



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, May 19, 2022  
5:30 PM

Work Session

Conference Rooms  
1A/1B  
Columbia City Hall  
701 E. Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

**Present:** 8 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Robbin Kimbell and Peggy Placier

**Excused:** 1 - Anthony Stanton

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

**Adopt agenda as submitted**

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### May 5, 2022 Work Session

**Attachments:** [Work Session Minutes](#)

April 21, 2022 work session minutes adopted as presented.

**Adopted minutes as submitted**

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

##### A. FY23 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Memo

**Attachments:** [Staff Report to Planning and Zoning Commission](#)  
[CY 23 CIP Project \(Year Funded\)](#)  
[FY23 PW P&Z CIP Presentation](#)  
[FY23 WL P&Z CIP Presentation](#)  
[FY 23 Parks & Rec P&Z CIP Presentation](#)  
[FY23 Utilities \(sewer - storm\) P&Z CIP presentation](#)  
[FY23 PZC CIP Memo \(Final\)](#)

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic. He recapped that the Commission had heard presentations and asked questions of the staff from each City Department responsible for programming CIP projects at the May 5 work session meeting. The CIP presentations contained projects from Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Sanitary Sewer, Stormwater Utility, and Water & Light. There were no Solid Waste CIP projects for the FY23 CIP.

Mr. Zenner provided a draft letter on the overhead screen based upon previous years' letters for the Commission to revise to reflect their thoughts on the current CIP. Mr. Zenner walked through potential language for the letter from his notes of the discussion that the Commission had at the May 5 meeting.

The Commission noted they would like the Solid Waste Utility Staff to attend next year even if there were no projects as they were interested in solid waste's work program. They asked that the project section criteria, and a list of all project that were considered (including those that weren't ultimately selected) prior to the presentations. They would like to have increased transparency on the selection process and how projects were selected and moved up and down in the CIP timeline. There was discussion on what was asked for last year in their letter and how they could better clarify what they would like to be provided within future CIP reviews so as to make a more informed recommendation to the Council.

There was clarification that the Commission was required to review the CIP. There was discussion on how the Commission could best be helpful in making recommendations on projects and selection processes to the Council and how the Council saw the Commission's role in the review process. The role of other stakeholder input and how it impacted projects was also desired to be more upfront and clear. The Commission desired to make meaningful recommendations.

There was also discussion on how the Columbia Imagined Comprehensive Plan was being used in project selection and how to better tighten the transparency pipeline of community input and project funding and timing.

Commissioner's also discussed how the CIP dashboard was designed and used. The Commission desired to have a full database/spreadsheet of project listings as was provided in previous years. It was noted that the CIP dashboard could be exported to a table.

The Commission desired to see broadband internet featured more prominently in the CIP and thought it should become a "Enterprise" service of the City. This was an element of the Comp Plan. There was frustration that the Broadband Task Force had not produced a report before being disbanded. This was an oversight of the CIP. The role of ballot initiatives in CIP programming was also discussed.

Commissioner's expressed the need for better alignment between the Comp. Plan, land use planning, and the CIP. Commissioner's acknowledged that they have insight into the immediate and upcoming impacts of growth and changing development patterns and view their review of the CIP as an opportunity for sharing that insight in order to be more proactive instead of reactive with CIP projects and programming.

The Commission discussed ways to make the presentation and question component with the departments more productive. The discussion component was generally more productive than the presentations over the project listings. If the

list was provided ahead of time, there would be more time for the discussion of why and how projects were needed, funded, or chosen. The Commission said they could give better feedback when they were asking more specific questions.

The Commission revised and re-worded the draft letter to reflect the format they would like to receive information in future CIP reviews. They voted unanimous to include a statement regarding the City's role in the provision of Broadband initiatives. There was wordsmithing to the correspondence to make this point as well as others (see attached letter).

Mr. Zenner said he would send out the final draft of the letter to the Commissioners Friday morning for review. He noted that Commissioners could respond to the draft by the end of Friday after which he would share comments with the Chair. Mr. Zenner stated that the goal was to send the letter to the Finance Department on Monday so that it could be included in the budget retreat packet that the Council would have at the end of the following week.

#### **B. Short-term Rental Snapshot Update**

This item will be discussed at the next meeting (June 9) as the Commission was unable to address the topic due to time constraints.

### **VI. NEXT MEETING DATE - June 9, 2022 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)**

### **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned approximately 7:00 pm

**Motion to adjourn**