

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
December 4, 2014
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Loe, Lee, Reichlin, Strodtman, Tillotson
Commission Members Absent: Puri, Russell, Stanton,
Staff: MacIntyre, Smith, Teddy, Zenner

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- **Infrastructure Scorecard Update**

Mr. Smith gave an overview of the purpose for the evening's presentation and explained the process that staff would follow in developing the final scorecard. He also explained that he had been working with other departments about the criteria that would be evaluated as part of the scorecard and desired to have the Commission confirm that the departments he had been meeting with were the right groups and the issues to be evaluated were correct or if there were other groups or issues that need to be explored.

Mr. Smith explained that the process of developing the scorecard was seen as containing two distinct parts. First, were services to be evaluated (i.e. the scorecard itself) and second was determining ways of allocating the costs associated with providing/installing those services (i.e. Council policies).

Ms. Burns and Ms. Loe noted that it may be valuable to have the Office of Sustainability added to the list of departments to engage. It was believed that their input could be valuable in implementing several goals and objectives of Columbia Imagined. There was discussion on this suggestion and Mr. Smith noted that he would follow-up. Mr. Smith noted; however, that it was unclear at this point how their contributions could be incorporated into the proposed scorecard since many of the issues they focus on were likely to be addressed as part of the Development Code re-write that was underway.

Mr. Smith also mentioned that he was aware of other agencies that have raised ideas that may need to be considered for incorporation into the scorecard. However, the ideas offer were often focused on "soft" infrastructure which may be difficult to gauge or quantify. As a result, the "soft" infrastructure issues were not given much weight in the scorecard that staff was developing. There was discussion on this topic; however, no consensus was reached as to what "soft" items should be included in the scorecard.

There was Commission discussion on what techniques would be used to determine how much time would be given for comments on infrastructure needs. The discussion focused on what groups would be contacted for information/opinions/ideas and how this information would be collected and then weighed. Staff expressed concern that involving too many organizations would compromise the usefulness of the scorecard as a way of evaluating projects and offering objective evaluations.

Engaging a broader group of individuals; however, was noted as being a possibility when the second part of the scorecard process began. Looking at ways to fund infrastructure would be something that multiple viewpoints could be useful for. Mr. Lee indicated that this was previously dealt with when the Infrastructure Task Force (ITF) was established. Mr. Smith noted that he had reviewed the material produced by the ITF and that it would

provide a launching-off point for the future discussion on how to address the question of adequate cost allocation.

Having discussed fully the general categories of the material to be included in the scorecard and the departments/organizations to be engaged, Mr. Smith sought confirmation from the Commission that the basic framework was acceptable. The Commission agreed that the items listed as to be included in the scorecard were acceptable. They did not desire to include those items listed as not desired on the scorecard.

Given the Commission's acceptance of the items to be evaluated and reviewed, Mr. Smith requested that the Commission consider how or what the scorecard could be tied to. He suggested that the City's GIS could provide an overall rating for specific parcels or areas that can be used as an early evaluation tool. He noted that the County currently has a similar rating process. This evaluation opportunity could be useful in directing those interested in developing to areas where infrastructure services already exist; thereby reducing negative land use impacts.

There was general discussion on this idea. The Commissioner's agreed that to pursue developing some type of "city-wide" evaluation would be valuable in their decision making as well as in providing future developers with a better understanding of where development would be less costly. Mr. Smith indicated that he would engage the City's GIS staff to begin work on this project and would report back at a future work session.

Mr. Smith also noted that based on the Commission's confirmation of the items for inclusion in the scorecard he would begin to finalize work on the evaluation instrument and the ratings. This effort would require involvement of the identified departments/agencies that were discussed this evening and that a final product would likely be available at approximately the same time, if not, shortly after the GIS-driven "city-wide" evaluation.

OLD BUSINESS

- Work Program Status – status update

No report given

ACTION(S) TAKEN: November 20, 2014, minutes were approved. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:50 p.m.