

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

Affirmations					
#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
1	Ainsworth	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
2	Bridges*	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
3	EMCC	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
4	Thomas*	No change	Supportive, increases to pedestrian infrastructure may be addressed through implementation.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
5	Vero*	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
6	Yould	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
7	Cusker*	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
8	Dubuque*	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change

Questions					
#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
9	Leonard	No change	Area in question (city) is not part of this project.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
10	Schwartz	No change	Area in question (Lolo) is not part of this project.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
11	Hayes* Can density bonuses work without annexation?	No change	Clustering and incentives are important tools for protecting resources like agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and public access. The zoning code update is key to implementing clustering and density bonuses successfully. Public systems may be necessary when pursuing a density bonus but would not be required. The systems can be privately owned and operated and do not require annexation into the city. It is intended that a portion of the cost associated with such systems would be offset by additional developable units.		Follow staff recommendation - No change

Comments Recommending Specific Changes					
#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
12	Benson Farm*				
12.1	Current zoning allows restricted commercial	Change to map	This is something we missed. Neighborhood Center is more compatible with current zoning. Upon further review, there are some adjacent properties zoned commercial that will also need to be changed.	Change map to Neighborhood Center in areas zoned commercial	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
12.2	Can I keep farming?	No change	The land use map does not require landowners to change the current use of their property. Agriculture can occur in any designation. The mapping project cannot alleviate pressure from existing development in the city.		Follow staff recommendation - No change

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
12.3	Benson Concern about traffic considerations.	Change to text	When the transportation plan is updated, they will use the updated land use map to identify road improvements and their modeling. We recommend a change to the implementation action under "Coordination" to discuss how this land use map and other plans like our Transportation Plan interact and inform each other.	Add text to Implementation Section. New Implementation Action "Relationship to Other Plans" Text: Land uses, demographics, the community's values and ideas on growth and development are always evolving. There isn't one plan that can address all the issues in Missoula County, in fact there are many. Some are specific to a location, called an area plan, some are specific to an issue, called an issue plan. This Land Use Element primarily focuses on land use at a 40,000 foot level; for example it doesn't incorporate all of our transportation considerations, or evaluate the detailed data on our changing environment, there are other plans that will. For example the county is currently drafting its first Climate Resiliency Plan. This plan is collecting the best available data, public input, and developing actions to address climate change in Missoula County. The Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization, a joint City-County entity that plans for our transportation network, will update our transportation plan in the next few years. These plans that guide decision making in the county are intended to work together and inform one another. As the resiliency plan is adopted, it will have recommendations regarding adaptation strategies that may warrant amendments to the land use map. When the transportation plan is updated, it will use the land use designations in this plan for their modeling, to help identify future transportation improvements. This cycle relationship will need to be ongoing in order to capture the never ending changes in our community. Priority – High Timing - Ongoing	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
13 13.1	Black and Dokken Requests Rural Residential rather than Residential designations	No change	The recommendation land use designation in this area is due to the level of infrastructure (sewer, water, roads) that can currently or feasibly be expanded to support a build out at higher densities. The scope of this update does not reflect covenants, but it also does not revoke covenants. Landowners are free to maintain requirements for less dense development.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
13.2	Non-motorized connection between Upper Miller Creek and Mansion Heights	No change	Non-motorized facilities are encouraged in the Residential designation due to the mix of uses.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
13.3	Against street lights	No change	Beyond the scope of this project.		Follow staff recommendation - No change

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
14	CFAC, Buckingham* Supportive of density bonuses and soil conservation. Requests changing the title of the "Rural Residential" designation to something that better acknowledges agriculture.	Change to text	The land use designation names could be changed to better reflect the important role agriculture plays in these areas. It would require changes to two designations: "Rural Residential and Small Agriculture" and "Rural Residential and Small Agriculture".	Change: <i>Rural Residential and Small Agriculture to Rural Residential and Agriculture</i> Change: <i>Rural Residential to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture</i>	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
15	Daigle* Requests change from Neighborhood Residential to Commercial Center to a portion of land along I-90	Change to map	This area is currently unzoned and lacks infrastructure. The current designation is an increase in density and allows for limited scale commercial activity. The limited area of commercial requested provides a buffer between residential uses and the interstate.	Change map according to comment	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
16.1	Dreissen, DeSmet Principal* Would like to see increased transportation safety to the school through the industrial area.	No change	The Industrial Center designation recommends that all roads provide non-motorized facilities, with additional separation as vehicle speed and traffic volume increases.		
16.2	Requests a land northwest of the airport be changed from Industrial Center to mixed use for increased pedestrian safety en route to DeSmet School, noting that Shadow Asphalt is currently zoned Commercial.	Change to map	Based on the landowner support and surrounding residential use a change to Neighborhood Center could be acceptable. This map update converts some industrial land to different residential designations within the DeSmet School District. The map also increases the acreage of residential designations north of the highway. The challenge in the DeSmet School District outside city limits is the lack of infrastructure to support residential development. The implementation strategy includes some potential infrastructure projects that would enable residential development in the DeSmet School District boundary.	Change map to Neighborhood Center south of Broadway and the railroad, and between the Residential designation to the west and Neighborhood Residential to the east.	On a 4-3 vote, PB approved following staff recommendation - Change to map. Note: Additional information from staff not considered prior to the Planning Board's decision - This area is currently zoned Light Industry with approximately five industrial operations taking place on site. With this information, a change to Neighborhood Center may not be acceptable.
17	Erickson and Wilson Change property on Ravenwood Lane from Residential to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture because of private covenants	No change	Covenants are agreements between private landowners and are not affected by the county land use map. The area is surrounded by the city, with roads, water and sewer all nearby.		Follow staff recommendation - No change

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
18	Five Valleys Audubon Change area west of the airport to Working Lands or Open Space	No change	This area was designated as Residential or Rural Residential to reflect the current zoning. Staff does not recommend applying land use designations that are less dense than existing zoning unless there are mapped and recognized public health and safety concerns like floodplains or high fire hazards. If the planning board recommends a change, we recommend Agriculture for the valley bottoms where the soils are better and Working Lands for the clay benches.		Deviate from staff recommendation - Change to map Given the area's important bird habitat and water features, and the echoing comment from Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Planning Board recommended a change to Agriculture on the valley bottoms, where there are better soils, and Working Lands on the clay benches.
19	Lowney Add more residential near DeSmet School	No change	See Dreissen Comment 2.	See Dreissen Comment 2.	
20	MBIA				
20.1	Include more areas for housing	No change	The broad request is balanced through other requests that give and take residential designations. This update provides for between 18,000 to 35,000 new housing units when population projections show a need for 6,000. Infrastructure is going to be our biggest challenge to meeting housing demands.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
20.2	Change Fort Missoula area to mixed use or commercial	No change	Based on the map notation, the area in question is not part of the planning area. There is some Working Lands adjacent to Fort Missoula but they have a conservation easement on them.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
20.3	New designation for Target Range with 6 units per acre	No change	Based on public input, the methodology for the Target Range area is to follow the densities recommended in the Target Range Neighborhood Plan.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
20.4	Expand Residential in Orchard Homes to Clements from Third to South	Change to map	In the Orchard Homes area, the locations for 3-11 units per acre is based on densities in the Our Missoula Growth Policy (city growth policy), as city services will be the driver of development patterns. A change to Neighborhood Center on South Avenue would match the Our Missoula Growth Policy and expand some potential for high residential density.	Change a portion of the map from Residential to Neighborhood Center to add density and to be consistent with City of Missoula Growth Policy	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
20.5	Commercial designation at Buckhouse Bridge	Change to map	Portions of the floodplain in this area has been surveyed and have proven to be outside the 100-year floodplain, opening more development options to the landowner. Recommend changes to commercial in the areas outside the 100-year floodplain in the area adjacent to existing commercial uses.	Change portions of area outside 100-year floodplain by Blue Mountain Road to Commercial	Deviate from staff recommendation - Change to map PB: Change the map from Agriculture to Commercial Center on Lot D2 of Buckhouse Flats which is zoned commercial, and the unzoned lots to the east that have been determined to be out of the floodplain.
20.6	Doubts the Planned Neighborhood NW of I-90 and Reserve will be achieved	Change to map	This area has terrain that may complicate development. In addition, other comments from MTFWP suggest this is an area of important wildlife value, it could be changed to Working Lands. See FWP Comment 14.	Change Planned Neighborhood to Working Lands	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
20.7	Supports the Community Mixed Use designation east of the airport	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
20.8	Wants Community Mixed Use instead of Neighborhood Residential	No change	Proposed land use designations in this area reflects discussions with city of Missoula staff. The proposed designation is for high density residential with limited mixed uses that is in character and scale to the surrounding neighborhood. Community Mixed Use would allow for more intense commercial uses. There is a general desire between the county and the city to keep larger scale commercial near Broadway, where there are fewer constraints with the transportation network.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
20.9	Wants Residential designation north of Mullan and east of Deschamps Lane	No change	Rural Residential and Small Ag reflects the current zoning and is more appropriate given the areas important bird habitat and wetlands.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
20.10	Supportive but the area needs infrastructure	No change	Supportive. Implementation plan calls for more infrastructure.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
20.11	Industrial on both sides of Hwy 93 and more residential west of Hwy 93	No change	Industrial is not in character with current development patterns. The only road in this area is a major arterial (Hwy 93). Industrial uses are more appropriate in areas with a more complete collector and minor arterial road grid. The area lacks infrastructure to increase residential density.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
21	MOR* Requests the area east of Clements change from Rural Residential to Residential	No change	Based on public input, the methodology for the Target Range area is to follow the densities recommended in the Target Range Neighborhood Plan.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
22	Stewart*				
22.1	Which document takes precedence in project review: this update or Target Range Neighborhood Plan?	No change	Both documents will be referred to as projects in the area are brought forward. This update will provide broad guidance and the Target Range Neighborhood Plan providing more site-specific guidance.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
22.2	Neighborhood plan uses term Conservation design, does not call for density bonus	No change	Density bonuses incentivize the protection of public goods and may be available in the update, but they are not required.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
22.3	Requests clarity on the Civic Employment Center	No change	This designation is intentionally broad to allow for it to be tailored to the wide range of potential uses (University, hospital, airport, public employer).		Follow staff recommendation - No change
22.4	Rural Residential and Small agriculture does not fit the O'Brien Creek area	No change	The proposed land use designations reflect current zoning designations, the area does not have infrastructure necessary to support higher levels of development.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
23	Left blank - No comment 23				
24	Left blank - no comment 24				

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
25	Swartz* Requests Rural Residential and Small Ag rather than Neighborhood Residential. Covenants require less density than what is recommended.	Change to map	The recommended land use for this location is based on sewer recently being extended to the parcel, providing an opportunity to support a build out at higher densities. Covenants are agreements between landowners and were not evaluated in this project, but it also does not revoke covenants. Landowners are free to maintain requirements for less dense development. That said, because this property is adjacent to a larger area of Rural Residential and Small Agriculture, a change can be supported.	Change Neighborhood Residential to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture on parcel north of Waldo Road.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
26	Taylor				
26.1	Requests areas in Target Range and Orchard Homes be designated as Agriculture	Change to text	The Agriculture designation identifies areas within the floodplain and/or prime farmland with irrigation facilities. There is potential to edit designation names in the following way to better reflect the important role agriculture plays in these areas: "Rural Residential and Small Agriculture" and "Rural Residential and Small Agriculture." Otherwise the methodology for Target Range is to follow the densities in the Target Range Neighborhood Plan.	See CFAC comment 14.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
26.2	Requests mentions of "density bonus" be changed to "conservation design developments"	No change	Density bonuses incentivize the protection of public goods and may be available in the update, but they are not required.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
27	TLI* Requests Commercial Center instead of Agriculture near Blue Mountain Road, north of Hwy 93 S	Change to map	The areas shown to be within the Shaded-X 500-year floodplain may be permitted to develop and should be designated Commercial Center.	See MBIA comment 20.5.	See MBIA comment 20.5 for PB decision.
28	Welzenbach Requests Residential rather than Rural Residential north of Hawthorne Elementary	No change	The proposed land use designation in this area follows the recommendations in the Our Missoula Growth Policy as city services will be the driver of development patterns. Current citizen-initiated zoning allows for two dwellings per acre.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
29	WGM Group* Requests Community Mixed Use rather than Neighborhood Center, near Reserve Street, south of I-90	Change to map	Large parcels, of about 82 acres, under single ownership may benefit from the potential for master planning, mix of uses and high density provided for in the Community Mixed Use designation. There is sufficient infrastructure in place or planned for the area. The original recommendation reflects current zoning as a mix of commercial and mid-level density, while the change would align with the city's growth policy designation of Community Mixed Use.	Change Neighborhood Center designation to Community Mixed Use	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
30	Bishop Request change from Neighborhood Residential to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture for small area north of Waldo Road	Change to map	See Swartz comment 25.	See Swartz comment 25.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
31	Julianna Engh Peters Change Rural Residential to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture in Target Range. Follow densities in neighborhood plan	No Change	The proposed land use designations are consistent with the densities in the neighborhood plan, the densities in rural residential and small agriculture are not. But see response to comment 14 on how to better highlight small agriculture and follow the densities called for in the neighborhood plan.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
32	Richardson, Dick Change Agricultural Designation to Commercial in area near intersection of Blue Mountain Road and Hwy 93 South	Change to map	The areas shown to be within the Shaded-X 500-year floodplain may be permitted to develop and should be designated Commercial Center. See comment 27.	See MBIA comment 20.5.	See MBIA comment 20.5 for PB decision.

General Comments					
#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change to Text	PB Recommendation
33	Dahlgren Give deference to target range neighborhood plan	No change	The land use map reflects the Target Range Neighborhood Plan, which was strongly supported during the public outreach process.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
34	Erickson				
34.1	Identify finding sources for funding agricultural easements as an implementation step	Change to text	Funding sources for easements is outside the scope of this plan, it is better suited for the Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails (PROST) Plan as that is the county document that guides conservation. But a change is recommended to the coordination implementation section to describe the relationship of this plan to other plans like the PROST plan.	See Benson Farm comment 12.3 and FWP-T1 comment.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
34.2	Include a map showing the no build areas around the airport	No change	The Missoula County Airport Authority now owns the no build areas around the airport and has been annexed into the city limits. Such a map is not warranted for this project since the area in question is not part of this project.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
34.3	Include a map showing zoning and easements	No change	These are existing conditions and have been evaluated. The current county zoning and conservation easements were included in the Planning Area Profile and played an important role in determining recommended designations. This is a forward-looking plan, documentation of existing conditions is not appropriate. As zoning and easements change, the zoning and easements maps would shortly make this plan out of date. Information about zoning and easements is available online.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
34.4	Developing impact fees to discourage development in hazard areas due to climate change	Change to text	There are limitations to the authority counties have in instituting impact fees. This is not within the county's legal authority. But we should improve language on climate change, specifically to how the resiliency plan will provide better directives to the county and may call for changes to the land use map.	See Benson Farm comment 12.3 and FWP-T1 comment.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
35 35.1	Matson, Gary* Supportive of a more proactive zoning, infrastructure planning and economic development.	No change	Supportive		Follow staff recommendation - No change
35.2	Expand the Live/Make designation to all of West Riverside	Change to map	Make change to unzoned properties accessing Tremper and Flagler. We do not recommend this designation for mobile home parks because the proximity of mobile homes in a park is too high for mixing businesses that are more intensive than home occupations.	Change portions of area to Live/Make	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
35.3	Increase the color difference for the ORR and Heavy Industrial designations	Change to map	These colors are hard to distinguish, especially in Bonner, where the designations are adjacent. This change will make the map more accessible.	Change color	Follow staff recommendation - Change to map
36	Matson, Judy* Expand Live/Make to all of West Riverside	Change to map	Make change to unzoned properties accessing Tremper and Flagler. We do not recommend this designation for mobile home parks because the proximity of mobile homes is too high for mixing businesses that are more intensive than home occupations.	See comment 35.2	Deviate from staff recommendation - Change to map
37	Richardson, Lorna Improve outreach to landowners	No change	Recommendations for specific ways to improve this communication are always welcome. The public outreach efforts for this project took place over the course of a year in three rounds of outreach, with attempts to reach as many interested parties as possible through email, public notice and advertising in news publications and on social media.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
38	Siebert Incorporate small scale forest management in areas within ½ mile of residences and utilize small diameter wood in creative ways	No change	The scope of this project is too broad to incorporate these suggestions.		Follow staff recommendation - No change
39	Gray Designate areas along major roads and multi-family	No change	Access to roads, water and sewer were considered in identifying locations for multi-family. Multi-family is allowed in the neighborhood residential, planned neighborhood, neighborhood center, commercial center and community mixed use designations.		Follow staff recommendation - No change

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
40 40.1	Haber Plan fails to mention climate change	Change to text	Climate change and resiliency should be addressed. See recommended changes. One of the key considerations of the land use map is to provide for a diversity and full range of housing types, and for better or worse, the 0.5 to 1 acre lots is a popular housing type. The land use map reduces the amount of area designated for low density residential development in the 0.5 to 1 acre lot size, and calls for higher densities in areas currently targeted for low density when in proximity to infrastructure, such as Orchard Homes, Miller Creek, and north of the airport. The only places where we kept this designation is where we have infrastructure limitations and conflicting wildlife values, such as upper the Rattlesnake and Grant Creek, or in areas with significant amounts of prime agricultural soils, such as Target Range. A few areas west of the airport have this designation because it is currently zoned that way and has significant wildlife values. We feel like we have limited this land use designation to areas where there are no other options. Overall, the land use map calls for a significant shift for development in the Missoula area to be more compact and provide diverse housing choices in the future.	See Benson Farm comment 12.3 and FWP-T1 comment.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
40.2	Rural Residential designation is incompatible with compact development	No change			Follow staff recommendation - No change
40.3	Figure 6 fails to mention riparian areas	Change to text	See response the FWP- T1	See Benson Farm comment 12.3 and FWP-T1 comment.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text

Comments received between February 10 and February 19, when the Planning Board closed the public comment portion of the hearing. These were not forwarded with a staff recommendation.

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change to Text	PB Recommendation
41	Finch Requests Buckhouse Flats Lot D-2 not be designated as Agriculture due to the current commercial zoning.		The areas shown to be within the Shaded-X 500-year floodplain may be permitted to develop and should be designated Commercial Center.	See MBIA comment 20.5.	See MBIA comment 20.5. Change to map.
42	Kim Request rezoning to mixed use		See Dreissen Comment 2.	See Dreissen Comment 2.	See Dreissen Comment 2. Change to map.
43	Rys-Sikora Request rezoning to mixed use		See Dreissen Comment 2.	See Dreissen Comment 2.	See Dreissen Comment 2. Change to map.
44	WGM Group, Jeff Smith* - Riverside Contracting, 2/22 update Requests a change from Planned Neighborhood to Working Lands in the nw, and Industrial Center along the eastern portion.		Consistency with surrounding infrastructure and land uses.	Change the northwest portion of the parcel to Working Lands and the eastern portion to Industrial Center.	Change to map

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
45	Simonich* Request change from Neighborhood Residential to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture for small area north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
46	Cowie Against rezoning Waldo Road area and requests Rural Residential and Small Agriculture, noting water concerns.		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
47	Guldseth Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
48	Crea Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
49	Weber Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road, noting covenants.		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
50	Thomasson Against a zoning change north of Waldo Road, noting impacts to the aquifer.		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
51	Bossous* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road, noting covenants.		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
52	Bagnell* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road, noting covenants and water concerns.		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
53	Gollofon* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road, noting covenants and water concerns		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
54	Birky Against more density in Waldo Road area, noting concerns about traffic, water and covenants		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
55	St. Onge Against rezoning the Waldo Road area, noting concerns about water and covenants		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
56	Fisk* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
57	League of Women Voters, Leifer* Provided information about a meeting on the land use map the League is holding on February 20.				No change
58	Sailer* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road, noted covenants and wildlife concerns		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
59	Rasmussen, Randy* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
60	Webster* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
61	Carlos* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
62	Markley* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
63	Rasmussen, Renee* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
64	Whiteman-Runshim* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
65	FWP, Ritter* Written comment is intended to guide population growth with fish, wildlife, and parks in mind.		See FWP Comments.	See FWP Comments.	See FWP Comments.
66	Chinikaylo* Concerned about density and water north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
67	Arthur* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
68	Morlock* Against Neighborhood Residential north of Waldo Road		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
69	TLI, Forsting* Requests Commercial Center near Buckhouse Bridge and Blue Mountain Road		See MBIA Comment 20.5.	See MBIA Comment 20.5.	See MBIA Comment 20.5 for PB decision.
70	Rupkalvis* Sympathetic to the concerns about density north of Waldo Road.		See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25.	See Swartz Comment 25. Change to map.
71	Hassanein* Suggested resources, copy edits and encouraged more inclusive language for agriculture.		Broader language is generally better for these larger scope policy documents.	Exact language dependent upon space and formatting considerations.	Change to text
72	Pent* Does not support increased density in the WUI, wondered about city support, appreciated FWP comments, and supported the Liv/Make designation.		Board discussion clarified issues.		No change

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
MTFWP Text					
#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
FWP-T1	Pg. 3. Implement setbacks that protect natural resource values	Text Change	Setbacks will address site specific issues that are difficult to address in a general plan. Focus on stream and riparian areas where these tools are customarily used. Use clustering for other resources. These concepts can be accommodated into the text in a manner consistent with other values and ideas.	<p>Recommended text change to "Preserve Working Land..." section:</p> <p>The role of the county must include the protection of three important habitats found in the Missoula area. First, stream corridors and associated riparian areas that are the most ecologically important and imperiled habitats for fish and wildlife species in western Montana should be protected. Second, important grassland habitats that are relatively rare in western Montana but provide critical resources for game and nongame wildlife communities, many of which are declining in North America should be protected. Third, geographic funnels and terrain features (e.g., riparian corridors, ridgelines, timbered draws, passes) that naturally guide wildlife to certain areas in harsh weather conditions and during seasonal movements and migrations should be accommodated.</p> <p>Recommended text change to "Realities" section under new headings:</p> <p>(Heading) Our Environment Our built environment is both affected by and affects our natural environment. Land use patterns need to include an over-arching approach to maintaining the ecological integrity of the area and consider the naturally functioning systems of the Missoula Valley. In addition, as our climate changes, our lifestyles and community will be affected in different ways. These realities need to be considered in how our community evolves over the course of the next 20 years.</p> <p>(SubHeading) Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Home to elk, deer, moose, bighorn sheep, bears, mountain lions, and an array of bird life, as well as nongame wildlife species and world-class fisheries, the Missoula Valley has a diversity and abundance of fish and wildlife species. The opportunities for fishing, hunting, photography, bird-watching, and general wildlife viewing are some of the most powerful reasons people want to live in this area. Wildlife living on the valley floor, along the rivers and stream riparian areas, and wildlife trying to move through the valley face obstacles as the community grows. Therefore, land considered important for wildlife as well as areas across the valley floor for recreation and wildlife passage need to be considered in land use planning decisions, and to allow harmonious overlap with human development and recreational plans into the future.</p>	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
				<p>(SubHeading) Climate Change</p> <p>We are already experiencing the impacts of climate change in Missoula County, and those impacts are projected to intensify over the coming decades and to touch every sector in our county. Changes are likely to include reduced low elevation snowpack, earlier spring snowmelt, more frequent and intense droughts and wildfires, and impacts to agriculture, recreation and human health. Many of the values and ideas that guide this land use plan, such as multi-modal transportation and walkable neighborhoods, will reduce our community's contribution to climate change by reducing fossil fuel use. Climate change will also exacerbate natural hazards such as wildfire and flooding, as described on page 9. Missoula County, is currently partnering with the City of Missoula and Climate Smart Missoula to develop a Climate Resiliency Plan, which will identify and prioritize vulnerabilities and recommend strategies that may address the vulnerabilities. These strategies may inform future planning efforts and future updates to the land use map.</p> <p>Recommended text change to "Emphasize community character..." section:</p> <p>Delete last sentence of second paragraph. Add new paragraph: Surrounded by rugged peaks from six mountain ranges and two wilderness areas, in a basin dissected by three rivers and multiple streams, Missoula is nestled in the area known as the Five Valleys. Our community is home to an abundance of native, and vulnerable, fauna and fish. As Missoula has evolved into a hub for mountain and river recreation, tourism based on the natural amenities surrounding us is a major economic driver and a reason why our community is known as a desirable place to live for outdoor enthusiasts. As the community grows, actions will be necessary to maintain local and large-scale movement corridors, as well as protect areas for wildlife in an otherwise urbanizing landscape, and will certainly be a worthwhile investment in the future of the Missoula Valley.</p>	
FWP-T2	Pg. 4. Place trails on edge of riparian areas	No change	Outside the scope of this planning document		Follow staff recommendation - No change
FWP-T3	Pg. 4. Include riparian buffers	Text Change	Same rationale as FWP-T1	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T4	Pg. 4. Develop conservation incentive program	Text Change	The draft already recommends use of clustering and density bonuses, but the language to improve the connection of their use to wildlife habitat and fisheries can be improved.	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
FWP-T5	Pg. 5. Additional land use designation for private lands that have conservation easements and values	No Change	The proposed PROST plan guides the use of county resources and identifies private lands with conservation values for future action. They have had a lengthy and robust public participation process with the public and an exceptional collaborative approach with the City of Missoula focusing on those efforts. The PROST plan is the appropriate avenue for directing future conservation endeavors. Conservation easements are an agreement between a land owner and typically a non-profit partner, Missoula County is not a party to them. Many easements allow for a range of uses and activities. We treat them as an existing condition, and in most cases the appropriate designation is Working Lands or Agriculture, but that might not always be the case. For example, not all CE have a desired conservation outcome. There are golf courses with conservation easements within the planning area.	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - No change
FWP-T6	Comment 1): Recommended additions to section on "Greatest Assets"	No Change	These comments are focused on highlighting the value of wildlife in the community, but do not fit into the organization of the plan as suggested. Instead, the key points of the important habitat types and concepts of permeability and connectivity should be incorporated into parts of the plan as appropriate. The text of the plan is very deliberately crafted to reflect the whole breadth of input, not just from one specific interest group or subject matter, and not to highlight one value over another.	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - No change
FWP-T7	Comment 2): Include paragraph on page 2 or page 21	No Change	See our rationale on FWP- T6	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - No change
FWP-T8	Comment 3): Include paragraph on page 2 or page 21	No Change	See our rationale on FWP- T6	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - No change
FWP-T9	Comment 4): Incorporate fish and wildlife species as part of "one community" approach	Text Change	These values were considered, but their importance can be better highlighted elsewhere in the document.	See FWP- T1	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T10	Comment 5): Human wildlife conflict as a hazard	Text Change	The purpose of the hazards section is to focus on hazards that the county has identified through other planning processes where growth should be avoided. It would be more appropriate to incorporate this concept into the land use designations as suggested in FWP- T14 and T15	See FWP-T14 and T15	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T11	Comment 6) Connectivity be extended to include connectivity for fish and wildlife. Make changes to "clustering" on page 14	Text Change	It was the intent that it was included with the statement "naturally functioning systems" but wildlife movement and habitat can be emphasized in the connectivity concept. Make change to clustering as recommended.	Recommended text change to "Ideas" list Cluster housing and development to preserve open space, fish and wildlife habitat and movement corridors, wetlands and riparian areas , public access and agricultural lands.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T12	Comment 7) a Changes to Open, Resources and Recreation	Text Change	Make changes to the recommended sections. Exact language dependent upon space and formatting considerations, redundancy, consistency and changes made within other parts of the document. Other changes in the documents (See FWP-T1, FWP- T11) add necessary supportive context.	Exact language dependent upon space and formatting considerations.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Comment	Staff Rec	Rationale	Proposed Change	PB Recommendation
FWP-T13	Comment 7)b Agriculture	Text Change	Make change under first character recommendation. Do not make change to second character recommendation as it is redundant and managing "irrigation efficiency improvements" is in not in the control of county government. Do not include Intensity recommendation, as it is covered under Character changes, is redundant and it requires implementation through zoning (in which it will be enforced).	Buildings are sited to preserve prime agricultural soils, sensitive natural features and waterways, fish and wildlife habitat and movement corridors , and hazards such as floodplains.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T14	Comment 7)c Working Lands	Text Change	Make changes to the recommended sections. Exact language dependent upon space and formatting considerations, redundancy, consistency and changes made within other parts of the document. Other changes in the documents (See FWP-T1, FWP- T11) add necessary supportive context.	Exact language dependent upon space and formatting considerations.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T15	Comment 7)d Rural Residential and Small Agriculture	Text Change	Make changes to the recommended sections.	Exact language dependent upon space and formatting considerations.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T16	Comment 7)e Rural Residential	No Change	This is more applicable as a character consideration rather than as a goal of providing for rural residential land use.		Follow staff recommendation - Change to text
FWP-T17	Comment 7)f Industrial	Text Change	Change text to highlight the importance of setbacks in the Industrial Center designation while acknowledging that some decisions are outside the scope of this plan.	Include language for setbacks from streams, riparian corridors and wetlands in both Industrial and Heavy Industrial.	Follow staff recommendation - Change to text

*Indicates at least part of the comment was spoken at a planning board hearing.