

**Community Forum Meeting
Meeting Minutes
September 25, 2008
7:00 p.m. City Council Chambers
Moderator, Ray Aten**

Captain John Mullan – Kathie Snodgrass (Rep)

Emma Dickinson –Jen Calder (Rep)

FarViews/Pattee Canyon – Ray Aten (Rep)

Franklin to the Fort – Jon Salmonson (Alt)

Grant Creek – Absent

Heart of Missoula – Absent

Lewis & Clark – Absent

Lower Rattlesnake – Absent

Miller Creek – Absent

Moose Can Gully – Jo Kimery (Alt)

Northside –Absent

Riverfront – Absent

Rose Park – Absent

South 39th – Jeff Stevens (Rep)

Southgate Triangle – Absent

University District – John Snively (Rep)

Upper Rattlesnake – Jan Hoem (Rep)

Westside – Absent

City Council Liaison – Jon Wilkins

Neighborhood Liaison – LaNette Diaz

Others Present

Laval Means, Steve King, Cynthia Holweger

Quorum

Quorum is not present.

Adoption of Agenda

No motion as quorum not present

Approval of CF Minutes from July 24, 2008

No motion as quorum not present

Consent Agenda

Approve request out of Neighborhood Project Grant Committee from the Lower Rattlesnake NC for a small grant in the amount of \$200 to supplement funding of a Large Project Grant called the "Gateway Project".

No vote due to no quorum present.

Public Comment (non-agenda items from audience)

Laval Means with OPG and project manager for the Zoning and Subdivision Update. Ms. Means offered her availability to address Neighborhood Councils with a presentation of where the process is currently. Development of draft language of over half of the zoning regulations has been reviewed by the advisory

group and would like to hear about how it works or affects neighborhoods, and gather questions and feedback. An email has been sent out to CF reps/alt and NC contacts. Just let Tom Zavitz or myself know if you are interested.

Mr. Salmonson had a question about the parkland dedication. Ms. Means expressed that Jackie (Corday) introduced the project at Planning Board to require parkland dedication for minor subdivisions Tuesday night which recommended waiting until the zoning and subdivision project was further along; it was then brought to Council with the recommendation of Planning Board and Council set a public hearing the third Monday in October. Mr. Salmonson said there is a great deal of interest in our neighborhood and would like to hear more about it if it will be included in the zoning update. Ms. Means said there may have been some modifications from PAZ and Planning Board; PAZ actions would be the most current and can be found on the city website.

Ms. Hoem asked how long the presentation would be. Ms. Means said they can work within the agenda; it would be great to have 20-30 minutes, but will work within the time available.

Neighborhood Liasion Report—LaNetteDiaz

*Budget there is a small increase in the mailing supplement for postage. The \$1000 asked for the training series was approved and placed in CF budget. Discussion will occur soon about what training topics will be for next year.

*The neighborhood grand deadline was last Friday and 13 applicants submitted \$27,000 in requests for \$20,000 available. Currently in department review for comments and will go to the committee for ranking and recommendation and then will come to CF in November.

*Bus tour will be October 11 and there are seats available for the general public. Submission forms are requested by Monday for sites to be included in the tour.

Committee Reports

Volunteer of the Year Committee Jeff Stevens

Ms. Diaz noted there is a nomination form in your packet, also available online at the neighborhood website. If you know of anyone this is the opportunity to recognize them for their efforts submit nomination by November 7. The committee will rank and select from the nominees and bring back to CF.

New Business

Move November and December CFLT and CF meetings to the respective dates: Nov. 6 CFLT and Nov. 20 CF, Dec. 4 CFLT and Dec. 18 for CF

*these items will be discussed and voted on next month

CFLT Bylaw Changes –Ray Aten

Mr. Aten indicated this is for review and discussion and will be voted on next month.

The changes proposed are under LEADERSHIP TEAM, i.e. specifically 5. LEADERSHIP TEAM 5.3 are to strike of 5.3.3, 5.3.4 and addition of new language 5.3.4.

Mr. Stevens suggests item 3, under 5.3 typo in last sentence ...report is prepared ~~is~~ shall be...strike second is and replace with **it** 5.3.4 second line ...of those **duties** at...correct spelling.

Ms. Hoem suggested addition of the word **annual** goals in 5.3.4 first line ...for setting goals of...

Draft Resolution adopting additional duties of CFLT Ray Aten

Ms. Snodgrass suggested a change in Paragraph 3, ...in the bylaws but ~~that~~...strike that and replace with in which.

Mr. Aten asked all present to take back to leadership teams for review and solicit any additional suggestions and get them to the Neighborhood Liaison to incorporate prior to next meeting.

Ongoing Business

Infrastructure funding—next steps (LaNette Diaz)

Steps so far: *looked at the citizen survey conducted earlier this year with the Mayor providing the results, which indicated that folks were interested in improving traffic management and road maintenance.

*Budget 101 with Bruce Bender took a look at ways things are funded and how to fund above and beyond what is funded currently.

*Street Maintenance District explanations by Brentt Ramharter from Finance Department and special improvements or 'enhancement districts' within those.

Where do we go from here? Ms. Diaz came up with some criteria to provide in a general meeting setting and provide explanation. Around those criteria, design the right questions to ask to gather and understand what people's opinions are. In what has been presented previously, came up with:

- Expenditure types and proportions from general fund
- How much goes into each department
- Expenses by department
- General fund revenues-where the money comes from
- Fees that can only be used for 'dedicated' purposes like impact fees; compare to other cities and how they use those
- Survey of how much impact fees are in other cities in MT for general office building, commercial building and a single family residential home.
- Compare what other maintenance districts exist in the state compared with what Missoula has currently

There could be a questionnaire to provide the opportunity to talk about how to set up a street maintenance or improvement district (would have to make sure it complied with MT state law). Some options for establishing districts are:

- a) have 1 city-wide district with pooled funds and prioritized by public works
- b) have 2-3 districts with pooled funds and prioritized by public works
- c) have many districts, combining neighborhoods, funds pooled in each area and projects prioritized by public works, and
- d) would people be more likely to vote in favor if they had a say in prioritizing projects

Clarification is needed to determine if an improvement district could be on its own or if it has to be within a street maintenance district in accordance with state code. Would like to determine what citizens would support if it came up for a vote. Would like to get a solid presentation together and present in Spring meetings to Neighborhood Councils.

Comments:

Mr. Snively commented that if the CF rep presents, there may be questions we may not be able to answer. **Ms. Diaz** suggested pulling together a pool or group of support to attend meetings to answer those complex questions could be worked out. **Mr. Aten** stated this is one particular model for funding, are there other kinds. **Ms. Diaz** replied, there are others like arterial and lighting districts but Mr. Ramharter brought forth these two examples (street maintenance and special improvement) because it goes above and beyond what is currently in existence and it can be included as part of the general fund. Parks maintenance districts are pretty much an SID, we could put that forward and see what people think, but this forum was interested in infrastructure so we focused on that. The storm water utility district could be

another part of the questionnaire. The arterial construction fee is already part of the general fund. We could look at more. **Ms. Snodgrass** expressed that the parks and tree and boulevard districts may spark interest, although it is in the budget, it is not as large an item as some would like to see. **Mr. Salmonson** suggested using the expertise of Steve King tonight to provide suggestions of other options, what is feasible, what is out there. **Steve King** stated this discussion has been going in city hall for some time and thanked the forum for having such discussion now. There has been discussion with the urban forester about street districts; it may include boulevards and trees. What does it cost will be the issue. Between the Mayor's initiative with the citizen survey, the forum's initiative with this type of grass roots survey, and the administration doing strategic planning with Council, all this could help formulate where we go. Missoula has a tradition of not having maintenance districts, other peer cities have them; we compete with departments like police, fire and parks to maintain our roads. Avenues of potential are street or maintenance districts within state law. There is a gasoline local option county-wide tax which could generate significant funds, not near as much as districts option, and there is a local option bed tax. A local sales tax has not been authorized by the legislature so is not an option. **Mr. Wilkins** commented that the league of cities is going to lobby the legislature this year on the local option sales tax so that is a potential future option. Some back and forth discussion on taxations and rededicating funds for establishing districts and spending occurred. **Ms. Diaz** explained that Mr. Ramharter is doing an in-depth survey looking at other cities to compare what they generate on the average price home with Missoula for tax comparisons for revenue generation. **Ms. Hoem** expressed the importance of clarity and why this is important to consider when bringing to NC's or we may lose their interest quickly. **Mr. Wilkins** commented that a big draw for citizens to get behind is the road maintenance. **Ms. Diaz** summarized by saying there is more potential of where this can go. **Mr. Stevens** said in looking at the four options, he is wondering what the administrative and organizational point of view—pros and cons may be—and if Mr. King has any thoughts on that. **Steve King** replied that these are good choices, but a blended alternative may be preferable. Obviously the simpler is better for administration tracking and accountability so it would be much easier if there were a single city-wide district, but popularity is important and responsiveness to unique neighborhoods and unique characteristics are important as well. Carrying the burden of multi-area districts with separate accounting and projects would require more administration and therefore be more bureaucratic. **Mr. Aten** said that from where we started with this, basically what are the other options for funding and transportation is the general picture we want to paint before talking about specific budget. **Ms. Diaz** will continue working on this presentation and bring forward updates and continue to solicit feedback.

Neighborhood Council Updates

- Lower Rattlesnake—absent
- Grant Creek—absent
- Miller Creek—absent
- Westside—absent
- Lewis & Clark—absent
- Northside—absent
- Riverfront—absent
- Rose Park—absent
- Southgate Triangle—absent
- Lewis & Clark—absent
- Heart of Missoula—absent
- University—will have a LT meeting in next week or two to plan upcoming fall meeting.
- Moose Can Gully—are planning for general meeting in November.
- South 3^{9th} St.—will have our general meeting October 22 to have elections, presentation on the proposed 911 emergency center, UFDA update and possibly the zoning rewrite, update on the Tonkin

Trail grant application, update on Southern Hills Trails grant application and update on the Southern Hills subdivision.

- Upper Rattlesnake—LT talking about preparation for a fall meeting.
- Farviews/Pattee Canyon—LT had decided on Nov. 6 for general meeting with multiple presentations and decision on the complete streets resolution and update on the neighborhood parks master plan.
- Emma Dickinson/Orchard Homes—our general meeting will be October 7 or 8 to present an update on the Milwaukee Trail project—where we are at and where we want to be. Looking at a new name to clearly identify our neighborhood and not be such a mouthful as well.
- Cpt. John Mullan—had our general meeting last week with a presentation from a state road representative about Mullan Road and other possible prospects for future development—not a bright picture for what we are interested in. There is a committee working on Pleasant View Park and they applied for a large project grant to get it started.
- Franklin to the Fort—had Russell/3rd St. meeting last night instead of general meeting, it was well attended.
- City Council Liaison Report—looking at possibly forming a peer group for the Russell St. EIS; PAZ looking at Phase IV to Flynn Ranch subdivision; and finally passed the budget.

Presentations

Residential Inspection Program (Cynthia Holweger)

Goal of the program is to assist home owners, tenants, landlords, and property managers in developing a healthier and safer environment for people to live in and to reduce substandard living conditions in our neighborhoods and maintain the reputation of the City of Missoula being a great place to live. Some of the unsafe conditions found in this program were 8" of water under a mobile home, a bedroom with exposed outlet wiring, numerous outlets that should be gfi rated due to location that are not, drainage not properly diverted and contributing to rotting of foundation. The program has attracted more home owners than tenants. There are 11 points on the checklist, which were gone over with examples shared of finding problems. People have been cooperative with the recommendations provided. Three certifications have been issued. Mr. Wilkins added that the subcommittee members that worked on this ordinance were from all facets and it was a long process to come up with the 11 points. He shared the story of a tragic death of a family member and that a building inspector fell through a rotted floor that sparked this program coming into place. With a rental property, this is a good marketing tool, having that certification sticker as proof of a safe property. There are some bad housing conditions in Missoula, this program is necessary and Cynthia and myself would appreciate the opportunity to present at general meetings the positive aspects of this program. There are carbon monoxide testers available that were purchased by the Missoula Organization of Realtors in support of this program as well. Next year the nominal \$15 fee will be increased to cover staff time, so take advantage of it now. There are brochures available to those who would like for distribution. The inspection can be asked for by home owners, landlords, tenants or be complaint driven. The implementation of recommendations is done voluntarily but there is enforceable code if necessary. In order for lower income folks to get low or no interest loans to fix problems, working with the University to find grant money.

Russell & 3rd EIS (Steve King)

Mr. King is here to inform as to what is happening with the EIS and extend an invite to participate in the public comment process. Looking at the physical features of our city, namely the Clark Fork River, presents a barrier thus the bridges line up with our major north/south streets. These bridges are limited and those streets are vital to cross town traffic which have a lot of traffic. With limited crossings of the river there is congestion. What is obvious is a process for action and remedy. Both Russell and S. 3rd St. were identified in the 1996 transportation plan as top priority projects. Subsequent transportation plans are done every 4 years, the 2000, 2004 and current 2008 plan updates all have these streets as priority.

Now is the time for the citizens to comment and engage in constructive criticism, please participate in that process. One of the things in the transportation plan is to receive federal money; it is required to be in conformance with air quality limitations. One of the big components of air quality degradation is congestion. Have to show that congestion would be relieved with the project to be in conformance with the long range transportation plan. It is not just a local choice to build whatever we want and use federal money, it is conditional with these factors. Problems: incomplete street built before ADA and sidewalk standards, Broadway intersection is not efficient or inviting, the trail connections along the riverfront are not tied in currently, and there is congestion. This area is a major non-motorized link area that this project has integrated into it with establishing connectors. Not so obvious problems are neighborhood cut-through traffic on Catlin and California streets are serious and getting worse and translate to problems in the neighborhood. Air quality is diminished with congestion-free flowing traffic would use 1/5 of the fuel as stop-and-go traffic—this is an economic factor as well. We have looked at solutions and narrowed down to five fully analyzed alternatives to bring for consideration. The preferred alternative is just that because it meets purpose and need of mobility and safety and conforms with federal regulations related to properties. What has been determined is that Stephens Ave. is the model of an arterial roadway that we should strive to emulate the features of—landscaping, lighting, pedestrian refuges, bike lanes and boulevards. The department has been meeting with the public and groups to get a broad perspective of what people want. There have been a lot of negative comments regarding Russell Street on the size of road compared to the scale of the neighborhood, people are wanting a less impactive road. Russell Street runs through neighborhoods and is now a blighted and unsafe road, but in my opinion, has the potential for being a much better road. After all the comments are collected and addressed, which will take several months, the feds and state will look at again, prepare a final EIS, have another comment period and a record of decision will come out which will allow access to the federal money.

on Russell Street, Broadway to 3rd Street is the first phase. There is money available and we are ready to start the final processes of design and start right-of-way acquisitions which are expected to take two years or so. We are three years from beginning construction. Need to determine financing for the southern section from 3rd to Mount and looking for alternatives to do that.

South 3rd Street will be a local project, will reconstruct with local forces and taxes—similar to Mullan from Broadway to Reserve, and South Ave. from Johnson to Reserve—those were local projects with assessments to adjacent property owners for curbs and sidewalks costs and gas tax money with city crews doing the work. This would take a couple years to complete and could begin in two years. It would need a decision by council regarding assessments to adjacent property owners for improvement.

Mr. King encouraged everyone to seek the EIS documents, there are summaries as well for review and submit comments. Mr. King said he is willing and able to attend general meetings of NC's to talk about this project.

Questions: **Mr. Aten** reiterated for clarification, there are two concepts for Russell Street, the northern section now, the southern section is in the future. **Mr. King** replied, yes, the southern section is unscheduled in the future pending funding. **Mr. Aten** asked once the record of decision is made is there flexibility. **Steve King** replied, on pg 2-63 project phasing relates to change of condition; the draft EIS recognizes that and there could be reconsideration. **Mr. Salmonson** asked how the comments will be assessed in order to make change. **Mr. King** said it is a federal document, my understanding is that every question is considered and comments are categorized accordingly, and are preserved, analyzed and responded to. As to how many comments would effectively change that issue, I don't know that. **Mr. Salmonson** asked if there were comments made addressing the trails in the area. **Steve King** replied yes, he particularly liked the painting which showed the four trails connecting with an aerial bridge. People don't even have to talk to make public comment; they can submit a drawing or whatever.

Monthly report to City Council—request to report on non-agenda items

(the monthly report to City Council will be made by the moderator of the meeting. The report made will address all items on the Community Forum agenda for the month. A request for reporting on non-agenda items will occur at Community Forum to ensure pertinent non-agenda are reported as well).

Moderator for the next meeting will be **Mr. Stevens**.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Ross

Christine Ross
Secretary, Office of Neighborhoods
City Clerk's Office

*Copies of any handouts and referenced documents at this meeting are on file in the City Clerk's Office