

**From:** MelissaBD@gmail.com  
**To:** [Bryan von Lossberg](#); [Jordan Hess](#); [Heather Harp](#); [Amber Sherrill](#); [Stacie Anderson](#); [Sandra Vasecka](#); [Jesse Ramos](#); [Mirtha Becerra](#); [Gwen Jones](#); [John P. Contos](#); [Julie Merritt](#); [Heidi West](#); [Mayor Staff](#); [Dave DeGrandpre](#); [friendsofgrantcreek@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Grant Creek Village Rezone Request  
**Date:** Monday, September 14, 2020 8:50:51 AM

---

Dear City Council Members,

I have lived in Missoula for over 25 years, but I am relatively new to the Prospect neighborhood in Grant Creek. I moved here to be further from the "urban core" of Missoula and am surprised by the statement that Grant Creek is considered the "urban core" given it lacks multi modal transportation options and it is over 2 miles to the nearest public park and grocery store. Grant Creek itself, the intersection of Grant Creek Rd/I-90/Reserve St, and the topography of the area present so many challenges that it may never make financial sense to connect this area to public transportation or create the infrastructure to provide easy biking and walking options or essential services to alleviate the need for a vehicle. The Growth Policy puts forth the goals of trying to reduce reliance on vehicles and utilize existing services. So why then does it make sense to put 1185 housing units with over 2200 people in an area where these things do not exist or would be difficult to create?

At the September 2nd, 2020 LUP meeting Mr. Hess asked Mr. Abelin to answer my questions, below, regarding the Traffic Impact Study. I have yet to see a response, so I am putting this in writing in hopes that you ask yourself why these questions go unanswered. In addition, **Mr. Stephen McDaniel raises 3 items that still need to be addressed, see attachment #17, City Traffic Engineer summary comments on revised TIS.08.13.20(1).pdf.** If the Expo and Stonebridge data collected by Mr. Abelin is not accurate or reliable then all subsequent numbers and conclusions will be flawed.

As someone who has worked with MT traffic data and statistical modeling, I would like to bring attention to the shortcomings in the traffic study presented by the developer. For the following reasons I feel that the study **significantly underestimates** the reality of our current and potential traffic volumes in the area surrounding the proposed rezone:

1) The data used to estimate peak traffic on Expo Parkway and Stonebridge Road was collected for **only one day, October 23, 2019 and for a few 15 minute increments.**

Making generalizations about traffic patterns based on such a small sample is unheard of in

any statistical modeling. How do we know these 15 minute time increments were peak times of day if there was no data collected for the AM peak period of 7am to 9am and the PM peak period of 4pm to 6pm? Mr. Stephen McDaniels asks this same question, his 3rd item, cited above.

2) The traffic report shows no westbound traffic on Stonebridge Rd for the entire collection time. How can this be true as the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and the Cottonwood Condos create westbound traffic. If this section is not accurately represented how do we know the other traffic flows are accurate? With only one day of data collection there is nothing to compare it to.

3) The multiplier of 5.44 daily trips per unit is used to determine trips during peak hours. Unfortunately this multiplier is based on studies in urban settings, where people can also walk, bike or take mass transit to work. The use of this multiplier underestimates traffic in Grant Creek, given that this is a vehicle dependent location now and for the foreseeable future.

4) How is this a sound model when Mr. Abelin's assertion that only 159 vehicles will be added to peak traffic at full build out? With simple math one can see this is yet another underestimate which contradicts his own statements of 5,000 additional trips per day.

Please don't be swayed by a traffic study that has so many weaknesses. I fear that approval of this rezone would be solving a small portion of one problem, lack of housing, in exchange for traffic and pollution problems that would require more expensive solutions that may never come to fruition. **Mr. Aaron Wilson sums this up perfectly in the Agency Comments of the Staff Report, "high density development will create traffic impacts, but none of the benefits of density."**

The Missoula Consolidated Planning Board voted against this rezone request (7 to 2) in favor of current zoning for solid reasons. There are better options out there, so we do not need a "housing at all costs" mentality. Please reject the rezone request at 2920 Expo Parkway that would triple our population and overwhelm this area which lacks services and infrastructure. Instead support the existing zoning which is still high density, at RM I-35, and has a buffer of single family dwellings adjacent to the Prospect neighborhood. I'm sure it is tempting to approve any rezone that provides more housing, but please do what is

reasonable and responsible, not reactionary. Make a decision that reflects the **principles of smart, sustainable, and environmentally friendly development** that all of Missoula deserves.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration.

Sincerely,

Melissa Bruns Board Member, Prospect Meadows HOA