



**City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Sherwood Police Facility
20495 SW Borchers Drive**

November 2, 2004

Regular Meeting -7:00 PM

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
2. **Consent Agenda – September 21 and October 5, 2004 PC Minutes**
3. **Agenda Review**
4. **Brief Announcements**
5. **Community Comments** *are limited to items NOT on the printed Agenda.*
6. **Public Hearing**
 - A. **Sherwood Transportation System Plan:** Staff and consultants will present the proposed Transportation System Plan. A public hearing has been noticed to accept public testimony. *(Kevin A. Cronin, Senior Planner, Planning Department)*
7. **New Business**
 - A. **Water Quality Facilities:** The Engineering Department has requested a discussion and recommendation from the Planning Commission on the development and maintenance of water quality facilities *(Lee Harrington, Senior Project Manager, Engineering Department)*
 - B. **Area 59 Update:** Staff will provide an oral report on the concept planning process for Area 59 (Elwert and Edy Roads). *(Kevin A. Cronin, Senior Planner, Planning Department)*
8. **Adjournment**

November 2, 2004

From: Jean Lafayette

Attached are my comments, questions, and suggestions on the draft version of the TSP dated October 15, 2004. I have organized it in the same order as the plan is written. I am open to suggestions on the best way to address each of these items. My goal was to get all of my thoughts out on the table and then allow for whatever course best suits the group.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Chapter 1: SUMMARY

1-6 Table 1-1: Transportation Demand Management: why wouldn't the city require this? See pages 8-46 through 8-50. Strategies and plan outlined. Is this done by the private sector?

Chapter 2: GOALS & POLICIES

Cross check and verify these goals and policies to the restatements made in Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

*(Goal 1: Provide a **supportive transportation network to the land use plan that provides opportunities for transportation choices and the use of alternative modes serving all residential areas and businesses.**)*

2-2 Policy 4 Add another bullet: Encourage infrastructure improvements with the least impact to the environment. Add a complimentary strategy including the reduction in impenetrable surfaces.

2-2 With the addition of the new Goal 7, should we remove Policy 5?

(Goal 2: Develop a transportation system that is consistent with the City's adopted comprehensive land use plan and with the adopted plans of state, local, and regional jurisdictions.)

(Goal 3: Establish a clear and objective set of transportation design and development regulations that address all elements of the city transportation system and that promote access to and utilization of a multi-modal transportation system.)

2-4 Policy 2: Should this specify full or half street improvements?

2-5 Policy 7 (14): Add language to prohibit new single family access on arterials and collectors, see page 8-41.

2-5 Add a new Policy 12: The City will establish guidelines and standards for the use of traffic calming measures. Strategy #9 provides for the code amendment.

(Goal 4: Develop complementary infrastructure for bicycles and pedestrian facilities to provide a diverse range of transportation choices for city residents.)

2-7 Add a new Strategy #9: Encourage new development with mitigation opportunities to extend sidewalks and or paths to fill an existing gap.

2-7 Add a new Strategy #10: Encourage the use of curb storm drain inlets over catch basins.

*(Goal 5: Provide **reliable convenient transit service to Sherwood residents and businesses as well as special transit options for the city's elderly and disabled residents.**)*

2-7 Policy 5: Didn't the Commission request the wording to be changed to "Tualatin employment centers?"

(Goal 6: Provide a convenient and safe transportation network within and between the Sherwood Old Town (Town Center) and Six Corners areas that enables mixed use development and provides multi-modal access to area businesses and residents.)

The addition would create emphasis on linking the two areas and on the revitalization of Old Town.

2-8 Policy 1: Remove "Town Center" and replace with "Old Town."

Strategy 3: Remove "Town Center" and replace with "the Old Town and Six Corners areas."

Strategy 4: Remove "Town Center" and replace with "Six Corners." Do Metro's parking standards have to be applied to Old Town?

*(Goal 7: Ensure that efficient and effective **freight transportation infrastructure** is developed and maintained to support local and regional economic expansion and diversification consistent with City economic plans and policies.)*

*(Goal 8: The Sherwood transportation network will be managed in a manner that ensures the plan is **implemented in a timely fashion and is kept up to date with respect to local and regional priorities.**)*

2-10 Strategy 3: "enhance or replace CAP" Can you expand on the local SDC ordinance? Will the CAP funding continue? Will there be a citywide pool of money? What will the process be?

** Modifications to Chapter 2 will have to be updated in future sections, including Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Chapter 3: EXISTING CONDITIONS

Chapter 4: FUTURE DEMAND & LAND USE

4-7 Table 4-4: Why are cost estimates for the Oregon Street project included? Isn't this portion of the project complete?

How are the following areas addressed: Brookman Road, Area 59, the Tonquin Road industrial areas, and the proposed I-5 to Hwy 99W Connector?

How will the redevelopment of the Cannery site affect this plan? What type of zoning changes can be allowed and still have the plan succeed?

Chapter 5: PEDESTRIAN PLAN

What considerations were made for the new Civic Center?

5-6 Figure 5-1 Pedestrian Master Plan: I have seen people crossing 99W near the old intersection, would a pedestrian crossing warning help or hurt?

Chapter 6: BICYCLE PLAN

6-7 Figure 6-1 Bicycle Master Plan: I notice gaps in the plan especially between Oregon and Sunset just west of Murdock Road. I would suggest adding Willamette to the Master Plan to provide safer access to the new Soccer Center.

Chapter 7: TRANSIT

7-6 Figure 7-2 Future Transit Coverage: How will this be communicated to Tri-Met?

Chapter 8: MOTOR VEHICLES

(Function can be best defined by connectivity. Without connectivity, neither mobility nor access can be served. Roadways that provide the greatest reach of connectivity are the highest level facilities.)

8-7 Figure 8-1 Proposed Functional Class: Why wouldn't Edy Road be a continuation of the Sherwood Blvd arterial?

Figure 8-1: Is this for existing streets only? What about classifications of expansion areas? How will roads be classified at the time an application is reviewed?

8-19 Figure 8-5b: the math is wrong $8' + 5'$ does not = $12'$.

8-23 Figure 8-8 Local Street Connectivity: Would it be appropriate to add a connection from Woodhaven Drive to the new 99W frontage road from one of the existing dead end roads?

Figure 8-8: What about a connection from Brookman to Sunset?

Figure 8-8: Are the arrows sufficient for planning and site plan review?

8-35 Are there provisions to add U-turns to 99W between Sunset and Meinecke? The most recent testimony received from an ODOT representative indicated that they are considering this.

8-43 & 8-44 Has a neighborhood traffic management program been drafted? What criteria can citizens expect to adhere to? What is basic process? Can citizens that meet the minimum purchase their own improvements if city funds are not available?

8-43 Should refer to Goal 4 Policy 8 for traffic calming.

Chapter 9: OTHER MODES

9-1 Shouldn't the new Goal 7 be referenced here?

Chapter 10: FINANCING & IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter merely outlines possible funding sources and the costs for the proposed plan improvements. Who determines which option to use? Will that decision be part of this public hearing process?

10-1 The 99W CAP is also a funding mechanism, isn't it? Should that be listed here? Is it being eliminated?
The funding? The trip generation maximum? Both?

One of the previous handouts implied a citywide fee program. Is that a viable alternative? Who determines the priorities of the pending projects?

Did I understand correctly that one third of the Motor Vehicle Improvements is widening Tualatin-Sherwood Road? Wouldn't those costs be paid by Washington County?

10-6 Again Transportation Demand Management is "Not required by the City", why is that?

Questions from 05/04/04 Workshop handout:

Page 6: Can you provide further information on the Hwy 99W Access plan, Adams Street Extension, Downtown, and south side projects that are outlined?

Page 8: Will we have an opportunity to reconsider the plan for the intersection across from the YMCA? (Yikes)

Page 8: What is the timeframe for Langer and Tonquin signal changes?

Other comments, questions, and concerns:

1-There appears to be some land locked property between Meinecke Road and Smith Road. How will this be addressed?

2-What ever happened to the idea of a hotel/motel overlay zone on the Hwy 99W corridor? How would such a zone impact the TSP?

3-Have the impacts of the new church across from the YMCA been considered?

4-If this is attached as a technical reference to Part 2 of the Comp Plan can the Master Plan Maps, Design Standards, and Financing be changed without public notice? What is the process?

5-What is the time table for the code language and economic development plan?

6-Was the Traffic Impact Analysis provided to Staff?

APPROVED MINUTES

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes
November 2, 2004

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Commission Members present:

Patrick Allen
Dan Balza
Adrian Emery
Dan King
Jean Lafayette

Staff:

Kevin Cronin, Senior Planner
Heather Austin, Associate Planner
Gene Thomas, Engineering

Commission Members absent:

Kevin Henry
Matt Nolan

2. Consent Agenda – September 21, 2004 & October 5, 2004 PC Minutes

Jean Lafayette moved the Planning Commission accept the September 21, 2004 and October 5, 2004 Planning Commission meeting minutes as corrected. Seconded by Dan Balza.

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

3. Agenda Review

Adrian Emery reviewed the agenda.

4. Brief Announcements

Lee Weislogel addressed the Commission regarding the 7-acre Cannery Site and study committee. Jean Lafayette is the Planning Commission's liaison to the committee. City Council is very interested in the Planning Commissions involvement with the study committee. Jean Lafayette gave an overview of the project and the committee.

Jean Lafayette moved the Planning Commission direct staff to return information on preliminary steps and timeframe for overlay and/or plan text amendment process to Planning Commission. Seconded by Dan Balza.

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

5. Community Comments

Eugene Stewart, PO Box 534, Sherwood, OR 97140.

Mr. Stewart addressed the Planning Commission regarding Part Two of the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 5, Page 9, Policy 12. This policy states that the Planning Commission adopted the 1989 Sherwood Cultural Resource Inventory and that it should be included as an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan. There are approximately 132 potential historic landmarks that were identified. There should have been a process to include each potential landmark in a registry which, in Mr. Stewart's understanding, never happened. Mr. Stewart is concerned about this issue because he owns a building on the corner of Railroad Street and Pine that was identified as a potential resource. As part of the cultural/historic resource inventory, a building permit should not be issued for any changes to any potential inventory items until the building is reviewed. However, Mr. Stewart obtained a building permit and has altered his structure. Some of the potential inventory items have been demolished without a resource inventory process. Mr. Stewart is wondering if he has a legitimate building permit, and if anything will be done in the future for historic/cultural resources.

In addition, Mr. Stewart stated that Part One of the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1980, Part Two in March 1991, and Part Three in June 2003. Mr. Stewart feels these time periods are too far apart, that there are conflicts among the parts, and the three parts should be brought together. Mr. Stewart pointed out that staff turnover limits the ability to bring these parts together.

Mr. Stewart stated that the Planning Commission is the oversight body for the Comprehensive Plan and therefore responsible for updating and aligning all three parts of the Plan.

Mr. Stewart also asked the Planning Commission what the City's Citizen Involvement Plan – Part 1 of the Plan. Mr. Stewart stated that because the three parts of the Comprehensive Plan are not in line, he believes the public involvement with the TSP process has suffered.

6. Public Hearings

6A. PA 04-03 Sherwood Transportation System Plan

Adrian Emery reviewed the City of Sherwood Rules for Public Meetings. Patrick Allen read the Public Hearing Disclosure.

Planning Manager Kevin Cronin gave a brief overview of the Transportation System Plan materials submitted to the Planning Commission for review. The consultants from DKS and Associates were introduced. Patrick Allen clarified that the Planning Commission did not have a hard copy of the draft Transportation System Plan but did have access to the document via the City's website.

Planning Manager Kevin Cronin stated that the Planning Commission would be deciding if the current draft Transportation System Plan is complete enough to recommend adoption to City Council. If not, what are the outstanding issues. One issue to be resolved is the lack of a policy in Chapter 6 on sidewalks or gaps in sidewalks. This issue is being addressed by staff and a policy will be added.

Patrick Allen expressed concern with the consultants' response to and work with the comment log for the TSP. He pointed out that many of the written comments he submitted to staff that were then given to the consultant for inclusion in the comment log were grossly simplified. He stated that many of the comments provided have been oversimplified and minimally addressed at best.

Jean Lafayette stated that the turnover in City staff has resulted in the loss of continuity for this project. The technical advisory committee for this project provided input and made changes without including comments from the Planning Commission. In the latest version of the comment log, the comments from the Planning Commission have been added and to some extent addressed.

Jean Lafayette typed comments on the draft TSP in an effort to save time at the public hearing and distributed copies to the commissioners and staff. She stated that her comments do not include questions concerning the Code because she realizes a code update must follow the TSP adoption or the TSP will be a document with no teeth.

Jean Lafayette asked staff about the CAP program discussed in the staff report, if it will remain in effect after TSP funding mechanisms are identified. Kevin Cronin stated that the updated Chapter 10 of the TSP addresses funding mechanisms and the CAP should be discussed by the Planning Commission. He asked the consultant to address the question in more detail.

Jean Lafayette also asked staff about page 5 of the staff report, regarding evaluation of the City's existing transportation infrastructure and growing population. She stated she would like to know specifically how four subject areas were addressed through this process: the UGB expansion of Brookman Road area, Area 59, Tonquin Road, and the potential of redeveloping the Cannery site.

Kevin Cronin stated that the four areas Jean Lafayette listed were included in the TSP as "transportation analysis zones" in the transportation forecasting section. These zones were all analyzed as part of a forecast for transportation demand and land use. The trick with the UGB expansion areas is that we do not know what the land uses in those areas will ultimately be. That is a decision that Planning Commission and City Council has to make through the concept planning process. We can make some best guesses at what those land uses will be, and if they do change after TSP adoption, we can come back and make amendments to the TSP to ensure consistency.

Jean Lafayette asked if part of this process is creating a document that is an attachment to the comprehensive plan. Kevin Cronin verified this.

Jean Lafayette asked if we then want to make an amendment to the TSP, would it go through the comprehensive plan amendment process even though it is a technical reference. Kevin Cronin verified that amendments to the TSP will go through the comprehensive plan amendment process.

Public Comment:

Eugene Stewart, PO Box 534, Sherwood, OR 97140

Mr. Stewart asked the Planning Commission if the TSP planning process is violating Goal 1 because of lack of citizen involvement. Mr. Stewart pointed out that Part One of the Comprehensive Plan states that "citizens are to be involved in the six stages of the planning process- data collection, plan preparation, plan adoption, implementation, evaluation and revision." Mr. Stewart pointed out that the TSP update process is considered "revision" and the citizen involvement defined in Part One of the Comprehensive Plan has been ignored.

Adrian Emery asked Mr. Stewart to clarify exactly which part of the citizen involvement portion of the Comprehensive Plan has been ignored. Mr. Stewart stated that the citizen planning committee should be open to all. The mayor, city councilors and planning commissioners can attend meetings but cannot vote, they are ex-officio members. Mr. Stewart stated that there are no citizen planning committee members and there has not been a recommendation from a body such as this. Mr. Stewart stated that he did not believe the Planning Commission had not done a great deal of work in this planning effort, but that involving citizens would result in more ideas coming into the planning process. He stated that the citizens may not have technical expertise in a matter, but that they will have an idea of what impacts them. This is important information to be relayed to consultant "experts." The city planner has been assigned to help citizens in this planning process and the Planning Commission is responsible to make sure this function is functioning.

Jean Lafayette asked Mr. Stewart if his statement is that there should be a sub-committee under the Planning Commission.

Mr. Stewart replied that you should have the City Council, Planning Commission, Sherwood Citizens Planning, an Advisory Committee with an executive committee, and sub-committees. Mr. Stewart stated that he believes this section of the Comprehensive Plan is out of date and should be revised to include planning areas within the city, that the city is large enough (population). It has been 23 years since the last revision of this portion of the Comprehensive Plan.

Patrick Allen stated that this is the type of revision you would make to institute neighborhood associations or a similar concept.

Mr. Stewart agreed, stating that this process should begin with citizen involvement, an advisory committee to the Planning Commission that could form sub-committees if they see a need. A staff person should prepare plan elements, collect and present information to the citizen committee, and serve as a liaison to the LCDC and the Metropolitan Service District.

Mr. Stewart gave the current process of revisions to Goal 5 as an example that should have a citizens advisory committee but currently does not. Mr. Stewart stated that if you look at the Oregon Statewide Planning Goal Guidelines, they say the citizen advisory committee must be established. The parameters of the committee can be adjusted, but there must be one in place.

Mr. Stewart stated that without citizen involvement, Goal 1 is ignored. He stated that this could result in all planning efforts being overturned because the proper procedures were not followed. Mr. Stewart stated that he did not know if it applied to Planning Commissioners, but City Council members who perform an illegal act can be sued by citizens for damages caused by Council actions. Mr. Stewart stated that he was unsure if the City Charter made this applicable to all board members or not.

Adrian Emery addressed the consultants from DKS and Associates in asking if they felt Goal 1 was satisfied in the public involvement efforts undertaken as part of the TSP update process.

Kevin Cronin responded by addressing the advisory committee to which Mr. Stewart is referring. Mr. Cronin stated that this advisory committee is a plan policy that was implemented with the last Comprehensive Plan periodic review process. He stated that this is similar to the Landmarks Advisory Board which was dissolved by mayoral or council action in 2001 and is not currently active. The Citizens Advisory Committee is the same situation with an inactive body. When establishing the public involvement program for the TSP, the Planning Commission was designated as the Citizens Advisory Committee. The Technical Advisory Committee was made up of all the experts, including the consultant, affected agencies, and transportation planners in the various special districts, Tri-met, etc. Mr. Cronin stated that the city does not currently have an active Citizens Advisory Committee but has done a good job with public involvement throughout the TSP process.

Patrick Allen asked Kevin Cronin if he is confident that the City's failure to have members of a Citizens Advisory Committee and to assign the committee work does not put the Planning Commission in jeopardy.

Kevin Cronin stated that he cannot answer that question at this time but that he did not know of too many LUBA cases based on Goal 1.

Patrick Allen stated that he could think of a recent procedural LUBA case from Pendleton.

Kevin Cronin stated that there are instances where procedural issues get remanded to the city for remedy but that he is not sure if the current situation is a procedural issue open to scrutiny.

Jean Lafayette suggested this question be referred to the City Attorney to answer before the next Planning Commission meeting.

Adrian Emery agreed that this is the appropriate next step.

Eugene Stewart read a part of the state's citizen involvement plan, "Citizen involvement is to provide for widespread citizen involvement. The citizen involvement program shall involve the cross-section of affected citizens in all phases of the planning process. As a component, the program for citizen involvement shall include an officially recognized committee for citizen involvement broadly represented geographic areas and interests related to land use and land use decisions. Committee members shall be selected by an open, well-publicized public process."

Jean Lafayette stated that the Planning Commission is a well-represented, widespread citizen body.

Eugene Stewart stated that as ex-officio members, Planning Commission members are not allowed to vote. Mr. Stewart asked how the Planning Commission cannot pass something when they are not allowed to vote.

Patrick Allen stated that the Planning Commission has a legal question that they will get an answer to.

Eugene Stewart stated that he hopes the Planning Commission will go back and include a Citizen Advisory Committee in the TSP planning efforts to make the planning process run more smoothly. Mr. Stewart stated that he is interested in downtown traffic as far as where it is coming from and where it is going. In the Chamber of Commerce Visitor's Center there is a bicycle map that gives traffic volumes that do not match some of the numbers given in the TSP.

Patrick Allen asked Mr. Stewart what the source of the information is for the bicycle map.

Mr. Stewart responded that he did not know but that it is an official state map of some sort.

Patrick Allen asked how old the map is.

Eugene Stewart responded that it is not more than one year old.

Patrick Allen asked how old the data is.

Mr. Stewart responded that he did not know, but that the map shows heavy traffic on North Sherwood Blvd., turning by the old grade school and going toward the high school. It did not show heavy traffic coming down through downtown.

Patrick Allen stated that if you have ever sat at Oregon Street and tried to turn left, you would question that map.

Eugene Stewart stated that as people come downtown, half go up Washington Street and the other half take South Sherwood Blvd. Mr. Stewart stated that instead of just adopting the TSP, it needs to be folded in to Part Two of the Comprehensive Plan.

Jean Lafayette stated that integrating the TSP into Part Two of the Comprehensive Plan is part of the process that has been done.

Eugene Stewart stated that with the documents the city has, this has not been shown. Mr. Stewart stated that the Planning Commission should be going through Part Two and identifying which parts are being replaced.

Kevin Cronin stated that Chapter 6 has been updated as a condition of approval for this plan amendment.

Mr. Stewart was provided with a copy of this updated Chapter 6.

Jean Lafayette stated that instead of trying to fix something that is so old it is obsolete, the Planning Commission has removed and replaced Chapter 6.

Eugene Stewart stated that the TSP shows Pine Street as a truck route. Mr. Stewart stated that this makes no sense to have trucks going up the steepest hill in town when S. Sherwood Blvd. could handle it.

Jean Lafayette pointed out that the only truck routes labeled on the TSP are Highway 99W and Tualatin-Sherwood.

Kevin Cronin pointed out that Mr. Stewart is referring to the proposed truck routes shown on Figure 8-11.

Jean Lafayette stated that in addition to the two truck routes, there is one more potential truck route on the future I-5 to 99W connector road.

Eugene Stewart stated that the Downtown Streetscapes Plan identifies Pine as a truck route.

Kevin Cronin stated that the Downtown Streetscapes Plan designation of Pine as a truck route is for local delivery trucks, not freight trucks.

Eugene Stewart wanted to know if First Street is going to be extended to Villa.

Adrian Emery stated that all specific street connections are still undecided.

Patrick Allen stated that this is a decision the Planning Commission will need to make before it is able to make a recommendation to City Council.

Jean Lafayette asked Mr. Stewart if he is for or against the extension of First Street to Villa. Mr. Stewart stated that he is against this.

Mr. Stewart stated that a city staff person has said there is no way this extension will be implemented because the people in Woodhaven are going to oppose it, yet there are no Woodhaven residents here to oppose it. Mr. Stewart stated that even though people oppose things, they get frustrated with the process and don't come to public meetings. Mr. Stewart stated that this is why there is need for a Citizens Advisory Committee.

Adrian Emery said the Planning Commission will be looking into the Citizens Advisory Committee in the future. Mr. Emery thanked Mr. Stewart for his time and comments. Mr. Emery asked Kevin Cronin if he would refer the public involvement questions to the City Attorney to ensure that the proper procedures have been followed.

Susan Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, OR 97140

Susan Claus stated that she agrees with Eugene Stewart's comments. Mrs. Claus stated that historically there has been more of a citizen involvement process. Mrs. Claus was on the citizen's committee in the 1990s. This committee was a combination of a representative from the Planning Commission and a representative from City Council and they approached different stakeholders in the community who were not unified in their interests. Mrs. Claus believes that the process has been lost and because we are generating a document that will be in place for the next twenty years, we definitely need more citizen input. Specifically, Mrs. Claus stated that she has not personally been notified of the current TSP process. She spoke to the library and they received a copy of the draft TSP on Friday. In addition, the library only has a page-by-page duplicator that is not high speed, so it is a painstaking process to obtain a copy of a document such as the TSP.

Adrian Emery stated that the draft TSP is available to be viewed or printed from the City's website. In addition, the TSP planning process has been noticed for months in the Tigard-Tualatin Times and the Sherwood Gazette.

Susan Claus asked if this particular meeting has been noticed.

Adrian Emery stated that any TSP meetings up to this point have been noticed and that public notice has been done to the best of the city's abilities.

Susan Claus stated that she was unable to download the "existing conditions" section of the draft TSP and has not had time to review the materials. Based on a cursory glance, there are a few issues that concern her. For example, a proposed roadway on Figure 8-10 on the Traffic Control Master Plan would dissect property the Claus Family owns and has lived on for twenty years. Mrs. Claus is not sure of the scope of the roadway because it is not enumerated in the parts of the document she has seen. Mrs. Claus stated that in the past in transportation planning efforts, specific meetings of land owners (along the highway, for example) have been conducted to identify significant impacts. Mrs. Claus is surprised that this public outreach has not occurred in this transportation planning effort.

Mrs. Claus stated that the TSP proposes roadways that you can't tell what the roadways will be (2-lanes, etc.) and who will pay for it.

Adrian Emery stated that the TSP is only conceptual in some places because it is unknown as of yet how the areas will develop. The roads shown as dashed lines are basically just placeholders to give an idea of where a road could go.

Susan Claus stated that while she understood this, there are some numeric projections on cost.

Adrian Emery stated that these are estimates used for budgetary purposes down the road.

Jean Lafayette stated that in addition to the city conceptualizing where the roads may be located, ODOT requires the city to show where access to the highway will be located.

Susan Claus stated that there is a short comment in the TSP stating that the city and ODOT had had some meetings and ideas about the access plan. Mrs. Claus stated that her family has five deeded accesses to their property and the ODOT-City access plan is of grave concern.

Susan Claus requested an extension of this public hearing.

Adrian Emery stated that the Planning Commission is planning on extending the public hearing and did not have an intention to make a decision tonight.

Susan Claus stated that as a 20-year resident of Sherwood, a lot of the citizen input policy seems like it has changed dramatically. She is not faulting staff or consultants for the lack of citizen input. Mrs. Claus stated that much of the public comment that has occurred has been from public agencies.

Adrian Emery stated that there are two different process, a citizen advisory committee and a technical advisory committee, which the public agencies are part of. Mr. Emery also stated that there have been open houses throughout this planning process.

Susan Claus asked how attendance was at the public open houses. Mrs. Claus stated that the document she saw with stakeholder comments only contained comments from either members of the Planning Commission or City staff. She is wondering where the people are to make public comments for this process. Mrs. Claus stated that historically, every time the city has gone through the TSP process, there has been a large amount of public input.

Susan Claus asked to be informed of the public input process and how to interact with the process to give concerns not only for the draft TSP but also if there are going to be stakeholder or community meetings she would like to be informed.

Adrian Emery stated that at any time Susan Claus may e-mail any members of the Planning Commission or City Staff with comments for the TSP.

Susan Claus asked when the staff report for this meeting was available.

Kevin Cronin stated that staff reports are always available one week before the Planning Commission meetings. Mr. Cronin stated that staff could e-mail or mail a copy of the staff report to Mrs. Claus or she could come into City Hall to pick up a copy.

Susan Claus asked to be included on the interested parties list for all future TSP planning efforts. Mrs. Claus stated that the City Council relies on the Planning Commission's expertise in efforts such as this and that the Planning Commission's expertise should be backed by as much public input as possible.

Adrian Emery stated that another issue with the process is that a lot of it is dictated to the Planning Commission by what is happening on the state and county level, having to meet their requirements as we go through this process.

Jean Lafayette stated that information should be provided to all citizens who came to open houses throughout the process.

Susan Claus stated that the funding for the components of the TSP is very important. She stated that standards are set by other agencies and municipalities that may not necessarily be right for Sherwood. Mrs. Claus stated that most of the land in the city has been developed and is not generating a lot of money for ongoing projects so the city should be frugal.

Susan Claus's son thanked the Planning Commission for hearing his mother's testimony.

Adrian Emery asked if there is anyone else who would like to speak.

Sue Fugere, 22700 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, OR 97140

Sue Fugere stated that she has not reviewed any of the materials for the TSP and is not familiar with the planning process but was advised by her attorney to be present at this public hearing because the Planning Commission would be discussing the future road plans and she has not been notified of the planning process. She stated that she did not see the announcement in the Sherwood Gazette but was sure it was there.

Sue Fugere asked for clarification of the dotted lines in the figures in the draft TSP.

Adrian Emery stated that they are "placeholders" for where general areas where future roads will be used for planning and budgetary purposes.

Sue Fugere stated that the dotted line road shown on the map in the TSP is actually being constructed to the south of her property. She stated that she has been told that she is losing her driveway and she will be responsible for continuing the road as it crosses her property.

Kevin Cronin clarified that the extension of this road across Ms. Fugere's property would not be required unless the property is redeveloped.

Sue Fugere asked if having a plan approved pushes the issue of developing that road through her property. She is concerned about her property value if this is the case. Ms. Fugere stated that she is looking to sell her property. Ms. Fugere's attorney has been in contact with Kevin Cronin about the redevelopment potential of her property and they have a meeting set for the near future. Ms. Fugere stated that her attorney told her the city has some ideas for the development for her property and she is curious as to what those ideas are. Ms. Fugere requested to be informed of any land use actions that are going to occur near her property.

Adrian Emery informed Ms. Fugere that all people who own property within 100 feet of a piece of land that is being considered for a land use action are notified of the action being proposed.

Jean Lafayette pointed out that Ms. Fugere should have been notified of the proposed development south of her property called Woodhaven Crossing. The proposed frontage road near Ms. Fugere's property would have been discussed in the planning process for that property.

Adrian Emery asked Ms. Fugere if she attended the public hearing when Woodhaven Crossing was proposed.

Sue Fugere confirmed that she was at the public hearing when Woodhaven Crossing was proposed. She stated that in general she feels public involvement is missing through the City's planning efforts and she was not sure if the outcome of tonight's election would further affect the planning process.

Adrian Emery thanked Ms. Fugere for providing testimony.

Randy McCormick from DKS and associates, the consultant for the TSP, provided information about the funding section of the TSP, Chapter 10. The TSP outlines funding sources in general. Last spring, Terry Keyes, former City Engineer, worked with Carl Springer from DKS on different funding strategies with financial consulting solutions groups. The summary provided to the planning commission outlines the financial strategies that were considered. Some of these funding sources are the minor collector system development fee, the 99W CAP, the urban redevelopment districts and the Washington County TIF program. The recommendations that flow from that is that many of the strategies are similar to SDCs and a city-wide consolidated unified development charge that would be utilized to deal with the capacity-related elements of the transportation plan.

The overall funding strategy identifies nearly 70 million dollars from various sources- local, regional, public and private. The single unified system development charge was developed based on the trips associated with growth between now and 2020 and an estimated fee-per-trip, roughly \$2500. That fee would be applied toward transportation funding needs of the community to fund the portion of growth-related development (as opposed to safety-related development used by everyone, for example). On page 8 of the Chapter 10 handout different fees are shown in relation to single family dwelling units or to general office spaces.

Randy McCormick stated that the portions of this chapter that need to be refined as part of the Planning Commission's review process is a review of the fee for growth matching the effects of the growth on the transportation system and how a unified system development charge would be administered.

Patrick Allen asked Mr. McCormick if there has been a comparison of the table on page 8 with the proposed fees to other current SDCs in Sherwood. Mr. McCormick stated that the fee today for a minor collector is \$25.30 per average daily trip. For every evening peak-hour trip there are approximately 10 daily trips (single family).

Jean Lafayette asked Randy McCormick to clarify the fees associated with the CAP. Mr. McCormick stated that a developer is responsible to pay fees and mitigate the trips over 43 trips per acre. Jean Lafayette stated that she thought you could have up to 43 trips per acre, but you still have to pay for those trips.

Patrick Allen asked if a column could be added to the table that would give an approximation of the corresponding charges under the current financing system. Mr. McCormick said this would not be a problem.

Jean Lafayette asked if it could be two columns, those projects subject to the 99W Cap and those that are not. Ms. Lafayette asked if the CAP ordinance as far as the maximum trips allowed remain in force. Mr. McCormick stated that the new financing strategy will incorporate both the minor collector fee and the CAP fee. Mr. McCormick also stated that the CAP trip limit will remain in effect, but may need revision in the future. Jean Lafayette stated that the CAP limited developments to 43 trips per acre maximum and that she did not remember any deviation from that maximum.

Adrian Emery asked if we are replacing the funding portion of the CAP, how will the mitigation portion be defined.

Randy McCormick responded that mitigation will be assessed on a project by project basis.

Randy McCormick asked if there has ever been a project approved in Sherwood that exceeds the CAP trips per acre. Jean Lafayette responded that it has not happened since the CAP was implemented. Mr. McCormick stated that he would work with Kevin to resolve the CAP issues.

Eugene Stewart asked Mr. McCormick if the fees will restrict growth which is a goal of the planning process. Mr. Stewart stated that our growth is geared toward housing which is costly to maintain. Mr. Stewart stated that the only thing keeping the city going is the costly property the School District owns in Tualatin.

Patrick Allen stated that this is one of the reasons he would like to examine how the fees will change and what they will be applied to.

Eugene Stewart stated that 99W is filling up and this plan will not work for twenty years.

Randy McCormick stated that this fee being proposed would be very similar to other fees being assessed throughout the Metro region. It is much higher than current fees but is not substantially different from the fees being charged by other jurisdictions.

Jean Lafayette gave a brief overview of the written comments she provided.

Patrick Allen moved the Planning Commission continue the Transportation System Plan to the November 16th, 2004 Planning Commission meeting date. Seconded by Jean Lafayette.

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

7. New Business

Area 59 Update- Kevin Cronin, Senior Planner, gave an update of the planning efforts. He addressed the need for a Planning Commission representative to the Area 59 Advisory Committee.

Patrick Allen moved the Planning Commission nominate Dan Balza to the Area 59 Advisory Committee. Seconded by Jean Lafayette.

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

Senior Planner Kevin Cronin stated that the December 2004 Planning Commission Meeting agenda would include time for setting 2005 priorities, including wireless tower discussions.

8. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Emery adjourned the meeting at 8:37 PM.

End of Minutes