

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #2

May 14, 2019 1:00-2:00 PM

Location: CAPS Conference Room, 127 E. Main St., 2nd Floor

AGENDA

I. Introductions for new members (5 min.)

	Attendance
Laval Means, City Dev. Services	✓
Aaron Wilson, City Dev. Services	✓
Heather McMilin, Homeword	✓
Erik Dickson, Co. PW	✓
Nicole Whyte, Co. PW	✓
Jeanna Miller, MCCHD	✓
Adriane Beck, OEM	✓
Dwight Easton, MOR	
Mike Morgan, Hoffmann Morgan	✓
James Sage, Missoula Engineering	✓
Kate Dinsmore, WGM	✓
Paul Forsting, TLI & MBIA	✓
Clint Burson, Chamber of Commerce	✓
Bonnie Buckingham, CFAC	✓
Stephanie Potts, Planning Board	
Torrey Ritter, FWP	✓
Don McArthur, McArthur Means & Wells	✓
Peter Bensen, Planning Board	✓

II. Project Updates (10 min.)

- a. Allison (OPD) reviewed the current project status and provided an overview of the internal and external surveys that are being developed for release in early June, in coordination with the audit trip.
 - i. Peter Bensen asked whether the audit and amendment process would take into consideration the land use designations in the MAMP that the Planning Board and Commission recently approved; Allison and Jennie confirmed that growth policy alignment, specifically alignment with the

soon-to-be-adopted land use designations, is a core component of this process.

- ii. Nicole Whyte asked if only the text was changing as part of this project, or whether the map boundaries would also change? Jennie responded that at this time it is unclear; originally the plan was for just text changes, with on-the-ground zoning boundary changes following immediately on the heels of the text amendments. However, the reality is that there may be some boundary adjustments or even new zones added (like in East Missoula) as an outcome of this process. The audit will be a factor in determining whether text amendments, map amendments or both are needed.

III. Audit Trip – June 3 - 6, 2019 (30 min.)

- a. Allison (OPD) reviewed the week’s objectives, stakeholder topics and agenda for the audit activities scheduled in June. Steering Committee members were then asked for their input on the preliminary topic areas.
 - i. Laval Means asked whether there would be a City-specific roundtable, or whether an internal meeting with City and County staff would be arranged. The importance of having a conversation about “regulation for regulation” with the entities administering similar aspects of two different codes was discussed; Laval suggested including representatives from the City’s engineering, public works, transportation, parks and recreation, permitting, contracts and development services departments in a City-specific roundtable. Allison noted that in some cases stakeholders could be invited to more than one roundtable given their expertise; for instance, City transportation planning staff may be invited to participate in a City-specific roundtable as well as the Transportation topical roundtable.
 - ii. Nicole Whyte asked about the “Other County Departments” roundtable group and whether the consultant team would be meeting with County departments individually or altogether; Allison responded that this meeting would likely be with all departments together (given time constraints and the benefit of hearing multiple perspectives), but additional department conversations could happen outside of that meeting if necessary.
 - iii. Jeanna Miller asked whether Public Health could have a separate meeting with the team so that she and staff could identify which roundtables would be most appropriate to attend. This could be a consideration (based on response to Nicole’s question above). Allison reiterated that the stakeholder roundtable topics were really a means of organizing conversations and that the Steering Committee and stakeholders shouldn’t get too caught up with which topics were “correct” or appropriate in terms of attendance. People are going to talk about what they want.

- iv. Torrey Ritter asked what “sustainability” meant, as a roundtable topic. Jennie responded that the topic area is broad and encompasses everything from resource conservation, alternative energy potential and addressing impacts related to climate change. She also noted that sustainability is pervasive to all of the topic areas – the expectation is it will be discussed by many of the groups, but as a County priority it was seen as too important a topic not to have a focus group on. Torrey asked if a stakeholder has comments on more than one topic, if the open house sessions would be most appropriate for their participation? Allison answered yes.
 - b. Steering Committee participation
 - i. Allison noted that Steering Committee members would receive the final schedule for June and would be welcome to participate in any of the topical roundtables of interest, in addition to those they are specifically invited to.
 - c. For discussion: stakeholder invitees
 - i. Allison and Jennie opened discussion on who (organizations/individuals) should be at the table come June, under these topic areas or others?
 1. Peter Bensen asked whether there could be an information “Zoning 101” presentation to the Steering Committee (or full group of stakeholders) at some point during the week. Allison responded that CAPS staff had discussed a similar idea at an earlier meeting, and that there would be materials provided to committee members and stakeholders via the website to review in advance of the meetings. A “101” session could be considered but would take away from a potential stakeholder meeting in order to fit in – and timing would inevitably not work for all. Allison explained there would be a 10-15 minute introductory component to each of the stakeholder roundtable discussions.
 2. Laval suggested getting the Missoula Architecture Group membership list.
- IV. Website (5 min.)
 - a. Jennie noted there were some tweaks being made to the Steering Committee file sharing portal based on an earlier discussion, and that we would fill committee members in once these had been finalized.
- V. Public comment (5 min.)
 - a. None
- VI. Questions? (5 min.)
 - a. See above