



CITY COUNCIL MEETING PACKET

FOR

Tuesday, October 17, 2023

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

6:00 pm City Council Work Session

7:00 pm City Council Regular Meeting

This meeting will be live streamed at
<https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofSherwood>



6:00 PM WORK SESSION

1. **Council Goals Update**
(Keith Campbell, City Manager)
2. **Roundabout Art Work**
(Kristen Switzer, Community Services Director)

7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL**
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
5. **CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. **Approval of September 19, 2023, City Council Meeting Minutes** (Sylvia Murphy, City Recorder)
- B. **Approval of October 3, 2023, City Council Meeting Minutes** (Sylvia Murphy, City Recorder)
- C. **Resolution 2023-080, Approving the Sherwood Public Library Department Collection Development Policy** (Adrienne Doman Calkins, Library Manager)

6. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**
7. **CITY MANAGER REPORT**
8. **COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS**
9. **ADJOURN**

How to Provide Citizen Comments and Public Hearing Testimony: Citizen comments and public hearing testimony may be provided in person, in writing, or by telephone. Written comments must be submitted at least 24 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting start time by e-mail to Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov and must clearly state either (1) that it is intended as a general Citizen Comment for this meeting or (2) if it is intended as testimony for a public hearing, the specific public hearing topic for which it is intended. To provide comment by phone during the live meeting, please e-mail or call the City Recorder at Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov or 503-625-4246 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting start time in order to receive the phone dial-in instructions. Per Council Rules Ch. 2 Section (V)(D)(5), Citizen Comments, "Speakers shall identify themselves by their names and by their city of residence." Anonymous comments will not be accepted into the meeting record.

How to Find out What's on the Council Schedule: City Council meeting materials and agenda are posted to the City web page at www.sherwoodoregon.gov, generally by the Thursday prior to a Council meeting. When possible, Council agendas are also posted at the Sherwood Library/City Hall and the Sherwood Post Office.

To Schedule a Presentation to the Council: If you would like to schedule a presentation to the City Council, please submit your name, phone number, the subject of your presentation and the date you wish to appear to the City Recorder, 503-625-4246 or Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov

ADA Accommodations: If you require an ADA accommodation for this public meeting, please contact the City Recorder's Office at (503) 625-4246 or Cityrecorder@Sherwoodoregon.gov at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting time.

AGENDA

SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL October 17, 2023

6:00 pm City Council Work Session

7:00 pm City Council Regular Session

**Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140**

**This meeting will be live streamed at
<https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofSherwood>**



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
September 5, 2023

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:45 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Councilors Kim Young, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, Taylor Giles, and Dan Standke. Council President Keith Mays was absent.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell and City Attorney Ryan Adams.
4. **TOPICS:**

A. ORS 192.660 (2)(h) Legal Counsel, ORS 192.660 (2)(e) Real Property Transactions and ORS 192.660 (2)(i) Performance Evaluation

5. **ADJOURN:**

The executive session was adjourned at 6:30 pm and a work session was convened.

WORK SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Councilors Kim Young, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, Taylor Giles, and Dan Standke. Council President Keith Mays was absent.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Ryan Adams, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, Records Technician Katie Corgan, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
4. **TOPICS:**

A. Discussion on Youth Advisory Committee

Mayor Rosener explained that programs to get students involved with government at the federal and state level already existed, but there were no programs for students interested in municipal government. City Manager Keith Campbell presented the "Youth Advisory Group" PowerPoint presentation (see record,

Exhibit A) and explained that this program was a joint effort between the city and the Sherwood School District and was a deliverable for Council Pillars, Goals, and Deliverables. He provided an overview of the Youth Advisory Group and explained that the City Manager and the Superintendent would meet regularly with 16 Sherwood High School students, four at each grade level, during the 2023-24 school year. Mayor Rosener explained that he had spoken with Superintendent Lyon on how to include students who were not enrolled in traditional schooling and reported that the school district would choose four students per grade level and the city would choose one at-large student per grade level, for a total of five students per grade. Discussion on the demographics of students in Sherwood occurred and Council agreed that the Youth Advisory Group should be open to every high school-aged student in the city. Councilor Brouse asked for more information on how the ratio of students was decided. City Manager Campbell replied that allowing the school district to choose four students was to help create a partnership between the school district and the city as well as minimizing city staff time while still meeting the goals and objectives of this idea. Mayor Rosener commented that the school already offered other programs to get students involved in government, so it was important that the Youth Advisory Group not be comprised of those same students in similar programs or groups. Discussion regarding public meeting laws occurred and Councilor Brouse commented that the proposed group appeared to be more school-related versus city-related. She said that when she had first brought up the idea for a committee several years ago, the group was to be focused on getting youth involved with city government. Mr. Campbell explained that the Youth Advisory Group had endeavored to be about both student government and city government. He outlined that the group would meet at the high school during lunch time, lunch would be served, and meetings would last for one hour. He reported that the Sherwood High School admin team and counselors would be responsible for appointing students to the group. He recapped that he and Dr. Lyon had discussed the desire for the group to be comprised of students who did not normally participate in these types of groups. He stated that the agenda for each meeting would be jointly developed by the City Manager and Superintendent. He outlined the three goals for the Youth Advisory Group as: provide a framework for students to get to know representatives from the city, to provide a framework for students to get to know representatives from the school district, and to empower the students to speak about their experiences in both the school and the city as a way of providing feedback or voicing concerns they may have. Councilor Brouse asked if a representative from the Youth Advisory Group would regularly attend City Council meetings. Mr. Campbell replied that in the spring, student representatives would present a report of activities to Council at a regular Council meeting and at a school board meeting. He clarified that this would be an opportunity for the representatives to speak on their experience as a part of the Youth Advisory Group as well as an opportunity to provide feedback on the process. Councilor Brouse commented that she had hoped that the Youth Advisory Group representative would attend more Council meetings than what was outlined. Councilor Scott stated that he liked the proposed Youth Advisory Group and commented that what was presented was very different than the "Youth Advisory Board" Council had been discussing for several years. Councilor Brouse commented that she had concerns that the Youth Advisory Group only ran during the school year. City Manager Campbell replied that he had hoped to start the program, ask for feedback on what could be enhanced or improved, and then adjust from there. He commented that as the program was adjusted and changed, a summer program was a potential option. Councilor Young commented that she appreciated that this program would require less staff time from city employees to help run and City Manager Campbell referred to public meeting laws. City Attorney Ryan Adams replied that as it was presented, the Youth Advisory Group fell into a "gray area" when it came to public meeting law and read the statute aloud. He commented that he did not think that the public policy was intended for student advisory groups, such as the Youth Advisory Group. Mayor Rosener referred to the city's choice of students to serve on the board and explained that it did not have to be one student per grade, it could be a mix depending on the applications they received. Councilor Giles asked why the Youth Advisory Group

could not be comprised of entirely at-large positions, regardless of grade or enrollment in the Sherwood School District and discussion occurred. City Manager Campbell commented that after the Youth Advisory Group update in May, he hoped to hold a work session to review the program and to discuss possible changes for the next year. Councilor Giles commented that the outgoing seniors should also be interviewed to provide their feedback on the program. Mayor Rosener asked if Council agreed to move forward with the proposed Youth Advisory Group and Council signaled their agreement. Councilor Standke asked what the goal of the Youth Advisory Group was. Mr. Campbell replied that the goal was to find a way for the city to engage with youth to help educate them on local government and school district structure, as well as providing the opportunity to speak with the Superintendent and City Manager about issues within the city and to do so in an informal environment to help create relationships with their city. Councilor Standke asked if someone from the city would attend each meeting. Mr. Campbell replied that both he and Dr. Lyon would attend each meeting and Mayor Rosener added that City Manager Campbell may also designate a staff member to attend a particular meeting. Councilor Giles commented that since the city would help to set the agenda, Council could add things they wanted to get student feedback on. Council discussed the need for the creation of the Youth Advisory Group and the benefits of having a program that offered students a chance to learn about local government. Mayor Rosener asked if a resolution needed to be drafted for the creation of the Youth Advisory Group. City Attorney Adams replied that a resolution would not be necessary as there was Council consensus, the meetings would be held on school property, and it was not an official city board or commission. Mayor Rosener stated he and City Manager Campbell were working with the LOC and explained that in the past, several companies had sponsored high school aged students to travel to Washington D.C. as a part of the National League of Cities' City Summit event. He explained that he hoped to provide the opportunity for students serving on the Youth Advisory Group to participate in the City Summit event.

5. ADJOURN:

Mayor Rosener adjourned the work session at 6:58 pm and convened a regular session.

REGULAR SESSION

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.
- 2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Councilors Kim Young, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, Taylor Giles, and Dan Standke. Council President Keith Mays was absent.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Ryan Adams, IT Director Brad Crawford, Police Captain Dan O'Loughlin, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, HR Director Lydia McEvoy, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
- 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 6:0; ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCIL PRESIDENT MAYS WAS ABSENT).

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

- A. Approval of September 5, 2023, City Council Meeting Minutes**
- B. Resolution 2023-074, Appointing Jane Parisi-Mosher to the Sherwood Cultural Arts Commission**
- C. Resolution 2023-075, Appointing Michelle Nedwek to the Sherwood Cultural Arts Commission**
- D. Resolution 2023-076, Appointing Marilee Ratliff Ponangi to the Sherwood Library Advisory**
- E. Resolution 2023-077, Appointing Shruti Pawaskar to the Sherwood Library Advisory Board**
- F. Resolution 2023-078, Authorizing staff to submit an application to become a member of the WHO/AARP Network of Age-Friendly States and Communities**

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 6:0; ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCIL PRESIDENT MAYS WAS ABSENT).

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

There were no citizen comments and Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

7. PRESENTATIONS:**A. Recognition of Eagle Scout Award Recipients**

Mayor Rosener recognized Jaden Will and Timothy Wieland for their achievement of attaining the rank of Eagle Scout and explained that Mr. Will was present at this meeting and called him forward and asked him to explain his Eagle Scout project. Mr. Will stated that he was a member of Troop 528 in Wilsonville and explained that he had been a Boy Scout since first grade, and he was currently a senior at Sherwood High School. He stated that he had wanted his project to give back to his previous school, St. Francis, and explained that his project involved renovating the Stations of the Cross trail to make it more accessible for different ability levels. He outlined that he leveled the trail, placed landscape fabric on top, covered the fabric with gravel, and added natural stone pavers along the sides of the trail. He reported that this project took two days to complete. Mayor Rosener asked if he had gotten any assistance with the project. He explained that he received help from 20 members of Troop 528 and thanked them for their hard work. Councilor Young asked if anyone had contributed materials for the project. Mr. Will replied that he had received donations from two local businesses who had helped to fully fund the project. Councilor Giles asked Mr. Will which badge had been his favorite to achieve. Mr. Will replied that his fishing badge was his favorite as he enjoyed fishing as well as his biking badge. Councilor Brouse asked who would maintain the trail now that it was complete. Mr. Will replied that the parish would maintain the trail. He reported that he hoped to help as many of his fellow troop members attain the Eagle Scout rank with his remaining time in the Boy Scouts. Mayor Rosener congratulated Mr. Will for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout and presented him with a certificate of achievement.

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item and the City Recorder read aloud the public hearings statement.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Ordinance 2023-009, Approving a zone change and conditional use permit for the Sherwood Family YMCA property, Tax Lot 9100 of Washington County Assessor Map 2S131CB

Community Development Director Eric Rutledge outlined that the current zoning was Low Density Residential PUD and the Applicant sought to change the zoning to Institutional Public. He reported that no public comment had been received on the application and asked for questions or feedback from Council. Mayor Rosener explained that the proposed ordinance was a part of the process for selling the City of Sherwood recreation building to the YMCA and this ordinance was needed to partition out the skate park, as the city would maintain control over the skate park. Mr. Rutledge commented that this zone change should have been completed a long time ago and this was the city's last chance to change the zoning while they owned the property. He outlined that the entire site was public recreational use, so the zoning was most compatible with the IP Zone. Mayor Rosener opened the public hearing to receive public testimony on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Mayor Rosener closed the public hearing and asked for discussion or a motion from Council.

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2023-009, APPROVING A ZONE CHANGE AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE SHERWOOD FAMILY YMCA PROPERTY, TAX LOT 9100 OF WASHINGTON COUNTY ASSESSOR MAP 2S131CB. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 6:0; ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR (COUNCIL PRESIDENT MAYS WAS ABSENT).

Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

9. CITY MANAGER REPORT:

City Manager Keith Campbell referred to Resolution 2023-078, Authorizing staff to submit an application to become a member of the WHO/AARP Network of Age-Friendly States and Communities and congratulated Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, Senior Center Manager Maiya Martin Burbank, and the Senior Advisory Board on this achievement. He explained that this was a Council Goal deliverable and commented he wished to recognize the work that had gone into completing that deliverable. He reported that a Sherwood West Concept Plan open house would be held on October 4th at the Ridges Elementary. He reported that Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman had been awarded the Greater Portland Champion award and explained that the designation was awarded to a member of the community who advocated for economic development and has a track record of creating positive economic outcomes for their community. He reported that Mayor Rosener had nominated Mr. Coleman for his many accomplishments as the City of Sherwood's Economic Development Manager including his skills building relationships, his efforts with the Urban Growth Report, and his key role in bringing Lam Research, DW Fritz Automation, and NSI Manufacturing to the city.

Councilor Standke asked how long the application for the age-friendly city designation would take to process. Community Services Director Kristen Switzer replied that the application would take approximately one month to process. Councilor Giles asked what the benefits of being an age-friendly city were. Ms. Switzer explained that the designation would provide the city with access to more resources as well as qualifying the city for more funding and more grants to complete ADA improvements, sidewalk improvements, and Senior Center programming. Councilor Brouse added that the designation created better livability for the seniors in the Sherwood community.

Mayor Rosener referred to the Sherwood West Concept Plan and the urban growth boundary discussion and explained that the city was seeking input from the community on the Sherwood West Concept Plan. He provided background information on the urban growth boundary and the process for submitting an ask to Metro. Mayor Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

10. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilor Giles reported that he would attend the Library Advisory Board meeting on September 20th and reported that some members of the board were working with the Library Foundation on bylaws. He reported on recent events at the library.

Councilor Young reported on her attendance at the most recent CDBG and Home Policy Advisory Board meeting where they held a public hearing on their CAPER (Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report). She explained that the report detailed the progress of the Washington County Consortium's execution of the five-year strategy outlined in the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and she provided an overview of the statistics cited in the CAPER. She reported that she attended the most recent Cultural Arts Commission meeting on behalf of Council President Mays where they began work on mapping out their priorities for the next year.

Councilor Brouse reported that she would be unable to attend the upcoming Housing Advisory Committee meeting as she would be out of the country. She reported that she had been unable to attend the most recent Senior Advisory Board meeting and expressed her excitement for the completion of the age-friendly city application. She reported that the RWC would meet next on October 4th.

Councilor Scott gave his kudos to Councilor Brouse for her work and initiative in getting the city to apply to become an age-friendly city. He reported that he was unable to attend the most recent Parks and Recreation Advisory Board meeting where they selected a representative to serve on the Charter Review Committee and encouraged residents interested in serving on the board to apply.

Councilor Standke reported that he attended the most recent Planning Commission meeting where they approved a major modification of the Chevron station on Highway 99W.

Mayor Rosener spoke on the Charter Review Committee and importance of home rule and a strong city charter to help manage a city. He reported that he attended the most recent WCCC meeting where they heard a presentation on Metro's Regional Transportation Planning process and tolling. He reported that he attended the most recent LOC Telecom Policy Committee meeting where they discussed broadband infrastructure funding. He reported that he attended the most recent Oregon Broadband Advisory Council.

11. ADJOURN:

Mayor Rosener adjourned the regular session at 7:40 pm.

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Tim Rosener, Mayor



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
October 3, 2023

WORK SESSION

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Rosener called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm.
2. **COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Tim Rosener, Councilors Kim Young, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, Taylor Giles, and Dan Standke. Council President Keith Mays arrived at 5:35 pm.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Ryan Adams, IT Director Brad Crawford, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, Senior Planner Joy Chang, Community Development Director Eric Rutledge, Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, HR Director Lydia McEvoy, City Engineer Jason Waters, Land Use Legal Counsel Carrie Richter, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
4. **TOPICS:**

A. Discuss Sherwood West UGB Expansion Proposal

Community Development Director Eric Rutledge presented the “Sherwood West UGB Expansion” PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit A) and outlined that this was the second work session on the topic and recapped previous work session discussions. He explained that this work session would focus on master planning, annexation policy, and middle housing. He noted that an open house would be held at the Ridges Elementary on October 4th and stated that a questionnaire would be provided to attendees. Discussion regarding the questionnaire content and open house format occurred. Mr. Rutledge explained that the open house feedback would be processed and given to Council prior to the November 7th work session where Council would also provide direction to staff on the letter of interest (LOI) to Metro. He reported that the LOI needed to be completed by December 1st if the city wished to submit the letter to Metro. Mayor Rosener confirmed that submitting a LOI did not obligate the city to complete a UGB expansion request application. Mr. Rutledge replied that was correct. He outlined key questions raised by Council and the Planning Commission regarding Sherwood West on page 3 of the presentation as: Could Cottage Cluster and Middle Housing-only zones be created in Sherwood West? What were the benefits of a city-led master plan for portions of Sherwood West and how would HB 2001 be implemented through a master plan? How could annexation agreements or policies be used to achieve the city's desired outcomes for Sherwood West? He added that Council had also requested a map of the vacant residential land and a developmental phasing map. Mayor Rosener asked that Hospitality zoning also be discussed. Community Development Director Rutledge provided an overview of the vacant residential land map on page 4 of the presentation and explained that the green color represented vacant residential properties and the red color represented vacant commercial properties. He noted that there were approximately 1,404 units in residential zones, the majority of which were located to the south. He stated that the majority of commercial zones were located along Highway 99W and explained that if residential in commercial zones were approved by the Planning Commission and City Council, there was a capacity of approximately 916 units in

commercial zones. Mayor Rosener asked how many housing units existed currently. City Manager Keith Campbell replied that he believed approximately 6,600 units. Mr. Rutledge provided an overview of the infrastructure/development phasing map on page 5 of the presentation. He explained that the map was drafted based on location and physical attributes for the location of the utilities that were likely to develop first. He referred to annexation and orderly growth and explained that a similar approach was used for the development of the TEA. Mayor Rosener asked if including Sherwood North in the expansion request was an option. Mr. Rutledge replied that including Sherwood North was not an option. He provided an overview of the planning and development timeline on page 6 of the presentation and explained that if Metro approved the city's application, the next step would be to complete the Metro-funded comprehensive planning process where zoning, development code, public facility master plans, and annexation policy would be addressed. Councilor Giles referred to Metro funding the comprehensive planning process for the area and asked if the funding came with stipulations that the city was required to follow. Mayor Rosener replied that Metro would not have any additional control over the comprehensive planning process other than the power already granted to them through Metro ordinances. Mr. Rutledge added that it was possible that Metro could condition their approval of the city's application. Mayor Rosener commented that he felt that annexation policies, agreements, and legislation needed to be completed prior to starting the comprehensive planning process because of the uncertainty of potential annexation legislation from the state. Legal Counsel Carrie Richter clarified that Council wished to have the annexation code in place prior to starting work on the comprehensive plan. Councilor Scott commented that he wanted to update the annexation code before anyone could apply for annexation. Community Development Director Rutledge replied that Council and staff were on the same page regarding updating the annexation code. Ms. Richter recommended that Council create new annexation policies that would apply city-wide over the next six months, ensuring that comprehensive plan work could begin as soon as possible. Mr. Rutledge added that staff had drafted an annexation policy that had been modeled on local jurisdictions with strong annexation policies and commented that staff could bring that forward to Council soon. Mayor Rosener referred to HB 3414 and commented that he wanted the city to be ready. Councilor Scott and Councilor Brouse commented that they were in favor of updating the city's annexation code soon and then updating the code as needed. Mr. Rutledge stated that work on a city-led master plan could begin after the comprehensive planning process was complete and before the work on annexation began. Councilor Scott asked if a developer-led master plan process or a developer and city partnership master planning process was an option. Mr. Rutledge replied that a developer-led master plan would need Council approval and Ms. Richter said staff would circle back around at a later time. Mr. Rutledge stated that cottage cluster and middle housing-only zones were possible for Sherwood West. He explained that city staff had spoken with the DLCD and explained that HB 2001 only required that middle housing be included in single-family zones but not the other way around. He added that according to the DLCD, there currently were no other cities with middle housing-only zones. Councilor Giles asked if middle housing zones could have separate design standards. Ms. Richter replied that that was an option, but those standards had to be clear and objective. Discussion occurred and Council commented that they did not want to be overly prescriptive in the design standards so as not to hinder development. Mayor Rosener referred to Hospitality zoning and Mr. Rutledge replied that Hospitality zoning could be discussed at the next work session. He addressed the question of the benefits of a city-led master plan for certain portions of Sherwood West and how HB 2001 would be implemented through a master plan and explained that the state had adopted administrative rules that stipulated how a jurisdiction could regulate middle housing. He explained that the city had updated their middle housing code in 2021 and the city did not have any adopted master plans that modified those regulations, but the OAR allowed for that. He explained that the city could regulate the location and design of middle housing in Master Planned Communities through implementation of one or more of the following actions: plan to provide urban services to accommodate 20 units per acre within the Master Planned Community; provide a variable rate SDC for middle housing within the Master Planned Community (i.e. reduced rate for middle housing units); or require a mix of residential types including at least two middle housing types other than duplexes within the Master Planned Community. Council referred to the 20 units per acre stipulation and Ms. Richter stated if the city chose the first option, then the city should plan for 20

units per acre and clarified that that was for the total Master Plan area. She commented that the city should not pursue the first option. Council asked if the city already offered the variable rate SDC for middle housing and Community Development Director Rutledge replied that staff would investigate further. Ms. Richter voiced that the purpose of the variable rate SDC for middle housing was to incentivize the development of middle housing. Councilor Scott commented that it was to also lower the price of the units to make them more affordable. Councilor Scott expressed his concerns over HB 2001 and middle housing in Sherwood West. Ms. Richter explained Master Planned Community zones would be separately identified in the Master Plan and those separately identified communities were where the city could implement one of the three options discussed earlier. She added that the city could still have single-family residential zones with no middle housing as long as the city also allowed duplexes. Mr. Rutledge outlined that the minimum master plan area was 20 acres, and the zoning must allow for duplexes where single-family was permitted. Councilor Scott confirmed that this would also allow the city to stipulate and plan where certain amenities would be located, such as parks and roads. Ms. Richter replied that was correct. Councilor Young asked what the drawbacks were for completing a master plan. Ms. Richter replied it was a time intensive process for staff and discussion occurred regarding not wanting to be overly prescriptive and hinder development when creating the master plan. Council President Mays commented that the SDC fee structure could be designed in a way that reimbursed the city for any infrastructure the city had paid for. Councilor Standke asked if there was a maximum area that could be master planned, and Mr. Rutledge replied that he did not believe that there was a maximum area. Mr. Rutledge addressed the question of what specific area would have a master plan and explained that it was ultimately a Council decision. He stated that residential zones, mixed residential/commercial zones, and mixed-use zones were the most logical areas to complete a master plan for. He reported that the Sherwood West Concept Plan had identified different planning areas and explained that the west district would be ideal for a Master Plan Community because the area contained the nearby high school, a variety of zones, parks, the Chicken Creek greenway, etc. Mayor Rosener asked if the master plan area had to be contiguous. Ms. Richter replied that the definition did not state whether or not the area had to be contiguous, but that she believed that it was expected to be contiguous. Councilor Giles asked if the city could do more than one master plan. Staff replied that that was an option. Discussion regarding the master planning process occurred and Council and staff discussed the need for continual input from developers, property owners, and Metro throughout the master planning process. Mr. Rutledge addressed the question of how annexation agreements or policies could be used to best achieve the city's desired outcomes for Sherwood West. He explained that annexation was currently regulated by the city's Comprehensive Plan, Metro, and state law. He recommended that the city also adopt an annexation policy as part of the Development Code and explained that this could also include a requirement for an annexation agreement. He reported that SB 1573 did not prevent the city from having a strong annexation policy that ensured orderly development and adequate provision of public infrastructure. Mayor Rosener asked what the permissible provisions and scope of an annexation policy were. Mr. Rutledge stated that as a part of the annexation code, it could be required that the property owner and city have an annexation agreement. He recommended a stipulation that a transportation analysis be completed prior to a finalized annexation agreement which stated that developers could not develop more than the capacity shown in the transportation analysis. He explained that this was a valuable tool that the city did not currently have but could have for Sherwood West. Councilor Brouse asked if master plans were typically only done for residential zones. Ms. Richter replied that the city would have a stronger justification as to why it did not allow middle housing in single-family zones if a variety of zones were included in the master planned area, not just residential zones. Councilor Scott commented that he felt the west district option shown on page 10 of the presentation was the best option for master planning because of the variety of zones in the area. Mr. Rutledge commented that it would be good to address compatible development for the mixed-employment zone in the north via the Development Code and explained that completing a master plan for that area should be done at a later date so as not to cause delays to the current timeline. Mayor Rosener asked how a change in property ownership could impact annexation agreements. Ms. Richter replied that typically, property agreements were recorded and reported that development agreements were typically valid for 10 years. She explained that once someone

was annexed into the city, they could not be forced out even if they did not complete everything stipulated in the annexation agreement. City Attorney Ryan Adams asked what legal option the city could have in such a case and Ms. Richter replied that it would likely be a civil breach of contract suit. She commented that because annexation agreements had very specific terms, such a situation was unlikely to occur as it was unlikely that anyone would engage in annexation agreement negotiations if they were not serious about following through. Mr. Rutledge addressed the question of if an annexation agreement could require single-family only and replied that the answer to that question was unclear. He voiced that the best way to get the kind of development the city was seeking was through the master planning process. Ms. Richter outlined that HB 2001 stated that local governments must allow for the development of middle housing. As an alternative to that, local governments could do Master Planned Communities. She explained that HB 2001 did not state a third alternative in which an owner agreed not to exercise those rights, and because HB 2001 did not state that, that it appeared to her that a homeowner should be able to exercise those rights. She commented that given the current legislative environment for housing, any effort that could be perceived as trying to constrain choices would be a difficult case to win. She referred to PUDs and explained that there was the possible option for a city to be able to put stipulations about certain housing types, such as only allowing for single-family duplexes but not triplexes or quadplexes. She explained that she was unsure if that was a viable option, but the middle housing rule did not state anything about “alternative track choices” that applicants may make. Mayor Rosener asked about the possibility of a developer of a previously approved PUD coming back and saying that because of HB 2001, they had changed their mind on what they would be developing. He asked that in such a case, which situation would trump the other. Ms. Richter replied that the development of middle housing would likely take precedent and clarified that such a situation had not been tested in court yet. She added that currently, the rule says that master planning was exempt. Mr. Rutledge reported that the next work session on this topic would be held on November 7th. Council asked Mr. Rutledge to look into Hospitality zoning, including getting feedback on what other partnering agencies thought of the idea and defining what a Hospitality zone was. Mr. Rutledge added that Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman, City Manager Keith Campbell, and himself had heard a lot of support for a Hospitality zone, including feedback from Metro.

Record note: Community Development Director Eric Rutledge emailed Council Sherwood West materials in preparation for the work session (see record, Exhibit B).

B. Police Department Policy Updates

Police Chief Ty Hanlon referred to the policy updates he had sent to Council prior to this work session (see record, Exhibit C) and explained that all of the changes and updates were recommended from Lexipol. He addressed Policy 303.7, “Crowd Control Guidelines” and explained that this policy was created as a part of the reaction to riots over the last few years. He explained that the Sherwood Police Department did not have a crowd control team, but relied on Washington County if crowd control was needed. He addressed the Wellness Program and commented that Sherwood was “ahead of the curve” and that the city had already implemented many of the features of the Wellness Program cited in the policy update. He commented that Sherwood’s program and the Lexipol Wellness Program were very similar, and he liked what Lexipol had put forward. He addressed “Vehicle Pursuits” and reported that the policy had not changed but had been reorganized within the document. He addressed “Briefing” and explained that much of the trainings could be easily incorporated by the Sherwood Police Department. Mayor Rosener asked Chief Hanlon to clarify Sherwood’s vehicular pursuit policy. Chief Hanlon explained that Sherwood Police Officers would not pursue anyone unless that person was a major threat to the safety of officers or citizens. He explained that “time, place, and manner” were factored into the decision about whether or not to pursue a vehicle. He referred to the use of the term “excited delirium” in the “Medical Aid and Response” chapter and explained that the term had been updated to include descriptive behaviors. He addressed “Vehicle Towing” and reported that nothing had changed in this chapter as Sherwood was covered under Washington County’s towing policy. He addressed the “Investigation and Prosecution” chapter and policies

for interacting with juvenile witnesses or suspects and reported that the Sherwood Police Department had been following the new policy for several months. He clarified that the policy covered: “Where we can talk to them; How we talk to them; Questions we can ask; The environment we set them up in.” and depending on the situation, contacting their parents. He explained that the policy was to help make it so that juvenile witnesses or suspects did not feel compelled to answer questions because they were speaking to the police. He continued that the policy was a safety mechanism to ensure that juveniles had all of their rights afforded to them. Councilor Giles asked if there was a separate protocol for when the juvenile was being asked questions about their parent/guardian and Chief Hanlon confirmed that there was a separate protocol for those situations. He addressed Chapter 1011, “Personnel Complaints” and referred to “presumptive sanctions” for certain types of misconduct and stated that the changes were to hold the police officers to higher standards and would give police departments better credibility. Councilor Standke referred to Chapter 300.10 “Use of Force Analysis” and asked who reviewed that report and was the report made available to the public. Chief Hanlon replied that it was not publicly available, but it was a part of the Police Department’s process for accreditation. Councilor Giles asked if the report could be requested under the FOIA. Chief Hanlon replied that he believed that it could be. Councilor Scott asked for an estimate of the average number of times force was used by the Sherwood Police Department. Chief Hanlon replied he estimated that it was “less than one hundred” uses of force per year and clarified that there was “maybe a dozen” instances of “major” force used per year. He clarified that major uses of force included using a taser or the use of bodily force to gain control of the situation. Councilor Young asked for City Attorney Ryan Adams’s opinion on if the use of force analysis would be subject to public disclosure via a records request. Mr. Adams replied that it was likely that the report would need heavy redaction prior to being sent out with the goal of providing the requestor with the information without disclosing sensitive information. Councilor Scott commented that he would like to have a summary of the use of force analysis shared periodically with Council. Discussion of public records law occurred, and City Attorney Adams commented that each request was reviewed on a case-by-case basis and denials could be appealed to the District Attorney. Councilor Standke referred to section 305.10.1 and asked why the entire section had been removed but the section number remained. Chief Hanlon replied that that was an error. Councilor Standke identified the remaining uses of “he/she” in place of “officer” in the draft policy. Councilor Giles referred to “crowd control” asked if the term “crowd” had been defined. Chief Hanlon replied “crowd control” pertained to behavior of a group of people that had turned violent. He outlined that these new policies would be placed on an upcoming Council agenda under consent and asked for feedback on this format for reviewing police policy updates. Council agreed that they liked this format and that the proposed policy updates could move forward to the consent agenda. Councilor Standke asked what the process was for reviewing these types of policy updates. Chief Hanlon explained that he compiled the policy changes and brought them to the Police Advisory Board for review after which the draft policies were presented to Council for review. After Council had reviewed the policies, they were placed on a future City Council meeting agenda. Councilor Young clarified that the Police Advisory Board was not responsible for crafting the policies, since most policy updates were state-mandated.

5. ADJOURN:

Mayor Rosener adjourned the work session at 6:57 pm.

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Agenda Item: Consent Agenda

TO: Sherwood City Council

FROM: Adrienne Doman Calkins, Library Manager
Through: Kristen Switzer, Community Services Director
Keith Campbell, City Manager

SUBJECT: Resolution 2023-080, Approving the Sherwood Public Library Department Collection Development Policy

Issue:

Should the City Council approve the proposed Library Collection Development policy?

Background:

A library's collection development (CD) policy is a guiding document for procurement and management of library collections. It is founded in the ethics of the library profession and the Constitution of the United States to provide equal access to ideas and information.

The proposed policy includes language to match the new Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County Cooperative Library Services, clarity about roles and local decisions, and updates to the request for reconsideration procedures.

The policy has been reviewed by the Library Advisory Board at regular meetings in 2023. The Library Advisory Board recommends approval of the proposed policy, which has been reviewed and vetted by the Library Manager, Adrienne Doman Calkins, City Administration, and the City Attorney.

Financial Impacts:

There are no additional financial impacts as a result of approval of this resolution.

Recommendation:

Staff respectfully recommends City Council approval of Resolution 2023-080, Approving the Sherwood Public Library Department Collection Development Policy.



RESOLUTION 2023-080

APPROVING THE SHERWOOD PUBLIC LIBRARY DEPARTMENT COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY

WHEREAS, in accordance with Sherwood Municipal Code 2.08.070(C)(3), the Sherwood Library Advisory Board shall regularly review library policies and make a recommendation to the Sherwood City Council; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the State of Oregon Administrative Rule 543-010-0036, minimum conditions to be a legally established public library include a requirement to a collection development policy that incorporates relevant American Library Association (ALA) professional ethical codes, rules, and guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Library Collection Development Policy revisions include updates to match the new Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County Cooperative Library Services, clarity about roles and local decisions, and updates to the request for reconsideration procedures; and

WHEREAS, the Sherwood Library Advisory Board reviewed the Library Collection Development Policy during their regular meetings in 2023 and the board and staff recommend approval by the Sherwood City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SHERWOOD RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council approves the Library Collection Development Policy attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Section 2. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by the City Council this 17th of October, 2023.

Tim Rosener, Mayor

Attest:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Collection Development Policy Sherwood Public Library

PURPOSE

A collection development policy defines a library's user community, guides the selection of materials pertinent to the needs of the library's users, and identifies the goals for maintaining the collection—including guiding decisions about how items are withdrawn from the collection. The purpose of Sherwood Public Library's collection is to provide materials that meet the informational, educational, cultural, and recreational needs of our diverse community and to provide materials that open windows to the broader world.

Sherwood Public Library is committed to providing equal access to a diverse and inclusive collection that serves all people within the community and represents regional, national, and global diversities that may not be present in our current demographics.

BACKGROUND

Sherwood Public Library operates as a department of the City of Sherwood and serves the residents of the city and adjacent areas within our service area¹. The library serves as a limited public forum for access to a full range of information.

Sherwood Public Library is also a member of Washington County Cooperative Library Services (WCCLS). WCCLS is a department of Washington County government that exists to coordinate, contract for, or provide countywide library and information services. The other members of WCCLS are the City of Banks, City of Beaverton, City of Cornelius, City of Forest Grove, City of Hillsboro, City of North Plains, City of Tigard, City of Tualatin, the Aloha Community Library Association, the Cedar Mill Community Library Association, and the Garden Home Community Library Association. Both the City of Sherwood and WCCLS are funded by local taxes.

The WCCLS Information Network includes the shared integrated library system software (including the software that supports circulation, public access catalog, and cataloging); the wccls.org website and its resources; e-books, other databases and e-content provided by WCCLS, and other technology. Collections from all member libraries are shared throughout the county by placing holds in the catalog and routing material via a WCCLS courier system. WCCLS library card holders may check out materials from any member library.

This policy addresses items in the Sherwood Public Library collection only.

SCOPE AND LOCAL DECISIONS

The scope of Sherwood Public Library's collection is to select a broad choice of circulating print and non-print materials to accommodate reading levels, learning styles, languages, and

¹ Nearly 25,000 people in 2022, per Washington County Cooperative Library Services service area population data provided for fiscal year 2021-2022.

interests of users of all ages from birth through the various stages of adulthood. The library supplements and complements the collections of academic, school, and specialty libraries, does not duplicate the full range of materials these organizations make available, and expands beyond the scope of those collections.

Goals to improve the collection and increase access are developed locally by library staff through strategic planning², community input, ongoing learning and professional development, emerging practices, analysis, and data-informed decisions. The City of Sherwood Library Advisory Board regularly reviews this policy and all Sherwood Public Library policies at public meetings, and provides input to planning, goals, and objectives. Policy recommendations are adopted by City Council. A designated team of local Sherwood Public Library librarian staff are selectors for materials in the local collection and follow this policy in that work.

Sherwood Public Library's collection development practices support the library's goals and mission to inspire discovery, enrich lives and build community through equitable access to life-long learning in the following ways:

- A. Provide free and equitable access to the collection.
- B. Encourage and support an informed citizenry and provide community engagement resources.
- C. Provide information and educational materials that are current and relevant.
- D. Provide materials for developing reading habits and skills.
- E. Provide popular materials in print and audio-visual formats.
- F. Provide access to a diverse and inclusive spectrum of viewpoints, ideas, and creative expression.
- G. Provide materials in languages that serve the needs and interests of our community.
- H. Provide STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math) learning materials for at-home and in-library use.
- I. Supplement access to Internet connectivity with hotspots and Internet-enabled devices for checkout.

The library strives to meet the needs of the community for access to informational, educational, cultural, and recreational materials in the following ways:

- A. Selection of materials for the library's collection.
- B. Knowledge of materials available through WCCLS and its member libraries.
- C. Participation in InterLibrary Loan (ILL) services.
- D. Promoting resources available from other agencies.

² Sherwood Public Library (2023). *Library Strategic Planning*. Retrieved from www.sherwoodoregon.gov/library/strategic-plan

POLICY AND OBJECTIVES

Intellectual Freedom

Sherwood Public Library follows the principles documented in the American Library Association's *Code of Ethics*³, *Library Bill of Rights*⁴, *the Freedom to Read Statement*⁵, *The Freedom to View Statement*⁶, and the *Access to Library Resources and Services for Minors*⁷ in versions below. The library upholds the constitutional right of the individual to access information, even though the content may be controversial or unacceptable to others, and for individuals to make their own judgments about information without restricting the freedom of others to read, view, or inquire.

The library does not stand *in loco parentis*, or in the place of a parent. Parents and guardians, not the library, have the responsibility to guide and direct the reading, listening, viewing and Internet browsing choices of their minor children. All cardholders and visitors, regardless of age, have the right to access all materials in the library and library cardholders have the right to borrow any circulating item. While certain library card types may have restrictions on quantity and material types allowed for checkout, this does not eliminate the need for parent and guardian responsibility.

Selection of materials for the library collection does not mean endorsement of any one person or affiliation, perspective, viewpoint, or opinion.

The library collection will be organized, marked, and maintained in a non-judgmental, objective manner to help people find the materials they want. Materials will not be restricted, sequestered, altered, or labeled by the library because of controversy about the author or the subject matter.

Offsite storage at the WCCLS warehouse is used for seasonal shifts of materials (e.g., holiday books), and not in response to controversy or sensitive subject matter. The library collects and retains a variety of archived local history printed materials, some of which are stored in the City's Records room. Due to the specific and unique nature of archival special collections, access is limited. See library staff for more information about viewing these materials.

³ American Library Association (2021). *Code of Ethics*. Retrieved from www.ala.org/tools/ethics

⁴ American Library Association (2019). *Library Bill of Rights*. Retrieved from www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill

⁵ American Library Association (2004). *The Freedom to Read Statement*. Retrieved from www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/freedomreadstatement.

⁶ American Library Association (1990). *The Freedom to View Statement*. Retrieved from www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/freedomviewstatement

⁷ American Library Association (2019). *Access to Library Resources and Services for Minors*. Retrieved from www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/interpretations/minors

Selection Policies

The collection development budget is part of the library's adopted budget; it is considered annually and adjusted according to collection usage patterns, circulation trends, community needs, emerging practices, ongoing learning and professional development, publishing trends, and priorities made through strategic planning.

In making any selection decision, selectors employ the standards of professional librarianship below. Factors are not listed by order of importance, nor is the list exhaustive. Not all factors may apply in every situation and factors are weighed to best serve the community.

Factors for selection:

- Demonstrated or perceived interest, need, or demand by library users or potential users of the item.
- Currency and quality of information.
- Relevance to current trends or events.
- Affirmation of the inherent dignity and rights of every person.
- Relation to the existing local and WCCLS collections.
- Physical design suitable for library use.
- Reputation, qualifications, and competence of the author or publisher.
- Positive critiques and reviews in professional sources.
- Budget, space, and staff capacity limitations.
- Expected ongoing value to library users.
- For various collections there may be additional factors unique to the format or target audience age.

PROCEDURES

Purchasing and display

Materials are generally purchased through vendors with which the library has established relationships for purchasing and processing of materials. These vendor relationships help library staff work efficiently and effectively to manage funds and provide timely service. Alternative vendors will be considered to provide materials otherwise unavailable from our primary sources. Vendor contracts and agreements are reviewed periodically for fiscal responsibility and quality of services provided.

The library acquires materials in a variety of formats, including but not limited to hardcover and paperback books, magazines, newspapers, audio and visual media, electronic games, board games, tools, and gadgets (e.g., Library of Things). Formats may change in response to evolving technology and usage patterns and are reviewed regularly. Some physical formats may be replaced with electronic access. The library selects materials in the formats most appropriate for use by the community, while also considering digital equity goals⁸.

⁸ Sherwood Public Library participates in national Edge Assessments to guide digital equity goals.

While most materials are acquired in English, Sherwood Public Library purchases some materials in other languages relevant to the community. Spanish language materials are purchased for all ages. Additional languages are purchased for youth materials. These collections are intended to expand as the community changes. In addition, the library collects language instruction materials in languages other than English, as well as dictionaries, phrase books, and bilingual works in representative languages.

The library does not purchase textbooks unless their addition to the collection fills a gap in the collection where other materials are not readily available, or in situations when a textbook is the best source for an overview of a subject.

The library may acquire independently published books with content otherwise not obtainable through major publishers. In this instance, selectors still refer to selection factors for guidance.

Within the constraints of available funds and space, the library may acquire multiple copies of popular items. The need to provide duplicate copies is balanced with the library's dedication to providing access to a wide array of information.

Decisions to add or change shelving, incorporate finding aides, and help make the collection more browsable are also part of collection development decisions library staff make to encourage usage and invite discovery. Care is taken to have displays throughout the library that reflect a diverse and inclusive collection.

Collection Maintenance

Selectors are responsible for periodic review of the collections they are assigned. As materials become worn, outdated, damaged, or lost, selectors will determine whether an item should be withdrawn (a.k.a. "weeded" or "deselected") or replaced. The process of withdrawing materials is essential for the maintenance of a dynamic, useful, accurate, appealing, and accessible collection. At times decisions are driven by space needs to allow for new materials, collections, and services.

The decision-making process and factors to withdraw material follows the selection factors above, with the following additional factors:

- Whether the item is still available and can be replaced.
- Whether another item or format might better serve the same purpose.
- Whether there remains sufficient need for the item.
- Whether there is an updated, revised, or newer item that is preferable.
- Whether the content has been determined to be inaccurate.
- Whether the item may serve a unique community need.
- Whether the item has historical or local value.
- Availability of item elsewhere in the cooperative or through interlibrary loan.

Sherwood Public Library staff refer to professional practice for guidance in weeding collections. These include but are not limited to CREW⁹ methods (Continuous Review, Evaluation and Weeding) developed by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission. CREW methods are considered by American Library Association to be a benchmark¹⁰ tool for weeding library collections. Selectors also consider that items in the collection that have been acquired specifically to serve a diverse community may need nuanced analysis that consider usage by smaller audiences.

Suggestions and Donations

The library welcomes patron suggestions for additions to the collection. Suggestions may be provided directly to library staff or via a purchase suggestion form on the library website. The decision to purchase is made according to the selection factors. Alternative solutions to answer the patron's need may be suggested, including InterLibrary Loan from a library outside of WCCLS. InterLibrary Loan is meant to compliment the local collection, not substitute for local collection development.

Donations of materials may be accepted and are subject to the same factors for inclusion in and withdrawal from the collection as purchased materials. Library staff may decide to: add donations to the library's collection, use them for library programs, give them to the Friends of the Sherwood Library for sale or giveaways, or donate them to another library or organization. Materials unfit for the above uses may be recycled or disposed. Guidelines for donations of materials are available on the library's website.

Donations of funds for library materials are welcome. Contact the Library Manager to discuss options. Choices of materials added to the collection are subject to this policy.

Requests to Reconsider

Sherwood Public Library recognizes and respects the right to question selection decisions. A person with concerns about the inclusion, categorization, or exclusion of an item from the collection is encouraged to share their concerns with library staff. This procedure applies regardless of the source of the challenge, whether from a library patron, library or city staff member, volunteer, board member, community member, elected official, or another government employee. Requests to remove or reassign materials from the Sherwood Public Library shall be considered within the context of the principles affirmed in this policy and must come from individuals. Requests and concerns about materials available only through WCCLS or another library's collection will be routed to appropriate staff at that agency.

Designated Sherwood Public Library staff will listen to the requester's concerns during

⁹ Texas State Library and Archives Commission (2012). *CREW: A Weeding Manual for Modern Libraries*. Retrieved from <https://www.tsl.texas.gov/sites/default/files/public/tslac/ld/ld/pubs/crew/crewmeth012.pdf>

¹⁰ American Library Association (2015). *Weeding Library Collections: A Selected Annotated Bibliography for Library Collection Evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/tools/libfactsheets/alalibraryfactsheet15>.

an informal conversation about the specific item or items and may provide context with this policy and other relevant information. Should the concerns still stand, the Library Manager, or designee, will have a further conversation about the concerns and communicate the options available for reconsideration. A formal process may be initiated in writing using the *Requests for Reconsideration of Library Materials* form, made available by designated library staff.

Communication methods and modalities throughout the process may be modified to best suit the requester's needs (e.g., translation or interpreter services, verbal vs. written). Any changes to the communication to the requester described in the process below still require library staff to create a written record of the process and decisions.

The formal review process includes:

- At the coordination of the Library Manager, a Selection Review Committee will review the request for reconsideration and the material. The committee, designated by the Library Manager, will include at least two Sherwood Public Library staff, one Library Advisory Board member, and optionally an additional subject matter expert. The panel must have an odd number of members.
- An item under formal review will not be taken out of the collection while under review. Additional copies of the material will be made available for the Selection Review Committee.
- The Library Manager, or designee, will endeavor to respond to the requester within five (5) business days and to provide a Selection Review Committee decision about the title(s) in question within thirty (30) business days per title. The requester will be informed in writing of an expected timeline of the process. Time required will depend upon the volume of requests for reconsideration (including other requests currently being reviewed), the available staff to respond to the request, and the difficulty in reviewing the title(s).
- Each review will include all members of the committee reading, viewing, or listening to the item, as well as research, consideration of reviews, and usage data.
- City of Sherwood stakeholders (Sherwood Public Library staff, the City of Sherwood Library Advisory Board, City of Sherwood Community Services Director, City Manager, and City Council) will be alerted that the library has received a formal request for reconsideration and the expected timeline.
- The State Library of Oregon and the Oregon Library Association Intellectual Freedom Committee will be consulted. Other local libraries and schools may be alerted to the review process.
- The Review Committee will evaluate if the material meets the objectives of this policy using a scoring matrix that mirrors the factors and principles set out in this policy. Example decisions could be to keep the item in the collection as is, to move the item to another public area of the library if it is determined to be

miscategorized, or to remove the item. Any decision must be supported by this policy and the scoring matrix.

- The requester and above-named City stakeholders will be informed in writing of the Selection Review Committee decision by the Library Manager.

Appeal

The requester may appeal the decision of the Selection Review Committee in writing to the City Manager or designee within 10 days of issuance.

The appeal process includes the following steps:

- The Community Services Director, or designee, will confirm receipt of the appeal and schedule a hearing with the requester and Library Manager.
- The above-named City stakeholders, State Library of Oregon, and the Oregon Library Association Intellectual Freedom Committee will be informed in writing of the appeal by the Library Manager.
- The hearing will be informal. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Community Services Director may affirm the decision or recommend further review.
- The Library Manager will document the hearing in writing as an addendum to the scoring matrix.
- If further review is recommended, the Library Manager will coordinate with the Selection Review Committee to reconvene with at least one additional subject matter expert and consultation with the State Library of Oregon and the Oregon Library Association Intellectual Freedom Committee.
- The process and notification will be the same as the original formal review process. All records will be added as addendums to the original request and scoring matrix.

Any item that has been kept in the collection after a formal review process, including after appeal(s) with the same decision to keep the item in the collection, will not be reviewed again through a formal review process for at least three years.

If an item is formally reviewed and removed, it may be added back to the collection if it is later deemed to meet selection factors. The Library Manager will, for a period of three years from the date of removal, make reasonable efforts to alert the original requester in writing of an item being added back to the collection and share the corresponding selection factors.

The original form, written responses, and any additional related records become part of public record. The specific title(s) included in the request are reported to the State Library of Oregon, the Oregon Library Association Intellectual Freedom Committee, and the American Library Association's Office of Intellectual Freedom.

History

Replaces the Materials Selection Policy from 2006.

Approved by the Library Advisory Board February 20, 2019.

Revised by Library Admin 2022-2023. Draft review by the Library Advisory Board 2/2023.

Reviewed by the State Library of Oregon 2/2023. Reviewed by the OLA EDIA Committee 2/2023.

Legal and City Manager review 2023. Reviewed 5/2023 by Library Advisory Board.

Adopted by City Council _____.