

**Community Forum Meeting
Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2008
7:00 p.m. City Council Chambers
Moderator, Greg Gullickson**

Captain John Mullan – Kathie Snodgrass (Rep)
Emma Dickinson – Absent
FarViews/Pattee Canyon – Absent
Franklin to the Fort – Jon Salmonson (Alt)
Grant Creek – Brian Walter (Rep)
Heart of Missoula – Absent
Lewis & Clark – Greg Gullickson (Rep)
Lower Rattlesnake – Carol Elsen (Rep)
Miller Creek – Absent
Moose Can Gully – Lyle Guerts (Alt)
Northside – Brooks Priest (Rep)
Riverfront – Melissa Schmitt (Rep)
Rose Park – Annette Puttkammer (Rep)
South 39th – Jeff Stevens (Rep)
Southgate Triangle – Hans Christiansen (Rep)
University District – John Snively (Rep)
Upper Rattlesnake – Jan Hoem (Rep)
Westside – Absent

City Council Liaison – Absent
Neighborhood Liaison – LaNette Diaz

Others Present

Laval Means, Dean Hendrix

Quorum

Quorum is present.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Christiansen motioned for the adoption of the Agenda. *Ms. Elsen* seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

None

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Snodgrass moved for approval of the February minutes. *Mr. Christiansen* seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

Liaison Report-Ms. Diaz

City Zoning Public Workshop will be held April 2, 6-9 pm Missoula Children's Theatre 3rd floor. This will be a presentation of the concept and direction support, group discussion and the next steps. The

concept can be previewed at the website www.zoningmissoula.com. This is the next big public meeting for the zoning rewrite.

Community Building training will be Saturday, April 26. Childcare, refreshments and a small lunch will be provided—trying to make it convenient as possible so that folks can make it on a Saturday. Workshop focus will be how to use the media to increase visibility, how to get and keep people involved and how to run effective meetings. Presentation of a framework for the neighborhood change cycle which are the steps that need to take place for change to happen or things to improve. The location is Bethel Baptist Church and postcard invitations will be out shortly.

Bus Tour Committee looking for folks to be on the committee and start meeting to plan next tour. Every year we pick a theme of interest to citizens as well as City Council members to highlight in the neighborhoods—last year was an example of a zoning like and dislike—this helped with the zoning rewrite. The committee picked the theme and helped organize. The office staffed the committee to set up logistics and details. The involvement will probably be four one-hour meetings between now and whatever date (in June) is chosen.

Mr. Christiansen asked why was it decided to go to one bus tour a year instead of two? **Ms. Diaz** replied due to the amount of time it took to put together, it being held so close to the project fund grant deadline, costs, and there is more interest in the June tour than September. We could relook at the timeframe; September is a hard month to hold it. This is the feedback I have heard so far. **Mr. Stevens** asked who made the decision. **Ms. Diaz** replied that she heard it from Ms. Rehbein; this decision was made before I came into this position. **Mr. Stevens** stated his concern that there will not be enough time to adequately cover the city in one day and that all neighborhoods may not be represented. **Ms. Diaz** commented that this is something the committee can address and bring forward to Community Forum. **Ms. Snodgrass, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Salmonson** and **Mr. Snively** volunteered to be on the committee. **Ms. Diaz** will be in touch to figure out best day and time to get together.

Committee Reports

Neighborhood Project Fund Committee – Hans Christiansen

*Recommendations on Second Round of Large Project Grants.

The committee had their hands full—lots of good applications submitted—hard to pick the recommendations.

*Reframing the growth debate request for \$2840 recommend funding \$1900

*Missoula Sidewalks Curb and Gutter Inventory request \$2000 recommend funding \$1800

*Neighborhood Training Series request for \$800 (Ms. Diaz made a comment that the amount requested is \$1070) recommend funding \$800

Submissions not recommended for funding include the Silver Park Bench Shelter Project, Lowell School Garden Project, and the Greater Downtown Master Plan. Remarks and comments about the submissions were shared. **Ms. Schmitt** commented that she would have recommended funding for the Greater Downtown Master Plan, does anyone want to consider this further before the vote. Also think the Timber Park frame bench shelters is a critical project and am wondering what the rest of the group think about that. **Mr. Stevens** would like more information on the Silver Park proposal, was it put forward by a NC. **Mr. Christiansen** replied not really. **Ms. Schmitt** replied that was before it was a requirement, it is the Riverfront neighborhood and the NC fully supports it. **Mr. Stevens** I had seen a presentation on that project and was impressed, I haven't seen the details of the proposal, but I am disappointed it didn't receive funding. **Ms. Diaz** interjected that for background sake, this is the 2nd round of funds and there is only \$4500.00. In the first round Silver Park was funded, this is another request in the same round (year) for another \$3000.00. In the first round they were funded \$3000.00. If someone on the committee wants to provide more about the discussion for funding so there is more history it might be useful. **Mr. Snively**

stated the issue of the Greater Downtown Master Plan is largely a plan that is rotating around the business community and is seeking funds somewhere near a half a million dollars from the business community and this is a drop in the bucket and not really a neighborhood plan so it was eliminated outright for the same reason we dismissed the plan for the Block Party at the Hip Strip in the last round. With the Lowell School Program, we had reservations about the use of the land and there were a lot of issues that conflicted with our concept of what might be appropriate as far as the use of the park facility at Lowell School. We have already talked about Silver Park so that leaves three things. Reframing the growth debate speaks directly to hot topic issues at this time, presenting alternative viewpoints that as a community we need to look at. As far as curbs and sidewalks inventory, that is a reasonable price to pay for a survey by an intern. The result from that will provide long term input and a sustainable result to provide information for future planning in the city. The neighborhood training series is viewed as a one-time grant to push this project forward to train people in neighborhoods and how they can provide input into the neighborhood forums. In the future it will be attempted to be put through as a budget item with council to provide for the cost. Does that answer questions. **Ms. Schmitt** yes except that the downtown master plan is not being funded by businesses, it is being funded by MRA the redevelopment agency, the business improvement district (which is largely businesses) but also the parking commission and one of the reasons I feel CF should support it is that our neighborhoods are going to be greatly affected by it, it is important for us to have ownership and a voice and investment in the process so that it isn't solely a business run venture. **Mr. Snively** my answer to that would be that people have to be mobilized to participate but I don't know that \$3000.00 here or there in the context of such a large budget is going to make a difference in itself, does anybody else have thoughts on that. **Mr. Walter** commented that we have never had real clear ground rules about what could qualify for these neighborhood funds. Grant Creek applied for two year for a \$22,000.00 project and were clearly told that a project of this magnitude were too big for NPF and to go the CIP route for those. We seem to be chipping monies in on giant project, the Mill Site, and now contributing small funds here and there on that. Think there are some good conclusions here but should think about the ground rules. **Ms. Diaz** provided clarification that the Silver Park project the design was funded to raise money for the project. **Mr. Walter** commented that it doesn't matter; it is so many thousand dollars for a project that would cost \$25,000.00 to build. **Ms. Diaz** added that for the downtown plan when **Mr. Snively** said it was not neighborhood planning, that is a specific criterion for the grant, it does say neighborhood planning. **Ms. Elsen** added a thought for **Ms. Schmitt** –if your NC thought of a smaller project within the greater project that might be a way to ask for \$3000.00 to accomplish this part as your neighborhood voice. I think it would be easier for the committee to see that neighborhood councils are represented. **Ms. Schmitt** to clarify, it is being supported by the Heart of Missoula not Riverfront neighborhood, but I am just speaking in favor it because there are a number of neighborhoods that are affected within the boundaries of the plan. A good point was made–that as the plan develops to seek funding for specific projects. **Mr. Christiansen** added that next year there are guidelines in place about what we want, this year we were working with last year's rules and had a small amount of money this round to award. Each one of these grants could have stood on their own if we had \$18,000.00 to give out. **Ms. Hoem** shared that 'reframing the growth debate' will cost a finite amount of money and they don't have the capacity to get the remainder that the grant did not fund. Many neighborhoods are paying for a share of bringing **Mr. Fodor** to Missoula. Other councils are encouraged to contribute to this effort to fund it in its entirety.

Mr. Snively made a motion to accept the committee recommendations for the second round of project fund grants. **Ms. Elsen** seconded. Two nays. Motion carries.

Community Forum Funds Allocation Committee-Greg Gullickson

Last August we formed a committee to talk about funds that aren't being utilized by neighborhood councils. (See handout with policy at that time). It was designed so that community forum could request monies from neighborhood councils that may not be using their budgets. This is a mechanism to do that,

this handout spells that out. If neighborhoods haven't expended their budgets at this point, required to provide the Liaison some indication of what you intend to spend by the end of the year. If you do have projects that you do not have funds for, you need to provide that information to the Liaison as well. **Ms. Diaz** added that this is an attempt to show that the \$800 budget for each NC is being expended every year—can't ask for an increase in the budget if monies allocated are not being fully spent to begin with. I need budget from each NC stating what you expect to expend through June 30 and move what is not anticipated to be spent to the CF budget. Neighborhood Councils that have expended their budget can submit a budget to the Neighborhood Office stating what you need funds for. I think the procedure states that it can be approved by the Liaison. I would like to set a deadline of April 30 so the leadership teams can discuss and approve the reallocation. I will send out an email of what is requested and will not take action on this until I hear from each neighborhood in writing.

Budget Reports-LaNette Diaz

Look over your budgets and if there is anything that needs review, contact me. Community Forum balance is \$195.19.

New Business

Outreach to young people, young families and renters-Jamee Greer

Ms. Diaz commented that Mr. Greer was unable to attend tonight; he will bring this up at a future meeting.

White Pine Sash Rezoning-NSWS asking for letter of support-Brooks Priest

The neighborhood(s) are asking the CF for a letter of support in supporting the federated Northside Westside Neighborhood Council's in opposing the rezoning of the White Pine Sash Site. That site is a brownfield on the Northside that used to be part of an old mill. It is just west of the Scott Street Bridge and North of the railroad tracks. There is a portion of the property owned by the Scott Street Partners and in April they are going to the Planning Board requesting a rezoning of the property. Its current zoning includes residential use. It will need to be cleaned up for any development to occur; it currently has dioxins and penta contamination. It would have to be cleaned up to a residential standard with current zoning. This group (the owners) is requesting to rezone to a category that would not include residential, so it would be a lower cleanup standard. Goal is to move along development of the property or be able to sell it. At our neighborhood council meeting last week, we took a vote to have an official statement from our neighborhoods opposing the rezoning. It was a unanimous vote by all attending. Reason for bringing it to Community Forum is that it is a public safety and health issue for the entire city, having a large brownfield site in the middle of Missoula affects all neighborhoods and impacts quality of life for all. **Mr. Christiansen** made a motion that Community Forum writes a letter supporting the Northside Westside Neighborhoods in their opposition to this zoning change. **Ms. Snodgrass** seconded. Motion passed unanimously. **Ms. Diaz** will draft a letter and circulate to the Community Forum Leadership Team for approval.

Ongoing Business

Neighborhood Council Updates

- Moose Can Gully—Mr. Guerts there will be a general meeting April 8 at Chief Charlo School.
- Lower Rattlesnake—Ms. Elsen there general meeting will be April 8 at the old Prescott School, now the International School. Will be hearing from OPG regarding the UFDA proposal and latest survey out regarding the noise barrier along the interstate.
- Southgate Triangle—Mr. Christiansen reported there will be a general meeting the second Wednesday of April discussing Belleview Park and a change to having general meetings every month instead of just having leadership team meet.

- University—Mr. Snively has nothing to report.
- Northside —Ms. Priest we just had a general meeting, but we will be meeting soon to discuss the Orange ST. underpass issue that is coming up.
- Riverfront—Ms. Schmitt there will be a leadership team meeting a week from tonight at 6 pm at Bernice's, anyone is welcome to attend, we will be planning a general meeting in the near future.
- Lewis & Clark—Mr. Gullickson has nothing to report.
- Upper Rattlesnake—Ms. Hoem the leadership team meeting is the second Wednesday of every month at the Rattlesnake Gardens. A lot of people have been involved in the work to preserve the Lincoln School, there is a deadline of May 13 to have \$500,000 in the bank—we have a long ways to go.
- South 39th Street—Mr. Stevens there will be a general meeting on April 23 at Meadow Hill School and will include a presentation from Jim Clark on the coming secondary bond issue, an UFDA presentation, considering a neighborhood proposal for park benches and trees in Homestead Park and will be deciding whether to apply for a project grant for that.
- Captain John Mullan—Ms. Snodgrass reported that at their general meeting a couple weeks ago they created bylaws which are now approved through council. Have three new leadership team members. Had the UFDA presentation, which was great. A questionnaire to determine interests of the neighborhood was disseminated. Leadership team will be meeting second week in April. One of our sandwich boards got stolen when advertising for last meeting. There have been emails circulating amongst LT members regarding erecting permanent signage at entrances to neighborhood. If anyone else has thought or done anything like that, I would be interested in talking to you.
- Rose Park—Ms. Puttkammer there will be a general meeting May 15, 6:30 pm at St. Paul's Lutheran Church. Now that the weather is warming up, trying to finish the planting, finishing the maze, raising the flagpole at Triangle Park. Parks and Recreation hopes to have the final recommendation redesign of the Rose Memorial Park completed sometime in May—there is still time to submit public comment.
- Grant Creek—Mr. Walter there will be a general meeting on April 15. Mr. Millar will be presenting UFDA and other related efforts—Long Range Transportation Plan, Zoning update and Envision Missoula. Hoping to get a large turnout. Making progress on the trails project, the Open Space Advisory committee has recommended funding for our easement acquisition program, still needs to be approved through County Commissioners and City Council. Completed the southern half of the fuel reductions program, still has the upper section behind Colorado Gulch to do, we ran out of money. There was not enough timber to sell off the Southern portion as hoped so we are looking for more funding to finish the project.
- Franklin to Fort—Mr. Salmonson thanked the CF for the grant money to support the inventory project, we hope this to be helpful for neighborhoods across the city and will start on that as soon as possible. The complete streets effort is ongoing and is picking up with certain groups in town. The leadership team meets next Tuesday night at the Bethel Baptist Church and the general meeting will be at Pope John Catholic Church on Eaton Street on April 10. Program includes UFDA presentation primarily. There will also be a meeting at Franklin School in the Gym on April 16 on the Russell/3rd St. Project.

Ms. Diaz commented that the project funds will go before City Council on April 14 for final approval.

Monthly report to City Council—moderator prepare

Ms. Elsen made a motion to have the moderator (Mr. Gullickson) summarize the agenda and prepare monthly report to City Council. **Mr. Christiansen** seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Moderator for the next meeting will be Ray Aten

Presentation—UFDA, Roger Millar Office of Planning and Grants

As a follow up to the presentation last month, I am here to answer questions.

Discussion of Missoula's growth rate, it is about 2%—to offer some perspective—Aspen Colorado, which has one the most aggressive growth management in the county, limits growth to 1.8%. Boise Idaho has been growing at 6% for last 25 years and McCall Idaho in excess of 10% per year. A 2% growth rate represents a doubling of the population every 50 years. The population in Montana is aging and the growth rate is slowing. We are not dealing with a growth management crisis, but every development that happens affects somebody. I understand the concern and desire people have to participate in the process. There has been extensive public outreach effort made on this and other projects. Last June we began the long range transportation project. We have had over 400 people through public meetings. The LRTP has a July/August timeframe with a list of projects to put into the next 20 years of construction and the zoning/subdivision rewrite is a year or two from completion. The Greater Downtown Master Plan recently had a public workshop; all of the neighborhoods around the downtown area have been on the steering committee to develop the scope of services for the plan and were represented on the selection committee for the consultant selection. The UFDA project started with data collection last September to develop a database. The database was put into place late December and presented to county commissioners and city council in January. The directive came to take this information out to the community. Basically, the UFDA presentation is about the database—what's in it and how to use it. Through input and the information gathered, scenarios will be created for the future, we will ask what people like or don't like about them, and create a scenario that would go through the public hearing process to amend the growth policy. If we are going to have this 2% growth rate over the next 20 years, and 15,000 households come to Missoula, this is where we would like them to go so that we can make infrastructure investment and zoning/rezoning decisions.

The alternatives or scenarios derived in the long range transportation project were:

- *If Missoula continues to grow as we have grown in the past, what would Missoula look like in 50 years?
- *If the growth focus is on town centers like Bonner, French Town, Lolo and the Wye area, what would the implications be?
- *Then looked at an inward focus scenario—redevelop and reinvest in the urban area.

The intent was to ask people what they like and didn't like about each scenario. The consultant is taking those ideas and crafting a draft scenario for the Long Range Transportation Plan. We are proposing to take those three concepts and do a 20-year projection in the context of this UFDA data and bring it to the officials, discuss it and take it to the public in a series of open houses to have a discussion about likes and dislikes of those alternatives in order to craft an alternative that would then go back to the officials asking permission to send it to the public hearing process. There would be a public hearing before the planning board, and then city council, and county commissioners as an amendment to the growth policy. Goal was to have something to take to the council and commission that we've developed scenarios, taken to the community, gotten feedback and crafted a draft based on that feedback. We think we can get there by July. We will take whatever time necessary for public engagement however.

Concern expressed about getting the information out to neighbors and soliciting comment by this July goal seems very fast tracked. Don't know if this is enough time to get neighborhood councils together to get that kind of feedback when the mindset currently is that UFDA is informational, the transition to policy seems pretty quick. Roger Millar stated that this information sharing has been ongoing since January. All the projects occurring right now are coordinated; intent is to have scenarios available in April to have discussion in April, May, June and July, which would be 4 months and that would get us to a point where we would be comfortable moving forward into a public hearing process, which would provide weeks if not months more opportunity for the public to engage.

Concern about money to fund all these projects—where is the money going to come from for infrastructure. Mr. Millar replied we are looking at is it more or less expensive to grow the way we have been with sprawl over the landscape or to grow in a more compact form and are the potential impacts of growing in a more compact form worth it to the community in terms of savings and money. Can we design development that takes advantage of the existing roads and water system and sewer system...yes we can...does it have implications on people's quality of life...yes it might...that's what the discussion is about, that is why we want people to look at the database. If you ask public works when the 201 plan for the wastewater service area built out how much will that cost and who pays for, Steve King will probably give you a number. We need a scheme that minimizes costs. What we have is a constrained transportation plan, we have to guesstimate how much money we have, the federal government tells us how much money is coming in, we have impact fees and other monies, add all that up, take out what we are projecting to spend to maintain and operate our existing system, and that tells us how much money we have for improvements; it is woefully inadequate—not up to task. Plan will be to get to where we have enough money to make the improvements, let alone to accommodate growth, but pave the streets to the level of quality people would like to see. It is going to take revenue we don't have; we will have to find it.

Question asked, "what are some things you foresee being included in the amendment that would create changes for neighborhoods; would it be changes in density, zoning, or changes in making wider roads?" Mr. Millar explained that what we are looking at is where you want to see and how many you want to see of the 10-15 thousand projected new homes. Not talking about radical numbers, it may be some change, like housing downtown where it doesn't exist today. Might see housing in mixed use communities along the Brooks Street corridor or around the Southgate Mall where it doesn't exist today or where things are just starting to happen. This is a growth allocation or framework map that will be in the growth policy if it is amended and adopted that the elected officials could then look at for neighborhood plan updates, for requests for rezoning of property. Decision makers can refer to the plan when asked to make decisions. It is not going to change the zoning on anybody's land directly, not going to change the transportation plan directly, but it will be a part of our growth policy that will be used when consider rezoning requests. Orchard Homes area has no plan, it has a 1990 land use map and a neighborhood plan has not been produced. The neighborhood wants a plan and our office is working to put a budget request together for next year so that we can initiate a neighborhood plan. The idea would be that whatever growth is on that map would be accounted for in the neighborhood plan, we would accommodate that through the land use recommendations and through the investment in infrastructure decisions so that we had a plan that was a product of the neighborhood but fit the regional context.

We are looking for feedback, the score cards being handed out at meetings are optional, if you have a question or comment you can write that on the back, comments can be submitted via email on the website, they can be mailed in, they can be sent to me, informal process. A lot of the meetings are aired on MCAT as well. When we get to the public hearings and the public comment matters, people know what is going on. This project is available for neighborhoods if you are looking to develop a wildlife plan, or what is going on with sewer, or wondering where bike trails are, or where proposed future development will be you can use this database to formulate your comments.

Mr. Millar gave a power point presentation at this point.

We took the alternative scenarios from Envision Missoula and bring them into the database and look at a smaller window—20 year as opposed to 50-100 year window. Some common themes: 34 of the 35 maps showed more transit than roadway improvements; 26 of the 35 showed extensive high capacity transit; and 25 of the 30 focused on multi-modal improvements to existing roadways. There was strong interest in mixed uses. Multi- modal improvements coupled with redevelopment was another idea.

Scenarios give us the ability to explore the consequences of different strategies. 'Business as usual' was roadway expansion based, employment in central Missoula with housing trending out the way it has been (low density sprawl). The 'satellite town centers' had four distinct multi-modal corridors. It proposed the greatest amount of public investment in transportation of the three scenarios, and employment was in satellite and mixed use commercial centers. The 'focus inward' really looked at the downtown and a mobility district and focused most of the investment in pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

Explained the colors on maps and what it means. 'Business as usual' emphasis is on roadway expansion, employment continued to be in central Missoula and it extended the current housing trends. 'Satellite town centers' activity centers in addition to central city, four distinct multi-modal corridors (Hwy. 93, 3rd Street, Mullan, Broadway/I-90) the most investment in transit and greatest geographical distribution. 'Focus inward' intense level of development in the downtown, Brooks and Reserve Streets corridors, and the downtown mobility district would really focus on pedestrian and bicycle investment. Growth occurs contiguously and compactly near central Missoula and downtown really becomes a 24-hour a day place.

Showed slides of maps that referenced numerous areas like growing employment, multi-modal improvement coupled with redevelopment, housing, transportation ideas and development patterns, green house gas emissions, vehicle trips per day (miles/time), newly developed land in square miles, etc. Comment regarding facts, and costs. It is hard to make decisions without the benefits of fact; there are no facts on the table as to what the cost is going to be for any of these scenarios. Mr. Millar replied we will try to have some cost information, but we probably won't have enough information to satisfy many.

Ms. Diaz would like people to think about ways you want to be involved from this conversation tonight and the planning last month. Most have a concern that you want to make sure the public knows what is going on and that there is public opinion involved, which is really what NC's are all about, increasing citizen participation and in what way can we help increase participation that for the open houses that OPG will be conducting. That is one thought, if there is others, we can start discussing next month how as a group you want to work together on certain projects.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Ross

Christine Ross
Secretary
City Clerk's Office