



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MEETING PACKET

FOR

Tuesday, November 20, 2018

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

URA Board of Directors Regular Meeting
(Following the City Council meeting)

**SHERWOOD URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING AGENDA**

Tuesday, November 20, 2018
(Following the 7:00 pm City Council Meeting)

**City of Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon**

URA BOARD WORK SESSION MEETING

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. TOPIC**
 - A. URA Property Discussion (Joe Gall, City Manager)**
- 4. ADJOURN**

Sherwood City Council Meeting

Date: November 20, 2018

List of Meeting Attendees: --

Request to Speak Forms: --

Documents submitted at meeting: ✓

Work Session

3.) Topic

A.) URA Property Discussion

Email from City Manager to URA board members
w/ fact sheets for URA properties, Exh. A

Sylvia Murphy

From: Joseph Gall
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 1:59 PM
To: City Council; Doug Scott
Cc: Josh Soper; Sylvia Murphy; Julia Hajduk
Subject: FW: URA property fact sheets
Attachments: URA property fact sheet_Sherwood blvd prop.docx; URA property fact sheet_Cannery NE Phase.docx; URA property fact sheet_Robinhood Theater lot.docx; URA property fact sheet_School House.docx; URA property fact sheet_Cannery lot 4.docx; URA property fact sheet_Cannery lot 3.docx; URA property fact sheet_Cannery lot 1.docx

In preparation for our URA work session on Tuesday evening, here are one-page fact sheets for each of our URA properties. Hopefully, everyone will get the chance to review before the meeting. Thank you!

Joseph Gall, ICMA-CM

City Manager

City of Sherwood – 22560 SW Pine Street – Sherwood, Oregon 97140 - 503.625.4200 (direct) 971.979.2989 (cell)

"The pessimist complains about the wind; the optimist expects it to change; the realist adjusts the sails."

-- William Arthur Ward, American writer

From: Julia Hajduk
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 1:22 PM
To: Joseph Gall <GallJ@SherwoodOregon.gov>
Subject: URA property fact sheets

Joe – Attached are the fact sheets for the URA properties.

Julia

Julia Hajduk
City of Sherwood
Community Development Director
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140
503.625.4204

Nov. 20, 2018 URA Board
Date Gov. Body

Work Session A
Agenda Item Exhibit #

Former School House Property



Property Information

- Zoning
Retail Commercial; Old Town Overlay
- Size
.67 acres
- Appraisal Price
September 5, 2016 estimate:
\$590,000; \$20.21/square foot.

August 22 2018 estimate:
\$790,000; \$27/square foot
- Acquisition History
Acquired by City of Sherwood
in 2000 for \$550,000;

Sold to URA in 2008 for
\$550,000

The Old School House property was acquired by the City in 2000. At that time, the school building was still located on the property.

In 2005, the City held a public hearing to consider selling the property to the URA. While that was approved, the City did not formally amend the URA plan to include the purchase of the Old School House property until 2008 (Resolution 2008-016).

The resolution amending the plan to include the property indicates that it was envisioned that the property would be privately re-developed.

A RFP was released April 2008 for re-development of the property. It is unknown if proposals were received but it appears no further action was taken.

Cannery Square – Lot 1



Property Information

- Zoning
Retail Commercial with PUD overlay, Old Town Overlay, Cannery portion
- Size
4,250 square feet
- Appraisal Price
September 5, 2016 estimate:
\$200,000; \$47.05/square foot.
- Acquisition History
Lot 1 was subdivided after acquisition of the full 6.6 acre Cannery site which was acquired by City of Sherwood in 2004 for \$1,824,000¹ and sold to URA in 2008 for \$3,065,000²

The City acquired the Cannery property in 2004. In 2008 the URA plan was amended to add the Old Cannery property as a possible acquisition and the property was transferred to the Urban Renewal Agency.

In 2007 the City issued a RFP for potential developers and in 2008 (after the property transferred to the URA), the URA entered into a development agreement with Capstone Partners. Lot 1 is part of the Cannery PUD which was envisioned as a vibrant mixed-use project to be built in 10 or fewer phases. The subdivision of land was approved in 2010. The streets and plaza were constructed first and subsequent phases were to be sequenced based on private market demand conditions. Only 3 phases were constructed (East Residential Phase, West residential Phase and Machine Works Phase) before the partnership was terminated in 2015. Lot 1 is part of the "West Phase" in the PUD. It was envisioned to be a one-story retail building of approximately 3,750 square feet and a 31-space off-street parking lot to be shared with the "Machine Works Phase" (the Arts Center).



1- Information obtained from Resolution 2004-080 authorizing the purchase of the Cannery property
2- Information obtained from Resolution 2008-014 authorizing warranty deed for sale of Cannery

Sherwood Boulevard Property



Property Information

- Zoning
High Density Residential
- Size
1.80 acres
- Appraisal Price
No appraisal; tax assessor assessed value is \$276,850.
- Acquisition History
Acquired 5.32 acres by the URA in 2009 for \$325,000

Lot line adjusted to separate the slopes, wetland and floodplain area from the buildable portion, created the 1.80 acre lot.

This property was acquired by the URA in 2009 for \$325,000. Originally it was envisioned that this lot would facilitate development of the Cedar Creek Trail and the remaining, buildable portion could be developed.

The URA had an offer pending on the property for development of condo units, however after delays and additional due diligence the offer was terminated because it was determined that it was not economically feasible for them to develop as originally planned.

Robinhood Theater Property



Property Information

- Zoning
Retail Commercial; Old Town Overlay
- Size
10,000 square feet
- Appraisal Price
September 5, 2016 estimate:
\$205,000; \$20.50/square foot.
- Acquisition History
Acquired by City of Sherwood
in 1998 for \$200,000
(remainder of value was
donated);

Sold to URA in 2009 for
\$250,000

The Robinhood Theater was acquired by the City in 1998. The funds came from Act III (\$200,000) with the remainder of the value donated by the property owner. The purpose of acquisition/donation acceptance as stated in Resolution 98-759 is that it was a community asset. At the time, the theater was still located on the property. In 2001, after multiple reports relative to seismic safety of the building, the building official recommended that the building be closed. A demo permit was issued in 2003 for the demolition of the building.

In 2004, a temporary use permit was issued to allow the use of the, now vacant lot, "as temporary parking until the Downtown Streets Plan is completed, and permanent parking areas established in Old Town..."

In 2009, the City held a public hearing to consider selling the property to the URA. The transfer was approved (Resolution 2009-081) and the URA plan was amended to include the property for acquisition. The resolution amending the plan to include the property (resolution 2009-071) indicates that it was envisioned that the property would be privately re-developed.

Cannery Square – Lot 3



Property Information

- Zoning
Retail Commercial with PUD overlay, Old Town Overlay, Cannery portion
- Size
9,803 square feet
- Appraisal Price
September 5, 2016 estimate:
\$195,000; \$19.89/square foot.
- Acquisition History
Lot 3 was subdivided after acquisition of the full 6.6 acre Cannery site which was acquired by City of Sherwood in 2004 for \$1,824,000¹ and sold to URA in 2008 for \$3,065,000²

The City acquired the Cannery property in 2004. In 2008 the URA plan was amended to add the Old Cannery property as a possible acquisition and the property was transferred to the Urban Renewal Agency.

In 2007 the City issued a RFP for potential developers and in 2008 (after the property transferred to the URA), the URA entered into a development agreement with Capstone Partners. Lot 3 is part of the Cannery PUD which was envisioned as a vibrant mixed-use project to be built in 10 or fewer phases. The subdivision of land was approved in 2010. The streets and plaza were constructed first and subsequent phases were to be sequenced based on private market demand conditions. Only 3 phases were constructed (East Residential Phase, West residential Phase and Machine Works Phase) before the partnership was terminated in 2015. Lot 3 is part of the "South Phase" in the PUD. It was envisioned to be a one-story building with approximately 4,000 square feet of service, retail or office and an 8-space parking lot.



1- Information obtained from Resolution 2004-080 authorizing the purchase of the Cannery property
2- Information obtained from Resolution 2008-014 authorizing warranty deed for sale of Cannery

Cannery Square – Lot 4



Property Information

- Zoning
Retail Commercial with PUD overlay, Old Town Overlay, Cannery portion
- Size
25,074 square feet
- Appraisal Price
September 5, 2016 estimate:
\$450,000; \$17.94/square foot.
- Acquisition History
Lot 4 was subdivided after acquisition of the full 6.6 acre Cannery site which was acquired by City of Sherwood in 2004 for \$1,824,000¹ and sold to URA in 2008 for \$3,065,000²

The City acquired the Cannery property in 2004. In 2008 the URA plan was amended to add the Old Cannery property as a possible acquisition and the property was transferred to the Urban Renewal Agency.

In 2007 the City issued a RFP for potential developers and in 2008 (after the property transferred to the URA), the URA entered into a development agreement with Capstone Partners. Lot 4 is part of the Cannery PUD which was envisioned as a vibrant mixed-use project to be built in 10 or fewer phases. The subdivision of land was approved in 2010. The streets and plaza were constructed first and subsequent phases were to be sequenced based on private market demand conditions. Only 3 phases were constructed (East Residential Phase, West residential Phase and Machine Works Phase) before the partnership was terminated in 2015. Lot 4 is part of the “East Phase” in the PUD. It was envisioned to be a two-story, approximately 13,800 square foot building with ground floor service, office or retail and second floor office space along with a 36-space parking lot.



1- Information obtained from Resolution 2004-080 authorizing the purchase of the Cannery property
2- Information obtained from Resolution 2008-014 authorizing warranty deed for sale of Cannery

Cannery Square – Lots ~~4-8~~ ^{5 KC} (NE Phase)



Property Information

- Zoning
Retail Commercial with PUD overlay, Old Town Overlay, Cannery portion
- Size
 - Lot 5 – 7,046 sq ft
 - Lot 6 – 8,112 sq ft
 - Lot 7 – 13,003 sq ft
 - Lot 8 – 15,591 sq ft
- Appraisal Price
none; assessed value is:
 - Lot 5 – \$120,820
 - Lot 6 - \$130,260
 - Lot 7 - \$198,790
 - Lot 8 - \$236,800
- Acquisition History
Lots 5-8 were subdivided after acquisition of the full 6.6 acre Cannery site which was acquired by City of Sherwood in 2004 for \$1,824,000¹ and sold to URA in 2008 for \$3,065,000²

The City acquired the Cannery property in 2004. In 2008 the URA plan was amended to add the Old Cannery property as a possible acquisition and the property was transferred to the Urban Renewal Agency.

In 2007 the City issued a RFP for potential developers and in 2008 (after the property transferred to the URA), the URA entered into a development agreement with Capstone Partners. Lots 5-8 are part of the Cannery PUD which was envisioned as a vibrant mixed-use project to be built in 10 or fewer phases. The subdivision of land was approved in 2010. The streets and plaza were constructed first and subsequent phases were to be sequenced based on private market demand conditions. Only 3 phases were constructed (East Residential Phase, West residential Phase and Machine Works Phase) before the partnership was terminated in 2015. Lots 5-8 are part of the "NE Phase" in the PUD. It was not fully envisioned and there were several options left open for development in the future.



1- Information obtained from Resolution 2004-080 authorizing the purchase of the Cannery property
2- Information obtained from Resolution 2008-014 authorizing warranty deed for sale of Cannery

Approved Minutes

**SHERWOOD URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, November 20, 2018
(Following the 7:00 pm City Council Meeting)

**City of Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon 97140**

JOINT WORK SESSION WITH CITY COUNCIL

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Mays called the meeting to order at 7:45 pm.
- 2. BOARD PRESENT:** Chair Keith Mays, Board Members Sean Garland, Kim Young, Renee Brouse, Russell Griffin, and Tim Rosener. URA Board Member Elect Doug Scott. Member Jennifer Kuiper was absent.
- 3. STAFF AND LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:** City Manager Joe Gall, City Attorney Josh Soper, Finance Director Katie Henry, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Records Technician Katie Corgan, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
- 4. TOPICS:**

A. URA Property Discussion

City Manager Joe Gall recapped that the City of Sherwood currently owns seven URA properties and passed out a handout containing information on all seven properties (see record, Exhibit A). Mr. Gall stated that the goal of this meeting was to begin the conversation about what the URA board members would like to see happen to the seven URA properties. Community Development Director Julia Hajduk added that the City has previously had offers from outside entities to purchase several URA-owned properties.

Chair Keith Mays stated that he hopes that the URA board thinks of the possibilities for these properties in a long-term, big-picture sense. Specifically, recognizing and planning for potential future changes within the community in regard to any investments or decisions made about the properties. An example was given that if City Hall or the library should ever move locations, where would its new location be? Should the new City Hall or library be built on one of the URA properties? Mr. Mays also brought up the fact that when the Urban Renewal District closes any district-owned property becomes City property and that the City was under no obligation to sell or develop the new land. Chair. Mays stated he wished to get from this meeting a sense of what people's ideas are for the properties.

Chair Mays stated that there are roughly three to four prominent lots that are in high-traffic areas, so any project built on those lots will be highly visible to the community. The prominent lots include the lot by the Art Center, the Robin Hood Theater lot, and the former School House property. A board member asked Mr. Gall about which properties the City has been approached about selling. Mr. Gall responded that the

City had been approached about selling primarily two parcels, the former School House property and Lot 1. He also said that none of the offers had been serious offers thus far, but the offer for the former School House property had been the most comprehensive offer in its plans for the parcel.

Mr. Gall stated that the City had gone through a lengthy process with a potential buyer for the Sherwood Boulevard property that fell through due to the difficult nature of developing that specific lot. Ms. Hajduk mentioned that two of the main reasons for the difficulty in development of the parcel was due to the geotechnical report and sewer availability issues which indicated that the developer could not build the facility they desired. Julia recommended that the City wait to develop the Sherwood Boulevard lot until the construction of the Cedar Creek Trail is complete.

Ms. Brouse asked about a recent meeting involving representatives from the Spring's Living coming to look at purchasing a URA property for their headquarters. She said they were specifically interested in the School House and Cannery Square properties. Chair Mays stated he had had a conversation with the Spring's Living executives, which included a tour of the property, but the Spring's Living had not reengaged in conversation with Mr. Mays by the time of this meeting. City Manager Gall said that he too had reached out to the Spring's Living via email earlier but had not heard back from them as yet.

Mr. Griffin clarified that the Spring's Living would be moving their offices from McMinnville to a location in Sherwood. Mr. Mays confirmed that the organization had expressed interest in both McMinnville and Sherwood.

Mr. Rosener expressed that he believed that it would be a good idea to reach out to the Spring's Living again. Mr. Mays agreed and said he planned to do so. Mr. Mays stated that procuring the Spring's Living transaction would be ideal for several reasons, i.e., the amount of people they employ and the potential new revenue stream from their employees spending money within Sherwood.

Mr. Mays went on to state that the lot next to Symposium Coffee had sold and will be developed into a three-story multi-use facility. He also stated that the lot behind Symposium Coffee is currently for sale. Julia Hajduk stated that the people who had purchased the lot next to Symposium Coffee had also indicated their interest in Lot 1. Mr. Gall said that their interest stems from the fact that the footprint of Lot 1 is very similar to the footprint of the property next to Symposium Coffee. Ms. Hajduk stated that if the purchasers of the Symposium Coffee lot bought Lot 1 and wished to similarly develop it, there would need to be some modifications to the PUD. Mr. Mays expressed that whatever structure that would be built on Lot 1 would need to be accepted by the community and be successful given its highly visible location. He also wanted the board to keep in mind how much control the board would wish to have over the lot.

Mr. Rosener asked the board if they should revisit previous URA board plans for the properties they discussed at this meeting. Mr. Gall stated that the board should review the reports at a later date but that this meeting was to get a general idea of what the board wanted for their URA-owned properties, and that no decisions would be made at this meeting.

The board addressed the Robin Hood Theater lot. Ms. Young expressed that she wished to see the Robin Hood Theater Lot remain a parking lot and acknowledged that this may not be ideal as that does not generate revenue. She also communicated that she would like to pave the lot. Mr. Rosener stated that he would like to see it turned into an event space. Mr. Griffin agreed adding that it should be both a parking lot and an event space. Mr. Mays expressed his interest in making the lot into a plaza. This would allow the lot to be used as both a parking lot and an event space. Discussion about the potential uses for the event space followed.

Ms. Hajduk asked for an update on the current URA fund from Finance Director Katie Henry. Ms. Henry stated that unless the city sold a piece of property, there is currently no URA money to spend on projects. Mr. Rosener stated that the Main Street Group and several Sherwood business owners had some good ideas, but that they were currently restricted in acting due to current SDC standards. He hoped to sell a URA property and use the money from the sale to use as a grant for helping to encourage the type of development the URA board wants. The City of Beaverton's grant program was brought up as an example. The board discussed how the major desire for current Old Town business owners was more parking for customers and ways to drive up business.

Mr. Mays reminded the board that in roughly three years the Urban Renewal District would go away and there would be the option to form multiple small Urban Renewal Districts. He had previously discussed with Mr. Gall and Ms. Hajduk the possibility of completing small Urban Renewal projects. The example of the City of Wilsonville was discussed.

Mr. Gall brought up a hypothetical point that if the URA board were to sell the School House property, which had recently been appraised at \$790,000, the money from that sale would cover the cost of converting the Robin Hood Theater lot into the plaza Mr. Mays had discussed earlier.

Mr. Rosener reminded the board that they should focus on discussing and planning what their vision is for Old Town before they make any plans, so the board has an exact vision guiding their future choices. Ms. Hajduk mentioned that several years ago Main Street had gone through a branding effort but was unclear on what the outcome of said effort was. Discussion about previous branding efforts by Main Street business owners and the complexities of non-local building owners not wanting to spend money updating their buildings was discussed.

Mr. Mays reiterated that the two greatest opportunities for the URA board were to sell the two lots, including the lot near Symposium Coffee. The potential for the lot that is currently being utilized by Andy's Auto & Truck Service, Inc. as a business annex to become available in the near future was discussed as a possible new acquisition to the URA board. The sale of the School House property was discussed and the fact the Urban Renewal District would like a say in how the lot gets developed as the property is within the Old Town boundaries. Ms. Hajduk stated that because the School House property is URA-owned, the board has the ability to pick and choose which proposals they would accept for the development of the lot.

Mr. Mays referred to the difficulties developers would face on all of the URA-owned properties. Issues included: the location of the properties being away from main thoroughfares, visibility issues given the property locations, the types of customers the businesses would attract given their location, access and parking, utilities, and current design standards. Mr. Rosener brought up the fact that the recent development in the south Cooper Mountain area would drive customers into the Sherwood area, and encouraged the board to come to a decision about what their overall vision was.

Mr. Mays asked the board if they would like to get the Cultural Arts Commission involved with the discussion of the development of Lot 1. Mr. Griffin agreed that that would be a good idea as whoever developed Lot 1 would share the parking lot with the Sherwood Center for the Arts. Mr. Rosener agreed with Mr. Griffin's assertion of working with the Cultural Arts Commission. Ms. Brouse reminded the board that the Art Commission was currently composing the Public Art Master Plan and believed this would be a good time to engage them to get their thoughts on the development of the lot. Mr. Gall stated that he had heard the Arts Center staff would like to see a plaza built instead of a structure on Lot 1. Mr. Griffin specified that he would like to see the lot be developed into something that generates traffic towards the

Arts Center. Mr. Mays proposed the idea that the lot could be developed into a local restaurant. Discussion followed.

Ms. Hajduk discussed the PUD for Lot 1 as a one-story retail structure that would share the parking lot with the Arts center. She also mentioned that the PUD is able to be amended at the board's discretion. Mr. Rosener stated that he wished to see something visually distinctive developed in Lot 1 given its prominent location. Mr. Mays asked the board if any in attendance did not want to build a structure on Lot 1. Mr. Scott put forth his idea that the board could develop Lot 1 into the previously discussed plaza (instead of the Robin Hood Theater lot), and then develop the Robin Hood Theater lot into a structure of the board's choosing.

Mr. Gall suggested that the for sale sign be removed from Lot 1, have the URA board decide on what the board and the Cultural Arts Commission would collectively like to see happen with both Lot 1 and the School House property, and then market Lot 1 and the School House parcels. Mr. Gall recommended hiring a broker for the marketing of the parcels. The conversion of the Robin Hood Theater lot into a plaza was discussed. Mr. Griffin proposed that there could be a public art installation included in the plaza's development. Mr. Rosener stated that he wished to preserve the original Robin Hood Theater sign that is currently on the lot given its historical value.

Mr. Garland asked if there was consensus amongst the URA board members about which parcels they were most interested in selling, specifically the School House lot and Lot 1. The board agreed that those two lots were the properties they were most interested in selling. Mr. Mays stated that Cannery Lot 3 was also a property that interested him in selling. Discussion about the current state of Cannery Lot 3 and the marketing potential of the lot followed. Mr. Mays asked Ms. Hajduk about the PUD for Cannery Lot 3. Ms. Hajduk responded that the PUD currently allows for a one-story building with approximately 4,000 square feet of service, retail, or office, and an eight-space parking lot.

Mr. Garland asked if there were potential pedestrian visibility issues should Lot 1 be developed into a structure. Mr. Mays stated that the crosswalks were already quite wide and that the potential visibility issues could be mitigated by the design of the building. Ms. Brouse stated her agreement that there could be pedestrian visibility issues given the typical speed of traffic in that area.

Ms. Hajduk asked the board to discuss potential development on Lot 4. The board responded that they were potentially reserving that lot for the future site of either City Hall or the library. Mr. Gall asked the board if they would be willing to sell Lot 4 if the Spring's Living stated their interest in the lot. The board agreed that they would be willing to sell Lot 4 to the Spring's Living if the opportunity arose. Mr. Rosener reminded the board that Public Works would need to be relocated in the future and that the lot that Public Works currently resides in could be the potential future site of City Hall.

Ms. Hajduk stated that there was an error on Cannery Square—Lot 4-8 (NE Phase) fact sheet and should be titled Lot 5-8, (see record, Exhibit A). Mr. Scott asked the board to discuss Lots 5-8. Mr. Mays said he believed the development or selling of Lots 5-8 is something that the board will look into down the road after the development of the more prominent URA parcels. Ms. Brouse inquired into the PUD for Lots 5-8. Ms. Hajduk responded that the design for the lots was not as defined as other URA-owned lots. The PUD ambiguity for Lots 5-8 was purposeful so the board could keep the lots adaptable for development.

Mr. Griffin stated his wished for the URA board to continue to meet and discuss development opportunities of the URA-owned properties. Mr. Griffin gave the example of the Spring's Living potentially moving their headquarters to Sherwood. Mr. Mays stated his excitement at that prospect. Mr. Rosener agreed that

procuring the Spring's Living headquarters in Sherwood would be a big win for the city and broaches the idea that the board should potentially use incentives to secure Spring's Living interest in moving to Sherwood. Discussion about the positive impacts of getting the Spring's Living headquarters to move to Sherwood was discussed. Mr. Gall asked for the go-ahead to remove the for sale sign on Lot 1. The board agreed.

Mr. Griffin inquired if the current location of City Hall was Urban Renewal property. Mr. Mays stated that it was. Mr. Griffin stated he wished to discuss the fact that there is not a fence between the Oregon Street Townhomes and the URA-owned parking lot next door and the potential for residents of the Oregon Street Townhomes to park in the URA-owned parking lot which could affect access for library patrons, Planning Commission patrons, etc. Mr. Griffin stated he recalled a fence in the original plans for the townhomes. Ms. Hajduk agreed that she believed there had been a fence in the plans but that generally fences are not required between properties. Mr. Griffin detailed that his worry stemmed from the fact that the parking lot will be considered "prime real estate" for those moving into the townhomes and there is currently no signage or restrictions on the URA-owned parking lot. Mr. Gall commented that there is a potential issue with the current city-owned public parking lots in that there are no rules governing who and when people can park in the lots. Mr. Gall brought up the idea of a permit-process for the nighttime use of the lots. This would be a small revenue generator for the city. Mr. Gall stated he believed that while townhome owners parking in the URA lot was not currently an issue, it would become one very shortly with the additional sale of more townhome units. He also recapped that the current issue of people parking overnight in the Arts Center lot. Potential ideas about how best to operate the permit process was discussed. Mr. Gall went on to say that regardless of the decision about implementing a specific permitting process, the board needed to create rules and regulations for overnight parking in city-owned lots. Mr. Gall stated that he wished to avoid the potential for people dumping their cars in the lots. Ms. Hajduk brought up the idea that in addition to overnight parking requirements, the city could also implement hour-parking requirements. The City of Tualatin was brought up as an example.

With no further business discussed, Chair Mays adjourned the meeting.

5. ADJOURN

Chair Mays adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Attest:


Sylvia Murphy, MMC, Agency Recorder


Tim Rosener, Vice Chair