City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 6, 2020 **5:30 PM**	**Work Session**	**Conference Rms 1A-1B** **Columbia City Hall** **701 E. Broadway**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Present: 8 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Brian Toohey, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll and Sharon Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - Joy Rushing

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Zenner introduced Adam Kruse as the representation from the Law Department for the meeting. He said Mr. Kruse was the City's ADA Coordinator and an attorney.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Meeting Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

Move to adopt agenda as presented

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 23, 2020 Work Session

Ms. Carroll asked for revisions to the July 23 work session minutes indicating she was not advocating for less information to be provided in the infographic, but what she meant was that a pull out graphic for the section about mobility and connectivity be added to the infographic in addition to keeping the other information for all elements. The infographic as revised with this pull-out detail generally reflected what she had desired to see. Ms. Bacon offered that this revision may be included in the August 6 minutes if that was acceptable. August 6 work session minutes were adopted as presented.

Move to approve July 23 minutes as amended pursuant to clarification captured in August 6 minutes

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Comprehensive Plan 5-year Update - Follow up Discussion

Mr. Kelley presented a recap of the previous discussion. He highlighted the revision to the infographic to have a call-out as Ms. Carroll had mentioned. He said he would ask for discussion on the individual surveys geared towards subject-matter experts (boards and commissioners, civic groups, etc.) first. He went through each question and the format of the survey. He said he had reviewed the questions from the phase 3, 4 and 5 phases of the Comprehensive Plan from public outreach in 2012 and 2013 and used the information to inform the general survey questions. He

viewed this outreach effort as a progression of the previous outreach and a way to build upon that outreach while engaging new groups and individuals in the planning process.

He further described the revisions to the current surveys were based upon the feedback from the Commissioners at the last meeting. He said staff worked on clarity- simple and more user-friendly terms, a better introduction that included how long the survey would take, revised the demographic questions, and revised how the action item questions started by adding the policy to which the action item was connected to. There was discussion on how to link the infographic so it would be easily accessible while taking the questions. There was also discussion on how the way the survey was now set up. Commissioners commented it may now allow for assessment of how priorities have changed for the public and stakeholder groups since the previous public outreach.

Commissioners recommended that the question about the role of the Planning and Zoning Commission (what would you like to know more about) should be revised to be the Community Development Department or City Planning for growth and development rather than just the Commission's role. There was discussion of how to handle open ended responses that were in conflict - there would be information gained but how to use it? Staff indicated that this may require preparing additional surveys or questions to drill down to understand friction points and conflicting priorities as well as looking critically on the Plan's objectives and the impacts of specific priorities and action items.

There was general consensus that staff would revise the survey to reflect Commissioner's comments and then have them prepared for distribution. It was noted that the anticipated launch date would be at the end of August to early September.

Mr. Kelley displayed the general public survey and said many of the clarity, organization and structural changes made to the other survey had also been made to this survey to reflect feedback from the previous meetings. He said staff was also listening to the Commissioner's comments with an ear on how the Status Report itself should be revised to address Commission feedback.

Mr. Kelley said the general survey asked about public outreach in the past and if or how individuals had participated. It also sought to assess individual's basic understanding of the Comp Plan and how they would like to learn more. The survey also asked questions to get a sense of what forms/types of public input opportunities would be most useful (based upon what was used in the past) now given the limitations of public gatherings. Staff noted that outreach would need to be adaptive given the pandemic was changing the nature of public engagement, but also provided an opportunity for opening the door to innovative and technology-based options.

There was discussion on the need to ensure outreach was respectful of all abilities, took into account available resources and challenges to gaining access to

technology, and incorporated a variety of outreach methods so it be as widely inclusive as possible. There was discussion to be clearer about what participation in previous public input meant - could just be taking a survey. There was a desire to allow individuals several options to choose from since a variety of input types occurred and should be counted.

There was discussion of measuring separately outreach methods and outreach participation in terms of satisfaction or critique by the public. There was a difference in being satisfied with the plan, or planning in general (or not) and why and how the City could improve on either measurement.

Staff provided an update on the upcoming public outreach and what was anticipated to be socially distant options. This topic would be discussed more at the next meeting. Staff noted there would be a "teaser" announcement about the upcoming survey activity in the August City Source that is included with all utility bills. Staff noted that efforts to distribute information through the "Friday Folders" with elementary school students were no longer centralized at the main office, but had become moved online and specific to each school. Staff would ask CPS what was possible in utilizing this new communication tool given reaching 10,000+ parents of children was believed an excellent way to reach a lot of families in the community who may not otherwise participate. Staff also noted the school district had been a helpful outreach partner and that schools had been the site of many of the public meetings previously.

Commissioners noted that the "general" survey appeared to be heavily targeted to individuals who participated in the development of the Plan ten years ago. Commissioners expressed a desire to see more broad input in this survey verses focusing on a narrow group, especially as the City grows between 2-3% annually and many residents have moved here in recent years. Commissioners noted they wouldn't want to leave anyone out or make them feel not welcome to participate and provide feedback now.

Several Commissioners recommended structural changes to make the surveys more welcoming and inclusive. There was general discussion on restructuring the survey to start with more open and encouraging questions designed to find out what brought them to Columbia and what they like best about it. The survey could then transition into gaining their feedback on priorities for plan implementation. Mr. Kelley said the questions about past participation could be expandable and put further down in the survey so that if someone did not previously participate they aren't bogged down with questions directed at understanding that participation. Those questions could be skipped if someone was not involved previously.

Commissioners cautioned that the survey design should not expect the participant to have vast knowledge of the Plan to take the survey and to have options to link to the Plan from the survey. Staff would work on imbedding links to the Plan website and the infographic in a structurally simple way. There were suggestions for the community planning and prioritization questions be ranked 1-7 on level of importance to the respondent, have the respondent pick their top three, or rank

the questions “high, medium, low” so as to have the priorities emerge more clearly.

There was discussion on how the demographic questions could be tweaked to better fit Census categories. There was discussion on utilizing the Council and other outreach methods if a particular ward or citizen group was not well represented in survey responses. Mr. Kruse was asked to review the demographic questions. He gave feedback that there needed to be opt-out option for the questions (“prefer not to answer/identify” etc.) and to make sure surveys could be taken anonymously. He gave suggestions on how to be as inclusive as possible and get the broadest feedback.

There was discussion on how to measure values based questions and see how community values and priorities have shifted or remain the same from the past outreach efforts. Mr. Zenner said the answers would help to measure community changes and that measuring survey responses during the Comp Plan to those expressed during the previous Visioning public input was helpful as a litmus test.

There was discussion on how to indicate the 2013 priorities while asking for new prioritization. The survey should indicate these aspects were prioritized in 2013, but not give the previous priority assignment so as not to bias the new responses based upon past prioritization in efforts to see the differences in prioritization. It was suggested that the text could be revised to state “these elements were identified as priorities” instead of the current wording. Word-smithing the surveys was discussed with the priorities to ensure they were more easily understood. It was also noted that the differences in priorities was something very important to the staff to measure as a metadata measurement, but not something the public would be as interested in knowing as a metric given the public was likely more interested in stating their priorities.

There was general consensus that the survey was nearly ready to go out and that staff should take the feedback from the Commissioners and revise accordingly. The Commission indicated its support of staff efforts and was generally ready to move forward.

There was general consensus staff could work more directly with Chairman Loe on the memos that would go with the surveys rather than presenting to the Commission as a whole for approval. There was desire to get the surveys out by the end of August or early September.

There was additional discussion of outreach options, such as having a computer with Zoom capabilities available. Outside venues were discussed. The need to keep online meetings small with a moderator was discussed. Press releases were also discussed. There would be overlap with meetings of various types during the survey window and feedback would be rolling and public input options would be evaluated and modified along the way to be responsive. Staff noted it was working with the City Channel to produce a short overview video relating to the Comp. Plan and its purpose which could serve as an additional outreach tool/educational tool.

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE - August 20, 2020 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:58 pm

Move to adjourn