attending events at that end – it will be even more dangerous. Also, with more cars coming through there is the opportunity to increase our crime rate, right now it's pretty safe for the kids. That's it.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you. Any questions?

**Doris Stark, 16320 SW Willow Dr., Sherwood OR 97140:**

I am also known as the dog lady, because I walk my dogs and I have walked Old Town, I have walked through the park, and it's such a delight to see no cars there and no through traffic. I see all the kids walking there and having fun, and not only that I take the back way to Greenway and there are no cars there. It is a delight to see no cars there and not worry about it, and as the dog lady I would like to see it kept that way.

**Chair Emery:** Ok, thank you. Any questions?

**Amy Stratton, 22820 SW Saunders Dr., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I have several concerns with the extension. By extending that I believe it would go through the middle school, also Target and Albertson's. [soft, inaudible]...

Correct me if I'm wrong but I believe people were told that Dewey would be extended if necessary in 6 months to 1 year, and I feel very sorry for them. I know they didn't wait the full 6 months and there is a lot of traffic – I don't want to see that on our street. [soft, inaudible].... I don't know if I can ask questions or not?

**Chair Emery:** You sure can.

**Amy Stratton:** The first question I have is “what are the funds for this, how are these raised? And are we going to be able to vote if we want to have a bond?”

**Kevin Cronin:** Again, I want to take all the testimony and respond at the end.

**Chair Emery:** Ok, we will definitely add those to the questions we cover.

**Amy Stratton:** Ok. And is this an informational meeting?

**Chair Emery:** No, this is testimony.

**Amy Stratton:** Ok. About this extension, is this..are pretty much minds made up?

**Planning Commission:** No.

**Kevin Cronin:** No.

**Patrick Allen:** Amy, what do you think?

**Amy Stratton:** I think yes.

**Chair Emery:** Back in September we chose specifically to there wasn't enough knowledge in the community about what was going on, so we called for a big room of people because we knew there were a lot of strongly felt feelings out there. If we wanted to just do it we would have done it.

**Amy Stratton:** [soft, inaudible..] I guess my concern...is there a vote for funds?

**Chair Emery:** Not at this time.

**Amy Stratton:** If there were could enough people rally to beat it?

**Chair Emery:** You're a little bit ahead...

**Kevin Cronin:** You're way ahead...

**Jean Lafayette:** This process is just to identify a 20 year plan. I know that there 75 people in the room and 74 are here to tell us about Villa Rd., but there are many other roads in the community that being closed or changed, widened – identified with needs in the community. Out on the other side of town, for those of you that haven't read the rest of the transportation plan, Oregon St. is no longer going to cross the railroad tracks. There are a lot of other big projects and issues that are up that I really appreciate your neighborhood got together with Villa Rd., because it is an important topic but this process is a 20 year plan and there is a lot of other



things going on. This is the ground work that would allow us over the next 20 years to do the specific projects that are going to happen.

**Kevin Cronin:** Thank you Jean.

**Jean Lafayette:** This isn't just about Villa Rd., it's about building Oregon St. straight into Old Town, there are going to close that crossing and divert another way. We're talking about accesses on Hwy. 99. We're talking about how Adams Ave. is going to go all the way from Home Depot down to Old Town. It's a very exciting plan and it does a lot for the community for the 20 year future.

**Amy Stratton:** I just want to close – ever since I've lived here everyone has been trying to revise Old Town and I think [soft, inaudible]...one way of revising it [soft, inaudible].

**Chair Emery:** Thank you very much.

**Stuart Larson, 17666 Fitch Dr., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

Everything everybody has said so far just rings a big bell with me. I'm a refugee from Tigard. You have something special here, you really do. One of the reasons..a very important reason why I came to Sherwood and Woodhaven was because of what I saw walking around the area before I moved here. It happened to be on a night when there was a concert here. There were a whole bunch of people going up W. Villa with folding chairs and I thought, whoa this is something special. You can find a lot of towns with a lot of roads going in and out of, but very few that you can walk on like this. It just seems to me that you ought to find another engineering firm to figure what needs to be done. I agree with something someone else said earlier, if you're really serious about taking this goofy idea off the list, take it off list and then let us know.

**Chair Emery:** That is done through City Council, our task is to look at all the options and that's what he was hired to do – all the options, and he did that.

**Patrick Allen:** There have been a number of comments with the notion of putting that road there was to draw traffic to Old Town, and I really think that the issue is that the traffic is generated by Woodhaven..by the people who live in Woodhaven. People come & go obviously, I think what was being attempted to get at there was the fact that if a proposal like Woodhaven came in today as a blank sheet of paper, we would probably ask for more connections in and out that what you would typically ask 15 years ago when it came in as a blank sheet of paper then. But it's a real different animal when it's a blank sheet of paper than when it has existing homes and existing people those kinds of things, so I think that it's not completely fair to our engineering consultant to just look at that and say that makes no sense at all. There's a way that something like that makes sense. It may not make sense in this circumstance and it may be something that we're going to completely pitch, but it's not something that is just totally off the wall in terms of making sure you can get in and out of neighborhoods and have good connections.

**Ed Stormont: 22979 SW Hosler Way, Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I'm actually on the opposite side of Woodhaven from W. Villa. I'm here as an opponent to the extension of W. Villa. My problem is really ditto from what has been said; safety, traffic, all those concerns. My 2 questions are: Number one, what is the specific stated advantage to the W.

Villa extension, and number two, what is the specific criteria to decide whether or not that it happens?

**Chair Emery:** [acknowledgment of] Krystal –

**Krystal Nanna: 957 W. Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I just have 2 questions: One of them is when I was here at the open house about a week ago there were numbers and W. Villa Rd. was listed as the number one priority, and I think that was the view of one other gentleman, and I think we're trying to figure out if that meant that this was a number one priority? And the second is what would be the steps...how...would you let us know in this room tonight how things will happen, what are the next steps, when meetings will be available, what do we do next?

**Chair Emery:** Just for your information I'll just hit that right now. The 1<sup>st</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> is when the City Council will be looking at it –

**Jean Lafayette:** As long as we don't continue it..

**Chair Emery:** Yes, as long as we don't continue it. They would like to see the plan soon as possible and again, we have been working on it a long, long time and taken a lot of public testimony. It's always a good idea to continue to follow-up anything you have brought to before the Planning Commission also with the Council. There are some things we will be discussing tonight with more detail.

**Jean Lafayette:** Could I add to that – that it is not only advisable it is very much encouraged because we could recommend, and this has happened before, to the Council a particular action and the Council makes the decision exact opposite us. So even if all of us say remove the W. Villa Rd. connection the Council will look at it and make their own decision, and it is an open hearing, so they will and be able to make any decision they want based on any given testimony.

**Krystal Nanna:** So on the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> we can expect that we would be sitting here listening to what was...it's not a time for public testimony it's just a time to listen...

**Chair Emery:** No, they will be taking public testimony. Thank you.

**Roger Button: 16705 SW Stellar Dr., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I was listening to what was going on and you mentioned something earlier that really hit me when we were talking about this – she said that there were like 24 or 25 agendas on this – Oregon St. and things like that...no one else is talking about anything else but W. Villa. The voice of reason says obviously, this must be flawed.

**Kevin Cronin:** Actually we have been having meetings for some time. 2 years.

**Roger Button:** Alright. I'm not hounding on any one thing, I'm just noticing that no one is talking about anything but W. Villa.

**Jean Lafayette:** The last public hearing that we had there were...was on Pine and one was all access to Hwy. 99.

**Roger Button:** Ok, thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you so much for coming.

**Scott McAuley: 490 Villa Rd., Sherwood OR, 97140:**

**Kevin Cronin:** Mr. Chairman, there is 5 minutes per person and this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> time, could we get some order back...

**Scott McAuley:** Excuse me, I'd like to explain on that – I was going to say that I spoke pretty much about Villa Rd. and who you were talking about was Mr. Haufstetter ...[inaudible] Thank you.

**Brian Fox: 17337 SW Woodhaven Drive, Sherwood OR, 97140:**

I guess I'm the only one here, but my only complaint is Woodhaven Road from the south side just before Dewey Drive, basically all the way to the high school is extremely narrow. I guess I'd like to see the Woodhaven subdivision, if we could take a look at what streets are.. yes Dewey Drive has a lot of traffic on it and not wide enough to support it. I think it's incredibly unsafe that lower portion of Woodhaven to extend out anymore traffic than there already is. I think we need to see which streets are really physically capable of holding that traffic that would help.

**Chair Emery:** Any questions?

**Jean Lafayette:** Which connection are you talking about?

**Brian Fox:** Dewey Drive and then...

**Kevin Cronin:** Near the LDS church.

**Jean Lafayette:** Oh, yes the church connection. Ok, thank you.

**Chair Emery:** Thanks, appreciate it. Anyone else? Ok.

**Jean Lafayette:** Can we take a 5 minute break?

**Chair Emery:** We'll take a 5 minute break and then we'll have staff questions.

**Kevin Cronin:** There were a number of questions that were and I would like to try and get them point by point. The first one is that there is some sort of conspiracy theory that this is the first meeting we've had. As I mentioned earlier this has been going on for 2 years. Let me summarize the public involvement that has happened thus far. We've had 3 open houses, 5 public hearings, and 3 work sessions; work sessions are open to the public, but comments are usually allowed at the work sessions - but the public can watch the proceedings. So I want to make sure that people know that we have been struggling over this plan for a good 2 years now. I also wanted to talk about the connection I spoke of earlier, so that there are no misunderstandings – so I will go to the map.. There was a question about the Dow street connection. There is a Timber Crossing subdivision that was heard about 2 weeks ago by the

Hearings Officer for a 48 lot subdivision. The record is closed on that, there is no additional testimony to be received on that – as far as I know it is going to be approved. The property in question is right here, where I'm pointing at is on Meinecke Road, the LDS church is right here, the high school here, and mostly trees right here...the old Salisbury property. There is a local street that is going to go right through there and connect with existing streets up here just north of Woodhaven. I just want to make sure that everyone knows that.

**Jean Lafayette:** And that's not part of this process?

**Kevin Cronin:** It is not.

**Patrick Allen:** It's not part of this plan. This plan does envision a local connection of some sort in that same general area, is that right?

**Kevin Cronin:** That's correct, when we started 2 years ago we knew we needed a connection there so we put that in place on the maps. Two years later we got an application on that particular property for a level 3 connection through a separate decision, so as far as I know that has been approved. I want to invite Carl Springer of DKS Associates, Rob Dixon, Community Development Director, and Gene Thomas, City Engineer to kind of help us run through some of the questions that we heard tonight. Carl, I'm going to put you on the spot first and you get to talk about Villa Rd. That seems to be a popular topic tonight.

**Jean Lafayette:** First, how's the baby?

**Carl Springer:** We had a baby during this process. I'm Carl Springer with DKS Associates and I am the knucklehead who recommended the Villa Rd. extension, so let the fruit fly. I think that thing that needs to be pointed out to some degree is that the work that we do really focuses on the community and the City as a whole. We are not trying to target any one neighborhood or any particular street segment of the neighborhood. Our goal is to look for options to make neighborhoods, in this case, options to make neighborhoods better connected to the neighborhoods around it. Unfortunately Woodhaven, for all its virtues, and we've hear a lot of virtues tonight in public testimony, was developed at a time when connectivity was at the opposite end of what you wanted to do with circulation systems. You really wanted to extremely limit your connection options to as few as possible. Now neighborhoods are developed on the opposite end of the spectrum. Connectivity is a much higher priority. The street systems actually are mandated, and most cities have codes that mandate better connectivity than neighborhoods in those days.

*[unidentified from crowd]* Why?

**Carl Springer:** For a couple of reasons, one is – it's more painful in this case because that neighborhood has so few connections now, so by adding one more it's seen as a large change. But the thinking in general is that the more connections the less any one street carries. So if you have lots of connections there's no high volume on any one street. In this case it's difficult because you have what you have. And so, some of the thinking that went into this was recognizing the limitations and looking at say, the Dewey Road area, and what can we possibly do – kind of a brainstorming – what could we possibly do to help relieve those folks. I didn't hear many Dewey Road people come up tonight – were there any names on here?

**Chair Emery:** No.

**Carl Springer:** This is the concept really to extend that into downtown for one reason, to service the local streets. There is a lot of testimony I heard about having a huge surge in traffic and I also heard about really narrow streets that if you park on both sides you can't really go anywhere, so I am thinking to myself do those 2 statements really add up?

**Patrick Allen:** Doesn't that describe what Dewey is? Parking on both sides?

**Consensus:** Yes.

**Carl Springer:** The other way of looking at this – the neighborhood is a pie that generates so much traffic today, so all we're going to do is redirect a portion of that pie to this new connection. There is not going to be a net increase in traffic in the neighborhood. There will be a reduction elsewhere, so there are other parts of the neighborhood that would actually marginally benefit. But it would be so small that they probably wouldn't notice it – then the people here on the extreme east end of Villa would certainly notice because it is completely different than what they are experiencing today. So we were trying to figure out options to connect the neighborhood. We are basically trying to figure out ways to work with the system that you have and there are big obstacles to overcome, certainly Villa Rd. We maintain that this is a decision that needs to be made by the community, and there is a greater good served here for the neighborhood. The people here certainly have vested interest maintaining the way it is today, that is certainly a valid part of the process – I don't want to discount that, we just never hear from the other folks. My job in doing these kinds of plans is to look at everybody equally, I don't target one group or one street or that kind of thing. There are some benefits in terms of lower volumes on other parts of the neighborhood, they talked a little bit about emergency response. I think the police chief is on record for saying it's a good thing. If it's better than it is today – is it absolutely necessary, well that's a decision to make for sure. That the way we were coming at that, is that what you were looking for Kevin?

**Kevin Cronin:** Sure.

**Jean Lafayette:** I have one more question – about connectivity from the Woodhaven and Pinehurst to the new frontage road that is going to be on Hwy. 99, is that going to be added? I know you have no idea what I am talking about.

**Carl Springer:** Right.

**Jean Lafayette:** It's something that I've asked a couple of times and I just want to know if this is something for the Commission to make a recommendation on. So I didn't know why it wasn't included. I can point it out on the map or show you what I'm talking about...

**Kevin Cronin:** Can we come back to that? I want to go through public testimony first.

**Jean Lafayette:** Yes, ok. If we're going to talk about providing connectivity to one neighborhood, that would also provide connections...I don't know why that was omitted.

**Kevin Cronin:** I understand. Gene or Rob did you have anything to add to that about Villa Rd.? I want to have that discussion and move on to some of the other questions that were raised?

**Jean Lafayette:** I want to know the answer to the question of list priority –

**Kevin Cronin:** No, it's not.

**Carl Springer:** No, it's an unfortunate number I guess, given the folks that are meeting in the room – but they aren't in priority order.

**Jean Lafayette:** So it's just random?

**Carl Springer:** Yes, it's just an index for what is the number on the project table to what is on the map so you can find it.

**Jean Lafayette:** I know that, I just wanted to –

**Carl Springer:** I guess I could use letters instead of numbers.

**Kevin Cronin:** I hope Rob or Gene could talk about Pine Street and how that relates to this talk about Villa.

**Rob Dixon:** I was going to do that after I let Carl finish his comments.

**Kevin Cronin:** Sure, ok great.

**Rob Dixon:** My comments are in the context that what the community decides to do through its elected officials in the process that has already been talked about, is what the community decides to do. Representative of them at least. What technically makes sense in the overall connectivity thing is what Carl is trying to do. And I do think there has been density, but it's important not to shoot the messenger when the messenger has really done the job as directed. As a technical professional, a professional consulting engineer for 12 years as well as the City Engineer 10 years - and I know how that feels. I think Carl has done a good job in answering the technical questions. What you, the appointed body can do in response to the citizens and what the Council does with all that accurate technical information, that's a different issue. And in the final analysis isn't even for this body to decide. To some degree I think we've lost sight of that, mostly because if I was asked when – I guess I'm an average citizen, I just happen to work for the government, you don't pay attention to all this kind of stuff until it affects your back yard.

As we've seen for the last 2 years while going through this process, this is really affecting the Villa Road people's back yard and they've shown up in a well organized fashion that they are to be complimented for. But the process goes on and the technical solution has to be out there. Again, the community has to decide what they are going to implement. There are questions though why Villa Rd. is being considered and Villa Rd. is a unique connection to the Woodhaven community not just to Old Town, but as you take the access of the City, the main roads, it's the missing piece that creates an overall broad connection, not just connecting Old Town and Woodhaven. It's tied very closely to long term economic progress, you invest tremendous amounts money into Old Town – tie Old Town together with other communities.

We also have the unfortunate situation of having to trying to correct a lot of past ills, things that would not have gone in the way they did today.

I think a few general comments about Villa Rd. is that there are many, many valid concerns. Emergency response, which Gene has said would be reduced but we've heard that emergency response by some people's estimation is acceptable as it is. Another Dewey, or one more street that cuts the traffic in half on Dewey and picks up somewhere else. The wetlands preservation, where would money be spent and so forth. Those are all very valid issues about Villa Rd. and those issues need to be documented because they are accurate, they are valid, and they are expressed by the community and need to be sent on to the City Council which is the proper body that is going to sort these things out. But is the technical solution to a very severe activity problem and is one of the tricks in the bag that needs to be evaluated as we go forward in the community. But I wouldn't cut short the tools that are to be considered by the elected officials, that's my concern on Villa Rd.

**Kevin Cronin:** Thank you. Gene, about Pine St. and the opportunity or the work session that's happening on the 22<sup>nd</sup> and how that relates or doesn't relate to TSP, because of a specific design issue on Pine St.

**Gene Thomas:** Pine St. is the extension or the existing road from Willamette to the top of the hill to the west edge of Sunset Park to Sunset Blvd. With the closure of the Washington St. railroad crossing development at the cannery site, Pine St. is likely to become the collector of choice from downtown to Sunset Blvd. We currently are doing conceptual work looking at the opportunity to provide safety enhancements and improvements to Pine for what we expect to be enhanced traffic on the road. We are charged with conceptual work, but do not have a construction project planned.

**Patrick Allen:** I have a question about that. Just to be clear – Pine St. in the current transportation plan is a collector and is supposed to be a collector in this draft of the transportation plan, is that accurate?

**Carl Springer:** That is correct.

**Patrick Allen:** So, does this change...

**Carl Springer:** I don't plan any minor or major designation...

**Patrick Allen:** If we adopted TSP as drafted with respect to Pine St. are we changing the status of that road?

**Carl Springer:** I don't think so. No.

**Patrick Allen:** Thank you.

**Kevin Cronin:** There was another question about finance. Chapter 10 deals with finance in the TSP and what we're doing is providing a range of options of how to finance transportation. There are a number of ways we can finance transportation, we can do it through gas taxes, we can do it through bond measures, there are probably about 10 or 15 different ways we can do

that. We're charged with providing those options to Council. Council at a later date, after the adoption of TSP will consider different funding strategies to fund transportation outside of what we presently have. Any prior types of financing through our capital improvement plan again, separate from the TSP, so I want to make sure the audience knows we are not dealing with specific funding for specific projects, we are dealing with funding on a 30,000 foot level in how we are looking at funding transportation. I think that answers most of the questions unless your notes are different than mine, do you guys have any other questions that need to be answered from your notes?

**Patrick Allen:** If I came to a meeting tonight to hear about this and was concerned about financing, I'm not – I understand what you just went through, but I'm not sure if I just came and heard this I would...so maybe if we were to quickly just run through where today we get our transportation money from: A piece of the State gas tax that comes to us..

**Kevin Cronin:** Sure, we use it for maintenance usually.

**Patrick Allen:** Yes, we use for maintenance; minor collector systems development charge which goes for certain street projects that comes from new development; Washington County traffic impact fee which comes from all new development collected from Washington County that comes back to us; funding that goes to certain projects having to do with Hwy. 99 capacity allocation programs from improvements that happened on Tualatin-Sherwood where it intersects with Hwy. 99, those kinds of things that are paid by developers; urban renewal money which goes primarily into Old Town projects; and then what are called exactions where someone is going to do a development where there is a direct street improvement. That's what we have now.

**Kevin Cronin:** That's correct.

**Patrick Allen:** And right now with the draft plan – the strategies that are called, but we wouldn't be making a decision to use any of them, we are sort of identifying the tools in the tool box for the City Council to use when it makes its decision. Or they could use general fund tax dollars in transportation projects and that's the City budget process. They could do a local gas tax, which usually but I don't think always requires voter approval. Could it be done as referred?

**Pam Beery:** That's correct, it can done by ordinance and then referred.

**Patrick Allen:** We can do street utility fees that get a added to utility bills, and then maintenance is often what that goes for. We can do a single systems development charge, which is basically a charge on new construction that would go toward new facilities. You could do a local improvement district which means for particular areas that can have a particular piece of infrastructure that is needed, and the properties that benefit could be charged, and then there are some federal and state grant sources that we can pursue. Those are the things that are currently in the plan that again, if we adopt the plan as written we'd be sitting in front of the City Council saying the transportation plan has tools available to you – but the Council would have to decide use one or more.

**Kevin Cronin:** That was a great summary, thanks for doing that. I think that's all the questions, so I am going to turn it back to you Chair Emory and let you deliberate and ask us questions.



**Chair Emery:** Alright. Was there something Jean....

**Jean Lafayette:** Just clarification on the next step, for citizens coming tonight they need to know that even if we make a recommendation in favor of whatever they were standing for, doesn't preclude the Council from making a decision opposite of that. And what we've heard is that the Council is going to have at least 2 public hearings on this for additional testimony to be taken, and move to a deliberation much like what we are doing tonight. Correct?

**Patrick Allen:** 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>...

**Kevin Cronin:** I'm sorry, I cut off Rob who had some additional reporting to do for staff –

**Rob Dixon:** I have some general comments on Villa Rd., some of these have already been covered. I first wanted to take a minute and compliment the audience. In these types of activities you don't get so much input often and quite frankly, I think it's great when you do get a lot of people who throw everything into the pot, because these guys really do listen. It's a process where not everyone agrees, but the community has to come to a consensus of how they are going to go forward. It is a shame that in some of the other areas there hasn't been a lot of input even though it has been advertised for several years. The value of having a transportation plan... right now, staff: Kevin, myself, Engineering, we are to some degree hamstrung and have to work doubly hard through a number of different processes to get streets built that are wide enough that work, that do connect so that we don't hear otherwise. I stare at this map everyday, I look at it and I cuss and swear everyday, because I look at how nothing connects throughout the whole community. I'm not critical of those who allowed it in the past, I just put it in front of me to say that we've got to do better in the future.

One of the key tools to be better in the future is having a Transportation System Plan adopted that defines policy. This is primarily a general policy document more than specific projects. So I really encourage the Commission to conclude tonight, because a conclusion tonight is just a next step. I'm glad that Jean brought that up, that question that was asked earlier about what is the next step. It goes before the City Council on the 1<sup>st</sup> and then again on the 15<sup>th</sup>, and what is going before them is the general plan of how to improve connectivity for pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles throughout the community. There is no authorization to build anything in the plan, unless I'm missing something – and stop me so I don't mis-state, this plan doesn't authorize anybody to go build anything anywhere. It just lays out all the tools like a complete Sears set of tools with 85,000 socket wrenches and everything else, so that the elected officials really have something to work with in trying to correct what we have. So that in 10 years from now, we're not still bemoaning so many difficulties we have throughout the community. There is no money implemented in any of this either. The options that Patrick went through, and a number of other options that the Council is going to have to wrestle through on how to both maintain our streets and make the improvements people are calling for.

I want to encourage the Commission to generally consider the community as a whole as we've talked about. I think I've really covered almost all the other aspects in my notes. What will happen as you go through and approve this plan - I encourage you to approve it - I encourage you to send it forth to Council as it is, but with the qualifications and concerns that have been raised tonight by so many people. How does a project get built? It has to be proposed to the

budget committee, get through a budget hearing, has to go through City Council and have a public hearing as well for input and process. Many, many of the detailed questions that were asked tonight can't be answered tonight – it wouldn't be fair to ask of Carl tonight. How do you mitigate a wetland problem? How do you mitigate the traffic? How do you make the streets safe, how do you do all these various things? Can you fix everything perfectly? No. Can you mitigate things through a broad range of engineered controls? Yes. Is it worth it? That is something that the Council will have to determine. You can fix almost anything with enough engineering and money. But is it worth it – those are not the questions we are trying to answer tonight, that's the tough job the elected officials have. But the plan, I'd recommend, to be as complete as possible based on the technical expertise to connect the community throughout that we've put forth tonight. Thank you.

**Patrick Allen:** Thank you.

**Kevin Cronin:** Thank concludes the staff report.

**Chair Emery:** Thanks very much. Discussion. I know we've got a couple of things...

**Pam Beery:** Mr. Chair, before you get into deliberations I just wanted to respond to a couple of the procedural things we have requests by members of the public on. This is a legislative hearing as you know, so we're not legally required to respond to a request for a continuance. I do think we should leave the record open so that we can receive the exhibits that were not presented – Mr. Claus wants to present...

**Chair Emery:** Krystal Nanna also wanted to submit..I don't know if she can get it to us in that amount of time, but if not..

**Pam Beery:** Right, so you should just clarify if you do wish to leave the record open following your decision this evening just to receive those things that you know are coming, then you should clarify the end date and where those things can be submitted - and then they will be part of the package that you send on to the City Council.

**Chair Emery:** Thank you, I appreciate that. Right now I'm thinking 7 days, which will still give staff enough time to react before they send packages to Council. Is that going to be okay with everybody? Again, I know Krystal you may not be able to get it that soon, but again there are 2 hearings in March with Council.

**Krystal Nanna:** Yes.

**Chair Emery:** Next.

**Patrick Allen:** As Kevin said this has been a really, really long process and I think we've really tried, particularly in the last 6 months of this process, to fall back a little bit and say we know there a lot of things and challenging ideas and I'm really glad to see a room full of people tonight - and I've really been glad to rooms full of people, we've had a couple of open houses. We've had an exchange of consciousness about what is in the plan and engaged people and I think that's really a good thing. In listening to the testimony tonight there are a few – in general about what

Rob suggested to us about just moving ahead with this to Council and the Council to decide, I think there are a couple of changes I'd like to see.

One issue raised that may not be an issue with the plan, the first was extending the written record - I think we should do that. I've been very troubled by the fact that we put out a notice saying we were having a Planning Commission hearing on this plan on March 15<sup>th</sup> and that was printed not just in the newspaper, but in the City's newsletter in the newspaper, which you'd think would be something you could count on. The whole change-over in Planning Commission and Council meeting dates threw a wrench into that, and the Mayor has assured me that the Council will hold at least 2 public hearings in this same room on the dates that they are scheduled to be held. I am persuaded to think that we don't need to continue tonight, because there will still be opportunities in the same place and same time to deal with those issues. I think we should extend the written record to the 22<sup>nd</sup>. The 2 substantive issues in the plan I think we really need reconsider. One is the W. Villa connection. I guess I'll say I came in here really wanting to hear the comments, because I probably started from a place of being open to the basic transportation planning argument about more connectivity. The idea of having neighborhoods with just having a couple of connections for a thousand houses is not a good way to plan connections and there needs to be more. But there has been a lot of testimony tonight that I think is persuasive about why that's not a good idea. Discussions about open space value, about impact on the wetlands. I'm dubious about the 2.9 million dollar figure. I think everyone acknowledges that's a planning estimate not a hard cost estimate, but I think at the point we actually got to doing that it would be significant cost. The discussion about the history of vacating Villa Rd. and the letter I think is just incredibly important to this discussion. It's those kinds of discussions that puts a whole different cast on the issue for me. I am in support of removing the W. Villa Rd. connection from the plan.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> substantive issue I wanted to bring up is one that I was debating on awhile ago is the bicycle facility plan. It think it's boiled down now to a disconnect between the plan language, which I support and the project map. The plan language says we're going to comply with state law and as we build and construct roads, we are going to build them to current state standards which includes bicycle facilities. The project list includes the expectations that on pieces of...particularly Sunset Blvd. and Dogwood Rd. that have either been recently reconstructed or built - the project was presumed that sometime within the next twenty years we were going to rip those up and rebuild them to bicycle facilities in there. I just don't think that's realistic or a good idea. Either you're going to have to go in soon and rebuild newly built roads, or go in twenty years from now and rebuild roads that will have nice big large trees - deal with right-of-way and those kinds of issues. I just don't see that happening either way. Given that we have a funding issue with the plan I think we can on the project list, but not the plan text, we can withdraw the bicycle portion with Sunset. Probably...Cedar Creek and South Sherwood Blvd., all South Sherwood Blvd. as not being included in the actual plan list.

Those are the 2 substantive changes I'd like to consider making and then just additionally - I don't think it ends with this plan, but it's something I think we should consider doing. There are a number of communities where there are places there are roads that are going to go through, there's a sign that says, "this road is going to go through when future development occurs". I think based on Jean's comments that we've all heard - that there are some of those instances when someone says, "Gee, I didn't know this was going to happen". I think that being able to

post and say here are where roads are going to happen, gives people the opportunity when they are looking at a house or looking at a neighborhood to be able to see what is going to happen.

**Kevin Cronin:** That's a great idea and I've seen that happen, but trying to get signs to actually stay and not be vandalized is a real challenge. We actually put notice signs up for land use applications as everyone knows probably, and those often get taken down and trashed or whatever so it's a constant battle to do that. But I think it's an excellent idea.

**Patrick Allen:** So those are my recommendations.

**Kevin Henry:** First of all I'd like to thank Carl for all the work he's done. Carl and I have butted heads over this last 2 years, it's been a long 2 years. You're the real reason I'm resigning. And I can say that to Carl because we have a good relationship and he's done an excellent job with this. However, the W. Villa extension – I'm going to support obviously the suggestion made by Patrick to take that out, but I think it's a quality of life issue and not a quality of traffic issue. That's one tool I don't want in the tool box. So, for me I say "ditto" to everything said here tonight. Hopefully we recommend tonight taking out the W. Villa Rd. portion of it. Although, it's still very important as Jean pointed out that it could get put back in - so it's very important to still show up at the March 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> hearings to make sure that our elected officials don't put it back in. Part of the charge for us as appointed officials is to give them something that we think is workable and stand behind, and I can't stand behind it if the W. Villa extension is in it.

**Jean Lafayette:** Moving off W. Villa, I have a couple of concerns. One is that the financing information has just been presented to us within the last 2 weeks. This has been completely reworked from what was presented to us previously. It's in a different order and has different numbers - numbers that are in this section are 2003 and the numbers here are in 2004. All that being said, I'm sure at some point someone will match up the numbers. My point on that is that I would like to know that we're going to have a final document that the City Council is going to be able to look at. And that those of us that actually dot our 'i's, and cross our 't's and follow behind to make sure it's going to happen have an opportunity to look at that before it goes to Council so that any changes or alterations, most specifically the map. Things that have come up on the map that we've talked about month after month - we have not gotten a new map with these suggestions that we've come up with. I'd like to see a final map with all the additions and deletions based on what we're hearing tonight and what has been said previously before it goes to Council.

**Carl Springer:** Specifically the local street connectivity maps? There are lots of maps.

**Jean Lafayette:** Yes. You've been with me Carl so many times, you know what I go through before every meeting and you know what I put you through before every meeting to make sure everything is tied down. I don't believe financing is tied down, what some of these things mean. I see one little fine line in here that says, "of the 72 million dollars as part of this plan, 26 million dollars of it is unfunded- action plan by the City." I understand that this is a 20 year plan, but this is also 20 year financing that's going forward. I just have concerns that we're creating something that's never going to be complete.

**Carl Springer:** I would say that it is a goal of the plan to identify – basically what we are trying to do is respond to standard regulations and desires within the community, City and Metro in terms of what the Transportation System Plan needs to do to support the growth you'd expect. That's our number one charge. If you're really going to grow like I think you're going to grow, here is what the transportation plan needs to look like. And then we say here's how much it's going to cost. The fact that it doesn't match up with your current revenue stream isn't really of a concern to me, because that just tells you that if you grow the way you think you're going to grow you're going to have to find new funding mechanisms to do those improvements. You've got to do something different than what you've been doing to build those projects.

**Jean Lafayette:** On that, the recommendation from what I read off this...was a state-wide system development charge and a calculation based on that?

**Carl Springer:** That's right.

**Jean Lafayette:** And again, I'm asking a question that...we simply haven't had enough time to study it and I'm not putting you on the spot, and I'm probably opening myself up to a very simple answer. This calculation shows that your SDC based on all the magic that happens ahead of time about the 35% growth means that 35% of the funds available to be used or whatever number is in here...35.5 of system capacity.. the end of the story is that this SDC can grow as 14.6 million and I am presuming that's toward the 26.1 unfunded. That leaves a 12 million dollar shortfall. I'm thinking well, we are getting closer, maybe there's a gas tax. King City's got a gas tax, maybe Sherwood gets on board with that. Then I flip the page over to the back and it says, by the way this SDC is not a double tax off the tip we already get from Washington County, so we're going to preclude collecting SDC's on all single-family homes. We're a bedroom community how does that help us? If we think we're going to collect 14 million in SDC's and then we're precluding collecting it on houses I've just missed the whole boat there.

**Carl Springer:** That's a good question. The current County traffic impact fees structure already collects on homes built in Sherwood. So all we are doing is being very careful about not double-dipping.

**Jean Lafayette:** Right, which means that is not enough to cover the cost.

**Carl Springer:** Yes. The calculated fees for the city-wide tip would essentially be no higher than the County tips. The County tip had already collected that money for a house, there would be nothing left from the revenue source on that. The one that it actually makes a difference on is commercial-industrial, it's actually higher.

**Jean Lafayette:** Right, but the County, Regional or State already has 18 million dollars of revenue so in addition to the 18 million there is 26 unfunded – I'm here on page 8. I guess I don't get that this is supposed to be 14 million dollars toward the 26 unfunded. That's the new idea, and that's what we as a Commission are going to back as a funding option that will help narrow this gap – but we are excluding what Sherwood is. We are a bedroom community and we're not going to be able to doing anything about filling in the gap.

**Carl Springer:** I think the answer is you can't. Legally you can't charge again for the same...

**Jean Lafayette:** So we don't have a financing option to present to the Council that helps fill the gap?

**Carl Springer:** Well, this is an incremental step toward filling the gap – but I think there are other steps that need to be done. And I think it's fair to say that the intent of the city-wide SDC was really to simplify some of the existing programs. When any land development goes anywhere in the city there is one fee that is paid, as opposed to all these like one for 99, one for other places. We're just trying to simplify it a bit and put it in one pot. Is that pot big enough yet? The answer is no, it's not – you need others.

**Jean Lafayette:** So, by putting this SDC in place you're....this doesn't remove the 99 tab board, because that would have to be...

**Carl Springer:** No, no. We're just laying out a menu of options.

**Jean Lafayette:** Ok.

**Kevin Henry:** There are other things not on the menu too, like bonds...

**Jean Lafayette:** Well, it has to be on the menu – bonds have to be part...

**Kevin Cronin:** They are listed.

**Jean Lafayette:** I'm just nervous going forward presenting –

**Kevin Cronin:** And that's a valid concern. The City Council is to figure out how we're going to pay for transportation projects. TSP is not for figuring out which funding mechanisms we're going to use. It's a discussion for later on.

**Patrick Allen:** Just to be clear, we could adopt a TSP that didn't talk about funding at all.

**Pam Beery:** Well, actually no.

**Kevin Cronin:** The transportation plan will need to provide estimates, time line and how you pay for it in a general sense.

**Carl Springer:** Frankly, the whole point of this chapter is to force this discussion and realize you have a gap. You need to find new solutions. That is why the County came up with a TIP in the first place, because they did this 20 years ago. They said we've got all this growth, we've got no way to fund it, so here's a TIP. They were the first in the state to do it. It's a valid discussion to have. We can't answer all the questions at this point. We're saying there is a clear need and there are other solutions that need to be done. I don't know that it's comforting at all, the numbers I've seen for communities around the state that go through this process, the revenue never matches the need. Ever. Partly because it forces you to look at new funding mechanisms, it forces you to prioritize what's in the plan – so if you can only afford to take half the plan...if you have a list of 50 projects, which of the 25 do you really want to get built first?

**Jean Lafayette:** So, then we took off 2 things. I know your memo addressed this, but I want to hear why...special assessments and employment taxes were options that were removed from the plan. If we want to provide every opportunity to the Council to be able to pick and choose from other revenue sources, I just wanted to know why those were removed?

**Kevin Cronin:** The Finance Director had an opportunity to review the latest version of Chapter 10. She elected to remove those because she thought it was not feasible. If the Planning Commission wants to put those back in for City Council to consider, that's no problem.

**Jean Lafayette:** Again, they never have to use it. But we are living with the mistakes of one person from 20 years ago by limiting ourselves we're cutting ourselves short.

**Kevin Cronin:** Sure. It's pretty easy to cut and paste it back in.

**Patrick Allen:** Jean's questions reminded me that I had one other on financing. After the discussion of different financing options there is a paragraph that says, "it's recommended that the City consider establishing a transportation or street utility", which is one of the previously discussed options. Am I reading that correctly – as I read that it looks like, "here's a bunch of bullets of things that you could do and we recommend you do this one". Is what is meant in that paragraph?

**Carl Springer:** Where are you?

**Patrick Allen:** I'm on page 11. If that's the intent, I'm not sure that's what I'd feel comfortable recommending.

**Carl Springer:** The intent isn't to single that one out as the only way to go.

**Patrick Allen:** It kind of reads that way, because it's previously identified as one of the bullets.

**Carl Springer:** Yes – out of all the bullets you're arguing today, it's one of the more viable ones...

**Jean Lafayette:** Maybe that would be better wording, that it's more viable rather than recommended.

**Carl Springer:** More and more communities in Oregon are doing them.

**Patrick Allen:** If that's the notion – under viable alternatives then I think the other bullet that should go under it is the gas tax.

**Carl Springer:** There's quite a few communities doing that as well.

**Jean Lafayette:** On that same paragraph, the previous version had a provision for allowing people for rate reduction based on actual usage. I do know that was stated that it doesn't have to be part of the transportation plan. But I would feel more comfortable if we are going to recommend that people get taxed on their utilities for using a car, that people that commute by bicycle into Old Town should be able to get that tax taken off their utility bill.

**Carl Springer:** Right. The communities that do have those kinds of fee programs have that comment that if people can demonstrate that they are usage rate is different than what is on the rate schedule...

**Jean Lafayette:** I would just like to see it written in here.

**Carl Springer:** Yes, I'll be glad to do that.

**Dan Balza:** I don't live in Woodhaven and I don't go down Villa Rd., being kind of a casual observer my initial thought was that for the people that live in Woodhaven this would be a pretty cool connectivity route. But it's interesting, as I've not heard one person favor the Villa Rd. extension. So, based on everything I've heard I am inclined – I would ask that it not be recommended to Council.

**Jean Lafayette:** I think that if Villa Rd. was on the map 20 years ago there would be a hundred homeowners that would be thankful for a connectivity that would go across to the city. The one woman that came up and said if you put that road in it's connect me to middle school, it's going to connect me to Target, it's going to connect me to the new – she didn't say it, but it would – the new Civic Center. It's going to connect me to this and I don't want to be connected. So we've got 50 people that here and now it's going to impact their homes, and that connection that had it been made 20 years ago would be an absolute right thing to do. Right now I think it would destroy a community that feels the isolation section on both sides is what they want. I think we need to look at what they are saying and if they want to be isolated on both sides to preserve their quality of life, and the natural corridor that has been created by the City, then we need to listen to the community and take that for what it's worth. Knowing that a connection could have, should have, would have been done 20 years ago the right way.

**Chair Emery:** On that same note, though I'd originally planned on at least passing it on to Council as – part of what quite frankly I thought was a bad recommendation. Simply because I felt that the monetary cost of trying to put it in would end up being a bridge...and just physically I just didn't think we wanted to spend all of our dollars in that one spot when there were so many other things to do. All with having so many citizens come and that's how they want it so I agree with it as well.

**Jean Lafayette:** I would think that we forward it on....I would....I don't know if I should make a motion at this time just for Villa Rd. about removing it...But at least put our comment in that if the Council so desires to put Villa Rd. extension on the map, that it have a special consideration knowing the nature of that area – it be built to preserve...no light pollution, no whatever. If they have to have it on the map make sure it doesn't get built in the same way...if they are going to keep it on then it should have it's own special class of little small roads with no big street lights...

**[mass: disagreement]**

**Jean Lafayette:** Don't build it at all?

**[mass: No.]**



**Chair Emery:** Ok. Any other discussion on anything else? Kevin you got anything?

**Dan Balza:** Actually, just one other comment. The letter from ODOT, I don't know who exactly...did you initiate that or did ODOT initiate that from a work session?

**Kevin Cronin:** It was from a work session.

**Dan Balza:** I found it very valuable document that really addresses Hwy. 99 connectivity issues, a great insight.

**Kevin Cronin:** Great. Thanks for saying that.

**Patrick Allen:** I move we recommend to the Council adoption of Plan Amendment 04-03 Transportation System Plan with the following previously discussed changes: **1)** removing the W. Villa Rd. connection, **2)** eliminating bicycle facilities from the recently constructed streets that were outlined earlier in discussion, **3)** adding back the other funding options as raised in Jean's comments, as well as credit back on the utility fee discussion, and expansion of the recommendations paragraph on funding options to include specifically calling for a gas tax, **4)** and further move to extend the written record on this to February 22<sup>nd</sup> to allow further materials to be submitted and be made part of the record.

**Jean Lafayette:** And to include the previously identified changes on the map.

**Kevin Cronin:** That is already written in the memo.

**Jean Lafayette:** Ok.

**Kevin Henry:** Second.

**Chair Emery:** Any further public testimony? We have a motion to second. Any further discussion on the motion?

**Vote for Passage of Motion: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

**Motion carried.**

## **8. Adjourn**

Chair Emery adjourned the hearing at 9:38 PM.

**End of Minutes**