

Community Forum Meeting
February 24, 2005
7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
Moderator, Carol Elsen

Moderator, **Carol Elsen** began the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and took roll:

Emma Dickinson – Bill Earhart
Farviews/Pattee Canyon –Celeste River
Franklin to the Fort – Jerry Tahija
Grant Creek – John Hendrickson
Heart of Missoula–absent
Lewis & Clark– Jon Wilkins
Lower Rattlesnake– Carol Elsen
Moose Can Gully—
Miller Creek– absent
Northside– absent
Westside– John Couch
Riverfront– absent
Rose Park–absent
South 39th – Mike Williams
Southgate Triangle–Hans Christiansen
University District–Jan Hoem
Upper Rattlesnake–absent
City Council Representative – Clayton Floyd
Neighborhood Liaison—Ruth Brennan Anderson

Others Present

Jim Nugent, City Attorney

Quorum

It was announced that a quorum was present.

Adoption of Agenda

Hans made a motion to approve the agenda. *Jon Wilkins* seconded the motion. The agenda passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Public Comment

Sheila Mischke wants to help get Riverfront N.C. going.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of January 27, 2004: *Jon Wilkins* made a motion to approve the minutes. *Hans Christiansen* seconded the motion. The minutes passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Special Orders

None

Announcements

Jon Wilkins: Pyramid Printing will give each Neighborhood Council \$50 off of the printing cost if the NC runs an ad for Pyramid Printing in the NC newsletter. Also working with Towne Mailer on a similar deal, but they have not responded yet. Just tell Pyramid Printing when you go in with your newsletter that it is for a NC and leave a business card size space for them for the ad.

Hans reports for Ruth on Moose Can Gully's re-organization meeting and resolution of the South 39th St. boundary issue.

Presentations

None

Committee Reports

3030 Committee

●1. South 39th St. boundary issue: **Hans**—Ruth and Hans attended South 39th St. NC meeting last night. Described Jeff Stevens' history that Jeff presented at the NC meeting. South 39th St. NC proposed a new boundary line that Moose Can Gully will address at their meeting. **Clayton** reminded the CF that after each NC votes on the boundary then the issue comes back to CF for approval.

●2. Mentoring NCs: **Jon**—Moose Can Gully, with Carson Robinson spear heading the effort getting the NC going again. Carson got a newsletter out. Speaker will be there to talk about the Lolo Peak ski area. The general meeting is set for March 2nd, 7pm at Chief Charlo. Next big project is with Sheila Mischke to help get Riverfront NC going.

Extraordinary Events Committee

No report.

Outstanding Neighborhood Volunteer of the Year: **Celeste**—reports that committee met to discuss the one submission and also discussed possibility of reopening nominations and ultimately decided to move forward with the nomination provided. Marilyn Marler on S. 8th St. W. in Franklin to the Fort NC is the recipient. She has helped get public participating in NC and developed their website. Committee felt that the work that Marilyn has done for the neighborhood and NC was worthy. Committee is sorry that there were not more nominations and hope that next year people will be inspired to submit more nominations so that even more people can be honored. She will be honored next month at City Council and Community Forum.

Neighborhood Project Fund Grant Committee

Jon: Committee met two weeks ago. We have 6 applicants and committee has some follow up questions for the applicants. Committee will meet again.

Unfinished Business

●1. Glen Eagle sewer issue. **Clayton:** Referral is still sitting on the PAZ Committee held in committee list. I am hopeful that we will take off the zoning part of the issue in the next couple of weeks. Second part of the issue is the sewer side of the issue. Clayton, Don Nicholson, Steve King (City Engineer), Mr. Nugent, Mr. Loomis (OPG), and the property owners with their attorney met Friday. Initially proposed that the Sewer Development Account be used to extend a trunk line up to the Glen Eagle Subdivision. Mr. King's problem with that proposal was that it was not a wise use of public funds. Second proposal, property owners would reimburse the City, City would in fact put the trunk line in with an advance of the funds from that account, but the advance would be reimbursed at 50% or \$250,000. Total estimated cost of the project is \$500,000. This way the developer is meeting part of the obligation for sewer they will pay for the full amount within the subdivision itself plus ½ of the trunk line. This has been in litigation once. County lost. But the approved agreement was missing some important details. This is a great way to resolve the problem. Protecting the aquifer and anticipating future development. Right now it is between Clayton, Mr. Nicholson, people from administration to work out the details to everyone's agreement and bring it back to Public Works Dept. and get something voted. Will try to meet with the Mayor.

Sheila Mischke: is the developer paying ½ the cost or are they going to levy an SID on each lot to be paid through taxes. **Clayton:** The way it was proposed was that of the 93 homes approved through the PUD \$250,000 divided between the 93 works out to about \$2,840 per house that they would pay in addition to the normal \$1,400 hook up fee. **Hans:** is very pleased to see that things have been really happening on the issue once CF got involved. **Clayton:** Hopefully this will get us past the litigation grid lock.

●2. Brainstorm future CF topics/agenda items that help implement CF Goals & Action Plan (how can CF increase participation in City process). **John Couch:** This topic recently came up in the paper, so the timing is right to address the topic. We have not been getting a lot of ideas. Maybe we can build on the successes with the Glen Eagle sewer issue. We need some input and ideas from CF members and NCs. **Clayton:** The conservation committee will need to decide how to use the parcels that are aside for parks pursuant to subdivision laws that the City holds the deed to. This would be a good topic for discussion at the neighborhood level. We should be addressing this issue more aggressively. **Jon:** How can NCs receive information about which of these park parcels are in their neighborhood? **Clayton:** City can provide that information. **Hans:** Each NC should take it on themselves to get that information. Who would the NCs talk to, to follow up on whether or not developers are meeting the standards that the developer told the City he was going to meet? **John Couch:** Going to OPG with questions would be an option. **Carol:** How can we follow up on getting the park site information to the NCs? **Clayton:** Willing to email Donna at Parks & Rec. with that request. **Carol:** Maybe we could get the information at the next CF meeting? March 24th. **Jon:** Answering Hans' question; go to OPG to start. **Hans:** If the City gives the developer a variance and the developer modifies that, do we have any recourse? **Clayton:** Variance is granted by the Board of Adjustment. If they have a PNC or a Density Bonus or a

PUD, what recourse do you have? OPG will review that item if they receive a complaint. But there is no funding for OPG to go out and actually follow up. **Hans:** Complaints or questions by the neighborhood would get OPG to look at it better? **Clayton:** Absolutely. Describes an example at Mount/14th development where he asked OPG to take a look at the project to see that it met code and OPG went to the site. **Jan:** Those parcels that are set aside from sub-divisions are any of them large enough for building on for Habitat for Humanity? **Clayton:** Some of the parcels would be suitable for that. **Carol:** Summarizes brainstorming discussion. **Celeste** remembers a presentation by Donna Gaukler on those parcels.

●3. Affirm election of 2 new CFLT members to comply with CF bylaws. **Ruth:** John Hendrickson and Freddi Thompson were the nominees last month. **Jon** makes motion to elect the nominees to the CFLT. **Celeste** seconds the motion. Motion carries.

●4. Clarification of notice from OPG: **Jon Wilkins:** Mike Barton from OPG asked Jon about the request after reading the minutes of the last meeting. Jon asks Ruth to formally ask someone from OPG to come to next meeting to discuss notification. **Ruth:** Has emailed Mike Barton and Cindy Klette are aware of the CF interest and are interested in being at the CF. **Jerry:** Ruth, before you ask anyone it should be brought up at the CFLT meeting to see if everyone actually wants a presentation, rather than one person deciding this on their own. **Ruth:** Refers to last month's CF minutes showing a motion and second for someone from OPG to present to CF. **Celeste:** At the BOA meeting last night there was a variance request in her neighborhood that she did not get notice of that variance application. Maybe someone else did. Maybe the practice has not been to send out notices of things coming before the BOA. Celeste would like to see each NC getting notice of things going before the BOA. **Carol:** We would like to know how those notices are sent out, so we know where to look for them. **Clayton:** There are 3 ways you can get that information. Currently, there is not a requirement on OPG to notify NCs or CF. On Sundays, there are advertisements and read the legals to stay informed. The City website does have an announcement of the agendas for the PB and BOA and most City boards. Weekly, check with OPG yourself. Remember that this option does take staff time that the other two options do not. **Jon:** Reads from last month's minutes regarding the request to have OPG present at CF.

New Business

- 1. CF Small Project Fund Grant Application (for Outstanding Neighborhood Volunteer of the Year Award). **Hans:** Each year for the Outstanding Volunteer Award we ask for a small grant to fund an award to be used on a project in that volunteer's neighborhood. **Jon** makes motion to approve the grant. **Celeste** seconds the motion. None opposed. Motion carries.
- 2. Franklin to the Fort NC Small Project Fund Grant Application: **Jerry**—\$200 small grant to be used to purchase sandwich boards. Want to purchase 3 this year and 3 next year. **Hans** makes motion to accept application. **Jon** seconds the motion. **Celeste:** Request small grant balance. **Ruth:** Will email everyone with the information. None opposed. Motion carries.

- 3. Discussion of any recommended budget change. **Ruth:** Reminds CF that the City Clerk's budget is due March 11th; any CF budget change recommendation need to be given to the City Clerk by March 1st. **Jon:** Would like to see the Neighborhood Liaison position be full time. Would like to see another \$200 be added to each NC budget. We've never had an increase in our budgets since the NCs started. Mailing newsletters costs more and more all of the time. \$800 is not enough to run an organization for one year. **Celeste:** Agrees with both recommendations. A number of neighborhoods now are requesting a \$200 small project grant. Most of those seem to be for newsletters, sandwich boards, or some other way to communicate with the neighbors. This also shows that the \$800 is not enough. The Neighborhood Liaison position requires much more than a half time position can allow them to do. **Jon makes motion** to ask for a full time Neighborhood Liaison and a \$200 increase in each NC budget. **Jerry:** Thinks the neighborhood budget should be increased. Does not think that the Neighborhood Liaison position should be full time. Talked to Ruth after the CFLT meeting, if the position is made full time, Ruth will not take the position and so you will have to hire another person. Would like to see to separate motions one on the NC budget and one on the Neighborhood Liaison position. **Jon:** I will separate the motions. **Ruth:** I would not be able to accept a full time position personally. Believes that the position should be full time. **Clayton:** There are some people that a part-time position does work well for them. Describes another future option of ½ time FTE. **Celeste seconds the motion** for increasing each NC budget \$200. No discussion. None opposed. **Motion carries.** **John Hendrickson:** Can we word the Neighborhood Liaison motion to state that we want either two ½ time or 1 full time? **Clayton:** When it goes in the budget it needs to be either, or. **Jon:** Part of the problem last year had been when things came up on Fridays or the afternoons & would have to wait until the following week to get answers and that created problems. **John Couch:** Agrees with Jon that having someone in Liaison's office everyday of the week working on the issues that the CF comes up with. Like bringing up NCs that have fallen behind or bringing on new ones; there is a lot of work there. The ultimate goal is to have that office open for 40 hours a week and working on the issues and our concerns. **Ruth:** Feels that the CF should be concerned with making a decision to make the CF and NCs stronger. Don't let my being in the room be a source of awkwardness. The ultimate goal is to make proposals that you as a group feel will make the program stronger. **Jon:** It should be a full time position with one person. It is more difficult to run something when it is divided between two people. The study commissions said that the NCs should be stronger. One way to make it stronger is to have a full time Liaison. **Jon makes a motion** to have a full time Neighborhood Liaison. **Jerry:** Thinks Ruth does more than we should expect. Everyone should read Section 8, Section 1.1808 paragraph (e) of Ordinance 3030 what the City expects of the Liaison. Instead of doing a lot of extra work that the CF should be doing ourselves she would have enough time to do her duties. There is nothing in 3030 that says she should be taking minutes. **John Couch seconds the motion.** **John Hendrickson:** How hard was it to fill the position at half time and how hard would it be to find a competent person for a full time position. **Clayton:** There were some very qualified individuals in the last set of interviews. Would it be any harder to fill it full time? Probably not. **Jon:** Reads from Ordinance 3030 the Neighborhood Liaison obligations, seems like a lot to do for one ½

time person. **Jan**: If it were a 40 hour week job, would your time be filled? **Ruth**: Oh, yes. In order to do the position properly, helping the CF and NCs implement their action plans, I cannot get that far half-time, full-time is necessary to achieve all of those goals. **Celeste**: Could you imagine having a half-time position and having a half-time assistant that was in the office when you weren't; like a time share position? **Ruth**: Looking at it from a job security perspective, I think it could work. However, I think the other option would be for one full time person. There would be enough administrative type duties that another person could handle. **Celeste**: We need to have the position of the Liaison be full time so that important work is not set aside because there is not time to do it. **John Hendrickson**: In the budget, is it one full time position or is it and/or? **Clayton**: You are probably going to need to put it forward as one. So that you can vote this, maybe you can make two different motions. **Jon**: **Calls for the question**. None opposed. **Carol**: Takes the vote on Jon's motion to increase Neighborhood Liaison position to full time. **Motion carries**. Jerry Tahija and Bill Earhart opposed. **John Hendrickson makes a motion** to propose a budget change for adding a ½ time administrative assistant to become effective at the failure of the motion for a one full time Neighborhood Liaison. **Jan seconds the motion**. **Jon** will not support that because it weakens the first motion. **John Couch**: If the first motion goes to the budget committee, can the committee decide to instead add a half time assistant? **Clayton**: The motion will go to Marty, and she will decide what to put in her budget that would go before the budget committee of the whole for consideration. It is still within the power of any member sitting on the budget committee of the whole to make that particular item. Items can also be put on the tickler list. **Celeste**: This motion gives Marty or others considering the budget other things to consider. **Jon**: So for whatever reason, if the motion for full time Liaison does not get funded, would we still have an opportunity to say then we want an assistant? **Clayton**: You can always come to me and ask me to put it on the tickler list. **Jon**: I think we should do that instead of the 2nd motion, otherwise it weakens our position. **Clayton**: Other departments may also be interested in filling a ½ FTE. The budget process moves very quickly. **Jan**: Did this request make it to Marty last year? (yes) And turned down? (yes) then it is probably good to have a request that involves less money in our back pocket. **Jon**: Encourages the CF members that do want the position to be full time to go to the meeting when the finance committee meets. **Carol**: Takes the vote on John Hendrickson's motion. **Motion fails**. Celeste, Hans, Bill, Jerry in favor. **Clayton** will put it back in as a tickler item as a half time enhancement administrative assistant if it fails.

- 4. Discussion of proposed amendments to Ordinance 3030. **Hans**: Clarifies that the vote next month will be on what to recommend to City Council, because it is City Council that has the authority to vote on implementing changes. **John Couch**: If Section 4E) removing language "property owners" makes the section consistent with Section 2A); would it be alright to make it consistent to include the language "property owners" in 2A)? **Hans**: That would be up to the group. **John Couch**: Does not want "property owners" taken out. Would like to see the NCs with a more inclusive mind set. Property owners in my neighborhood have a keen interest in what is happening in the neighborhood. If the proposal is just to make the sections consistent would like to see "property owners" added to 2A). **Hans**: taking "property owners" out would exclude

some people. Some property owners are owners of rental properties or apartment houses. **Clayton:** When neighborhood councils were formed it was to be as inclusive as possible of those folks who live within the boundaries of the NC with the exception of business people and churches. The words "property owner" would have been synonymous with home owner. If "property owner" is going to be included would like to see the term defined more clearly. **Jim Nugent:** The Charter refers to all residents within the boundaries of the neighborhood district shall be eligible to serve on Neighborhood Councils. The City Charter itself does not actually talk about property owners. It is not really a legal decision. There are pro and con arguments. The CF has to decide what they want to recommend to the Council. **John Couch:** Is still in favor of language of "property owners." In the Northside/Westside neighborhood there are mostly renters. A lot of those houses are owned by people that don't live in the neighborhood and we want them involved in our neighborhood, they are vital. **Celeste:** How do we track the "property owners" down for mailings? Also, they are like a business owner and so might want to know what is happening in the neighborhood. **Clayton:** It is important to define membership for the purpose of voting privilege. It may become difficult to establish that privilege if you can't prove that you're a member of that NC. **Hans:** The concern for opening it up to property owners is if you have a property owner that owns 8, 10, or 12 different apartments does he get 8, 10, or 12 votes or just one. How would that be handled. **Jan:** It could end up with a property owner and a resident having two votes for one residence. Some neighborhoods might not like having the balance shift that way. **Jon:** Supports the proposal set forth by Hans. **Jerry:** Will support the proposed amendment. In Franklin to the Fort NC they are dealing with infill. For the most part these are property owners that do not live in the neighborhood and they are changing drastically how the neighborhood looks. If a person wants a vote in the area he should at least have to live in the area. **John Couch:** Jerry would you also exclude business owners? **Jerry:** I would not. **Bill Earhart:** Ultimately it is the property owner who is responsible for the taxes that drive everything that the NC and City Council does. If they are paying the taxes they should have a vote.

- 5. Discussion of proposed amendments to CF bylaws. **Jerry:** Regarding 6.3 want to change that to majority vote. **Hans:** regarding 4.3 was changed through the City Clerk's office. **Ruth:** This change in the bylaws is intended to make it consistent with the change proposed to 3030. **Jerry:** Item 5.3 we want to change that the CFLT will meet two weeks in advance because that is what the practice has been. **John Couch:** regarding 6.4 how does that work with the vote? **Jerry:** Some people would like the alternates sitting at the table if there is room. In the past only one person could vote. **Clayton:** if both the primary and the alternate were at the table, the primary would be the one voting. **Ruth:** Clarifies that the proposed change in section 3. addresses who the one voting member is. **Hans:** Wants the alternate to feel more included in the CF operation. **Ruth:** Jim's input was that if the intention is for the alternate to get to participate, but not vote the current language does not clarify this. **Jon:** Concern is that the CF meeting will get long if alternates are also participating in the discussion. We should find a way though to include the alternates. **Celeste:** What would be the problem with inviting them to sit in the audience chairs? **Clayton:** If you are going to amend the participation language in you should do that now. **Ruth:** We would need to do that tonight. **Jon:**

Makes a motion that the alternates be encouraged to attend and sit in the audience. **Ruth:** If the CF wants to change the proposal regarding participation at the table that is the item that should be voted on, not whether or not the entire section should be adopted as proposed. **Carol:** Should we add language “as merely observers?” **Bill:** Presents that if you are at the table, if there is room, then you are a participant. **John Hendrickson:** There could be some situations where some alternates get to participate and others don’t. suggests that they don’t get to participate. **John Couch:** Wants alternates to be involved, but they are alternates. They could participate in public comment period. **Jon: Makes a motion** that we invite the alternates, but that they not participate unless the primary is gone. **John Hendrickson seconds the motion.** **Carol:** We would be clarifying the proposed amendment that the alternate if at the table would not be participating. **Jan:** Would like to see 6.4 stricken, saying we encourage our alternates to attend. **Carol:** calls for a vote on the motion clarifying 6.4 by striking 6.4, welcoming alternates to attend, but as observers in the audience chairs. **Motion passes.** Hans opposed.

John Couch: part of the proposed amendment to 3030 section 4E) there hasn’t yet been any discussion. **Jim Nugent:** The Charter states all residents. You can’t put an age restriction without amending the Charter. The last study commission wanted all residents to participate. The current study commission can recommend a change to the Charter or City Council can put something on the ballot that changes the Charter. **Hans:** The thought was that there could be an issue with mom, dad, 5 children and that’s 7 votes. **Jon:** Participated in setting up the NCs and that was something that was important that young people be included because they do contribute a lot to the neighborhood and their voice should be heard.

Ongoing Business

Monthly report to CC

After CF discussion:

- We discussed changes to Ordinance 3030 and the CF bylaws.
- We’ve asked for information about notice requirements.
- The parcels that are aside for parks pursuant to subdivision laws.
- We are moving forward with The Volunteer of the Year Award.
- Elected two more members to CFLT bringing CFLT to seven members.

Jon makes motion to approve the Committee’s selection for the Volunteer of the Year Award. **Celeste seconds the motion.** None opposed. **Motion passes.**

- CF budget recommendations: Full time Liaison position.
- The Neighborhood Project Fund Committee still meeting.

No Motion.

Neighborhood Updates

Neighborhood updates were reported.

- Emma Dickinson/Orchard Homes: Pass.
- Farviews/Pattee Canyon: LT will be meeting every other week until they have the general meeting in April. Planning on an April 14th meeting. LT meeting 3/2, 3/16, 3/30, 4/13. The zoning that Jerry Ballas got on the tickler list of the PAZ Committee is item #26. Hillside Design Standards, the Planning Board is becoming more interested to understand more about the HDS and how they seem not to be adhered to. Call 721-7528 for more LT information.
- Franklin to the Fort: NC meeting March 9th to elect two new officers and discuss Neighborhood Plan.
- Grant Creek: Pass.
- Lewis & Clark: Pass.
- Lower Rattlesnake: Pass.
- Moose Can Gully: Pass.
- Westside: LT meeting at 6:00 pm March 3rd. 728-0161 for more information.
- South 39th St.: NC meeting was last night. Did settle what South 39th St. NC wants to do with their boundaries. Plan to attend Moose Can Gully's NC meeting next week to see if can get their agreement on the boundary issue.
- Southgate Triangle: Canvas of the residents around McLeod Park next Monday. Discussing how they want the play ground equipment moved. Next LT meeting with Paxson Park issue to discuss problems.
- University District: LT meeting last night, another one will be March 15th. We have a very active group looking at safety in Bonner Park, Neighborhood Watch and the development committee is looking at the traffic proposals.
- Clayton Floyd: Try to coordinate your NC meetings so that you can get candidates to be able to go to every NC rather than having to choose.

Ruth: Small grants budget \$1,600 remaining, not including tonight's two action items. Hans is signed up for moderator of CF meeting in March and John Couch is signed up for moderator in April.

Celeste: Will not be here next month and does not have an elected alternate.

Adjournment

Carol adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Brennan Anderson
Neighborhood Liaison