



CITY OF ST. HELENS PLANNING DEPARTMENT
M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Jacob A. Graichen, AICP, City Planner
RE: Proactive Planning Commission framework version 2.0
DATE: May 3, 2022

Attached to this memo is a new version, as emailed to staff on April 27, 2022, of proposed proactive commission initiative rules that was worked on by a non-quorum group of Commissioners (Hubbard, Pugsley and Toschi) following last month's discussion.

This version includes suggested edits and comments by staff following review on May 2, 2022.

This does not include the discussion last month about agenda items. For example, should there be a "placeholder" agenda item with a time limit or not? "Placeholder" means always present regardless if there is an item to discuss or not. The minutes from last month (to be approved this month) and the Planning Commission's draft annual report to Council memo provide a good overview of last month's discussion and are both part of this month's meeting packets.

The latest draft of rules establishes a completeness determination by staff with a timeline for submittal. If the Commission concurs with this approach, the proactive item would be on the agenda only when we receive a proper and timely proposal. This could just go under the DISCUSSION ITEMS portion of the agenda or another new title like PROACTIVE ITEMS or whatever the group thinks it should be called. If this is the case, a "placeholder" agenda item would not be necessary.

CITY OF ST. HELENS OREGON

PLANNING COMMISION PROACTIVE PROCEDURES

- 1) Any Planning Commissioner can request that an agenda item include a proactive matter for Commission consideration (“Proactive Item”). In order to place a “Proactive Item” on the Planning Commission Agenda, the proposing Commissioner shall at least 10 business days before the week prior to the scheduled Planning Commission meeting, submit the “Proposed Item” for Staff review and comment.
- 2) The “Proactive Item” submitted to Staff must shall contain the following elements:
 - a. The proposed Proactive Item must shall identify in the presented materials how the item or matter for Commission study, planning, approval, action, proposed legislation, or other is within the Jurisdiction of the Planning Commission and must shall identify specifically which provisions of the St. Helens Municipal Code Section 2.08.080 or 17.36.020(6) is/are applicable for the purposes of Jurisdiction;
 - b. The proposed Proactive Item submission should shall outline the reasons the Commissioner believes the Proactive Item is something the Planning Commission should undertake;
 - c. The Proactive Item submission should outline process of study, investigation, or decision making that the Commissioner suggests the Planning Commission adopt. The opportunity and participation of Public review, participation and comment should be outlined for the process.
 - d. The Proactive Item submission should discuss a timeline for Planning Commission decision and budget.
- 3) Having timely received a proposed Proactive Item submission from a Planning Commissioner, Staff shall review the proposed Proactive Item submission for compliance with 1 and 2 and place it on the Agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting if 1 and 2 are met. Staff may comment upon the Proactive Item.
- 4) The Planning Commission may take up the Proactive Item on the Agenda as it sees fit. In considering a Proactive Item, the Commission shall include as a basis for its determination:
 - a. Determination of Jurisdiction per 2.a and reasons per 2.b.
 - b. Alignment with the goals and projects identified in the City Council adopted strategic plan. If a Proactive Item is not related to a project identified in the strategic plan that specifically pertains to Planning Department staff, whether and how much the Proactive Item will detract from Planning Department staff’s ability to act on the strategic plan item(s) within the strategic plan period combined with other necessary tasks staff must already perform must be evaluated.
 - c. What level of staff involvement will be necessary for the Proactive Item to advance and what actual staff availability is anticipated based on workload trends and overall staffing within the confines of the city budget? Research and reporting on that research is an example of an activity that can be

Commented [JG1]: This means about two weeks before the week of the PC meeting. Because agendas are due about a week before the meeting, this is not much time. Because often things are hectic with multiple deadlines this could result in frequent insufficient staff consideration, review, comment, etc.

For land use applications, code gives us 30 days to deem an application complete. Often, something is submitted, and it takes more than a week to start reviewing it because of the many other things staff is already engaged in. Based on this, the lead time should be about 37 days (30 days + one week) to ensure “completeness” before packets are due.

However, 30 days is simpler to manage/track and may be feasible and is worth discussing.

This is also question of how “raw” the proactive item request should be in the agenda.

Commented [JG2]: Ideally, there would be some staff input, but this can vary greatly depending in the nature of the item, and the personality or aptitude of the commissioner.

This brings up a question of how much material the item includes (e.g., 1 page v. 50 pages). And what if several commissioners are vying for separate proactive items simultaneously?

Should the Councilor who is the commission’s liaison be included here too? When is their input, if at all?

Staff “comment” could be considered inconsistent with the last sentence of 3.

Commented [JG3]: This seems overkill for the submittal stage for commission consideration. Seems details would be worked out after the commission agrees to pursue something.

Commented [JG4]: Like “c” before it, this seems like a lot to just pitch an idea. Also seems like a lot for a commissioner who may not know how to answer these without assistance.

conducted by Commissioners that minimize staff inclusion and helps preserve staff's ability to conduct daily work tasks and other necessary priorities.

- d. Will there be any expenses and if so, are there available funds in the city's adopted budget for anticipated expenditures?
- e. The proposed Proactive Item is not a result of conflict of interest or bias of any Commissioner.

RUSS HUBBARD SUGGESTED ENDING AT ITEM 4.

- ~~5) If the Commission is persuaded the item is something it would like to explore, the Commission would vote to do so. The Commission may also vote to reject the item for consideration as a Commission, or it may request the item be refined and presented at a future meeting;~~
- ~~6) The Commission would discuss how it wants the item to be explored, and when and what information it would like to have at a further meeting;~~
- ~~7) An item would move forward at a pace on the Agenda as dictated by the Commission;~~
- ~~8) Public Comment and input, proper notice, and public participation need to be included in all Commission decisions, recommendations, and proposed Legislation;~~
- ~~9) Once an agenda item works its way through the Planning Procedures, formal adoption of a resolution can take place for communication to the Council.~~

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.25", Tab stops: 1.5", Left

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Commented [JG5]: I agree with Russ. The Commission voting or being majority in favor of pursuing something is already a given.

Discussion about how and timing is also a given, or dictated by several factors, both internal and external.

Public inclusion is already baked in city (Comprehensive Plan) and state (Statewide Planning Goal 1) policy.

Finally, how something is adopted will vary. Some things may not be subject of adoption.