



**City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Masonic Hall, 60 NW Washington Street
Tuesday, December 15, 1998
7:00 PM**

Note: The Senior Center is not available for this meeting as requested by the Commission. Therefore the meeting will be held at the Masonic Hall.

A G E N D A

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. Approval of Minutes - December 1, 1998 (may not be available)**
- 3. Agenda Review**
- 4. PUD 98-2 Millers Landing Preliminary Development Plan & Preliminary Plat:** a request by Biggi Development for Glenn & Mary Miller for a 135-lot single-family subdivision and planned unit development located at 17780 SW Edy Road. Tax Lot 100, Map 2S 1 30C. **Adopt findings recommending denial of the application. Public hearing and record are closed.**
- 5. Urban Renewal District Proposal - Review (Commission members, please bring information from the December 1, 1998 Planning Packets)**
- 6. Community Comments:** are limited to items NOT on the printed agenda under Public Hearings.
- 7. Other Business**
- 8. Adjourn**

**ITEMS NOT COMPLETED BY 11:00 PM WILL BE CONTINUED
TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING**

APPROVED MINUTES

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes
December 15, 1998

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Bill Whiteman called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Commission Members present:

Susan Claus
Adrian Emery
Scott Franklin
Keith Mays
Paul Stecher
Angela Weeks (7:05 PM)
Bill Whiteman

Staff:

Jason Tuck, Associate Planner
Scott Clark, Assistant Planner
Rob Moody, Finance Director

2. Minutes of December 1, 1998

These minutes will be available at the January 5, 1999 Regular Commission meeting.

3. Agenda Review

Chairman Whiteman announced additional information had been placed on the table regarding the Urban Renewal District proposal. In addition, each member of the Commission was provided with a copy of Chapter 457 of the 1997 Oregon Revised Statutes.

4. PUD 98-2 Miller's Landing Preliminary Development Plan & Preliminary Plat

Chairman Whiteman referred the Commission to the findings recommending denial of the application which were included in the packets. This application will automatically go to the City Council for a public hearing. There were no further comments from the Commission.

Bill Whiteman moved the Planning Commission adopt the findings recommending denial of PUD 98-2 Miller's Landing Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat. Seconded by Keith Mays.

Vote for Passage of Motion: 6-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain (Claus)

5. Urban Renewal District Proposal - Review

Jeff Tashman, Tashman Johnson LLC, the consultant, discussed the role of the Planning Commission in this review. Traditionally, when Planning Commissions looks at urban renewal plans, they usually focus on how it relates to the comprehensive plan. If they find it conforms to the comprehensive plan, they would recommend support of the plan to the City Council.

Chairman Whiteman said today he saw an ordinance which had already been prepared that said the Commission recommended approval.

Rob Moody, Director of Finance for the City, addressed the Commission. Originally, Staff prepared ordinances to be taken to the December 8 Council meeting. When they moved this date back, it had already been made public that a copy of the ordinances would be available for review. Stating that the Commission had already approved the plan was an oversight on his part.

In response to Chairman Whiteman's question, Mr. Tashman said part of the process is review by the Commission.

Robert J. Claus asked for a point of information. It is not just advisory that the Commission review the proposal, it is obligatory. This means there must be public testimony, minutes and a recommendation. Any suggestion to the contrary is not only false, it is contrary to the law. He read the statute which states, "Falsification of a public record is a felony." The record has to show what occurred.

Chairman Whiteman asked Mr. Moody if he wished to make the presentation on the Urban Renewal District proposal. He made a slide presentation of the proposal and noted the following:

- Urban renewal is making the most out of public and private partnership opportunities. In Sherwood's case, this is offering a plan for revitalization and redevelopment in the Old Town area of Sherwood. His presentation would outline the following:
 - Brief history.
 - General introduction into urban renewal.
 - The process.
 - How it is going to be funded.
 - Specifics about urban renewal in Sherwood.

Mr. Moody said the 1983 Old Town Revitalization Plan is a major basis of this proposal. He discussed subsequent plans. Susan Claus asked if the third plan was adopted. Mr. Tuck said it was not adopted. Scott Spence, Assistant City Manager, said the last plan was presented at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting held at Stella Olsen Park last year.

Mr. Moody said the City Council held a public hearing on this proposal on December 8, 1998 and has deferred any action to the January 26, 1998 Council meeting. The report the Commission received tonight do not contain any substantive changes from the previous material and some of the blanks have been filled in. The word "blighted" was questioned by one of the Council members. The word "blighted" is defined in the Oregon Revised Statutes, Section 457, and that is why it was used in the draft ordinances.

Mr. Moody discussed Tax Increment Financing and referred to the graph. The plan is paid for by:

- The City identifying the assessed value within the plan at the time the agency is formed.

- Any growth in that value is taxed at the same rate as the other, but all of these taxes are fed into the urban renewal agency. It takes growth within the district and reinvests it back in the agency in the form of tax proceeds.

The portion of the urban renewal portion of the projects is paid for by:

- The City issues debt (tax increment bonds).
- The debt service on these bonds is paid from the taxes on the urban renewal growth.
- The typical term of the bonds is 20 years, but it can be 20 or 30 years.
- Once the debt is paid off, the agency dissolves and all of the growth reverts back to the other taxing districts.

Mr. Moody said the estimate of the assessed value in the district is \$26 million. The estimated growth within the district boundaries is 3% per year which is compounded, plus the value of the district. The Civic Center is proposed to have private and retail space and that portion would be taxable. This part of the plan is in concept only.

Mr. Moody said the maximum debt number is very important in urban renewal. This number cannot be exceeded. The proposal shows \$9 million. This number cannot be exceeded without going through the whole urban renewal process again. The urban renewal plan contains the process for amendments.

Mr. Moody said the "Report" on the plan includes more technical and background information. It details project costs and time lines. It also offers an impact analysis on what impact the urban renewal will have on other agencies. At the end of the urban renewal agency, when it is dissolved, the City has estimated about a 9 year pay back. This means that once all the districts get the tax on that growth section, the taxes they collect will pay back what they gave up in tax collections over the life of the plan.

Mr. Tashman said the boundary can be increased, but if it is increased by more than 1%, an amendment would have to follow the same process as adoption of the plan. Under no circumstances can you increase it by more than 20%. The schedule for this project does not have a specific time limit in terms of when the plan ceases. It has a projection when the projects will be undertaken and it does have a binding amount of debt that can be raised.

Mr. Moody reviewed the goals and objectives of the plan. Utility infrastructure is a big part of an urban renewal plan. The public right-of-way is not taxable. He reviewed the urban renewal projects which are proposed. The numbers are total costs of the project, not just urban renewal amounts. The Commission had several questions about these projects. He explained that any projects done prior to the district being formed are not eligible.

Chairman Whiteman asked if the figures will show where the balance of the money would come from (between the \$9 million and \$22 million) prior to adoption of the plan by the City Council. Mr. Moody said in addition to what is already in the report, this would be difficult. This is still a concept. All they are attempting to do in forming the urban renewal is put another tool in the bag

to use. If the numbers don't pencil out, some of these things would not happen. Without the urban renewal in place, none of these project would happen. This gives the City the flexibility to pursue some of these opportunities. Mr. Whiteman asked more specific questions about the City Hall complex, land acquisition, site improvements and building regarding other funds such as grants, the general fund and other sources. Mr. Moody said prior to adoption of the urban renewal district it would be difficult to provide more specific information on where the \$4.5 million would come from. However, prior to the project getting off the ground, the City would need to have this information. He continued with his presentation.

Chairman Whiteman asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak on the urban renewal district proposal. A list of questions which could not be answered tonight would be addressed by Staff and City Council.

Jean Lafayette, 230 SE Nottingham Court, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Her major concern was that there be adequate citizen involvement in all phases of the plan. She discussed the positive aspects of citizen involvement. She was concerned about the lack of information known by Staff for a multi-million dollar project. She asked where the accountability and authority would be. The process for this proposal seems to be only an exercise to fulfill the ORS regulations. She noted:

- When she received her last water bill, it contained information about the proposed urban renewal district. She attended the first meeting scheduled for November 30. She created a list of questions and even met with Jon Bormet and Rob Moody. They did not have all of the answers that she would have expected for a multi-million dollar project. She was referred to the consultant for the project. In the limited time available, she had been unable to contact the consultant.
- There seems to be a lack of advance notice to the citizens regarding this project.
- She was told by Mr. Bormet that this was a goal-oriented project and was planned to be finished in this calendar year in order to get it approved by the current City Council. She is pleased to know that this decision has been deferred until after the first of the year. Is this really enough time to allow the citizens of Sherwood to make informed decisions? What type of information is really available?
- Many of the details of the plan are not spelled out clearly. With Regard to funding, the plan clearly states how the City will get its estimated revenue, but a lot of the money will be coming from an unnamed source called "other sources".
- The plan does not limit the funds that will be spent on administration, nor does it describe the amount which would be spent on relocation. These could be two very costly items and they are not even mentioned in detail or referenced as a percentage of the project.
- She was shocked and amazed that this plan was not even mentioned in the December 1998, *Sherwood Gazette*.
- She has talked to many residents in the last two weeks about the urban renewal proposal and about their vision of Sherwood. For every person she spoke to, there were new ideas and new information. Without adequate citizen involvement the end result may not be what the community of Sherwood envisions.

- She would like to see, within the plan, details about when and how citizens can have an active part in the future of Old Town Sherwood.
- Since the current plan has the City Council being the members of the agency, she does not see where the accountability is and where the authority ends. She would suggest a citizens advisory committee, citizen members on a budget committee for the agency itself and maybe an architectural review committee.
- Without adequate citizen involvement and accountability, the City may be left with an unaccountable agency, granted that can be re-elected or not every four years, that could do so much good or damage within their term of office.
- She said at this particular time she could not be a proponent or opponent of this plan.

Ms. Lafayette said she has been told repeatedly that the agency will be the City Council. Mr. Moody said this has been proposed, but nothing is decided until the ordinance is passed. The ordinance will define the City adopting the agency and how the agency will be comprised. There will also be an ordinance which adopts the plan.

Chairman Whiteman said, at this time, the proposal is Staff driven rather than Council driven. Mr. Moody said he would agree with this.

Barbara Leonard, PO Box 1088, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. She was totally in agreement with the previous speaker. She had many concerns and noted:

- Her main concern is lack of citizen input into the project.
- When she went to the initial presentation, Staff was present, she had many questions and was told to please wait until the slide presentation was completed. Then, when she asked her questions she was told they did not have time to answer her questions in a group situation and to go talk to someone else. When she asked someone else, they usually responded to her that they did not know.
- The City is coming to the Commission and Council for a loan. What the City is really asking for is \$22 million, not \$9 million, and they do not really know what they are going to do. There are some properties they are calling “blighted” and unless they call these properties blighted, the properties will not qualify for urban renewal.
- One of her properties is being considered as a “blighted” property.
- The Commission has asked the question, what is the square footage of the building and what are the relocation costs. She understands there are 7-year leases on some of the cannery properties.
- She asked Mr. Bormet about the post office proposal. Post Offices usually have long-term contracts or leases. The City does not have any idea what the term of the lease for the current post office is and she does not know if the City has even contacted the post office about a proposed sub-station.
- They have a viable business on one of the properties which is being termed as “blighted”.
- It has been indicated that 3 of the 4 corners at SW First and Pine need to be redeveloped. Tonight, it seems that Staff did not even know that one of the properties on this corner was only one tax lot. There may also be some environmental concerns on this property. Have these been addressed?

- She would be interested in seeing a line by line item on the amount of monies that are proposed to be spent, how the costs are calculated, and how this is related to the year.
- In response to Ms. Weeks' question, she said she is on the Washington County Planning Commission.

Mr. Tashman said the expenditures in the report are calculated by year of expenditure dollars. For example, \$250,000 is the current cost for the theater improvements. This expenditure would be shown in later years at an inflated level. Mr. Moody said it is a combination and part of the cost was conceptual in that they knew there were needed improvements for the Robinhood Theater, such as the roof, the wall on the Clancys side leaks, and electrical improvements.

Mr. Moody said the three corner properties originally identified the Leonard property, the vacant lot across the street and the Robinhood Theater parking lot. In response to Ms. Leonard's specific objections the reference to her property was taken out of the presentation. At no point did the City say these properties would be redeveloped. The point was that there was potential for private redevelopment. These three lots were identified as areas which could potentially be redeveloped. There is only one piece of property identified in the plan for acquisition and that is the cannery property.

Mr. Tashman said if any other properties were identified, there would be a recommendation before the Commission and a public hearing before the Council and adoption by a non-emergency ordinance. The only difference between the Council approved amendments and the more substantial amendments is a notice would not be required to be sent to each individual household within the City. If there are additional properties to be acquired by the agency, that could be done by minor amendment as noted on page 17 of the plan. Minor amendments would just involve an approval by the urban renewal agency by resolution. He would have to get back to the Commission regarding the rights of appeal for the property owner. Susan Claus said the Commission would need to know this answer.

Mr. Tashman said there are two types of amendments that would have to go through the total complete, individual household notice process. These are expanding the district by 1% or increasing the maximum amount of indebtedness process. Anything else would be at the discretion of the Council when the plan is adopted.

Ms. Leonard said she was concerned about the City Council becoming the agency. Mr. Franklin said from a credibility point, the City should allow for more citizen input. The City may have a potential problem if the agency is made up entirely of Council members. This is something the Council should take a hard look at. Angela Weeks asked who made the decision that the City Council should be the agency. Mr. Tashman said this is a draft proposed plan. There are 39 urban renewal agencies in the state of Oregon and 32 are governed by the governing body. The statutes require the City have the agency which is appointed and a mixture of citizens and Council. Another thing that is commonly done, especially where the Council is the agency, is to have a citizen advisory committee to advise the Council. This becomes a major vehicle for public involvement.

Chairman Whiteman recessed the meeting at 9:30 PM and reconvened the meeting at 9:37 PM.

Robert J. Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He asked if Staff could provide him with an easel and marking pen. He noted:

- This is not meant to be personal, but there are several very real problems with the plan from a historical perspective.
- When the last bond was approved by the voters and the City purchased the existing City Hall, there was a movement to try to continue to make Sherwood a low cost City. The message was that Sherwood was not going to be a high cost City.
- When he offered the acre across the railroad tracks in the Strangs subdivision, off of Columbia Street, to the Police for \$50,000, the City could not take it because the Historic Old Town Overlay did not intend for any migration of the historic district on the other side of the railroad tracks. Carole Connell, the previous City Planning Director, should have been used as a consultant because she knows much of the history of Sherwood.
- The Commission is trying to make an incredibly major decision on this proposal which flies in the face of the history of Sherwood. It would be extending a boundary line into an area they would not even allow the police to go. Going to the other side of the tracks would be a major change.
- The cannery site may have serious contamination problems. The City cannot afford to jump into something by taking on contaminate problems. The service station which now houses the nursery business may contain some historic architecture. He spent \$131,000 to get a DEQ clearance on this property.
- One of the other sites being discussed in this plan has oil tanks on it.
- The cannery area and surrounding industrial zone was appealing to State agencies because it allowed employment close to housing. They are now being asked to take out the industrial zone which changes the Historic Old Town plan and convert it into a Civic Center with so-called multiple use.
- The plan does not address the risk factor. The downtown of Sherwood has never been a Central Business District (CBD). It was a work and living area. When the shopping center was put in, the activity shifted out towards 99W.
- No one is saying let's not have urban renewal, but if we are going to have it, let's have a community discussion where we talk about history and where we are really going. Too often urban planning becomes something like Disneyland without the rides.
- What is the primary goal we are trying to accomplish? If you read the report, the primary goal in this report is to build a new City Hall.
- Another issue which has not been addressed is parking. If you are going to follow the historic plan, you need to have some way to purchase property for parking, or you have to abandon the historic plan. If you look at the list of projects, there is no parking. Parking is a critical infrastructure.
- The City has simply jumped into an evolutionary project, the bricks on the street are an example, a \$650,000-\$700,000 project, and we have abandoned preservation of the Old Town under the original plan. He explained the reasons why this has happened.

- Some of the businesses in Old Town are surviving without the parking because if they make two or three sales a day, they've made enough to go home on. They are also renting the space for \$0.50 a square foot. Why, because there is no parking.
- Where is the feasibility study for this plan?
- If you take out the cannery, and businesses using this space, you are removing a large employment base for the City.
- A feasibility study would show that the best use for the cannery space would be ball fields. This would bring the community back into the Old Town area.
- If you are talking about renovating the Robinhood Theater and current City Hall, you are talking about big bucks. The current City Hall needs a seismic review and an elevator.
- We all want to see the downtown and cannery area improved. Nine million dollars has got to be used very wisely or you are going to screw the downtown. This is the bottom line.
- Are we trying to renovate and preserve Old Town or build a new City Hall?
- With every other urban renewal he has worked on, you get to the point where you have to have trade-offs. You won't get a performing arts center for less than \$1.5 million that is going to compete against the theater.
- How do you finance the new City Hall?

Mr. Tashman said the plan shows a range of sources, including urban renewal, as about \$2.2 million of the urban renewal that goes into this project. Mr. Claus said he is talking about the building. Mr. Tashman said the urban renewal can pay a proportionate share of a public building. Mr. Claus asked how much? Mr. Tashman said \$2.2 million towards the whole project. Mr. Claus said urban renewal can pay \$2.2 million towards the whole project, but the rest will be bonded and you are going to have to find alternate sources. It has a chance to become a general obligation bond and if it fails, it will depress property prices.

Mr. Claus continued with his testimony and presentation:

- He discussed HUD loans for rehabilitation. He would like to know the grants they are working under, the amount and procedures to get the money. He said the City would have a better chance in buying the cannery property, turning it into apartments, and getting lottery money. If you put in apartments, is that what the residents want.
- He does not believe the plan complies with the existing Comprehensive Plan. There is no job trade-off.
- The plan shows the estimated tax base is \$26 million. There is no reason to have the word "estimated". The plan should be specific as to the date and tax base. The average tax rate on this \$26 million is 1.5%. That is \$390,000 and this is how much money is flowing out of this area. The plan shows 136.62 acres. How much of this is in public land now? Fifty-two acres are in public land. He discussed the figures.
- He discussed in detail how he lost money because the process of public input was not in place. The City has the misconception that citizens will not help this town, hence, the back door deals.
- If the citizens can help the City get ahead without screwing the historic buildings and taking out the theater, then we would have a better City and everyone would cooperate. It is only going to happen with public meetings.

- The City has to bring together this plan with the Comprehensive Plan because this plan is in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and stated goals of the original Historic Old Town.

Sandy Rome, 1780 E. Willamette, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He said the plan talks about a lot of unknown dollars to fund an “idea”. He owns property all around the proposed urban renewal district. He discussed the price of real estate and past LID’s. The Bancroft bonds failed because the people could not make the payments. The City assumed the bonds and sent them back as general taxes to everyone in Sherwood. He can’t say he is against revitalization or redevelopment of Sherwood, but don’t come back and ask him or the citizens for more money. Maybe this plan is the City Manager’s proposal to full employment for the next 5-20 years for the 65 employees the City currently has employed. Mr. Rome said he does not want to be the target if the plan fails. When it is time, the land will develop or redevelop. The City needs to allow more citizen input and help develop some of these plans.

Dan Leonard, PO Box 1088, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He said he formerly worked for the Unified Sewerage Agency (USA). He agreed there needed to be more citizen input on the proposed urban renewal district. The numbers for this plan have been determined by Staff. He talked about the downtown renovation of the City of Tualatin and City of Hillsboro. With this plan, what will be the draw to the downtown of Sherwood. The lack of parking is a problem. He referenced and read from ORS 457.085 regarding urban renewal plan requirements, report contents and approval required. Relocation is not addressed in this plan. The Commission needs more information about the ORS requirements to see that these are fulfilled prior to approving the proposed plan. By definition, he did not believe the areas the plan states as “blighted” are such. He discussed ORS 457.035 the urban renewal “agency” powers, “The urban renewal agency shall not exercise its powers until, or unless the governing body by non-emergency ordinance declares that the blighted area exists and there is a needs for the urban renewal agency.” If he understands the definition of “blighted” in the ORS, he does not believe the City has demonstrated that those conditions exist for the whole plan.

Mr. Tashman discussed the need for the Plan and Agency to be adopted together and the definition of “blight”, as used in the plan. There is substantial information in the report that deals with various aspects of blight within this district.

Scott Franklin read ORS 457.010(1)(a) regarding “blighted” areas.

Mr. Tashman said the “agency” has to come before the “plan”. The completion dates are driven by the projection of what revenues are available and the order. Chairman Whiteman asked if the Commission was taking public testimony on the plan? Mr. Tashman said they were taking public testimony on the plan. The plan is deemed complete, as far as Staff and the Consultant are concerned, subject to public review.

Mr. Franklin asked how the twelve projects cited in the plan were chosen and prioritized and what public process was used to establish these projects. Mr. Moody responded he did not know of any specific public meetings, but these have been projects which have been discussed at the Staff level as needing to be accomplished, with input from citizens living in each of these areas

wanting their various infrastructure projects accomplished. Mr. Franklin said these projects need to be done, but the public should be included when prioritizing the list. Mr. Moody said the list is not set in stone and could be revised, as necessary. Mr. Franklin said the citizens need to be involved on what they want the downtown area to look like.

Mr. Leonard said he would like the Staff to show how this plan meets ORS Section 457.085. Mr. Moody said this could be done.

Mr. Tashman encouraged the Commission to review the Table of Contents in the report which is specifically organized and the wording is meant to track the requirements of ORS 457.085.

Chairman Whiteman said he would assume the process would be to take the input received tonight and as a Commission, they would make a statement to the City Council.

Susan Claus said the Commission should hold a workshop and invite the public to attend. Chairman Whiteman said the Commission could reserve some time for a workshop following the public hearings at the January 5, 1999 Regular Commission meeting. Staff will respond to this request.

Chairman Whiteman said apparently the City is using the joint meeting of the Council and Commission at Stella Olsen Park as the meeting that updated the plan. At the time of this meeting, the Commission was not aware that this was the plan. The Commission agreed that the meeting at Stella Olsen Park was more of a workshop and should not be used for the development of this proposed plan.

Chairman Whiteman said the Commission is dealing with a Comprehensive Plan which has not been amended since 1991. Mr. Tuck said findings were written stating compliance of the proposed urban renewal district complying with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Whiteman agreed the Commission, the Council, the consultant and the public need to sit down in an informal work session to further review the proposed plan.

Ms. Weeks and Mr. Mays both agreed there was a need for urban renewal, but that the public should be included in the process. Mr. Stecher said it would be prudent to look at the other 39 urban renewal districts in the state to review their impact, how they are working, and the effect on the economy of the jurisdiction. He also agreed the plan needed to comply with the Comprehensive Plan and Historic Old Town District Plan. The Commission agreed they could review jurisdictions with a similar population of 12,000.

Ms. Lafayette asked what impact the Commission really had on how the Council would vote. At the open house, it was suggested that whether the Commission was for or against this plan, the Council could still create the urban renewal district. If this plan would remove some of the money which is supposed to go to the General Fund, what impact would this have on the General Fund? Mr. Moody said the report and plan have been provided to each of the taxing districts, as required by ORS. Mr. Tashman said the only requirement for a face-to-face meeting is with the

County Commission and the City has done this. The County Commission was supportive of this plan. Ms. Lafayette said the County Commission wanted to know why the plan did not include property all the way out to 99W (Six Corners), if the City really wanted to bring people in to downtown Sherwood.

Mr. Leonard suggested the Commission look at all 39 jurisdictions with urban renewal districts. He said a City Council member told him that they were tired of the Planning Commission not making decisions. Based upon this comment, he said the Commission should advise the Council and Staff that they need the Consultant at the January 5 meeting so they can make a recommendation to the Council.

Chairman Whiteman said the tentative schedule is to have a Commission statement regarding this plan be prepared for the January 26, 1999 City Council meeting.

Scott Franklin said the Commission does not have the authority to spend City funds and requiring the Consultant to come to another meeting would be spending City funds.

Chairman Whiteman moved following the public hearing at the January 5, 1999 Regular Commission meeting, the Commission adjourn to a work session to include the Consultant, if possible, Staff and invitation to the public, to further discuss the proposed Urban Renewal District. Seconded by Susan Claus.

Vote for Passage of Motion: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

Scott Franklin amended the motion to include in an attempt for the Commission to be diligent in their review of this proposal, that the consultant be present at this work session. Seconded by Susan Claus.

Vote for Passage of Amendment to Motion: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

Vote for Passage of Amended Motion: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

6. Community Comments

Barbara Leonard, PO Box 1088, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. She prepared a letter date December 15, 1998 which she would like entered into the record and requested that this letter be forwarded to the Mayor and City Council. The letter requested resumes of City of Sherwood employees. She read the letter and further discussed a subsequent telephone call she received from the City Manager regarding this request. It was her opinion that Mr. Bormet's telephone call contained veiled threats and was meant to be intimidating. The information she requested is public information. She asked that Mr. Bormet not communicate with her, after this incident, except in writing. She asked that Mr. Bormet's unacceptable conduct and abuse of power in resisting her lawful request be noted by inclusion of this letter in his employment file and that this request be duly investigated and responsibly deliberated during his next job evaluation. She presented copies to the Commission.

Scott Spence, Assistant to the City Manager, was in the audience and asked if he could respond to Ms. Leonard's allegations. He was in Mr. Bormet's office when the telephone call to Ms. Leonard was made. He did not feel Mr. Bormet was trying to intimidate, it was merely a legitimate concern.

Ms. Leonard reiterated that in the telephone call from Mr. Bormet, he said that he would have to give her name and address to City employees and ask their permission to give her the information she requested. He also said this request would upset the police officers.

Chairman Whiteman said this letter will be noted in the Commission meeting minutes and will be forwarded to the City Council, as requested.

7. Other Business

Chairman Whiteman noted that at the second Commission meeting in January 1999, the Commission will hold an election for Chair and Vice-Chair of the Commission. Scott Franklin's position will be open because of his election to the City Council. Susan Claus has reapplied for her position which will expire in 1999. These positions will be filled by Mayor-elect Walt Hitchcock.

8. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 10:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Department