

Missoula Board of County Commissioners

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES COVER SHEET



THURSDAY, AUGUST 08, 2024 – 2 PM

Hybrid meeting – Missoula County Courthouse Annex Sophie Moiese
Room/Microsoft Teams

[Click here to view the meeting recording.](#)

Time stamps (in green) correspond to meeting recording above. Please click to
the time stamps listed to view a particular item in the meeting.

ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners Present:

Chair David Strohmaier
Commissioner Juanita Vero

Staff Present:

Cheryl Hartman, Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office
Annie Cathey, Lead Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office
Chris Lounsbury, Chief Administrative Officer, Commissioners' Office
Shane Stack, Director, Public Works
Patrick Swart, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Jacob Allington, Civil Attorney, County Attorneys' Office
Randy Arnold, Director, Lands, Culture and Recreation
Anna Sheroke, Property Records Specialist, Clerk and Records' Office
Mattie Scott, Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office
Melissa Fisher, Strategic Initiatives Manager, Commissioners' Office
Patrick Swart, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Allison Franz, Communications Manager, Communications
Anne Hughes, Chief Operating Officer, Missoula County
Kim Myre, Seeley Lake Projects and Operations Coordinator
Carey Powers, Communications Coordinator, Communications
Tim Worley, Senior Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Elisha Buchholz, Equity Coordinator, Commissioners' Office
Jennie Dixon, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Kyla Lehnerz, Office Coordinator, Lands and Communities
Brian West, Civil County Attorney, County Attorneys' Office
Glen Sundberg, Computer Specialist, Technology
Lauren Ryan, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability

1. CALL TO ORDER *[Time stamp – 0:02]*
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE *[Time stamp – 0:04]*

3. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT [Time stamp – 0:24]

Missoula County acknowledges that this event takes place in the aboriginal territories of the Salish and Kalispel people.

4. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS [Time stamp – 0:36]

- a. Closed Captioning
- b. Missoula County Fair Aug. 06- Aug. 11

5. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA [Time stamp – 3:05]

6. CURRENT CLAIMS LIST [Time stamp – 03:23]

Claims received as of July 29, 2024 to July 30, 2024 by the Commissioners' Office total \$1,044,849.92.

7. HEARINGS

a. Missoula Rural Fire District Annexation Petitions [Time stamp – 04:14]

Anna Sheroke, Property Records Specialist, Clerk and Recorders'

Commissioner Vero made the motion to approve the Missoula Rural Fire District Annexation Petitions as presented by staff.

Commissioner Strohmaier seconded.

[Motion Passed 2-0.]

[Resolution 2024-086 Book:1103 Page:384]

b. Simonovich Family Transfer [Time stamp – 29:22]

Patrick Swart, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability

Commissioner Vero made the motion for the Simonovich Family to utilize the family transfer exemption to create and transfer one tract to their daughter Liya Simonovich as presented in the exemption application and affidavit.

Commissioner Strohmaier seconded.

[Motion Passed 2-0.]

[Letter 2024-157 sent to Simonovich Family on August 27, 2024]

c. Final Resolution- Restricted Parking on Sunnyside Ct. [Time stamp – 18:40]

Shane Stack, Director, Public Works

Commissioner Vero made the motion for the Board of Missoula County Commissioners approve the resolution restricting parking on a portion of Sunnyside Court in East Missoula.

Commissioner Strohmaier seconded.

[Motion Passed 2-0.]

[Resolution 2024-083 Book: 1103 Page: 387]

d. Final Resolution- Restricted Parking on Waterside Dr. [Time stamp – 20:58]

Shane Stack, Director, Public Works

Commissioner Vero made the motion for the Board of Missoula County Commissioners approve the resolution restricting the parking on the east side of Waterside Drive in East Missoula.

Commissioner Strohmaier seconded.

[Motion Passed 2-0.]

[Resolution 2024-081 Book: 1103 Page: 388]

e. Final Resolution- Placing/Calling for a Mill Levy in Support of Missoula County Public Infrastructure [Time stamp – 24:25]

Chris Lounsbury, Missoula County Chief Administrative Officer

Commissioner Vero made the motion for the Board of Missoula County Commissioners approve and the resolution calling for submitting to the electors of Missoula County the question of whether the Board of County Commissioners should be authorized to levy up to five mills for the purpose of funding the construction, repair and maintenance of county roads, bridges and trails.

Commissioner Strohmaier seconded.

[Motion Passed 2-0.]

[Resolution 2024-084 Book: 1103 Page: 389]

Please refer to the Commissioners' Administrative Meeting on August 22, 2024 for more information/ Resolution reconsidered and was withdrawn.

f. Grass Valley Gardens [Time stamp – 1:11:31]

Jennie Dixon, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability

Commissioner Vero made the motion that the Board of County Commissioners' approve the Grass Valley Gardens PUD subdivision be approved based on the findings of fact and conclusions of the law in the staff report and subject to the recommended conditions of approval in the staff report as amended.

Commissioner Strohmaier seconded.

[Motion Passed 2-0.]

[Letter 2024-167 sent to WGM Group in c/o Jamie Erbacher on September 19, 2024]

8. OTHER BUSINESS

[None]

9. ADJOURN

Chair Strohmaier – Called the meeting to adjourn at 3:32 p.m.

BCC Public Meeting August 08, 2024 – Transcription

This transcription was produced by transcription software. There may be discrepancies between this transcription and meeting dialogue. You can view the recording of the meeting on the county's YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/c/missoulacounty> or contact the commissioners' office to obtain a copy.

Dialogue in the transcription attributed to "Sophie Moiese Room" is for all speakers that attended the meeting in person. Attendees that participated virtually are labeled individually.

BCC-Commissioners' Public Meeting-20240808_140038-Meeting Recording

0:02

Public meeting of the Missoula Board of County Commissioners.

0:04

Please stand and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

0:09

Pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands.

0:16

One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

0:24

So I'd like to call today's meeting to order and also acknowledge that this event today takes place in the aboriginal territories of the Salish and Kalispell people.

0:36

Cheryl, please bring us up to speed on closed captioning and all things that people need to know housekeeping wise for this meeting.

0:51

Hello everyone.

1:03

Hello, everyone.

1:04

If you're joining us for this meeting virtually today, instructions for turning on closed captioning are going to be on your screen momentarily.

1:14

If you're joining us in person, we'll have closed captioning on all the screens here in the Sophie Louise room.

1:20

There will be an opportunity to speak during the meeting for public comment, virtually and in person.

1:24

We ask that all speakers today speak slowly and clearly.

1:27

This helps with the accuracy of the closed captioning.

1:30

If you're on Microsoft Teams, you would.

1:32

If you would like to speak when discussion has been open for public comment, we ask that you use the Raise Hand feature.

1:37

This is the small hand button at the top of your team screen.

1:40

If you're calling in on the phone, you'll need to hit *5 to raise your hand.

1:44

Once called upon, you'll need to hit *6 to unmute.

1:47

If you have any questions, please find me during the meeting and let me know.

1:50

We also have assisted listening devices if you like one, find me during the meeting.

1:55

Thank you.

1:57

Thank you, Cheryl.

1:58

So also I would like to bring to people's attention, if you did not know already, the Western Montana Fair is happening this week at the Missoula Fairgrounds.

2:09

Missoula County Fairgrounds admission is free, so head on out there and check it out and take part in your beautifully renovated and restored Missoula County Fairgrounds.

2:24

Is there any?

2:27

Yes, the Klaus Bauer brand new grandstands.

2:31

You will not want to miss that.

2:33

So wear pink tonight if you're going to the rodeo to support breast cancer.

2:37

OK.

2:39

Any other tough enough to wear pink?

2:41

OK, Any other staff or announce public announcements?

2:46

OK, so there are six public hearings today.

2:49

If you're here to speak on any of those topics, ranging from fire district annexations to subdivision to parking restrictions, please hold your comments until we get to that item.

3:01

You'll have a chance to comment at that time.

3:03

However, now is your opportunity.

3:05

If you want to comment on anything that is not on the agenda, come on up to the microphone and say what's on your mind or raise your hand if you're online and we will call on you in the order in which you raise your hand.

3:20

OK?

3:21

See no public comment and non agenda items.

3:23

Claims received as of July 29th, 2024 through June July 30th, 2024 by the Commissioner's Office total \$1,044,849.92.

3:38

As I mentioned, we have six public hearings today, with one small exception, which I'll explain when we get to it.

3:46

The way each of these public hearings will work is that we will begin with a staff report, followed by an opportunity for the applicant or applicant's representative to say a few words.

—

3:58

That will be followed by public comment.

4:01

Please be succinct and try not to repeat others if they're saying the exact same thing.

4:06

We'll close the public hearing.

4:08

We'll have an opportunity for county Commission questions and discussion and then we will take action.

4:14

So with that, we will begin with a Missoula Rural Fire District annexation petition and do come on up.

4:26

What was that, Cheryl?

4:29

Right, Yeah.

4:30

And for everyone, please just state your name for the record and then open it up.

4:36

All right?

4:37

My name is Anna Shiroki and I am a property records specialist.

4:41

You're going to have to talk right into that mic, like a an inch away, literally.

4:46

Is that better?

4:47

That's better.

4:49

My name is Anna Shiroki and I am a property records specialist.

4:52

With the Missoula County Clerk and Records Office.

4:55

A petition to annex land into the Missoula Rural Fire District has been submitted to the Clerk and Recorder.

5:02

The property proposed to be annexed is legally described as Track two of Cos 5850.

5:08

The physical address of the property is 1005 Deer Creek Rd.

5:13

in Missoula, Mt 59802.

5:16

The petition has been signed by property owners who represent at least 40% of the acreage and 40% of the taxable value of the property to be annexed.

5:25

A Notice of Hearing has been published twice in the Missoula IN and all property owners have been notified of this hearing.

5:32

The petition is now presented to the Board for your decision.

5:34

Thank you.

5:36

Thank you very much.

5:37

Is there any public comment on this proposed annexation into Missoula Rural Fire District?

5:45

OK, thanks.

5:46

Anna and I will close the public hearing.

5:48

Presumably, since this is before us, the Missoula Rural Fire District is in support of this annexation request.

5:56

Yes.

5:56

OK.

5:58

Questions or a motion?

6:01

I move that the board approve the Missoula Rural Fire District annexation petitions as presented.

6:07

I'll second that.

6:08

Any further discussion on the motion seeing none all in favor.

6:11

Aye, OK, thank you.

6:13

Thank you, Anna.

6:17

Next we have the Simonovic Simonovic family transfer proposal and Patrick will provide a staff report.

6:28

Good afternoon.

6:28

My name is Patrick Swart and I am a planner with the Office of Planning, Development and Sustainability.

6:34

And today we are looking at a request.

6:36

Let me get the slideshow pulled up from Alexi and Olga Simonovic to utilize the Family transfer exemption on their property at 2985 Big Flat Rd.

6:47

here in Missoula.

6:55

Here is a look at the property location out on Big Flat Rd.

7:00

just to the West of where it meets Kona Ranch Rd.

7:02

It's outlined in black and green here on the screen.

7:10

The property is currently described as Lot 21N Block 4 of Sol Acreage Tracks Second Filing.

7:17

It's 2.34 acres developed with a single family residence as you can see here, and it's zoned RRS 1, which has a minimum lot size of one acre.

7:35

The Simonovich family is proposing to split the property in two along this boundary that runs east West that you can see right here, and to gift Lot 2B to their daughter Leah.

7:49

The resulting lots would be 1.21 acres and 1.13 acres, both compliant with zoning, and the intent is to retain ownership of Lot 2A and to continue to reside on Lot 2A as well.

8:08

This was reviewed against our general evasion criteria and rebuttable presumptions in the Missoula County Subdivision Regulations.

8:16

It did raise one flag in the rebuttable presumption review in that there wasn't a clear intent to occupy or utilize the family transfer parcel that was presented in the application.

8:29

What was stated in the application is that Leah would continue to reside on the remaining parcel with her parents.

8:37

Leah is a minor child.

8:43

Well, we sent it out for agency comment and we did receive a comment from John Hart and the Missoula County Attorney's Office and John stated the applicant's stated purpose for a transfer of property to their minor daughter is to safeguard her future.

8:58

In light of uncertain economic forecast, I strongly encourage the applicant to consult an attorney prior to transferring any real property to their daughter so that her interest in the property is protected and guaranteed until she reaches adulthood.

9:12

We did not receive any other adverse comments in addition to this.

9:25

And is one of the applicants present in the room today or online?

9:35

Hi Bryce Hale with Eli and associates, and I'm here with Alexi the Clayton.

9:41

Welcome.

9:41

Hello, thank you.

9:44

If you could state your name for the record, please.

9:47

So I'm the owner of the property, Alexei Salonovich.

9:50

Perfect.

9:50

And we just have a few questions for you.

9:53

Did you buy the property with the intent of dividing it?

10:00

Do you or the transferee intend to transfer the property within the next year?

10:05

Fine.

10:07

Have you talked to anyone at the county?

10:09

Hang on just a second.

10:10

We're having some audio we're not able to pick up.

10:12

Yeah, Alexei's comments, they're not coming through on the transcript.

10:17

Can you hear me?

10:20

Sort of if there's a microphone speak up.

10:24

Yes, if you'd like, I can read through the questions again.

10:28

Yeah, we're we're going to do just a slight do over here.

10:31

Alexi, sorry for that.

10:33

And if you could speak as loudly and close to the microphone on your end, that would be great.

10:38

OK.

10:40

All right.

10:41

Did you buy the property with the intent of dividing it?

10:44

No, I did not.

10:48

Do you or the transferee intend to transfer the property within the next year?

10:53

No.

10:55

Have you talked to anyone at the county about going through subdivision review?

10:59

I have not.

11:00

No.

11:02

Will the property be developed?

11:06

No, not.

11:07

Not in the near future.

11:09

You know, maybe.

11:09

What?

11:10

She's an adult.

11:13

OK.

11:14

And will the recipient of the property be residing on the property?

11:18

Yes, she will be.

11:23

OK.

11:24

Which piece of property did you mean?

11:25

Electric?

11:26

Just to clarify, She'll she'll be residing in in your residence on on that parcel.

11:31

OK.

11:32

Not, not not the new parcel we're creating.

11:34

No, thank you.

11:36

Unless you're forcing her to camp out temporarily.

11:41

OK, thank you.

11:43

Thank you.

11:47

All right.

11:49

With that, the Missoula County Planning Office did not find this to be an evasion of subdivision regulations or Missoula County regulations.

11:59

So we would be recommending approval today and there is a recommended motion up on the screen.

12:05

Excellent, We appreciate that.

12:06

Thank you.

12:07

Is there any public comment on this proposed family transfer?

12:13

Any public comment?

12:16

OK, seeing none, we'll close the public hearing.

12:19

Any questions, Juanita?

12:21

Nope.

12:23

OK, we can take a motion unless you did you have any questions?

12:29

I I do not have any questions.

12:30

I move to approve the request by Alexei and Olga Samanovich to utilize a family transfer exemption to create and transfer one truck to their daughter, Leah Samanovich as presented in the exemption application and affidavit.

12:43

I'll second that.

12:44

Any further discussion seeing none.

12:46

All in favor.

12:47

Aye.

12:48

All right, Thank you, Alexei and Olga.

12:51

Thank you.

12:52

Thank you.

12:53

You bet.

12:56

And thank you, Pete.

12:58

Patrick, we are on A roll.

13:03

So our next item is going to be, let's see who's going to present this.

13:13

Shane, are you handling the next two items here, both of which pertain to parking restrictions?

13:21

Yeah, I, I think I have most of three items.

13:26

OK, so we'll start with Sunnyside Court, And this is Jane Stack, our chief public works officer for Missoula County.

13:33

All right, Maybe I will start by sharing my screen if I can.

13:46

All right, hopefully everybody can see that.

13:50

So this is a conclusion of the hearing that was opened two weeks ago to consider restricting parking on Sunnyside Court.

14:02

I was contacted by Cindy Winchell, who represents the Sunny Meadows Water and Sewer District.

14:10

And they had been contacted by the Montana Department of Water Quality or sorry, Environmental Quality with concerns that people were parking close to the the wells that that serve this neighborhood, that those wells could be contaminated.

14:26

And so in an effort to reduce the risk of, of contamination reaching those wells, Cindy had asked if if we could consider no parking restrictions on Sunnyside Court.

14:38

So what I've got there is an exhibit.

14:41

I'd actually also like to just zoom in and, and show everybody kind of where those wells are located.

14:50

So this is again, Sunnyside Court, this is Hwy.

14:53

200.

14:54

This is the new parking lot for for Chevron.

14:58

So just to give you an idea of, of, of where we are at in the county.

15:04

This is one of the wells of concern.

15:06

If you can see my cursor moving around.

15:09

And then there's a also a second well, when we first heard from Cindy the the request was just to to cover the the property line.

15:20

But DEQ did say that they wanted the parking restriction to reach 100 feet.

15:26

So we've extended that restriction from this well 100 feet.

15:30

So that would get somewhere out in this neighborhood.

15:35

So that is essentially is the is the request is to restrict parking as shown on Exhibit A from Hwy.

15:46

200, call it northwest to the location shown on the on on the exhibit.

15:54

And it's just one side of the street.

15:55

It is just one side.

15:56

They just requested the one side.

15:59

But it's not 100 feet if someone parks, right.

16:02

I don't I'm confused.

16:04

Yeah, I, I, Yep.

16:06

And we can, if you want, we can add that 100 feet as well on the other side too.

16:12

But I've, and again, I've, I've reached out to the, the neighboring property owner, just the one that would be impacted and, and she was completely in supportive of the, the idea.

16:27

I have not talked to any of these folks here nor has it been requested to restrict parking on that other side.

16:35

Thank you.

16:36

Cindy, would you mind coming up here?

16:38

I'm, I'm assuming you were the designated representative of the water district.

16:44

I am.

16:45

So had that ever this is Cindy Winchell.

16:48

So had that ever come up in conversation as far as the other side of the street restricted parking or no or is that even a requirement of of DEQ?

16:59

Well, I had asked the homeowner and they were not in favor of that because it would impact their ability to have guests.

17:08

You know, I'm sure that if it was necessary that they would probably be able to work it out.

17:17

I do have one other question if I'd like to bring it up.

17:21

Yes, in lieu of our discussions about you know putting up signs etcetera and the fact that enforcement really isn't going going to be an easy thing to manage.

17:36

We would like to know if there is a way that we can request an easement variance or right away variance so that we could put pin downs along the boundaries of our property to further hinder people from parking.

17:52

I spoke with Sandy Arnold yesterday from the DEQ about my concerns about that because you know, having signs and and not being able to really follow through with the enforcement isn't really going to help us.

18:08

But pin downs might and we would purchase and place them and I just don't know how we would go about that.

18:15

Is that a separate issue that I deal?

18:18

Well, I think you're requesting pin down curb along the entire length of of that restriction, right?

18:25

And, and, and I'd like to know how we would address that grassy property that's ours along Hwy.

18:33
200.

18:35
Yeah, I, I think we would want to talk to Montana Department transportation about that.

18:40
So, but let's focus on Sunnyside Court.

18:43
I, I, I think we can work with you to just put curbs.

18:46
And I don't know that you need a variance or any kind of change to the right of way.

18:50
I think would, would, Shane would, would those vertical delineators work also?

18:57
And maybe there's pros and cons to either, but yeah, I, I think if we went with metal delineators and and don't remove them, that might be a, a good solution.

19:10
OK, so it's, it sounds like there's a, a possibility we can put something physical in there on Sunny.

19:15
Yeah, because that's, it's really critical that we keep people from parking there and they don't respond to the signs.

19:23
So we would appreciate it if you would work with us on that.

19:27
Sure.

19:27
OK, oh, go ahead and whatever else you need from us, I will do it.

19:34
I think the other thing Dave to answer well and and Juan, I think you asked the question about how come not the other side.

19:40

I think 1 positive is is at least the water is draining away at that point.

19:46

OK, I just, I don't understand the topography, so.

19:48

OK, Yeah, I generally the roads have a crown and so it's going to drain away.

19:55

And so, you know, it doesn't completely alleviate any risk, but it certainly reduces it compared to the other side.

20:03

OK, Thank you.

20:04

Thanks.

20:05

Thank.

20:05

Thanks, Cindy.

20:06

Thank you very much.

20:07

Is there anything else, Cindy, you wanted to share from the water district's perspective?

20:11

No, I we've really appreciated your help and your willingness to help us deal with this because we.

20:19

Aren't engineers and we don't know how to do this stuff.

20:21

So thank you.

20:22

You bet.

20:23

Thank you.

20:23

Is there any public comment on this proposed parking restriction on Sunnyside Court?

20:30

Any public comment?

20:32

Anyone online who would like to comment on this?

20:36

OK, seeing none, we'll close the public hearing.

20:39

Any additional questions, Juanita?

20:41

Nope, I moved.

20:43

I'm sorry.

20:43

Unless did you have anything going on?

20:44

I have nothing.

20:45

So go for it.

20:47

Move that.

20:47

The board approve the resolution restricting parking on a portion of Sunnyside Court in East Missoula.

20:52

I'll second that.

20:53

Any further discussion seeing none.

20:55

All in favor.

20:56

Aye.

20:58

Moving on to a similar proposed parking resolution for Waterside.

21:04

Dr.

21:05

Shane.

21:07

Thanks.

21:07

Commissioner Strohmeier.

21:08

Kind of the same story, two weeks ago we opened a hearing to discuss the request for parking restrictions on the east side of of Waterside Dr.

21:21

and tried to sharing my screen kind of give you an idea of where that is.

21:27

If you see the main road here is Deer Creek and then Waterside Dr.

21:33

just one of the the roads that leads off of of Deer Creek Rd.

21:39

Handful of homes that are that are on this stretch of Rd.

21:43

When this subdivision was originally created, it was intended to not have parking on that east side.

21:49

However, I don't think there was any restrictions at that time.

21:52

And so the the HOA has reached out and I know Andrews here as a represent representative of of the the HOA, but they reached out and and asked if if we could create a parking restriction there or pass a no parking resolution for that specific location.

22:11

Again, we open that hearing up two weeks ago.

22:15

The request would be to close the hearing and and vote on the the closure.

22:22

Thank you.

22:23

Anyone from the HOA want to say any words?

22:25

No.

22:26

OK.

22:28

Any public comment on this final resolution to restrict parking on a portion of Waterside Drive?

22:37

Anyone online?

22:40

OK, seeing none, we'll close the public hearing.

22:42

Any questions again, Why is it the east side as opposed to the West side?

22:49

Come on up.

22:50

You're not going to get off so easy today.

22:52

And the microphone's on.

22:54

So please state your name for the record and have at it.

22:56

Yeah, my name is Andrew hers.

22:57

I live live at 4628 Sunnybrook Way in Water's Edge.

23:02

So as you're aware of, as you're aware, there is a proposed development to the South of us and we have an issue with the bend in Waterside Dr.

23:11

and we and one of the reasons is sight lines and also just organically parking for the most part is occurring currently on the West side.

23:20

And what we want to do is make it clear to everybody that's only on the West side because those people who do park on the east side make it sort of a slalom course.

23:26

And that's going to be more problematic when the subdivision or if a subdivision gets opened up down there.

23:32

Also, we have more people coming in from overflow from the Sharon access.

23:38

So we're wanting to make sure that that's locked down as well for them.

23:42

Thank you.

23:43

Thank you, Andrew.

23:45

Any other questions?

23:46

OK, we are ready for a motion.

23:48

I move that the board approve the resolution restricting the parking on the east side of Waterside Drive in East Missoula.

23:54

I'll second that.

23:55

Any further discussion on the motion seeing none all in favor.

23:59

Aye, OK.

24:00

Thanks, Andrew.

24:02

Thank you, Shane.

24:03

And we're not going to let you off the hook, Shane quite so early either.

24:08

So I is this A tag team here between Chris and Shane?

24:13

So this would be taking up a potential resolution calling for a mill levy election in support of Missoula County infrastructure.

24:25

And this is Chris Lonsberry, the chief administrative officer for Missoula County.

24:31

Thank you, commissioner.

24:31

So Shane and I just want to walk you through some of the challenges we've been facing.

24:35

As you know, we've been talking for a long time about the the resolution calling for submitting to the electors of Missoula County the question of whether the Board of County Commissioners should be authorized to levy up to five mills for the purpose of funding the construction, repair and maintenance of county roads, bridges and trails. ture deficiencies around Missoula County.

24:40

We've had some really public facing ones recently around Mcclay Bridge and some of our other bridges.

24:46

And we face a significant challenge due to the mill cap that's in place across the state of Montana, as well as the restrictions in code that allow us only half the rate of inflation.

24:56

And that has put severe pressure on our public works department over time, meaning that the funding that's available to them goes a shorter distance each year in the projects that need to be accomplished.

25:06

And so our Chief Public Works Officer, Shane Stacks, going to walk you through some of those.

25:11

And then I'll talk a little bit about why a mill levy from staff's perspective makes sense in this case as a way to help try and close some of that gap, not all of the gap that is there in our public works infrastructure needs.

25:24

Thank you, Shane.

25:28

All right, thanks, Chris.

25:38

And of course this maybe let me All right.

26:27

Thanks, Chris.

26:31

OK, So I just wanted to just talk a little bit about the, the general road and bridge information experience here in Missoula County.

26:40

So we've got 450 miles of of maintained roads, 264 of those are are paved, 186 are gravel and and 63 are non maintained.

26:49

Those numbers are changing regularly as we see more roads paved.

26:55

We also see annexation in the city subdivisions come on.

26:59

So and and we also pick up some of these non maintained roads too.

27:04

We've slowly been trying to to include those into our maintenance schedules.

27:11

So bridges, we've got 61 bridges that are over 20 feet long and 62 under 20 feet.

27:18

And, and why that's important is Montana Department Transportation does inspection on those bridges that are over 20 feet long.

27:26

And they will report back to Missoula County on a regular basis on, on, you know, the results of those inspections.

27:33

And they do inspections every two years on, on all the county bridges.

27:38

And then we've got 346 culverts throughout the county that need to be maintained.

27:43

And then finally 47 miles of trails maintained by Missoula County.

27:51

And then just talk a little bit about the funding for roads based on just property tax income, we're just around 3.4 million estimated to to come in this year.

28:03

And then there's some other categories Forest Reserve Act, gas, state gas tax, state entitlement in total

we're receiving right now close to 6.4 million annually for just roads going to the bridge program, property taxes at 960, state entitlement 183.

28:25

So totals around 1.2, a little over 1.2 million.

28:32

What did I guess that I just want to cover the kind of the basic cost of of operations at at the county public works just for road and bridge.

28:42

Our personnel costs alone are around 4 million, operations are two million.

28:47

And then we're, we've really tried to spend more on our equipment.

28:50

Our, our equipment had had become fairly old and we're trying to catch up on equipment.

28:56

And, and one nice thing about getting caught up on equipment is we also become very, I guess a lot more efficient.

29:04

I would say with old equipment, we end up with a lot of breakdowns and the equipment isn't as good.

29:11

So capital projects we end up with around 600,000 for road and bridge on an average year until the total cost around seven, 7.6 million, the combined road and bridge revenues and in that \$7.6 million range.

29:26

And then touching base on the trails maintenance costs, we've got one staff person and I want to be clear to public works doesn't maintain trails.

29:36

Our parks, trails and open lands team does, but certainly need to cover trail maintenance as well, not just roads and bridge.

29:47

So P2L does have one staff member and we're thinking it's around \$50,000 that we're spending on plowing, sweeping, mowing, and then pavement maintenance.

29:59

What that means is fog seals or overlays, things like that.

30:02

There's they their budget around \$10,000 a year.

30:05

There was a \$3,000,000 trail bond passed several years ago.

30:09

There's 1.7 million remaining in that.

30:11

That trail bond is essentially used as match for grants.

30:15

We've also used it for some preliminary engineering to inform grants and we've been successful with receiving grants with that funding.

30:27

So just touch based on the paved roads, we have 264 miles of paved, paved roads.

30:32

Again, you know that's increasing with subdivisions and and paving of gravel roads.

30:38

What we're recommending for for maintenance is an overlay every 20 years plus or minus.

30:45

So that would be 13 miles a year and a chip seal every 10 years plus or minus.

30:49

So 26 miles a year, that overlay cost is around 170,000 per mile and understand every Rd.

30:58

is not identical.

30:59

And so this is just kind of an average 24 foot wide is a typical roadway with and three inches thick for asphalt is kind of a a normal overlay thickness that we would use.

31:12

And you could probably you know, you have a maybe you have an 18 foot wide Rd.

31:17

somewhere that you know that cost isn't going to be 170,000 a mile, but it's close.

31:23

If we were going to overlay 13 miles a year that would roughly come to 2.2 million chip seal cost at 20,000 a mile.

31:31

And I would say just the cost this year of our chip seals it, it's coming in right around 20,000 a mile.

31:41

And understand too these costs are these are not contractor cost.

31:46

These are just material cost.

31:48

This doesn't include the cost associated with our staff going out and doing the work.

31:53

And if we did hire a contractor, obviously you know those cost would be higher.

31:58

They would be wanting to, to, you know, have profits and, and one nice thing with us keeping this work in, in the house as much as we can is it we're, we're, we're doing it for as as low as we cost, as low as we possibly can.

32:13

So back to the chip seals, you know we're looking at 520,000 a year that we probably should be spending.

32:22

If we're going to chip seal 26 miles a year, that total pavement preservation cost would be around 2.7 million a year.

32:29

We currently spend 500,000 ± a year on our pavement.

32:33

So we are nowhere near what we should be spending, which basically means our infrastructure continues to deteriorate.

32:44

We did complete an asphalt an asphalt assessment on all our paved roads in 2019 and 2020.

32:52

The result of that study they were recommending anywhere from \$3.8 million to \$5,000,000 per year depending on what PCI or pavement condition index we would like to see in the county.

33:04

So and and I put a list here of of the number of miles in in that was in 2019.

33:11

Obviously these numbers have changed since then.

33:15

We've continued probably to see further degradation, although we've overlaid a few miles here and there.

33:22

In general that \$23 million cost to to address all the deficiencies in 2019 is probably considerably higher today.

33:33

I just wanted to share a few examples of, of, of roads that we have across the county that just, I don't know, experiencing some deterioration.

33:45

You can see this road, this is just a shot of big flat, we've got potholes and then a lot of alligator cracking, which probably you'll see you'll see this on a lot of our our roads is this alligator cracking, which eventually leads to these roads completely coming apart.

34:05

So these roads examples are, are they're not far from needing a, a complete reconstruct.

34:15

So again, this is just another shot of, of roads that are, are are pretty well potholed.

34:24

Talk a little bit about our bridges.

34:26

Again, we have the 61 bridges that are 20 feet and over the 60, two bridges that are under the 20 feet and then the 346 culverts.

34:37

I would just want to talk about the more critical bridges just to give you a sense of, of where our priorities are.

34:42

Mcclay Bridge is, it's got an 11 ton load limit in these five bridges that I'm going to talk about are the five bridges that we have that are currently load posted.

34:53

Boy Scout Bridge is closed.

34:55

Sunset Hill has a 7 ton load limit on it that's in Greenough.

34:58

And then we've got two in Condon, one's in one's on Glacier Creek Rd.

35:02

and the other in Styler Dr.

35:05

And then we've got four bridges that are scour critical.

35:08

What that essentially means is that there's risk of if you have a high enough water event that the structure fails due to the foundation being damaged or washed away.

35:24

So Boy Scout Bridge, the northern bridge is scour critical.

35:27

Rock Creek and Clinton is scour critical, although that was mitigated this last spring.

35:34

Schwartz Creek and Clinton scour critical.

35:37

We are working with Morrison merrily, though, to put plans together to address that.

35:42

And then Cold Creek on the Swan River.

35:47

Other bridges of concern.

35:49

Got Bench Rd.

35:51

in the Grant Creek area, its sufficiency rating is 46 out of 100.

35:55

Lolo St.

35:56

in the Rattlesnake, it's 56 out of 100.

35:59

We didn't receive a protect grant for that though, and also some Senate Bill 536 funding, which essentially one nice thing is it you know, that's almost a \$4 million bridge will cost around 250,000 in in local funds.

36:13

So that's, that was a huge win and we want to we want to see more of those Loisel Lane in Frenchtown 49 and then Arlene Dr.

36:22

is 58.

36:22

And I guess just to give you a sense like sufficiency rating, you know the lowers is obviously not good, the higher numbers is a good thing.

36:33

I just wanted to give you a sense of you know how many bridges we have in those lower sufficiency ratings.

36:44

Here are some images of of some example structures that we're trying to replace.

36:48

Glacier Creek as I mentioned is has a load limit on it and if if you can see it's the photo on the left, you can see this piling that is sit in an angle.

36:58

So half of this bridge is actually closed.

37:01

I shouldn't say half, but a portion.

37:03

This upstream portion of the bridge is closed and it is again 22 ton load limit.

37:10

The bridge needs to be replaced.

37:12

We do have a plan for a called a quick fix of just replacing this piling and extending the life of the structure.

37:22

The one on the right is is Boy Scout.

37:26

A fair number of these pilings are damaged or need to be replaced to the point of I don't know if we can view whoever's on.

37:41

There we go.

37:41

Thanks.

37:43

We are looking at Boy Scout as far as you know, are there any quick fix solutions And HDR is is currently evaluating that and and we should hear back soon from them if, if they've got any solutions that would be cost effective that we could, we could do rather quickly.

38:02

And then again, this is Lolo St.

38:04

We do have the protect grant, but this is just an example where you can see some of the the steel exposed concrete's cracked and this thing is due for replacement.

38:19

Just to give you a sense these were I kind of mentioned the higher priority bridges.

38:23

If you sum the those the costs of all of those bridges up here you're in you know over \$60 million Mcclay Bridge being in that \$30 million range.

38:34

If you include the PE right away ICCNCE and basically what that means is all your preliminary engineering, any right away cost, any utility relocations, construction management and then the overall construction cost.

38:47

So these are these are very expensive pieces of infrastructure that we do not have the ability to repair or replace.

39:01

If you look at the long term bridge cost, what we did is we took the the bridges that are 20 feet and longer and we know what the length is, we know what the width is and we can put basically an average cost.

39:13

What we try to do is it's going to be somewhere around \$500 a square foot to replace a bridge.

39:18

And we tried to just put a cost on if we were going to replace all of our bridges and what would that cost be?

39:25

And the end of the day, it's, you know, it's going to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 165,000,000.

39:31

But again, you know, we didn't do preliminary engineering reports.

39:34

There's no real hard, you know, engineering behind these cost estimates.

39:40

It's more of just like on an average, what would it look like?

39:43

And then if you give those bridges an unexpected life of 75 years, we should be spending \$2.2 million a year on our bridges.

39:52

And we are nowhere near that trail costs again, we had 50,000 for maintenance staff.

40:04

We can do the work in house if, if we can get the the fog sealing material, the oil that's required to do that.

40:10

We have a distributor truck and we can, we can do this work for \$20,000 a year and extend the life on our trails overlays.

40:20

We should probably be doing 2 1/2 miles every year.

40:24

And that would be 175,000 a year.

40:26

So we should probably should be spending 250,000 a year.

40:29

The recent trails plan that was completed by Ark Trails open Lands right was recommending 400,000 a year, but somewhere in that range.

40:38

So and those are again just for us those are just material costs and you know public works staff time would would not be included in those \$250,000.

40:55

So what are the needed funds in?

40:59

In total we should probably be spending 4.3 million a year on roads and and bridges.

41:06

And right now we have around 600,000.

41:09

And so there is a huge gap there and we need, we do need more funding.

41:14

And if we don't, what you'll see is more bridges continuing to be closed, you'll see more roads that are deteriorating, more potholes.

41:25

And we are just not going to be able to keep up with it.

41:28

Trails, they're, you know, if we could get another 190,000 a year there, I think we would be able to, to really take care of the, the shared use paths and trails in Missoula County.

41:41

So that concludes, I don't know, Chris, if you wanna continue your presentation.

41:47

Chris.

41:54

Thanks, Shane for that depressing overview of deficiencies.

42:10

Thanks, commissioners.

42:10

Thanks, Shane.

42:11

So I just wanted to give a a quick overview because Shane paints a really good picture of what the need is in the community.

42:19

But I do also want to point out that this is not an issue that Missoula County has not been working on for some time.

42:24

So we really have been looking over the last several years and through the last legislative sessions at ways that we could attempt to fund infrastructure that was not reliant on property taxes because we are all very aware that property taxes are higher than we would like them to be.

42:38

The property tax shift that has occurred between residential and centrally assessed has had a real impact.

42:46

So we have worked hard over this last legislative session, the two prior sessions, as well as during this session to look at what are some options that are out there.

42:54

So one thing that Missoula County residents passed was a local option gas tax.

42:58

They passed that in 2019 and in the next legislative session the legislature took away that tool.

43:04

So we are not able to tax two cents per gallon for local infrastructure.

43:09

So unfortunately, that mechanism was taken away from us.

43:12

During this last legislative session.

43:14

We worked with the Montana Association of Counties on Senate Bill 442, which passed with an overwhelming by party majority to fund local infrastructure to the tune of several \$100,000 a year to Missoula County through the state's marijuana tax revenue.

43:30

That was vetoed by the governor and was not overturned by the legislature.

43:34

During the interim, we have also worked really closely with the governor's property tax task force to put forward the idea of some form of local option tax specifically to fund infrastructure and property tax relief.

43:47

Unfortunately, that did not come out as a recommendation in the governor's property tax Task Force this week, which leaves us with, unfortunately, one tool which is asking the voters to support additional funding for public works through property taxes.

44:04

So I also want to point out to folks that while property taxes are a source that we can use for this, Missoula County is nearing its mill cap.

44:13

And this is true for both our county wide and county only mills.

44:16

There's a particular section of statute that limits the number of mills that we can levy and it also limits the rate of inflation that we can get for those.

44:23

We continue to look at state and federal, the state and federal government for some of the funding for this.

44:29

And we've had some success, just to be clear, and I'll talk about a few of those projects.

44:34

And Missoula County voters have stepped forward when we've had real needs in the past and dedicated specific funding for projects.

44:41

And so things like open space, the historical museum and mental health services all in Missoula County are funded through voter approved levies.

44:48

But those funds when their voter approved, can only be spent in the area for which the voters approved them.

44:54

So we can't use things like open space bonds to address Rd.

44:57

deficiencies.

44:58

So if the voters were to pass this, these funds would be used specifically for county roads, county wide bridges, which includes bridges inside the City of Missoula and trails that connect both the outlying areas and the City of Missoula to help make sure that that infrastructure stays in better shape than it currently is.

45:17

And so I mentioned we've had some success.

45:19

We had the Mullen Build project, a very successful program in partnership with the City of Missoula and the federal government is allowing development to help ease some of our housing pressures.

45:29

We recently were awarded the Highway 200 Improvement grant, the East Missoula.

45:33

That will be a transformational change for that community and not the South Avenue bridge, but a reconstruction of South Avenue that runs between Reserve St.

45:43

all the way out through Target Range in the Clements area.

45:46

That will allow for there to be curb and gutter and sidewalks in that area, which will help to improve safe routes to schools for the folks living in the Target Range area.

45:56

All of those federal projects require a local match.

45:59

And so when Shane talks about the fact that we have about \$600,000 that we can dedicate to projects, he's he's being generous in the fact that sometimes that money doesn't go to a particular project, but instead is going towards that federal match component that we have to provide when we go after those grants.

46:17

And we're really fortunate to be able to go after those competitive grants, but unfortunately we aren't always successful either.

46:24

And so Shane mentioned Boy Scout Bridge and some of the bridges up in the North Country and the Celia and Swan area.

46:30

We applied for a RAISE grant to be able to repair five of those bridges.

46:34

And unfortunately we're not successful.

46:35

We'll look at the criteria, we'll look at the scoring sheets for why they weren't, and we'll go back after that federal funding.

46:41

But those projects still required a pretty significant federal match or local match to meet those federal dollars.

46:48

And so we still have needs that we we can't quite meet even when we look towards those state and federal funding partners.

46:55

So if voters were to approve this mill, it would mill levy.

46:59

It would be specifically for the construction, repair, maintenance of counties, roads, county wide bridges and trails.

47:05

So that means it could be used for match towards Boy Scout Bridge or Swartz Creek or the bridge and Grant Creek or depending on the cost, it could be used to directly fund some of those repairs and replacements to make sure that those bridge bridges are available for folks.

47:20

We recognize that the need, you know, Shane mentioned the amount that's actually required if we wanted to stop deteriorating and start making improvement in those.

47:29

And we recognize that that amount is more than is effective and and property tax conscious wise to ask our local voters.

47:40

And so instead we went back to the drawing board and looked at what is a reasonable ask that we think could be out there.

47:47

And so we looked at the concept of five mils, which would raise about \$1.7 million per year and what would the impact be to a homeowner.

47:55

And that mill levy, if it were to be passed would be about \$6.75 per year for \$100,000 in value.

48:02

So the average home price for taxable value in Missoula, not necessarily at sales price, but what folks are actually taxed property taxes on, is right around \$500,000.

48:12

So about \$33.75 per year is what the average homeowner would pay.

48:17

So about \$3 a month.

48:18

That would be dedicated funding specifically to help us match federal funding, but to also begin to catch up on some of these infrastructure needs in Missoula County.

48:27

And we felt like that was a good point to bring forward to the Board of County Commissioners for your consideration to put before the electorate of Missoula County.

48:37

And so with that, I would ask you to open the public hearing and take public comment on this.

48:42

And then when you're ready, I can put this proposed motion up in front of you if it is the direction of the Board of County Commissioners to consider it.

48:48

So with that, I'm going to stop sharing my screen temporarily so you can see the folks online.

48:53

Thank you.

48:54

OK, Thank you, Chris, and thank you, Shane.

48:57

This is a public hearing that I will open up at this time.

49:01

Is there any public comment on this proposal?

49:05

We have a caller online ending in the number 1829.

49:10

Go ahead.

49:14

Thank you, Commissioners.

49:15

This is Keith Copperavika.

49:17

I'd like to go back to the initial tax meeting that you guys did on June 30th, budget presentation from Chris Lounsbury, where he talked about numerous ways that the county has attempted to limit spending increases.

49:34

Excuse me.

49:35

One thing he mentioned was negotiating contracts with vendors.

49:40

I've been encouraging you now for the past year to hire a procurement director because someone that's trained in procurement is a professional negotiator.

49:49

And let's be honest, asking department managers or employees that are trained in their field to negotiate is not fair, either to them or to the taxpayers.

49:57

You have employees trained in grant writing to apply for grants.

50:01

Why not have someone trained in negotiating to negotiate contracts?

50:06

That's what a procurement director does best.

50:09

Chris also mentioned that there are required services that must be funded.

50:14

I believe he used the detention center and the health department and the elections offices as some of those services, but they also use services and supplies every day those services do.

50:28

So the detention center, for example, spends about \$800,000 a year on food.

50:34

Who's negotiating prices with the food vendor?

50:37

Who's negotiating the price of asphalt?

50:39

The chain talked about, Chris talked about the wildfire mitigation department and how a staff of two costing just over \$200,000 brought in over \$5,000,000 in grants.

50:52

That's a great investment, just like a procurement director would be a great investment for the county.

50:58

An average of procurement director will save at least 10 times their salary.

51:02

And in fiscal year 2024, Missoula County paid almost \$102,000,000 in claims.

51:09

So even a 5% savings would amount to about \$5,000,000.

51:14

And a 5% savings is just just from the food vendors alone at the detention center would save about \$40,000.

51:23

You're considering placing a \$1.8 million mill levy on the ballot for infrastructure.

51:29

I have no doubt that the county needs this infrastructure, but I do doubt that the county's getting all of the savings that you can.

51:37

So I would ask that instead of putting this on the ballot, you hire a director of procurement and use the savings he or she would get to fund this and maybe even more than 1.8 million, 5% savings would be \$5,000,000.

51:54

Heck, the credit cards, even if you just started using, getting a 2% cash back credit card, that would that that would create 10s of thousands of dollars.

52:03

So please consider instead of putting this on the ballot, hiring a procurement director and saving some money and putting that money toward infrastructure.

52:13

Thank you.

52:14

Thank you.

52:14

Mr.

52:15

Copper Rica, anyone in the room like to comment on this?

52:21

Yes, Sir.

52:21

Come on up.

52:28

My name is Mike Paterny, and you're going to have to talk right into the mic.

52:31

My name is Mike Paterny.

52:33

Thanks.

52:34

I would like to propose that that before you put this on the ballot, that some reductions in debt be achieved to offset the increase in spending.

52:47

Sadly, they'll never be enough money to do all the work that's needed on infrastructure because it given the change in the tax base and the things and the entities that contribute to it and the lack of an industrial tax base in Missoula County, it's going to be a tough row to hoe, is it not?

53:08

It's a question you can ask the question to me, Mr.

53:12

Pateri.

53:13

So.

53:13

So at any rate, I wanted to propose that that you not put this on a ballot for a as proposed for a special on the election in November, unless you can make some reductions somewhere else and at least display to the taxpayers what you'd have to give up to increase the burden to increase the, the, the, the amount that we're going to impose.

53:40

I don't that was kind of rambling.

53:41

I apologize, but I'm tired and these meetings are tough to, to make.

53:48

And, and one other thing I, I would like to mention for you folks to consider is a different way of, of proposing your budget.

53:56

It's really hard to go through it and look at all the things that you want us to consider.

54:04

And, and you know, my, my gut reaction is just say no to everything because for a while we ought to be trying to keep the impact on property tax taxes neutral.

54:15

There's been large increases over the years in the Missoula County spending.

54:19

And I know a lot of it's been financed by grants and so forth, but it's also been a large increase in the, in the property taxes.

54:30

I, I don't, I have a hard time tracking it, finding information on the on the web page.

54:36

It's available.

54:37

It's and I haven't had the time to come in and and ask somebody to take me through it, but like a lot of other people, I don't really have the time and energy to do a lot of that.

54:48

So whatever you could do to make that more clear would be helpful.

54:52

And starting with the current budget and showing what would be have to trade it, what what would be traded off to include things that you consider important would be a real improvement in my view.

55:01

Thank you, Thank you.

55:03

And we would be happy to invite you into our office and schedules permitting, sit down and have a more in depth conversation.

55:14

Any additional comment from folks in the room here in the courthouse?

55:19

OK, let's go back online.

55:21

Ted Morgan, thanks for holding this meeting.

55:27

Commissioners, my name is Ted Morgan.

55:29

I live up in the Swan.

55:31

Right now.

55:31

We're dealing with a lot of infrastructure issues, not just bridges, roads, when it comes to long term.

55:37

I just had a couple questions.

55:38

I know we didn't get the raise grant for our projects up here from Boy Scout Sunset, you know, Cold Creek and all of them.

55:45

Did we hear about the BIP grant that was also a matching grant and the Shane, can Shane answer that or somebody?

55:52

Thank you, Ted.

55:53

Shane, do we have an answer?

55:54

Yeah, good question, Ted.

55:55

We have not heard back on BIP.

55:57

So that one's still out there.

55:59

And then that would require a \$3,000,000 match, Ted.

56:03

OK, So my question, yeah, sorry, just my follow up question is, I know you guys, the county and the city came together and they'll be together in their new federal building that you're redoing.

56:15

You said that you plan on selling your old building that you used for your guys offices.

56:20

Where will that money go from the sale to that?

56:22

Because we did use ARPA funds when it came to building the new building for the county and city officials.

56:29

I I think the short answer Ted is that yet to be determined the final disposition of our building, our administrative building and the other properties, some of them will undoubtedly be sold and maybe that would include 199 W pine that is there a current administrative facilities.

56:49

I have no doubt that those monies would probably be plowed into the John Engen building project given the fact that we currently don't have enough available funding to completely build that out.

57:07

OK, well, thank you very much.

57:08

And I question Chris, anything you'd like to, to add to that?

57:12

Hang on just a second, Ted.

57:13

Sure, happy to commissioners.

57:15

So yes, I, I think that is one possibility.

57:16

But just as a reminder for folks, if if we were to dispose of those properties or when we dispose of those properties, it will be one time funding, right?

57:23

So will not it will not put us further ahead on infrastructure.

57:27

Even if we were to use all of that towards infrastructure, when we're looking at this large of a deficit, you know, in the in the multiple millions of dollars, it's a it's it's an ongoing issue, not just a one time cost issue that we have related to infrastructure.

57:42

OK, thank you, Chris.

57:43

OK, I was just looking, I was just looking towards the match section of like potentially the bit grand if we got that.

57:49

And then I just wanted to make a comment just, I know you guys posted three days about this meeting and I know it's hard for a lot of people to come during the week at 2:00 PM.

57:58

So I just wanted to reiterate that 24 of the 24 comments were against this mill levy as well and putting it on the ballot.

58:06

And it shouldn't be the fault of people for skipping work to make a meeting at 2:00 PM.

58:11

And my final comment will be the RAISE grant was supposed, it was named rebuilding American infrastructure with sustainability and equity.

58:19

The county areas of your county, the county only areas are not getting equitable treatment.

58:25

And I think that those \$24 million that went to the city of Missoula when they were approved should have probably been focused on your areas out here.

58:32

But I appreciate your time and thank you again.

58:37

OK, thanks.

58:38

Ted.

58:38

I'm, I'm assuming you're referring to the \$23 million Hwy.

58:42

200 corridor grant.

58:46

Is that correct?

58:47

That that was not part, that was not part of the RAYS grant.

58:50

I think that was separate.

58:51

I remember Tester announced that I think this fall, the city of Missoula, I think got the RAYS grant.

58:56

Am I, am I incorrect, Shane, or what?

58:58

What was that?

59:01

I'm, I guess we've got the Highway 200 grant, but that's not RAYS.

59:06

And then the city has the downtown project, which was 20 some million.

59:10

I, I, I don't know.

59:12

Yeah, I'm, I'm not aware of what you might be referencing, Ted.

59:16

And if it's a if it's a project that the city of Missoula submitted a grant on and got funded for, we wouldn't have any, any sway in that decision.

59:27

OK, Thank you very much.

59:28

OK, Thank.

59:30

Thank you, Ted.

59:31

Any additional comment from anyone in the room or online?

59:38

OK, we will close the public hearing and go to any questions or discussions on the part of the Commission.

59:46

Juanita, if since Slotnick is not here, what what would he say?

59:50

What would he ask?

59:52

What, what would he say \$3 a month, 3 bucks a month for roads and bridges?

59:58

That is probably what he would say.

1:00:01

I I I guess I would just.

1:00:06

Well, I, I will ask a question and I think I know the answer to it.

1:00:08

So Shane or Chris, given the given the huge backlog in maintenance that we have and the fact that even this one approximately 1.7 million per year is a significant shortfall of what we would like per year to maintain infrastructure.

1:00:29

Is it possible to use some some piece of this to pay debt service on?

1:00:37

For instance, if we wanted to bond a bunch of projects just to kind of clear the decks, that's not going to, to deal with our ongoing annual maintenance needs.

1:00:48

But but if we're wanting to take a more significant bite out of of our backlog initially, would would these levy dollars be able to use be used for debt service to some extent?

1:01:04

So great question, Commissioner.

1:01:05

And, and the short answer is yes, because these would be voted mills again, as long as the projects were related to the purpose of, of the mill, so related to roads, county wide bridges and trails that funding can be used to bond against, it can be used for debt service.

1:01:21

I, I think we would need to look at how we bundled those projects together because again, we, we don't want to use 100% of that towards a debt service scenario, which would then leave us falling further behind in those other areas.

1:01:31

So I think it would end up being some combination of that, but we absolutely could potentially look at how you would bundle those to, to make the biggest impact.

1:01:42

Thank you And to Mr.

1:01:47

Kopervika's comments.

1:01:49

Yeah, it's, it's not lost on us, Keith, the, the opportunities and we, we discussed this at length in the past, both the Commission and staff and then also with you in terms of ways in which we might realize savings and and get the, the best bang for our buck, so to speak.

1:02:09

I, I don't dispute that there are still opportunities to, to realize some of those additional cost savings, but I also think that, that we need to move forward with trying to find new revenue for these road bridge and trail projects.

1:02:29

And, and even as is with the, the levy that's before us, it's still far short of what I think we actually need.

1:02:40

And I'm thinking of Mike attorney's comments about wanting to see a trade off, you know, a, a reduction in something.

1:02:52

And I understand that initial feeling.

1:02:56

I, it, it seems to make sense.

1:02:57

But we're looking at something that is ongoing.

1:03:00

I think this is what you talked about.

1:03:01

Chain two is ongoing maintenance.

1:03:05

I mean, and when Ted is right, like Morgan up in up in the swan, like this is constantly what we hear about is it's Rosen bridges are the things that and potholes and dust are the things constituents complain about the most and have a right to.

1:03:21

I mean, we're not anywhere near able to do the maintenance that's that's needed.

1:03:29

I mean, we're we're spending what, a 6th?

1:03:31

I'm not doing the math right.

1:03:32

1/6 of what is required, it should be at 4.3.

1:03:38

And we're spending 600,000 on, on our capital needs.

1:03:44

And I just, I, I, I don't see any other way forward.

1:03:49

It's just going to get worse.

1:03:53

Yeah.

1:03:54

And I think as, as we might have heard, had Commissioner Slotnick been here to speak to his favorite topic, property taxes, we, we would have, we would have heard that because of some of the tax shifts that have gone on recently and the increase in property values, had Missoula County not raise taxes, property taxes 1 penny last year, last fiscal year, property owners would have still seen an increase in their property taxes because of the increasing burden that has been shifted to residential property away from other tax classifications in the state of Montana.

1:04:42

And that is just the reality.

1:04:44

And that is a sign of the inability of local government to unilaterally fix this without partnership with the state legislature.

1:04:56

Other questions?

1:04:58

And this is a we are not making this decision on behalf of Missoula County.

1:05:01

This is putting the item before the voters presumably on at the November election.

1:05:09

Commissioners.

1:05:10

Yes.

1:05:10

The request is is to place this on the November ballot.

1:05:13

That means that Missoula County would not begin collecting this money until the following fiscal year.

1:05:17

So this would not come online until the fiscal year 2026 budget just because of the way property tax rolls work.

1:05:24

But what it would allow us to do, Dave, is exactly what you were talking about.

1:05:27

Then work through the projects that we have.

1:05:29

We'll know whether or not we got the BIP grant.

1:05:31

So we'll know whether we need to use this as match and how do we repackage things potentially to be able to address those needs going forward through another mechanism be a bonding or or different using this as different match for different grant programs.

1:05:46

And so one other question this is this is a different mechanism that than what some might conclude and that this is not a a special Rd.

1:05:56
district.

1:05:56
This this is a straight up levy, correct?

1:06:00
This is a straight up levy.

1:06:01
So it's it is five mils.

1:06:02
So it will be fixed at those same 5 mils going forward.

1:06:05
They will float with the value of a mil.

1:06:07
But but it wouldn't be that the Commission, for example, could go back and change the number of mills and levy more or change the fee structure as you can through a special district.

1:06:16
This is this is a fixed levy.

1:06:18
And what can the Legislature do if even if a voters approve this levy?

1:06:24
That's a, that's a great question, Commissioner Vero.

1:06:26
So that is one of the reasons we looked at doing a levy.

1:06:30
Once the levy is in place, the legislature cannot modify it.

1:06:33
They can modify the process for levies going forward.

1:06:37
So in the next legislative session they could change the structure of levies but once it is approved by the

voters in this case it would be in place unlike the something that it was in code which was the two cent gas tax for example, which they were able to take away by eliminating that section of code.

1:06:52

My understanding is once this is in place it will remain in place because the IT was voter approved as a levy.

1:06:59

Thanks for explaining that.

1:07:01

So one final question, why 1.7 million rather than 3.8, Right.

1:07:08

Yeah, pull, pull the number out of thin air.

1:07:10

Yeah, that's a, that's a another good question.

1:07:12

Commissioner Strommeyer.

1:07:13

I really, it was working hard with Shane, but with bond counsel with our finance department to try and come up with something that would meet not only the, the minimal need of the department, but also would allow us to really stay in a range that we felt would potentially be approved by voters.

1:07:32

And we felt like \$3 a month or roughly \$36 a year was a, a reasonable amount to ask for because of the fact that it could be used for things like match and would give us that ability to go after and continue to be competitive on the federal and state level for grants in that.

1:07:50

And so that's, that's how we arrived at the, at the amount of five mils, which works out to a little less than \$3 a month for the average home.

1:07:59

Thank you.

1:08:00

And I, I mean, I think it's worthy to put on the amount of budget folks.

1:08:05

Oh, sorry, who is out there?

1:08:09

I just do one, one more Ted Morgan still.

1:08:12

Oh, OK.

1:08:12

And I just have one more question.

1:08:14

Apologize.

1:08:16

Yeah, go go ahead, Ted.

1:08:17

So.

1:08:18

So yes, pretty much.

1:08:19

My last question is like, instead of taxing, you know, people in Montana, I saw Josh Slotnick post something on his social media that I really resonated with.

1:08:28

Sometimes we bash heads, but I did resonate there.

1:08:31

We had what, 2.6 million visitors in Missoula County last year I believe it was.

1:08:37

And I know that we can't tax them specifically and ask for their ID, but why not a marketing program starting at the airport and going towards tourist leaning businesses where you ask them to donate?

1:08:48

I'm a bartender on Tuesday nights at Liquid Louie's and I've talked to this about with Taurus and the tourists themselves say we would love to help upkeep your roads and bridges.

1:08:57

Let's find a way to make them pay without making our taxpayers do it.

1:09:02

Thank you, Ted.

1:09:03

Not a bad idea.

1:09:07

Yeah.

1:09:08

In addition to that, I think it's also by putting this before voters.

1:09:13

And we, we really do know we have.

1:09:17

And if they say no, then then, yeah.

1:09:21

Shane, you don't have to struggle so hard to address these concerns.

1:09:31

All right, So.

1:09:31

OK, so I'll, I'll.

1:09:33

Elena.

1:09:36

Thank you.

1:09:37

Elena Gagliano, I do have property in Missoula.

1:09:41

Just for general information, what's the deadline to get this on the ballot?

1:09:46

The deadline date.

1:09:48

Thank you, Elena, and welcome from Granite County.

1:09:54

Go ahead, Chris.

1:09:57

Yeah, so we, we worked.

1:10:01

So we, we did work with bond counsel and the elections office.

1:10:05

This is your last public meeting before this.

1:10:07

We've internally been working on this for some time and, and working with the Commission to try and gauge needs.

1:10:13

And then we're bringing this forward today.

1:10:16

The deadline is next week.

1:10:17

I'm sorry, I don't remember the exact date next week.

1:10:20

OK.

1:10:20

So this is the last opportunity for action on the part of the Port of County Commissioners before the deadline to get it on the November ballot.

1:10:31

Did she have another question, Elena?

1:10:34

Elena, you still have your hand up.

1:10:35

Did did you have more you wanted to say?

1:10:40

Yes.

1:10:40

I just want to say one thing.

1:10:42

Thank you, Dave.

1:10:44

I enjoy attending your meetings.

1:10:46

They're very informative and they're handled in a very formal and professional way.

1:10:53

Thank you.

1:10:55

Thank you.

1:10:59

OK, with that motion, yes, I move to approve the resolution calling for submitting to the electors of Missoula County the question of whether the Board of County Commissioners should be authorized to levy up to five mills for the purpose of funding the construction, repair and maintenance of county roads, bridges and trails.

1:11:17

I will second that further discussion by the Commission.

1:11:21

Seeing none, let's go ahead and vote.

1:11:22

All in favor, aye.

1:11:24

OK, that will be going before the voters in November.

1:11:28

Thank you, Chris and Shane.

1:11:31

Our six, if you can believe it, 6th and final public hearing today is the proposed Grass Valley Garden subdivision.

1:11:38

And this is the one item where we're going to break with our typical order beginning with a staff report.

1:11:44

And we will begin with a report from the applicant's representative, I believe second here to get set up.

1:12:11

It's just getting good.

1:12:11

What are you doing?

1:12:12

It's OK.

1:12:15

Let them go now.

1:12:17

OK, OK.

1:12:18

You're going to have to really swallow that microphone until such a time as we have a technology levy to upgrade our system in the building.

1:12:25

So thank you, Commissioners.

1:12:29

Yes, this project is Grass Valley Gardens.

1:12:31

It's a major subdivision and a planned unit development.

1:12:39

So just very quickly to go over our agenda, Matt Millott is going to introduce the overall concept and the master plan for this development.

1:12:49

I will then transition up and go over the subdivision overview and a slight condition amendment request followed by Julie Merritt with WGM to discuss water rights, Bruce Anderson to discuss water quality and water quantity, and then follow up and end with Don Mlott of Ethos Engineering to discuss sewer.

1:13:09

With that, Matt, I will turn it over to you, Matt Mlott with Grass Valley Gardens.

1:13:17

They'll see the applicant and the commissioners.

1:13:19

Thank you for your time this afternoon.

1:13:21

Appreciate the opportunity to present our case here for Grass Valley Gardens subdivision.

1:13:26

My, my job here is to cover more of the, the what and then the why briefly before handing off on the how and the more technical matters.

1:13:35

So starting with the what behind this, we we've submitted here.

1:13:40

This project is just to the West of Desha Lane off Hwy.

1:13:43

10.

1:13:43

By the why we have submitted the first four phases of what we hope to be a 13 phase subdivision, but this is just the first four phases.

1:13:55

As you can see by looking at this, the intent here for Grass Valley Gardens is to be a complete Town Center that is built around a 45 acre permaculture farm that also has 6 plus miles of trails around it.

1:14:10

That, that is the, the, the goal here.

1:14:13

We have designed this community to provide a wide range of housing options from a studio apartment all the way to a four bedroom home for sale and for rent and then everything in between.

1:14:26

We, we've referred to it as a housing incubator where you could theoretically get out of high school, get your first apartment and live in the same community, moving houses up and down as you, you know, as you age and stay in the same community.

1:14:38

And so that's the intent behind that.

1:14:39

This is not some, you know, gated community that is keeping people out or only a certain types of houses.

1:14:48

So we've also, I think it's very important and, and it follows along with the topic we were just discussing.

1:14:52

Is it, it's been shown over and over again that mixed-use walkable community is with medium density produce sufficient tax revenue per per acre to cover its own infrastructure, plus the future replacement of the infrastructure that it has and even a surplus beyond that.

1:15:08

And, and it's been shown over and over and over again this development achieves that the walkable mixed-use communities and they like I said, generally they produce tax revenues that exceed the the cost to operate them over time and even to replace them.

1:15:23

And so they often produce surpluses.

1:15:27

I would say.

1:15:27

Lastly, we've intentionally designed this, this project here as a on the what side of it anyway.

1:15:32

Lastly, the we've designed it around food.

1:15:34

It's designed around the farmers that create the food.

1:15:38

And then when we get into the retail portions of it and that those sorts of things to put food at the forefront of it.

1:15:45

We think it's something that everybody holds in common.

1:15:46

Just about everybody likes food.

1:15:48

There's a unifying and, and you can gather around food.

1:15:51

And I, I think it's a great theme to develop a project around on the why behind this, like why are we doing this project is that fundamentally think that's the wide ownership of land and property and buildings and houses in the community creates a stronger community.

1:16:10

When I first got into development, my first project, we built a very small project.

1:16:15

We built some starter homes, but two of them in town and we were able to build them for this in 2018.

1:16:21

And we were able to build them for \$199,000, two bed, two baths.

1:16:25

We were to sell them at a profit and I was about 3 1/2 times median household income at that time.

1:16:32

Same house is now in the market for \$475,000, which is 7 times the median household income in Missoula County, which I think demonstrates pretty clearly that there's a broken housing system here.

1:16:44

There's been consistent demand for housing without enough supply being introduced.

1:16:49

Grass Valley Gardens is our, you know, our contribution to the effort to do something about housing availability, whether that's for sale or for rent.

1:16:57

And we think that the scale here and the way that is designed and the methodologies that we've employed will make a dent in the the housing situation in Missoula.

1:17:06

On the the why of this particular site here is I live about a mile and a half north of this property just off of O'Keefe Creek Blvd.

1:17:19

I moved there in 2018.

1:17:21

Something I observed very quickly is that if you need a bolt or a hammer or you need to get a loaf of bread or a gallon of milk, it's a 20 minute drive into Missoula.

1:17:31

And also notice there's, there's about 1700 people that live within a mile and a half radius of the Y interchange.

1:17:38

And so me doing, you know, going in to get a gallon of milk or my neighbor going in to get a hammer and you start to add up this trips and it back and forth into Missoula.

1:17:48

And that significantly adds to the vehicle miles travelled on our roads and streets.

1:17:53

And so it becomes very clear I'm, I'm in the commercial real estate business on my, you know, day job.

1:17:58

And it's become very clear that there's a gap in, in services in that area.

1:18:03

And if you want an area to not become sprawl, you need to have a Town Center where people can go for groceries, hardware, medical services, basic retail things.

1:18:13

In addition to that, there's a job center there.

1:18:15

There's also about 1700 jobs within a mile and a half radius of the Y that already exists.

1:18:21

There's already people being pulled there for for for the purposes of, of jobs.

1:18:25

And that continues to grow month by month or continue to be manufacturers that are looking to locate there.

1:18:32

And then I would say that the last why of why we are doing this project now and here is that we have paid attention to what the Commission and the Missoula County has put forward in terms of where it would like to see growth occur.

1:18:49

The estimates that I've heard are around 8000 housing units needed between now and 2040 to account for the growth that Missoula is anticipating.

1:18:57

This has to occur somewhere.

1:18:59

The county, I think has done a fantastic job of setting out its vision of where they would like to see growth happen and how they would like to see it happen.

1:19:06

That started with the 2019 land use element, which designated this particular area for Town Center development and plan neighborhood.

1:19:14

And then later it was, you know, the that was the vision and then the tools.

1:19:19

In 2020, when the Missoula County passed the, the revised its zoning, updated the zoning.

1:19:27

It then provided the tools and the zoning capability to allow the private sector to go solve problems, solve housing problems.

1:19:36

I think we have paid attention and heard loud and clear what the county has said that it wants through these documents.

1:19:42

We are now submitting a project, we think meets the both letter and spirit of the of the wall, if you will, on these documents in an effort to one, create a great place for people to live and two, to make an effort or to make a den into the the the housing affordability crisis that we have in Missoula.

1:20:00

So I'll leave it with that.

1:20:01

We'll get into the more the how and go from there.

1:20:04

Thank you.

1:20:05

Thank you.

1:20:06

Jamie, All right.

1:20:10

Thank you for that, Matt.

1:20:11

He did still a little bit of my Thunder, so you might hear a couple repeats.

1:20:15

But so Missoula County has been looking forward and setting the stage for future development at the Y since the Y Mullen plan in 2005.

1:20:24

In 2016, the county adopted the new growth policy where they identified the Y as an area for growth.

1:20:32

In 2019, as Matt mentioned, the land Use element future Land use map was adopted again focusing on the Y as an area for urban expansion.

1:20:42

In 2021-2022, the county revised their archaic 1970s zoning Thank you to be in line with that 2019 land use element and zone the subject property, neighborhood, residential.

1:20:55

Shortly after this, 2 tax Increment Financing districts were developed, one in 2020 and the other in 2023.

1:21:02

On the heels of establishing the second Tax Increment Financing District, the County contracted services for the development of the Y Infrastructure Plan.

1:21:10

This is a 50 year infrastructure plan which will create a vision for how Missoula County could address infrastructure deficiencies at the Y such as roads, sewer, water, broadband and others.

1:21:23

Missoula is a community of advocates and activists, all of who have strong opinions.

1:21:29

We understand it's not common for all to agree as we do work in the Y, but we must recognize that the Y is currently a job and economic center.

1:21:38

We have to work together to efficiently use the land and preserve other areas from development.

1:21:44

To do this, urban scale developments are required to generate a taxable value per acre that are sufficient to be self-sustaining for infrastructure construction and maintenance.

1:21:57

So as we look at the why, we see a number of properties on this screen that have already undergone subdivision.

1:22:02

However, not all of this land may be developed to its fullest potential due to the lack of the infrastructure in the area.

1:22:09

We do see six developments, five of which but six I've highlighted on the screen here, but five of which have already been entitled.

1:22:19

And then the Grass Valley or Grass Valley Garden site which is going through the entitlement and subdivision process.

1:22:25

Now these developments are denser in nature due to the sewer and water infrastructure proposed or that have been approved with these developments.

1:22:33

This does include Grass Valley Gardens where we will be instrumental in building the tax increment within the Ted that can be used then to for public infrastructure improvements.

1:22:48

So again, as we develop in the Y that the funding that is generated for the tax increment that can then be applied to that infrastructure.

1:22:59

In 2023 the Ted was formed to facilitate workforce housing.

1:23:05

This was also a change within state statute to facilitate workforce housing.

1:23:11

Grass Valley Gardens is one of a few mixed-use developments that will have self-sustaining infrastructure but that can later tie into a larger regional system, be it water, wastewater or Rd.

1:23:22

network.

1:23:23

The infrastructure plan will be a mechanism that can be utilized for the next 50 years in developing a regional infrastructure improvements.

1:23:31

The forward thinking on behalf of the county and in particular you, the commissioners, will drive the drive Missoula's future economic and community health.

1:23:41

Once the Y builds out, it's gone.

1:23:44

So we must work together to implement the community's vision as stated in the growth policy, the land use element, the Ted documents and the zoning regulations.

1:23:57

So now as we focus back in on the Grass Valley Gardens development, the growth policy designation for this property is planned neighborhood.

1:24:03

The goal of this designation is to accommodate a range of residential options that contribute to county wide housing diversity.

1:24:11

Residential density that should be 8 units per acre or greater and that that contains mixed building types and provides for a range of housing options.

1:24:22

Commercial buildings should be sited along the arterial or correct collector roads.

1:24:25

Roads providing a cluster of limited commercial activities with a compatible intensity level, scale and form to the adjacent neighborhood.

1:24:34

Grass Valley Gardens is planned to do just this.

1:24:37

A mix of commercial and residential development, all within a neighborhood scale.

1:24:43

The zoning designation for this property is right in line with the growth policy.

1:24:47

The designation is neighborhood residential.

1:24:49

The purpose of this zone is to provide a mix of homes and neighborhood scale professional and Commercial Services in urbanizing areas of the county where public water and sewer services are available.

1:25:06

The zoning serves as a transition between lower density residential neighborhoods, for example, to the West and more intensive commercial areas like in the industrial center to the east.

1:25:16

Mobility and access are characterized by a complete St.

1:25:19

network that includes protected or buffered bike lanes, sidewalks and enhancing crosswalks.

1:25:25

This district is defined by shorter block lengths and a traditional grid pattern Rd.

1:25:29

network.

1:25:30

A minimum density of eight dwelling units per acre is required.

1:25:34

And it's important, and this is important to note, we again recognize that not all of Missoula area residents may be ready for that density at the Y.

1:25:42

However, it is a minimum and we do have to connect to a public sewer or water system as defined by DEQ.

1:25:51

So what does 8 dwelling units per acre look like?

1:25:54

It's exactly as the purpose statement says, a mix of housing types including apartments and single family homes.

1:26:02

We are going to accomplish these goals through a planned unit development or PUD subdivision.

1:26:08

The Grass Valley Gardens PUD subdivision provides narrower streets with bulb outs for safety, increased non motorized transportation options, multi generational living and opportunity for agricultural development, farm to table options, commercial operations and the ability to live where you work.

1:26:27

The purpose of this PUD subdivision is to encourage creative subdivision designs that are superior to the designs typically produced under the county subdivision regulations.

1:26:38

Flexibility in certain standards is provided in sections of the subdivision regulations to promote mixed-use mixed land uses, cluster designs that better respond to natural site characteristics, reduced infrastructure costs, and to accommodate common areas.

1:27:01

So to accomplish this, we would be able to obtain a waiver from the lots and block requirements of the subdivision regulations.

1:27:09

Within the transportation standard section.

1:27:15

We do need to meet three of five criteria including preservation of natural characteristics of the land, efficient infrastructure, protection of cultural historic resources, dedication of common areas in excess of the Parkland requirements and then the actual development of those recreational areas.

1:27:37

So Grass Valley Gardens is going to be a stage subdivision with the first stage including four phases.

1:27:44

Those first four phases are in the northeast corner.

1:27:48

We are required to plat what we are calling Lot A, so the larger pink area to the West, southwest and we're required to plat that because it is an or it is, excuse me, less than 160 acres in size.

1:28:05

As you can see though, with the next stages of development, it will include multiple phases.

1:28:12

One item to note outside the agricultural development that Matt spoke about is the opportunity to dedicate land for a future school that right now is planned in phase seven, probably stage two of this development.

1:28:30

So as we look at this stage and 1st 4 phases phases of the development, here are some Rd.

1:28:38

network with varying widths from 36 feet as shown in the orange to 20 feet as shown in the blue.

1:28:47

The reduction in roadway widths in combination with bull belts at the end of the streets and roundabout at the entrance of the subdivision will reduce speeds on the internal subdivision roadways.

1:28:57

Parallel parking will still be allowed on most streets with the exception of those shown in purple and green.

1:29:04

We are providing for future connections to this stage of the OR this stage of the subdivision as shown to the West and to the South of the subdivision and then, although unlikely based on other land constraints, if the property to the north is further developed, conditional access easements are extending northward as well.

1:29:26

These conditional access easement connections begin to build the road grid and non motorized transportation system sought by the county plans.

1:29:39

A looped non motorized multimodal transportation system is planned with accessible routes.

1:29:45

The non motorized transportation system will connect the development to the future harvesting and crop areas, neighbors to neighbors, future commercial uses and the common areas and park features.

1:29:58

We have proposed roughly A1 acre native species growth and harvesting area that we were proposing that that the Salish and Cultural committee could potentially utilized as they wish for species growth and harvesting.

1:30:19

However, after further conversation with the tribe, we have learned that this is not a desire of theirs.

1:30:27

Although recognizing the importance of the tribe in in this area of the community as well as overall in Missoula, we are continuing conversations with the Tribe as future stages of this development come online.

1:30:47

Off Site Rd.

1:30:47

improvements are going to be limited to two deceleration lanes and a trail fronting on Hwy.

1:30:54

10.

1:30:55

The deceleration lanes will be completed in the first three phases of the subdivision as warranted.

1:31:02

So while the Traffic impact study has identified intersection impacts, these impacts are not solely based on this development and further conversations with MDT, the MPO, Missoula County, and the City of Missoula are happening as the Y Infrastructure Plan develops.

1:31:19

These intersection impacts are seen as regional issues that have either already existed or will be exasperated as the Y area continues to develop.

1:31:29

Therefore, a larger solution is being considered, which may include funding for improvements and this funding may come from the Y Ted or other transportation grants back to schools.

1:31:45

We've been in close contact with Les Meyer, the Superintendent of Frenchtown School District.

1:31:50

We do have his support for this development and he recognizes that not all four phases of the subdivision will be built at one time and that future stage of this development could include dedication or the plan is to include dedication of land to the district for another school.

1:32:12

There is one bus stop or there's a bus stop currently located at the intersection of Dayshaw Lane and Hwy.

1:32:18

10, but depending on demand from this subdivision, there may be an opportunity for a second bus stop or to relocate that existing bus stop closer to this subdivision.

1:32:33

After the Planning Board hearing, we did get a call from Joe Kalinan at Frenchtown Fire regarding the potential need for a new fire station or a new location for a fire station on the South side of the intersection or junction of I-90.

1:32:50

Excuse me?

1:32:52

We did meet with Joe and Adrian Beck early on in the process sharing the conceptual plan as well as the first stage of development.

1:32:59

At that time there were no concerns raised.

1:33:01

But post planning board, as I mentioned, we did hear concern from Joe that because this property is

within a tax increment financing district, they don't receive all of that funding that they may otherwise receive.

1:33:17

So we're, we are aware that all new developments will be required to pay impact fees and higher impact fees actually in this area because they're within the French Town Fire District.

1:33:30

So we did have a conversation with Joe Andrew Hagemeyer with Missoula County has also had a conversation with Joe to discuss further funding options for the fire district.

1:33:42

And Andrew does plan to continue those discussions and strategic planning with the fire district.

1:33:49

The big concern from the fire district, my understanding, is that they don't want to be left behind as the Y is developing and they want emergency services to be on the forefront of people's minds as the density increases out here there.

1:34:07

No, there are no egg water user facilities on site.

1:34:10

However, the soils are considered farmland of local importance as we understand it.

1:34:15

This land is not currently irrigated but does produce one cutting of hay a year.

1:34:20

The developers do intend to work with CFAC and have had multiple conversations already, as well as local farmers to regenerate the soils and develop the permaculture concept that you see on this screen.

1:34:34

Through this development, we will see protected farmland, food production space, Agri hood event space, farm stands and markets, edible landscapes, all connected to a larger community through an accessible trail system.

1:34:54

As I mentioned when I was outlining the agenda, we do have one small recommend or one small consideration to the conditions that we would like to see amended.

1:35:04

And this is in relationship to condition #15 and the requirement to include a geotechnical study as an attachment to the covenants.

1:35:16

And so with our subdivision application, we submitted a geotechnical analysis from All West.

1:35:24

And while we have no problem working with All W, sometimes as we need a geotechnical, they're not always available right when we are doing final design.

1:35:34

So would just request that similar geotechnical study could be allowed depending on where we're at in the stage of design and when the subdivision is working through the process.

1:35:49

So with that, I will turn it over to Julie to talk about water rights.

1:35:54

Thank you, Jamie.

1:35:55

Julie, I'm sorry, Julie, quick.

1:35:58

I just want to talk to Cheryl real quick, if you don't mind.

1:36:01

Hang on just a second.

1:36:01

Apparently folks from Frenchtown aren't able to get into the meeting.

1:36:09

Yeah, like, right.

1:36:14

And so like nine people said they're no one's that they, they're not being admitted, but they they must have power to be able to get online.

1:36:24

Well, if they're on their phone, I'm imagining or, Well, if they can't get admitted on their phone, that's a separate issue from the power outage.

1:36:36

OK.

1:36:41

Am I able to be heard right now?

1:36:43

Yes, we can hear whoever that is.

1:36:46

Yeah, sorry.

1:36:47

This is Josh Smith in Frenchtown.

1:36:49

I had that initial problem.

1:36:50

But I will say when I clicked on the link to go to this and then takes you to a document where or to a website where there there is a meeting they may not be realizing they're clicking on.

1:37:01

That's for a different date, second meeting down admitted me.

1:37:05

I have the same screen waiting to be admitted by someone, so they may be clicking on the wrong link.

1:37:12

OK, thanks for that background information.

1:37:15

We appreciate it.

1:37:19

OK, let's continue.

1:37:21

Thank you, commissioners.

1:37:23

Good afternoon.

1:37:24

My name is Julie Merritt with WGM Group and I want to just talk with you briefly about the water rights associated with the Grass Valley subdivision.

1:37:32

As this subdivision is going to be outside of the service area for Missoula Water and Sewer, we have to establish our own public water supply and that is what we're planning on doing.

1:37:46

That will require that we go through the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation water right permitting process, which is extensive.

1:37:56

I wanted to touch base just a little bit on what what all is entailed with that.

1:38:01

So to get a new water right permit, the applicant has to prove that they have that there's water physically and legally available.

1:38:09

And that means that there has to be adequate water at the location over and above the amount that is already needed for the existing water rights and that there's more water available than what those existing water rights are needing.

1:38:26

We also have to prove that we won't have an adverse impact on those existing water rights, both groundwater and surface water, since those two things are very closely connected.

1:38:39

And then the third criteria that we have to focus on is beneficial use.

1:38:44

And that means that the use itself is recognized as beneficial, which of course applies to residential and commercial uses.

1:38:52

But it also means that we have to demonstrate that the amount of water that we're asking for is what is needed to supply the use.

1:39:03

That ensures that the permit is issued for enough water to meet the applicants needs and that any that there is no excess water being reserved that can't be used.

1:39:16

So proving these criteria requires extensive aquifer testing to evaluate the yield and the influence of the new wells.

1:39:28

Next, I want to talk a little bit about the part of the water right process where mitigation is required and that is how we are planning to prevent adverse effect to any existing water rights is by providing mitigation.

1:39:49

So the Y area is located within the middle Clark Fork River basin, which is technically still open for new appropriations, unlike the Bitterroot River basin, which is and the Blackfoot River basin which are close to any new surface water appropriations.

1:40:07

That said, Avista Corporation owns large hydropower water rates at Knox and Dam.

1:40:14

And these water rights are for more water than the river flows most of the time.

1:40:20

And that is the main reason why mitigation for new water rights is required.

1:40:26

So several years ago, the Grass Valley French Ditch Company went through the DNR CS process to convert a portion of their water right from agricultural use to mitigation.

1:40:40

Through this process, they actually established the first private water bank in Montana.

1:40:47

Under the DNR CS authorization, they're allowed to sell or lease water to other users.

1:40:53

When someone buys water from the ditch company, that water is left in the river to offset any new impact a new water right would have on mainly on Avista's water rights.

1:41:08

So for mitigation to be effective the IT must meet the timing, location and amount of the impacts.

1:41:19

So typically mitigation for new year round uses with irrigation water rights means that the timing aspect cannot be met.

1:41:32

In this specific instance though, it does work because the the large hydropower water rights also have storage in Noxon Reservoir.

1:41:43

And so water that is released in the summertime in the river can be stored and the the Avista can generate power with that whenever they need it because they can store it.

1:42:00

I'm going ahead too fast.

1:42:02

Finally, I want to point out that the DNRC also does consider impacts to groundwater.

1:42:07

I know it's mainly focusing on surface water there.

1:42:10

And Bruce is going to, Bruce Anderson, my colleague is going to come up and explain a little bit more about the groundwater situation in this area and the work that the testing and the work that we've done so far.

1:42:23

Thanks.

1:42:24

Thank you, Julie.

1:42:26

Bruce, Hi, my name is Bruce Anderson.

1:42:33

I'm a Senior hydrologist at WGM and I support Julie doing the technical work for surfacing groundwater appropriations.

1:42:42

So she's giving you a pretty nice background on water rights.

1:42:46

And underlying all that is the technical work that we do to demonstrate the physical and legal availability of water, to evaluate adverse impacts potentially to pre-existing or senior water users and also to determine how much water we might need to use for mitigation.

1:43:02

So I'll go through a little bit of what we've done to date.

1:43:05

We drilled 4 wells out on the site.

1:43:08

Those are at depths between 244 and 418 feet.

1:43:15

These are test wells, but they're also sufficiently sized to be used for production wells and they're completed to public water supply standards.

1:43:23

The groundwater in the area is actually pretty well understood.

1:43:26

There was a study that Amec Geometrix did back in 2010, looks at the regional groundwater out there and there's a cross section in that study.

1:43:36

That's cross section A to a prime, which basically covers our site.

1:43:41

And if you look at that cross section, this is a conceptual image of what they concluded was the regional and local conditions there.

1:43:51

Our site would be located here, Grass Valley on the left side of that at point A in that cross section.

1:43:59

And it shows it's kind of a layer cake of gravels and then mixed with silts and clays.

1:44:05

And generally speaking, the productive aquifer is at depth north of 200 feet below the ground surface.

1:44:13

So when we drilled our four wells, we ended up with a variety of depths again between 244 and 418 feet.

1:44:22

The flow rates when we tested them range from 80 gallons a minute to 380 for the last well was most productive.

1:44:30

Actually that 80 gallon a minute well was limited by the size of the pump, not so much the yield of the well.

1:44:37

But what we saw, say, for example, at well for our most productive well is during pumping at 380 gallons a minute, we had about 100 feet of drawdown in the well.

1:44:47

So water table was 106 feet below water surface.

1:44:50

We do that down 100 feet during pumping.

1:44:52

And at our observation well #3 we saw about 6 feet of drawdown 200 feet away.

1:45:00

So that was a pretty high pumping rate at 380 gallons a minute.

1:45:03

And here's what those pumping tests look like without going down the rabbit hole.

1:45:07

When you turn the well on, the water draws down and hopefully it stabilizes and these tests at least for this level of appropriation need to be 72 hours long and you need to see the water level stabilize.

1:45:19

And in all cases in the wells we drilled, we did see that result indicating like no limitations for sustainability or boundary conditions that would limit the flow in the well.

1:45:31

So that was a good result and what we saw is that the wells recovers.

1:45:35

This is a graph that shows we turn the well on and off at the beginning of the test just to get calibrated for the long term pump test.

1:45:43

And as you turn the well on it draws down and then it recovers quickly.

1:45:46

So very responsive wells and very productive wells.

1:45:50

So again the the drawdown attenuates very quickly with distance from the pumping well.

1:45:56

At that well, four we tested, we saw like less than six feet of dry down at that pumping rate 200 feet away.

1:46:06

None of the wells that we monitored that were more distant showed any effect at all, including welding 1:00 and 2:00 and also the trap club to the north cross the road.

1:46:17

And we do need to supply, as Julie mentioned, a pretty comprehensive analysis here for our water rights application that includes looking at that physical and legal availability, potential adverse impacts to any senior users that have groundwater appropriations or surface water, and also the need to mitigate any influence we have on the surface water reporting to the Clark Fork and ultimately Avista's senior right.

1:46:42

We concluded, however, based on our tests that the likelihood of impacting any senior water users is very low.

1:46:49

So note that our peak water demand is only 83 gallons a minute and we were pumping at a well at 380 and that's just one of the wells.

1:46:56

So any of the four wells could supply our peak demand and as a constellation of four, we have more than enough legal and physical availability of water to meet our requirements.

1:47:07

As I mentioned, very little chance of adversely impacting any senior users.

1:47:11

That includes also O'Keefe Creek upstream, which some of you may know does have some limitations in that small valley for water users.

1:47:20

But not only are we fairly distant from there, but we're not hydrologically connected in a way that would have impacts the new appropriation of water.

1:47:29

Of course, we will need to mitigate potentially any, any amount of water that would be withdrawn from the Clark Fork as a result of our water use.

1:47:39

And we do have Grass Valley Water Bank available to do that.

1:47:43

So we've got plenty of water available.

1:47:45

We have strategies to mitigate any of the consumptive use that increase to the Clark Fork and we're in good shape in this area for water supply.

1:47:56

Thank you.

1:48:03

Good afternoon, Commissioners.

1:48:04

Don Malott with ETHO Civil.

1:48:06

We've given you a lot of information.

1:48:08

I will try to make this brief and wrap up with wastewater.

1:48:17

So you've heard about the water side of this.

1:48:20

Obviously, the opposite of that is the wastewater side.

1:48:24

For this project, we are looking at a gravity wastewater collection system that will operate through the subdivision.

1:48:36

The low point on the site is up on the northwest corner.

1:48:41

And so we are planning a gravity collection system that will flow towards that direction.

1:48:49

And at that location we will have a membrane bioreactor otherwise known as an MBR facility.

1:48:59

And then from there we will pump to a subsurface rapid infiltration area down South of this portion of of the subdivision.

1:49:10

So that's the the broader concept that we're looking at here.

1:49:17

Just a little bit of information.

1:49:18

I won't bore you with all these numbers, but we have looked at the number of lots, residential and commercial, the expected flows from all of those and our design has been based on that 115,000.

1:49:36

We've really rounded that up to 120,000.

1:49:39

So that is the design flow that we are operating off of.

1:49:42

We've done a lot of soil explorations out on this site of all sorts.

1:49:48

You've heard a little bit about geotechnical, about 20 of those.

1:49:53

There have been a number of test pits that have been done.

1:49:57

The wells that Bruce just mentioned, we're nearing 50 different explorations on the site.

1:50:03

So we know the soil well out there and that's particularly important as we talk about wastewater.

1:50:11

Since we are planning a rapid infiltration beds for the site, we've begun the initial process for discharge permit.

1:50:24

We've had numerous communications and meetings with Department of Environmental Quality DEQ to go through the permitting process for discharging via those rapid infiltration beds.

1:50:39

You can see here 3/4 of data that we've collected for the DEQ.

1:50:47

That's the data that's needed.

1:50:48

We will be submitting for this permit within weeks.

1:50:54

And then you can see we've done testing to verify that we have the appropriate soil conditions for disposal of the wastewater.

1:51:05

So this is basin flood testing and a pretty extensive testing that we've done little bit of the process here.

1:51:14

It won't go into great detail here, but this is a very detailed process that we go through to get this approved through the Department of Environmental Quality.

1:51:25

DNRC also weighs in on this.

1:51:28

So there's still work to be done, but so far we have, we've had very good feedback from ADEQ as we've moved forward.

1:51:38

A little bit of information about the membrane bioreactor, There's interest in these.

1:51:44

They are a package wastewater treatment plant.

1:51:47

They typically will come in on a skid prepared particularly for the site.

1:51:54

They're kind of a plug and play system.

1:51:56

They're modular, so they can be expanded over time, which is great for the type of site that we have here.

1:52:03

They're used throughout the state.

1:52:06

They're one of the newer technologies and by that I mean they've been around for several decades.

1:52:11

They're well tested and and they're they're efficient in terms of their space consumption.

1:52:18

So a lot of good things about the MBRS.

1:52:22

There's been some question about what would this look like, What would an MBR facility look like in our plan is to house that inside a building.

1:52:31

One of the questions that one of the neighbors had was will there be odors related to this MBR.

1:52:38

And the answer to that question is with it being inside a building that mitigates most of the concern about odors, there is the possibility to scale up odor control of various sorts filter media.

1:52:55

So as time goes on, we have lots of options that are availability to manage odor, but for the most part, everything will be inside a a building.

1:53:06

Here's just a picture of a of an MBR inside a building very similar to the one we're proposing.

1:53:13

You can see everything's housed right inside that building.

1:53:16

And actually in this particular case, the blue facility on the left is odor control.

1:53:25

We took a look at the wind map for this area can as it relates to the question of odor and you can see

from this generally the prevailing winds are from the West to the east and given the location of our MBR, these first four phases are immediately downwind of the MBR facility.

1:53:46

So we have a highly vested interest in making sure this works and that odors are taken care of.

1:53:53

And we we believe that we will have that well addressed.

1:54:00

And finally, I'll just say with the MBR facility, the effluent produced by these facilities is well known to be a very high quality affluent basically meeting drinking water standards.

1:54:14

There's additional things that can be done beyond the MBR, but in general, it's, it's the highest quality of treatment house in a very, very compact facility.

1:54:28

And with that, I will close this up for our portion of the presentation.

1:54:32

Thank you very much for your time.

1:54:35

Thank you very much, Don.

1:54:37

So we will transition to a staff report from Jenny Dixon.

1:55:04

Thank you for your patience.

1:55:05

For the record, my name is Jenny Dixon with the Office of Planning, Development and Sustainability.

1:55:11

And I'm going to hit on some highlights with minimal repetition of what has been said so far.

1:55:18

But I would like to clarify that this proposal is for 218 residential lots, seven and seven commercial lots and a large 121 acre lot for future development.

1:55:33

That was shown on the plan that would be the future phases.

1:55:37

So it's it encompasses a total of 187 acres along Highway 10.

1:55:46

You've seen this image before, which is the master plan that was prepared by Grass Valley Gardens LLC at the beginning stages of this proposal.

1:55:57

And it shows the a larger area, 227 acres, 40 acres of which are not currently under their ownership, but part of their larger plan for an Agri hood emphasizing physical connections, reduced car reliance and multi generational living.

1:56:17

The current proposal includes the 1st 4 phases developing from east to West to be completed by 2036.

1:56:26

Each phase will be self-sufficient with necessary access infrastructure and utilities.

1:56:33

The subdivision has been reviewed as a planned unit development subdivision meeting four of the five criteria to qualify by meeting Abd and E here.

1:56:44

Natural resource protection, integrating efficient infrastructure, exceeding Parkland requirements, and emphasizing recreational and open space development.

1:56:58

Since none of the reviewing agencies had any adverse comment on the proposed waivers that APUD Subdivision allows that was discussed earlier by Jamie from WGM Group staff is supporting the deviations to block length, Rd.

1:57:13

grade, curb, gutter and Blvd.

1:57:16

and non motorized facilities.

1:57:21

Except for approved access points to the subdivision from Hwy.

1:57:25

10 W, there is a one foot no access strip.

1:57:29

All roads except alleys are proposed to be publicly maintained.

1:57:35

Improvements such as new deceleration lanes and potential roundabouts are planned to mitigate impacts on nearby intersections, and a traffic study that was included in the application concludes that the improvements proposed will maintain acceptable levels of service for traffic operations or current levels, and a condition of approval requires the applicant to install improvements as required by MDT.

1:58:03

The MPO, however, did express concern about wider traffic impacts in the community given the timing of the development and the lack of infrastructure that they feel does not accommodate increased traffic coming into Missoula.

1:58:15

The Missoula urban area.

1:58:18

The sewer and water systems have already been discussed by WGM and Ethos, so I won't cover that any in any more detail.

1:58:27

The proposed subdivision includes sidewalks along all internal streets varying in width from 5:00 to 6:00 feet.

1:58:35

The site is not encumbered by any floodplain, riparian resource or high groundwater, and the topography necessitates with some slopes over 25% necessitates some specific grading, foundation and stormwater management strategies as outlined in the geotechnical report that Jamie referenced from All West.

1:58:56

The plot also shows those areas over 25%, which will be subject to additional standards and review at the time of building permit.

1:59:06

Fire Protection includes hydrants and a storage tank along with Class A roofing as a condition of approval and a Fire Protection plan addressing wildland urban interface risks will be reviewed by County Fire Inspector prior to final plat approval.

1:59:19

I would like to note, just for the record, that fire finding effect #9 should state that the subdivision has a low hazard rating, not moderate.

1:59:31

The subdivision meets the Parkland common area requirements by designating areas across multiple phases for community use, including trails, orchards and Vista points.

1:59:42

The plat shows approximately 17 1/2 acres of common area and this well exceeds the required 7.91 acres.

1:59:52

Further, our Department of Parks, Trails and Open Lands is satisfied with the proposed open space and recreation areas proposed in the subdivision.

2:00:00

All areas designated as open space or common area within the subdivision will allow are excuse me, are proposed as common area.

2:00:10

The trail network, however, will allow public access around the perimeter and throughout the subdivision.

2:00:17

The property has been historically used for grazing and hanging and is not, but is not irrigated.

2:00:24

The staff findings indicate no impacts to agricultural agricultural users have been identified.

2:00:32

The property is within, excuse me, within range of various wildlife.

2:00:36

However, no critical plant species, critical wildlife habitat or linkage corridors have been identified on site.

2:00:49

I do want to address the issue raised relative to the comments from the tribe.

2:00:55

The Confederate Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes commented on the cultural significance of this land and this general area, noting that place themes connected to creation stories and sources of abundant Bitterroot, one of their most important food sources, have been play a significant role for them.

2:01:15

Upon request by the tribes, Subdivider conducted a ground survey of native plants, none of which remain at this location as the site has been farmed for decades.

2:01:28

As mitigation to concerns raised by the tribe, the subdivider initially proposed that one acre growth and harvesting area that, as WGM stated earlier, was declined by the CSKT, noting their interest instead in restoration of a portion of the property.

2:01:48

The site being as large as it, as it is 170 acres, excuse me, 187 acres, potentially up to 220 acres does leave the opportunity and future expansion of this development to better address the impacts identified by the tribes.

2:02:08

But I would like to offer revised conclusions of law for this section, which we also presented at Planning Board new language to indicate that the conditions of approval to some degree mitigate the impacts on natural environment, wildlife and wildlife habitat.

2:02:29

However, general impacts to cultural resources have been identified by CSKT, but specific impacts with mitigations remained undefined and therefore we cannot conclude that the proposal mitigates impacts to those resources or cultural landscapes.

2:02:47

I guess what I would say with that also is that it is not essential that every identified impact be mitigated, but we want to recognize that there has been work to ascertain the impacts and offers of mitigation which have not yet been resolved on this project.

2:03:11

The public comment we received on this project through Missoula County Voice indicates a pretty even split with eight commenters opposed or raising concerns and six commenters in favor of the proposed development.

2:03:26

For those in favor, reasons include the provision of affordable housing and reduced commute times and access to services, which in turn supports economic growth and employee retention and the local and the local economy.

2:03:42

The other reasons for support includes community focused amenities like gardens and recreational areas, and the promotion of quality of life, sustainable development and multi generational living, and the encouragement of a sense of community and diversity.

2:03:59

Opponent's concerns include doubts that this development will lower housing costs, dissatisfaction with a small size and aesthetics of the of affordable units, and the loss of agricultural land.

2:04:11

The high density housing is seen as incompatible with the rural character of West Valley.

2:04:16

Opponents also cite noise from the nearby railroad and airport, potential traffic congestion, infrastructure needs, and water resource challenges.

2:04:26

Additionally, there was expressed concern about school overcrowding and the belief that the system favors developers, leading to inevitable approval.

2:04:34

Despite public opposition, the staff is recommending approval and provided nearly 50 pages of staff report findings and conclusions to aid you in making a decision on this project.

2:04:52

The findings and conclusions identify some mitigations, excuse me, that would require conditions of approval and the those are, I believe they're about 1919 recommended conditions of approval.

2:05:15

I just want to call your attention to first, I want to call your attention to the one condition #15 that the applicant has has requested revision to which we are amenable to.

2:05:27

It's simply identifying a geotech study still needs to be provided.

2:05:32

It's just who does it is the issue.

2:05:34

The other conditions of approval are address pretty standard components of the plat including depicting areas of slope over 25%, installation of roadway and pedestrian facilities and grading, drainage and erosion, erosion control, addressing the water and wastewater issues that were discussed previously by Ethos and WGM, installation of bare resistant garbage containers a a system discuss.

2:06:08

I discussed this personally with Jamie Jonkel and with the location of some repairing area off site to the north and West, he did recommend this type of garbage treatment in phase four.

2:06:24

So the westernmost phase, the fire suppression plan and Class A roofing, the geotech study being part of

the covenants, a weed management plan and revegetation plan being part of the covenants and then standard language regarding phasing.

2:06:42

So none of these conditions are jump out at as needing special identification for you.

2:06:47

I just wanted to cover that see in a little more detail.

2:06:55

Finally, the Planning Board did conduct a public hearing on this on July 16 and recommended unanimously 7 to 0 to support this proposal as APUD subdivision with the conditions as recommended by staff.

2:07:11

And when you are ready, I have a recommended motion.

2:07:15

And you will note that it does say subject to conditions of approval in the staff report as amended, and that would refer to the change requested to condition #15 Thank you.

2:07:27

OK, thank you, Jenny.

2:07:30

So let's take some public comment.

2:07:32

Is there anyone here in the Sophie Moe's room who would like to comment on this proposed subdivision, PUD subdivision?

2:07:42

Can we?

2:07:43

First, I just want to clear up what's happening with the technology.

2:07:47

Can you, do you want to do we have all the Frenchtown people on the meeting that we're trying to join?

2:08:12

OK, so folks are squared away, at least at least those who are trying to.

2:08:19

We can't speak for everyone in West Valley area, but OK, thank you.

2:08:27

OK, we will get to folks online if they want to comment here in just a moment.

2:08:32

So first, anyone in the room, Sophie Maui's room here in the courthouse who would like to comment on this proposal?

2:08:40

OK, seeing none, we'll go online.

2:08:41

Is there anyone online or on the phone who would like to comment?

2:08:44

If you're online, please use the raise hand function and Teams and we'll call on you in the order in which you raise your hand or we will take phone callers too.

2:08:53

And let's begin with, well, I just lost it.

2:08:59

Can you, I, I cannot see from my screen the, the phone numbers.

2:09:07

Could you speak into the microphone please?

2:09:09

Cheryl, the phone number ending in 4080, is that Jerry?

2:09:15

Yes, it is fabulous.

2:09:19

Go ahead.

2:09:19

If you would like to introduce yourself, please and provide your comment.

2:09:24

Sure.

2:09:25

So Jerry Dallas, Froncetown Valley resident, 40 years.

2:09:30

I just, we had a power outage here, so we weren't able to hear the comments from WGM.

2:09:37

So I'll just jump in my comment.

2:09:41

I think timing is everything and I wanted to address why this proposal should not be passed at this time.

2:09:47

On August 24th, 2023, U Missoula Board Accounting Commissioners adopted a resolution of infrastructure deficiency designating the Y2 area as infrastructure deficient.

2:09:59

This subdivision is in the Ted two that you created.

2:10:02

You acknowledged by creating the Ted too, that there's a lack of transportation infrastructure, water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, stormwater damage, life safety, broadband, workforce housing, general improvement.

2:10:14

On July 18th, I watched the planning department's meeting and I was curious if if they took into consideration the inventory that's been passed into the Frenchtown Valley and the stress the subdivisions that have been passed are putting on the lack of infrastructure in the area and they didn't consider those facts.

2:10:30

With that, I'm asking you to consider the following before you approve this proposal.

2:10:35

At this time since 2021, you've approved subdivisions that that have created 249 lots.

2:10:42

Most of those are in process.

2:10:44

We know from the planning department's estimate that each home contributes to 4.2 trips per day.

2:10:49

That equates to 1045 additional vehicle travel in an area that you have deemed as infrastructure deficient.

2:10:57

Missoula County has entered into a separate contract with WGM Group for Y Infrastructure Planning to identify infrastructure needs and evaluate a total alternatives for the Y2 area as well as the existing Y Ted.

2:11:10

This information, a statement of infrastructure deficiency, is based in part on WG Ms.

2:11:15

preliminary findings.

2:11:16

Their final report will not be available until sometime in 2024.

2:11:21

And I can't find this report and it's curious to me that WGM is the planner for this proposal.

2:11:26

Additionally, you're asking voters to consider a mill levy to help fund roads that are already in existence that the county can't find a way to take care of fund.

2:11:35

By passing a subdivision of this size, you're adding to the inventory of roads that you don't have the means to take care of.

2:11:41

I would ask that you put this subdivision on hold until the area's infrastructure deficiencies be addressed and remedied.

2:11:49

Based on your own findings of fact, I don't know how in good conscience that you can approve this subdivision as it clears.

2:11:55

Clearly goes against your own resolution of infrastructure deficiency.

2:12:01

Thanks for allowing me to comment.

2:12:05

Thank you, Jerry.

2:12:06

Additional public comment.

2:12:09

Who's next?

2:12:09

Cheryl.

2:12:10

Elena.

2:12:11

Go ahead.

2:12:14

Elena.

2:12:15

Is this Elena Gagliano *6 to unmute yourself?

2:12:26

Is there an Elena who wants to comment?

2:12:30

Let's go to the next caller, Josh Smith.

2:12:36

Yeah, thanks for taking the time to have this meeting allow us to comment.

2:12:41

I'm Josh Smith on Montana Knife Company out in Frenchtown.

2:12:44

Been out there about 20 years.

2:12:49

We're in a position right now as a valley where the cost of rising with the rising home costs, we're in a position where we need to figure out how we're going to deal with that and build.

2:13:02

And with the geography of our valley between floodplain, mountains, lack of water, Interstate railroad leaves us very few places to build.

2:13:13

I don't see very many places in this valley better to build than that area of which is somewhat developed within that region.

2:13:22

Though, as Jerry stated, also underdeveloped from a utility standpoint, infrastructure standpoint.

2:13:30

But in being at some of the meetings this winter or spring, I also heard people complaining about how this is all going to get paid for, how we're going to pay for infrastructure.

2:13:41

So in one minute we're in community meetings where people are complaining about the cost of taxes to put in water infrastructure, sewer, some of those things.

2:13:50

But in the next minute we have people complaining about building homes that are actually going to provide the tax base to build those infrastructures.

2:13:59

There's a chicken or egg debate here that maybe no one's wrong and no one's right, it's just is what it is.

2:14:06

But we are gonna need places for people to live.

2:14:09

I currently have hired in the last four years, 63 employees in my company, 56 of which live in the fringe town Missoula area.

2:14:20

We are looking at expanding our facilities up to that Y area and possibly hiring up to another 100 or 200 people.

2:14:28

But I currently have right now about 8 open positions in my company, 5 or so of which are advertised on our website right now.

2:14:37

And our number one concern and our number one conversation with anyone that we look to hire to move in from out of state is the price of housing around here.

2:14:47

And if they are aware of it, it often causes us to not be able to hire quality applicants.

2:14:53

That being said, a lot of my employees are very young and they actually are currently still living with their parents trying to afford housing.

2:15:01

So unless we want to create a whitefish type housing situation here where only the rich out of Staters can afford to live here, we're going to have to provide some affordable homes.

2:15:13

Seems like these guys have addressed as best as they could as the developers, the infrastructure needs and and some of the issues that come along with with a subdivision.

2:15:26

I support this as a business owner.

2:15:27

We're going to I, I want to hire local people and then we're going to need a place for them to live.

2:15:33

So I hope you guys will vote to pass this.

2:15:39

Thank you Josh, appreciate that additional public comment online.

2:15:42

Cheryl, is there anyone else with their hand raised?

2:15:46

Elena, Elena, are you still wanting to comment on this?

2:15:49

Yes, thank you.

2:15:50

Can you hear me?

2:15:51

Yes, we can hear you now.

2:15:53

OK, Sorry.

2:15:54

I had a problem unmuting Laney Gagliano.

2:15:59

I think you should hold off on this.

2:16:02

You mentioned the CSKT and they're they are going through a current mitigation.

2:16:11

There's close to 1000 objectors, I'm one of them.

2:16:16

And it just may affect the water usage for an area that's big.

2:16:24

I believe this is in one of the basins that's being mitigated.

2:16:29

And that would be 76 F.

2:16:32

And so I think you should hold off 'cause you don't know the outcome of that.

2:16:38

And like I said, it's currently in the water court right now.

2:16:43

Thank you.

2:16:54

Sorry, everyone, we've got tech issues here.

2:16:58

So yeah, thank you, Elena, for that.

2:17:01

Any additional public comment?

2:17:06

Yes.

2:17:06

Come on up.

2:17:07

Jamie, is there anything you'd want to respond to?

2:17:11

OK, yeah, come on up.

2:17:15

If you want to respond to the previous comment or any anyone else, yes, Julie Merritt with WTM Group.

2:17:23

Just a quick clarification about that last public comment.

2:17:27

The basin where this is located is actually the 76 M basin, the Middle Clark Fork, the basin that she referenced, 76F is actually the Blackfoot Basin.

2:17:38

And so they're as far as the CSKT Water Compact and the objections to that this, the basin where the Y is located is not implicated in that in any way.

2:17:51

Thanks.

2:17:52

OK, thank you.

2:17:53

That's helpful.

2:17:55

Go ahead.

2:17:56

Matt Mollat with Grass Valley Gardens LLC, the applicant in response to the comment about the paying for the infrastructure.

2:18:03

The the key way that you can create funds or or provide the funds to introduce this infrastructure in a TIF district is to increase the increment of that TIF district.

2:18:16

And the, the, the subdivision at the scale that we were talking about will create significant amount of increment, which then allows for tools like RSI, DS or, you know, potentially TIF usage and things like that to pay for this large scale infrastructure.

2:18:34

So I think yeah, that that is, yeah, it's a chicken and egg thing.

2:18:37

But you got to have the the increment first, which the houses and the commercial property and industrial property generates in order to then pay for the infrastructure.

2:18:45

So thank you, Matt.

2:18:49

Any additional public comment from anyone who has not previously commented?

2:18:56

OK, we will close the public hearing and open it up for questions and discussion on the part of the Commission.

2:19:04

Commissioner Rivero question for Don's.

2:19:12

I think I, I miss what happens after the membrane or yeah, the, the next phase it's, it goes out to the western corner to the, the, the bioreactor.

2:19:26

And then what happens where it is, I think Jamie's trying to pull up a map here, but it will go down to that lower portion of the property on the northwest and then OK.

2:19:40

And then from the BMR there, then where does it go?

2:19:43

It will be pumped back up basically to the middle of the 187 acre parcel.

2:19:52

Generally the open space where the agriculture is is planned and we've tested those soils.

2:19:59

They're they're good soils for the rapid infiltration beds that are proposed.

2:20:05

And so the the effluent will infiltrate into the ground in that area.

2:20:11

So basically in the center of the 187 acre parcel.

2:20:15

Thank you.

2:20:15

Sure.

2:20:16

And before you leave, Don as far as the.

2:20:21

Membrane bioreactor and options in the future to perhaps scale up.

2:20:27

Just hypothetically, if an adjoining property wanted to build out in a way that that could benefit from tapping into this system is would that be an option to, to, for someone else to partner with you?

2:20:41

Obviously not at no cost, but to to scale up this system in a way that it would service more than the subdivision that we're looking at.

2:20:51

Yes, we have.

2:20:54

That has been one of the very important elements for us is just providing an adaptable system.

2:21:00

And so if there are other adjacent properties or even an entity that say a public entity that wanted to take a possession, ownership and maintenance of that, we would be open to all of those discussions.

2:21:20

We're not trying to just keep this only for this particular subdivision we have.

2:21:27

I think this is in the application.

2:21:29

We have approached the City of Missoula to see if we can pump our sewer to the sewer system that's there at Day Shaw and Hwy.

2:21:39

10, very close to the property.

2:21:42

Thus far, the city has indicated no, they don't provide sewer service to the West side of Day Shaw, but we're we're keeping that option open.

2:21:57

If that might change in the future, we'll certainly engage in that conversation.

2:22:02

However, we're prepared to see this all the way through for the full subdivision and incrementally build out the MBR system as needed.

2:22:13

OK, thank you.

2:22:15

And before you sit down, this might be a question for you or or Matt or someone else on your team just thinking about coordination with or consultation with the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes moving forward.

2:22:31

So clearly they, they were not wild about the, the one acre parcel option that that was floated with them.

2:22:42

I, I guess other thoughts of yours going forward, what, what consultation might look like if there's an opportunity to do some something broader that would be creative that would address some of their concerns.

2:22:58

Yeah, that is a great question.

2:22:59

And we, we are taking this topic very seriously.

2:23:02

We are, we have every desire to work in good faith with the tribes.

2:23:10

We have thought about the possibility of interpretive signage other other things that may be of interest to the tribe.

2:23:23

I think we would we would certainly want to engage in further conversations with them.

2:23:28

Jamie made an attempt here in in the last couple weeks and that just didn't work out.

2:23:34

But we are we are willing to continue this conversation.

2:23:39

And obviously we're we tried to get something that was, you know, sort of black and white for the purposes of the subdivision and and that just didn't quite meet what the tribe, I guess was looking for.

2:23:52

But we want to continue to operate in good faith on this.

2:23:56

Thanks.

2:23:56

So unsolicited suggestion for me would be if if you've not done this already, to physically go up to Saint Ignatius and and meet and maybe you've done this already, you've done it already.

2:24:09

OK, Yeah.

2:24:10

It, it, it always is best to meet in person face to face at their location of, of of of meeting.

2:24:20

And in the case at hand, I, I would have, I would have suggested, had you not apparently done it already to, to meet with the Salish Kalispell Culture Committee in Saint Ignatius and or tribal representatives in Pablo.

2:24:35

So we will continue that outreach.

2:24:37

OK, thank.

2:24:38

Thank you.

2:24:38

Thank you.

2:24:40

I had a question about the whether it was Josh Smith or Jerry Dulles made a comment about concerns around infrastructure at I-90.

2:24:50

Was that right?

2:24:51

Can you explain what, what what's going to happen there to address concerns about traffic and and also maybe speak to there are limitations in this process to doing or requiring off site mitigations?

2:25:08

Yes, thank you, Dave.

2:25:08

Jamie Erbacher, am I?

2:25:11

Go ahead, Josh.

2:25:11

Am I able to talk?

2:25:13

Oh, I'm sorry.

2:25:14

I'm in.

2:25:14

I'm in the go.

2:25:15

Go ahead, Josh.

2:25:18

OK, sorry, I, it's a little loud here.

2:25:19

I'm in the 4H barn at the fair with our kids of Steers.

2:25:25

Yeah, my, my concern wasn't so much about traffic at the at the Interstate.

2:25:30

I think it's just a general public concern about and frankly, our concern with the land that we have with our building is water.

2:25:38

You know, generally water and sewer, though there's sewer at our location.

2:25:41

There is no water, you know, so hopefully and it sounds like there is a plan involved or in in in the works to provide to provide water.

2:25:51

For example, we're trying to build a 50,000 square foot manufacturing facility of which I think the current rules right now with the water situation off of a well out there limits us to about 11,011 or 14.

2:26:04

I can't remember specifically, but you know, in order for that area of the Y to grow into a a very productive part of our community, we're going to need infrastructure such as sewer and water.

2:26:21

And I think it was a math that was talking earlier mentioned the, the, the drive from the Frenchtown area into Missoula to buy like what he referred to as a hammer or something like that.

2:26:35

You know that I, I would much prefer to see a planned a subdivision like this that does take into account a larger sewer and water system than to see us continue to allow onesie twosie houses here and there.

2:26:50

But no, no infrastructure systems, maybe including traffic and signals and all the stuff that would come with that.

2:26:58

You know, those onesie twosies are not going to solve the, the, the bigger infrastructure problems and also help provide the ability for people like us and and other people to build larger, whether it's manufacturing facilities, maybe it's grocery stores, hardware stores, whatever kind of amenities that a community would need.

2:27:24

And and potentially help keep even people from Frenchtown have to be forced to go drive down Reserve St.

2:27:31

to come into town for a simple item.

2:27:32

So that that's more of my infrastructure concern than the traffic.

2:27:38

But I do think over time, the county is going to need to think about, you know, signals in certain locations, such as even coming out of the airport, which is a different complaint of mine that has nothing to do with this trying to come out of the airport and turn left.

2:27:52

So anyway, that's all I've got.

2:27:54

OK, thank you.

2:27:56

And then some, some of those cases that will also include discussions with the Montana Department of Transportation, whose jurisdiction that would be out by the airport.

2:28:05

But thank you, Josh.

2:28:06

And I think I also misspoke, I said I-90, I think I probably meant US ten.

2:28:11

OK, sorry, but go ahead, Jamie.

2:28:12

Sure.

2:28:13

Thank you, Jamie Urbacher with WGM group for the record.

2:28:17

So yes, Dave, I think you were alluding to Nexus and proportionality as far as off site improvements and what could and should be required of this subdivision.

2:28:25

And so we have considered those.

2:28:29

We are making some improvements to the Highway 10 frontage.

2:28:32

Again that walkway is one of them.

2:28:35

Obviously intersection improvements for this subdivision, but otherwise off site traffic improvements.

2:28:41

I-90, the off ramp was one of the focuses within the traffic impact study, but also was day Shawn Highway 10 intersection.

2:28:53

Again, a lot of those impacts already exist and they will be exasperated over time.

2:28:59

And so that's why the why infrastructure plan is going to look at that larger regional solution and improvements through potential Ted funding, other transportation grant opportunities to address those concerns.

2:29:14

As far as water, Josh had mentioned water is his main concern.

2:29:19

Certainly if a regional system is able to come online, Grass Valley Gardens would tie into that system and contribute and be party to that as well.

2:29:32

And then last clarification, Dave, just regarding the Salish Kootenay Tribe, I did go up there and try to meet with them.

2:29:40

Unfortunately they did have a loss and so we were not able to meet, but I have extended that to Sadie to go up and meet with her again as soon as she is available.

2:29:52

Excellent, much appreciated.

2:29:54

Thank you.

2:29:56

Any other questions, Juanita, no or comments?

2:30:03

I would.

2:30:03

I would just like to add, I think that that they're being very generous in their characterization of their work with the tribes in the sense that when we received their the comment from the tribes requesting study, I believe that the applicant reached out to the tribes, invited them to participate in that study on the site, asked them for a, you know, whatever kind of feedback could be provided.

2:30:36

I, I realized and and I and suggested at that time and has have witnessed attempts to meet up at their location as well as on the site.

2:30:47

And so just want to give you some sense of assurance that I do believe the applicant certainly is working in good faith to try to address this issue.

2:30:56

Thank you, Jenny.

2:30:59

So I will be supportive of this today.

2:31:02

I recognize full well that this is going to be a change on the landscape at this location and it might be jolting to many in terms of the changes that they will see over time.

2:31:15

But these are exactly the sorts of changes that we envisioned that this Commission envisioned when we adopted the land use planning map for this area and adopted zoning.

2:31:25

So that ship really has sailed literally years ago in terms of the vision and plan for what will occur and what is desire to occur out here.

2:31:36

And the whole upshot of that planning effort was so that we did not have to repeat the same sort of just have have a piece meal sort of planning effort every time a subdivision came before us in an unzoned area.

2:31:52

So this is what I see today before us is what I think is a pretty thoughtful, innovative and creative approach to realizing the vision that was set out in zoning and our land use element work years ago.

2:32:08

Josh who called in is is completely accurate and that there is a bit of a chicken and the egg scenario here in that while we can require and and by law subdividers and applicants need to do work within the boundaries of their proposed subdivision.

2:32:29

There is there's this Nexus of proportionality in terms of what can be required off site for an applicant like this.

2:32:40

And that's where in this case we have this tool, namely a tax targeted economic development district, the the Y2 Ted that will start to generate tax increment over time that can be plowed back into those off site public infrastructure improvements.

2:32:59

But that's going to take some time.

2:33:02

We need the actual projects coming online that will be contributing increment into that.

2:33:07

And and so we do start at a an uncomfortable place and I recognize that full well that that there will be a period of time where we wish that we would have more off site infrastructure in this Y area than what we do.

2:33:23

Over time that will be ramped up and addressed.

2:33:26

But that is not where we are right at this moment in time.

2:33:30

But I do think that this proposal will add to housing stock.

2:33:34

It's doing so in a creative manner.

2:33:37

I absolutely appreciate the work that you've extended and tried to extend to the the tribal community to address concerns there.

2:33:48

And Commissioner Rivero, anything you'd like to add?

2:33:51

Just echoing all that.

2:33:53

And this is a way to to get at the infrastructure deficiencies that I feel like Jerry Dallas raised.

2:33:59

And this is the tool to address that.

2:34:01

So with that, I move that the Grass Valley Gardens PUD subdivision be approved based on the findings of fact and conclusions of the law in the staff report and subject to the recommended conditions of approval in the staff report as amended.

2:34:17

I second that.

2:34:18

Any further discussion seeing none all in favor.

2:34:22

Aye, thank you all.

2:34:25

Thank you.

2:34:30

Any other business that come before the Commission today?

2:34:33

OK, go to the fair.

2:34:35

It is free.

2:34:36

We will be adjourned.

2:34:37

Thank you everyone.