

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
April 24, 2014
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Loe, Reichlin, Stanton, Strodtman, Tillotson, Wheeler

Commission Members Absent: Lee, Puri

Staff: Bacon, Smith, Teddy, Zenner

Guests: None

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

None

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- **Infrastructure “scorecard” overview**

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and noted that Mr. Smith was the case manager for this task and Mrs. Bacon was assisting him. He noted that the purpose of tonight’s meeting was not to come up with a solution or a scorecard that the Commission could use but rather was intended to give the Commissioners an overview of what Boone County’s scorecard looked like and how it is used in their decision-making process. Mr. Zenner also noted that this introduction was likely the beginning of a much broader discussion dealing with the topic of “Adequate Cost Allocation” for infrastructure. He noted, discussing the establishment of a scorecard was recommended by Columbia Imagined and that establishing one may assist in identifying objective criteria that could be used or incorporated into the Commission’s and Council’s consideration of annexation, rezoning, and subdivision requests.

Following his introduction Mr. Zenner turned the meeting over to Mr. Smith and Mrs. Bacon for a detailed presentation of the Boone County scorecard process and its elements. Mr. Smith began his presentation with a PowerPoint slide show that explained the objectives for the evening’s discussion. Mrs. Bacon provided a recap of what Columbia Imagined had to say about the scorecard concept and gave an overview of how the Urban Service Area and Growth Priorities maps could be used in conjunction with the scorecard.

There was general discussion at various points within the presentation among the Commissioners with general questions being asked of staff. It was noted that while the County indicated that it only uses their scorecard as an advisory tool for development requests, its actual application and impact at times can be somewhat different. Mr. Smith confirmed that the County’s scorecard is not part of its regulatory structure.

Mr. Smith noted that not all of the categories within the County scorecard may be appropriate for use within a future City scorecard. He indicated that the City’s scorecard may want to include unique categories that address or assess compliance with the new comprehensive plan or other adopted

documents such as the CIP. Such a system could establish the benchmark by which certain proposals could be required to enter into a development agreement.

Mr. Smith further indicated that a single scorecard may not be appropriate either due to the variety of actions that the Commission considers. While multiple scorecards would likely make a future process more complicated it is something that staff believes should be considered. There was general Commission discussion on this idea; however, the no consensus was reached on how to address this matter.

Mr. Smith concluded his remarks by summarizing how the staff saw the scorecard process being used within the City's planning process. He suggested that discussion was still needed on what types of projects should be covered by the scorecard (discretionary vs non-discretionary) as well as should it be used as an internal evaluation tool during concept reviews and development application evaluation with the results being shared with the Commission as part of the staff report.

Having noted the need for additional discussion, Mr. Smith distributed a questionnaire to the Commissioners and asked them to complete the questions by the next work session meeting. He indicated that the responses would allow staff to begin the process of structuring a City scorecard. Mr. Smith further noted that as the staff moves forward with this project it would engage other City departments that have a stake in infrastructure provision to ensure that the scorecard accurately reflects criteria that would be useful for everyone affected by development. He noted that a final scorecard is anticipated to be put into use by the fall of this year.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business items discussed.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: April 10, 2014 minutes were approved. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:50 p.m.