

**Community Forum Meeting
July 28, 2005
7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
Moderator, Ray Aten**

Moderator, **Ray Aten** began the meeting at 7:02 p.m. and took roll:

Emma Dickinson – Bill Earhart
Farviews/Pattee Canyon – Ray Aten, Alternate
Franklin to the Fort – David Schmetterling, Alternate
Grant Creek – absent
Heart of Missoula–Lynn Redding, Alternate
Lewis & Clark– Jon Wilkins
Lower Rattlesnake– absent
Miller Creek– absent
Moose Can Gully—absent
Northside– Jane Madison
Westside– John Couch
Riverfront– absent
Rose Park–Ellen McCullough
South 39th – absent
Southgate Triangle–Hans Christiansen
University District–Jan Hoem
Upper Rattlesnake–Freddi Thompson
City Council Representative – Clayton Floyd
Neighborhood Liaison—Ruth Brennan Anderson

Others Present

Meeting attendee sign in sheet available at Office of Neighborhoods.

Quorum

It was announced that a quorum was present.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Public Comment

None.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of April 28, 2005: Freddi Thompson clarified an error on page 8 instead of “the conductivity” it should read “connectivity.” This error is also in the June 23, 2005 minutes in Approval of Minutes. **Freddi** made a motion to approve the April 28, 2005 minutes with the amendment. **Hans** seconded the motion. The minutes as amended passed unanimously on a

voice vote. *Jon* made a motion to approve the June 23, 2005 minutes with the amendment. *Hans* seconded the motion. The minutes as amended passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Special Orders

None

Announcements

Ruth Anderson: CF budget is \$400. Missoula Historic Preservation Commission is holding a zoning overlay meeting, August 9th from 5-6 pm at Missoula Senior Center. Refer to NC calendar in order to avoid double booking dates. I will be creating and maintaining a new Neighborhood Events Calendar for the Office of Neighborhoods, after meeting with the CFLT about it. This calendar will be posted to the neighborhoods website at www.missoula-neighborhoods.org It is intended to be an additional information resource for citizens and neighbors of neighborhood events that are happening within Missoula's neighborhoods. Those people interested in submitting events should contact me. An update regarding Neighborhood Network. I attend each monthly meeting. Last month they had a presentation by Ellen Buchanan, MRA who talked about URDII & URDIII. She may be an interesting speaker for some of your NCs as well. Community Forum house keeping. August 25th CF meeting will be held at the Missoula Public Library, Large Meeting Room at 7:00 pm moderated by Jon Wilkins. There will be no Community Forum meeting for September, because of the Fall Bus Tour. Hans has signed up to moderate the October 27th CF meeting, currently scheduled for the Fire Station #4 conference room, off of West Broadway. We will no longer be holding CF meetings in Council Chambers.

Presentations

Holly Truitt, Community Health Specialist: Missoula City-County Health Dept., Walkability and Health of Missoula Neighborhoods: My job was to look at a community based health survey, analyze that information and come up with a health campaign. Our health campaign is, "Be a User of Missoula Sidewalks and Trail Systems." The Missoula Neighborhood Survey was carried out by the Montana Cardiovascular Health Group, funded by the Center on Disease Control and Prevention. The 2003 survey divided Missoula into 7 neighborhood groups. Those groups were based on already established Neighborhood Council areas. The neighborhood specific results are on CDs I will leave for you. Over 700 people were interviewed and asked about their personal health, own physical activity and the activity friendliness of their neighborhoods. Regarding City-wide results. Over ½ of Missoulians self-reported that they are over-weight. Only 45% of Missoulians self-reported that they get the recommended level of physical activity (1/2 hour 5 days per week). One out of two Missoulians self-reported that sidewalks were not available in there neighborhood. 98% of Missoulians reported that there were trails available in their neighborhood. Of that 98%, 92% said that they found their trail systems very appealing. One-half of Missoulians are having an inactive lifestyle. That concerned us. We are getting stellar reviews on our trails, but it seems that we have room for improvement on our sidewalks. Not just because ½ the respondents were saying there weren't sidewalks, but also a lot of the people that were responding that there were sidewalks, were saying that there were issues with visibility or lack of cross walks or they perceived that it wasn't safe to use those sidewalk systems. That all led us to focus our newest health campaign on getting Missoulians out and being active on their trails and their sidewalks. We also wanted to

put an emphasis on the importance of sidewalks and trails for personal health. This resulted in the “Be A User” campaign. We want to get every Missoulian out on their trails and sidewalks every day, walking, biking, rolling. We also want to get the information out to Missoulians that it really is pretty simple to have an active lifestyle. You can break the 30 minutes of physical activity into 10 minutes segments and researchers have found that that is just as effective in getting that 30 minutes of physical activity. The focus on sidewalks and trail systems is because public health officials believe strongly that they are the key to having an active lifestyle; it’s riding your bike to work, it’s walking to errands, it’s the simple day to day exercises that are really critical. We have been working on CDs that are full of information, City trails, open space, recreation areas, maps of different neighborhood trail systems that will become available during the month of August. Our goal is to distribute them to local gathering places. What we think you can do to help your neighbors be users. It comes down to all of you facilitating the user friendliness of your neighborhood and continue to support trails, sidewalks, open space and having a mix of businesses and shops close to your neighborhood so people can do their daily errands on foot. The CDC has found that creating and improving places to be activity friendly can result in up to a 25% increase in the number of people who are getting exercise 3 times a week. I have a challenge for all of you; for all NC members to go back and think about evaluating the walkability of your neighborhood. Walkability checklist are available. My challenge is 3 parts. One, all of you to go back and share the neighborhood specific results at a neighborhood council meeting. Then based on those results, work as a neighborhood, brainstorm a couple destinations that you as a neighborhood want to be able to easily walk to. Based on that list to form a walkability committee that is responsible to get enough people to carry out a walkability check list for those walks. Then based on whatever you find about those walks you can pin point what the areas are in your neighborhood that need to be improved in order for it to be a more accessible place to have an active lifestyle. The images/artwork for the campaign can be shared with your neighborhood too. **John Couch:** Have you been coordinating at all with the Bike Ped. Office, Missoula in Motion Way to Go Club? How does that all tie in? **Holly:** We have been communicating with them and collaborating with them. **Hans:** Can you clarify how you arrived at the number 1 out of 2 people don’t have access to sidewalks? **Holly:** They had a survey question that talked about is there a sidewalk in your neighborhood, in front of your house that you can use? We didn’t do the study, but were given the results. When Helena statisticians crunched the numbers they found that 1 out of 2 people who responded said that there were sidewalks in their neighborhood. 700 people with an equal number of people from each neighborhood area. **David:** There is a lot of concern about both pedestrian safety with crosswalks and accessibility of services and schools in our neighborhood. We are working on an infrastructure plan and one of the big elements is sidewalks. It would be wonderful to get your program incorporated somehow into this infrastructure plan we are working on. What is the best way. What is the first step to working your plans into a more comprehensive neighborhood plan? **Holly:** We would love to help as far as providing backing what the public health benefits are. We also have a lot of contacts with other folks working on similar issues.

Committee Reports

Bus Tour Committee

Ruth: The forms went out and are due back August 4th from NCs via CF representatives. The Fall tour includes the following neighborhoods: Grant Creek, Westside, Northside,

Riverfront, Rose Park, Heart of Missoula, Lower Rattlesnake, Upper Rattlesnake. The Committee will be recommending September 7th as the date of the tour. But the Committee will be looking at changing that to September 6th due to conflict with the Riverfront NC mayoral candidate forum and general meeting. Committee will recommend the same vendor as they have the lowest quote. And will recommend expanding the invitation list to include candidates and county commissioners. Committee will recommend using \$200 of the \$400 CF budget combined with a \$150 small grant application to pay for the bus. The NC Bus Tour Forms are due to me August 4th. Committee will meet again after August 4th to determine the sites & route.

Training Committee

Hans: Several of the neighborhoods have asked us to update the websites to make it more user friendly. We are recommending that it comes out of City funds instead of neighborhood funds. **Ruth:** I will also see that training is included. **Hans:** Makes motion to approve decision to update the websites. **Jon:** Seconds the motion. **Jan:** Will website training be included? **Ruth:** The updated format will be more user friendly and I will see that training is also included. **Couch:** Is your motion also for the City to pay for the updating? **Hans:** Yes. **Ray:** The money would be from the Office of Neighborhoods, correct? **Ruth:** Yes. I have already spoken with Marty and there is money in the Office of Neighborhoods budget. The guestimate was between \$250-\$350. **Marilyn Marler:** (question inaudible). **David:** Is that a one time update? **Ruth:** All of the neighborhoods will have access to the updates, but won't be forced to use it. When the computer savvy person leaves, a new person could use the updated version if they don't have the software from the prior user. **Clayton:** We wanted to attempt to have the format be that it could be fill in the blanks to update. It is a good idea to keep it so that the folks without the technical skills have the ability to do it that way. **Hans:** Some of the NCs weren't able to do what they wanted with the site. **Ray:** Some of the text sites that Clayton mentioned got corrupted. **Hans:** Makes friendly amendment to motion that the funding would come from the Office of Neighborhoods budget. Motion carries on a voice vote.

Extraordinary Events Committee

Jon: Committee has only met once or twice since it started. Still no news to report.

Unfinished Business

•1. Glen Eagle sewer issue, **Clayton:** What we are attempting to do is have an informational meeting with Grant Creek folks who felt like they didn't have as much information as they wanted regarding how this whole process would work before we moved forward. The public hearing is still scheduled for the City Council meeting on August 8th. The parties to the agreement, Mr. Nie and Mr. Denton and the City are close enough to agreement that we could probably sign an agreement and proceed. But we would like to have as many people as possible be satisfied with the action we would be taking.

•2. Discussion and vote on recommended proposed changes to Ordinance 3288 regarding NCLT recommendations. **Ellen:** This change came about because we have had instances where LTs have gone ahead and written letters or spoken at City Council meetings on issues that came up prior to having a NC meeting. And then they would go back to the NC, after the fact, and say this is what we did what do you think. It was brought to my attention that this was not in the original Ordinance. I was recommending this change to try to clarify it. Section 5, part C. Section 6, part E. **Clayton:** Did you have Mr. Nugent review

your proposal? **Ellen:** No, it's just a clarification of what already exists. **Ruth:** When Ellen first proposed this, she mentioned it was to make those two sections consistent, because one section made it sound as if a LT may be able to make a recommendation, where the other is very clear that only the NC can. **Ellen:** There was some ambiguity in there. Several people brought it to my attention that according to the ordinance, this is the way it should be happening. **Clayton:** When representations have been made by either the CF or by NCs in the past, typically there has been a designated spokesman to do that task. When you look at the way you have structured it with the strike out in E, I think you are almost precluding that. It's not practical to have multiple people down here making presentations. In the strictest sense of the language there, I think that is what you would be asking. **Ellen:** What we are striking out said "and shall not be delegated to any individual or sub-committee." So basically it was taking that because it is redundant. **David:** The way it is worded doesn't seem very pragmatic to have the NC convene to make a recommendation to City Council. **Ellen:** You think it clarifies it to say "and shall not be delegated to any individual or sub-committee?" **David:** No. I think to clarify, it could be, "made by a delegate in lieu of the NC." Where are the two places in the Ordinance that you are trying to make consistent? **Ellen:** Section 5E, "communicating with City government and with NC members." That was one of the functions of the LT. Correction, 5C. This sections tells what the functions of the LT shall include. The change makes it so a function of the LT is to communicate with City government, but only at the direction of the NC. **Clayton:** I would be more comfortable with something that makes sure that we are not exceeding the authority of Ordinance 3288. **Ellen:** Leaving in the language in 6E would be the same thing. **David:** Is that kind of redundant, because the LT should be representatives of the NC. **Ellen:** It might seem redundant, but we have had a lot of situations since the inception where the LT has spoken on behalf of the NC because a lot of issues come up there are not that many full NC meetings and so the LT would speak on behalf of the NC, then go to the NC at the next full meeting and say this is what we said on your behalf. **David:** I think that's proper as elected representatives to the neighborhood, you should be speaking on behalf of the neighborhood. **Ruth:** What has happened, problems have arisen with a variety of NCs so it is not any singled out instance where an individual or a committee, which could be considered a LT, is presenting whether via letter or speaking engagement, saying my NC believes this or my NC advises you the City or department in the City that our NC wants this, having not had a NC meeting that tells the LT that the NC has in fact voted on that and that the LT or individual should go forward. Section 6E, original language saying, "and shall not be delegated to any individual or sub-committee," was a purposeful inclusion in the original 3030. Because the original committee studying NCs, there were concerns that individuals would speak on behalf of the entire NC without actually having had a NC meeting so the NC could actual have a vote and input. **Clayton:** The purpose of taking the action taken or the statement made or the review given back to the NC at the next regularly scheduled meeting would be to allow the NC to accept the action taken if necessary to admonish the person if they acted inappropriately. I really think that is where the action needs to be occurring. **Ruth:** That is still possible. If the group wants to make a recommendation to amend the Ordinance to allow for individuals and committees to speak on behalf of the NC and then go back and get approval or confirmation then that would be the change you would make. But this change is doing the opposite. I wanted to clarify that so that you are not mixing apples and oranges. If you don't want to go this way, then you would vote against it and someone would make a

different amendment to say that individuals and committees would have authority to do that.

David: What I said before about elected LT members speaking on behalf of the NC, that's the basis of our country. I think it is incredibly important to represent the neighborhoods appropriately via communication and soliciting input from the neighborhood. You all are delegates as well making decisions on behalf of the neighborhood. How many people have taken these comments before the NC? **Couch:** I understand where we are going with this and to have that check in the NC system is important. Our NC struggles to meet 3 times per year. We miss things. Every now and then we get a packet in the mail. The LT or the development committee gets a packet that talks about a subdivision or PNC or some kind of notice asking for comment within a short period. It is nice to be able to have a committee in place to look at that, comment on it, and then at the next NC meeting, they bring that back saying this is what we commented on and how we did it. It gives the NC the chance to say we don't think you are commenting on that the way we think you should be. I understand that it is water over the dam at that point. Otherwise, how does our NC comment on these items in a timely manner without having a meeting once a month? **Jan:** This issue has come up a lot of times in the past. What I have been told by others, what they have done, we would hold a NCLT meeting or development team meeting and have people on those committees write letters as individuals who are members of that committee but saying that they are speaking for themselves, because it had not yet gone before the NC. My concern is that if we do not pass this, too much power ends up in the hands of very few people and they may be speaking incorrectly for the desires of their NC. I think this is a good motion. **Jon:** I think it's a good motion, but I am torn here too. Examples of what has happened to me on this same situation. Last night we had a BOA meeting, I represented the NC, because we had taken a vote against this type of development. Four-five weeks ago I got information in the mail about aquatics at Playfair Park, which I am in support of, but they wanted to delete some parking spaces, and we have a tremendous parking problem down there already. I felt I couldn't respond to this and I only had I think 6 days. Normally, I go and knock on doors. I didn't have the time to do that. I didn't respond to it. We have variances that come up that we have to respond to in 6 or 7 days. Normally, I would call all the committee members and get their take on it and respond that way. It is a problem, we need to respond to these things we get from OPG. It is a dilemma. **Ellen:** I think all of these comments are really valuable. This is the way we have always operated. I agree with what every one of you is saying; things come upon us, we don't have very much time to respond, and the way many of us have acted in the past is the LT takes a role, and then goes back to the NC and asks the NC for their response. A problem with that is that you can't always say that people are going back and taking it to their NC. Rose Park was called on it. We were told we were not acting in accordance with the Ordinance. So I brought this forward to say, that if the Ordinance says this, let us clarify the language and have it read so that we all know what we are doing. Because we were called on it, I read through it and noticed that there was some conflicting language. On the one hand it says that the LT is allowed to do this. Then in a different section it says no we are not. I am all for if the CF wants to go ahead and redo this and say that we have the right to do this. But we are setting ourselves up for a can worms. If we are not going to vote on this right now, maybe there needs to be a sub-committee to rewrite it. **Freddi:** I think the LT members need to have some flexibility and we assume they sort of know the bolts of the neighborhood. That being said, I think everybody should compare your NC bylaws with the language in 3288. As I am looking at our bylaws, it says the council

shall advise the City government . . . decisions and advice to City government shall be made by a meeting of the council and shall be not delegated to any individual or sub-committee. If we change 3288 do we all have to go back and change our bylaws to conform? **Ellen**: When we wrote the bylaws they had to be in conformance to 3030. **Freddi**: I think I understand what you are trying to accomplish, which is not that the LT can't have flexibility in certain types of situations, but that the LT can't speak for the whole council in perhaps advising the City Council or something like that. **Ruth**: The ordinance is pretty clear how it exists now. It says, which is in conflict with what John Couch was mentioning, right now none of the NCs when it comes to advising the City government, should be delegating that role to individuals or sub-committees, that is right out of the existing ordinance, they can't do that right now. And Ellen's proposal would keep it the same way. If the group wants more flexibility then that is a completely different amendment that you have to make. **Ray**: I suggest that we look at section 3. If you look at authority, not once is the word leadership team used at all in there it says neighborhood councils and community forum. I think that is what Ruth is alluding to. When you look at authority it is NCs not LT. As LT members we are administrators. That is the way it is right now. If there is a larger issue of changing authority, that is a big deal and it will take a lot of work. **Hans**: I agree with Ellen and Jon that there is a problem in the way it is written. We've all mentioned that it was a vote from the LT, because there was not time to have a NC meeting. Section 5C, about appointing CF alternates is something we need to talk about. **Ray**: We do need to move on. **Jan**: Appointing replacement members is important and I want to get to that too. Somewhere in here we are empowered to do surveys within our NC so that if our survey is broad enough we can report on the results of the survey. **Ellen**: I would like someone to make a motion to vote on this. This is simply clarification of what's already written. If we want to change it, we can revisit it and have a sub-committee look at it. **Couch** makes a motion to approve proposed amendment that Ellen has brought forward for clarification. **Jan** seconds the motion. **Ray**: Calls for a hand vote. By show of hands motion passes 5 to 4.

●3. Discussion on recommended proposed changes to Ordinance 3288 regarding appointment of temporary CF Alternates. **Couch**: We are looking at Section 5C, the underlined is the addition. [reads proposal]. **David**: Exactly who would be responsible for appointing a replacement? **Couch**: It would be a function of the LT. **David**: But that's not a committee. It says establishing a nominating committee to seek candidates for LT positions and CF representative and alternate. So would the appointment be a function of that committee or of the LT? **Ray**: I think the semi colon between those makes those different responsibilities at different times. So this would be an additional function of the LT. **Clayton**: I'm troubled by the word appoint, because that authority rests with the NC and the NC only. Where you actually have the verbiage that states you are going to do that at the next regularly scheduled meeting why would you want to assume the authority away from the NC? **Ellen**: I think it is because you have people that drop out mid stream and you don't have someone attending the forum. Often we don't meet more than 2-3 times per year and we have to be able to do that. I think it is well worded. **Jon**: I agree with what Ellen said. I would back this as soon as there is a motion on the floor. **Hans** makes a motion to vote on proposal next month. **Freddi** seconds the motion. Motion passes on a voice vote.

●4. Farviews/Pattee Canyon NC Rezoning Resolution: **Ray**: [Introduces proposed resolution (green sheet)]. We are proposing that the City Council move forward with this as quickly as possible. What is the difference between A and R-1 and where is it? There are

very few areas that have A any more. It was one of the original designations. There was A, B, and C. One of the A areas is in our NC area. Another one is in the Lewis & Clark area. I believe that is it. There are a lot of the old B designations around. At one time all of it was A. Why do we want to change it to R-1? [Ray refers to separate comparison sheet prepared by Celeste River]. Height: in A 40 feet is allowed. In R-1 30 feet is the height. [Reads through rest of comparison]. No other significant differences. For us the important thing is the height, particularly on the hillside. We are asking for your support in our work to try to get this changed. **Jon**: I have had a lot of residents asking me about this same thing. Unfortunately, we are not having a meeting until October so we can't get a vote on it. But I have a feeling after October we will come with the same type of request, mainly because of the 40 foot tall building. I am going to support this. **Hans**: I think this is a place where the CF is really put to the test, because I think we really should support other neighborhoods. And this neighborhood has voted and passed it in their NC. I think we need to support it and I'm going to support it. **Couch**: If the zoning is changed from A to R-1 and there is a 30 foot height limit, how many structures in the area right now would then be legal non-conforming? **Ray**: What I understand from Jerry Ballas, that is the next step in the process. If we can get this process started then an exploration of the entire area needs to be done. People need to be interviewed about whether they are supportive of this. I don't want to have to be the one to go door to door. I prefer it be done by the zoning and planning people. That's where we are going. **Couch**: Clayton, if there are structures within the area that become legal non-conforming structures, what does that mean to the folks that own those buildings? If that building gets destroyed, are they able to build their building back the way it was or are they limit to the current zoning of 30 feet? **Clayton**: For example, let's assume you have an existing single family residential that is 45 feet in height. Part of the problem in this particular controversy is where do you start measuring the height from? Planning staff has measured it any where from where the highest point of dirt on the foundation intersects the foundation and up. I think, if you have a basement, it should be from the floor of that basement up. Let's assume that we do it from the intersection of the highest point of dirt on the foundation up. If the home were destroyed by less than 50%, it could be rebuilt to the same height it was before. If it was destroyed by over 50%, it would not be allowed to be rebuilt that high. Legal nonconforming chapter was implemented in the zoning code to try to reduce that conformity where possible, identify, reduce or eliminate non-conformity. That's why you have that rule of 50%. When you go about this rezoning request it happens one of two ways. One, council can initiate it and they can take that action without going out and having the individual property owners be signators to that rezoning. The second way is what you're speaking of Ray, where you define where that zoning district is going to be geographically and then every single property owner within that geographic area has to be notified and agree or disagree. If you have 50% or more signators then you have a rezoning for that district. **Couch**: City initiated zoning then, they would have to go out and get signatures of people affected in the zoning? **Clayton**: No, City initiated is through council. There is always a public process and part of that would be at least one public hearing. If you had a sufficient protest within that defined boundary it would trigger a super majority requirement on Council. Which is almost impossible these days. **Ray**: What I understand is that since it is a relatively large area that would be covered everyone would be notified that there was a public hearing. **David**: On the permitted uses, looking at the bottom it says bold small print the differences, it is my understanding you are trying to eliminate as permitted

uses, colleges, public utility installations, libraries, fraternities, sororities, temples. **Ray:** We have no intention of eliminating any of them. But also know that in the area there are none. **David:** What does that have to do with permitted uses? Does that mean you are not going to permit temples? **Clayton:** If he didn't accept R-1 as it's currently written and accepted in the zoning manual he would have to come up with a new zoning district that had virtually all of those things in it other than existing uses. But it wouldn't be R-1 any longer. Basically, what you are doing is taking R-1 and saying this is as close as we can get to what we want without drafting a new zoning district. **David:** Churches are still permitted, but temples aren't. I don't understand the permissibility of the distinction. **Ray:** I understand, and I am surprised it doesn't say churches and temples under conditional use. **Freddi:** I am going to support this because I believe it is enormously important that we all support neighborhoods that are trying to work for the changes they want in their neighborhood. I believe all the questions will be answered during the planning and public hearing process and I don't feel like I need the answers to those questions. I think those will be taken care of in committee and by the City Council. I also believe that it would be possible if since the only differences are in permitted and conditional uses, that if it becomes difficult it might be possible to simply amend that zoning district and amend only the height limitations. I will be supporting this. **Jon:** In other words what we are going to support is what's on this green sheet. **Ray:** That's what I'm asking. **Jon:** I also want to make it clear that if a citizen went out and tried to do this it would be a huge amount of money to come up with and the fee is going up by about 30%. I'm going to support this. That's what we are here for is to support each other. **Hans** makes a motion that we accept the proposed resolution. **Jan** seconds the motion. Motion passes on a voice vote.

New Business

- 1. CF Small Project Fund Grant Application (for traffic calming project in Farviews/Pattee Canyon neighborhood). **Hans** makes a motion to approve the small grant application. **Jon** seconds the motion. All in favor, none opposed. Motion carries on a voice vote.
- 2. Community Forum Presentations Policy. **Hans:** The CFLT feels that we are spending too much time on presentations and not enough time on CF business. [Reads proposed policy, copy available from Office of Neighborhoods]. **Couch:** Why do you have that the CF would make the decision on the presentation instead of the CFLT? **Hans:** The CFLT feels that maybe some of the CF may feel that the presentations are more important than we do. **Couch:** Wouldn't that cut into our time for neighborhood discussions? **Hans:** Yes. **Couch:** I like the idea of limiting the time to 10 minutes. Tonight I liked the concise presentation, she was telling us this is what's available, take it to your neighborhoods. I still think the CFLT should make the decisions. **Ruth:** At the CFLT meeting, I suggested that the CFLT come up with a policy on this topic, because each CFLT meeting the team is spending a lot of time and discussion on how to handle the presentation requests. The CFLT nominated Hans to put that together. The goal is to come up with a policy and the content is up for discussion. **Jon:** I like the policy, but I think the CFLT should make that decision. **Ray:** Do you feel that with the policy it will be a quicker discussion in the CFLT about whether it meets the requirement. **Jon:** I do believe it will. It gives guidelines. **Jane:** I think the 10 minutes is good. I think the CFLT has been doing a good job deciding on presentations. **Freddi:** I'm not certain that

all presentations should be limited to 10 minutes. We might want to have a discussion on that. Is this going to be posted on the neighborhoods website? **Ruth**: I will type up Hans' proposal and email to the CF representatives and alternates. Once the policy is adopted I can post it to the internet where the presentation requests are. **Ellen**: I like the 10 minutes. One area I can see where we might want more time is when the City needs to bring us information. Maybe we can add that to the policy. **Hans**: That is a different situation. A lot of times we are asking them to come to us with information.

Ongoing Business

Monthly report to CC

After CF discussion:

- Bus Tour.
- Small grant approved.
- 3288 proposed amendment discussion & action.
- Rezoning resolution supported by CF.
- Health Survey
- The action items on the agenda.
- Couch**: Regarding the support of the neighborhood's rezoning resolution, say that this is really the way the CF should be working. I'm hoping that we start getting listened to.
- Ellen**: Mention that things are working better at the CF now than in the beginning.

Jon makes a motion to present the above. **Bill** seconds the motion. Passed unanimously on a voice vote.

David: Clarifies for the record that he abstained from the rezoning resolution voice vote.

Neighborhood Updates

Neighborhood updates were reported.

- Emma Dickinson/Orchard Homes: We had a meeting on July 11th. We had elections with a new LT in place. We are going to have our regular general meeting in October. We would like to invite all the candidates from Ward 2 and Ward 6 to that meeting. We voted to support the neighbors on Hutton Lane. The City wants them to pave a private lane that serves 4 parcels of land, a 25 foot street with curbs and gutters and sidewalks. And it is a private lane. We will have a LT meeting to set up the candidate forum.
- Farviews & Pattee Canyon: We had an ice cream social general meeting on July 17th at Whitaker Park. We had good participation. There was a lot of good discussion on the pocket parks shown on the parks map Celeste had. People were also interested in the possibility in the change in zoning heights. About 80 people were there. The Parks Department finished the Little White House outside is done.
- Franklin to the Fort: We just had an NC meeting about our infrastructure plan which is progressing really well. NC was pretty well attended for a summer meeting with 55 people there. There has been a lot of interest. We have standing monthly meeting infrastructure plan steering committee meetings and LT meetings we typically have about 15 people at those meetings. We have a mayoral candidate forum in conjunction with the Southgate Triangle NC on August 24th. We are also dealing with other issues in our neighborhood like our wading pool in Franklin Park; it's gone. The park doesn't get used any more. The attendance and enthusiasm in our meetings has been great.

●Lewis & Clark: Are general meeting will be in October. Lewis & Clark area voted a year ago to fight any type of infill in our neighborhood. We had one on Thames and Fairview come up and we took it to the BOA and the BOA came out in our favor last night. They are starting on McCormick pool.

●Heart of Missoula: pass

●Westside: The LT of the Westside/Northside NC will be meeting next week. Call 728-0161 for more information. The general topic will be to decide what to present on the bus tour. The other thing happening in our neighborhood is some kind of request for action to be taken on the West Broadway corridor. We had another fatality in our neighborhood on that street and still nothing is being done on that road. There is new housing and new construction going on across the road there. There will be more families. More people are wanting to get across the road there for ball games and aquatics center.

●Southgate Triangle: Not too much going on. The LT meets monthly. We have been made aware that a lot of things we thought were going to get done in our parks this year are not going to happen, because the aquatics program cannibalized the Parks. Department's maintenance budget. We aren't pleased about that. We will have a general meeting in October, our semi-annual meeting. We are excited to share in the candidate forum with Franklin to the Fort in August.

●University District: We are having a LT meeting next Tuesday, August 2nd 6:00 pm at 345 Daly. We will be talking about the planning for September NC meeting. We can't have summer meetings because the students aren't here. We will be looking at the historic overlay plan. Talking about the bus tour and talking about the fact that I am moving out of the University District and Jane Bucks is the alternate.

●Upper Rattlesnake: pass

●Northside: The Broadway intersection is really a problem. There have been 4 fatalities there. One was in 1998, 2003, 2004, 2005 and one more. There have been 5 fatalities. There will be a memorial there from noon to 1:00, but I forgot the date.

●Rose Park: In August we will hopefully have a general meeting.

RUTH: Bus tour committee please check in with me about changing the bus tour date to September 6th. Also remember the presentation DVDs are at the door.

Adjournment

Aten adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Brennan Anderson
Neighborhood Liaison