

Working Together

*A best-practices approach
to improving the City of Missoula's
development review system*

Submitted to:

Mayor John Engen

Chief Administrative Officer Bruce Bender

City of Missoula, Montana

Submitted by

Dennis M. Taylor

*DMT Consulting
January 2011*

Introduction

I began serving as an elected official for the City of Missoula in 2002, first as a councilman and chair of the Plat, Annexation and Zoning Committee, and, since 2006, as mayor. A recurring theme during the course of nearly a decade in public office is simple: our reviews take too much time, we are inconsistent, we don't communicate well inside and outside of City Hall, we don't work at finding solutions or coming to resolution, we are regulators, not facilitators.

In some cases, those criticisms are exaggerated, but generally they are consistent, persistent and fair. They've been expressed by reasonable folks and confirmed now by three reports: the Mullen Report, the National Community Development Services Report and, now, the Taylor report.

Each of them says we could get better. I think we should try; it's as simple as that.

My hope is that this report is the trigger for the City of Missoula and our partners in Missoula County and the community to work together to execute some of the recommendations this report offers.

Here is what this report and our efforts in this endeavor are not about: This is not an indictment of individuals who've worked hard for the City and County over the years and, in some cases, decades. We've got great people with professional pride working in a system that needs some work. They need the tools and the structure to work together more effectively. This report is not another unfounded shot at the Office of Planning and Grants. Frankly, I believe the planning and grant functions are sound. (In fact, the grants program is a model for the state and region.) It's the delivery of reviews that are in question, and that delivery is the responsibility of departments on a couple of floors of City Hall and the Missoula County Courthouse. This is not about pointing fingers, but about isolating problems and working to solve them.

Dennis Taylor is the right person to provide this report and its recommendations. A very bright, reasonable and experienced public servant and administrator, Taylor has looked at these issues from both sides and finds the measured middle. His recommendations are based on practical, incremental change. His approach is fair, and his interests are honorable.

There's much to consider here, but I think it's important to note that many of the criticisms offered in this report reflect those in an earlier report. We acted only in part then. I hope we do more this time.

*John Engen
Mayor, City of Missoula
January 2011*

Background

Missoula Mayor John Engen initiated this study in July, 2010, to find ways to improve the Missoula development review process. Mayor Engen and Chief Administrative Officer Bruce Bender hired me, a former city manager with long experience in public administration in Montana, as a consultant to review the structure and organization of current City-County organizations that perform the City review and support private, residential and commercial development within the incorporated city limits of Missoula. The charge was to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the current organizational structure and recommend improvements. In addition, Mayor Engen asked me to identify the steps necessary to provide a “one-stop” customer service model for permitting and licensing services for the citizens of Missoula.

Methods for gathering information

During the five months from July to November, 2010, I interviewed citizens, policymakers and staff to find out their views and opinions on the positive and negative aspects of the planning and development review system and to solicit their ideas for improvements. This study focused on the processes falling under the general planning and development review umbrella with special interest in the planning, building code enforcement and City engineering functions.

More than 70 key internal and external stakeholders, local government leaders, practitioners and other interested people familiar with the Missoula planning and development processes were interviewed. People interviewed included architects, developers, planners, engineers, contractors, builders, lenders, planning board members, city council members, county commissioners, and staff from the Missoula Office of Planning and Grants (OPG), the County Public Works Department, the City Department of Public Works, City Engineering and Building Inspection.

The first task was to determine the strengths, weaknesses and perceived problems of Missoula’s planning and development review process. This task involved understanding how things currently work, both from a staff and from a user perspective. That information was described through interviews with key managers and staff in all involved City and County agencies. I also reviewed policies and procedures, the current 2005 Interlocal Agreement, current budgets and previous studies such as the Mullen report (2005), the Best Place Project report (2010) and the Competitive Realities report (2010).

The next task compared the Missoula planning and development review process, organization structure and current practices to the models used by five other Montana cities (the City of Billings, City of Bozeman, City of Great Falls, City of

Helena and City of Kalispell) and selected “best management practices” cities in the region (the City of Eugene, Oregon, and City of Ft. Collins, Colorado.) None has a city-county structure similar to Missoula’s. Planning and development directors, city managers, assistant city managers, chief building officials and various other staff in these cities were also interviewed during the five-month study process.

All together, I consulted more than 80 people to determine their views on ways to improve the Missoula development review process. Missoula stakeholders interviewed have good ideas of what a successful planning and development review system should produce. Everyone interviewed generously shared their time and openly shared their opinions about ways to improve the process. The passion and consistency in the criticism of current processes was palpable.

The underlying problems with the current practice and processes have been a long time in the making. While no single, simple or immediate solution exists for many of the perceived problems with the current planning and development review process, it appears that stakeholders are developing a growing consensus about what must be done.

All those interviewed generally agreed that the City of Missoula needs to develop a modern, effective and efficient planning and development review system. A new, improved system must be faster, better, concurrent, more predictable, customer-focused, and transparent, and it must maintain high-quality community standards and protect the public interest.

Missoula is at a crossroads. After more than two decades of high growth and little time for changing the way things are done, there is now a unique opportunity to implement strategic changes in the City’s planning and development review process. The recent change in leadership at the Office of Planning and Grants (OPG) was a catalyst for the Mayor’s review. Before beginning the recruitment process to find a replacement for the OPG director, Mayor Engen wanted to take a thoughtful, independent and critical look at organizational structures, policies and procedures.

The crippling effects of the economic downturn have also had a significant impact on recent growth, development and economic activity in Missoula and across the region. Since applications for subdivision review, permits and zoning are down, there is time to study, rethink, reorganize, and retool the planning and development review system to improve the way things are done to focus accountability, increase user satisfaction, increase efficiency, and enhance municipal outcomes.

This report to Mayor Engen and Chief Administrative Officer Bender seeks solutions to problems that have plagued the Missoula planning and development review process for decades. Many of the perceived problems are not new. Nor are they unique to the City of Missoula. Communities across the country are struggling to streamline, automate and improve their planning and development review processes for improved redevelopment and economic development.

The City of Missoula needs a clearly articulated municipal policy and approach to planning and development. The City's development process should be clear and reasonably predictable. Both the applicants and their representatives should know what to expect from the process. Conflicting policy direction and poor coordination among the major partners in the development review process—planning, building, and engineering—must be better coordinated and systematized.

The policy challenges confronting the City of Missoula require decisive action, sustained leadership, a clear vision of what an improved and responsive planning and development structure, process and practices should look like, and the political will to make that vision a reality.

Building on strengths

While the current structure is fragmented, it is held together by good people who are technically and professionally competent. The dedicated employees of the City Building, City Engineering and the City-County Office of Planning and Grants work hard to meet the needs of Missoula citizens. Many praised staff for their presentation skills and their professionalism while appearing before the planning board and the governing bodies. City and County agencies were complimented for their public involvement processes and their commitment to citizen engagement.

The recently completed revisions of important planning and development regulations are perceived by all stakeholders as significant. The new City zoning ordinance, Title 20, adopted in November 2009, and City subdivision regulations revisions that were adopted in June 2010 go a long way toward improving the City of Missoula's regulatory and review environment.

Summary of findings

The current planning and development review process is fragmented, sequential, slow, contentious and frequently unpredictable, characterized by disconnected silos of professional and technical review isolated from one another by different processes, timeframes and personalities.

Timeliness

By far, the biggest complaint from stakeholders involves the length of time required for approval of applications, projects and permits. The community generally perceives that the current planning and development review process simply takes too long. The time required to review and approve an application or project seems longer than most other Montana communities. Applicants complain that the lengthy process adds to the costs of projects for homeowners, businesses and developers.

The length of time it takes to process an application or project seems excessive, and therefore costly to many applicants and their representatives. Basic management information on processing times is generally unavailable and unreliable.

There is widespread consensus that the Missoula development review process is broken. All recognized the need to revamp the process that has evolved over the last three decades of high growth and change in Missoula. Stakeholders identified issues with the unpredictability and high levels of complexity in the current review process. Most external stakeholders believe that current development review processes are unpredictable, protracted and confusing for all involved. There is no single entity to walk an applicant through the cumbersome and confusing permitting, licensing, and regulatory procedures.

Inconsistent direction, uneven leadership, agency variation, lack of accountability and City and County differences contribute to the sense that the current planning and development review process is floundering, confused and lacks focus. Under these circumstances, accountability and credibility at all levels of the planning and development review process emerged as common concerns.

Communication

Communication is frequently cited as a major issue. Lines of communication among building, engineering, planning and other reviewing agencies seem nearly nonexistent. Poor communication, lack of overall direction and confusion about City and County priorities further erode the public's confidence in Missoula's planning and development process and undermine staff morale. Building, engineering and planning staff rarely interact, rarely go to the same meetings, do not have relationships and do not share mutual trust and respect.

Leadership

Missoula's planning and development system suffers from a lack of clear, unified leadership. Organizational units are isolated. Isolated silos of single functions and a corresponding tendency toward protection of turf prevent integration and cooperation. City and County officials have conflicting priorities and policies. There are divided political expectations. Many times, City and County lawyers offer conflicting opinions. Tension between the City and County unnecessarily undermines the process. Some staff members find it difficult to serve two masters.

Customer service

The development review and business licensing processes are not customer-focused. Applicants for business licenses have to carry their applications from agency to agency. Applicants complain of inconsistent and unresponsive service. Reviewing agencies and their staff are frequently characterized as being inefficient,

indifferent, and unresponsive to the needs of applicants. Many staff members do not know or care about the rest of the development review process. They understand their specific reviews but fail to understand how their reviews fit into the entire picture.

The development review process is not user-friendly. Applicants complain that the current system is overly bureaucratic and resistant to change. There were frequent complaints that staff members are regulators rather than facilitators. Too many staff members were frequently criticized for not being courteous, helpful or friendly. Current practices and organizational structures create an environment of distrust and mistrust.

Organizational cultures

Reviewing agencies are not in sync with each other. Better coordination is needed. Applicants often get contradictory comments from various reviewers. The lack of coordination among reviewing agencies, as well as among these agencies and project proponents, leads to an overall atmosphere of disrespect for all involved—business community, citizens and their municipality. A fragmented process encourages parties to blame each other when problems arise.

External stakeholders complain of what they perceive as an “us versus them” mentality when submitting applications for review. They feel staff comfort takes precedence over customer service, and procedures seem more important than solutions. It was difficult to separate myth and legend from reality, but these feelings run strong with applicants and their professional representatives.

Over time, perception has become reality for many stakeholders to the point that a culture of contempt has grown unabated. This situation has led to maximum mutual misunderstanding. Many believe that existing practices threaten opportunities for economic development.

In summary, the current process is time-consuming and poorly coordinated. Missoula’s current planning and development review process takes too long, uses too many resources and needs an overhaul.

Action must be taken now to reform the organization structure, implement process improvements and develop a “one-stop” permit information and developmental services center.

Recommendations for improving the organization, policies & processes

These recommendations are focused on enhancing accountability, simplifying processes, expanding services provided over the Internet and ensuring consistency and transparency in the process to provide a better level of service.

Structural & organizational change

Recommendation 1: Consolidate all existing municipal planning and development review functions and staff in a single City department with one department head responsible for managing the entire municipal planning and development review process.

The City of Missoula should designate a lead municipal organization to plan for, provide, and monitor a full continuum of planning and development services. The Mayor and the CAO should create a central coordinating agency that consolidates all planning and development-related municipal functions into a single department. The Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer are the only people in the City organization that have full scope of the community. Because responsibility for planning and development review is shared among many agencies (Planning, Building, Fire, Attorney, Public Works, Finance), strong municipal leadership is essential to transcend internal organizational boundaries.

(Option 1A): The City of Missoula should consider creating a robust municipal Planning and Development Department.

The City of Missoula should consider creating a robust, modern municipal Planning and Development Department that includes the planning, building inspection and enforcement, city engineering, economic development, community development and neighborhood services including Community Development Block (CDBG) and Home Investments Partnerships (HOME) programs, redevelopment (Missoula Redevelopment Agency), urban renewal, downtown development, housing, historic preservation and parking services (Missoula Parking Commission) in a single administrative agency.

These important functions, together with all current and long-range municipal planning, City engineering services, building inspection and permit review activities, are the core of most of the high-performing municipal planning and development organizations in the region. It is time for the City of Missoula to change and adopt this more integrated approach to planning, development and land use services.

Or, if a more gradual approach is preferred, at the very least the City should create a central coordinating agency for the key planning and development functions of Building, Engineering and Planning in a single municipal agency.

(Option 1B): The City of Missoula should create an integrated municipal Planning & Development Department.

The City of Missoula should create a modern municipal Planning and Development Department that includes the core planning, building inspection, and City engineering functions in a single administrative agency supervised by a single agency head.

Process improvement

Recommendation 2: The City of Missoula should compile a list of “best management practices” for streamlining the planning and development review process.

Several important improvements can be implemented to make the planning and development review process more predictable, consistent and efficient without endangering the standard of review. If these “best management practices” reforms are implemented, they reduce administrative costs, increase customer/user satisfaction, increase clarity and consistency and will allow the City to better manage controversy and conflict. Most of all, these reforms will position the City for economic development without lowering Missoula’s high-quality development standards.

Adopting these basic process improvements will encourage economic development that is appropriate and beneficial to the community. A streamlined permitting process is needed to help get the Missoula economy back on track. High performing cities adopt best management practices, benchmark against other similar high performing cities, relentlessly measure their performance and are committed to a continuous improvement process. High performance is positively associated with heightened customer satisfaction and improved outcomes.

Recommendation 3: The City of Missoula should move from the current sequential review process to a concurrent development review process.

Because reviewing agencies review applications sequentially, the process can be unnecessarily long and tedious. Leadership, improved processes and changes in technology will be required to move from the antiquated and cumbersome sequential review to a concurrent planning and development system. This system will require the cooperation of all reviewing agencies.

Recommendation 4: The City of Missoula should ensure that only one manager is responsible for the overall planning and development review system.

To increase accountability and improve citizen satisfaction, Missoula needs to create one central inter-agency authority to facilitate the planning and construction process from the earliest design stages to a building’s occupancy. The City must be proactive to develop uniform procedures to guide the work of review staff and use a project management approach to review of development proposals.

Recommendation 5: The City of Missoula should use a regularly scheduled multi-member interagency review committee.

The Mayor and CAO should ensure the creation of an interagency committee meeting at the concept review phase and design development phase of every major project. Some cities use the conceptual review check-in, sometimes called the development issues meeting, to improve communication with project developers, builders and the key staff members who will review their applications. It is important to establish a technical review team comprised of representatives from all the reviewing and permitting agencies who meet early in the review process. This multi-member team meeting should provide an initial “heads up” on issues, bring agreement on key issues, and then serve as the check-in and notice team for any changes as a project becomes more refined.

Regular team meetings should be mandatory to allow early technical review of complex and controversial applications. Missoula should use the multi-member team meetings for intake and element and sufficiency review and to conduct more rigorous pre-submittal meetings to screen out incomplete applications earlier in the development review process.

Having all people in the same room at the same time allows the different agencies to review the application concurrently, identifying and communicating issues early in the process to each other and to the applicant. Regular team meetings ensure early assessment of a proposed project and help coordinate responsibilities and project concerns among reviewing agencies.

Recommendation 6: The City of Missoula should use a project manager approach to coordinate permit and subdivision applications and projects.

A project manager approach helps redefine the role of staff in the development review process from regulators to facilitators. The City should assign a single staff person to serve as the project manager, the one point of contact and liaison to reviewing agencies to guide each project through the development review process from beginning to end. The City should establish this central contract person as the applicant liaison, case manager or ombudsman to serve as the primary conduit for the flow of information and the appropriate forms among the applicant and reviewing agencies. The project manager stays involved until the application is approved.

It is imperative that the City establish a project manager for large, complex, controversial projects. A project manager approach leads to improved application management and better communication with customers and helps to expedite the review process. The project manager serves as the applicant’s primary point of contact to answer any questions, resolve issues that affect an application’s flow, evaluate performance of reviewing agency staff and consultants and help keep the application on established time lines to ensure that the applicant gets a decision as

quickly as possible. The project manager should flag permit or application problems early to alert the applicant sooner.

Recommendation 7: The City of Missoula should upgrade the automated permit information system to enable all reviewing agencies, applicants and their representatives to track and manage work activities via the Internet.

The City should develop a single, comprehensive, automated permit information and tracking system. A new, computerized permit tracking system is needed so all reviewing agencies involved in processing, commenting on and approving planning and development review applications use the same system to track critical dates. The system should enable monitoring of service levels provided and also store all plan check comments, annotations, and comments digitally attached to the database record for the application.

Develop a request for proposals (RFP) to evaluate all automated permit information systems that are available. Purchase and implement a new, integrated permitting application software package that will allow electronic applications and plan submittal via the Internet. Implement on-line payment of permit fees. Provide sufficient training for all staff that will use the system.

In an effort to reduce costs and review time, the City should implement a web-based permit tracking system that allows commercial and residential applicants to submit their plans electronically for review. The system should also allow for tracking and status updates online.

Current information technology that allows for downloading forms, submitting applications, checking plans, issuing permits, scheduling inspections and tracking applications is currently available for purchase.

Tracking and status of permits, inspections and registration for contractors can be done via the City's website. Citizens should be able to login, schedule and research the status of inspections, determine whether a permit has been issued, and search for registered contractors. Access should be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week

Recommendation 8: The City of Missoula should work with staff, applicants and applicant representatives to agree on, set and monitor timelines.

The City should work with external and internal stakeholders to create a predictable and timely course of action for permit applications. Staff, applicants and their representatives should agree on timelines for review. Together they should develop uniform time frames for permit processing and decisions.

Once timelines are set, they must be rigorously measured and reported. Contract out development review when timelines can't be met. Some cities consider

contracting reviews to private consultants if necessary to reduce the time for review and to address peak load problems, to foster competition and to ensure timely reviews.

Recommendation 9: The City of Missoula should adopt expedited review alternatives.

Expediting the overall development review process is a common practice in many best practice cities. Divide permit applications into two or more categories based on complexity. Fast-tracking uncomplicated requests provides more time to staff and allows a greater level of scrutiny for more complex applications. Streamlined permitting solutions have been implemented successfully in other municipalities and are designed to save the City and applicants' time, money and frustration.

Cities offer expedited permit review as an incentive for developers to undertake projects that will benefit the community. For example, a project's impact on the local and regional economy may bring about a decision to consider the project worthy of an expedited review. Developers with proven track records for successful completion of projects and evidence of satisfying the City's performance criteria may also be worthy of expedited review.

Expedited review may provide new incentive for key policy outcomes—density, mixed use, downtown redevelopment, workforce housing, infill development or green buildings.

Recommendation 10: The City of Missoula should create easy public access to information, procedures and processes.

The City should provide current, accurate, well-organized information on the City's website. Prepare a guidebook and process flow chart for distribution to applicants. In addition, the City should post the flow chart of the planning and development review process on the website. Provide easier access to policies and procedure. Publish a clear and concise procedural manual. Compile a list of issues and concerns about the development review process. Provide zoning code interpretations to applicants at the permit counter and on the website. There should be readily available handouts and checklists for just about everything.

Recommendation 11: The City of Missoula should train planning and development review system staff to improve efficiency and increase customer-service quality.

The City should regularly train staff to improve efficiency and customer service quality. The City should develop a class to train all members of the planning and development review system in the basics of good customer service and ways to cultivate better relationships with key stakeholders and customers. Staff members

need training on problem-solving skills, communication, customer service and facilitation skills.

Recommendation 12: The City of Missoula should develop and implement customer feedback and evaluation systems.

The City should implement a customer satisfaction survey to be administered upon completion of the development review process to give applicants opportunities to voice their opinions and allow staff to get feedback that can be used to improve the permitting process. This information should be used to improve the process over time.

Recommendation 13: The City of Missoula should create business assistance teams to help applicants negotiate the City's planning and development review process.

In times of economic downturn, some cities have created a special business assistance team (BAT), a quick response team made up of members of Planning, Public Works, Fire, the Missoula Redevelopment Agency and the Missoula Area Economic Development Corporation, to meet with prospective applicants and their design and conceptual teams to cooperatively develop permits and plans. A BAT can enhance the City's outreach efforts to promote economic development in cooperation with the business community.

Recommendation 14: The City of Missoula should create an industry advisory council.

The City should consider creating an industry advisory council similar to the Development Process Advisory Review Board (DPARB) in Billings. This group composed of developers, lenders, architects, engineers and surveyors serves as a dispute resolution process for industry concerns and appeals.

Recommendation 15: The City of Missoula should consider conducting City-sponsored training for architects, developers, planners, engineers, contractors, builders and lenders on submittal requirements.

The City should create opportunities for regular communications with the development review stakeholders. Once uniform minimum acceptable standards for applications are developed, they should be regularly communicated to the development community.

Recommendation 16: The City of Missoula should develop and implement a communications plan to ensure timely, proactive relations with community stakeholders.

Poor communications can be overcome by having an articulated communications plan that is regularly and consistently implemented. The City needs to relentlessly create opportunities to communicate improvements and changes in the development review process.

Recommendation 17: The City of Missoula should conduct an annual survey of architects, engineers, builders, developers to identify satisfaction levels, problems and recommendations for solutions.

The City should be proactive in soliciting information from the user community. At least annually, ask bankers, title companies, real estate brokers, contractors, developers, land use attorneys and others to provide staff with better understanding of the needs of the private sector. City staff should work with the planning and development community to continue to streamline the approval process for development while maintaining the City's high quality development standards. The City should reach out to its core businesses and commercial entities to listen and understand exactly how the economy is impacting their ability to do business and what the City can do to make a difference.

One-stop shop

Recommendation 18: The City of Missoula should create a one-stop permit information and development services center.

There is an appetite and apparent need for a "one-stop" shop for planning and development services in Missoula. The City of Missoula should establish a "one-stop" permit information and development services center for all permit information and applications. The idea behind "one-stop" shops is improved customer service by co-locating of all planning and development review functions in a single, easily accessible location--the same physical location as the other core permitting and reviewing agencies.

A permit information and development service center is the first point of contact for citizens who are seeking planning-related assistance and information, would like to submit plans and applications or want to make contact with specific department staff.

A "one-stop" shop should be the customer service hub of the City's new Planning and Development Department. It manages all phases of the development review process, including the approval of subdivision plats and site plans and the issuance of building permits. "One-stop" shop staff members are responsible for building plan review, conducting building inspections and other engineering issues related to development.

Improved user satisfaction is possible when citizens can obtain more complete and comprehensive information quickly in one location. A new facility should include comfortable meeting rooms and small round tables for face-to-face meetings in a welcoming environment with a feel more like a small café than the traditional service counter. Easy access parking close to the development service center is a must.

A mandate for change and a call to action

Very little has changed with the planning and development process in Missoula since the Mullen report in 2005. External stakeholder satisfaction remains low. Internal stakeholders are ready to make significant changes to improve the City's development review process. The need for change is clear.

Some communities allow the future to happen to them. Successful communities decide the future is something they can create. Comprehensive, effective reform of the Missoula planning and development review system will involve more than the implementation of proposals for reorganization, process improvements and the creation of a "one-stop" developmental services center—although all three approaches will help.

The full involvement of the working staff in each of the reviewing agencies is crucial in reforming the process. Staff members do the work and know what has to get done. And they will be the ones who must carry out the new process improvements and deal with citizens face-to-face.

One thing is clear: If nothing is done, the frustration with the current system will continue to fester. There is a short window of opportunity, economically and politically, to make the recommended changes and improvements. The time for action is now.

Just because "best management practices" work, save money, increase clarity and meet user expectations, that does not necessarily mean they will be implemented and replicated. Strategies for change and improvement are not simply controlled by information or effectiveness. Implementation strategies are required to focus on dissatisfaction, awareness influence, and most important, action. In a financially constrained world, timely execution of an implementation plan is critical. Given the current economic climate, the City of Missoula cannot afford to wait. The community wants and is ready to support a planning and development system that is fast, efficient, affordable, effective, clear and predictable.

It is possible to deliver services seamlessly, without duplication and overlap and without bureaucratic boundaries that impede service delivery. Timely implementation of these process improvement recommendations will improve

citizen satisfaction with the planning and development process, lower the City's cost of regulating construction, increase private investment, raise new tax revenues and create jobs while still ensuring that building meets Missoula's high standard for development, and decisions are made in the spirit of service to citizens.

Resources

The Mullen Report: www.ci.missoula.mt.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=5435

The Garner Economics Report:
<ftp://ftp.ci.missoula.mt.us/Documents/Mayor/BestPlace/GarnerEconomicsRpt.pdf>

The NCDS Report: <ftp://ftp.ci.missoula.mt.us/Documents/Mayor/BestPlace/NCDSRpt.pdf>

Interviewees

In addition to the individuals named here, I had conversations with a small number of persons I deem credible who sought anonymity for honorable reasons.

John Engen	Mayor	City of Missoula
Bruce Bender	CAO	City of Missoula
James Grunke	Consultant	NCDS
Dale Bickell	CFO	Missoula County
Mike Barton	Interim Director	Office of Planning and Grants
Bob Jaffe	City Council	City of Missoula
Bob Brugh	Owner	RGM Development, Pearl Café
Alan McCormick	Attorney	Garlington, Lohn & Robinson
Mike Hickey	President	First Interstate Bank
Jim Decker	Architect	Decker & Sutherland
Steve King	Public Works Director	City of Missoula
Ellen Buchanan	MRA Director	City of Missoula
Don Verrue	Building Superintendent	City of Missoula
Mary McCrea	Senior Planner	Office of Planning and Grants
Bill Carey	Commissioner	Missoula County
Michele Landquist	Commissioner	Missoula County
Mike Kadas	Former Mayor	
Denise Alexander	Principal Planner	Office of Planning and Grants
Jean Curtiss	Commissioner	Missoula County
Pat Keiley	Planner III	Office of Planning and Grants
Ann Mary Dussault	Former County CAO	
Dave Loomis	Senior Planner	Office of Planning and Grants
Jamie Hoffman	Architect	James Hoffman & Associates
Vince Gavin	Architect	Gavin/Hanks Architectural Studio
Aaron Hanks	Architect	Gavin/Hanks Architectural Studio
David V. Gray	Project Architect	Paradigm V2 Architects P.C.
Carl Posewitz	President	Paradigm V2 Architects P.C.
Don Garramone	Owner	Garramone Builders

Wade Hoyt	President	Hoyt Homes
Ed Childers	City Council President	City of Missoula
Don MacArthur	Architect	MacArthur, Means and Wells
Dave Edgell	President	Edgell Homes
Ryan Mannix	Owner	Mannix Construction
Stacy Rye	City Council Vice President	City of Missoula
Nick Alonzo	Owner	Food N' Fun Inc.
Bob Powell	Owner	Food N' Fun Inc.
Dick Haines	City Council	City of Missoula
Hal Fraser	Banker	First Security Bank
Janet Donahue	Former City CAO	
Dale McCormick	Planner	PCI, Inc.
Ed Weatherbee	Partner	CVM Equity Funds
Marty Noyd	Principal Architect	OZ Architects
Dick Ainsworth	Retired Owner/Developer	PCI, Inc.
Gene Mostad	Owner	Mostad Construction
Janet Rhoades	Planner II	Office of Planning and Grants
Greg Robertson	Public Works Director	Missoula County
Collin Bangs	Real Estate Broker	Coldwell, Banker, Steinbrenner Inc.
Kevin Gordon	Owner	Gordon Construction
Roger Millar	Former OPG Director	
Ana Aronofsky	Planner II	Office of Planning and Grants
Mark Bellon	Vice President	Territorial Landworks Inc.
Jason Rice	Engineer	Territorial Landworks Inc.
Andrea Davis	Executive Director	homeWORD