

CONSERVATION COMMITTEE REPORT

November 10, 2010

10:00–11:00 am

140 West Pine Street

Members Present: Marilyn Marler (chair), Pam Walzer, Bob Jaffe, Dick Haines, Renee Mitchell, Ed Childers, Jon Wilkins, Stacy Rye, Lyn Hellegaard, and Roy Houseman

Members Absent: Dave Strohmaier

Others Present: Jackie Corday, Genevieve Jessop Marsh

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

A. Approve minutes.

Minutes of November 3, 2010 were approved as submitted.

II. FINAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS

III. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS –

IV. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS –

Consider a new ordinance that will create a process and criteria for the naming of public parks, trails, open space, and recreation facilities. ([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Jackie Corday) (Referred to committee: 10/25/10) **(HELD IN COMMITTEE)**

Motion: The Committee recommends Council set a public hearing on December 6, 2010 on an ordinance amending Title 12 to establish Chapter 12.43 Missoula Municipal Code entitled "naming of Public Parks and Recreation Facilities" to provide a process and criteria for naming public parks, trails, open space and recreation facilities.

Jackie Corday reviewed the proposed ordinance with the committee. As parks and trails are added and as the community grows, requests for naming facilities for certain individuals are received. The City currently does not have a well developed written policy to guide in the process. The Parks Department was asked by the City Parks Board to research what other cities have adopted for park naming policies. Staff started this process last year and brought forth a draft document for the Park Board and Administration to review and revise. The Park Board recommended approval of the ordinance at their October meeting. Administration added a few changes including charging an application fee. The fee would be included in the annual fee schedule. After a name is proposed and approved by Park Board, Council would make the final decision at a public meeting by adoption of a resolution.

The ordinance would formalize the current process used by staff and Park Board and provides criteria for choosing a name. Jackie reviewed the criteria for the selection of names.

Discussion:

Several committee members were in favor of adding additional criteria to include names may be nominated Council and language to allow for naming for the outstanding contribution by a citizen while they are still alive.

The committee discussed the pros and cons of having an actual ordinance as opposed to either a policy adopted by the Parks Board or just a resolution. While the process and criteria are important there were several who stated an ordinance is restrictive and they were not convinced of the need for an ordinance.

Jackie – which process to use was discussed and creating an ordinance was chosen for ease in tracking and it is easy for citizens to find.

Jon – I would like to see guidelines drafted for a naming contest in order to move forward with a process for a contest to rename the Children's Fish Pond.

It was moved to set the public hearing for December 6.

Discussion continued as the call for Question by Stacy Rye failed.

Ed –I would like to hear public comment on the issue to get citizen input on this item.

Roy – I would agree that it would be good to have more discussion and thanked the Park Board for bringing the item to Council.

Public comment: - none

The motion to set public hearing was voted on with six voting in favor and four against. The motion passed and the item will be discussed in Committee Reports.

Marilyn – I would agree we should get comments from the public hearing and have the item sent back to committee.

2. Approve an agreement between the City and Garden City Harvest (GCH) to allow for community gardens on City owned properties that will be identified in the future.
([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Jackie Corday) (Referred to committee: 10/25/10) **(HELD IN COMMITTEE)**

This agreement is for the City and Garden City Harvest to work together in good faith to locate and evaluate potential city owned land for garden sites through the formation of a Garden Committee consisting of GCH, Parks, Public Works, OPG, Office of Neighborhoods staff and any other agency staff needed. This would be an ad-hoc committee that would only meet when a potential site needs evaluation. This agreement sets forth the process and does not preclude other uses for land.

It was noted that the agreement for community gardens was not correctly linked to the referral. The corrected version will be sent to the committee and City Clark for correction on the web page.

Discussion:

Marilyn – I would like to take a broader view for cooperative garden groups and make this an agreement that could be used by various community groups rather than specifically GCH.

Stacy – I don't want this agreement to go forward until there is further discussion on what property should be used for affordable housing. I would like to make a referral on having the Parks Department create some policies using the skills from the Parks staff.

Bob – I don't see any conflict with this and the affordable housing effort. Having a written procedure is good. I do not think a new committee is necessary – it could be handled by Park Board.

Jon – I would agree that a template is good and should be available for all those who are doing gardens as Marilyn suggested.

Lyn – I would like to see a real defined process for neighborhood outreach to ensure the neighborhoods have say on community gardens in their area.

Dick – I agree with Marilyn.

Renee – these are valid points and we need a list of lands that that would make good gardens. She wondered if the land would be divested from city ownership.

Ed – I appreciate the input and effort but I would not favor one group over the other.

Marilyn – so each time there is a request for a garden we would have to go through the agreement process, and I would like to start with a blank agreement.

Jason – I agree we should have a template for other users and organizations and not an exclusive agreement. However, GCH is a known successful organizer of community gardens and I commend them for moving this along.

Jackie – I will try and answer some of the questions and to start with, any lots that are buildable will be kept for that reason – we are no longer pursuing the Marshall & Ivy site for gardening based upon comments received at last week's A&F meeting where a clear preference for

affordable housing for that site was expressed. The City is not divesting any property, it will remain in city ownership. We need the neighborhood to want the gardens and their involvement is key to the success and they will be involved in the process. There will not be a new committee like OSAC – no staffing is needed, it will be on an ad-hoc basis. We are working with Garden City Harvest as they are well organized and successful and this agreement does not favor them nor is it exclusive, any group can come forward with a proposal.

Marilyn – I would agree that Garden City Harvest is the most successful group and also thank them for initiating this process.

Public –

Genevieve Jessop Marsh - with every garden there has to be a partnership and involvement by the neighborhood. It takes a year or two of planning to actually get a garden ready and each garden involves doing a survey making sure all voices heard. GCH has many partners and we assist those who want a garden. We have fifteen years experience and we have found in the past several years how many people depend upon the gardens for food.

The committee will continue to discuss this item.

V. NON-AGENDA ITEMS

VI. HELD AND ONGOING AGENDA ITEMS - PER COMMITTEE CHAIR – Marilyn Marler

ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.