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Throughout the history of land-use planning in the U.S., there have been numerous attempts to find a balance between performing the professional and technical requirements of the job while trying to meet the need to have citizens participate in planning decision making, and also to evaluate the job that is being done. Many theoretical approaches of the past have been too specialized, or overly geared toward scientific efficiency to fully involve the citizenry who can provide richer local detail to both physical and social needs. As changes in planning approaches have evolved, the notion to focus on the scale of neighborhoods, and to use communicative planning techniques, has allowed planners to consider the needs of smaller community groups in new ways.

One method for performing planning at the neighborhood scale is to organize voluntary neighborhood councils who can discuss their local needs and concerns, and report to city government. Neighborhood councils have recently been organized in many cities in the United States. In 1997, the city of Missoula, Montana, organized neighborhood councils. In 2005, Missoula’s Franklin to the Fort neighborhood council began to develop a neighborhood infrastructure plan. This process served as a case study for this research which seeks to determine whether this neighborhood council allowed for a truly participatory planning process to be realized.

The design, makeup, and operation of the neighborhood council, the impact of participants’ demographic characteristics on the plan, and the neighborhood’s satisfaction with the resulting infrastructure plan are assessed by the observation of 33 neighborhood meetings, 19 in-depth interviews conducted with active participants, and a random survey of 300 neighborhood residents. During the study period, participants expressed their appreciation for what they experienced and learned, and their desire to continue their involvement in neighborhood planning. They felt the process gave them a voice in policy matters, and they had first-hand experience collecting the necessary data required to make policy decisions. The results indicate that the design and operation of the Neighborhood Council contained many necessary elements to consider the outcome participatory, but the makeup of participants was not representative of the neighborhood. Because representation is a primary goal of participatory planning projects, concern remains about whether all issues in this case received the necessary time and attention to declare the process truly participatory. By improving the attendance at meetings to represent the broader diversity of the neighborhood however, neighborhood councils such as this one in Missoula, Montana, have the potential to generate truly representative participatory planning products. As neighborhood councils are established in other localities, much can be gained by studying what has been done by this neighborhood in Missoula.
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PARTICIPATORY PLANNING AND NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS:  
A NEIGHBORHOOD’S INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN IN MISSOULA, MONTANA

INTRODUCTION

Urban planning in the United States has continuously evolved and undergone numerous changes throughout its history. While some planning efforts began as early as William Penn’s 1682 plan for Philadelphia, PA, James Oglethorpe’s 1733 plan for Savannah, GA, and Pierre L’Enfant’s 1791 plan for Washington, D.C., major stimuli for planning didn’t come until the 1893 World Exposition in Chicago, which launched the City Beautiful era, which emphasized the visual appearance of cities. In addition to the appearance of the city, early planning often focused on health and safety issues, such as those concerned with fire hazards, air and water pollution, proximity of emergency care to residential areas, and routes of evacuation from areas of dense development. Further, measures taken to reduce harm to the public included the regulation of structures and land uses considered harassing or undesirable, the regulation of which, was often deemed legal through the use of police power. These powers were reinforced in the 1920s with zoning and planning enabling acts (Cullingworth and Caves 2003; Guttenburg 1987). Next, the City Efficient movement brought an interest in the relationship of land use and function, with concern for economic development and transportation. In the 1950s and 1960s, planning began to become more comprehensive in response to the 1954 Housing Act, and during this time, emphasized good design, developed more sophisticated land
classifications, verbal policy development (former plans were weak in verbal description, and were mostly based on maps), and paid greater attention to managing for growth (Kaiser and Godshalk 1995).

Each of the planning movements mentioned above center on planning for the physical environment and scientific efficiency, though social goods were implicitly addressed. Along with the civil rights movement beginning in the 1960s, which eventually led to greater public participation in local government policy including planning, a greater emphasis for the social aspects of planning and design began to become a concern for planners and theorists. It is not implied here that planning or design prior to this era lacked social structure, but that with the new attention to civil rights, planners began to be more aware how planning can play a role in social structure, and that there was a need to increase citizen involvement in the planning process.

Since the early twentieth century, urban planning theorists have recognized the neighborhood unit as a significant element in designing comprehensive plans, yet planning practice, even after the awakening to civil rights in the 1960s has seldom found satisfactory ways to involve the community in a way which fully communicates and implements the goals of neighborhood residents. Indeed, it is widely accepted that planning on the scale of neighborhoods, rather than at the scale of the city, allows for greater attention to both physical and social needs Fainstein (1987). However, periods of social change and neglect in the late 20th and even into the early 21st century have caused many participatory neighborhood planning efforts to prove situational and/or hypothetical
(Kaiser and Godschalk 1995). Much of this struggle has resulted from the transition from rational planning efforts to communicative planning efforts.

One model for citizen involvement in neighborhood planning is the neighborhood council. Neighborhood councils have become common in many cities across the U.S., including places such as Atlanta, GA, Pittsburgh, PA, Chicago, IL, Denver, CO, Omaha, NE, Phoenix, AZ, Fresno, CA, Portland, OR, and Spokane, WA, just to name a few. Such neighborhood councils have been established in a variety of ways, have embarked on a variety of different planning tasks, and have found varying amounts of success (Rohe and Gates 1985).

Since 1997, Missoula, MT, has utilized a neighborhood council model in an effort to solicit greater neighborhood involvement in local government. Recently, Missoula’s Franklin to the Fort (F2F) neighborhood has determined that it has a need for a neighborhood Infrastructure Plan. This plan will serve to identify areas where sidewalks, curbs, streetlamps, paving of streets, bike lanes, and other such features are inconsistent, and develop a plan which will recognize neighborhood residents’ present and future vision for these pieces of infrastructure. This neighborhood’s development of an infrastructure plan serves as a case study for this research which seeks to determine whether this neighborhood council allowed for a truly participatory planning process to be realized. The design, makeup, and operation of the neighborhood council, the impact of participants’ demographic characteristics on the planning process and plan, and the
neighborhood’s satisfaction with the resulting infrastructure plan are assessed by observations, interviews, and a survey.
Questions and Hypothesis

The goal of this study was to determine whether the neighborhood council design utilized by the F2F neighborhood allows for a participatory planning process as it prepares its infrastructure plan. This was assessed by seeking answers to the following study questions:

1. Has the neighborhood council design, makeup and operation allowed for truly participatory planning?
2. How does the demographic makeup of participants in the neighborhood council differ from the neighborhood as a whole?
3. What is the level of satisfaction held by neighborhood residents of the neighborhood council as a planning vehicle?

It was expected that while many citizens have greater access to, and are becoming more informed about planning issues than they may have been during former planning eras, volunteer neighborhood organizations are still led and conditioned by a handful of outspoken residents. It is hypothesized that these few who shape the neighborhood’s involvement in community planning are not representative of the general population of the neighborhood. In addition to answering the research questions presented above, this research describes the measures that F2F has taken to include participation of neighborhood residents in the development of their infrastructure plan and will discuss the usefulness of the neighborhood council as a participatory planning model.

This research is being conducted not in conjunction with, but concurrently with a Missoula Local Government Study Commission, organized in 2004, that seeks to
characterize the state of affairs of local governing bodies including the neighborhood councils. This commission has been organized as permitted by the Montana Constitution, Article XI, section 9, which requires all local governments to conduct a vote at a minimum of once every ten years to determine whether a local government study should be conducted. When approved by voters, a local government study commission is organized to “study the existing form and powers of a local government and procedures for delivery of local government services and compare them with other forms available under the laws of the state” (Montana Code Annotated 7.3.172). It was by the recommendation of a 1994 local government study commission that the 1996 Missoula City Charter was written, which established neighborhood councils. Because the 2004 Study Commission’s evaluation of neighborhood councils is more broad that this research, and is not particularly concentrated on planning, the research presented here can be used to more meticulously detail the status of planning through one of the neighborhood councils in Missoula, with particular interest in their ability to perform participatory planning. By examining participatory planning efforts through the neighborhood council model, planners and neighborhood council participants can be informed about its usefulness. This study may be beneficial to other neighborhood councils in Missoula, as well as other communities who have an interest in understanding how neighborhood council design, makeup, operations, and participant demographics all play a role in the practice of participatory neighborhood planning.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Planning History and Public Participation

During the 18th to early 20th centuries many towns in the United States exercised participatory democracy through town-hall meetings, and decisions were often made as a body (though such meetings often excluded women, criminals, blacks, and others deemed not suitable). As towns grew larger and decision making became more complex, however, towns and cities began to adopt a more professionalized structure of government with Mayors and often City Managers. In 1926 and 1928, the Standard State Zoning Enabling Act and the Standard City Planning Enabling Act were passed by the U.S. Department of Commerce, providing a legal backdrop, model statutes, and facilitating sustained planning efforts at the state level. Some states built upon these acts, creating their own state and/or local enabling acts. By constructing enabling acts, government entities have shown their general support for planning, and are able to legally justify planning actions taken for the benefit and safety of the public (Cullingworth and Caves 2003).

As planning efforts began to turn toward professionalism in the early 20th century, they also began to require less intensive public involvement and limited public access to planning in some ways (Hester 1999). During years of war, growth, the Great Depression, and more war, Johnson and Ward (1972) suggest that citizens were too busy in their disparate situations to be concerned about participation in planning policy.

As World War Two ended however, the nation was vaulted into a boom of rapid building and change that brought a renewed interest in planning and development
(Chapin 1947). During this time, T.J. Kent, Jr., and F. Stuart Chapin, Jr., who were early planning practitioners and theorists, each developed planning frameworks for cities to follow. These frameworks aided some cities (i.e., Berkeley, CA) in developing long range comprehensive plans which were necessary in order to obtain urban renewal housing grants afforded by the 1954 federal Housing Act. Grants available through the Housing Act motivated many cities to prepare long range comprehensive plans (Kaiser and Godschalk 1995).

Despite this mid-20th century push to develop comprehensive plans, the pace at which such plans were desired by governing bodies, and the skill which was assumed necessary by the general public for developing those plans, led to no certain return to participatory planning. According to Beauregard (1989), this period caused diversification of planning into multiple specialty areas such as social planning, energy planning, transportation planning, environmental, health, housing, etc. Such specialization was a result of rationalist/modernist thinking about planning, and widened the already existing gap between planners and citizens within communities.

In the 1960s, civil rights movements began to bid for greater public involvement in political matters including planning. Many of today's public hearings and notice requirements for decisions regarding public matters were adopted during this era. The effect on the planning field was that the existing rational planning model began to require an additional step, giving the public an opportunity to comment on pending planning decisions, most generally in the final stages of the plan development process.
For many cities, the opportunity for public comment has been given through public hearings. According to Cole and Caputo (1984), the public hearing is the most commonly used method for citizen participation in the United States. The public hearing usually occurs as a public meeting in which the ordinance, regulation, or plan, etc., is presented by the administrative body (i.e., the Planning Council or Commission) before the City Council, Mayor, City Manager other decision making or legislative body for final review and/or adoption. After presenting the item, a discussion usually takes place among the deciding body, and then any attending public are invited to make comments. If the comments/concerns brought up are not addressed already, the deciding body may require further study or an amendment to be made.

Based on their longitudinal research of public hearings on General Revenue Sharing (part of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972), which surveyed every U.S. city having a population of over 50,000 between the years 1973 and 1982, Cole and Caputo (1984) note that when governing bodies first begin a public hearing process, the general level of public interest is greater than before the hearing process existed. However, they also discovered that public interest tapers off over time. The greatest concern expressed by these authors was that public hearings, as a mechanism for public participation, is a weak form of public involvement, and that it generally does not result in any significant or outstanding impact on public policy.

In addition to Cole and Caputo’s assessment on the strength of public hearings, Lee et al. (1984) addressed the decline-of-community sociological theory. This theory posits that residents relate to the community in a partial, calculated, and selective way,
based on their level of anxiety with household, neighborhood and community interests. If residents are comfortable in their household, and with neighborhood and community interests, they are unlikely to get involved in activist roles to change public policy because they lack motivation to do so. Such motivation typically comes from dissatisfaction with the current situation. In addition, citizens today often expect to, and frequently enjoy, amenities readily provided in urban areas such as police protection, sidewalks, streetlamps and so on, hence it is natural not have to participate because these things are part of most neighborhood’s status quo.

**Communicative and Participatory Planning**

As they are often conducted, public hearings appear to be a weak form of public participation, and citizens are rarely involved unless they are discontented or in some way directly affected by the decision at hand, Solitare (2005) says the following about involving the public in land-use decisions:

> In terms of benefits, participation could promote democracy, improve the quality of decisions, educate the public, legitimize decisions, promote community empowerment, break gridlock and minimize costs... If lay citizens participate in the process, they tend to accept the outcomes of the process as valid and fair, even if these are not to their own advantage. Furthermore, the local knowledge of lay-citizens, gained through public participation, can produce better decisions (p. 920).

As public participation programs have been further studied and constructed, planning theorists have been built upon Habermas’s 1981 Communicative Action Theory, which posits that practical social issues, including conflicts, can be solved by rational discourse among people (Mitrovic 1999). Planning practices based on Communicative Action Theory are frequently known as participatory planning, collaborative planning,
community-based planning, and their variants, and fall under the larger general scheme of “communicative planning.”

In its most orthodox practice, communicative planning should utilize the discussion of stakeholders to form a resounding assessment of the situation at hand, and will regard that collective assessment as the basis of truth in the matter. One common communicative planning method is collaborative planning. This is frequently implemented as stakeholders are brought together to form a discussion group to resolve a particular issue. In the case of collaborative planning, stakeholders frequently represent various public constituencies and their sub-committees (Solitare 2005). According to Fainstein (2000), the planner’s role in collaborative planning is to mediate among these stakeholders, and aid them in achieving agreement on action that expresses their mutual interests.

Participatory planning is another communicative method, and has a greater extent than the collaboration of a small group. Where collaborative planning typically seeks to represent the diversity of the affected group by a relatively small collection of “stakeholders,” participatory planning invites the entire affected body to become involved in the process, emphasizes that decisions must be representative of the affected body, and encourages participants to become involved in the development of the plan (Hutcheson 1984; Lange 2005; Solitare 2005). This involvement may include gathering data, conducting planning meetings, mapping, and even drafting part or all of the written documents. While these communicative methods are quite similar, and the technical skill
of the planner is required with each, the latter method provides a broader opportunity for public participation.

**Participatory Government and Planning in Missoula**

Missoula was incorporated as a city in 1883. The city government consisted of a Town Council (later changing its designation to City Council) with 12 volunteer Aldermen. While this form was established to carry out representative democracy, it would not likely be considered truly participatory by today’s standards. By 1942, with the approval of the City Council, citizens of Missoula had also drafted an article of organization for the Missoula Community Council which provided additional opportunities for public participation (Missoula Community Council 1942). This council was designed to coordinate the efforts of several citizen-based committees, some of which were organized at the time of that draft, while others had existed previously. These committees included the Calendar, Program, Resources, Projects, Public Relations, Education, and Legislative Committees.

In 1975, McGill prepared a Brief *Synopsis of Local Government in Missoula*, which also addressed public participation. McGill identifies several efforts that functioned in 1975 to include public participation in local government. These efforts included, among other things: nearly all meetings were publicized before-hand by newspaper; all meetings held by County Commissioners and City Council persons were open to the public; County Commissioners had designated office hours open to public consultation; some City Council members held town meetings with citizens within their council wards; the County Commissioners were informed by voluntary citizen ‘advisors’;
and the Planning Board had established a Citizens Coordinate Council, designed to
develop planning goals for Missoula (1975, 89). Although these efforts sound reasonable
for soliciting public input, responses to interviews conducted by McGill indicated that the
majority of citizens and government officials felt that participation was low. McGill
states that citizens appear only to become involved when an issue has a personal impact
on them (decline-of-community theory), and that citizens feel that officials are not
responsive to their wishes. McGill’s study concludes:

Public awareness in the local government review process is quite
low. Further, the people seem to be satisfied with the status quo.
We felt that this should be interpreted less as a sense of satisfaction
but rather indicative of a lack of dissatisfaction (1975, 90).

In Missoula today, a recent effort has been made to involve public participation in
planning. As noted above, the Montana Constitution requires all local governments to
conduct a vote at a minimum of once every ten years to determine whether a local
government study should be conducted. In 1994, Missoula voters chose to re-evaluate
their form of government and organized a Study Commission. The evaluation resulted in
the development of a City Charter which was approved by voters in June, 1996. Section
6 of that charter established neighborhood councils, participatory neighborhood bodies,
for the purpose of advising the City Council and the Mayor on issues in individual
neighborhoods as well as city-wide issues. The charter says the following about
neighborhood councils:

Neighborhood councils...shall provide a structure for increased
citizen participation in the governance of the City, and shall build
cooperation and improved communication between citizens and City
officials. Neighborhood council duties shall include, but shall not be
limited to, developing proposals for neighborhood plans and
advising the City on neighborhood projects as they occur. Neighborhood councils shall respond to neighborhood issues at the neighborhood level (Missoula City Charter 1996).

Though neighborhood councils have been in operation in Missoula for approximately nine years, F2F’s Infrastructure Plan is only the third planning project to occur. Previous planning projects initiated since the formation of neighborhood councils have included a comprehensive Joint Northside/Westside Neighborhood Plan for the Northside and Westside Neighborhood Councils, and an Infrastructure Plan for the Emma Dickinson Neighborhood Council.

In March of 2004, elected representatives from the F2F neighborhood, referred to as the “Leadership Team,” expressed their desire to the joint City/County planning office, the Office of Planning and Grants (OPG), to develop an Infrastructure Plan, and requested the aid of OPG in preparing the plan. Due to other pre-existing planning projects, the F2F infrastructure planning process did not get under way until March, 2005.
STUDY AREA

In the spring of 2005, the City of Missoula recognized 17 formal neighborhood councils, and expected to create additional councils in the future as additional properties become annexed into the city limits. The F2F neighborhood is bound on the north by 3rd Street, by Russell Street on the east, follows the Burlington Northern railroad tracks from their intersection on Russell, southwest to Brooks, continues southwest along Brooks Street to the intersection of Brooks and Old Highway 93, turns northeast on Old Highway 93 to Post Siding Road, continues northwest along Post Siding Road, then takes a clockwise course to include the property of Fort Missoula to South Avenue where the boundary continues east to Reserve Street. Reserve Street acts as the western edge of the neighborhood, though the few parcels on the west side of the street which have been annexed into the city are also included in the neighborhood. This western edge of the neighborhood is not permanently fixed, but continues to the west as properties become annexed into the city (see Figure 1). Because of some very distinguishable differences in density, income, age of structures, design, and overall character of the area west of Reserve Street from the majority of the neighborhood, key participants in the infrastructure planning process (with the agreement of OPG), chose to limit the plan to the neighborhood east of Reserve Street where the character of the neighborhood is more congruent. Throughout the remainder of this document, each reference to the infrastructure plan and the F2F neighborhood is limited to that part of the neighborhood identified by these participants east of Reserve Street.
According to year 2000 U.S. Census data, the population of the City of Missoula was 57,053. The Franklin to the Fort neighborhood contained roughly 7,100 people and approximately 3,150 dwelling units. These counts for dwelling units and population include 12% of the city or more within this single neighborhood. Approximately 46.5% were homeowners, which was less than the City’s 50.2% homeownership. Household income was also less in this neighborhood than other households in Missoula, at about 89% of the 1999 median household income for the city.
Like much of the city, the F2F neighborhood has experienced continued rapid growth over the past decade. Much of this neighborhood was originally developed between 1930 and 1960. Approximately 60 blocks in the northeast section of the neighborhood were annexed into the city in 1910. These include the blocks east of Johnson Street and north of Mount Avenue. A few lots were annexed in the mid 1960s, but most of the remaining portion of the neighborhood was not annexed until 1995. Because the neighborhood was outside of the city limits for so long, and homeowners were not required to adhere to city codes, many homes were built without curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. For those builders who chose to install such items, there were no guidelines regarding how they should be installed (such as the width of the sidewalk, and whether there should be a boulevard design element or not). During recent years since the annexation of the neighborhood, new development has been required to include the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, and there has been an increased need for fire hydrants and street lights.

The discussion of infrastructure issues in the neighborhood originated from concerns about growth and development in the neighborhood, lack of continuity of infrastructure, and safety and traffic issues. In recent years, F2F has seen substantial increases in apartments and townhomes, and the increase in density has brought an increased concern for safety and sense-of-community issues. Originally, neighborhood participants wanted to prepare a comprehensive plan for their neighborhood, but later determined that this smaller effort (the Infrastructure Plan) would be a good start, and would allow them to learn the process used for preparing a neighborhood plan.
METHODOLOGY

In the spring of 2005, as a tentative schedule was announced for the development of this neighborhood’s infrastructure plan, it was found that the schedule would allow the opportunity to study the process as a case study. The methods used in this study include participant observation, in-depth interviews, and a random survey. Analysis includes findings from observations, interview responses, and statistical analysis of survey data. Statistical analysis includes chi-square tests, t-tests, and nonparametric correlations tests to determine differences between active neighborhood participants and the general neighborhood with respect to planning priorities and demographic characteristics, and to determine any associations between demographics and meeting attendance. This mixed methods approach has been used to gather detailed data to answer the main study questions:

1. Has the neighborhood council design, makeup and operation allowed for truly participatory planning?

2. How does the demographic makeup of participants in the neighborhood council differ from the neighborhood as a whole?

3. What is the level of satisfaction held by neighborhood residents with the neighborhood planning process?

Qualitative data gathered through observation and interviews helped to answer questions 1 and 3 regarding design and operation of neighborhood councils, and satisfaction with neighborhood planning through these councils. The quantitative survey was used primarily to compare demographics of those people actively participating in
neighborhood council functions with those not involved (question 2), but also asks about residents’ familiarity with the purposes of neighborhood councils and their satisfaction with planning through the neighborhood council (questions 1 and 3).

The primary reason that more than one research method was used in this study was to allow for a triangulated approach that gives richer insight to each of the research questions. This is often referred to as methods triangulation, and allowed for the checking of data consistency by using different methods, and sought to find a degree of compatibility among varying methods (Lofland et al. 2006; Patton 2002; Tashakkori and Teddlie 1998). Just observing at meetings would not have allowed a full understanding of participants’ concerns about issues that were not brought up during the meetings (thus the need for interviews). Interviews alone could not describe residents’ planning priorities or satisfaction with neighborhood planning, especially the opinions of non-participating residents, unless sufficient time was taken to randomly sample and interview a very large number of people in the neighborhood (thus the need for the survey). The survey by itself would not have provided a good understanding of the design of the neighborhood council and the way that residents’ concerns were discussed and treated in meetings (establishing the need for observations). Finally, as is discussed in this chapter, each of the methods is used to answer two or more of the primary research questions, lending more rigor to the study.

This chapter discusses how each method has been employed. Sampling issues and data analysis are also discussed.
Instruments

Observations

There were three primary meeting types conducted by the F2F neighborhood. The first was the Neighborhood Council meeting, which was a public meeting open to all. Any residents of the neighborhood and one representative from each business within the neighborhood boundaries were permitted to vote on decisions made in Neighborhood Council meetings. There was no minimum nor recommended number of Neighborhood Council meetings per year required by the City Charter, though certain duties as outlined in the charter, and later by the administering Ordinance 3312, were recommended for completion on an annual basis. During the study period, F2F held three Neighborhood Council meetings in 2005, and had tentatively planned at least three meetings in 2006.

The second meeting type is the Leadership Team meeting, and this was also a public meeting open to all. A leadership team could consist of 5 to 7 persons (6 in this case) elected by the Neighborhood Council to convene and administer Neighborhood Council meetings, communicate with the city government as directed by the Neighborhood Council, promote participation in city governance, establish committees to carry out necessary functions, maintain necessary elections to fill roles, and build opportunities for neighborhood communication, neighborhood-initiated projects, and engage in problem-solving (Ordinance 3312 Section 5, 1.18.050 C-D). Though Leadership Team meetings were open to all, the only persons permitted to vote at such meetings, were the elected Leadership Team members. These meetings were held on a
monthly basis in the F2F neighborhood, and required a quorum of four or more Leadership Team members to make motions and cast votes.

The third type of meeting in F2F was a committee meeting of the Infrastructure Plan Steering Committee (IPSC), which was also open to the public. This committee was made up of any residents in the neighborhood who wished to attend and participate, as well as any attending single representative from any businesses, schools, churches, or other organizations within the neighborhood boundaries. Anyone present who met the requirements could vote on actions taken in the IPSC meetings. The IPSC was formed at the will of the Leadership Team following the March 9, 2005 kick-off meeting for the infrastructure plan. No election or appointment was necessary to participate as an IPSC member. These meetings were also held on a monthly basis.

Observations were made by attending each of the three meeting types mentioned above from April 2005 to April 2006. Field notes were taken, following the advice of Lofland et al. (2006), to log data promptly, record the particular words and actions of characters, distinguish character’s comments from each other, and include analytic ideas and hunches. In addition to field notes, meeting minutes taken by the meeting secretary were gathered and cross checked to be sure that all important details were considered for analysis (these minutes were readily available on the neighborhood’s website: http://www.missoula-neighborhoods.org/franklintothefort/files/). Meeting minutes from meetings prior to the study period, as well as interviews held with participants, were also useful in gaining an understanding of the history of the neighborhood’s infrastructure planning process. During the study period, meetings were held at the community room of
one apartment complex in the neighborhood and at two different neighborhood churches, depending on availability and the needs of the meeting. The meeting rooms at each of these locations were large enough to accommodate several dozen participants, though an average of only nine or ten people were in attendance at the Leadership Team and IPSC monthly meetings during the study.

While attending neighborhood meetings, attention was given to things such as: what was the procedure used to accomplish the development of the plan; who performed the tasks necessary to perform the work; what efforts were made to include residents in the planning process; were neighborhood concerns heard and incorporated into the plan; were there any issues raised that did not get reasonable attention; and what were the causes of conflict at meetings and how were they resolved?

The observation of these specific things allowed analysis of the meeting design and participation of residents (question 1), and informed the researcher for the development of interview and survey questions regarding demographics of participants and satisfaction with the process (questions 2 and 3). Attention to these items allowed for focused coding of field notes and meeting minutes. The coding was performed by highlighting the written notes with differing colors of highlighters for different categories of events/issues. Within each category were two to four narrower “codes” which were labeled with identifying phrases which described their content. This organization allowed for orderly analysis of the data (see Charmaz 1983; and Lofland and Lofland 1994).
**Interviews**

Each person holding or assuming a leadership role during the study period, as well as participants actively involved in the process and development of the infrastructure plan were interviewed. Interview participants were selected from attendance records kept by meeting secretaries; these meeting minutes were available through the F2F neighborhood website. Interviews began in the last week of October, 2005. Individuals who had been present at four or more of the 16 meetings which had taken place up to this point of the study period were selected for an interview. The result was that 17 out of 19 individuals who qualified were interviewed.

Of the 19 individuals who qualified for the interview process, 14 were residents of the neighborhood (hereafter referred to as Neighborhood Participants). The Neighborhood Participants included all 6 leadership team members, a City Council representative, and 7 additional neighborhood residents. Twelve of the Neighborhood Participants were interviewed. The two not interviewed declined to make time in their schedules for the interview. The remaining 5 individuals interviewed were staff (hereafter referred to as Staff Participants), including three from OPG, another City Council person, and the Neighborhood Liaison from the Missoula Office of Neighborhoods, which is found within the City Clerk’s Office.

The timing of interviews during the study period was chosen in order to allow participants to have had sufficient exposure to the process through meetings, while keeping in mind that the interviews needed to be completed before a vote was taken on the final plan, so that the outcome would not influence participant’s responses. Fifteen of
these were conducted in the months of October, November, and December 2005, and two in January, 2006. The location for each interview was chosen by the respondent in order to accommodate work, family and leisure activities. The importance of a quiet meeting place so that responses could be clearly understood was stressed when arranging interviews. This quiet setting was also needed for the purpose of tape-recording the interview. These interviews took place at participants’ work places, homes, and at a coffee shop adjacent to the neighborhood. The tape-recordings were then transcribed for use on a personal computer. Unlike the field notes from meetings that were coded by hand, the interviews were coded using QSR International’s software for that purpose, Nvivo. The concept was the same using software as it was for field notes; codes were applied to sections of text, and were later queried and compiled for further analysis (see Weitzman 2000).

Interview questions explored topics such as the purpose of neighborhood councils; the steps taken to create a neighborhood plan; how participants’ previous experience with planning influenced their decisions in meetings; the structure of leadership; their perceived key issues of the infrastructure plan; conflicts and resolution; and successes (see appendices J and K).

By seeking answers to these questions, further analysis of the design of the neighborhood council and the participation of residents has been made beyond that which was possible by just observing meetings (question 1). Also, as mentioned above, the selection of interview participants allowed for the identification of those Neighborhood Participants who were key players. These individuals comprise the participants spoken
of in question 2, which asks how the demographics of the participants differ from the neighborhood as a whole. Interviews also helped to reveal the level of satisfaction these Neighborhood Participants had with the neighborhood planning process (question 3).

With the consent of the individual respondents, the interviews were each tape-recorded and then transcribed for analysis. Further, the transcriptions were then coded into simple related nodes, identifying similarities among responses. This coding (or grouping), then allowed the data to be analyzed by theme, and provided much of the detail included in the results. Although some participants intimately involved in the planning process during the course of the study may be able to determine the identity of certain responses and/or certain characters discussed, care has been taken not to reveal the identity of the people involved in the study; their names, genders, and for the most part their roles have been excluded from the analysis. In addition, participants were identified by number in this text (i.e., Neighborhood Participant 1). When assigning such numbers, care was taken so that they were not assigned to the individual by the order in which they were interviewed, by alphabetical order, or by the contribution/position of the individual.

Survey

In January 2006, when the draft infrastructure plan was near completion, a survey was administered to a random sample of 300 neighborhood residents. The sample was randomly chosen by placing all of the property addresses in the F2F neighborhood into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, and using the software tools to generate a random number for each row holding an address. The spreadsheet was then sorted by these random
numbers, and by the nature of executing the sort function, Excel reassigned new random numbers to each row, ensuring randomness. The first 300 rows of data were selected for the sample. The property address data were freely available to any public internet user through the Missoula County GIS website, and the file used for this research had been updated on November 18, 2005 (ftp://www.co.missoula.mt.us/Surveyor/DataRequests/AllAddresses_Geocodes_TaxIDs.pdf).

The method used for distributing the survey is similar to Dillman’s (1999) Tailored Design Method which requires five contacts with survey respondents. The strength of this method lies in making several contacts to each recipient, which increases the response rate to the survey. This increased response provides a more representative sample of the population, allowing greater reliability in the data. The first and second contacts made included a pre-survey notice, followed by a first issue of the survey (see appendix L and M). Next, a card with a thank you and reminder notice was sent to encourage those who had not yet responded (see appendix N). Fourth was a second issuance of the survey to those who had not yet returned it. The fifth contact was an additional thank you/reminder card, and was mailed out just two days after the second issuance of the survey. It was hoped that this design with multiple contacts would produce a high response rate. The result is that over 40% of the sample responded to the survey (see results chapter).

In addition to the random sample selected, the 14 Neighborhood Participants were also given the survey. Responses from the Neighborhood Participant group were kept
separate from the other surveys, and for certain analyses, were used to compare the Neighborhood Participants to the neighborhood as a whole.

The survey was designed to be taken at the time and place convenient to the participant receiving it, which in most cases was likely in the convenience of their own home. The survey did not likely take more than fifteen minutes to fill out, and was accompanied by a postage paid return envelope for mailing.

The survey sought to determine what proportion of the neighborhood was aware/informed of the Neighborhood Council’s planning efforts; whether there were any particular social/economic demographics which correlate with meeting attendance; if the Neighborhood Participants were representative of the neighborhood with regard to socio-economic demographics, and with respect to expressed neighborhood planning priorities; and how well the Infrastructure Plan incorporated and met neighborhood planning priorities (see appendix M).

The survey allowed for the comparison of the demographics of Neighborhood Participants with those of the neighborhood as a whole (question 2) and allowed statistical associations between demographics and participation to be compared. In addition, the survey identified planning priorities and satisfaction with the neighborhood planning process, and allowed the comparison of these responses between the Neighborhood Participants and the general neighborhood population (research questions 2 and 3).
Sampling Issues

Observations

Observations were informative to the study for many reasons. It is possible, however, that participants acted differently during meetings because they were aware that a study was being conducted. To disguise the study though, would have been unethical. Instead of disguising the research, an initial introduction was made by the researcher at the first meeting attended which informed participants of the researcher’s status as a student and of his interest in how neighborhood plans are created. Permission was requested to attend their meetings over the next several months. The moderator of the meeting welcomed and thanked the researcher for having an interest in their neighborhood, and on later occasions as meetings included introductions, the researcher was again introduced. Despite possible effects of the researcher’s presence at these meetings, it was likely the best way to understand the function of the meetings, and to observe the acknowledgement given to residents’ concerns. During these meetings, as well as outside of them, researcher comments and personal opinions were withheld from neighborhood members with regard to their neighborhood planning process or the questions being studied.

Interviews

Because some respondents may have otherwise been hesitant to disclose information during interviews, the researcher sought to establish some rapport with each individual before asking questions, and expressed genuine personal and academic interest in the neighborhood planning process. Each respondent was given the postal box number
which had been established for inquiries about the study and for the collection of surveys. They were also welcomed to read the study findings when completed by accessing this thesis through the Mansfield Library on the University of Montana campus. Respondents were also informed that their responses would be kept confidential (using Internal Review Board protocols) and that any questions could be skipped if they were not comfortable responding. Because the respondents were each older than 18 years of age and they were each members of the Leadership Team and/or identified as Neighborhood Participants, they were assumed to be non-impaired. Each interview was conducted only after receiving vocal consent to participate by the interviewee.

Survey

The method used for distribution of the survey instrument was chosen in order to obtain the highest saturation possible. It was decided that it was better to send the survey to a manageable number of people that could be contacted multiple times (pre-survey notice, survey, reminder, second survey, second reminder), than to send it to a larger number of recipients without these follow-ups, which would likely have a lower response rate. Without such reminders, survey respondents would more likely be limited to the outspoken activist types that would already be represented in Neighborhood Council meetings. It is expected that the method used produced a more representative response because the reminders should have prompted those who would not typically respond to a single contact, and such opinions matter.

The survey was written so that residents with no awareness of or involvement with the infrastructure plan, as well as those thoroughly involved, could comfortably
answer each question. A brief explanation of the survey and the purpose of the research was included as part of a cover letter for the survey. This cover page informed recipients that their responses would be kept confidential and that any questions included in the survey could be skipped if they were not comfortable responding. Again, respondents were given contact information for the study, and would have access to the completed research.

One measure taken which improved data quality was to deliver the pre-survey notices by hand. By doing so, not only was postage spared, but more than 20 of the addresses were found to be vacant or incorrect. In such cases, the incorrect address was replaced with an additional address which had been randomly generated in case this should occur.

As far as saturation is concerned, the method described here is believed to be the best that could be done on the budget established for this project (all research was personally funded by the researcher). One other method considered to increase the survey response rate would have been to offer a monetary incentive to respondents. Funding was not found for this kind of incentive.
RESULTS

The results of the study are found this chapter. Items noted from observations, responses to interview questions, and tables and charts illustrating survey data are presented. The results are presented as answers to the three study questions in order to maintain structure.

**Question 1: Has the neighborhood council design, makeup and operation allowed for truly participatory planning?**

As noted above in the literature review, participatory planning includes the opportunity for affected individuals to not only provide verbal or written input for a plan, but the manifestation of efforts such as gathering data, conducting planning meetings, mapping and even drafting part or all of the written documents. If the question simply asked whether participatory planning opportunities were provided, the answer is a definite yes; evidence shows that the neighborhood did participate in the preparation of its infrastructure plan (to be discussed below). In order to more fully understand the state of participatory planning for this study area however, the following discussion examines the design, makeup, and operation of the neighborhood council.

*Design*

Ordinance 3312 is an administrative ordinance which amends Section 6, Chapter 1.18 of the Missoula City Charter, and is entitled Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum. According to the ordinance, neighborhood councils have been designed to accomplish the following:
• Strengthen neighborhood participation in City governance where such participation exists, and to encourage and support neighborhood participation in City governance where it does not yet exist (1.18.010a).

• Provide a structure for increased citizen participation in the governance of the City, and to build cooperation and improved communication between citizens and City officials (1.18.010b).

• Build opportunities for neighborhood communication, neighborhood-initiated projects, interaction, and problem-solving (1.18.010d).

According to the ordinance, a neighborhood council consists of all residents within the neighborhood’s boundaries, as well as one representative from each business, school, neighborhood association, church, and other organizations within its boundaries. Each of the above are considered neighborhood council members without further qualifications, registration, etc. It is the duty of each neighborhood council to advise the City on neighborhood and city-wide issues that they value. These issues should be determined by using a modified town meeting process as defined by Ordinance 3312. In order to conduct business, F2F operates under a set of adopted by-laws (see appendix G) and during the study period, utilized an elected leadership team of 6 people. The purpose of the by-laws is to govern the conduct of neighborhood council business. The purpose of the leadership team is to administer neighborhood council meetings and report the desires of neighborhood council members to the Neighborhood Liaison, the Community Forum, the City Council, and other City government offices. Ordinance 3312 specifies that the purpose of the leadership team includes administering Neighborhood Council meetings,
filling voluntary leadership and committee positions, and to facilitate communication among residents of the neighborhood and with city government.

One of the things the Leadership Team as well as the IPSC did to organize meetings was to follow a prepared agenda and enforce time limits for speakers. Table 1 outlines the typical agenda items and the times given for each item:

Table 1. Typical meeting agenda items and time devoted to each item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Typical Time Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Call to Order</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>(3 min. limit/speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes (review/adopt from previous meeting)</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations (if applicable)</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer’s Report (LT meetings only)</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reports (LT meetings only)</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forum Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSC Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished Business</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Business</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjourn (No later than two hours after meeting opens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings were conducted using a modified town meeting process as defined by Ordinance 3312. This suggests equal deliberation and decision making powers placed in the hands of all neighborhood council members present. It also requires that members be notified with meeting times and locations early enough to plan to attend them, and that meetings be conducted by a moderator selected by the neighborhood council (1.18.020e). During the study period, four Neighborhood Council meetings took place, one on July 20, 2005, October 19, 2005, and February 16, 2006, and April 20, 2006. In each case the meeting was moderated by the Chair of the neighborhood leadership team. While the person selected as the Chair of the leadership team was likely chosen because of speaking and leading capabilities, it is noted that no votes were taken at the opening of these meetings to establish the leadership team Chair as the meeting moderator. This is noted simply because some neighborhood councils in Missoula require that this vote be taken before the commencement of each meeting (South 39th Street Neighborhood Council February 2005).

During interviews, participants were asked to describe the leadership of the Neighborhood Council, and whether there was any kind of leadership hierarchy in the development of the infrastructure plan. The following remarks told much about the leadership design:

It’s all the same; whoever shows up gets to be part of it. The Leadership Team or whoever shows up gets to vote. You hope somebody will come forward that actually will do the job (Staff Participant 1).

The system is set up so that it’s not a true representative election, because they’re not elected to speak for that neighborhood. They are
elected to call meetings, and at that meeting, the neighborhood tells them what they can say (Staff Participant 5).

We have set up where we can have five to seven people on our Leadership Team and we had a meeting when new people first came into it—the present people that are on it right now—and we decided, or elected [a chairperson] to be kind of our spokesman. All neighborhood councils are kind of that way I think. They have one spokesman, so we elected [someone] to do that (Neighborhood Participant 7).

In terms of the duties of the Leadership Team, [the duties] are quite small and it is somewhat vague and open to interpretation. We’re supposed to moderate meetings, and conduct meetings, and advertise meetings, and have meetings on issues. The neighborhood councils should meet a couple of times a year. It really is vague, and they’re not all that meaningful (Neighborhood Participant 8).

As far as chain of command, the only thing that I have heard them talk about is the need for communication with OPG or with the City Council to go through the Leadership Team. A couple of times that has not happened and then OPG or the City Council get conflicting opinions of what it is our Neighborhood Council is doing, what we want, and so we have really tried to funnel the neighborhood’s comments through either the steering committee or the Leadership Team to OPG (Neighborhood Participant 2).

As far as any hierarchy, I feel like it’s been a pretty inclusive process. We keep pretty accurate minutes and the OPG folks read the minutes, and whenever people make comments they are in the minutes and the OPG staff have access to what everybody is saying. From a planning structure, there’s everyone who lives in the neighborhood, and then there’s the Leadership Team, and then as a side to that the Infrastructure Plan Steering Committee, and then there is talking to OPG. And ultimately, they are getting paid to read the plan (Neighborhood Participant 6).

The [City] Council is going to be the ultimate decision maker. That’s a fact of life. They’re elected and they make the final decision. So there’s your hierarchy I guess, and that’s representative government at its best or worst; I don’t know, it depends on which side of the decision you’re on I suppose. But when we’re in a meeting I don’t see a hierarchy. I see it as a dialogue, and I see
everybody having equal footing or status in that dialog. That’s the way I look at it (Staff Participant 4).

In addition to the descriptions above of leadership during this process, staff participants were asked to describe the purpose and powers of neighborhood councils.

The following are some of the responses:

The primary role of the neighborhood councils was to be the eyes and ears for the neighborhood; to find out what topics and issues were most important to the neighbors to let the City know about, and vice versa, for the City to be able to go to some specific people and say, “Look this is going to be happening,” or, “We’d like to be able to find out or share information with the neighbors, could you call a meeting” (Staff Participant 5).

It’s an attempt to I think, to foster grassroots involvement, and provide an opportunity for grassroots involvement with local government processes and projects, and to give them a voice (Staff Participant 4).

They provide an opportunity for folks within the neighborhood to gather and express issues that affect them. Those issues could be development projects, or a desire to have more parks, or stop signs on a certain street, or anything really (Staff Participant 3).

Some concerns were also expressed about the purposes of neighborhood councils however. These concerns included lack of direction given them, and lack of planning tools.

I don’t think [the purpose of neighborhood councils] is very well defined. I don’t think that the neighborhood councils’ structure really serves the City very well; maybe if it had more form and content, or purpose. There isn’t much connection between the neighborhood councils and the City Council; it’s kind of like, you’re out there on your own, you come together in a Community Forum and it is a network, but to what end? (Staff Participant 2)

I really think a lot of people’s frustration with it not working is because they’re trying to flex more muscle than they were even given. In regards to planning, [the neighborhood council] is a
natural vehicle involved in that, but I think if that would have been
their impetus, they would probably have some different language
and some different notice requirements, and that doesn’t really
coincide with the way that neighborhood councils are operating.
They are just to get the word out. So planning is possible, but it
wasn’t designed to help them do that (Staff Participant 5).

**Makeup**

Next, the makeup of the Neighborhood Participants is described. As noted
earlier, the neighborhood council is designed to include every resident as well as one
representative from each business, church, or other organization in the neighborhood.
Naturally, not everyone can or will attend the various neighborhood meetings though, so
it is necessary to discuss who does attend, as these active Neighborhood Participants are
the ones who have ultimately influenced what has happened with the infrastructure plan.
As discussed earlier in the methodology chapter, the active Neighborhood Participants
were identified during the interviewing process. Of the 14 Neighborhood Participants
involved, 6 learned about the neighborhood council and became active in it because of an
invitation by a particular person who will be called Mr. Parks from here on out. A few of
those activated by Mr. Parks said the following:

I learned about it from Mr. Parks when I saw him down at the Good
Food Store. He called me up before one of the leadership team
meetings, so I went to that (Neighborhood Participant 14).

Mr. Parks got my name somehow; some neighbor gave him my
name. He called because of that little pocket park down on the
corner of Grant and 8th. That was a few years ago now
(Neighborhood Participant 12).

It was Mr. Parks who asked me to run for the Leadership Team, and
that was probably three years ago. He convinced me that it was a
good time to get involved...so I went to the Neighborhood Council
meeting and I got elected to the leadership team that night. I had
never even met Mr. Parks; he had just called me up (Neighborhood Participant 9).

Mr. Parks it turns out, had been a former F2F Leadership Team member, and had kept current with both neighborhood and city planning issues. It is unknown how or why Mr. Parks selected these individuals, but each of them continued to take an active part in their neighborhood since the time that he contacted them. Many of the Neighborhood Participants also had some education or experience with planning in the past. Three of the Neighborhood Participants were architects, all three actively involved in ongoing development in Missoula. Two participants had been involved in neighborhood meetings since the beginning of neighborhood councils, at least one of which aided in the drafting of the original Neighborhood Council and Community Forum ordinance. Two were employed in careers which included some form of environmental planning, another had a Bachelor’s degree with emphasis in planning, and two others had experience with water resource planning. Two other members mentioned their past involvement with the City regarding traffic and growth concerns, and another had been involved in traffic, trails, and park planning. That list accounts for 13 of the 14 Neighborhood Participants and shows that each of them had some interest in planning that extended beyond the recent neighborhood infrastructure planning process.

When asked how their personal experiences and opinions influenced their decisions as IPSC members, eight of the Neighborhood Participants had a difficult time describing this. Five of them, however, specifically mentioned their desire for sidewalks in the neighborhood for reasons attributed to concerns for personal safety, safety of children, concerns about increasing traffic, and for aesthetic reasons. Staff Participants
made the following observations about the Neighborhood Participants’ personal influence:

I would think that some of the people that are involved may be involved because they’ve had either a really poor or negative experience with planning in the past, or possibly a really positive experience with planning in the past. There’s probably some of both. One thing I’ve heard is that there are folks who have bought houses and want to invest in the neighborhood. They plan to stay there for a long time, and they see parts of town that may have better infrastructure or amenities…and people want to have more of that in their own neighborhood because they see that as enhancing the quality as well as the safety (Staff Participant 3).

I’m sure that a lot of them have had bad experiences with City government, or government and government offices or departments. And some of them see a potential for getting things for their area, and look at the more positive viewpoint of it (Staff Participant 4).

It’s natural to be motivated by personal issues; and personal issues might be motivating this Leadership Team because they are young; but actually not all of them have kids. I think that’s a concern for some of them because they have kids, and I empathize with those concerns (Staff Participant 5).

In this last statement, the age of participants and the existence of children in the home are mentioned. These demographics along with others were compared to see if they were different from the neighborhood as a whole, and are further discussed in the section below in regards to question 2.

Other differences between the Neighborhood Participants and the surveyed residents that were compared include attitudes toward particular planning issues. Thirty three planning priority questions were asked on the survey within questions 5-12, 17-18, 21, and 25. A crosstabulation was used to perform a chi-square test of homogeneity to determine whether the variance of proportions between the surveyed residents and the
Neighborhood Participants were significantly different. To determine whether the differences between the two groups were significant, a p-value was calculated. A p-value indicates the probability that the observed statistic would occur naturally. If the p-value is low, for example, below 0.05 as was used in this research, it is not likely that the difference between the two groups occurs by chance, or in other words, the two groups could not be considered equal on that matter that has been tested.

The questions regarding planning priorities in the survey asked about specific items which had been discussed at Leadership Team and IPSC meetings, mixed with related issues, and ongoing issues of city-wide importance. By mixing these questions, it could be determined whether the Neighborhood Participants focus on specific infrastructure items were also concerns held by the neighborhood, or if they differed. The 33 questions (see appendix M) asked about the safety of neighborhood streets for walking and riding bikes; the importance of sidewalks, streetlamps, curbs, and gutters; the amount and character of automobile traffic; the frequency of bus stop use; the priority given to businesses and jobs, affordable housing, street improvement, protection of neighborhood character, public transit, parks and recreation, shops and grocery stores, sidewalks and trails, emergency services and law enforcement. They identified whether sewer, curbs and gutters, sidewalks, bus stops, trail systems, bike lanes, cross walks, traffic signs, road maintenance, speed limits, traffic calming, neighborhood safety, street lights, fire hydrants, open space, and parks were thought of and considered when discussing neighborhood infrastructure. Finally, it was asked whether residents would be willing to pay a special assessment tax to improve the infrastructure in the neighborhood.
From the thirty three questions asked, Neighborhood Participants were found to show significantly greater concern than the general neighborhood population for public transit, parks, playgrounds, places to recreate, shops and grocery stores, sidewalks and trails, and fire hydrants (see appendix B). The Neighborhood Participants were not significantly different from the general neighborhood population with regards to the other questions asked. It is noted that the issues of significant difference were all issues identified during the infrastructure planning process except for the concern shown for insufficient shops and grocery stores.

The final question which was found to be significantly different by sample group was question 25, “How willing would you be to pay a special assessment tax on your property to improve the infrastructure (sidewalks, curbs, parks, traffic calming, etc.) in your neighborhood?” Table 2 shows the results to this question, and indicates that the surveyed residents would not be as willing to pay an assessment for these things as the Neighborhood Participants would be. It is also noted however, that although each Neighborhood Participant was thoroughly involved in the process of developing the infrastructure plan, the results to this question indicate that their involvement does not necessarily mean that they would be willing to financially support it.
Table 2. Results to the question, “How willing would you be to pay a special assessment tax on your property to improve the infrastructure (sidewalks, curbs, parks, traffic calming, etc.) in your neighborhood?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to pay SID</th>
<th>Support it</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Sample</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Surveyed Residents</th>
<th>Neighborhood Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose it</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operation

Having discussed the design and makeup of neighborhood councils, it is necessary to next discuss the operations carried out during the development of the F2F infrastructure plan. This section will provide detail on the beginnings of the F2F infrastructure plan, and the course of actions taken to develop that plan.

Review of the previous year’s F2F meeting minutes and responses from interviews indicated that discussion on neighborhood infrastructure first began as individuals in the F2F neighborhood voiced concerns about increases in development throughout their neighborhood. Much of this concern was voiced when planned neighborhood cluster developments were discussed at Leadership Team meetings.

During this study, many Neighborhood Participants mentioned during meetings and interviews that the neighborhood lacks unity in design, upkeep, adherence to municipal codes, as well as lacks certain amenities that other neighborhoods in the City enjoy. In February 2005, one property owner who had built two homes on a single block in the neighborhood wrote a letter regarding the degree of adherence to codes in the
neighborhood. The letter was submitted to the Leadership Team for their information. Though this letter dealt with a single resident’s concerns about a particular block of homes in the neighborhood, it addressed enough of the same concerns which had been discussed in Leadership Team meetings during the previous year that the letter was forwarded on to the City Council and the Mayor, stating that the problems addressed “are pervasive throughout our neighborhood,” and are “reflected in many areas throughout the Franklin-to-the-Fort neighborhood,” and “the current situation is not acceptable.” The owner’s concern was that two newly developed lots on the block had not sold largely because of the poor condition of the neighborhood. The letter points out more than 25 violations of municipal code, 14 of which were right-of-way violations including fence, parking, building structures and other personal property encroachments, all within a single block of the neighborhood. Other code violations within that block included health issues and lack of public water and sewer on one of the lots, off-street parking violations, and parking and curb violations (Code violation letter 2005).

Though the number of concerns held by Leadership Team members were many, Neighborhood Participants felt that a comprehensive neighborhood plan was too large a project to tackle without having any experience with such a project. In March, 2004, the Leadership Team held preliminary discussions with OPG about what items might be feasible to include in a neighborhood plan that would address some of their concerns. Office of Planning and Grants staff soon informed the neighborhood however, that they would be unable to begin working on the plan immediately because of their pre-existing workload, but they recommended beginning work on the project in late fall of that year.
During the next several months, a small cohort of individuals rallied together by one concerned Neighborhood Participant, made several contacts with neighborhood residents, City Council, OPG and City officials alerting them to the potential costs to homeowners, if for instance, a plan for sidewalks was implemented. The concern was that many low-income households in the neighborhood, including elderly persons on fixed incomes, would be impacted beyond their capacity. Because this person was able to influence the City Council, they agreed to schedule a special meeting of the Platt, Annexation, and Zoning Committee to determine the practicality of pursuing the development of an infrastructure plan for this neighborhood. Though this cohort of individuals had communicated their concerns to some neighborhood residents by knocking on doors and informing them of potential improvement costs, their position did not prevail at the Platt, Annexation and Zoning Committee meeting because it was noted that a plan for sidewalks or other infrastructure would not equal implementation. Instead, the plan would serve as a guide to staff, advising them of neighborhood opinions if infrastructure should be implemented in the neighborhood.

In December 2004, OPG staff prepared a Scope of Work document which outlined the proposed procedure for developing the infrastructure plan and answered many questions the neighborhood had asked about the process (appendix H). The Scope of Work identified four primary topics for development which was later revised to five topics when OPG staff met with the Leadership Team in February, 2005. These topics included: sidewalks, trails, and bicycle facilities; curbs and gutters; traffic; parks; and fire hydrants. During the March, 2005, Neighborhood Council meeting, the Leadership
Team chair presented background information on the infrastructure plan discussion to date and displayed pictures of good and bad examples of infrastructure issues. Office of Planning and Grants representatives then introduced the Scope of Work to the Neighborhood Council, defined how a plan is used to influence future policy, and discussed how infrastructure improvements might be paid for if such improvements were ever implemented. When residents raised questions about the costs involved, OPG staff reiterated the fact that a plan does not result in a bill because a plan does not necessitate implementation.

During interviews, the following was said about why infrastructure issues were chosen for the basis of planning in the neighborhood:

Let’s find out how people want to clean up their front yards, and then maybe they’ll start taking care of what’s behind it; basically that deals with curbs, sidewalks, boulevards. Without curbs and sidewalks, people are likely to park in their front yard—all four vehicles. Or without curbs, people are parking over the top of the sidewalk, and it’s a mud pit out there. So if you fix up your front yard, everything else will get fixed up around it (Neighborhood Participant 14).

Development comes up at almost every one of these meetings, and I almost always reiterate that this is an infrastructure plan and not a neighborhood plan, but it’s such a big issue in our neighborhood, and that’s why I got involved. We just need to start somewhere, and maybe we will do a neighborhood plan at some point; I think that would be great. At the inception of this, that was kind of our plan, was to start with this and figure out how it works—how you do one of these things—and then maybe do something bigger later (Neighborhood Participant 8).

It’s an older neighborhood and yet it’s been ignored and been untouched by improvements. So we wanted to be a part of that, and we thought that we could do an infrastructure plan like Emma Dickinson had done. We thought perhaps we could move forward with that before we thought about the zoning or anything like that.
The infrastructure seems to be where we had been left off when you look at any other neighborhood in the city, especially considering curbs, gutters, and even paving the streets (Neighborhood Participant 4).

A Staff Participant said:

They want to feel safe walking down the sidewalk. About three or four weeks ago we took some of our maps and lists of locations where people wanted to see more sidewalks and we were driving down Johnson Street, and we saw a woman pushing a baby stroller in the street because there was no sidewalk. She was between the parked cars and the travel lanes. I can see why people are concerned (Staff Participant 3)

From the infrastructure plan “Kick-off” meeting (March 9, 2005) through the rest of the study period, there were 14 Leadership Team meetings, 14 IPSC meetings, and 5 Neighborhood Council meetings (the later of which were each given meeting titles in the OPG Scope of Work). Neighborhood Participants were involved in many different ways, from identifying issues, organizing discussions, setting up communications and feedback, walking the streets to plot infrastructure on aerial photographic maps, entering resident’s comments into spreadsheets, editing draft documents, etc. Appendix C provides a partial time-line and illustrates events that took place during the process. Residents were notified of Neighborhood Council meetings by direct mail on each occasion except for the April 20, 2006 “Release of the Draft Plan” meeting. Residents also received notification of the first meeting by a flyer, the second meeting by a newsletter, and for each meeting sandwich-boards were posted throughout the neighborhood. The neighborhood council had also established an email list which residents could subscribe to, which informed them of upcoming meetings. Each meeting was also listed on the Neighborhood’s website, the City’s online calendar, and in the local newspaper.
Comment cards were distributed prior to the Kick-off meeting, and at the July 20, 2005 “Issue Identification” meeting, and the October 19, 2005 “Recommended Improvements” meeting (for an example see appendix E). In addition, a post card survey prepared by the IPSC chair was distributed by community service workers prior to the Recommended Improvements meeting (appendix F). As comment cards were received (addressed to the Leadership Team chair) and post card surveys were received (addressed to the IPSC chair), these participants categorized and entered the comments into spreadsheets, and provided them to OPG staff as well.

Neighborhood Participants were also involved when OPG staff brought aerial photographs dividing the neighborhood into 13 sections for ground-truthing. For ground-truthing, Neighborhood Participants volunteered to walk the streets with the map in hand, plotting traffic signs, cross-walks, fire hydrants, streetlights, curbs, sidewalks, boulevards, parks, and trails. The maps were then digitized by OPG and presented at three review sessions (two at IPSC meetings, and the third at the Issue Identification meeting).

The Recommended Improvements meeting allowed all in attendance to have some hands-on input using both maps and commentary. At this meeting, five maps were displayed, identifying the existing status of each of the infrastructure plan topics. Beside each map was a list of the comments which had been gathered from comment cards to that point. Each person was given three colored dots to match each of the color designations for the five infrastructure topics. Attendees were instructed to place the dots beside the comments which they felt were the most important for each of the mapped
topics (more than one dot could be placed on a single comment if the person desired). If there was an issue not identified that they wished to add, they could add their comment along with those listed, and place a dot(s) beside it.

Despite the many efforts to involve residents in the process, participation in Neighborhood Council meetings tapered off over the course of the process, such as was found in the study conducted by Cole and Caputo (1984). The first meeting had approximately 72 in attendance, and the next meetings were approximately 55, 50, 23, and 26, respectively. The following are some of the things that people had to say about participation and the neighborhood’s influence:

- It’s kind of a big task, and it’s kind of doing the job of city government. Not instead of, not that somebody else is supposed to be doing, but it’s a plan that the residents wanted, and they are voluntarily taking on a lot of extra hours (Staff Participant 5).

- Our staff has just been excited to work with these folks. Their energy, their enthusiasm, and their intelligence really; and designedly so, they’ve done the lions share on this project. It’s a neighborhood product. I hope that that has been clear in the meetings; we’re not imposing anything on anybody. We’re just putting some structure to it, and making it consistent with other forms and processes and bringing some expertise to it (Staff Participant 2).

- We’ve worked out our relationship and [the OPG] were pretty clear up front that they don’t have the resources to do everything; so it’s kind of a trade off, we do the busy work, and they’ll do the paperwork part and put it together. To me it seems like its pretty amicable and they’re doing a good job (Neighborhood Participant 14).

- We’ve been soliciting comments for this from day one. If people have constructive comments—you know, negative or positive—we incorporate them, or we listen to them (Neighborhood Participant 8).
I can’t imagine that there’s anyone who would feel like they haven’t had a chance to comment on it unless they just don’t know about it because they haven’t read the newspaper or seen the sandwich-boards or whatever. People can send comments on the internet, they can call over the phone, they can contact [their City Council person, or the Leadership Team], or even the Office of Planning and Grants. Plus, it’s been going on for a year and a half. There’s been a lot of opportunity, and I was really impressed that the whole mailing survey was orchestrated by [the IPSC chair] because it was really informative (Neighborhood Participant 6).

I think overall it’s been a very comprehensive project and I admire and appreciate the time that folks at put into it (Neighborhood Participant 3).

These comments note the significant effort that has been put into the plan by residents of the neighborhood, as well as the recognition that both parties involved give each other for their efforts. There were also some participants however, who felt that the neighborhood did not have a significant influence in the plan. These issues will be further discussed with results to question 3.

**Question 2: How does the demographic makeup of participants in the neighborhood council differ from the neighborhood as a whole?**

As noted earlier, some demographic information was collected via the survey, and used to compare Neighborhood Participants with the general neighborhood (i.e. through surveyed residents). Section 2.3 of the F2F by-laws indicates the neighborhood’s aspiration for a representative Leadership Team:

Leadership Team composition shall attempt to reflect the diversity of the Neighborhood Council area in age, gender, homeowners, renters, landlords, business owners, and school age children.
The purpose of this section is to compare demographic characteristics of the Neighborhood Participants with the neighborhood as a whole, including age, home ownership, education and household income, and additional demographic characteristics.

Before proceeding, attention is given to the quality of the survey data. As noted in the Methodology chapter, great care was taken to obtain a random sample of residents for the survey. In case any statistical analysis would rely on confidence intervals, the survey sample chosen was large enough to demonstrate a 94% confidence. Additionally, each survey recipient received five contacts in order to promote a high response rate in order to obtain an accurate representation of the general neighborhood. However, data from one of the demographic characteristics, home ownership, indicated that the respondents to the survey were not representative of the neighborhood. There may be many reasons for this, some of which are discussed below; however, the data collected from sampled residents were compared to Neighborhood Participants despite possible inaccuracies because it is believed that those survey responses received summarily represent those who are sensitive to planning issues in their neighborhood. In other words, there may be some groups under-represented by the survey data, but for the purposes of this thesis, it is presumed that these individuals are passive about planning issues, and their votes, if taken, would not sway any decision on these matters one way or another. In this section, a t-test was performed for each of the demographic questions to determine whether the Neighborhood Participants were significantly different from the neighborhood with regard to those characteristics polled for.
**Age**

For age comparisons, the mean ages were 46 and 49 for Neighborhood Participants and surveyed residents respectively. The median ages were 36 and 49 for these groups respectively. A t-test for equality of means indicates a p-value of 0.619, which denotes that the differences in age between the two groups were not statistically significant.

**Children**

When considering children, Figure 2 shows a comparison of number of children in the home under age 18 by sample. Though the survey data do not give the age of the children, it is noted that the Neighborhood Participants were much more likely to have one child in the home than were the surveyed residents. The distributions of children among the two samples however, were not found to be statistically significant.

![Figure 2. Number of children in the home.](image)
Home Ownership

Another demographic question from the survey asked if respondents were renting or leasing their home, buying or already own their home, or “other.” Of the Neighborhood Participants, all 11, or 100% of respondents owned their home. The surveyed residents indicated that 71.9% were home owners, while 23.4% were renting or leasing their home. Data compiled by the OPG in preparation for the Infrastructure Plan said that 46.5% of the neighborhood residents were homeowners and 53.5% were renting or leasing their home. There are some interesting things here; first, that all of the Neighborhood Participants owned or were buying their homes. Since the Neighborhood Participants that responded to the survey captured all 6 of the leadership team individuals, it can be said that renters were not represented by the leadership team at all, or by other Neighborhood Participants. Secondly, the fact that the proportions were so different between the OPG data and the data collected from the survey is telling of what kind of individual takes the time to fill out a survey about neighborhood planning. That is, if the demographics prepared by OPG were correct that 53.5% of the neighborhood residents were renters, compared to only 23.4% of survey respondents who were renters, this low survey response rate may indicate that renters feel so detached from or insignificant in the neighborhood planning process to the extent that they would not even take the time to fill out a survey about their neighborhood’s infrastructure.
Education and Household Income

Data indicated that Neighborhood Participants had a higher education and income level compared to the rest of the neighborhood. These were found to be significant with a p-value of less than 0.05. Graphical representations are shown in figures 3 and 4.

![Figure 3. Education by sample](image1)

![Figure 4. Household income by sample](image2)
**Additional Demographic Characteristics**

In addition to those five demographic characteristics investigated above, it was also asked how long respondents had lived in the neighborhood, how long they expected to live there, the number of adults in the home, and the employment status of the respondent and their spouse or other supporting adult. While the demographics discussed previously showed significant differences, p-values for each of these additional characteristics were greater than 0.05. With a p-value greater than 0.05, the likelihood that this group of Neighborhood Participants could have been selected at random from the entire neighborhood group is greater than 1 in 20, and therefore any difference in these characteristics were not statistically significant.

Further, nonparametric correlation tests were used to determine if there were any associations between each of the survey’s demographic characteristic questions and meeting attendance. It was found that there was a slightly positive correlation between expected future residency in the home and meeting attendance ($r = 0.203$, significant at the 0.05 level), and there was a slightly negative correlation between how many children were in the home and meeting attendance ($r = -0.192$, significant at the 0.05 level). In other words, as residents’ expected future length of residency increased, their attendance at neighborhood meetings increased slightly; and the fewer children they had in the home, their attendance at neighborhood meetings also increased slightly.
Question 3: What is the level of satisfaction held by neighborhood residents of the neighborhood council as a planning vehicle?

Before discussing the level of satisfaction held by neighborhood residents with the neighborhood council as a planning vehicle, it is necessary to briefly explore their knowledge of the Neighborhood Council and the infrastructure plan. Survey questions asked how often residents hear of planning issues in the community, how familiar they are with relevant local planning and decision making bodies, and how they first heard about the neighborhood’s infrastructure plan. While it was not expected that the majority of residents should have extensive familiarity with all of these things, such questions were asked in order to understand the validity of respondents’ answers to further questions regarding their satisfaction with the infrastructure plan.

This section first presents data regarding F2F residents’ level of awareness of planning, decision making bodies, and of the neighborhood’s infrastructure plan. Next is a discussion of residents’ satisfaction with the neighborhood council as a planning vehicle; and finally, some analysis of issues that were identified during the process.

Residents’ Awareness

The survey asked, “How often would you say that you hear about planning issues in your community?” Approximately 40% said they heard of planning issues at least monthly, with the other 60% hearing of planning issues a few times a year or not at all (see Figure 5).
Residents were also asked whether they had heard of certain organizations, and if they understood the duties of those organizations. It was found that the larger the organization, and the greater their political responsibility, the more likely it was that residents had heard of them, and the more likely it was that they felt they understood the party’s duties (see Table 3).

Table 3. The percentage of residents who had heard of, and felt they understood the duties of the included local decision making bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Heard of</th>
<th>Understand its duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Planning and Grants</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin-to-the-Fort Neighborhood</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Leadership Team</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked how they found about the neighborhood's infrastructure plan, 64% of residents said they just found out from the survey. The next most recognized informers for the infrastructure plan were the door flyers and the sandwich-board signs (see Figure 6).

![Graph showing how residents first found out about the infrastructure plan.](image)

**Figure 6.** How residents first found out about the neighborhood's infrastructure plan.

*Satisfaction with the Neighborhood Council Model*

After considering residents' awareness of planning events and organizations in Missoula, survey questions that indicate the level of satisfaction of residents with the process were considered. Approximately 4 out of every 5 individuals in the neighborhood did not feel familiar enough with the planning process to answer these questions. It is noted, however, that although respondents were not eager to mark “pretty well” for questions regarding discussion of infrastructure issues, representation of opinions, or the ability for neighborhood councils to perform planning, the question that

...
got the highest marks for “pretty well” and the lowest marks for “pretty poorly,” was the ability for the plan to meet the needs of the neighborhood (see Table 4).

Table 4. Residents’ answers to survey questions regarding satisfaction with the process used to develop the neighborhood’s infrastructure plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How thoroughly have infrastructure issues in your neighborhood been discussed?</th>
<th>How well do you think your opinions about neighborhood infrastructure are represented at neighborhood meetings?</th>
<th>How well do neighborhood councils work to develop neighborhood plans?</th>
<th>From what you understand about the infrastructure plan, how well do you think it will meet the needs of the neighborhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Well</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Well</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Poorly</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know well enough to say</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infill Development**

In addition to responses from the survey, many valuable opinions about satisfaction with the process were shared at neighborhood meetings and during interviews. Some of these comments centered on the goals of the infrastructure plan, and the plan’s inability to address more important issues in the neighborhood such as concerns about infill development, long-term planning, and design standards. As discussed earlier, five topics were selected to be addressed by the infrastructure plan. While each person interviewed had an appreciation for each of the five topics, nearly every one of them also commented about the desire and need to discuss more complex issues. The following quote is illustrative of how some participants felt about infill development:
I think the neighborhood should have a voice in how [infill] happens, and that developers should have to listen wholeheartedly. So I think we need to get some of those things in writing that we care about, and we should have a voice about the character of our neighborhood. It’s so hard to put on paper, and it’s a way bigger bite. It would be an even bigger conversation than the arguments we have had about sidewalks, but I wish we could have just a little more impact on how things are being shaped and approved in our neighborhood. That’s a whole ‘nother long set of meetings and procedures (Neighborhood Participant 13).

**Infrastructure Costs**

The next most discussed concern about the process was how to address the concerns of infrastructure cost. As noted earlier there was one particular individual that took extensive action to let people know that by their understanding, this plan was going to cost the residents money. This individual voiced the opinion that the cost was a very real threat to low-income individuals, particularly the elderly residents of the neighborhood. In one notification distributed by this individual to neighbors through the mail, it said that there was not any funding for sidewalks and curbs in the neighborhood, and that the current project would be paid for with an area-wide special improvement district property tax assessment (SID). In addition, this notification insinuated that residents were being lied to with respect to infrastructure costs.

While it is true that curbs and sidewalks are paid for by the adjoining homeowner, no curbs or sidewalks were installed or designated for installation when this claim was made, or at all during the infrastructure planning period, and no SID was assessed. The infrastructure plan was not designed to require immediate curb or sidewalk installation by homeowners. Instead, like other plans, it specified areas lacking curbs and sidewalks, stated neighborhood values, and prioritized where they might be installed if they were
called for through the Missoula Public Works Sidewalk Maintenance and Improvement Program. One Staff Participant said:

What we’ve tried to convince folks of is that some of these things are going to come regardless. They come through processes that are absent of a plan, and don’t have very much neighborhood involvement. For instance, if the City decides, or the Council decides on the recommendation of the Public Works department that sidewalks should go in some places, Council simply orders those in. And I think some folks have been misled to think that once we establish a plan, then the City through Public Works and Council, will simply start ordering in sidewalks wherever we have designated them, and sidewalks seem to be the most contentious concern because of the cost (Staff Participant 2).

So while the cost of curbs and sidewalks were a potential issue that homeowners may have to deal with, the establishment of a plan does not establish a sidewalk in one’s front yard. The reason this issue is discussed in this continued detail here is because of the significant amount of time that was devoted to it during the development of the plan, and caused some to become dissatisfied with the planning process. This issue may be part of the reason that two leadership team members ultimately stopped coming to IPSC meetings.

With regard to costs, one survey question asked, “How willing would you be to pay a special assessment tax on your property to improve the infrastructure (sidewalks, curbs, parks, traffic calming, etc.) in your neighborhood?” To this, 24% of the survey respondents said they would support it, 35% said they were undecided, and 41% said they would oppose it.
Meeting Conduct

Even though there were several concerns about costs, an even greater number of people discussed concerns about the conduct of meetings. Six out of 14 Neighborhood Participants interviewed said that they had either been cut off by the meeting moderator, or observed others who had been.

I think when you have someone up there conducting the meeting that cuts you off and the issue when it’s raised, it’s really treading on thin ice. And if you really wanted to force the issue you could say no, under an open meeting law, this was an agenda item that was advertised and I have a right to speak to it. Whether you agree with it as the facilitator or not, I have a right to speak to that. I think by and large that opportunity has not been granted, and it needs to be at some point (Neighborhood Participant 3).

I know you’ve seen it, when someone is trying to say something, and then someone is interrupting them all saying, “you can’t talk about that right now.” Come on, this isn’t the Supreme Court; let’s let them talk a little bit. Although I understand why, and you can’t do that all the time, but you’ve got to let people feel comfortable (Neighborhood Participant 4).

At one particular Leadership Team meeting when the chairperson was absent, it was observed that issues were discussed for longer periods of time, and in greater depth than was usually observed. Following this meeting, Neighborhood Participants 12 and 14 both verbally expressed their observance of this fact as well.

On the other hand, another participant said the following about a meeting moderator:

I kind of have to applaud [the meeting moderator]. He’s pretty good at handling people. I think he tries anyway, to make people feel like they’ve been heard; like I hear you, I understand; now we’ve got to move on. I’ve seen him do that especially at the big Neighborhood Council meetings. He will acknowledge that yes, your concern is
valid and we hear you on that, but we can’t address that right now (Neighborhood Participant 2).

One participant who also had concerns over conduct of the meetings said that contentious issues need to be talked out, and that heated arguments indicate that these important issues are being raised. Heated arguments did not occur during the study period though, and this participant said that without them, “you’ve got a meeting agenda that’s two hours and that’s it, we’re gone. ‘Same way the meeting will be on Thursday. Here’s a couple of hours, we sit here and hold each other’s hands and sing Christmas carols, and we’re gone again” (Neighborhood Participant 10).

Neighborhood Councils not Taken Seriously?

Even greater than the concerns about meeting conduct however, were concerns participants had that neighborhood councils appear to be unheard by the City Council. These concerns were mentioned by 7 Neighborhood Participants, and included comments such as:

Right now the City Council does not listen to the neighborhood councils based on my experience here (Neighborhood Participant 14).

I think we should disband and do away with neighborhood councils. I’ve talked with a few of the City aldermen and they’re all for it. Our neighborhood councils today are costing us $40,000 a year. Now, I told one Councilman that $40,000 a year would pave my street, which we need. I would rather accomplish something like that then at the rate we are going (Neighborhood Participant 7).

If there’s any kind of improvement that could be made, it seems that it would have to be made in the structure that makes the will of the neighborhood council real; in other words, having some bite or some real clout; and they don’t. If anybody wants to get anything done in the city of Missoula, you go down to the City Council meetings. You get a hold of the Council members, but you don’t go through
the Neighborhood Council. I could see the neighborhood councils just going away, just evaporating, and nobody missing them a bit (Neighborhood Participant 12).

*Neighborhood Influence in Planning*

During interviews, participants were asked how much influence they thought the neighborhood had in the plan. While most Neighborhood Participants felt that their efforts and input had merit, two participants felt that the plan was being overly directed by the OPG. They both said that the OPG was dictating the plan to the neighborhood. Another participant felt that the plan was being created mostly by OPG, but this was because of the lack of neighborhood participation. This participant also said:

> I really thought that people would be excited and come out and have an impact and a voice, and I thought that they would care. I guess we have had some impact because we got the ball rolling on the infrastructure plan, and I really think there are some good things that have come out of it. I think a lot of good discussion has come out of it, but I think my idealistic bubble has been burst and I don’t have as much faith in the process as I used to (Neighborhood Participant 9).

In the quote above, the participant also pointed out the importance of the neighborhood getting the ball rolling on the infrastructure plan. Five participants said that the fact that they began developing the plan was a huge success simply because of the decisions that had to be made to get it started, the patience that they had to have waiting to collaborate with OPG, and the challenges encountered, especially when the project nearly got halted in the beginning at a Platt, Annexation, and Zoning meeting. “Resistance to it has been pretty aggressive,” one participant said. Others noted the risen awareness and opportunity to influence neighborhoods:

> I’ve been really impressed with the increased awareness of the Neighborhood Council as an entity that comes together. It has risen
awareness of there being a community and of there being other people that are interested (Neighborhood Participant 6).

There have been a couple of general neighborhood meetings where people have been involved in giving feedback, and where the people have had a chance to give feedback rather than just listen; that really works. With this leadership group, they’ve been sort of redundant in having information cards, response cards, then having the public meetings, and putting up those dots. I think this leadership group has been pretty good in soliciting and being open to community participation and response. That’s a high point, when the community has had a chance to have their say (Neighborhood Participant 12).

I think giving people a voice, and empowering them, providing them an outlet for concerns for the neighborhood and for residents, has been a great success. And to show people that we’re doing something... We have standing meetings now, and they’re well attended, and people are involved and engaged and they’re productive (Neighborhood Participant 8).
DISCUSSION

Having already displayed results of the study in relation to the three main research questions, this chapter is used to provide some further discussion and summary of both supportive and hindering elements asserted during the study about this Neighborhood Council in relation to participatory planning. It also further addresses demographic analysis, and concludes with a section on neighborhood satisfaction with the process.

Support for Participatory Planning

Of the many means available to local governments for sanctioning neighborhood councils, Rohe and Gates (1985) say that the City Charter is the most permanent, most legally sound. While some Neighborhood Participants expressed frustration that neighborhood councils do not receive their deserved attention by City Council, it is noted that the Charter was not established by City Council, and having been approved by the voice of Missoula voters, it necessitates that citizen concerns be heard.

The Modified Town Meeting Process described and required by Missoula’s Ordinance 3312 also encourages participation by notifying the public of meetings in advance. The F2F neighborhood regularly posted meeting times and places in the local newspaper, on two internet sites, with sandwich-board signs throughout the neighborhood, door-to-door flyers, and direct mailings. Neighborhood volunteers, including individuals from the Leadership Team and the IPSC, exercised great care and effort to notify residents.

Meetings were conducted under Montana Open Meeting Law (Montana Code Annotated 2-3-2) which require that meetings not exclude interested parties, that detailed
meeting minutes be recorded and available upon request, and include the substance of all matters proposed, discussed, decided and voted upon (Neighborhood Council Planning Committee 1997, 7). These requirements were upheld by the F2F Neighborhood Council, and the meeting minutes were also posted on the council’s website. In addition, meeting agendas were posted on the website and/or emailed to residents on the email list before meetings when the volunteers preparing them had the time to do so. The F2F by-laws also allowed for a minority report on issues to be written within 10 days after a vote which would be included with other prepared reports. Such minority report could include important opinions that did not have the support of the majority.

Open committee membership also contributed to participation. There were no pre-requisites to participate as a member of the IPSC, other than being a resident of the neighborhood, or representing a business, church, school, or other organization that existed within the neighborhood.

In addition, all five Staff Participants interviewed commented that this was the most active neighborhood council and leadership team in Missoula. It was not common to hear of other neighborhood councils in Missoula meeting more than once per year, and some only held leadership team meetings when concerns were raised in the neighborhood. Four of the Staff Participants, and one Neighborhood Participant, pointed out that the infrastructure plan proactively addresses issues that residents felt will become greater concerns in the future as growth continues in their area. This type of enthusiasm shows the neighborhood’s ability to depart from the otherwise common reactive form that is experienced all too often in planning.
Those active in the F2F Leadership Team and in the IPSC all had personal, professional, or academic exposure to planning in the past. This allowed them greater ability to communicate about issues and have a greater understanding of them as well as the trials, and processes involved.

The neighborhood worked cooperatively with the OPG to complete the plan. When the neighborhood had concerns about issues or the process, these were relayed to OPG, who took care to answer their questions. The OPG also requested input and ground-work performed by neighborhood residents which allowed for greater detail and local knowledge as discussed by Solitare (2005).

**Hindrances to Participatory Planning**

Though neighborhoods in Missoula have always been afforded the opportunity to prepare neighborhood plans, the establishment of neighborhood councils would seem to provide greater facilitation of such plans. Despite the fact that Missoula’s neighborhood councils were organized by a city charter, and that a Neighborhood Liaison position was created to communicate between the neighborhood councils and City government, and annual funding has been provided to them to supplement the printing of newsletters and other communications, it appears that they lack guidance. Not that they lack resources to assist them, but that they were not designed especially to perform planning, or any other specific function for that matter. It is not stated what they were designed to do other than to establish communication between the city government and neighborhoods, and make recommendations on neighborhood and city-wide issues. This broad charge could allow
a neighborhood council to become involved in issues that were never anticipated, or on the other hand, they may do nothing at all because they don’t know what to do.

Next, as was noted earlier, some Neighborhood Participants feel that the neighborhood councils are not heard or recognized by the City Council. With such perception and possible reality, residents may be less likely to become involved than they would be otherwise. The Missoula City Local Government Study Commission, whose members were elected in 2004 to perform the 10-year review of local government as noted above in the literature review, say that the neighborhood council system is “still developing, faces a number of challenges related to participation and funding, and is not yet fully integrated into regular City government decision processes.” They say that “there is a pressing need for better coordination between the Neighborhood Councils/Community Forum and City government,” and when it comes to planning, the Commission says the City Charter “recognizes neighborhood planning as one of the fundamental roles and responsibilities of Neighborhood Councils,” yet, “this responsibility remains largely unrealized, and recommends that the City devote more staff and resources to the creation of neighborhood plans in areas in which citizens have expressed a need for planning and a willingness to work together with City staff” (Missoula Local Government Study Commission 2006, 20-22).

With regard to the conduct of meetings, there are a few issues of concern. First, the public meeting process takes more time than many participants have patience for. If, for instance, a resident wanted to make a statement to the City Council supporting the funding of a transportation corridor study, including the signatures of the neighborhood
Leadership Team (such occurred during the study period), one would first have to request a spot on the agenda with enough advance time to get placed on it. Next, the proposed statement would have to be presented at the Leadership Team meeting. A motion would have to be made to accept the letter, and seconded, before discussion could take place about it. If the motion were seconded, discussion could then take place on the matter. The leadership team could decide to accept the statement as prepared, recommend changes to it, appoint a committee to study the issue, or reject it entirely. In the case of the later three options, each would require redrafting of the original statement, scheduling a slot on the next meeting’s agenda which would be a minimum of one month away, and the hope to obtain a favorable vote. This process could possibly take several months to reach consensus, which could be very discouraging to residents limited by time, or who ultimately determine that the window of opportunity to influence the City Council has passed. The time that participatory planning takes is one of the greatest challenges noted by those who have studied the subject (Randolph 2004; Solitare 2005).

Secondly, both the Neighborhood Council Handbook and the F2F by-laws state:

> Neighborhood Council meetings shall be conducted by a meeting moderator selected by the Neighborhood Council” (Neighborhood Council Planning Committee 1997, 7; Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council By-Laws 2005, 3.1).

In addition, the Handbook says:

> This person need not be a member of the council Leadership Team. The job of the moderator is to conduct an efficient meeting at which all who wish to speak are heard (1997, 7).

The moderator for the F2F Neighborhood Council meetings was the Leadership Team Chair, who was not chosen by the Neighborhood Council, but by the Leadership Team
(which was found not representative of neighborhood residents). While it may have seemed natural to Leadership Team members that their Chair lead Neighborhood Council meetings, the purpose of the moderator is not to be the primary speaker, but to facilitate discussion, introduce speakers and agenda items, recognize people and offer opportunities for those who desire to speak, be mindful of the time spent on individual items, count votes on motions that are raised, and if necessary, prohibit argumentation and back-biting. In order to satisfy the language of the Neighborhood Council Handbook and the F2F Neighborhood By-laws, the moderator must be identified by some explicit method through the voice of the Neighborhood Council. Such method should be specified in the neighborhood’s by-laws, and establish when, or on what occasions, a new moderator should be selected. Establishing a moderator by the voice of the neighborhood council allows the residents of the neighborhood to determine who conducts the discussion. If the moderator is found to be overly biased or unfair, that person will not likely remain in the moderator position.

Thirdly, it was found that several Neighborhood Participants felt that their opinions were not heard because the meeting moderator limited their time. Section 3.2 of the F2F By-laws says that, “If necessary, a three minute rule per member per issue may be initiated to expedite meetings.” In each of the occasions that the three minute rule was exercised, it was not apparent whether it expedited an otherwise overly lengthy meeting. This kind of operational guideline needs to be exercised with caution so that residents are still given an opportunity to express themselves.
In addition to the concerns mentioned above about meeting conduct, further consideration is also warranted concerning how neighborhood issues are identified and judged of interest to the Neighborhood Council. As noted earlier, Staff Participant 5 said that leadership teams are “not elected to speak for that neighborhood. They are elected to call meetings, and at that meeting, the neighborhood tells them what they can say.” This seems to concur with what Ordinance 3312 and the Neighborhood Council Handbook has to say about the duties of the leadership team. After a review of observation notes and meeting minutes from the 33 neighborhood meetings which took place during the study period, however, it was found that only one issue was raised by someone other than those identified as Neighborhood Participants. This one issue, was discussed earlier on page 42, and was expressed in a letter to the Leadership Team concerning the fact that neighborhood residents’ violations of city codes negatively impacted the value of and opportunity to sell the complainant’s property. While there were some discussions and presentations at neighborhood meetings during the study about issues other than infrastructure, each one of these was raised by Neighborhood Participants or brought to the attention of the neighborhood by activist groups that were not part of the neighborhood.

With respect to the infrastructure planning process, however, while it appears to have gained fair support of neighborhood residents during the process, both Neighborhood Participants and Staff Participants said during interviews that the plan began as a result of discussions which took place among Leadership Team members
during their meetings. There was no indication that the Infrastructure Plan resulted from
the expressed concerns of residents outside of the Leadership Team.

Since 8 of the 14 Neighborhood Participants identified were not members of the
Leadership Team, some may argue that issues raised by these individuals were legitimate
issues initiated by common residents (other than Leadership Team members). It is not
the intent of this analysis to suggest that the concerns and issues raised by these 8, or
even all 14 individuals for that matter, were insignificant. However, since guests rarely
ever included anyone outside of this group, it is difficult to say that the issues discussed
at Neighborhood Council and Leadership Team meetings represented the neighborhood.
In other words, as stated in the hypothesis, neighborhood planning is still led and
conditioned by a handful of outspoken residents, and as was found, these few who shape
the neighborhood’s involvement in community planning are not representative of the
general population of the neighborhood.

The final hindrance to the process discussed here is the difficulty to achieve
representation of the neighborhood by a leadership team. The F2F Leadership Team,
which had a goal to represent the neighborhood by age, gender, home-ownership, family
size, and business interest, were unable to be representative because the Leadership Team
was made up of interested volunteers who were elected during a Neighborhood Council
meeting which likely didn’t represent the diversity of neighborhood interests to begin
with. As noted in the results chapter, they also did not represent renters, and had greater
levels of education and income. Typically, as noted in the literature (Lee et al. 1984), and
as indicated by Staff Participants 3 and 4 during interviews, a majority of people who are
active in public participation are active because they have been influenced in either a really negative fashion in the past, or possibly in a really positive one, and in this case, 13 of the 14 Neighborhood Participants were shown to have had considerable experience with planning processes.

**Demographics and Participant Differences**

When considering the representativeness of leadership teams and committee members to their neighborhood councils, it is natural to ask whether there are demographic differences between the active participants and the general population. It would seem natural to say that the activity of residents may be influenced by age, by size of family, by term or expected term in the home, or by education or income level, as each of these may affect how much time one has to devote, or how much one may have concern for, or be influenced by infrastructure issues. As noted in the results chapter however, the only demographics which were significantly different were those of home ownership, education, and income. The statistical analysis also indicated that the longer residents’ expected to live in the neighborhood, their attendance at neighborhood meetings increased slightly; and the fewer children were in the home, meeting attendance increased slightly as well. Solitare (2005) also says that children in the home place a constraint on the time that residents can put into political action. There did not seem to be any association among surveyed residents however, between education or income level and meeting attendance.

In addition, it was found that active participants did have some significant differences with regard to planning priorities. The active participants were much more
likely to be concerned with, and desired more of each of the following in their neighborhood: public transit (i.e. busses); parks, playgrounds, and places to recreate; shops and grocery stores; sidewalks and trails; curbs and gutters; and fire hydrants. In addition, the active participants were much more likely to say they would be willing to pay a special assessment tax on their property to improve those things. What is not known is whether these active participants valued these things because of their involvement in the infrastructure plan, or whether they were involved with the infrastructure plan because they valued these things.

**Satisfaction**

While most residents in the F2F neighborhood were familiar with the basic political bodies which govern local planning policy (the City Council and the Office of Planning and Grants), and they were familiar with the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council, they were generally unaware of the Infrastructure Plan which had been going on in their neighborhood for two years, despite the efforts that Neighborhood Participants had made to contact and involve people. The fact that the majority (about 64%) of people were unaware of this process in their neighborhood makes it understandable that 4 out of every 5 individuals surveyed felt they could not appraise the thoroughness of discussed issues, the representation of residents’ opinions, the abilities of neighborhood councils to plan, and the ability for the plan to meet neighborhood needs. For those remaining respondents, it appears that although they were unsure whether infrastructure issues were discussed thoroughly, and whether their opinions were represented well, they had more confidence in the ability of the Neighborhood Council to develop a
neighborhood plan (with 64% marking moderate or pretty well), and, that it would likely meet the needs of the neighborhood (76.9% marking moderate or pretty well) (see Table 5). Residents were also somewhat open to considering the cost of a SID, since only 41% marked that they would oppose it, and the remaining 59% marked undecided or in support.

Table 5. This revised table shows only the proportional responses to satisfaction questions from those who marked one of the three included responses shown here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How thoroughly have infrastructure issues in your neighborhood been discussed?</th>
<th>How well do you think your opinions about neighborhood infrastructure are represented at neighborhood meetings?</th>
<th>How well do Neighborhood Councils work to develop neighborhood plans?</th>
<th>From what you understand about the infrastructure plan, how well do you think it will meet the needs of the neighborhood?</th>
<th>Total Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Well</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Well</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Poorly</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With further regard to satisfaction, the two greatest dissatisfactions with the process noted in interviews were 1) the conduct of neighborhood meetings, both large and small, did not allow development of issues because of time constraints and leadership direction; and 2) the Neighborhood Council does not appear to be heard by the City Council. The greatest successes mentioned by Neighborhood Participants had to do with the fact that the process allowed them to get involved in planning in a way that they could influence things for good, and that their voice could be heard through the plan.
CONCLUSION

The preceding two chapters detail many procedures and characteristics of the F2F Neighborhood Council during the process of developing their Infrastructure Plan. Events have been shown as both supporting and hindering the Neighborhood Council’s ability to perform participatory planning. This style of analysis was used in order to understand how this process worked and how it might be improved in the future. Though this section will provide recommendations for improvement, it is believed that this neighborhood council effectively provided the necessary structure and opportunity to carry out participatory planning with regard to its infrastructure plan.

In this section, a brief discussion of whether or not this process was participatory or not will be provided, and this is followed by recommendations for how this neighborhood council might improve the planning process. Finally, recommendations for further research will also be offered.

Whether or not this neighborhood continues to perform planning projects (as several participants expressed their desire to do), these recommendations, along with other evidence of favorable design and processes mentioned in this report may benefit other neighborhood councils in Missoula and other communities facing similar issues or tasks.

Was it Participatory?

To declare that the development of the F2F infrastructure plan was truly participatory or not presents a challenge. Overall, the design, makeup, and operation of the neighborhood council allowed participants to thoroughly become involved and
influence the planning process. The amount of effort exercised by Neighborhood Participants to move the process along, the questions they raised, the solutions they found, the legwork they did, and the measures taken to involve residents helped them learn about planning, public participation and policy, contributed to the community, and helped to create a product that could potentially benefit their neighborhood for years to come.

The challenge, however, comes in that the majority of residents claimed that they didn’t know that an infrastructure plan was being developed in their neighborhood, that the plan was overly influenced by a small collection of highly motivated individuals with a strong interest in having sidewalks (among other things) installed because they felt it added beauty and uniformity to the neighborhood, and that these individuals had much higher household incomes than the average residents of the neighborhood, therefore expecting less financial stress should the infrastructure be installed.

Though this neighborhood made several varied attempts to involve residents, the following quote by Thomas (1995) still rings true:

> Public participation is often nonrepresentative. No matter what the circumstances, many who are eligible to participate do not, and those who do participate are seldom a cross section of all who were eligible. In particular, participants usually have higher socioeconomic status – better education and higher incomes – than non participants. Those who do become involved…are frequently nonrepresentative of the larger citizen populations (p. 24).

Lange (2005) and Solitare (2005), mentioned in the literature review, both thoroughly describe participatory planning. In doing so, they suggest that such is akin to direct democracy, that representation occurs in participatory planning as larger groups of the
affected body become involved. In order to emulate true participatory planning, neighborhood councils would have to show better evidence that the plan originates from the voice of the majority, that minority concerns are addressed (in this case, the drafted plan has addressed infrastructure costs fairly substantially), and that participants in the process do represent the neighborhood more closely.

Further, residents’ satisfaction with the neighborhood council and its planning efforts in this neighborhood appeared to be fairly mixed. However, because the results of the survey indicate a lesser proportion of dissatisfied individuals, neighborhood councils may be able to win the approval of neutral individuals in their neighborhood and continue to take on exciting new projects. This same sentiment is expressed about the neighborhood’s ability to perform participatory planning; that is, with a bit more effort to involve participants who better represent the diversity of the neighborhood, the structure to perform participatory planning is nearly in place. Further recommendations below are also suggested to provide a more truly participatory program in the F2F neighborhood in Missoula, Montana, and other similar communities with similar concerns.

**Recommendations**

First, it is recommended that an evaluation be made of the relationship between the neighborhood councils and the City Council, including a summary of their individual and respective authorities. The main purpose for this is to address what appear to be significant concerns from residents that their neighborhood councils are not being taken seriously by the City. This evaluation may require the formation of a focus group made up of Neighborhood Council Leadership Team members and of City Council members.
It may require legal advice from the City Attorney’s Office, particularly since the establishment of neighborhood councils by City Charter may provide them with some inherent rights. The Neighborhood Council Liaison should play a central role in this dialogue in order to moderate the discussion, and in order to learn how the Liaison role may be affected by the outcome of the evaluation. The Missoula City Local Government Study Commission also recognizes this need in the following statement:

There is a pressing need for better coordination between the Neighborhood Councils…and City government. As the Neighborhood Council system matures, it is becoming more integrated with local policy-making and planning. Improvements in the current system, however, are needed in order to reassure citizens that their work on Neighborhood Councils is taken into account by government officials (Missoula Local Government Study Commission 2006, 21).

Second, it is recommended that greater emphasis be placed on the elections of Leadership Team members in order to encourage diversity and educate residents about the Neighborhood Council’s structure and activities. Just as the F2F neighborhood made numerous efforts to involve the neighborhood in their infrastructure plan, it is recommended that neighborhood councils exhaust all avenues to attract residents to organizational meetings where leadership team members are nominated and elected.

Third, it is recommended that neighborhood councils amend their by-laws (if necessary) to adopt wording similar to that used in the Missoula Neighborhood Council Handbook with regard to meeting moderators. In addition, an explicit process for choosing a meeting moderator, as well as details on when, or on what occasions, a new moderator should be selected should be included. The ability to choose a moderator by
the voice of the Neighborhood Council allows residents to avoid individuals who might encourage biased discussion or who might not allow fair discussion of all issues at hand.

Fourth, while it is helpful to prepare an agenda to keep meetings on track, the meeting design must allow for modification of the agenda, and apply some tolerance for useful, although sometimes unplanned, discussion. Time limits must be exercised with great caution, as participants are not compensated for their efforts, and will not likely continue to return if they feel they are not given an opportunity to express their concerns.

**Further Research**

During the development of the infrastructure plan for the F2F neighborhood, maps were distributed to volunteers who walked the streets of the neighborhood and plotted infrastructure such as existing curbs and gutters, sidewalks, boulevards, street signage, crosswalks, fire hydrants, street lights, etc. Later, digitized maps of this information were presented at a Neighborhood Council meeting and residents were encouraged to locate their home, check to see that the information was correct, and comment on incorrect information or submit additional comments. As mentioned earlier, another meeting allowed residents to prioritize what they felt was most important about neighborhood infrastructure by placing dots on maps next to comments which addressed issues that they deemed most important. These types of activities, often called planning charrettes, are an extremely useful tool in participatory planning. It gets people involved and thinking about issues, allows them to discuss those with others, and allows them to see and take pride in the work they have done. It is recommended that a handbook be produced, including a variety of charrettes, which could be used and referenced by
neighborhood councils as they embark on planning projects. Such handbook might be compiled by an OPG planner, or perhaps by a planning student.

In addition, discussion that occurred at one of the F2F IPSC meetings, and was noted while analyzing survey responses, concerned the involvement of renters and their role and perceived role in neighborhood planning. It would be useful to conduct a study about whether the attitudes of renters toward long-range planning issues were the same or different from home-owners, and how they were included or excluded in the planning process. This seems an important topic, especially in communities such as Missoula which has a significant proportion of renters that doesn’t appear to be declining.

Final Word

During the study period, Neighborhood Participants expressed their appreciation for what they experienced and learned, and their desire to continue their involvement in neighborhood planning. They communicated and worked well with OPG, and with the exception of two Participants, they felt that the Infrastructure Plan reflected much of what they envisioned for their neighborhood. They felt the process gave them a voice in policy matters, and they had first-hand experience collecting the necessary data required to make policy decisions.

The design and operation of the Neighborhood Council contained many necessary elements to consider the outcome a product of participatory planning, but the makeup of participants was not representative of the neighborhood. Because representation is a primary goal of participatory planning, concern remains about whether all issues in this case received the necessary time and attention to declare the process truly participatory.
By improving the attendance at meetings to represent the broader diversity of the neighborhood however, neighborhood councils such as this one in Missoula, Montana, have the potential to generate truly representative participatory planning products. As neighborhood councils are established in other localities, much can be gained by studying what has been done by this neighborhood in Missoula.
APPENDIX A: MISSOULA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MAP
Survey question 12: Do you think there is too much, just right, or too little of each of the following in your neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Surveyed Residents</th>
<th>Neighborhood Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Surveyed Residents</th>
<th>Neighborhood Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Surveyed Residents</th>
<th>Neighborhood Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much Shops, Grocery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sample</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey question 17: Curbs and gutters may allow for better street maintenance. However, they may also decrease parking areas in front of some homes. How important do you think it is to have curbs and gutters throughout your neighborhood?

Survey question 18: When you hear the word “infrastructure” as it relates to your neighborhood, what do you think of?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Surveyed Residents</th>
<th>Neighborhood Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think of (Inf 'Yes, think of Fire Hydrant</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Samp</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, do not hink</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Samp</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Samp</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Samp</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: PARTIAL TIME-LINE, MEETINGS, NOTIFICATIONS, AND INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Feb 2005</td>
<td>OPG mails Neighborhood Council (NC) meeting notification to all neighborhood addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F Leadership Team (LT) enlists community service workers to distribute flyer and comment cards which advertise NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich-boards throughout neighborhood advertise NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mar 2005</td>
<td>NC &quot;Kick-off&quot; meeting for infrastructure plan (IP) - approximately 72 residents in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure survey/comment cards distributed at NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website updated to include detail and links for IP and provide opportunity for users to submit comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Apr 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 survey/comment cards received, 19 in favor of IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disbanded former neighborhood committees and formed the IPSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Apr 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG presents maps of existing neighborhood infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 large aerial maps distributed to neighborhood volunteers for ground-truthing, including the plotting of traffic signs, cross walks, fire hydrants, streetlights, curbs, sidewalks, boulevards, parks, trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First review of ground-truthed maps, call for completed maps by May 18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jun 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jun 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second review of ground-truthed maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG displays new maps with new ground-truthed items digitized (added with ArcGIS software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jul 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Jul 2005</td>
<td>OPG mails NC meeting notification to all neighborhood addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich-boards throughout neighborhood advertise NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service workers distribute newsletter which advertises NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jul 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization of upcoming NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jul 2005</td>
<td>NC &quot;Issue Identification&quot; meeting - approximately 55 residents in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of neighborhood comments through 7/19 discussed and distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground-truthed maps displayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps divided the neighborhood into four geographic areas of the neighborhood. Participants invited to gather around maps, check the information, and discuss issues and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure comment cards distributed at NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aug 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Aug 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of neighborhood comments through 8/08 discussed and distributed - comments from 50 residents so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sept 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oct 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG mails NC meeting notification to all neighborhood addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich-boards throughout neighborhood advertise NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IP postcard survey distributed by community service workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Oct 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 150 postcard surveys already received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG distributes preliminary draft chapters for IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG discusses prioritization of infrastructure issues, to be dealt with at upcoming NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Oct 2005</td>
<td>NC &quot;Recommended Improvements&quot; meeting - approximately 50 residents in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203 postcard surveys already received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG presents summaries of neighborhood comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAQ's answer sheet provided regarding IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each participant given 3 sticky dots for each map displayed. Dots were used to prioritize issues and locations of greatest concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure comment cards distributed at NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251 postcard surveys received so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dec 2005</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting - no official business conducted due to lack of LT quorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec 2005</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jan</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jan</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and edits made of preliminary IP chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Feb</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG mails NC meeting notification to all neighborhood addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich-boards throughout neighborhood advertise NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb</td>
<td>NC meeting - 23 in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Team member elections - 4 new team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IP was not central to this meeting, but it was announced that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draft IP would be posted on the neighborhood website by the end of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mar</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mar</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft plan presented and discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting schedule for IP review proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Apr</td>
<td>Monthly LT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich-boards throughout neighborhood advertise NC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Apr</td>
<td>Monthly IPSC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Apr</td>
<td>NC &quot;Release Draft Plan&quot; meeting - approximately 26 residents in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPG makes a presentation of the highlights of the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q and A period provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: ORDINANCE 3312

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 1.18 OF THE MISSOULA MUNICIPAL CODE TO BE ENTITLED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS AND THE COMMUNITY FORUM. TO GENERALLY REVISE AND UPDATE THE PROVISIONS OF THE ORDINANCE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MISSOULA THAT CHAPTER 1.18 MISSOULA MUNICIPAL CODE BE ESTABLISHED TO STATE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Section 1.18.010 Purpose

A) The City of Missoula recognizes that our democracy is enriched by the active participation of an informed citizenry. Therefore, it is the purpose of this ordinance to strengthen neighborhood participation in City governance where such participation exists, and to encourage and support neighborhood participation in City governance where it does not yet exist.

B) Pursuant to Article VI, Section 6.1(2) of the Missoula City Charter, Neighborhood Councils are hereby established to provide a structure for increased citizen participation in the governance of the City, and to build cooperation and improved communication between citizens and City officials.

C) Pursuant to Article VI, Section 6.1(4) of the Missoula City Charter, a Community Forum is hereby established to provide an arena for Neighborhood Councils to come together, share information, and make recommendations to the City government on neighborhood or citywide issues.

D) Neighborhood Councils and Leadership Teams are encouraged to build opportunities for neighborhood communication, neighborhood-initiated projects, interaction, and problem-solving.

Section 2. Section 1.18.020 Definitions

A) Neighborhood Council - all residents and one representative of all businesses, schools, neighborhood associations, churches, and other organizations physically located in one of the neighborhood districts.

B) Community Forum - a body consisting of one representative and one alternate elected by each Neighborhood Council.
C) Regularly or regular basis - reporting information on neighborhood and citywide issues with sufficient frequency and consistency for citizens to engage in informed participation in the City policy making process.

D) Timely or timely manner - reporting information on neighborhood and citywide issues in sufficient time for citizens to engage in informed participation in the City policy making process.

E) Modified town meeting process - consists of three key features: (1) all members of the Neighborhood Council, as defined in (A) above, who attend meetings shall participate in the conduct of business and the process of deliberation and decision making; (2) each leadership team shall make every reasonable effort to provide members with timely notice regarding the location and agenda of all Neighborhood Council meetings; (3) Neighborhood Council meetings shall be conducted by a moderator selected by the Neighborhood Council.

F) Neighborhood Liaison—A liaison under the supervision of the City Clerk who facilitates communication between the City government and the Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum, pursuant to Article VI, Section 6.2(8) of the Missoula City Charter.

G) Vacant position—A Community Forum Representative, Community Forum Alternate, or Neighborhood Council Leadership Team member’s position shall be considered vacated if one or more of the following conditions apply: (1) the member no longer resides within the Neighborhood Council boundaries; (2) the member has submitted written resignation (via U.S. mail or email) to the Neighborhood Liaison of his/her resignation; (3) the member has abandoned the position demonstrated by a failure to respond to three or more written attempts by the Neighborhood Liaison to contact the member.

Section 3. Section 1.18.030 Authority

A) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum may advise the City government on neighborhood and citywide issues.

B) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum shall adopt bylaws governing the conduct of its business. Such bylaws shall be approved by the City Council.
C) Each Neighborhood Council may modify its boundaries in cooperation with any other affected Neighborhood Councils in accordance with their respective bylaws, subject to the approval of the Community Forum.

D) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum may submit a budget proposal each year pursuant to the City-established review processes and procedures for consideration, review and approval by the Mayor and City Council. Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum may spend any monies allocated and approved by the City Council in accordance with State Law and City purchasing policies and procedures. Neighborhood Council and Community Forum spending is subject to the oversight of the City Council.

E) Each Neighborhood Council and Community Forum may apply for, receive and expend grant funds and other donations in accordance with State Law and City purchasing policies and procedures.

F) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum may act, in accordance with law, to increase citizen participation in the governance of the City and to enhance communication between citizens and City officials.

G) The Neighborhood Councils, the Community Forum, or the Neighborhood Liaison shall have the authority to call a meeting of a Neighborhood Council.

Section 4. Section 1.18.040 Duties

A) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum shall advise the City government on neighborhood and citywide issues. Each Neighborhood Council or the Community Forum shall determine the issues on which advice will be given. Those members of a Neighborhood Council or the Community Forum who disagree with advice to be given to the City government shall have a reasonable opportunity to produce a minority report. If such a minority report is produced, it shall accompany the advice submitted to the City government.

B) The Community Forum shall be a venue for Neighborhood Councils to share skills and information. The Community Forum shall be a place for neighborhoods to discuss neighborhood issues with multi-district or citywide implications, and shall be a place where neighborhoods may seek community-wide support for projects and goals. The Community Forum shall observe the operation of the Neighborhood Councils system and
make recommendations for changes to Neighborhood Councils, City officials, and the City Council.

C) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum shall report to the City government regarding concerns and interests of the residents in the neighborhoods and in the City as a whole on a regular basis, and in a timely manner.

D) Each Neighborhood Council shall make every reasonable effort to provide eligible members with timely information regarding City-initiated projects which impact the neighborhood.

E) All residents and one representative from each business, school, and other organizations physically located in a neighborhood district shall be eligible for voting and decision making in the Neighborhood Council. No person shall have more than one vote.

F) Each Neighborhood Council shall elect one person and one alternate to serve as its representative on the Community Forum.

G) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum shall strive to increase citizen participation in the governance of the City.

H) Neighborhood Councils and Leadership Teams are encouraged to build opportunities for neighborhood communication, neighborhood-initiated projects, interaction, and problem-solving.

Section 5. Section 1.18.050 Leadership Team

A) Each Neighborhood Council shall elect a leadership team in accordance with its bylaws to perform administrative functions on behalf of the Neighborhood Council.

B) Each Neighborhood Council shall strive to have a leadership team that consists of between five and seven persons. Each Neighborhood Council shall structure the team according to the Council's needs.

C) The functions of a leadership team shall include, but shall not be limited to: convening and administering Neighborhood Council meetings; establishing a nominating committee to seek candidates for leadership team positions and for the Community Forum representative and alternate; appointing replacements for leadership team positions, and Community Forum representative and alternate positions, when such positions become vacant prior to regularly scheduled Neighborhood Council general
meetings or elections; communicating with City government as directed by the Neighborhood Council and with Neighborhood Council members; communicating with the Community Forum and with the Neighborhood Liaison; assisting in establishing and implementing communication system components such as telephone trees, an annual survey, neighborhood kiosk; promoting participation in City governance; and establishing committees to carry out these and other functions as appropriate. In the event that the Leadership Team has appointed any replacement as provided for above, elections shall be held for that appointed position at the next general Neighborhood Council meeting.

D) Neighborhood Councils and Leadership Teams are encouraged to build opportunities for neighborhood communication, neighborhood-initiated projects, interaction, and problem-solving.

Section 6. Section 1.18.060 Meetings

A) Neighborhood Council meetings shall be conducted using a modified town meeting process. All members of the Neighborhood Council, as defined in Section 1.18.020(A) above, who attend meetings are encouraged to participate in the conduct of business and the process of deliberation and decision making.

B) Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum shall establish rules for decision making and adopt bylaws subject to the approval of the City Council. Suggestions for bylaws may be found in the Neighborhood Councils handbook.

C) Each Neighborhood Council shall meet with the residents of its neighborhood district on a regular basis.

D) All Neighborhood Council and Community Forum meetings shall be noticed and conducted in accordance with relevant city, state, and federal statutes including the Montana Open Meeting Law, Public Participation in Government Operations statute, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, and in accordance with Neighborhood Council or Community Forum bylaws. Each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum shall be responsible for fulfilling city, state, and federal meeting notification and location requirements. Official records including meeting minutes, agendas and bylaws of Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum shall be filed by the City Clerk in accordance with state law.

E) All decisions regarding budget proposals; election of leadership team members; election of the Community Forum representative; and advice to
the City government shall be made by a meeting of the Neighborhood Council.

Section 7. Section 1.18.070 Boundaries

A) Every part of the City shall be included in a neighborhood district. Neighborhood district boundaries shall not overlap.

B) Initial boundaries for each neighborhood district shall be established as delineated in the Neighborhood Council Proposal Map of March 19, 1997.

C) Each Neighborhood Council may change its boundaries in accordance with its bylaws, subject to the approval of the Community Forum.

D) Each Neighborhood Council shall review its boundaries as needed. Neighborhood Councils shall make recommendations to the Community Forum for boundary changes, which are consistent with each Neighborhood Council’s minutes and documented on a map.

Section 8. Section 1.18.080 Responsibilities of the City

A) The City of Missoula shall work with each Neighborhood Council and the Community Forum to strengthen neighborhood participation in City governance where such participation exists, and to encourage and support neighborhood participation in City governance where it does not yet exist.

B) The City of Missoula shall provide information on City and neighborhood issues to all Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum regularly and in a timely manner. The City shall make every reasonable effort to provide Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum timely information regarding City-initiated projects which impact their neighborhood. Any additional notification shall be made at important project milestones (if any) and whenever communications are required by ordinance.

C) To ensure that the City is able to comply with paragraph (B) above, the City of Missoula shall examine its project development schedules and alter these schedules to conform with the following standard: that project development schedules include early notification and time sufficient to enable citizens to participate in an informed manner in the policy making process concerning projects under development. All project development schedules initiated one year following this examination shall conform to the standard contained in this paragraph, except projects initiated during
and in response to a City emergency. Such emergency projects shall be exempt from the communication process described in this ordinance.

D) The City-initiated projects to which paragraphs (B) and (C) above refer include, but are not limited to:

Wastewater Facilities Plan Updates Amendments to Zoning Plans Annexations (10 parcels or more) Annual Sidewalk Program Annual Street Maintenance Program CIP Hearings Community Development Block Grant Special Meetings Comprehensive Planning Changes SID Maintenance Districts (perpetual) Zoning and Rezoning Requests and proposals Legal Notifications from City Clerk New Special Improvement Districts Park Development Projects Subdivision Proposals Annual Snow Removal Plan Modifications Street Vacations Transportation Master Plan Amendments Non-motorized Master Plan Modifications and Implementation of Major Projects Annual Transportation Improvement Program

E) Pursuant to Article VI, Section 6.2(8) of the Missoula City Charter, the city shall designate a liaison between City government and the Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum. This position shall be known as the Neighborhood Liaison. The Neighborhood Liaison shall report directly to the City Clerk. The Neighborhood Liaison shall work directly with Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum to:

strengthen neighborhood participation where it exists and encourage neighborhood participation where it does not yet exist; train participants; promote inclusiveness; facilitate communication between Neighborhood Councils, the Community Forum, and the City of Missoula; and in general coordinate the functioning of the Neighborhood Council system.

F) The City Council shall provide funding reasonable and sufficient to support the efforts associated with the formation and operations of Neighborhood Councils and the Community Forum.

Section 9. Section 1.18.090 Implementation

A) Nothing in this ordinance shall preclude any individual or individuals from access to, or participation with, the City Council, the Mayor, or City departments.

Section 10. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or word of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each section subsection, sentence,
clause, phrase, and words thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases or words have been declared invalid or unconstitutional, and if for any reason this ordinance should be declared invalid or unconstitutional, then the remaining ordinance provisions will be in full force and effect.

PASSED by a unanimous vote and


ATTEST:  
\( /s/ \) Martha L. Rehbein  
Martha L. Rehbein, City Clerk (SEAL)

APPROVED:  
\( /s/ \) John Engen  
John Engen, Mayor
Franklin to the Fort Infrastructure Plan
(Curb & Gutter, Sidewalks, Traffic, Trails, Parks, Street Lighting & Fire Hydrants)

We Invite Your Comments

Neighborhood Meeting, July 20, 2005

Based on your familiarity with the neighborhood, please describe anything that would make the information shown on the maps more accurate or complete.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

What does the information on the maps represent to you in terms of issues, problems or opportunities for the neighborhood?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Other comments or suggestions

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Please Provide Your Comments To:
F2F Infrastructure Plan Steering Committee
street address line
Missoula MT 59801

E-mail Address:
email address line

Contact Information
Name ____________________________

Address ____________________________

Phone ____________________________

E-mail Address: ____________________________

Thank You
## Franklin to the Fort Infrastructure Plan Questionnaire

Answer "yes" or "no" and then check each block that applies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ | ☐ | Would you like more **Sidewalks** in the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood?  
(If yes please fill in blanks below)  
- Would you prefer sidewalks installed:  
  ☐ On all streets  ☐ Only on streets used by children traveling to local schools  
  ☐ On Arterial Streets  ☐ Other |
| ☐ | ☐ | Would you like more **Curbs** installed along streets in the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood?  
(If yes please fill in blanks below)  
- Would you prefer curbs installed:  
  ☐ On all streets  ☐ On Arterial Streets  ☐ Other |
| ☐ | ☐ | Would you like more **Parks and Trails** in the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood?  
(If yes please fill in blanks below)  
- Would you prefer Parks & Trails:  
  ☐ be added throughout the entire neighborhood  ☐ improved in existing locations  
  ☐ made more accessible  ☐ Other |
| ☐ | ☐ | Would you like more **Traffic Control** (such as stop signs, roundabouts, bulb-outs, and similar devices) in the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood?  
(If yes please fill in blanks below)  
- Would you prefer more Traffic Controls installed:  
  ☐ On all streets  ☐ Only on streets used by children traveling to local schools  
  ☐ On Arterial Streets  ☐ Arterial and Collector streets  ☐ Other |
APPENDIX G: FRANKLIN TO THE FORT

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL BY-LAWS

Adopted February 13, 2001
Amended 3/9/05
Approved by CC

Franklin to Fort Neighborhood Council By-Laws

1.0 MEMBERSHIP

All residents of the Franklin to Fort Neighborhood Council area, as defined by City of Missoula Ordinance 3030, are members of the Neighborhood Council. Members are eligible to vote on all issues that come before the Neighborhood Council. Businesses, churches, schools, or neighborhood organizations within the defined boundaries of the Neighborhood Council may designate a representative to attend meetings and to vote on issues before the Neighborhood Council. Votes cast by Non-Members, unless they are a designated representative of an organization within the Neighborhood Council, will not count and will be forwarded as a minority report. No person shall have more than one vote.

1.1 Decisions shall be made by a majority vote of all members present. Decisions made by a majority vote may be accompanied by a minority report reflecting the opinions other than the majority. Responsibility for preparation of the minority report will rest with a designated member of the minority present at the time of the vote and be turned in to the Leadership Team of the Neighborhood Council no later than ten days after the vote.

2.0 LEADERSHIP TEAM

Election to the Leadership Team of the Franklin to Fort Neighborhood Council shall be by a vote of the Members of the Neighborhood Council as close as practical to the month of December each year.

2.1 Nomination to Leadership Team will be from the floor at a regularly scheduled Neighborhood Council meeting. Individuals may nominate themselves. To be eligible for election, nominees shall be present at the Neighborhood Council meeting at which voting for the Leadership Team member will occur, unless previously excused by the Leadership Team for good cause.

2.2 Members of the Leadership Team shall be elected by a majority. If a candidate cannot be placed in a vacant Leadership Team position by a majority; the position will remain vacant until the next regularly scheduled meeting to allow opportunity for other
candidates to be nominated. If candidates cannot be placed with a majority at the next regularly scheduled meeting. The remaining candidate may be elected by a simple majority.

2.3 Leadership Team composition shall attempt to reflect the diversity of the Neighborhood Council area in age, gender, homeowners, renters, landlords, business owners, and school age children.

2.4 If a vacancy occurs on the Leadership Team due to resignation, death, or Member moving from this Neighborhood Council area; nominations will be taken from the council for replacement candidates and the vacant position shall be filled by a majority vote at the next regular meeting.

2.5 Leadership Team shall be comprised of 5 to 7 members. The terms of the Leadership Team shall be staggered, and one or two years in duration. 2.6 Leadership Team Members may serve three consecutive terms by a majority vote of the Neighborhood Council.

2.7 Duties of the Leadership Team:

1. Convene and administer at neighborhood Council Meetings.

2. Report to Community Forum via the elected Community Forum Representative.

3. Report to City Council as necessary and with approval of the Leadership Team.

4. Record and submit minutes of meetings to the City Clerk.

5. Take attendance to be submitted as part of the minutes.

6. Set up and maintain a communication system between Members and/or City Government.

7. Submit minority reports when provided.

8. Set and file meeting agendas with the City Clerk.

9. Create Committees as needed and coordinate its volunteers.

10. Account for and report expenses and income in accordance with City Fiscal Policy.

11. May publish a newsletter.
12. Respond to City Agencies on the Neighborhood Council's behalf and report back to the Neighborhood Council at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

13. Attempt to encourage participation of people in all Neighborhood Council activities.

3.0 MEETINGS

A regular meeting of the Franklin to Fort Neighborhood Council shall meet at least once a year.

3.1 Neighborhood Council meetings shall be conducted by a moderator selected by the Neighborhood Council.

3.2 Meetings shall be conducted in an open manner. If necessary, a Three Minute Rule per member per issue may be initiated to expedite proceedings. In the event of unruly or otherwise unproductive behavior during Neighborhood Council meetings, Roberts Rules of Order shall be followed. Neighborhood Council meetings shall comply with Montana Open Meeting Law, Public Participation in Government Operations Statute, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

3.3 Leadership Team shall schedule meetings. However, a meeting may be called by any 20 Members of the Neighborhood Council who will designate a contact person to carry their request to the Leadership Team of the Franklin to Fort Neighborhood Council. The Leadership Team of the Franklin to Fort Council would have 7 days to respond to the contact person or that person then could appeal to the Community Forum for resolution of the issue for which the meeting was requested.

4.0 COMMITTEES

Committees of the Neighborhood Council shall be formed by the Leadership Team as needed. These may take the form of standing committees of permanent duration or ad-hoc committees focused on specific issues. Committee recommendations must be submitted to the Neighborhood Council for a vote before action may be taken.

4.1 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Membership on committees shall be open to all Members of the Neighborhood Council. Committee members must have been present at the last Committee meeting to vote on an issue for the current meeting. This encourages regular attendance which will keep all Members of the Committee informed.
5.0 EXPENDITURES

All expenditures of the Neighborhood Council shall be made with approval of no less than three members of the Leadership Team. All expenditures must comply with City Fiscal Policy.

6.0 BOUNDARIES

Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council shall review its boundaries bi-annually.

7.0 COMMUNITY FORUM REPRESENTATIVE

Franklin to Fort Neighborhood Council shall elect its Community Forum Representative and an alternate to attend Community Forum meetings.

8.0 AMENDMENTS

Proposed amendments to these By-Laws shall be presented for discussion at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Neighborhood Council. These proposed amendments shall be available in written form at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which the amendments will be voted on. A majority of Members present is a requirement to adopt any amendment.
Franklin to the Fort Infrastructure Plan

Preliminary Scope of Work

Activity Sequence

The following is a preliminary work program for completing the Franklin to the Fort Infrastructure Plan (F2FIP). Mike Barton will be the Project Manager for the plan. A detailed timeline is being developed.

- Draft and finalize scope of work/goals/work plan/timeline
- Assemble OPG and other City technical staff (Public Works, Parks, & Fire) and fine-tune scope, etc.
- Review scope with Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council Leadership Team (F2FNCLT).
  a) 5 January 2005 – NCLT meets to discuss (without OPG)
  b) 12 January 2005 – Traffic & Planning team meets
  c) 2 February 2005 – NCLT meets with OPG
- Reach agreement on scope with F2FNCLT, Planning Board, City Council, & staff.
- Set up web site.
- Set up mailing list.
- **Kick-Off (Meeting #1) – 9 March, 2005**
  a) Introduce Neighborhood leaders, City Council representatives and staff (F2FNCLT).
  b) Explain the plan and why it is being done (F2FNCLT).
  c) Show the Plan Area/Neighborhood boundary (staff).
  d) Present & explain scope, etc. (staff).
  e) Invite audience comments on issues. Important—we need to have consensus on the scope before the meeting.
- **Existing Conditions Assessment (including map layers) Mapping can start immediately**
  a) Air photo base (the most recently available to show existing structures)
  b) Neighborhood Boundary
  c) Property lines
  d) Street Right-of-Way (ROW)
  e) Street Functional Classification
  f) Street conditions (paved or unpaved)
  g) Curb & Gutter
h) Sidewalks
i) Trails or paths
j) Utility lines, reservoirs, pump stations, etc.
k) Irrigation ditches
l) Contour elevations
m) Parks (developed & undeveloped, including acreages)
n) Traffic Volumes
o) Traffic Calming
p) Transit Routes
q) Fire Hydrants
r) Research and compile information from other documents, e.g.,
   1) 2004 Missoula Urban Transportation Plan Update,
   2) Russell/Third EIS,
   3) City Master Sidewalk Plan,
   4) 2001 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan,
   5) City Parks Master Plan,
   6) 2004-2008 Missoula Consolidated Plan
   7) Urban Renewal District (URD) III Plan
   8) Other area plans.
s) Other?

• **Neighborhood Issue Identification (Meeting #2, workshop format)**
  a) Check Maps for Accuracy (neighborhood participants)
  b) Identify issues or problems, e.g., an especially dangerous street
     because of high traffic and no sidewalks
  c) Identify opportunities, e.g., a vacant lot that people cut across on
     foot might be a good park location.

• **Recommended Improvements (Meeting #3)**
  a) Location of needed improvements, prioritized or not
  b) Funding Options (e.g., Open Space levy; ordered in under Master
     Sidewalk Program; by owner at building permit; through SID;
     through CDBG; etc.)

• **Release Draft Plan**
• **Neighborhood Meeting (#4) on Draft Plan**
• **Planning Board Public Hearing**
• **City Council Public Hearing**
• **PAZ Review**
• **City Council Adoption**
Agency Assistance & Staff Needed For Project  
Estimated hours

- OPG Transportation  
- OPG Cartography  
- City Attorney  
- City Public Works
  a) Streets (includes attending 1-3 meetings)  
  b) Bike/Ped (includes attending 1-3 meetings)  
  c) Sidewalks (includes attending 1-3 meetings)  
- City Parks & Rec. (includes attending 1-3 meetings)  
- City Neighborhood Liaison--  

**Total FTE Hours** 1,810
F2FIP Outline

I Introduction & Background

II Transportation (Including curbs, gutters & sidewalks and traffic from David Schmetterling’s letter)
   A. Streets & Roads
   B. Non-Motorized Facilities (e.g., sidewalks, trails, bicycle facilities)
   C. Transit
   D. Fire Hydrants

(For each of the above, address existing conditions, recommendations, goals, objectives and strategies)

III Parks
   A. Existing Conditions
   B. Recommendations

(For each of the above, address existing conditions, recommendations, goals, objectives and strategies)
Memo

To: Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council Leadership Team
From: Office of Planning & Grants
Subject: Franklin To the Fort Infrastructure Plan Scope of Work, Issues & Expectations
Date: December 15, 2004

Specifics the Neighborhood hope to see addressed in the Infrastructure Plan:

1. Sidewalks
2. Curbs & gutters
3. Traffic (includes functional classification, connectivity traffic calming, etc.)
4. Parks (includes trails, new parks and improving existing parks)
5. Fire Hydrants

To facilitate this plan proceeding, David Schmetterling (11-12-04 letter) requests information and guidance regarding the plan and how the Neighborhood Council can help and be involved. OPG responses are in italic. Specifically:

1. "When can OPG start work on the infrastructure plan?"  
   TBD after 1-1-05
2. "What is the anticipated timeline for the infrastructure plan?"  
   TBD aim for 6-30-05, no later than end of FFY 05, or 9-30-05
3. "How can the neighborhood participate, or facilitate in completing the infrastructure plan?"

Ways the Neighborhood Can Participate in Completing the Plan

- Think about how you want to deal with traffic, what you want out of parks, curbs, and sidewalks.
- Attend meetings or workshops and tell friends and neighbors to do the same.
- Offer comments and ask questions at meetings, at workshops, by phone, letter, in person, or e-mail.
- Review maps and documents and let us know where we missed something or got something wrong.

Ways the Neighborhood Can Facilitate in Completion of Plan

- Encourage friends and neighbors to attend meetings, workshops, about the plan.
• When people get involved in the middle of or late in the process, help bring them up to speed about the plan and what it is trying to accomplish. Skeptical citizens will believe knowledgeable neighbors sooner than they will planners and engineers.
• Help publicize meetings, workshops, and other events by distributing flyers, etc.
• Provide staff with local knowledge about the neighborhood such as traffic problem spots, good park locations, etc.
• Help OPG identify low income and minority populations, the elderly and people with disabilities. We need to encourage their participation in the planning process because it’s a good idea, and it’s the law.
• At the kickoff meeting, Neighborhood leaders can encourage citizens to stay informed about future meetings and other events in the process by using the e-mail 16 December 2004 Franklin To the For Infrastructure Plan Page 6 of 6 or the web or calling us. We won’t be able to afford mailed notification for each meeting or other public involvement opportunity.
• Encourage people with computers to participate in the process through the web and e-mail if they can do so.

4. What are the **OPG’s expectations** from the Neighborhood?

• The plan will be limited to the types of infrastructure identified by the Neighborhood—sidewalks, curbs, traffic parks & hydrants
• Let’s keep the public involvement process simple.
• For the first (kick-off) meeting inviting the “whole world” (neighborhood residents, business owners, renters, homeowners, etc.). Use flyers, drop leaflets, announce it on the website, and press releases to print and other news media Use the RR/ED “Neighborhood Coordinating Group” model as a neighborhood public involvement vehicle—anyone who wants to may participate.
• OPG will post information in its website and on the City’s Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood website.
• OPG will develop an e-mail list for those interested in receiving information electronically.
• We need to be clear on what “traffic” means—street connectivity, traffic calming, cut-through traffic, speeding, etc.
• To minimize misunderstandings about what the plan is and is not, the Neighborhood, City Council and OPG need to agree on what the plan will cover and what assumptions the plan will make about land use patterns, density, zoning, buildout, and other issues. The agreement should be reduced to writing and signed by representatives from the Neighborhood Council, City Council, Planning Board and OPG.
Expansion of the scope of the plan should occur only if parties agree on the expansion and on additional time or resources needed for the additional work.

- If we are not careful to clearly define and agree on the scope of the plan, we could end up debating issues that belong in a "neighborhood plan" rather than in an infrastructure plan.
- OPG should provide appropriate lead time for citizens to review plan drafts and other materials related to the planning process, even if this means pushing back the completion date. The Council needs to concur in this approach. Stuff tends to take longer than expected.
- OPG will draft the plan document and prepare the maps, etc. The Neighborhood will review and comment.
- The Neighborhood, Planning Board, City Council and staff may need to agree to disagree on some issues.
APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW GUIDE – STAFF PARTICIPANTS

Opening Statement:

Thank you for meeting with me today. As you know, I have been attending meetings with the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council. I have appreciated the opportunity to attend neighborhood planning meetings. The reason I have been coming is because of my interest in planning. I have lived in Missoula for more than 20 years and I once lived this neighborhood for three years. I am conducting these interviews, as well as a survey that will be sent out to a sample of residents in the neighborhood in order to understand how residents are involved in neighborhood planning. I am interested to see how well the Neighborhood Council works as a model to provide opportunities for neighborhood residents to participate in planning in their neighborhood.

Today I would like to ask you a few questions about how Neighborhood Councils work. I invite you to use as many specific examples as you can from the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council. Although I will take note of your name so that I can keep the interviews from getting mixed up, your name will not be reported with your answers unless everyone that I interview permits me to use their name by initialing it on the consent form. Your participation is voluntary, and you may ask me to skip questions or terminate the interview if you desire. Your response to each question however, is valuable and appreciated.

Are there any questions that you have for me about the consent form, or about my study before we begin?

Questions:

1. Before we begin, could you tell me a little about your position (with the OPG / as the Neighborhood Liaison).

   How long have you been working here?

2. Neighborhood Councils appear to be the lowest level of organized planning in Missoula; what can you tell me about what they do and the powers that they have?

   Why did Missoula choose to establish Neighborhood Councils?

   How do you in your position, interact with Neighborhood Councils?

3. When a neighborhood such as Franklin to the Fort wishes to develop a plan, how do they go about doing it?
How are you involved in that process?

What other plans have been prepared by Neighborhood Councils in Missoula?

Before Neighborhood Councils, what other participatory planning measures were used in Missoula?

4. What role has local government and planning officials played in the development of Franklin to the Fort’s Infrastructure Plan?

   How do the contributions of the Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council compare to the contributions of the Office of Planning and Grants in regards to the work and voice of this plan?

   When considering both paid staff (such as OPG) and neighborhood volunteers, what would you say is the hierarchy of leaders and decision makers who are involved in preparing this plan?

5. How well do you think the decisions of the leadership team represent what the residents of the neighborhood want in the F2F Infrastructure Plan?

   How do peoples’ personal lives and experiences with planning influence the decisions that they make when preparing plans such as the F2F Infrastructure Plan?

6. What challenges does the current Neighborhood Council design impose on the planning process?

7. Is there anything else that you would like to share with me today about how Neighborhood Councils function?

Conclusion:

I want to thank you for your participation today. I also want to assure you that I have been impressed with the organization and professionalism shown in Franklin to the Fort Neighborhood Council meetings. Thank you again for helping me to understand a little more about how Neighborhood Councils work.
APPENDIX K: INTERVIEW GUIDE – NEIGHBORHOOD PARTICIPANTS

Opening Statement:

Thank you for meeting with me today. I have appreciated the opportunity to attend your neighborhood meetings. The reason I have been coming is because of my interest in planning. I have lived in Missoula for more than 20 years and I once lived in your neighborhood for three years. I am conducting these interviews, as well as a survey that will be sent out to a sample of residents in the neighborhood in order to understand how residents are involved in neighborhood planning. I am interested to see how well the Neighborhood Council works as a model to provide opportunities for neighborhood residents to participate in planning in their neighborhood.

Today I would like to ask you a few questions about your experiences in planning. Although I will record your name so that I can keep the interviews from getting mixed up, your name will not be reported with your answers unless everyone that I interview permits me to use their name by initialing it on the consent form. Your participation is voluntary, and you may ask me to skip questions that you are uncomfortable answering. Your response to each question however, is valuable and appreciated.

Are there any questions that you have for me about the consent form, or about my study before we begin?

Questions:

1. How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

2. What is your line of work?

3. How did you become involved in neighborhood planning?

4. What past experiences have you had in planning?

5. How has your personal life and experiences influenced the decisions you have made as a planning committee member?

6. Some key components have been identified for development in the infrastructure plan. Regardless of what is identified in the plan so far, what would you personally say are the most key issues?

   How would you say others feel about the issues you just mentioned?
7. What, if any, issues have the committee not agreed upon?
   How have disagreements been resolved?
   Are there any conflicts which have not been resolved?

8. What do you wish could be addressed in the infrastructure plan that has not been fully developed? (Are there issues that were brought up, and then dismissed?)

9. Describe the structure of the neighborhood leadership to me.
   Is there any kind of leadership hierarchy in the development of the infrastructure plan?

10. What role have city officials and the Office of Planning and Grants played in the development of the infrastructure plan?

11. How much influence do you feel the neighborhood has had throughout the process?

12. What have been the greatest successes so far during the development of the infrastructure plan?
   Why do you feel those items were a success?

13. Is anything that you feel the neighborhood has not been able to accomplish because of the way the process is set up?

Conclusion:

I want to thank you for your participation today. I have enjoyed attending neighborhood meetings, and I think there have been some great successes throughout this process. When I have completed my research, I hope to have the opportunity to share my findings with you and the other participants. Thank you again for helping me to understand a little more about Neighborhood Councils.
January 07, 2006

Greetings!

Within the next couple days you will receive in the mail a request to fill out a brief questionnaire for an important neighborhood planning study that is being conducted locally by me, a Master’s degree candidate at the University of Montana. You have been selected because your address is within the Franklin-to-the-Fort Neighborhood Council boundaries.

The survey asks about your opinions on current planning issues in your neighborhood. Your responses to this survey are important regardless of your understanding of planning in your neighborhood.

I am writing in advance because research has shown that many people like to know ahead of time that they will be contacted. This study is particularly important because it will address some of the strengths and weaknesses of the Neighborhood Council as a planning body. Your confidential responses to survey questions may prove useful to the University, to local government, and to other interested parties beyond Missoula.

In order for the results to represent residents in your neighborhood, the survey should be completed and returned by an adult (18 years of age and older) who is a primary owner or renter of this property. Please share this letter with such a person.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It is only with the generous help of people like you that will allow my research to be successful.

Sincerely,

Brian Speer
Graduate student
Geography Department
University of Montana
Dear neighborhood resident,

I would like to thank you in advance for filling out the following survey. The purpose of this survey is to gather information about your neighborhood’s recent planning efforts.

You will be asked about your opinions on certain planning issues and about your awareness and involvement in neighborhood planning. Your answers to each question are important regardless of your understanding of planning in your neighborhood.

Developing neighborhood plans which are specific enough to create action, yet general enough to please each resident can be difficult. Many different models have been used in the past to involve neighborhoods in planning. This research will be used to aid planners and Neighborhood Councils both locally and beyond by providing a greater understanding of strengths and weaknesses of the Neighborhood Council as a participatory planning model.

Your answers will be kept confidential, and you are asked not to write your name on the survey. Your participation is voluntary, and you may skip questions that you are uncomfortable answering. Your responses to each question however, are valuable and appreciated.

I am conducting this study in partial fulfillment of a master’s degree as a student at the University of Montana. Your answers may prove useful to the University, to local government, and to other interested parties beyond Missoula. If you are interested in the results of this study, please send a self-addressed stamped envelope to the address below, and you will be notified when the report is complete (expected completion is June, 2006).

Thank you again for your participation,

Brian Speer,

Mail inquiries to:

Graduate Student
Geography Department
University of Montana
91 Campus Dr.
Missoula, MT 59801

If you have questions about the authenticity of this survey, please contact Professor David Shively at 406-243-6478.
1. What is the street intersection nearest to your household?
   Corner of _____________________
   and ____________________(street)

2. Are you:  Mark one box (X).
   □ Renting or leasing your home
   □ Buying or already own your home
   □ Other (specify) ______________________

3. How long have you lived in this home?
   □ Less than 2 years
   □ 2 – 5 years
   □ 6 – 10 years
   □ 11 – 15 years
   □ 16 – 20 years
   □ More than 20 years

4. How long do you expect to live in this neighborhood?
   □ Less than 2 years
   □ 2 – 5 years
   □ 6 – 10 years
   □ 11 – 15 years
   □ 16 – 20 years
   □ More than 20 years

5. How safe are the streets in your neighborhood for walking and riding bikes?
   □ Pretty Safe
   □ Moderate
   □ Pretty Unsafe

6. How important do you think it is to have sidewalks throughout your neighborhood?
   □ Very important
   □ Moderately important
   □ Not important

7. How important do you think it is to have streetlamps throughout your neighborhood?
   □ Very important
   □ Moderately important
   □ Not important

8. You would say that the amount of automobile traffic in your neighborhood is:
   □ Too much
   □ Just right
   □ Very little

9. Drivers in your neighborhood are:
   □ Pretty Safe
   □ About average
   □ Pretty Unsafe

10. How often do you use bus stops in your neighborhood?
    □ Almost daily
    □ Approx. 1–2 times per week
    □ Approx. 1–2 times per month
    □ Approx. 1–2 times per year
    □ Not at all

11. The following are some issues that Missoula is currently facing. Please mark for each of these, the level of priority you think should be given to each issue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Priority</th>
<th>Lower Priority</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attracting businesses</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing affordable housing opportunities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving streets and road systems</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting neighborhood character</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you think there is too much, just right, or too little of each of the following in your neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too Much</th>
<th>Just Right</th>
<th>Too Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transit, like busses</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds, places to recreate</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops &amp; grocery stores</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks and trails</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services like fire, law enforcement</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How often would you say that you hear about planning issues in your community?
   □ Almost daily
   □ Approx. 1–2 times per week
   □ Approx. 1–2 times per month
   □ A few times each year
   □ Almost never

14. Please mark “yes” if you have heard of the following organization and “no” if you have not:

   Yes  No
   City Council  □  □
   Community Forum  □  □
   Neighborhood Council  □  □
   Neighborhood Leadership Team  □  □
   Franklin-to-the-Fort Neighborhood  □  □
   Office of Planning and Grants  □  □

15. Please mark “yes” if you feel you understand the duties of the following organization and “no” if you do not:

   Yes  No
   City Council  □  □
   Community Forum  □  □
   Neighborhood Council  □  □
   Neighborhood Leadership Team  □  □
   Franklin-to-the-Fort Neighborhood  □  □
   Office of Planning and Grants  □  □

16. From your experience, what portion of the streets in your neighborhood are smoothly paved, with holes filled?
   □ All of them
   □ More than half
   □ Less than half

17. Curbs and gutters may allow for better street maintenance. However, they may also decrease parking areas in front of some homes. How important do you think it is to have curbs and gutters throughout your neighborhood?
   □ Very important
   □ Moderately important
   □ Not important

18. When you hear the word “infrastructure” as it relates to your neighborhood, what do you think of? Mark “yes” or “no.”

   Yes  No
   Curbs & gutters  □  □
   Bus stops  □  □
   Road maintenance  □  □
   Open/Green spaces  □  □
   Crosswalks  □  □
   Fire hydrants  □  □
   Traffic signs  □  □
   Trail systems  □  □
   Other(s)  □  □
   (specify)

19. How many neighborhood planning meetings have you attended in the past 24 months?
   □ None
   □ 1 – 2
   □ 3 – 4
   □ 5 or more
   □ 5 or more, I have participated as a committee or leadership member

20. Recently, an infrastructure plan has begun to be developed in your neighborhood. How did you first find out about it?
   □ I just found out from this survey
   □ I saw signs posted in the neighborhood
   □ A flyer was left on my door
   □ I heard about it from a neighbor
   □ I heard from the media (newspaper, television, radio, etc.)
   □ Other  □  □
   (specify)  ____________________________
21. Which of the following do you think should be considered in an infrastructure plan for your neighborhood? Mark “yes” or “no.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood safety</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit review</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(s)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How thoroughly have infrastructure issues in your neighborhood been discussed?
- ☐ Pretty well
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Pretty poorly
- ☐ I don’t know well enough to say

23. How well do you think your opinions about neighborhood infrastructure are represented at neighborhood meetings?
- ☐ Pretty well
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Pretty poorly
- ☐ I don’t know well enough to say

24. How well do Neighborhood Councils work to develop neighborhood plans?
- ☐ Pretty well
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Pretty poorly
- ☐ I don’t know well enough to say

25. How willing would you be to pay a special assessment tax on your property to improve the infrastructure (sidewalks, curbs, parks, traffic calming, etc.) in your neighborhood?
- ☐ I would support it
- ☐ I am undecided
- ☐ I would oppose it

26. From what you understand about the infrastructure plan, how well do you think it will meet the needs of the neighborhood?
- ☐ Pretty well
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Pretty poorly
- ☐ I don’t know well enough to say

27. Do you have any religious, political, or other personal beliefs which make you less inclined to participate in neighborhood planning?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I’m not sure

28. How old were you on your last birthday?

__ __ Years (age)

29. Including yourself, how many adults (18 yrs. or older) live in your household?

__ __ Number of Adults

30. How many people under the age of 18 live in your household?

__ __ Number of children

31. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? Mark one box (X).
- ☐ Some high school
- ☐ High School Diploma or GED
- ☐ Some college
- ☐ 2-yr college degree (Associate’s)
- ☐ 4-yr college degree (Bachelor’s)
- ☐ Post-Graduate Degree (such as a Master’s, Doctoral, or other equivalent degree)
32. What is the highest degree or level of school completed by your spouse or other supporting adult? Mark one box (X).

☐ Some high school
☐ High School Diploma or GED
☐ Some college
☐ 2-yr college degree (Associate's)
☐ 4-yr college degree (Bachelor's)
☐ Post-Graduate Degree (such as a Master's, Doctoral, or other equivalent degree)

33. Which of the following best describes your employment situation right now? Mark one box (X).

☐ Employed full-time
☐ Employed part-time
☐ Employed, but on leave
☐ Staying at home / homemaker
☐ Not employed
☐ In school
☐ Retired

34. Which of the following best describes the employment situation of your spouse or other supporting adult right now? Mark one box (X).

☐ Employed full-time
☐ Employed part-time
☐ Employed, but on leave
☐ Staying at home / homemaker
☐ Not employed
☐ In school
☐ Retired

35. Which of the following categories best describes your annual household income?

☐ Less than $10,000
☐ $10,000 - $19,999
☐ $20,000 - $29,999
☐ $30,000 - $39,999
☐ $40,000 - $49,999
☐ $50,000 - $59,999
☐ $60,000 - $69,999
☐ $70,000 - $79,999
☐ $80,000 - $89,999
☐ $90,000 - $99,999
☐ $100,000 or more

You may use this space for any additional comments you may wish to make.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Thank you for participating in this survey!

Please take a moment now and seal the survey in the return envelope provided and place it in your mailbox.
Thank You for participating in the Neighborhood Planning Study. I hope you have taken the opportunity to return the survey I sent out to you. Your insight is useful and appreciated.

If you have not returned this survey, please take a minute to complete and return it now.

Your opinion is valued, and your responses are indicative of how well participatory neighborhood planning is working in Missoula.

Sincerely,

Brian Speer
Graduate Student, Geography Department

Franklin Neighborhood Resident
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