



MISSOULA CONSOLIDATED PLANNING BOARD (MCPB) MINUTES
City Council Chambers,
140 W. Pine
MARCH 05, 2019 - 7:00 PM

Members present: Helen Jenkins, Vice Chair (City), Stephanie Potts (County), Neva Hassanein (City), Michael Houlihan (County), Peter Bensen (County Alt), Dudley Improtta (City), Jamie Hoffmann (Board)

Members absent: John Newman, Chair (City), Jason Rice (County), Vince Caristo (City Alt), Andy Mefford (County)

Staff present: Andrew Hagemeyer (County), Christine Dascenzo (County), Donna McCammon (County), Karen Hughes (County) Chet Crowser (County), Chief Planning Officer, Community and Planning Services

Others present: Julie Lake, from Martin-Lake Associates, who is present to transcribe the verbal presentations to accommodate an attendee with a cochlear implant who otherwise would not be able to participate in this public meeting.

I. Call to Order

Ms. Jenkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Ms. McCammon called the roll with six regular members present and one voting alternate present, a quorum was met.

III. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hassanein stated that a correction was necessary regarding a comment she made concerning hazards at the February 19, 2019 meeting. She stated that her concern was not directed at the wildland-urban interface but rather the transportation corridor.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Hassanein and seconded by Mr. Houlihan to strike “at the wildland urban interface” from page 8 of 9 of the draft minutes from the February 19, 2019 Missoula Consolidated Planning Board Meeting.

With a voice vote of all “ayes” the motion passed.

Correction noted and made in the official minutes.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Hassanein to approve the February 19, 2019 meeting minutes as amended.

With a voice vote of all ‘ayes’ the motion passed.

IV. Public Comment on items not on the agenda

No public comments.

V. Staff Comments

No staff comments.

VI. Public Hearings

A. Continuation of Missoula Area Mapping Project, Amendment to the Missoula County Growth Policy – County

Ms. Jenkins stated that this is a continuation of the February 19, 2019 public hearing of the planning board. The public comment period was closed at the February 19, 2019 meeting of the planning board. Persons wishing to provide further comments are invited to the Missoula County Commissioners' public hearing at 2:00 p.m. in the Sophie Moiese Room of the Courthouse on April 4 and April 25, 2019.

Andrew Hagemeier and Christine Dascenzo, planners at Community and Planning Services (CAPS), have been working on the Missoula area land use map. Mr. Hagemeier re-stated that although the public comment period has closed, there are opportunities to comment at the County Commissioners' public hearing. The two comments received after the close of the February 19, 2019 meeting would be forwarded to the commissioners and will be considered part of the commissioners' public record. There was one clarification from Jeff Smith, WGM Group, that the requested land use was "Working Lands" in place of Open, Resource and Recreation. He has submitted this clarification on his original comment into the record for the commissioners.

Mr. Hagemeier stated that it was the role of the planning board to consider all the public comments presented at the hearing. Mr. Hagemeier and Ms. Dascenzo created a spreadsheet detailing comments received through February 10, 2019 and evaluated those comments to make it easier for board members to examine and vote on them.

Ms. Jenkins requested that Mr. Hagemeier re-state, for the record, the recommendation from staff regarding Meadows West, since it generated a lot of comment at the February 19, 2019 meeting. Mr. Hagemeier stated that the recommendation of the staff was to change the land use designation to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture.

Mr. Hagemeier gave a brief history of the two-year project, the public outreach, considerations and thought processes. He provided board members with an analysis of agricultural lands as well as housing numbers which had been requested previously. A section on climate change in the hazards section was not born from public comment but from work with CAPS' Sustainability Coordinator. Because it did not come from public comment, it does not appear on the staff evaluation, but Mr. Hagemeier requested that it be considered for approval in the plan. CAPS has also been working with the water quality district and the county attorney's office regarding the former Smurfit Stone site and have reached the decision that they would like to see Operational Unit 2 designated as heavy industrial, which would shrink the amount of industrial designation in the area. Settling ponds and trash dumps, with unknown contamination levels, would receive an agricultural designation which would help justify a higher cleanup level than industrial.

Ms. Jenkins opened the hearing to planning board comments, amendments and other considerations to the land use map. Ms. Potts asked for clarification on the preferred process for reviewing and making motions on the public comments and staff evaluations.

Ms. Jenkins offered that, due to the number of persons interested in the Meadows West decision, that it be discussed first; at the end of the public hearing a final resolution would need to be made for approval of the entire land use map and the element as well.

Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the land use map, as proposed for Meadows West, was neighborhood residential, which is a fairly dense land use designation. From the comments received, the neighborhood would like to see the one parcel designated Rural Residential and Small Agricultural. Covenants for Meadows West specify one dwelling unit per two acres, which is consistent with that land use designation.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Hassanein and seconded by Mr. Houlihan, that the land use map be amended so that the area north of Waldo Road, within the Meadows West subdivision, that is currently designated Neighborhood Residential be changed to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture to match the existing land use in that area.

With a voice vote of all “ayes” the motion passed.

Ms. Jenkins led the discussion based on the “Summary of Public Comment and Staff Evaluation, 2/13/19”. Line items where staff is recommending change were examined. **Staff will pull items that need individual attention and motions, all remaining recommended changes will be covered in one comprehensive motion at the conclusion.**

Comment 12.1 – 12.3, Benson Farm. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that part of Mr. Benson’s property is zoned commercial; however, it was designated neighborhood residential in the land use map. This was missed previously. The portion of the property zone commercial should be changed to neighborhood center. This is also true of several adjacent properties with commercial zoning that were missed in the initial review. The land use map does not change land uses, it allows people to change the uses. Mr. Benson can continue farming. Mr. Benson had previously stated that he experiences ongoing traffic challenges with urban development around his property. Mr. Hagemeyer responded that the land use map will help identify road improvement areas when the transportation map is updated. Ms. Hassanein asked Mr. Benson, who was attending the meeting, if the land use designation of neighborhood center was satisfactory; Mr. Benson replied that he did not have enough detail to respond at this meeting.

Comment 14, CFAC, Buckingham. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that “Rural Residential and Agriculture” better reflects the role of agriculture in this area, this is a change to text only. This is a change from “Rural Residential and Small Agriculture” to “Rural Residential and Agriculture” and from “Rural Residential” to “Rural Residential and Small Agriculture”.

Comment 15, Daigle. Request change of Neighborhood Residential to small area of commercial along interstate. This request would change the land use map. The property being discussed is northeast of Reserve Street at the interchange. There are several small businesses on this property, including doggie daycare. The limited area of commercial provides a buffer between residential uses and the interstate.

Comment 20.4-20.6, MBIA. 20.4 is to expand “Residential” in the Orchard Homes area. CAPS does not recommend expanding housing that much in the Orchard Homes area. Instead, a change to “Neighborhood Center” along South Avenue would be supported by infrastructure in the form of city water and sewer and would match the city’s growth policy. All the recent development has been annexed and that trend is expected to continue.

20.5 addresses surveyed areas that have been proven to be outside the 100-year floodplain, opening more development options to the landowner. 20.5 will be held for further discussion in conjunction with comment 27.

20.6 is an area of approximately 620 – 640 acres off North Reserve, near the Daigle property. The subject property has areas of terrain that would make development a challenge. Comments respond to both MBIA and Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP). It was designated “Planned Neighborhood”, which are areas that currently do not have the infrastructure for immediate development but could in 10-15 years. Properties would be best served by development on an urban scale, not 1 to 5-acre homesites. FWP has sited this area as regular elk wintering habitat.

With these considerations it was recommended to change it from “Planned Neighborhood” to “Working Lands”. It could be re-visited at a future date. Mr. Bensen is concerned about the continual loss of potential residential property development to agriculture when existing neighborhoods reject higher density housing near their lands, and how to balance housing with preserving agricultural lands and riparian habitat.

Comment 25, Swartz. Request for “Rural Residential and Small Agriculture” rather than “Neighborhood Residential” on the parcel north of Waldo Road. Comment has been addressed previously, part of Meadows West subdivision.

Comment 26.1, Taylor. Addressed in comment 14, CFAC.

Comment 27, Territorial Landworks, Inc. (TLI). The area near Blue Mountain Road, north of Highway 93 S. The request is for “Commercial Center” instead of “Agriculture”. Comment 20.5 is also addressed in this discussion. The area has been surveyed to show it is outside the 100-year floodplain, opening more development options to the landowner. Mr. Hagemeyer provided a history on this comment. In the planning area, Missoula County in general regulates the 500-year floodplain. One of the key points in the plan was to steer growth away from those hazards. The resiliency part forecasts that future flooding events may be more like what happened in 2018; larger flooding events happening more frequently. LiDAR survey data on this property demonstrated that the 500-year floodplain was not regulatory. The next step was to conform with existing zoning. In this region, there is a Part 1 Zoning, which is citizen-initiated zoning. This area is a checkerboard of zoned and un-zoned areas. Within Zoning District 39 is commercial, residential and agricultural zoning. The property owner has expressed a preference to have it designated commercial. Mr. Improtta discussed the protection of riparian areas and the heavy usage of the Buckhouse Bridge area as a recreational area. He questioned the expanded commercial designation. Ms. Hassanein referenced the FWP comments document and the emphasis on wetlands, streams, river corridors and riparian areas and if this was one of the areas identified in that FWP document. Mr. Hagemeyer replied that this property was not. Ms. Hassanein is concerned about commercial creep into areas of prime agricultural soils. This is also a flooding buffer area and are there compelling reasons to change to commercial? Ms. Potts is also concerned about the loss of agricultural lands. As an educator, she is very familiar with the richness of the wildlife of the area and adding more commercial to the area would be detrimental to the wildlife corridors and riparian areas. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that existing businesses also requested the designation of commercial to protect those enterprises already operating in that area. As the area is currently un-zoned, there is hodge-podge of commercial and residential in the vicinity. A designation of Agricultural would not change the existing uses of this land. As a compromise, the Board designated the parcel with commercial zoning and the un-zoned portions that are outside of the 100-year floodplain as Commercial Center. There is not an official neighborhood plan for the Blue Mountain area, other than the Part 1 Zoning. Ms. Jenkins expressed concerns regarding the infrastructure and if the sewer and septic could support higher density.

Mr. Rice, Territorial Landworks, Inc. (TLI), clarified his previous comments: the growth policy will not change existing zoning or existing property usages. There is a parcel that, in theory, could be developed at 80 residential units, another parcel is un-zoned, and TransSolutions is outside of that area. TransSolutions has a floodplain permit to operate their business. They are not going to leave, but they are not ever going to become zoned if this recommendation is approved. His favors a designation that would more closely match what is likely to occur. He feels this would give better control and facilitation for future development. Mr. Rice pointed out an existing RV park on the map, as well as storage units and shed manufacturing. The groundwater monitoring data is good for the area, which will support needed infrastructure. He argues that continuity is the key for the success of this area.

Ms. Hassanein stated that one needs to respect the existing commercial elements, which aren’t too different from what is being requested. Additional clarification of the site location was provided. The property being discussed is a half mile from Buckhouse Bridge and the river.

MOTION: Mr. Improta motioned to not extend or expand commercial to this area on the land use plan. Ms. Hassanein stated that commercial was already in the area in question. Mr. Hagemeyer provided clarification on property boundaries and usages on the overhead screen. Ms. Hassanein made a friendly amendment: That the extension of commercial into the existing commercially zoned area be allowed. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the current proposal was for agriculture, although commercial businesses are located there. Mr. Benson made a second friendly amendment: if regulation could be recommended for this area. Mr. Hagemeyer asked if the recommendation was for the entire property or staff recommendation, which is just the 100-year floodplain. Ms. Hassanein stated it be for just the 100-year flood plain. Mr. Improta stated that he would then stay with the staff recommendations. Mr. Hagemeyer stated staff did not recommend a commercial designation for that part of the area that is not zoned at all as it is within the 100-year floodplain. Given the additional explanation, Mr. Improta withdrew his motion in support of the staff's recommendation. Ms. Hassanein stated it would make sense to include the existing commercial zoning included and whatever portion that is outside of the 100-year floodplain.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Potts and seconded by Mr. Improta, that the property that is already zoned commercial and the property that is un-zoned, but above the 100-year floodplain, be designated on the land use map as commercial, with the remaining designated as agriculture.

"Ayes": Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Potts, Ms. Hassanein, Mr. Bensen, Mr. Improta

"Nays": Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Houlihan

Abstentions: None

Motion passed.

Comment 29, WGM Group. The board discussed changing the designation of approximately 82-acres near Reserve Street, south of I-90, from Neighborhood Center to Community Mixed Use. The change would align with the city's growth policy designation of Community Mixed Use. The property is an old gravel pit which has been reclaimed.

Comment 30, Bishop. Comment has been addressed previously, part of Meadows West subdivision.

Comment 32, Richardson. This was addressed and voted on through comment 27.

Comment 33.1 and 33.4, Erickson. 33.1 inquires about funding sources for agriculture easements, which is outside the scope of this plan. Recommended changes to the coordination and implementation sections that would describe the relationship of this plan to other plans like the Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails (PROST) Plan. 33.4 is an inquiry into impact fees, which is not within the county's legal authority and staff recommends changes to the text to improve the language on climate change. Ms. Potts clarified the difference between agricultural easements and conservation easements, and how the two are often linked.

Comment 35.2, 35.3, 36, Matson, Gary and Judy. 35.2 Residents of West Riverside want to expand the Live/Make designation to their locality. 35.3 requests a change to the colors used on the map to make them easier to distinguish.

Comment 40, Haber. 40.1 is a request to address climate change and resiliency. See response to comments 12.3 and FWP-T1. 40.3 is a request to mention riparian areas in the text. See response to comment 12.3 and FWP-T1. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that there is a commitment to protect the three important FWP habitats.

Comment FWP-M1, Blackfoot River Wildlife Movement Corridor (change to map) and Comment FWP-M3, Blackfoot River Wildlife Movement Corridor (text change).

Comment FWP-M5-M6-M7-M9-M10, LaValle and Butler Creek Wildlife Movement Corridor. Addition of text addressing the importance of riparian buffers/streamside protection.

Comment FWP-M14, Grant Creek Elk and Deer Winter Range. Previously discussed in 20.6; changing planned neighborhood designation to working lands.

Comment FWP-M19, Marshall Creek Movement Corridor and Stream Restoration. Staff is proposing to add language about the importance of riparian areas and change area currently zoned for 1 unit per 5 acres to Rural Residential and Small Agriculture.

Comment FWP-M22-M23, Miller Creek, South Hills Grasslands, Winter Range, and Movement Corridors. These relate to the importance of addressing riparian areas.

Comment FWP-M24, Smurfit-Stone and O'Keefe Creek Movement Corridor. There is potential to change this area from Industrial Center to an Agriculture designation. The industrial designation would be limited to the site of Operational Unit 2 (OU-2). This is where the infrastructure is still intact at the mill site and would allow the current landowner to make improvements and changes. The remaining operational units would be designated Agriculture which would help advocate for a higher level of cleanup. This would also pull the industrial area further away from the floodplain.

Comment FWP-M26, Smurfit-Stone and O'Keefe Creek Movement Corridor. Text has been added addressing the importance of riparian buffers/streamside protection.

Ms. Hassanein emphasized the importance of the maps included with the FWP comments, specifically the areas west of town, in the LaValle and Butler Creek movement corridor and the area near Deschamps Road. She stated that the FWP considers this area some of the last viable movement corridors for wildlife species to get from the Rattlesnake and the northern continental divide ecosystem down to the Clark Fork River and into the Selway. The importance of the riparian areas is repeated often; she asked if there are any other areas that might better protect the wildlife if a land use designation were changed. She stated that some of the land had been previously randomly zoned and much of it is also prime agricultural soils. Ms. Hassanein noted a recurrence on the FWP maps which include Sand Hills, Deschamps Road, and others. These are areas west of the airport. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that much of this area is called Grass Valley; it is east of Deschamps Road. This area is already zoned at one unit per acre or one unit per five acres. There is an ephemeral stream system where the water comes up from the ground; not from run-off or surface water. The waters here are warm so are open nearly year-round for wildlife habitat and is a unique area. There are also clay benches and together they offer unique habitat types. In the outreach effort, the Audubon Society identified this area as exceptional. They have identified every single species of native raptors in this one location. The comments from the Audubon Society, FWP and the stakeholders have all wanted less dense development. According to the methods applied throughout this process, the land use designations have been kept consistent with the current zoning. Staff was not comfortable recommending less density than allowed by zoning unless there was a demonstrated health and safety reason, such as a floodplain. In this area the land use designation reflects the current zoning. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the least intensive land use designation that targets private land is the Working Lands designation. That has a density range of one unit per 40 acres down to 160 acres. The Agriculture land use designation would be the second least intensive; at one unit per 40 acres. Although there are larger land tracts in this area, nothing is near 160. Ms. Potts asked if this area was within the boundaries of DeSmet School. Mr. Hagemeyer stated it was not. Ms. Potts asked if this area was in the 100 or 500-year floodplain. Mr. Hagemeyer believed that both designations applied in this region. Mr. Houlihan inquired about any future development aspirations the property owner might have. Mr. Hagemeyer stated he had not spoken to all the landowners in that area and could not speak for them. Mr. Hagemeyer said that if Ms. Hassanein desired a lower land use designation in the area, he would recommend Working Lands on the clay benches because if the lack of prime soils would not make it a target for an Agriculture designation. It is more rangeland than agriculture. He would recommend Agriculture for the lower area, if desired by the board. Mr. Houlihan felt it would be advantageous to reach out to the property owners. Ms. Jenkins offered that the CAPS planners reach out to those property owners prior to the County Commissioners' review. The motion was amended to accommodate that request.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Hassanein and seconded by Mr. Bensen, that the area in Grass Valley southwest of the currently proposed Agriculture area be changed to Agriculture and the area to the north of the currently proposed Agriculture area be changed to Working Lands. These are identified as FID 43, 277, 281, 280, and part of 189 on the FWP map called LaValle and Butler Creek. Mr. Houlihan added a friendly amendment: that the Planners at Missoula County Community and Planning Services reach out to property owners in the areas described and advise the Board of County Commissioners of any recommended revisions based on those comments.

With a voice vote of all 'ayes' the motion passed.

Comment FWP-T1, implement setbacks that protect natural resource values. Ms. Jenkins noted that there are a variety of text recommendations proposed by staff. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the FWP comments emphasized the importance of protections for three habitat types: stream corridors, rare grassland habitats, and movement corridors. In addition to the habitat types, the FWP recommended strategies to protect those habitat types through the concepts of connectivity and permeability. Because the habitat types are so important, they need to be identified within the document in the section that is the role of the county. This would modify page 11, modify the realities section which identifies our environment as a reality. There would be subheadings on wildlife and wildlife habitat providing more value-oriented discussion. It would also include the section on climate change. Page 21 is the strategies, incorporating setbacks and buffers as a strategy in the land use map to try to protect these habitat types and to employ concepts of permeability and connectivity. No comments from the planning board members regarding FWP-T1.

Comment FWP-T11. "Connectivity be extended to include connectivity for fish and wildlife. Make changes to "clustering" on page 14." Mr. Hagemeyer stated that were formatting constraints and limitations in trying to keep the document more readable and useable for the public. Ms. Hassanein added that she appreciated the additional language FWP recommended

Comment FWP-T13, T14 and T15. Staff recommended changes based on formatting. Ms. Hassanein requested to strike the word "prime" from the phrase "Building are sited to preserve prime agriculture soils, sensitive natural features, waterways....". She suggested the same change to the land use designation description. Ms. Hassanein stated that the word "prime" has a very specific meaning. Prime soils and/or farmland is a designation assigned by the U.S. Department of Agriculture describing land that has the best combination of characteristics for producing food. Second is soils statewide importance, which is very close characteristically to prime soils. Soils of local importance is usually mapped by a conservation district for the purpose of an open space program in order to enable landowners to access federal funds for conservation. These lands can also be eligible for bond monies. In the land use map, the use of "prime" agricultural soils can be misleading and is not inclusive of soils of statewide and local importance. Mr. Houlihan inquired how a distinction could be made for the reader of the document, giving a legal definition to the lay person. He stated that the designation of "prime" refers to how the federal government has classified those soils and if someone wanted to challenge that they would take it to the US Government, and statewide soils could be challenged at the state level, etc. He asked if a soil survey was required if a person desired to develop a piece a property. Ms. Hassanein stated that in recent years this has been done but has not been required. Ms. Potts stated that if the three classifications of soils are listed, it would be helpful to include descriptions of each for reader clarity. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that in the goals of the Agriculture land use designation it would read soils of prime, statewide and local importance and a definition would not have to made in the document. Ms. Potts agreed that the word "prime" implies a specific description and should be struck. Mr. Hagemeyer agreed but also stated that at this level of planning, general terms were preferred. Ms. Hassanein agreed with this observation and amended her original motion to:

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Hassanein and seconded by Ms. Potts, that the textual change proposed under FWP-TP 13 be revised to strike the word “prime” from page 17, FWP-T13 and page 32 of the element.

**With a voice vote of ‘ayes’ from: Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Potts, Ms. Hassanein,
Mr. Bensen, Mr. Improt, and Mr. Jamie Hoffmann**

Nay: Mr. Houlihan

The motion passed.

Ms. Jenkins stated that staff has recommended a variety of smaller edits and changes based on the comments from FWP that are listed on page 17. No additional comments or changes were recommended by the board regarding these edits.

Ms. Jenkins asked the board to refer to a document which included comments submitted after February 10, 2019 from members of the public and planning board members. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that some of these topics had been previously discussed, but some still needed to be addressed.

Comment regarding the property near Blue Mountain Road, sometimes referred to as the commercial property near Buckhouse Bridge: Mr. Hagemeyer stated that this has already been discussed and the Commercial Center land use designation has been supported.

DeSmet Public School has gotten letters from the landowners supporting their request to change an Industrial Center land use designation to Neighborhood Center. The school has issues with an industrial area lying between the school and the residential areas where students reside. The area is largely undeveloped, with some existing businesses. Mr. Houlihan stated that this area has previously been developed as industrial; he asked about the reasoning of constructing housing units in an area of existing industry. Ms. Jenkins asked Mr. Hagemeyer about further details regarding plans for this area. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the issue is before the planning board for a decision. Ms. Jenkins questioned if this would be a desirable location for housing; with the current industrial development and proximity to the airport. Ms. Potts stated that DeSmet School is a special place and a special community, and she has seen the work that is done there. She feels that the school offers a unique educational experience. She is in support of helping the school and the students with this request. Ms. Hassanein said that this is just an extension of the residential area. Mr. Improt asked about the distances from the school to the proposed residences and was advised by Mr. Hagemeyer that it was a mile and half. Mr. Improt asked if the school's request can be defended by the expectation that children will be walking a mile and half to school through mixed neighborhoods. He does not feel that it is a strong enough rationale to make the change. Ms. Hassanein stated she was sympathetic to the school and existing residences. She asked if there was anywhere else that may be closer to the school that could be provide more residential opportunities. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that he is also sympathetic to DeSmet School and have tried various scenarios to try to get more residential in that area. He showed the land use map, school district boundaries, current neighborhood residential areas, possible in-fill areas, and that a big change would be the Planned Neighborhood. He has communicated with the principal of DeSmet School that currently the biggest challenge for getting residential in the DeSmet School District isn't necessarily the land use designations or zoning, but the lack of infrastructure. The current infrastructure supports industrial level development because they don't necessarily need city water. Sewer runs through that area but both public water and public sewer would be needed for residential development. The designation of Planned Neighborhood would keep it open for when public water and sewer are brought to the area. If that level of development were to occur, a new school would be needed. Ms. Jenkins asked whether students in the Wye area attend DeSmet School or Frenchtown. Ms. Potts asked if Neighborhood Center would still be preferred, even with the restrictions of the water/sewer/utilities, from a planning point of view. What is the infrastructure impact of that change? Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the area could more easily be developed for industrial uses with the infrastructure in place. Residential development of any density would

require public water. Mr. Hoffman stated that, as a member of the housing authority board, they have had a good deal of discussion with DeSmet School about residential development to ensure its' survival. If enrollment does not continue to grow for DeSmet School, it may negatively impact their future as a school. He is sympathetic to their desire for more residential development in that area, so he is going to lean in that direction. Ms. Jenkins stated that while she is sympathetic to the school but is also considering the current airport expansion, additional airlines serving the airport, and trying to attract large employers to the area. The area around the airport has identified as being a future conference center destination, and she asked how industrial lands can be transitioned to either continue to be industrial lands or be supportive of tech centers or heavy industrial. All of this will be built around I-90 and the airport. For her, this will have to take priority. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that, without taking sides, he feels that industrial has continued to take the hardest hit in the land use planning map. Mr. Bensen stated that he worked with the Stevensville Community Foundation to help with a public/private fundraising effort to build a new school in Stevensville. The big problem they experienced was a very small property tax base, so a \$2 million addition to their school calculated into roughly \$1,000 in additional property taxes per household per year, which made it unrealistic and never passed. He stated that if DeSmet has an embarrassment of riches and sees the development of 100 homes, they will be in big trouble. He does not feel that zoning policy can be made based on what DeSmet School needs. Ms. Potts repeated that zoning policy was not being discussed, but rather the land use map. She feels that they have repeatedly given way to what has been requested by the property owners in the neighborhoods and that the requests of DeSmet School should be valued and approved.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Potts and seconded by Mr. Hoffman, that the recommendation proposed by DeSmet School to change the land use designation of the parcels being discussed from Industrial Center to Neighborhood Center.

With a show of hands vote of 'ayes' from: Ms. Potts, Mr. Hoffman, Ms. Hassanein, and Mr. Improta

Nay votes from: Ms. Jenkins, Mr. Benson and Mr. Houlihan

The motion passed.

WGM Group had submitted an item regarding land owned by Riverside Contracting. Mr. Hagemeyer displayed the area on the map. WGM Group requested changes to the area west of Deschamps Lane, south of Highway 10, and north of Moccasin Lane. Instead of Planned Neighborhood on the western portion, they would like to see Industrial Center, and on the northwest corner would prefer Working Lands. Ms. Hassanein sought clarification of the proposal which was adjusted from their first request after talking with staff. Mr. Jeff Smith, PE, WGM Group, gave an overview of the request. The parcel in question is 160 acres and there is a high-pressure gas line that cuts through the site. East of Deschamps Lane there are construction companies, a wrecking yard and a pre-cast concrete company. He does not feel that 8 unit per acre housing would be appropriate right across the street from industrial. There is an established gravel stockpile on one property for processing gravel. The request is for the area that is bound by the gas line to the south and the property boundary to the north be designated as Working Lands, a place holder for future residential. The industrial designation provides very valuable continuation of industry. The Planned Neighborhood is a buffered area, bound by the gas line. C-A3 zoning is to the south, which is lower density housing. Mr. Houlihan asked if sewer services exist in the area. Mr. Smith responded that sewer services extend only to one corner. The Wye sewer project brought sewer to Moccasin Lane. The closest area public water system is the Wye area system and the closest city water system ends at Butler Creek.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Improta and seconded by Mr. Houlihan to approve the land designation change requests on the approximately 160 acres in the WGM Group proposal.

With a voice vote of all 'ayes' the motion passed.

With all public comments addressed, comments from the planning board were reviewed. Ms. Jenkins voiced her concern with single access canyon neighborhoods needing fire evacuation. Even though development has been approved for those areas, she does not believe that is the best places to continue development. Mr. Bensen concurs with the concerns of fire in narrow valley residential areas. Ms. Hassanein asked if the land use map increases any residential area into valleys, beyond existing homes. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the land use map reflects current development and zoning in these areas; the land use map is not calling for any increased density nor development in these areas. Ms. Jenkins asked about the eventual annexation of the area around the airport into the city. Laval Means, Planning Manager, City of Missoula, stated that her office has been participating in the discussions, which has been very thorough.

Mr. Hoffmann asked about residential density increases in the Target Range and Orchard Homes areas. Mr. Hagemeyer asked the board to review his memorandum dated March 05, 2019. The housing numbers are called out in the memo along with potential impacts to soils, which the board had not seen yet. An analysis was done regarding potential impact to soils, focusing on prime agricultural soils and soils of statewide importance. Overall, there are approximately 13,000 acres of soils classified as prime farmland and farmlands of statewide importance within the planning area, but some of this acreage has already been developed and is not available for agriculture. An analysis based off tax data indicates that approximately 3,000 acres have already been developed, which leaves 9,000 – 10,000 acres available for agriculture. The three strategies of the land use map regarding agriculture are: 1) protect, 2) mitigate and 3) incorporate. Overall 95.8% of the available prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance are within one of these three categories. 46.8%, or about 4,600 acres, is in the “protect” category. 44-45% is in “mitigate”, and roughly 4% in “incorporate”. In the land use designations intended to mitigate, 65% of the lots are already less than 10 acres in size.

Mr. Improta encouraged Missoula City and County Planning staff to get involved in the development of future subdivision covenants, if possible. He referenced Philipsburg, in Granite County, and noted community minded covenants, not so much about protecting the development, which he found refreshing. He explained that one of the covenants stated that when the City of Philipsburg incorporates and builds a sewer system, that the landowners cannot protest that and would have to discontinue the use of septic systems. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that the memo also covers “Hazards and Resiliency” and suggests improving language on climate change in the document. He would like the planning board to include the language which was not directly based on public comment. Ms. Hassanein thanked Mr. Hagemeyer for the numbers on impacts to soils. She commended the staff on an excellent job throughout the entire process.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Hassanein and seconded by Mr. Bensen to insert a new paragraph under the existing text on Page 9, Protect Public Health and Safety, as provided in the “Hazards and Resiliency” section of the memo dated March 5, 2019 from Andrew Hagemeyer and Christine Dascenzo of Community Planning Services.

With a voice vote of all ‘ayes’ the motion passed.

Ms. Jenkins asked the board if they were ready to consider a motion on the full package resolution, to adopt the land use map, the element, with all the amendments made along with staff recommendations. Ms. Dascenzo suggested that after the motion is seconded, the board open the up to public comment asked if anyone in the audience had further comments on the motion. Mr. Benson, Ms. Jenkins and Ms. Hassanein spoke in appreciation of the efforts that have been put forth including the public outreach.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Bensen and seconded by Mr. Houlihan to resolve that the Missoula Area Land Use Map and Element, as shown in Attachments A and A-1, and as amended by the Planning Board, be recommended to the Missoula Board of County Commissioners for adoption as an amendment to the Missoula County Growth Policy, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law.

With a voice vote of all 'ayes' the motion passed.

VII. Communications and Special Presentations

B. City Growth Policy Prioritized Actions Monitoring Report, Jen Gress & Laval Means – City

Ms. Gress gave an update to the city growth policy. In November 2015 the City Council approved a resolution adopting the City Growth Policy 2035. This document is a requirement in monitoring the progress and effectiveness of the growth policy implementation on a regular basis. The next full update of the document is expected to occur in 2020. The plan is organized into six elements, which address the many community assets and challenges identified during the many outreach stages of the project: livability, safety & wellness, economic health, housing, community design and environmental quality. Within the six elements there are overlapping issues such as affordable housing, and some broad concepts which relate to all the elements. Each of the element chapters contains detailed information on the topic, goals, objectives and specific implementation actions. These are referenced as numbers in the element chapter, that directs the reader to the actions and outcomes chapter for more information. The actions and outcomes chapter lay out all the potential actions; the larger list of actions is divided based on the various methods of implementation. Methods of implementation: best practices, coordination, outreach, incentives, infrastructure, planning studies, programs and projects, regulatory, land development and funding and legislation. The steering committee established a smaller list of high priority action items, called the prioritized action themes monitoring report. It is this group of actions that they will focus their presentation on this evening.

Prioritized Action Themes: quality community, resilient community, compact community, sustainable community, affordable community, accessible community, and natural community. A report card attached to the monitoring report details the reporting process.

The first prioritized action is Quality Community. This will support Missoula's strong sense of place that comes from its cultural heritage, setting, accepting attitude, appreciation for active and healthy lifestyle, and the desire to meet the basic needs for all people. The first action is to continue with fair and open community process, next is to make transportation a wellness issue and finally to provide adequate safety and emergency training. Public outreach continues through a variety of sources including newspapers, digital mail, websites, regular mail, and in-person contacts. Alternative transportation continues to occur through organizations like Missoula in Motion, Let's Move! Missoula program as well as various city organizations. New sidewalks were funded and installed using CDBG funds. Staff and volunteer training for public safety issues is provided on a regular basis through organizations like Just Response, the City-County Health Department and Missoula Public School District. The Office of Emergency Preparedness updated several plans including the multi-year training and exercise plan. Missoula County Public Schools continues to educate their staff and students regularly regarding bullying and acceptance practices. Various entities continue to conduct workshops on place making and sense of place. These include the Design Excellence Project, the Brooks Street Corridor, and Downtown Master Plan Update. The city continues to encourage the creation of public places such as the Missoula Art Park. The update to the Historic Preservation Plan has not begun; however, the update to the Downtown Master Plan will consider historic preservation issues.

Resilient Community: Actions in this theme will improve the economic health of the community. The update to the Downtown Master Plan may help promote community assets in addition, the Missoula Economic Partnership developed a targeted industry strategy for Missoula, and the

Missoula Air Service Task Force has worked to encourage cheaper airline flights for the Missoula area. In the area of commercializing research ideas and promoting start-up business for graduating students, the University of Montana hosted several conferences including Innovate UM and the annual John Ruffatto Business Startup Challenge. The university also has plans to implement an Innovation Corridor across Missoula. The Missoula Economic Partnership launched a survey posing several questions and exploring the broadband needs of area businesses. The Downtown Master Plan Update will provide broadband recommendations within the study area. Development services regularly reaches out to the public through various avenues including hosting a monthly development community meeting. The city has launched its' 2019 Local Government Citizens' Academy. Encouraging carbon neutral industries to located and grow in Missoula is one of the few items not addressed at this time. The Hellgate Venture Network is collaborating with the Missoula Economic Partnership and the University of Montana Innovation and Entrepreneurship Program to develop an Innovation Initiative Program to develop an Innovation Initiative that provides physical and online environments for innovators and entrepreneurs in Missoula. Strategic redevelopment is being supported by the Missoula Redevelopment Agency through urban renewal projects. Development Services is creating and update to the UFDA project and numerous streets, trail and sidewalk projects have been completed.

Compact Community: Actions here will support quality, compact, and connected urban development in specific areas. Mixed used development and development close to existing infrastructure is encouraged. The City Council adopted the B3 and RM2 zoning districts, expanded districts allowing the Residential Support Services use, by permitting the use in RM districts. The adoption of the Design Excellence Overlay includes a set of incentives to promote development in the overlay area. Development Services is developing the UDFA suitability map as part of the UDFA Looking Forward project and has provided transportation demand modeling. To help incentivize and protect open space, Missoula has adopted the Land Use Map and updated the general land use designations. It is updating the parks and open space master plan and has supported a new open space bond. Continuing with the compact community theme, several city plans are used to evaluate project funding for improvements to infrastructure. They include the Missoula Long Range Transportation Plan, the Bicycle Facilities Master Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and the new Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan. Current policies that help reduce septic systems include Missoula City Sewer regulations which require connection to public sanitary sewer in specific situations; adopted goals for groundwater protection by the Missoula County Health Board and the UFDA Looking Forward project, which supports the community goal of focus inward. Design standards for higher density in-fill projects have been forwarded by the adoption of the Design Excellence Overlay. Projects helping to identify areas in the city for compact development include adoption of the Land Use Map and Development Services' UFDA Looking Forward project with its' associated suitability map. In addition, creation of the city housing policy is currently underway. Development Services is in the process of developing an annexation policy as well.

Sustainable Community: Actions here will help mitigate and adapt to climate change with sustainable practices and development. Actions helping monitor climate change include completion and implementation of the Community Climate Smart Action Plan and completion of the Community Emissions Inventory. A baseline greenhouse gas inventory was created and is in the process of being updated and a County-City Climate Resiliency Plan is being developed. Climate Smart Missoula, Garden City Harvest, the Missoula Demonstration Project and the City-County Health Department all provide on-going community education regarding best practices for locally produced food, healthy food preparation, and ecologically sound gardening. Ongoing outreach projects include the River City Roots Festival, the "Sustainable Missoula" column and the Zero Waste Ambassador Program. Climate Smart Missoula received a Bloomberg Award for Partners for Places, a grant to help promote resiliency measures during changing summer conditions, also referred to the "Summer Smart" initiative. The City of Missoula adopted the "Missoula Zero Waste" resolution and the "Zero by Fifty" program. The Missoula City Fire Department helps educate the public regarding fire prone areas by providing ongoing free defensible space consultations and being involved with the "Ready Set Go" program. Missoula County adopted the 2018 update to the community wide wildfire protection plan. Missoula City continues to promote conservation practice by hosting the "Going Solar" webpage and promoting the "Zero Waste" program. The City of

Missoula and Climate Smart Missoula have teamed up with other entities in Montana to investigate the potential for powering electric vehicle charging infrastructure with solar power. The historic preservation officer is working on a proposed adaptive re-use historic character overlay. The MRA established a Demolition Alternative Policy and Deconstruction Guide. The City Development Services Division has created a Deconstruction Resource Guide. The acquisition of Missoula Water has allowed the city to create sustainability goals regarding the city's water system. Climate Smart Resiliency Plan is underway.

Affordable Community: Actions here address housing costs to make housing affordable and accessible for all. Conversations and discussions regarding barriers to housing downtown have been and are included in the "Making Missoula Home" project, the Downtown Master Plan update and through the Housing and Community Development Office. Through the creation of a Housing Policy, Housing and Community Development Office is working with other city departments and community members to identify a host of financial tools aimed at promoting affordable housing. Rental assistance programs continue through the efforts of the Emergency Solutions Grant Program, the Rapid Re-Housing Program, and HomeWord. Housing needs assessments are moving forward. The Downtown Master Plan update will include a downtown housing strategy. The Making Missoula Home housing report was completed. Zoning tools to address affordable housing included adoption of the RM2 and B3 zoning districts into Title 20, as well as the relaxing of the accessory dwelling regulations. The Housing and Community Development Office is working on a new housing policy and will explore recommending additional zoning tools. Development Services is creating the UFDA Looking Forward project which will help inform future planning processes by identifying suitable and opportune areas for future residential development. This data will also be helpful to the Housing and Community Development office.

Accessible Community: Develops a connected, safe and accessible multi-model transportation system. The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), regularly reviews development projects, encouraging good design and safety. The Transportation and Policy Coordinating Committee adopted the Bicycle Facilities Master Plan and Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan. The MPO is also working on an update to the Community Transportation Safety Plan. City agencies, including the Bicycle and Pedestrian Office, Missoula in Motion and Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization are active in implementing policies that reduce automobile dependence. The Missoula in Motion strategic plan was approved. The Bicycle and Pedestrian office, as well as Missoula in Motion continue to reach out to the public with education through various platforms. Adoption of the Design Excellence Overlay includes a variety of standards that are aimed at enhancing pedestrian accessibility on-site, as well as improvement to the interface between private development and public realm. The long-range transportation plan describes the resources and priorities for funding of transportation projects. The Missoula Redevelopment Agency is a resource and has implemented several transportation projects. The Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan prioritizes sidewalks and other pedestrian needs by location. The Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization is actively seeking/applying for Transportation Alternatives grants for several projects, including neighborhood greenways. Mountain Line has updated their Long Rang Strategic Plan that will help to increase transit options, they have also completed the Bus Stop Master Plan. Missoula City Public Works is creating a Standards and Specifications Manual. The Transportation Safety Advisory Committee has created a roundabouts-first policy, currently waiting for City Council consideration.

Natural Community: Action items address the unique character of Missoula. Supplemental food programs continue to support SNAP participants and seniors. Impacts on water are being addressed through the city's creation of the City Storm Water Division, along with education and outreach by the Missoula Valley Water Quality District and their adoption of the Watershed Restoration Plan. Title 20 currently allows garden area to be counted toward required activity areas for specific multi-dwelling houses and multi-dwelling building that include ten or more dwelling units. The Parks and Recreation Department as acquired parcels along the river corridor and the city has plans to remove the dam and restore Rattlesnake Creek. The Parks and Recreation Department will be partnering with others to develop a river access plan. They have conducted a river use survey. The Invest Health Initiative provides a new resource for consideration of ways to support

connectivity and healthy environments in low-wealth neighborhood. The Missoula Redevelopment Agency has completed several projects, including the Bitterroot Trail crossing, Golden Spike Project, and Montana Rail Link Park. Adoption of the growth policy included adoption of the land use map, which help identify appropriate areas by use and includes and urban agriculture overlay.

Laval Means summarized the conclusions. Most of the actions are multi-faceted. Review of the growth policy will happen in about five years. There are some common themes in key areas, they fall under the category of regulatory items and being responsive to zoning in different ways with the available resources. Her summary of progress included: zoning responsiveness, climate resiliency planning, transportation planning, Downtown Master Plan Kick-Off, Design Excellence, Housing Policy work and Invest Health Initiative. The next tier of actions will compass housing policy implementation, UFDA Looking Forward, annexation policy, the Downtown Master Plan, a neighborhood plans template, coordinate Transportation and Land Use Plan, City and County Coordination, Climate Resiliency Planning, and Missoula Invest Health Initiative.

VIII. Committee Reports

No committee reports.

IX. Old Business

No old business.

X. New Business and Referrals

No new business and referrals.

XI. Comments from MCPB Members

No comments from MCPB Members.

XII. Adjournment

Ms. Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 10:53 p.m.