

Laurie Hire

From: caps
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 4:44 PM
To: caps
Subject: FW: Open Space Bond Comments

From: Jim Conkle [<mailto:jimconkle@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, June 24, 2018 3:37 PM
To: David Strohmaier <dstrohmaier@missoulacounty.us>; jdbari@ci.missoula.mt.us; jramos@ci.missoula.mt.us; conkle <jimconkle@yahoo.com>
Subject: Open Space Bond Comments

Hi

I am writing to the three of you because:
I know Dave and John are sensible people and not on the extreme as to their positions.
I am including Jessie, as he is the only conservative in Missoula government.
(It was amazing to see the lack of candidates on the recent ballot, but, a logical decision for a Republican not to run)
Jessie, I will be curious in watching to see if you are a sensible conservative, not extreme.
I write this with it being a public document that I will stand behind.

I am the vanishing breed of being a moderate.
I wish I wasn't, it would be so wasy to spout the mantra of one of the tribes. No need to think.
I thank you all for your service, and I discount my own input due to my failure to run for public office.
But, if on these types of issues, I offer my time to whomever.

Because of the pathetic current status of public discourse, I found myself turning off the national news this weekend, and retreating to SpongeBob Squarepants for more enlightenment. (no young children involved with that watching). I am amazed that people do not think that Montana and Missoula are headed in that direction. The means justify the ends. Lack of transparent disclosure is becoming more prevalent.
A non-Democrat/Progressive in Missoula is now justifying comments based on "they are all the same"

A moderate's thoughts.
(based on the Missoulian.....very mediocre paper at best.....rarely a thoughtful question asked , and my own experience.
And, % of Missoula readers are now so low it does not count as true information disclosure to the wider community.
Therefore, your civic obligation is more important as most people won't vote and won't know about the bond.

Process that successfully passed the "Parks and Trails bond" (90% to the FT Missoula Sports Complex)
and comments as to the Open Space Bond

1) I assume on this point, the powers to be met privately and set out a timeline as to when best to place the Mountain Line, School, Library etc bond on the ballot to enhance passage based on public's failure to not group all spending as spending. There probably is statistical strategy as to when to be able to ask for more \$\$\$\$. It is the Open Space Bond turn. I assume the next bond priority to put on the ballot has already been negotiated. Transparency suggests that be disclosed.

2) The "support group" is formed. The public employees, in theory, doing what they are allowed/supposed to, appearance of neutrality, while the private support group is not restrained in presenting a one sided presentation to the public. Any guess as to the economic status of most of this group? They all giggled at the Fort meeting "when the cost to taxpayers was explained as just a latte a day"

- 3) The private group hires a survey company. The company's, hired for the Fort, front page on their web site stated "we will help you get your bond passed". Not that we will provide you with honest and transparent information. The information in the nearly 100 page document was used by supporters in a cherry picked fashion at best, dishonest at worst.
- 4) The survey justifies the next step. A more detailed sales/marketing of the idea. I assume this is where they chose to call the "Fort Bond" the "parks and trails bond" and also chose the ballot language not to include a breakdown of what the spending amounts were for each of the components. How can you vote against "parks and trails". Easier to vote against a bond that mostly benefits the above average family. I do not see the current survey posted for easy review which Donna Gaulker cites as support. If the questions are suggestive, "should all our farmland be commercialized and lost forever?" as compared to " should we be able to convert farmland to allow for affordable housing development?" will make the data show two totally different outcomes. I can't wait to read the ballot language.
- 5) Unsubstantiated statements made with no authority or documentation. In the Fort, my favorites were how Frenchtown and Seeley Lake residents would use the Fort. The voting results showed otherwise. I live in the Rattlesnake, and my family has yet to decide the drive time is worth it. I am on the board of Larchmont Golf Course. I get a free pass. Even with that, we go to the University just as much to save the time. No survey has been taken as to who is using the Fort that is not involved with a big event. On the open space, Donna Gaulkler was quoted as saying "I have talked to people who say we can do open space and have affordable housing" She did not disclose who those people were. Missoula has spent (I believe \$20,000) to investigate the benefit of bike lanes on 5th and 6th. Public officials should only be citing actual data, or at least disclose that this is pure opinion. Logically, an unbiased economist is the only true expert on this issue and should be hired.
- AND, all of our budget issues are resolved as we can contract our employees out to every other similar situated city as to how that will be accomplished. I am sure San Fran, Portland, Boise, Boulder, Bozeman etc will hire the fix that they have spent millions on with little results.
- 6) The private group hires the analytical data company to allow them to target the correct pool of voters. Unlike Trump V Clinton, the opponents don't exist and do not hire a like company. Totally legal, good strategy, but obvious one sided impact on the vote.
- 7) Missoulians likes our open spaces was one of the quotes. True. But I like to see the Mountains. With all the high rises downtown, and no visibility. I now choose to take N 1st St to my house whenever possible. Even though I will dislike it infill is obviously coming. Something has to give. (The University Housing overlay allows for one more thing to be quoted as the process is not equal among Missoulians) I assume this Bond will push the affordable housing clusters out to Frenchtown and beyond, similar to what has happened in Bozeman. A narrow discussion will probably occur. No discussion as to the impact that commuters will cause to CO2 zero impact plan. Similar to the Fort hosting regional events where the quantity of big SUV's driving to the soccer tournament from distant cities is conveniently ignored.

In summary, I believe the Bond will pass. There will be likely little transparent discussion and disclosure. I discovered that in my involvement in the Fort. No trailer park residents will attend any meetings.(it would be fun to ask the public comment makers if any are on Snap/Food Stamps) Even affordable housing advocates will stay silent because of no desire to upset the team.

No discussion as to the impact in the future as the Feds and State will continue to cut dollar contributions that are plugged into our budget as forever. No discussion as to prioritization such as would you rather fund the mental/disability case managers or open space.

The belief that money is unlimited, is a false belief..

The Fed Deficit, along with the lack of social security, medicare, and medicaid long term solutions will make the need for tough decisions in the future. I assert that a true progressive is already thinking about conserving some spending for the needy of the future.

(Note.....I am a Simpson/Bolles supporter.....need more taxes and reduce benefits.....prioritization)

No need to respond, just wanted to spout.

P.S.

It is hard to understand city preliminary budget employee \$\$\$ request.

Administrative Assistant for Municipal Court request of \$60,800

I would think it will be advertised at about \$15 an hour.

2000 hours X \$15 = \$30,000

The rest in benefits?

Thanks for your time.

And seriously, thanks for your civic investment of your time.

Jim Conkle