

Public Comment

Engage Missoula

11/15/22 through 11/29/22

Gary Stubblefield 11/15/22

I agree with Patches. I have lived for the past 17 years in this exact area where this impact of traffic at the roundabout at Upper and Lower Miller Creek has been the subject of millions of dollars of research. Back in 2005-2007 this was studied to death by a firm out of Salt Lake City and MDOT. Their information was found erroneous during one of many meetings on the subject of dense traffic in Miller Creek and along the nearby section of Hwy 93. The roundabout was the only provided solution followed as it was the cheapest. Now the proposal is to increase that traffic, which has already been exacerbated by the school opening on Lower Miller Creek and additional houses built in the area above. More volume only increases the danger and congestion during emergencies with only one exit plus slowdowns during high traffic times. The entry onto Brooks Street is already severely strained. I am opposed to further development until another exit is implemented from out of this region of South Missoula.

John Wolverton 11/15/22

I urge the planning board and city council to at the very least support these modest incremental zoning changes to allow for more housing affordability and to spread the impacts of added housing units more equitably across the community. -- These parcels should be scrutinized for a further up-zoning to allow for added middle housing such as 5 to 16 unit multi-plexes and/or cottage courts. And most importantly with that, in order to address concerns about motor-vehicle traffic, it should be mixed use zoning to allow ground floor retail to which the new (and existing) residents can walk and bike for obtaining regular needs and to enhance social interaction in "third places" ... such as a small bank branch, salon, coffee shop / bakery / restaurant and especially a corner grocery (much like Rattlesnake Gardens). -- Neighbors who are worried about emergency evacuation should seek project funding and support for a nearby bike/ped bridge over the river designed to support managed ultra-slow speed automobile crossing in the case of an emergency. Thank you for your time and attention. John Wolverton - 8th Street.

P. Earling 11/15/22

Please accept this response as our strong opposition to the addition of this development to an already overburdened area. The open spaces are being destroyed, we have a "new school" that was already at capacity when it opened and traffic that exceeds what is manageable (a round-about fiasco and autobahn along Lower Miller Creek and Linda Vista Blvd that is rarely patrolled). Please stop cramming people into this area until there is additional infrastructure in place (stop putting the cart before the horse). I urge Ward 5 City Council Representatives Stacie Anderson and John Contos to listen to your constituents and vehemently oppose this project.

Rick Hall 11/15/22

There is nothing at all about traffic. What are the plans to alleviate the already congested Miller Creek intersection of lower and upper? Traffic needs to be addressed before any more housing. NO more until there is more than a single lane in the upper and lower to take all this new traffic. Insanity.

R. B. 11/15/22

1. How can any form of storm water treatment truly be realized in a storm water detention pond that is completely inundated with flood waters? Civil Sheet C6.12 with Pond and pond sections show elevations that seems to assume that when the river floods that the 10-year or 100-year design storm and associated runoff can't occur at the same time. The capacity of the proposed storm water conveyance system to properly convey water during a flood event is greatly diminished and will likely place homes upstream and typically outside of the flood plain at risk of flooding.
2. Flood plain elevations and lot elevations would imply that most crawl spaces will have water in them each year due soil saturation.
3. Flood Damage to storm water infrastructure and pond location will be subject to flood waters and would need to be armored to minimize maintenance and erosion. Costs the city will be accepting and passing along to taxpayers.
4. Any armoring of the pond within the floodplain will increase flood velocity and is not acceptable to downstream landowners or homeowners. Also violates FEMA regulations.
5. Water velocity from floods is directed generally toward outlet of pond and inlet of pond which has a Tideflex valve with a minimum cracking pressure. The pressure for this valve to work must be checked with external velocity head from flood waters as well as static water head to ensure it operates correctly and doesn't cause flooding upstream in the piping and inlet systems.
6. Base Flood Elevations show water filling many storm structures and storm water piping. Even if the system were able to be 100% waterproofed, which they can't be for very long, then it would only be a matter of time before water entering the new system would fill up the pipe and structures and this would likely have to reach an elevation that would cause road and structure flooding prior to the storm outlet functioning at all.
7. How are we achieving Floodplain storage volume and Design storm volume in the same pond? These are two different things that must be accounted for. Additional measures must be developed to maintain the existing flood storage capacity of the floodplain while permitting increased storage capacity for detention and control of excess storm water runoff from developed areas. Move pond out of Floodplain.
8. Potential for 5 feet of water depth will require fencing for safety and this fencing will be located in the floodplain and will cause a barrier for debris to be caught on and flood water issues to occur.
9. Maintenance issues for the City of Missoula with working within a Wetland and needing permits. Costs will be passed on to taxpayers.
10. Guarantee that homeless shelters and camps will not be setup in any open spaces or parkland. Real law that prohibits camping or use of homeless shelters on these lands.
11. Housing Density is too much.
12. Zoning changes that affect all existing residents who purchased in this area with the understanding of what was built and what was permitted under the existing zoning. Lowering home values while increasing taxes.
13. Traffic impacts to Upper Miller Creek from Lower Miller Creek. Upper miller Creek will not be allowed to enter the roundabout at lower and upper miller

creek due to increases in traffic.14. Traffic Impacts to Linda Vista from Lower Miller Creek. Linda Vista will have a much more difficult time getting out onto Lower Miller Creek.15. Traffic Impacts to Lower Miller Creek at new Round about.16. Floodplain land that cannot be developed on and will be open no matter what should be left untouched, and an additional open space designated for use of residence and maintenance by the City that will be useable all year and will reduce maintenance cost should be found.17. Schools. Where do all the new kids go? 18. SIDs for infrastructure is being placed on existing residents so their taxes must go up again.

Stephanie Lanza-Harvey 11/16/22

I am sure many have said this but I'll add my opinion for someone who lives on Coburg in Lower Miller Creek. Traffic going in and out on that single lane road would be crazy. The density seems problematic as well. There is no bus service out there which should be addressed. This means only cars on that road. People need to be able to come in and out of that area without a car. Having a secondary entrance that is proposed doesn't really address the problem since that hook up road is already congested.

Lauren Pierce 11/16/22

I commented on EngageMissoula on this project several weeks ago (I am opposed to it), and my comment, which was matter-of-fact and did not contain profanity, abusive language, or anything that went against their posting rules, appears to have been shuffled out of the responses. Very interesting, and I wonder how many other oppositional comments got shuffled.

Todd Schaper 11/16/22

Please accept the following comments regarding the Riverfront Trails Subdivision.1. I am opposed to the density parameters being requested as part of the Riverfront Trails Subdivision. The requested targeted growth policy amendment to change the land use designation on a portion of the property is beneficial to the developer not the community. The Growth Policy is a valuable document showing where density is more appropriate. It is clear the Growth Policy did not anticipate a higher density in this area. The increase from Low to Medium density is not appropriate. Recommend denying the request for increased density and require the subdivision follow the current adopted Growth Policy.

2. I am opposed to the NC Overlay request to allow the developer to implement changes to Title 20 requirements (building setbacks, heights, etc) with limited or no oversight from City Planning. Recommend the subdivision to follow Title 20 requirements as assigned to the current land use designation in the City of Missoula Growth Policy.

3. The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was completed in 4/21 and showing an increase in traffic flow and projecting some intersections as an 'F'. This is an indication of time delay and equates to driver frustration. The TIS makes recommendations to satisfy

some of the issues that will need to be provided by City of Missoula (us) not the developer. The TIS data is approaching 2-years. With the increase in completed development in the area should the TIS be updated? City Council's review would be better informed if the TIS is updated and accounts for the complete build out of the Miller Creek area.

4. Sewer system connecting to the Lower Miller Creek sewer main (circ. 2011). I may have missed the information in the packet. Is there any indication from City Engineering's review of any possible impacts to current downstream infrastructure issues with new models being updated?

5. I do support the annexation of the land in the subdivision currently in the County into the City. Land annexed into the City is to follow the current adopted Growth Policy and Title 20 requirements.

Thank you for your consideration.
Todd Schaper - Miller Creek resident

Bryan Muzzana 11/25/22

I wonder what the US Department of Transportation would say about the amount of traffic on Miller Creek after this subdivision is inevitably approved? NO TO THIS SUBDIVISION.

Elena Ulev 11/27/22

I have lived in Missoula since 1999 and the Miller Creek neighborhood since 2012. This neighborhood's growth is out of control. No new subdivisions should be allowed, especially in a floodplain. Jeannette Rankin Elementary School is at capacity too. Where will new residents' children even go to school? This is just another irresponsible and greedy idea. I don't know what's happening to Missoula. Just because thousands of people want to move here doesn't mean that we should destroy every parcel of open land to build upon. We don't have the infrastructure either. The traffic in this neighborhood has increased dramatically since I moved to Miller Creek just 10 years ago. I can smell diesel fumes from the traffic on Upper Miller Creek in my backyard, which is approx. 500 feet away.

Beth Kennedy 11/28/22

Obviously I have concerns about the amount of traffic this will engender. Another concern is I heard there will be a new roundabout constructed and paid for through SID. The Miller Creek roundabout was paid for by those purchasing lots from Lloyd Twite. The developer for the Riverfront Trails subdivision should charge his lot buyers extra to pay for the new roundabout. They are the reason that roundabout is needed, so they should pay for it rather than charging us.