

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes**  
**July 22, 2021**  
**Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**I. Call to Order**

Commissioners Present – Burns, Geuea-Jones, Loe, MacMann, Rushing, Carroll, Placier and Kimbell

Commissioners Absent – Stanton

Staff Present –Kelley, Palmer, Teddy, Thompson, and Zenner.

Guests- Lou and McDonald

**II. Introductions**

**III. Approval of Agenda**

Meeting Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

**IV. Approval of Minutes**

July 8, 2021 work session minutes adopted as presented unanimously.

**V. Old Business**

**A. FY 2022 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Review**

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic to the Commission explaining that the guest speakers in attendance are seeking input on the budgetary process of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Mr. Lou explained that the CIP process is different this year for the purposes of improving transparency with the public and City Council. The City has a new budget officer and more changes are anticipated for next year, FY 2023.

The Commission inquired as to what other committees review the CIP and how they do so. Mr. Lou responded that the Audit Committee reviews the CIP and that this was the first year the CIP was looked at on a “priority basis” regarding the needs of the City and each Department. Mr. Zenner and Mr. Lou noted that the CIP is fiscally constrained.

The Commission generally agreed that they felt unprepared to review individual projects and were curious as to what alternative projects were left out. Mr. Lou responded that most project priorities are decided at the department level which the City Manager then approves or denies. Commissioners wanted to be able to explain why certain projects get prioritized over another and how project rankings change from year to year.

Regarding Council’s input, Mr. Zenner stated that the Council looks at scheduling and sequencing of projects in coordination with growth and development in the City. He indicated that this was an area in which the Commission’s input is highly valuable. He commented that planners are viewed as jacks-of-all-trades and this Commission is no different.

The Commission inquired as to how COVID-19 has impacted CIP funding and Mr. Lou replied that last year's funding was impacted but this year's was not – it had rebounded.

Commissioners commented that the 10-year list is largely a wishlist and that it takes many years for a project to get completed once a need is identified and ultimately included in the CIP. Emergency maintenance takes up project funds which may impact low-priority project timelines. An example was given of a sewer project that was included five years ago that is now close to implementation.

Commissioners recommended that other individual boards and commissions review the CIP. It was suggested that the Parks Commission review the Parks and Recreation projects, for example. Commissioners noted these projects do reflect stakeholder input collected from different channels. For example, the sidewalk projects are collected from the Sidewalk Master Plan which has a public engagement component itself. Commissioners wanted to see that commissions were fully populated, meeting regularly, and that they were consulted in the CIP development process.

Mr. Teddy commented that comprehensive planning identifies City-wide needs and the CIP is an implementation tool. Commissioners pointed out that very few neighborhoods are active and that the outspoken groups get their needs prioritized and addressed. Mr. Zenner discussed the West Ash Neighborhood Plan and how it involved a neighborhood planning process with an identification of infrastructure deficiencies and needs. He pointed out that the first step in that process involves significant public outreach. He noted that publicly vetted plans are great at identifying needs but the challenge lies with implementation and funding.

Staff noted that the Parks Department is great at delivering projects in the ballot initiative. Staff and Commissioners agreed the tie of a ballot initiative to parks projects is the critical ingredient in their path to successful implementation.

The Commission still strongly agreed that funding maintenance for existing infrastructure should be a high priority. They felt uncomfortable prioritizing projects in each department as it is not their skillset but did feel comfortable looking at the CIP from a macro or big picture perspective. Commissioners would like to see how the proposed CIP projects align with the comprehensive plan and other specific area plans. The Commission looked forward to seeing how the projects are prioritized in next year's CIP and would like to see how the comprehensive plan and area plans inform the CIP.

The Commission wanted to see additional information for individual projects in the CIP such as stakeholders, what plans were consulted, what category for the comprehensive plan, benefits provided to the public, and how the project was chosen. For transparency to the public, Commissioners wanted project descriptions to be succinct and no longer than a tweet as an example.

Mr. Zenner thanked the Commission, Mr. Lou, and Mr. McDonald for their time. He let the Commission know that Mr. Smith would be presenting on UDC Text Amendments at the next work session. He also indicated that Short Term Rentals would be re-appearing as a discussion item soon.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned approximately 7:01 pm

### **ACTION(S) TAKEN:**

Motion made by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Geuea-Jones, to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion passed unanimously. Made motion by Commissioner Geuea-Jones, seconded by Commissioner Kimbell, to approve the July 8, 2021 work session minutes as presented. The motion passed 7-0 with one abstention.