

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Missoula Consolidated Planning Board

FROM: Andrew Hagemeyer, Missoula County Community and Planning Services
Tom Zavitz, City of Missoula Development Services

DATE: September 29, 2020

SUBJECT: **Mullan Area Master Plan and Form Based Code – Public Comment Packet**

Planning Board Recommendation

As of 5:00 P.M. of September 29, 2020 we have received 24 comments on the public hearing draft (dated September 11, 2020) of the Mullan Area Master Plan and Form Based Code.

The following documents are attached to this memo:

- Compilation of Comments. This file includes all comments we received as of 9/29/2020 at 5:00 P.M..
- Staff Evaluation of Comments. This document is intended to assist the Planning Board in prioritizing the evaluation of comments, and to track comments through the review process. The evaluation includes a table summarizing the comments and a staff recommendation.

#	Name or Agency	Date Submitted	Question, Comment, or Both	Subject	Comment period: Planning Board or Commission Hearing?	Comment	Staff Response (and/or subsequent correspondence)	Strategy for addressing comment
1	Dave & Glenda Scott	9/15/2020	Both	Master Plan	Planning Board	Andrew, my name is Dave Scott. Me and my wife Glenda have lived in the Country Crest subdivision off of Mullan Road since 2000. We have seen traffic flows steadily increase over this period of years to the point where obviously the transportation infrastructure is totally inadequate for the growth in the area. I like your master plan for the area and think that by adding those additional routes between Mullan and Broadway it should help ease the situation. My main concern is that i think the implementation of the plan should be bumped ahead several years and that the city, county and state should work together to seek Federal dollars to implement the plan at a much earlier time frame. i noted much of the implementation is 5 years or farther out. In 5 years with the rate of growth in the area we will be drowning in traffic much worse than exists now. Kalispell was able to fund their bypass with Federal dollars otherwise it probably never would have happened. I also like the idea of more roundabouts at intersections versus stop lights. Should help traffic mover easier. One intersection that i think needs to be addressed is the where Flynn Lane meets Broadway. I attended an earlier transportation meeting last year with county and city where the thought by the engineers was that nothing needs to be done there in terms of light. That is a most dangerous intersection for those entering Broadway from Flynn Lane as its a blind spot to the left for those entering Broadway. Appreciate all of your efforts in regards to this plan and thank you for keeping the public informed. Dave Scott	Dave, First of all, thanks for your comment and insights into the area. You are right, traffic and timing of improvements are of a concern. We did receive one federal grant last year, the same grant as Kalispell. It will complete a number of connections and improve a number of intersections. Here is the website on those projects https://www.mullanbuild.com/ . You will see construction on those projects start in the spring. Right now, they are in final design. You may have seen that we applied for a second federal grant, to complete the main road framework. We found out this week we were not successful. It sounds like we will try again. Overall, financing is the main hurdle to timing. The sooner we get federal grants, the sooner the improvements can be made. Even with the federal grants, it takes about five years from the grant award to the time the project is finished. I believe the plan is to limit Flynn on Broadway to right turn in right turn out. Mary Jane and Broadway will have intersection controls that will allow full access. That is being designed right now. I hope all this information helps	no changes to plan or code recommended
2	Nate P	9/15/2020	Comment	Master Plan	Planning Board	I respectfully disagree with the planning. I am sick of seeing our town built up with condo after condo, townhome after townhome, making the city 20% more condensed, populated, and crowded than it should be. If anything, there should be actual houses and neighborhoods where people have the space they need to actually live. Utilizing all these condos and such, stacking the population on top of each other you are making the streets even more congested and the city is at its limits of what it can handle as far as transportation logistics. Please stop building condos and townhomes, and please fix the traffic congestion. Look into a bypass like Kalispell has done.	The proposed plan and code are consistent with the City of Missoula's and Missoula County's growth policies for managing the projected growth of our community.	no changes to plan or code recommended
3		9/15/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	I would like to see a free campground funded by the city and county located on land near the prison. Within walking distance of the pov and bus station. Will also provide legal authority to prevent encampments at reserve, broadway island and elsewhere.	This comment addresses property outside the scope of the plan and code	no changes to plan or code recommended

4		9/16/2020	Comment	Master Plan	Planning Board	<p>The survey responses demonstrate what generally happens with public outreach in Missoula. The people who commute by alternative means (biking, walking, transit) turn out while those of us who drive our cars (a huge percentage of the overall population, especially in the Mullan area) are busy trying to commute through vast amounts of Missoula traffic and possibly traveling to Ravalli County to escape the high Missoula housing costs. The idea that this build-out should include a lot of biking and walking is unreasonable. Make the roads so they can handle the terrible traffic congestion. Mullan Road needs to be 4 lanes for a start, and that's before you add further impacts. Once more traffic is entering from Flynn, George Elmer or the proposed Mary Jane extension, Mullan won't be passable from those points to Reserve Street. The idea that we would cram more houses, and therefore more cars, into an already overcrowded system is insane. I agree with the comments from NateP regarding housing types. Stacking condos and townhomes on top of each other doesn't solve the terrible road infrastructure problem. As a person who was born and raised in Missoula, and has lived out Mullan Road for 16 years, I have seen the city deteriorate precipitously over the last 3-4 years with infill housing to try to accommodate a population that just can't "fit" into Missoula. We're slowly killing the special vibe/environment that has always made Missoula special, making it like any other crowded, polluted urban center</p>	<p>The city and county are not proposing this plan so this area can be developed, the plan is being proposed because this area can and is developing and there are issues like traffic, stormwater management, agriculture, and character of the area that need to be addressed. Without the plan these issues would not be evaluated on a comprehensive approach, but on a development by development basis.</p> <p>Construction on a number of traffic improvements will begin next spring including: Intersection of George Elemer and Mullan New connection of Mary Jane from Mullan to Broadway New extension of England Blvd to George Elemer. George Elemer North to England. Mullan Road is planned to be expanded to 4 lane. Timing is dependent of funding.</p>	no changes to plan or code recommended
5	Sheila McKinnon	9/15/2020-9/17/2020	Question	Zoning code	Planning Board	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Andrew –I am one of the owners of the Old Flynn Ranch, owned by the McKinnon Family Trust. I would like to speak with you regarding the proposed zoning changes and its effect on our property. I am told that you spoke with Pelah from Five Valley Land Trust, and that you believe the proposed changes will not affect our property. However, our property is shown in the highlighted section of the map. I believe we should not be included in the new zoning, since our property is in a conservation easement, and no development can take place on our land at any time. The easement is in effect in perpetuity. I would appreciate it if you could give me a call to discuss this. I want to make sure we are on the same page. Andrew –Thank you for that explanation. What you say makes sense. My concern is that we do not get looped into a zone that will increase our taxes that would be expected from high density development. I will read the information you attached and will get back to you next week. Thands for responding. Sheila McKinnon 2. Andrew – Thank you so much for your help. I think your suggestion to request the T2 designation is perfect. It was as if it was created for our place. I really appreciate your thoughtfulness on this whole effort. I won't be able to attend the hearing, but my sisters may be there. Thanks for your responsiveness. Good luck Sheila McKinnon 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sheila-I hear you. I completely understand the implications of a conservation easement. I also wanted to explain in a little more detail how the zoning works. I believe what we are proposing is actually more in line with the terms of the easement than the current zoning. The designation that we are prosing is a general designation. These are called Neighborhood Units. The Neighborhood Unit allows a range of specific zoning designations called Transects. The Transects are the specific standards that set density and use, not the Neighborhood Unit. The transects are not set as of right now. But maybe they should be for your property. I believe the most appropriate Transect designation for your property is the Rural Transect, or T2. It is designed to allow the continuation of agriculture and the preservation of open space. Look at Table 3.1 on page 3-3 of the proposed Form Based Code. Also, look at Section 3.8 (T2) RURAL TRANSECT ZONE STANDARDS in the proposed Form Based Code. You can find the code by following this link. You may remember I was at the meeting at the ranch with the engineers about that trail 	RECOMMENDED CHANGE – Apply T2 designation to the McKinnon properties that are under a conservation easement.

							easement awhile back. I really enjoyed listening to you and your siblings talk about your intentions for the property. I am confident that what we are proposing will bring the zoning on your property more in line with the conservation easement and the intentions that I heard you discuss that day. Even more so than the current zoning of Residential 1 unit per acre. I am really slammed right now preparing for some presentations and responding to comments and questions about the project. Can we talk next week? -Thanks Andrew Hagemeyer, AICP	
6	Misti	9/17/2020	Question	Master Plan	Planning Board	Good Morning- I had a few questions for you in regards to the proposed development for the Mullan Traditional neighborhood. I live in 44 Ranch, so I have a few concerns I would like more clarification on. 1.) Has an environmental impact study been done? If not, I would like to request one, or need directions on how to get one done. 2.) Will there be other entrances into and out of mullan road other than George Elmer from the subdivision. That is already a mess in the mornings and would be a nightmare if there were more houses. 3.) Will a walking path be constructed from the subdivision to Hellgate elementary. Kids are currently walking down mullan road which is extremely dangerous. 4.) Will another elementary school be constructed to accommodate this addition? If not, how will Hellgate Elementary have to adjust to accommodate more students. 5.) How will this impact my taxes? 6.) Will Mullan road be expanded to account for the extra traffic. 7.) Will stop signs and street lights be put up in the 44 ranch subdivision to help with safety due to heightened traffic. 8.) What impact will there be on the city sewer system. 9.) What impact will this have on the valuation of my home? Will more houses drive down the value? 10.) The current play equipment in 44 ranch was paid for by the homeowners, will they be reimbursed as this is considered a city park? 11.) In this new development will there be special or federal financing involved? (Section 8, section 42, etc.?) 12.) Has a traffic study been done and if not how can I request one? 13.) Will improvements be made to intersections and road signals? 14.) What impact will storm water runoff have? 15.) Has a hydrology study been done? I look forward to your response.	Misti- Thanks for sending in your questions. See my answers in red:1.) Has an environmental impact study been done? If not, I would like to request one, or need directions on how to get one done. Environment Impact studies are not required at the federal, state, or local level for these types of planning and zoning projects. However, one has been done for the BUILD Project, which is a project to build Mary Jane Boulevard and Improve George Elemer. Contact Katie Kleitz, the communications manager for that project. katie@bigskypublicrelations.com 2.) Will there be other entrances into and out of mullan road other than George Elmer from the subdivision. That is already a mess in the mornings and would be a nightmare if there were more houses. Yes. There will be two main roads running north south from Mullan to Broadway. There will be other connections in and out of the area as well. 3.) Will a walking path be constructed from the subdivision to Hellgate elementary. Kids are currently walking down mullan road which is extremely dangerous. Yes, it will need to be on the North side of the subdivision to the school, as the property owners to the south will not grant an easement. 4.) Will another elementary school be constructed to accommodate this addition? If not, how will Hellgate Elementary have to adjust to accommodate more students. Most likely yes. The plan identifies a second school further north of 44 Ranch. When that happens is up to the school district. 5.) How will this impact my taxes? The Montana Department of Revenue is the agency that evaluates how much your property is valued for tax purposes. They do not calculate planning and zoning into their formula. The adoption of the plan	no changes to plan or code recommended

							<p>does not change the mills the city or county assesses your property.6.) Will Mullan road be expanded to account for the extra traffic. Eventually, yes. That has already been planned, but it will be years out. 7.) Will stop signs and street lights be put up in the 44 ranch subdivision to help with safety due to heightened traffic. If those intersections meet the threshold for a treatment, than yes. 8.) What impact will there be on the city sewer system. The sewer system and capacity has been evaluated and can accommodate the growth. 9.) What impact will this have on the valuation of my home? Will more houses drive down the value? Unlikely. The consultant we work has been doing these projects for decades. Once built, the neighborhoods are very desirable and attractive. 10.) The current play equipment in 44 ranch was paid for by the homeowners, will they be reimbursed as this is considered a city park? The new developments will need to build their own parks, so no. 11.) In this new development will there be special or federal financing involved? (Section 8, section 42, etc.?) That is not prohibited, developers will have the right to seek those subsidize if they choose. 12.) Has a traffic study been done and if not how can I request one? Traffic modeling has been done in partnership with the BUILD Project. Contact Katie Kleitz, the communications manager for that project. katie@bigskypublicrelations.com 13.) Will improvements be made to intersections and road signals? Yes, certain intersections including George Elmer and Mullan Road will be improved within the next five years. 14.) What impact will storm water runoff have? Anytime an area develops stormwater runoff will increase and this area has had some issues in the past. The status que is to address it on a subdivision by subdivision basis. This plan included an Indepth stormwater section, and the framework for a comprehensive approach to stormwater. The zoning will have stormwater requirements not typically found in local zoning. The information is available on the website www.mullanareamasterplan.com 15.) Has a hydrology study been done? The plan recommends one and the city is working on funding it right now. I think the most important thing to consider is this entire area from Mullan to Broadway is going to get developed regardless if this plan is approved or not. Every single</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							major landowner in the area is selling right now, or has already sold to a developer. I know some people see those empty fields and think this plan is saying we should develop them. That is 100% incorrect. Those fields can already be developed, right now, today, without the plan. The plan isn't saying we should develop this area, it says we should develop this area better. Without this plan, the answer would have been "no" or "don't know" to almost every one of you 15 questions. Andrew Hagemeier, AICP	
7	Susan Meadowlark	9/17/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	While I was born in Missoula in '47, we didn't move here until '52. I was fortunate to live here in those early days, and to get to enjoy the slant streets for 40 years. I moved to Flynn Ranch last summer. I could no longer take care of my former home, and found a stand alone home with no steps and an HOA who handles mowing and shoveling, important at my age. I am less than a mile from my son. But my peaceful neighborhood is about to change for the worse. George Elmer will go from the dead-end by my house to a major street. The farm land across from me will become a neighborhood with multiple use housing and buildings more than two stories. That field is and its adjacent trees are currently home to red tailed hawks, geese, and so many other birds, and even fox and coyotes. Why can't we keep some farm land and open space? Why do we have to cater to so much new growth? I am aware that my neighborhood is on former Flynn Ranch farm land. But we are a community with covenants and neighborhood pride, not a hodge podge of buildings. I do not like my native city any more!!	The city and county are not proposing this plan so this area can be developed, the plan is being proposed because this area can and is developing and there are issues like traffic, stormwater management, agriculture, and character of the area that need to be addressed. Without the plan these issues would not be evaluated on a comprehensive approach, but on a development by development basis. 40% of the plan area will not be developed.	no changes to plan or code recommended

8	Melany Imes	9/17/2020	Question	Zoning code	Planning Board	<p>1. Hi Andrew - I reside at 2551 Flynn Lane in Missoula. We received the memorandum regarding the adoption of Mullan Traditional Neighborhood Development Form-Based Code. Our property is in the highlighted area. I'm not sure exactly what this means, as the memo indicates that it is to guide future growth in the area and to rezone undeveloped portions of the area in the proposed Mullan Traditional Neighborhood Development code. What exactly would our property (which contains a single-family residence and a shop) be subject to in this regard? We are currently in the county. I would appreciate some clarification. Thank you for your time. (Please reply to all so my husband receives your response as well.) Melany Imes</p> <p>2. Andrew- We do not currently desire to redevelop our property, but may consider it in the future. Is there some information I can look at to see what the development options would be in case at some point in the future we would be interested in potentially rezoning to the proposed form-based code? Thanks! Melany Imes</p> <p>3. Hi Andrew - Is it possible you could point me in the right direction to online information about the Neighborhood Unit, Crossroads Center Neighborhood Unit, and Missoula International Airport Extended Approach and Departure Area? I'm trying to figure out the following: 1) If we are included now in the Neighborhood Unit how does this affect our taxes? 2) If we wanted to divide our one-acre parcel into two parcels and possibly make one or both parcels commercial at some point in the future, what kind of commercial establishments would be allowed? Would a small commercial automotive/truck shop be allowed? 3) If we decided to opt-in at some point in the future rather than now, how much are the fees and what does the application process entail? Thank you for your time! Melany Imes</p>	<p>1. Melany and Justin-I see where you are there right next to Hellgate Elementary. We are not intending to rezone properties that are already developed. Your inclusion into the proposed rezoning is not consistent with our intent. I believe it was an oversight, thinking you were part of the school property when we drafted the boundary. I am going to recommend to the planning board and the County Commissioners that your property not be rezoned and remain C-RR1. You would still have the option to rezone to the proposed form-based code at some point in the future. I would only see you doing that if you wanted to redevelop the property. If you are planning to redevelop the property, let me know and I will not recommend you be removed. The proposed code would allow you many more development options than C-RR1. Let me know if you have any more questions. Andrew Hagemeyer, AICP</p> <p>2. Melany-The way the zoning works is a little different. We are proposing to zone the area as a Neighborhood Unit. The Neighborhood Units are very general zoning designations. They tell you what development options are available. These development options are called Transects. The Transects are the specific zoning standards, things like use, density, setbacks, ect. That is why this works best in undeveloped areas, or when redeveloping, as the developer gets to choose what their specific standards are. You would be in the proposed Crossroads Center Neighborhood Unit. However, you are in the Missoula International Airport Extended Approach and Departure Area. The maximum residential density in the airport approach area is 4 units per acre. You could have a commercial use in the future, but what could be depends on the use and how many people would gather there. It's to hypothetical for me to make suggestions, you would have to have a specific idea. Either way, if you want to be included, your existing home and shop would be grandfathered. So, no worries there. If you don't want to be included, you could also opt in</p>	No conclusion yet
---	-------------	-----------	----------	-------------	----------------	---	---	-------------------

							<p>at some point in the future. Right now, the county will include you for free. To opt in later, you would have to go through an application process and pay a fee. Andrew Hagemeyer, AICP</p> <p>3. Sorry for the delay. Here are my responses. Is it possible you could point me in the right direction to online information about the Neighborhood Unit, Crossroads Center Neighborhood Unit, and Missoula International Airport Extended Approach and Departure Area? Page 2-5 of the draft Zoning Code dated 9-11-2020 I'm trying to figure out the following: If we are included now in the Neighborhood Unit how does this affect our taxes? The Montana Department of Revenue, the entity that completes the property tax evaluations does not consider zoning in their assessments. So it will not change the way their calculations. If we wanted to divide our one-acre parcel into two parcels and possibly make one or both parcels commercial at some point in the future, what kind of commercial establishments would be allowed? Would a small commercial automotive/truck shop be allowed? It is really hard for me to speculate, generally things like a hospital or school would be a no. If we decided to opt-in at some point in the future rather than now, how much are the fees and what does the application process entail? The current minimum fee to rezone is \$4,000. They do increase from time to time.</p>	
9	Christine Larson	9/17/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	Andrew- Thanks for the public meeting information, the link to Missoula Connect and for your time today. What a difference good communication makes not only in understanding a project but also in our civic relationships. Thank you for doing the necessary work of a growing community and for being an effective part of the team process. I look forward to meeting you someday. Until then, stay well. Christine Larson 2405 Half Hitch Dr Missoula 59808		no changes to plan or code recommended

10	Apryl	9/20/2020	Comment	Master Plan	Planning Board	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to submit comments regarding the Mullan Road Redevelopment. After many years of concern for the area behind my home, I am grateful to have this platform with which to communicate. I am commenting today on the issue of conservation. The area at the west side of the proposed plan, labeled “Hiawatha Farm” in one part of the plan, is a riparian ecosystem that allows for an abundance of wildlife. This area was part of a flood plain mitigation that includes the subdivision I live in. This mitigation was within the last 2 decades, and subsequently has created an area that now has water throughout the year. As a result, habitat exists now where a diversity of wildlife are present. There is a family of Red-Tailed Hawks and a family of Great Horned Owls that live in the trees just above the water. Blue Herons fly overhead and use the cottonwoods as nesting sites. There are visiting Sandhill Cranes each summer. Additionally, there are deer, coyotes, skunks, foxes, frogs, toads, ducks, geese, Red-Winged Blackbirds, Yellow-Headed Blackbirds, and many other birds that choose to visit, live, and nest in the area. There has recently been a family of Bald Eagles with two juveniles frequenting the area as well. Is there any type study being done to determine the effects on wildlife as we spread our urban developments? If not, I would humbly request that this be part of the process for this area. And in determining those potential effects, what will you do to mitigate them? After reading much of the proposed plan at mullanareamasterplan.com, I feel like Dover, Kohl, & Partners offers a unique approach to the area. It is inspiring to see an alternative to housing development that is not based solely on how many units they can put in one acre or how much money they will be able to get out of the project in the long term. However, the current plan, as written, seems to focus on conservation for human use and recreation rather than conservation for the wildlife systems that exist in these areas. It is my opinion that the City of Missoula has approved far too many multi-family dwelling units that destroy habitat, block mountain views, create traffic congestion, and do not fulfill the true desires of the people who have lived here for decades. Many of the apartment areas that have been built toward the west end of Missoula are not anything like what is being proposed in the Mullan Area Master Plan. They lack the CSAs and farm areas, community centers, trails and parks. I am concerned that the vagueness of the zoning request would allow developers and the city to take advantage and create further population density in the area. How can you assure surrounding landowners that our wildlife areas, views, and peace will not be impeded? As my main concern is the for the property directly north of the Mullan Trail subdivision, I would like to request that specific measures be required for building sites. As it is stated currently in the plan, the possibility of apartments and multi-family housing exists. This would mean increased population density in the area which brings noise, light, and consumer pollution. It does not reflect abundant wildlife conservation efforts in that area, and I am deeply concerned about this. In the Master Plan documents, I find it confusing and vague that there are</p>	<p>The farmland pictured in the plan is not in the same location of the stormwater facility you speak of. The facility will not be altered.</p> <p>The city and county are not proposing this plan so this area can be developed, the plan is being proposed because this area can and is developing and there are issues like traffic, stormwater management, agriculture, and character of the area that need to be addressed. Without the plan these issues would not be evaluated on a comprehensive approach, but on a development by development basis.</p> <p>40% of the plan area will not be developed.</p> <p>Inclusion of farming, such as incubator farms and CSA’s are intended to be included into the neighborhoods.</p> <p>The zoning code includes height restrictions, bulk and dimensional requirements, and character requirements for multi-family buildings.</p> <p>The city and county plan for a mix of housing types including apartments because single family housing is expensive, and it is land intensive. A range of housing types including multi-family buildings is necessary to slow the continued march of urban sprawl into what remaining farmland and conservation areas we have in the western part of the Missoula Valley.</p>	<p>no changes to plan or code recommended</p>
----	-------	-----------	---------	-------------	----------------	--	---	---

						<p>multiple maps that indicate “Community Center” or “Hiawatha Farm”. These terms do not have any solidification at this point and seem arbitrary and vague. Please consider the landowners to the south of the proposed plan in the final proposal. I would like to suggest a height restriction on buildings, the elimination of the multi-family units in that area, and fewer through-traffic areas. Many of the residents in the area use Hiawatha Road as a walking trail for our families and pets, and we would appreciate your consideration of our lifestyles in your decision making. In closing, I understand that Missoula is growing and there are many people who want to call our beautiful valley home, regardless of how I feel about it. However, wildlife conservation is fundamental to Western Montana, and Missoula’s growth should reflect our values. I ask that you consider an option for the area I have addressed that is reasonable, applicable, and sound based in conservation standards and goals. Thank you.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

11	Leslie & Philip Mullette	9/21/2020	Comment	Zoning Code	Planning Board	<p>We are residents of the Pleasant View neighborhood. We wish to express our concerns about the Adoption of the Mullan Traditional Neighborhood Development Form-Based Code. We realize that you are in the beginning stages of this approval process, but would like to express our concerns about the traffic burdens that will obviously affect our neighborhood. Based on the boundaries of this proposed district, it appears that little consideration has been made on addressing adequate and safe traffic flow. Specifically, we are concerned that there appears to be limited streets being added to address north/south traffic flow, other than dumping most of the traffic on to England Blvd. Our homes border England Blvd. and we have noticed that traffic flow has increased significantly over the past few years. During the school year, there are no less than 10 school buses that use England Blvd causing increased noise and congestion twice daily. Our neighborhood association has been discussing options to address these concerns for years, but little has been done to resolve the traffic issues. We are hoping that you plan to study and address these traffic issues. There are several areas where traffic bottlenecks occur including both the north and south ends of Flynn Lane and the intersection of England Blvd and Reserve. For years we have been told that Mary Jane will eventually be expanded from Broadway to Mullan Rd to relieve this congestion, but to date no changes have been made to facilitate this. Some of the suggestions that have been made to address these bottlenecks include adding a stoplight at both ends of Flynn Lane and adding a right hand turn lane at the intersection of England and Reserve; but again, we have seen no progress regarding these suggestions. We would be interested in knowing what you plan to do to adequately address the current and future traffic flow issues. Will there be a process for those of us living in this area to be able to provide input to your planning board? Your letter dated September 11, 2020 mentioned that notification went out to all property owners within the proposed rezoning or within 300 feet. We feel that you should expand this notification to all residents of Pleasant View Estates, as the increased traffic flow will affect this entire neighborhood. We look forward to hearing back from you regarding our concerns. Respectively submitted, Leslie and Phillip Mullette 2798 Fleet Street</p>	<p>The city and county are not proposing this plan so this area can be developed, the plan is being proposed because this area can and is developing and there are issues like traffic, stormwater management, agriculture, and character of the area that need to be addressed. Without the plan these issues would not be evaluated on a comprehensive approach, but on a development by development basis. Significant evaluations of traffic has been completed, including modeling, coordination with transportation experts, planners, engineers, and transit authorities. The city and county has secured a 10 million dollar grant for transportation upgrades. Construction on a number of traffic improvements will begin next spring including: Intersection of George Elemer and Mullan New connection of Mary Jane from Mullan to Broadway New extension of England Blvd to George Elemer. George Elemer North to England. Mullan Road is planned to be expanded to 4 lane. Timing is dependent of funding.</p>	no changes to plan or code recommended
----	--------------------------	-----------	---------	-------------	----------------	--	--	--

12	Christine	9/21/2020	comment			The Mullan Master Plan looks great. One important clarification is needed. REFERENCES MUST BE MADE AS WELL AS EMPHASIZED TO INFORM RESIDENTS* that MPO (Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization – in charge of planning and providing a safe and efficient transportation system), intends to improve Mullan Road. • Residents need to know that the Mullan Master Plan Development Team and MPO have congruent plans, including the need to make Mullan Road safe, convenient, and able to accommodate the ongoing and significant increase in vehicle traffic. • Without a clear understanding, concerned residents are left to imagine the worst regarding normal, daily traffic as well as dangerously obstructed traffic, of personal and emergency vehicles, in the event of evacuation.** Montana’s wildfire history, the current fires on the west coast, and the reality of climate change make evacuation a distinct possibility. The Mullan Master Plan introduces the goal of expanding Missoula’s housing options along with the creation of an attractive, safe, and livable neighborhood community. *City and County proposals often use condensed, vague language. Continue to clarify by using easily understood words and sentences. **Mullan Area offers the appeal of wildland/urban interface as well as classification as a high wildfire risk area. Residents depend on city and county government to continue its obligation to safe guard the public.	The plan could have a better explanation of planned improvements outside of the planning area that will address impacts to growth.	RECOMMENDED CHANGE – Include a list of planned projects outside the plan area, such as widening of Mullan road to 4 or 5 lanes, that are in the MPO long range transportation plan
13	Missoula County Clerk and Recorder	9/16/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	No Comment		
14	Missoula County Public Works	9/21/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	No Comment		

15	Home Resource	9/21/2020	Comment	Zoning code	Planning Board	<p>To the City and County of Missoula Planning Staff: Missoula is leading the charge throughout Montana in its commitment to environmental sustainability: in 2018, The Missoula City Council unanimously adopted the ZERO by FIFTY goal to reduce Missoula’s waste stream by 90% by 2050; and in 2019 both the City of Missoula as well as Missoula County adopted a joint resolution that establishes a goal of 100% clean electricity for the Missoula urban area by 2030. As part of the effort, Home ReSource, with support from the City of Missoula, has initiated a Zero Waste Infrastructure Task Force. The purpose of the Task Force is to advise the City of Missoula and Missoula County on how to achieve the infrastructure goals defined in the Zero by Fifty Zero Waste Plan adopted by Missoula City Council in 2018. This is an important effort that will help Missoula to reduce the amount and toxicity of waste generated in the county, conserve mineral, fossil fuel and forest resources, and to mitigate the effects of climate change. The Task Force would like to make the following recommendations in regards to the Mullan Area Master Plan, as the City and County consider zoning and code requirements for future development. This is an excellent opportunity to create a model zero waste neighborhood to guide development and redevelopment in Missoula and beyond. The Task Force is available to offer guidance and support as this project moves along, and is fully committed to the success of a zero waste Mullan Area neighborhoods. Our recommendations include: 1. In order to reduce the amount of materials sent to the landfill, ensure opportunities for recycling and composting wherever trash receptacles are located. Initial funding and longterm maintenance for this requirement could be found through a traditional HOA structure or, even better, attaching it to a parks maintenance or lighting SID. Requirements include: 1515 Wyoming Street, Missoula, MT 59801 406.541.8301 office 406.541.8300 store homeresource.org a. Public areas such as sidewalks and business centers shall have three bin collection systems, with instructional signage, to collect landfill, compostable, and recyclable materials. b. Enclosure areas must have adequate storage space for landfill, compostable, and recyclable materials collection dumpsters and/or compactors. Relevant city code and examples can be seen from the City of Palo Alto. 2. The Mullan Area Master Plan should incorporate sustainable building practices into its requirements and criteria for potential developers. Sustainable building practices include, but are not limited to, deconstruction over demolition, reduction of waste on building job sites, incorporating reuse and sustainable materials into buildings, and increasing energy efficiency and water conservation efforts. These recommendations will help to ensure that the future Mullan Area neighborhood residents have the ability to reduce their environmental footprint, and supports the City’s goals of zero waste. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, The members of the Zero Waste Infrastructure Task Force: Chase Jones – City of Missoula Chris Behan – Missoula Redevelopment Agency Mike Kadas - Community Member Amber Sherrill</p>		RECOMMENDED CHANGE – Include the recommendations into the zoning code as feasible
----	---------------	-----------	---------	-------------	----------------	---	--	---

						<div>– Missoula City Council Travis Ross –Water Quality District Heidi West – Missoula City Council Katie Deuel – Home ReSource Leigh Ratterman – Home ReSource</div>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

16	Samantha	9/23/2020	comment	Master Plan & Zoning Code	planning Board	<p>The overall Mullan Master Plan raises multiple concerns, but there is also rezoning that was being proposed that will significantly increase those concerns. The proposed 347 residential lots would be a density increase that would overwhelm the current and proposed infrastructure changes, making it extremely difficult to navigate the division streets as well as Mullan Road. I am concerned with the number of people that would inhabit an area with currently 1 road going East into town, and only a second proposed road with the connection to Broadway. There are already times during the day where it is almost impossible to turn East onto Mullan, especially during the winter months. This rezoning proposal of multi-family style units would congest the area even further, making it more difficult than it already is. My other concern with the type of housing that is being proposed is the increase in potential rental units, and transitional housing that would create inconsistencies with the current dwellings being built in the division, and the future construction of the proposed units. Currently we have single-family units in our division, some of which are rentals, but still adhere to the architectural aspects of single-family homes. Adding courtyard/patio style dwellings, row houses and townhome/duplex style dwellings would decrease the desire to live in a development specifically designed with single-family homes, thus decreasing the property values of those who already reside in this subdivision. My final concern is that this is a very child-friendly subdivision, with hundreds of kids who are frequently out and about with their friends. Adding the proposed 347 residential units greatly increases the population density, which in turn increases the traffic within the subdivision streets. That will increase the danger of those children being injured as a result of the increased frequency of cars on the road. The proposed rezoning will bottleneck the already congested streets coming out of the 44 Ranch Development, as many people work in town around the same time. This bottlenecking not only has an impact on those who live in the division, but for those who live further west on Mullan, who have only one route to drive into town. Assuming one car per dwelling (and maybe more for transitional housing, as many people have roommates), the increase in population density will overwhelm the current and proposed infrastructure. There will be a greater danger to the children who have a wonderful area and neighborhood to play in, and will decrease the property value of the homes that are already build, and will continue to be built within the development.</p>	<p>Generally, this comment hits on density and traffic concerns. The city and county are not proposing this plan so this area can be developed, the plan is being proposed because this area can and is developing and there are issues like traffic, stormwater management, agriculture, and character of the area that need to be addressed. Without the plan these issues would not be evaluated on a comprehensive approach, but on a development by development basis. Significant evaluations of traffic has been completed, including modeling, coordination with transportation experts, planners, engineers, and transit authorities. The city and county has secured a 10 million dollar grant for transportation upgrades. Construction on a number of traffic improvements will begin next spring including: Intersection of George Elemer and Mullan New connection of Mary Jane from Mullan to Broadway New extension of England Blvd to George Elemer. George Elemer North to England. Mullan Road is planned to be expanded to 4 lane. Timing is dependent of funding.</p>	no changes to plan or code recommended
----	----------	-----------	---------	---------------------------	----------------	---	--	--

17	Missoula Food Policy Advisory Board	9/23/2020	Comment	Master Plan	Planning Board	<p>AGENCY LETTER TO SUBMIT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON MULLAN AREA MASTER PLAN. Agency: Missoula City-County Food Policy Advisory Board Members: Jessica Allred, Jason Mandala, Bart Morris, Jodi Wills (County Commissioner appointees) Erika Berglund (Mayor appointed) Michael Dorshorst, John DiBari and Claire Battaglia (City Council appointees Jennifer Zaso (Community Food and Agriculture Coalition (CFAC) representative)Members of the Missoula Food Policy Advisory Board have reviewed the Mullan Master Plan Draft, visited the Mullan Master plan location, and present the following comments regarding the impacts of this project on agriculture and local food systems. First, we want to recognize the permanent loss of almost 1,500 acres of prime, if irrigated, agricultural soil that will result in the execution of this plan.(1) Our primary recommendation is that formal regulatory mechanisms (i.e. farmland mitigation/impact fees, zoning plans and developer incentives for increased agricultural space in subdivisions) are enacted to ensure the protection of remaining preserved agricultural lands in the County, outlined in the current Missoula Area Land Use Element of the Missoula County Growth Policy plan.(2) For example, these mechanisms will ensure the lasting protection of important agricultural soils in areas such as the Grass Valley. Our other recommendations and comments are as follows:1)We do not have a precedent for farmland mitigation fees in Missoula, however, they are mentioned as a key farmland protection tool in the plan. While we support this as a tool, it is unclear what mitigation ratio these fees would require and what the accumulated funds would be specifically allocated for. What targets should be aimed for in this plan? For example, if we are permanently losing 50% of the best agricultural soils to development in the Mullan Area, 100% of soils in some other area within the County should be protected. There needs to be an explicit commitment (preferably detailed quantitatively) to protection of ag land in the BUILD area and elsewhere in the County as compensation for the loss of land in this area. 2) If one of the mechanisms to conserve farmland currently outlined in the plan is to expand existing conservation easements to ensure full protection of these lands, we recommend the use of County Open Space Bond funds as a way to purchase and conserve these lands if a willing landowner decides to sell. This option should be mentioned in the final plan. 3) In the spirit of this plan as a whole and in Big Idea #2 on pages 70-73, that there “can be” gardens and/or urban farms within each neighborhood. Can there be an incentive plan for higher density (conservation development) when accompanied by a larger farm set aside, protected by a conservation easement, and/or assurance of an affordable ag purchase price? 4) Is there an opportunity for animal agriculture allowances on the agricultural lands set aside in the plan? In the current Draft Form-Based Code animal agriculture is not allowed in any part of the Master Plan area, except by warrant. Should there be allowances for backyard chickens, two goats, etc. as well in any residential areas, which would be in keeping with the area’s agricultural heritage? When this land</p>	<p>Plans as far back as the 1960’s identified this area as a residential neighborhood, which was reaffirmed in the 1974 Missoula Comprehensive Plan, in the 2002 Wye-Mullan Plan, and again with the 2015 Our Missoula Growth Policy. The notion that growth is going to occur in this area because of the master plan is factually incorrect. This area has long been planned for growth, it has been transitioning since the 1990’s, and that rate of transition is only going to increase with the major increase of development applications submitted within the area within the last year. None of these plans or this growth is mitigating the impacts to agriculture. That is one of the reasons why we are doing the plan, as can be found on pages 29 and 45 of the Missoula Area Land Use Element.</p> <p>Second, the reference to 1,500 acres of Prime farmland if irrigated is incorrect. There are 1,143 acres of Prime farmland if irrigated within the planning area. To highlight how development is already occurring in the area, of the 1,142 acres, 448 acres has already been developed, or has received entitlements to develop (most of those entitlements were approved within the last 3 months). That means 40% of the Prime soils in the area have been “lost” without the guidance of the proposed plan. Of the remaining soil designation (694 acres), 236 is publicly owned or in conservation easement. That is 34% of the remaining soils, or 20.6% of the total. That leaves 458 acres of undeveloped Prime farmland if Irrigated under the purview of this plan.</p> <p>With the correct numbers entering the record, it does not seem to change the basis for the comments in the letter.</p> <p>1) The plan can’t make commitments, it can only recommend actions. The plan recommends impact fees for mitigating the loss of farmland. The process to adopt impact fees is specified in state law, it is a complex process that is ultimately a decision of the elected officials. The facilities that impact fees would go to purchase need to be identified in that process. There is no way we can commit to its successful adoption; we can only recommend it.</p> <p>2) The plan area is included as a Keystone in the most recent Prost Plan because of the ag soils, and Grant Creek restoration, in an area slated</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No change2. Recommended change3. Investigate options for inclusion into the plan4. Investigate options for inclusion into the plan5. No change6. No change7. No change
----	-------------------------------------	-----------	---------	-------------	----------------	---	--	---

					<p>is annexed to the city, city ordinances will allow for some of these things, however, HOA's that form may be further restrictive in their covenants. We recommend that HOA's should defer to city ordinances in this area vs. being able to put further restrictions upon animal agriculture enforced by the HOA. 5) The statistic referenced in the plan states that Missoula's population will grow by 30,000 over the next 20 years and that this neighborhood will house some of this new population. This also places an increase in demand on local food supply and producers of fruits, vegetables, grains, and proteins. What local food processing infrastructure needs to be a part of the plan to support the increased demand on the local food system associated with feeding this neighborhood? Processing, particularly of meats, is an existing bottleneck in the local food system today and is, therefore, a key consideration when anticipating the needs of a growing population. We recommend that the plan carefully consider and include strategic opportunities for farming and processing infrastructure.6) How does the plan ensure that farmers/gardeners get access to the protected parcels of land? We advise that a plan should be implemented prior to the development of this area to ensure that any protected farmland is indeed available to be realistically used by farmers/gardeners. Cost-wise it would be exceptionally limiting for a private individual to purchase these lands and farm them as a business venture. A potential solution is for the County or City to own the land and work with organizations to manage this land and actively seek farmers to farm the land with long-term affordable leases. This will help to ensure these lands are used in the ways outlined by the plan. 7) Opportunities for community-linked educational curriculums are many for this area. Everything from Climate Change live labs, to soil and hydrosciences, to crop rotations, domesticated livestock-agricultural renewal rotational programs, horticulture, silviculture, and entomophagy projects. These can be all inclusive with the community, educational programs, wholesalers, food retailers, and end-consumers. Food for the elementary school can be grown on adjacent protected agricultural land. How can we ensure that these programs and values are upheld in the plan with specific organizational programs and ownership outlined? The Missoula Food Policy Board recognizes that these questions are extremely complex and out of the purview of City and County planning staff. This plan is here to uphold the general values, protection and mitigation of farmland in Missoula County and offer suggestions for how we, as a community can implement policies, programs, projects, partnerships, etc. to ensure the agricultural values, farmland and farming/gardening operations outlined in the plan come to fruition. These questions and recommendations need to be taken into serious consideration by the residents of Missoula County, organizations that have missions aligned with conserving agriculture and bolstering local food systems, and other important stakeholders during organizational strategic planning efforts, and other opportunities for community action and engagement in the Mullan area. Thank you for the</p>	<p>for growth. It could be eligible for county or city open space funding. The proposed plan could discuss that option.</p> <p>3) The densities established in the code are correlated to the infrastructure capacity. In other words we shouldn't go any higher without more analysis. Perhaps there are other incentives besides density bonuses.</p> <p>4) I am not sure that local government can control what HOA's put into covenants. We can look into that. We can also liberalize the use of ag in the zoning.</p> <p>5) The zoning allows for these facilities.</p> <p>6) Plans can't ensure things; they rely on implementation. We can look to community partners, agencies, boards, and local government to prioritize the implementation of the plan. We will not recommend a moratorium on development.</p> <p>7) The plan, code and other tools available for implementation can provide opportunity, but the community needs to prioritize these types of endeavors.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

						<p>opportunity to submit these comments on the Mullan Area Master Plan for consideration. Respectfully, Missoula City – County Food Policy Advisory Board</p>		
18	Missoula Montana Airport	9/24/2020	Comment	Zoning	Planning Board	<p>In reviewing the referenced draft proposal, we noticed that on page 13 of this document, it calls for changing the zoning of a portion of Airport property (see attachment “Page 13.Traditional Neighborhood Development FBC”). The current zoning of all Airport property was designated as Aviation (A) upon annexation to the City of Missoula per the Letter of Agreement between MCAA and the City executed October 28, 2018 (“LoA”). The Traditional Neighborhood Development Form-Based Code proposes changing that zoning to T2 – Rural.</p> <p>Since it is not in the best interest of the Airport to change the zoning and or approved use(s) of Airport property and doing so would constitute a breach of the LoA, we respectfully submit that you remove all references to rezoning Airport property from this and any other proposed land use plans.</p> <p>If you have questions, please feel free to contact me.</p> <p>Respectfully, Dan F. Neuman</p>	The airport property would not be rezoned unless they requested it. Nonetheless we can remove the airport property from the Neighborhood Unit map (Map 2.1 FBC)	RECOMMENDED CHANGE - Remove airport property from Neighborhood Unit Map.
19	Karen Slobod	9/16/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	Looks amazing!	Thanks!	
20	Missoula MPO	9/25/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	<p>Tom and Andrew,</p> <p>I would like to submit the follow general comments in support of the Mullan Area Master Plan (MAMP) ahead of the Planning Board public hearing. This will be a critical planning project for Missoula, and has a number of innovative and essential ideas relating transportation to land use.</p> <p>First, the Transportation Planning Division, which includes staff to the Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization, Missoula In Motion, and the City’s Bicycle Pedestrian Office, supports the overall master plan and it’s</p>		no changes to plan or code recommended

					<p>potential to move us towards adopted mode split goals in Missoula’s Long Range Transportation Plan. While the project does consider a substantial amount of greenfield development, it does so with close consideration of how the development density, mix of uses, and associated transportation infrastructure design will maximize potential for non-SOV trips.</p> <p>The draft Mullan Area Master Plan presents an innovative and goal-oriented approach to the establishment of transportation facilities within the planning area. Using walkability and the concept of the 15-minute neighborhood as starting points, the transportation network envisioned in the plan has the potential to help the city and region achieve long term transportation goals of improved access, increased safety, and less dependence on motor vehicles.</p> <p>The MAMP, and the street atlas in particular, supports the community's long range transportation goals by focusing on multimodal transportation. The plan and accompanying regulations allow for and encourage design flexibility to promote biking, walking, rolling, and transit use, acknowledging that cars are important and necessary for many people while not constructing the built environment to prioritize their movement and storage. The MAMP envisions public streets as places for people to get around, safely, in the manner of their choosing. By placing mixed land uses in close proximity to housing, it is more likely that people will choose a variety of transportation options.</p> <p>In addition, the MAMP street atlas accomplishes a transportation goal we’ve long desired by tying street design to intended users (e.g. modes) and adjacent land uses. For instance, including protected bike lanes on key corridors, with specific design consideration for areas such as commercial centers and neighborhood residential streets, will ensure usability for all ages and all abilities. The street designs also explicitly consider future transit routes, which will ensure a smooth transition to operation of transit service through the area. Land use and zoning recommendations appropriately place uses along corridors that will be designed to support the development, including densities necessary for quality transit service located along planned transit routes.</p> <p>The MAMP project will further support our goals by providing the right level of development to maximize our investment in the BUILD grant infrastructure. Our hope is that we can use these transportation investments and innovative land use planning to create the right combination of both housing and transportation affordability. In fact, the BUILD project utilized growth projections from the MAMP project to ensure appropriate design. If we get development in this area right, it will significantly reduce impacts in the region’s transportation system. The project further supports and ties into other planned transportation priorities such as extension of the Milwaukee Trail – connecting this area directly to Missoula’s urban core and downtown via a high-quality shared-use path. If implemented, the project will also provide an area of growth,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>housing and employment that will support areas such as North Reserve within a short walkable or bikeable distance.</p> <p>While facilities like Reserve Street will continue to be transportation challenges, this project offers a vision that we can build on to start tackling those larger issues. By creating network connectivity, we can ensure transportation options in both mode and route. Trips from the area west of Reserve Street will no longer be forced through one single intersection and corridor (Mullan Rd). If the right mix of uses is realized, many trips will be retained within the plan area, further reducing growth pressures on these already congested facilities. Transit service provides yet another relief system. Finally, it is our hope that this master plan will spur action to improve connectivity from this area to the rest of Missoula, particularly the east/west connections across Reserve Street to areas such as West Broadway and Missoula's Opportunity Zone.</p> <p>It is Transportation Planning staff's hope that the MAMP, street atlas, and proposed regulations can serve as examples for the rest of the city as we strive to improve the entire transportation network. Please let us know if we can provide additional comments, or support this project in any other way.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Aaron Wilson</p>		
21	Institute for Sustainable Transportation, Bob Giordano	9/28/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	<p>The Mullan Master Plan looks pretty good overall. It seems we are on a good track, yet more can and should be done, to create a healthy and sustainable Mullan area, and how it relates to Missoula as a whole. We focus our comments on transportation and land use, our expertise over the last 25 years in Missoula. While the plan shows good design for bike, walk and transit, we need to do more as to not create too many car trips. Missoula has a goal to triple bike, walk and transit, so the highest priority needs to be made for good design, incentives and new creative ways to keep people from driving so much. We support the internal street and trail designs and we also support more attention to detail once things get built. For instance, it can be challenging for pedestrians if cyclists are also sharing those facilities in a street context vs. a trail context. We greatly support much more transit interfacing with the Mullan plan and development. We support even more bike walk trails connecting within and thru the development area. We also greatly support modern, single lane roundabouts and do not think we should be building any multi lane roundabouts, or even roundabouts with auxiliary lanes. The roundabout at Mullan/ George Ellmer shows auxiliary lanes: this makes it less safe and comfortable for people walking and cycling. So please work towards 'pure' single lane roundabouts for all intersections, including those with Broadway. We highly suggest '3-laning' Broadway, which is wider than an airport runway right now. A 3-lane street with modern single lane roundabouts typically moves traffic much safer and even more efficient than a 4 or 5 lane street with signals. Broadway, and Mullan for that</p>	<p>Mostly supportive of the typical road sections, wants to see one land roundabouts, road diet for Broadway, Mullan to be 3 lanes not 4 or 5, and a crossing on reserve.</p> <p>The plan does not design intersections, the design of roundabouts will be determined during engineering of intersections, which for the BUILD Grant roads is occurring now. Off-site transportation infrastructure, like Broadway, Reserve and Mullan, are being reviewed and prioritized in the update to the Connect Missoula Transportation Plan which is being updated now.</p>	<p>no changes to plan or code recommended</p>

					<p>matter, can be beautiul 3-lane streets, with single lane roundabouts, and separate cycle tracks and boulevard sidewalks. A separate bike walk trail can even/should be off to the side of these potential 'complete streets.' Frequent, good-coverage transit is also essential and will help with our collective mode shift goals. Instead of any multi lane or auxillary lane roundabouts connecting the development to greater Missoula, please do 3-lane streets with only _single_ lane roundabouts, yet perhaps secure right of way to 'upsize' the roundabouts if absolutely necessary in the future. Our strong hunch is that transportation is changing quickly and on a large scale, and so it is prudent to keep things as small as possible right now. This saves money, energy and lives. We follow international roundabout design trends and it is clear that single lane rounabouts are good for walking and cycling while multi lane roundabouts generally are not. We are also excited to see the momentum behind passenger rail restoration in the Missoula Valley, so this transportation mode cannot be discounted. In fact, it should be planned for. Other mobility enhancements for the Mullan area should include: bike share, car share, sustainable paving (permeable for instance) techniques, slower speeds (thru good design, such as 10' lanes), high-quality, secure bike parking (covered), bike fix-it stations and neighborhood greenways. If these techniques are employed up front, then development and people's habits conform and adjust- seamlessly- right away. It is much harder to retrofit and change habits later. We also want to 'plug' as much mixed use development as possible. In a way, we are creating a new community, even a new city, in the Mullan area. All services should be within, such as getting food, building supplies, jobs, night life, recreation and all other life requirements. Thank you, -Bob Giordano, Director, Missoula Institute for Sustainable Transportation, mist@strans.org</p> <p>We would like to add to our last comment. We believe it is extremely important to provide for safe crossings of Reserve Street, for all people and especially those that are walking or cycling. Two ways we suggest to do this: one is for a bike/walk path to go under Reserve Street at the north side of the Clark Fork river. There is already the space to do this and it would be an easy way to make for a safe crossing. No bridge modifications are needed- the under crossing is basically already there. It would be similar to the trail going under Madison, Higgins, Orange and Russell, along the river. This new undercrossing at Reserve should then connect both east and west. To the east: the trail can go along the Clark Fork river and connect to the trail that was just completed under the new Russell bridge. There is space already for this mile long trail. One point of the right of way is 'tight' yet this trail is very feasible. We have walked the route many times over the last couple decades, to explore the feasibility. Connecting the trail to the west: this simply means working with Walmart for a good connection and also going thru the City owned waste water treatment area- a trail along the river would not interfere with either operation and</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						could easily be constructed. This river trail heading west would connect with the Old Milwaukee trail already being planned by Parks and Rec and connect with the existing trail along Mullan road. A second crossing of Reserve can be done right at the Mullan intersection by going under Reserve Street at this location. The key is that there already is a natural grade change so this undercrossing would be much easier than it sounds. Ideally we would have both (and more) safe undercrossings of Reserve Street, to facilitate ease of walking and cycling. Thank you, -Bob Giordano, Director, MIST, mist@strans.org		
22	Vicki Watson	9/28/2020	Comment	General	Planning Board	Grant Creek is on MT DEQ's list of impaired streams. Stakeholders working on a Watershed Restoration Plan for the Central Clark Fork prioritized improving Grant Creek. Hence development must be planned & executed to avoid worsening the situation, & should strive to improve the creek's condition. This requires: 1 Detailed hydrologic study of Mullan area watershed to assess impact of proposed development on groundwater/surface water. This study informs where to place high density development (on less permeable soils) & where to place stormwater green infrastructure. 2 A creek buffer must be protected from development now – so creek can be restored when sufficient funds are found. Buffer width depends on purpose. To restore water quality, buffer 100 ft either side of creek or 100 year floodplain – whichever is greater. For good fish habitat, buffer 300 feet either side of creek or 100 year floodplain. A 300 foot buffer is also recommended for good songbird habitat with some species needing up to 660 feet. A buffer can also help absorb storm water runoff (width guided by the hydrologic study). To accommodate park trails, more buffer may be needed. Citations of scientific studies supporting these buffer widths available on request.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan recommends a hydrologic study for the Mullan Area, the scope of that project would be determined by the agency leading the project. 2. The zoning includes a 200 foot buffer from the centerline of the stream. According to our discussions with area biologists, this is greater than the minimum but not enough for all species. Because we are dealing with private property and mostly one landowner, buffer widths are a challenging subject. Right now, in the current zoning, there is no regulatory buffer. 	no changes to plan or code recommended
23	Katie Ward	9/23/20	Comment	General	Planning Board	<p>Mullan Master Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After extensive survey work, it is apparent the extension of George Elmer should align better with parcel boundaries. • Current projects are not represented on the plan. Parks and other densities are specified on several active projects. There are conflicts with current approved projects, recorded development agreements and the like. This needs to be updated. • Preserving historic structures should be encouraged but not mandatory. • Ch 3. 4. Walkable and integrated streets as designed appear to have a very large diameter which unduly burdens developers. Our downtown is walkable and bikeable with standard widths. The city can hardly keep up with snow removal now, how will they care for all the additional pavement required for this configuration. • Ch 3. 5. Civic uses (fire station, school, community centers) are very nice to have but take millions of dollars. If they need to be reserved they should be purchased by the city immediately or they will 	The Mullan Area Master Plan is an effort to address many of the issues and challenges that both the city and county are trying to address including transportation, stormwater, loss of agricultural lands and conflicts with the Missoula airport. The plan is consistent with policy adopted by the city of Missoula and Missoula County. While many of the ideas in the plan are grand, the plan itself doesn't require or implement any of them. They all require additional implementation steps. For example, new schools and fire stations will have to purchase the property, the plan does not incur any land to those uses. Form based codes have been in use in communities throughout the country for decades, literally hundreds of communities have adopted them. They have a proven track record of creating mixed use, mixed income, walkable, attractive neighborhoods. This is actually a much more simplified code than the existing city code, will reduce the amount of regulation	RECOMMENDED CHANGE: Reduce parkland requirement to 11% There are a number of other suggestions to change the code that staff needs more time to work with the consultant to evaluate. Final recommended changes will be made to the governing body.

					<p>unduly burden the current landowner (almost like a condemnation) and the future parcel purchaser by having to purchase land waiting for the city to raise the funds and be able to secure financing. There needs to be an alternative use allowed in the event the city does not have funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Page 57. The Mullan Neighborhood text stresses flexibility so that individual property owners and developers can meet their needs. The way the plan/code is currently written the uses are very narrow and the amount of public space is over 22%. That is double current standards.• Page 58-59. Describes the growing commercial needs. The actual needs in my opinion is much more light-industrial and residential style storage to serve these new neighborhoods. Uses need to be expanded for our Montana Community (with about five months of winter) needs and to insure promised flexibility. It is very difficult for small retail businesses to survive in settings like Hellgate Meadows which still has vacancies. <p>These designs are more appropriate for a downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The above items are in direct conflict with the ability to build affordable homes, especially single family. If money was no object or this was a publicly funded project the ideas are fabulous. On page 65 language exists suggesting encumbering the land by requiring a certain percentage of lots to be affordable. This is in direct conflict with the code requiring the highest Green Building standards, solar infrastructure, etc. they add huge costs to building... A better approach is to provide incentives and grant funding assistance to developers to meet this need. On page 67 it describes “simple construction” but the code is in conflict with that.• Pg. 71-73. Farms and Community Gardens. With the scarcity of development land in Missoula and the fact we are limited by mountains surrounding us on every side and four rivers we are not like Bozeman with abundant land in every direction. Farm land can only be profitable when purchased at \$4,000 to \$6,000 per acre (See land study). There is no such thing in the Missoula Valley Floor and using the small inventory of what is left for farming just is not feasible. There are neighboring communities/cities that fill that niche more appropriately.	<p>necessary to develop, and does not require annexation unless services are required. Overall, elements of the plan are consistent with what the majority of the public said during the significant amount of outreach that occurred on this planning process, and the planning processes that lead to the development of the our Missoula growth policy and the Missoula land use element.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pg. 74. Grant Creek Restoration. This is a very critical component to allow for the goals of the area. The draft plan calls for a 200’ area on each side of the channel which is in direct conflict to the agreements discussed with the landowners.• Page. 75-79. Parks and Trails. The description sounds very appealing, if money were not an object or if the city/county already owned the land. <p>There must be alternative uses provided should the city not have the funds to support these amenities. You cannot burden developers with all of these wish list items and not expect them to just go to another city. Conservation easements that provide tax benefits can only benefit wealthy landowners who need tax breaks. Cash conservation easements take funds which are not abundant from any resource. The majority of landowners in a market with the average wage under \$45k cannot afford a conservation easement venture. The city needs to find the funds before burdening the land with these great futuristic and big city ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Page 80-81, 92-93 Sustainability is great. We don’t have enough land to protect farms and land. This is not a farming area anymore. Also, there should be incentives for using Green Materials, renewable energy, etc. but requiring it will significantly increase the cost of building and make our housing problem even worse.• Page 94-104 We live in Montana. Driving is an essential way to get from one community to another. In a market where there are four distinct cities the emphasis should be equal on auto travel, pedestrian and bicyclists. This is not California or Florida. Kids sports tournaments are all over, the plan doesn’t even allow a gas station within it! In researching form-based code it is mostly used in downtown areas. <p>Form Based Code-Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is annexation mandatory upon adoption?• What cities has this worked in? What parts of those cities?• What cities have adopted it and then went back to traditional zoning?• Without a complete planning staff, will this further slow down the process?• Will it deter development and make the housing crisis worse? <p>Form Based Code-Comments and Concerns</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Page 1-2 The code references the Missoula City Growth Policy and the Missoula Area Land Use Element. Both of these documents are flexible and general. They let the market dictate uses and during the charettes I don't believe anyone realized the nature of Form Based Codes and how different they are from traditional zoning.• Page 2-4. In the EADA the maximum density is 4 DU/AC that appears to be in conflict with the use map. The uses allowed in this area should include residential style storage, and other uses that are appropriate. Otherwise it greatly de-values the property.• Page 3-2. Grant Creek Buffer width is excessive and is in conflict with landowner negotiations.• Page 2-5. 22% is excessive. (Restated from above page. 75-79.) Parks and Trails. The description sounds very appealing, if money were not an object or if the city/county already owned the land. There must be alternative uses provided should the city not have the funds to support these amenities. You cannot burden developers with all of these wish list items and not expect them to just go to another city. Conservation easements that provide tax benefits can only benefit wealthy landowners who need tax breaks. Cash conservation easements take funds which are not abundant from any resource. The majority of landowners in a market with the average wage under \$45k cannot afford a conservation easement venture. The city needs to find the funds before burdening the land with these great futuristic and big city ideas.• Page 3-3, Table 3-1. In T3 storage businesses will need a lower ground floor elevation.• Page 3-40 Section 3.12 Permitted Uses. Uses need to be expanded. More SD-W needs to be incorporated based on Broadway frontage and community need. Assisted Living/Memory Care/Senior Facilities of large sizes need to be incorporated. Gas Stations/Convenience Stores need to be allowed. Drive through's need to be allowed when appropriate. Live/Work units have not worked in Bozeman. Where have they worked and how?• Page 4-6 Signage. Limiting signage further that current standard code will unduly compromise business success. We have seen examples of <p>this in many markets. Advertising tells people where to go. Signs tell them they are there and direct them to parking, items, etc. Signs need to be big enough for automobiles to read while following the speed limit not just pedestrians and bicylists. Signs of Aluminum should also be allowed. Ground signs should be allowed.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pae 4-10. Section 3 states landscaping should be attractive during all seasons. That seems to be in conflict with our weather. <p>In summary, there is great concern that this plan is too idealistic, onerous and complicated. It has the good chance of failing and causing us to lose valuable time building homes to meet the demands. Our current codes, Like B2 can accomplish our goals with some simple architectural standards.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted. Katie Ward</p>		
24	no name	9/29/20	Comment	General	Planning Board	<p>i agree w/Vicki Watson on preservation and protection of Grant Creek. i share Apryll's concerns for the bird and other wildlife currently observed in the area: "HiawathaFarm" in one part of the plan, is a riparian ecosystem that allows for an abundance of wildlife. i also agree w/Vicki Watson: "preservation and protection of Grant Creek.Grant Creek is on MT DEQ's list of impaired streams. Stakeholders working on a Watershed Restoration Plan for the Central Clark Fork prioritized improving Grant Creek. Hence development must be planned & executed to avoid worsening the situation, & should strive to improve the creek's condition. This requires: 1 Detailed hydrologic study of Mullan area watershed to assess impact of proposed development on groundwater/surface water. This study informs where to place high density development (on less permeable soils) & where to place stormwater green infrastructure. 2 A creek buffer must be protected from development now – so creek can be restored when sufficient funds are found. Buffer width depends on purpose. To restore water quality, buffer 100 ft either side of creek or 100 year floodplain – whichever is greater. For good fish habitat, buffer 300 feet either side of creek or 100 year floodplain. A 300 foot buffer is also recommended for good songbird habitat with some species needing up to 660 feet. A buffer can also help absorb storm water runoff (width guided by the hydrologic study). To accommodate park trails, more buffer may be needed. Citations of scientific studies supporting these buffer widths available on request."vicki watson about 19 hours ago. i also agree w/a member of the Five Valleys Audubon Society, I am now aware of this Mullan Area Master Plan. As the City and County develop more human spaces, there needs to be a plan for preserving and restoring wildlife habitat. It would appear that this "master plan" has the opportunity to enhance the riparian corridor of Grant creek. this would somewhat offset the loss of open space and important bird habitat. I recommend engaging the experts on habitat enhancement (e.g. Audubon, Clark Fork Coalition, University of Montana) to strike this important balance between human development and preservation of wildlife</p>	<p>This comment has largely been addressed in the master plan: The master plan creates a comprehensive approach to stormwater management for the area, rather than the subdivision by subdivision approach today. The plan recommends a hydrological study. The zoning includes special standards to address stormwater through green infrastructure.</p>	<p>no changes to plan or code recommended</p>