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CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>The University of Montana-Missoula South Campus Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Implementation Date:</td>
<td>2007 through 2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent:</td>
<td>The University of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Missoula, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The University of Montana - Missoula (UM) is committed to developing a long-term strategy to provide facilities and surroundings to support various programs which are consistent with UM's vision, mission and strategic goals. A Master Plan was completed for the Mountain (Main) Campus in 2002. The Master Plan for Fort Missoula followed in 2004. As the third component in the UM strategic planning process, UM has proposed a physical development plan for the UM lands currently known as the South Campus. South Campus is located at the base of Mount Sentinel in Missoula, Montana. The 193 acres of South Campus lands lie in Section 27 and Section 34 of Township 13 North, Range 19 West in Missoula County. The planning area is bounded by Higgins Avenue, South Avenue, Maurice Avenue and Woodworth Avenue as well as City of Missoula open space lands (Figure 1). The planning and future development of the South Campus would be guided by the following principles:

- Integrate South Campus with Mountain Campus;
- Maximize flexibility;
- Preserve open space;
- Value community relations;
- Create a safe campus environment; and
- Strengthen transportation, circulation and parking while ensuring accessibility.

Approximately 25% of the planning area is currently developed with UM Lewis & Clark Village student housing and family housing (Elliot Village, Toole Village and Craighead/Sisson Apartments); Park-N-Ride service; Dombleser Stadium, Soccer Stadium and athletic practice fields; three research greenhouses, a community garden and a hang gliding landing area. A nine-hole golf course, putting green, driving range, pro-shop and clubhouse and two public easements to Mount Sentinel occupy the remainder of the planning area. Besides the UM research greenhouses, there are no academic facilities currently on South Campus.

The South Campus Master Plan (the Plan) proposes to develop new academic/research buildings and additional student housing, athletic facilities, recreational fields and parking and transportation centers on South Campus (Figure 2). The Craighead/Sisson Apartments (X's) would eventually be replaced with student housing that better meets the needs of students. The development proposed in the Plan would eventually replace the golf course and its associated facilities. Approximately 25% of the planning area consists of the moderate to steep slopes of Mount Sentinel and would remain open space. South Campus would be developed according to the Plan over a time period of 50 years; 2007 to 2057.

UM is part of the Montana University System (MUS). The MUS is obligated under Montana legislative order to accept all Montana resident students into one of the fourteen MUS campuses. UM is obligated to provide students with adequate academic facilities and student housing. The fall 2007 enrollment at UM, including the College of Technology (COT), was 13,858 students (MUS 2007). UM is currently unable to meet its obligation to students on the Main Campus because:

- the current classroom space on the Mountain Campus is inadequate for current attendance resulting in class meetings in temporary trailers in some cases;
• annual research funding requires specific and adequate program facilities not currently available or possible on the Mountain Campus;
• student housing is currently at capacity and enrollment has been increasing each year (MUS 2007); and
• UM programs are forced to spread their students, faculty and research facilities across several buildings on the Mountain Campus, which degrades efficiency, collaboration and cohesion.

The Plan would require the eventual phasing out of the golf course and its associated structures. All of the other structures, facilities and easements would remain on South Campus, with the exception of the Craighead/Sisson Apartments which would eventually be replaced with new student housing.

Proposed development details analyzed in this Checklist Environmental Assessment were provided in the South Campus Master Plan (UM 2007).

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:
   Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

   • Thirty committee, special interest group or public meetings were held between December 18, 2006 and October 15, 2007;
   • Numerous articles and opinion pieces were published in the UM Kaiman and Missoulian newspapers;
   • Board of Regents approved further analysis of the Plan at their meeting held September 19 through 21, 2007; and
   • Board of Regents unanimously approved the Plan at their meeting held November 14 through 16, 2007.

Groups involved in planning and development of the Plan included:

• UM students, faculty and administrators;
• Alumni Association;
• FarViews/Pattee Canyon Neighborhood Council;
• Lewis & Clark Neighborhood Council;
• University Neighborhood Council;
• Missoula Office of Planning and Grants;
• saltStudio, Inc.; and
• The Collaboration Institute.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

• Missoula Engineering Department – building and construction permits
• Missoula Wastewater Treatment Plant – discharge permit
• Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Water Protection Bureau – Stormwater Discharge Permit

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative: UM would not implement the Plan but would continue to own the lands in the planning area. Future development possibilities and management changes by UM are beyond the scope of this analysis.

Proposed Action Alternative: UM would implement the Plan over the next 50 years. New academic/research buildings and additional student housing, athletic facilities, recreational fields and parking and transportation
centers would be constructed. The golf course and its associated structures would eventually be removed. All of the other existing structures and facilities would remain.

Alternatives Considered But Dismissed:

1. Expand within the existing Mountain Campus – this alternative did not meet the purpose and need of UM’s obligation to Montana students or the planning guiding principles because the Mountain Campus is built-out. There is inadequate space available to expand the current buildings or construct new buildings to accommodate additional student housing, classrooms, office space or research facilities. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed.

2. Develop UM-owned lands at Fort Missoula – Fort Missoula is located too far for UM to provide efficient public transportation or for students to travel on their own from existing housing and academic facilities at the Mountain Campus; therefore, it does not integrate the campuses. Secondly, the UM-owned lands at Fort Missoula could not accommodate the configuration of student housing and academic buildings to meet the needs of UM. Last, a significant amount of the UM-owned lands at Fort Missoula are in the flood plain and therefore cannot be developed. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed.

3. Develop UM acquisition land on South 5th Street East and South 6th Street East – the area of homes that has been acquired on these residential streets would likely provide only enough room for one building the size of the Gallagher Business Building. Furthermore, most of these homes are occupied and UM does not wish to evict tenants to demolish the homes if the purpose and need of UM’s expansion would not be met. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed.

4. Develop South Campus according to the Plan but purchase the Highlands Golf Course (located closest to the UM golf course) to mitigate the loss of the UM golf course – this alternative was dismissed because the current owner of the Highlands Golf Course withdrew his offer to sell the property to UM. Additionally, public response from the golfing community indicated that the Highlands Golf Course would not be a suitable replacement to the UM golf course on South Campus because it is too steep and not suitable for older golfers or beginners.

### III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- **RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.**
- **Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.**
- **Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.**

#### 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

*Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.*

**Existing Environment:** The surface soils of the planning area consist of Big Arm gravelly loam (Map Unit 19) and Big Arm-Rock complex (Map Unit 20) soils on the slope of Mount Sentinel and Holland Lake gravelly loam (Map Unit 53) on the level portion of the planning area. The portions of the planning area that are already developed with student housing are classified within the Urban Land soil description. All of the proposed development would occur on the Holland Lake gravelly loam. There are no engineering limitations that would limit development on the flat terrain in the planning area (USDA 1995). There is a fault running along the base of Mount Sentinel and Mount Jumbo, but it is believed to be dormant.

**Impacts from No Action:** There would be no impacts related to geology and soils within the planning area.

**Impacts from Proposed Action:** Surface soils would be excavated as needed for the construction of buildings and other facilities as the Plan progressed. There would be no special reclamation considerations necessary to
implement the Proposed Action. There would be no direct, indirect or cumulative negative impacts to geology and soils as part of the Proposed Action.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:
   Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Existing Environment:

Surface water: Pattee Creek flows from east to west along the south boundary of the planning area. Pattee Creek drains a watershed of approximately 6,000 acres. It is a small, 4.7 mile-long stream that has been disconnected from the Clark Fork River through channelization for urban development (MFISH 2007). Pattee Creek is conveyed into a flood control structure at the intersection of Pattee Creek and Higgins Avenue; from this point the creek is channelized. The small storage pond passes normal flow underneath Higgins into the Pattee Creek channel west of the intersection. Flood flows from Pattee Creek are diverted into an underground stormwater collection system to divert water into large containment ponds at Playfair Park. Pattee Creek has experienced many significant flood events. In the recent past, Pattee Creek has flooded eight times (1962, 1964, 1967, 1976, 1980, 1986, 1996 and 1997) and impacted the Missoula urban area surrounding Pattee Creek (NHMP 2001). Pattee Creek is not listed on the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) 303d database of impaired waters (CWAIC 2007).

There are two artificial ponds on the golf course: one adjacent to the Maintenance Shop and one adjacent to Hole #6. These ponds are filled by the irrigation well and are maintained between approximately May 1 and October 1 each year. The remainder of the year the ponds drain to the subsurface and are dry. The ponds were constructed in approximately 1988 and 1992, respectively (Burt pers. comm.).

Groundwater: Groundwater beneath the planning area lies at a depth of 58 feet to 101 feet below the ground surface (bgs), according to five of six well logs for the University of Montana in Section 34. One exception to this range was indicated on a well log from 1985 which stated that static water level was at a depth of 8 feet below the ground surface (GWIC 2007). Based on the lack of corroborating well information on this well log it may not be accurate.

Stormwater: The EPA established guidelines for designating small municipal separate storm sewer systems (small MS4s), which MDEQ used to create the list of Montana small MS4s named in ARM 17.30.1102(23) because their discharge "results in, or has the potential to result in, exceedances of water quality standards, including impairment of designated uses, or has other significant water quality impacts, including habitat and biological impacts". Municipalities within the Missoula urban area which own and operate small MS4s are the City of Missoula, Missoula County, Montana Department of Transportation – Missoula Office and UM.

UM is required to regulate stormwater discharges through a General Permit. The General Permit requires a stormwater management program that specifies best management practices (BMPs) for minimum control measures and ensures implementation and responsibility for these control measures. The EPA has defined the six minimum control measures as follows:

1) Public Education and Outreach on Stormwater Impacts;
2) Public Involvement/Participation;
3) Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination;
4) Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control;
5) Post-Construction Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment; and
6) Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations.

The General Permit allows for the sharing of responsibilities; as such, the Missoula small MS4 operators have applied for and received coverage under one permit as co-permitees (Permit MTR 040007). UM retains jurisdiction over its own small MS4, maintains its own records and provides information for a common report.
UM's storm drain system is limited to two small piped systems with minor outfalls into the Clark Fork River and injection (dry) wells (MCG 2007).

Water rights: UM holds five water rights for their groundwater use in the planning area. One of the water rights is for domestic use and the other four are for irrigation (WRB 2007).

Impacts from No Action: There would be no impact to water quality, quantity or distribution as a result of the No Action Alternative.

Impacts from Proposed Action: New landscaping would be as efficient and water-wise as possible. Water for irrigation and cooling would be provided by the six on-site wells. Potable water would be provided by Mountain Water Co., the municipal water supply for Missoula. Domestic wastewater would be discharged to the municipal sewer. There would be no underground storage of hazardous materials or petroleum products as part of the Plan. Natural gas would be used as a heating source; however, fuel oil stored in aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) would be utilized as a back-up heating source.

Stormwater: Stormwater from parking lots and other paved surfaces would be discharged to swales and dry wells. The new stormwater discharges would be regulated under UM Permit MTR 040007 and would be required to follow the same guidelines and BMPs for control measures.

Water rights: If UM wants to change the purpose of use for their groundwater rights (for example from irrigation to additional domestic use) they must apply for a change of use through the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. There are no plans to do so at this time.

There would be no modifications to Pattee Creek as part of the Proposed Action. Pattee Creek is hydraulically up-gradient of the planning area; therefore, there would be no increases to discharge to Pattee Creek as a result of stormwater drainage in the planning area. The two artificial ponds may be removed if their location eventually conflicts with academic or student housing construction.

6. AIR QUALITY:
What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Existing Environment: The planning area is not located within a Class I airshed (pristine area). However, areas that violate federal air quality standards are classified as non-attainment areas. The City of Missoula was classified as a non-attainment area for particulate matter and carbon monoxide (CO) (MDEQ 2000). The late fall and winter months see greater negative impacts to air quality due to the inversion conditions that are frequent in the Missoula Valley during that time period. Because of its CO non-attainment status, Missoula was required by the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments to develop an oxygenated fuels program. Missoula has been compliant with all state and federal carbon monoxide standards since 1993. On August 17, 2007 Missoula was reclassified as a "maintenance" area in regards to carbon monoxide, but remains classified as non-attainment for particulate (Schmidt pers. comm.).

Transportation to the Mountain Campus, South Campus and West and East Campus of the COT is by passenger vehicle, Mountain Line public transit, UM Park n' Ride shuttle, walking and biking. The UM Park n' Ride shuttles are fueled with bio-diesel.

Air pollutant emissions related to UM currently come from vehicles driven by students, staff and faculty to UM facilities at the Mountain Campus and the COT. Public transportation buses also contribute air pollution but their negative impacts are lessened by the number of passenger vehicle trips they replace.

Impacts from No Action: All of the academic facilities would continue to be located on the Mountain Campus and the two campuses of COT. UM would continue to provide incentives and encourage alternative transportation; however, there could still be a desire for some students, faculty and staff to bring individual passenger vehicles to campus. Students would increasingly need to find off-campus housing options because
of the lack of available on-campus housing; therefore, these students would need to take vehicles or buses to academic facilities if they could not walk or bike. The impact to air quality as a result of the No Action alternative would depend on the success of UM alternative transportation programs. If the alternative transportation programs continue in their current trend of success (Section 18) and additional enrollment numbers can be mitigated by additional alternative transportation ridership, then air quality should not be affected by the No Action alternative.

**Impacts from Proposed Action:** Additional on-campus housing at South Campus would be built as enrollment needs dictated. South Campus would be developed with academic facilities that centralized academic programs. More on-campus student housing would be available to reduce the need for students to drive to academic facilities. The South Campus would be developed as pedestrian-oriented by directing vehicle traffic to the periphery and by promoting, and giving priority to, carpooling, biking, using public transportation and walking. The South Campus planning area would be analyzed as part of the 30-year Transportation Plan currently being drafted by the Missoula Office of Planning and Grants. Air quality would be modeled to assess whether it conforms to EPA standards.

Similarly to the No Action alternative, the direct and cumulative impacts to air quality as a result of the Proposed Action alternative would depend on the success of UM alternative transportation programs. If the alternative transportation programs continue in their current trend of success (Section 18) and additional enrollment numbers and expanded facilities can be mitigated by additional alternative transportation ridership, then air quality should not be affected by the Proposed Action alternative.

7. **VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:**

   *What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.*

**Existing Environment:** There is very little native vegetation present within the developed portion of the planning area, due to the athletic field, housing and golf course development. A small amount of native grasses and forbs are present on the hillside of Mount Sentinel. The limited amount of native grasses consists of Idaho fescue (*Festuca idahoensis*), bluebunch wheatgrass (*Pseudoroegneria spicata*) and rough fescue (*Festuca scabrella*).

The majority of the vegetation within the planning area consists primarily of landscaped ornamental shrubs and grass and golf course turf. However, there are approximately 24 different species of mature trees present within the golf course, many of which are trees native to Montana. The UM Mountain Campus is designated as the State Arboretum of Montana. The UM South Campus does not currently have a similar designation. There are two small artificial ponds within the planning area on the golf course. These shallow ponds contain wetland vegetation including cattails (*Typha latifolia*), bulrush (*Scirpus spp.*), dagger rush (*Juncus ensifolius*) and other aquatic species. These man-made wetlands are not considered jurisdictional by the Army Corps of Engineers because they have an artificial hydrology source.

The lower hillsides of Mount Sentinel are dominated by mostly undesirable non-native and noxious weeds species with a limited population of native grasses. The Montana stated listed noxious weeds present include spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa*), Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), oxeye daisy (*Chrysanthemum leucanthemum*), dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria vulgaris*), leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*) and sulfur cinquefoil (*Potentilla recta*). The majority of native grasses on the lower hillside of Mount Sentinel are heavily interspersed with cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) and tall tumbled mustard (*Sisymbrium altissimum*), both undesirable non-native species.

A discussion of the obscure evening primrose, a Threatened, Endangered or Sensitive (TES) plant species, is included in Section 9.0.

**Impacts from No Action:** There would be no change to the existing vegetation communities within the planning area.
Impacts from Proposed Action: The golf course would be removed as part of the Proposed Action. UM would include the South Campus as a component of the State Arboretum of Montana. Therefore, the diversity of tree species on South Campus would need to be retained. All construction would be planned to best avoid removing mature trees. If a tree species would be eliminated by construction, UM would plant another tree of the same species on South Campus to maintain that species. Weeds would be monitored and controlled on the developed portion of the planning area; however, noxious weeds and undesirable species would still persist on the hillside of Mount Sentinel. On-going weed control efforts have been implemented within these degraded grasslands along the base of Mount Sentinel to improve native vegetation.

The Proposed Action, in conjunction with the Mountain Campus, would cumulatively add to the State Arboretum of Montana.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Existing Environment: The planning area and vicinity provides a variety of cover and/or foraging habitat for many species adapted to a human presence including white-tailed deer, black bear, fox, small mammals and raptors. Mallard duck was observed on the stormwater pond outside the southwest corner of the planning area. A discussion of TES species is provided in Section 9.0.

Impacts from No Action: There would be no impact to terrestrial, avian and aquatic life and habitats.

Impacts from Proposed Action: The wildlife species that currently utilize the planning area and vicinity are adapted to a human presence. There would be less open space available to these species as the Plan progressed; however, these species have shown to be very tolerant of development and would continue to use the planning area and vicinity for cover and/or forage. Open space would be retained on the hillside of Mount Sentinel.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Existing Environment: The Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) identified eight TES species that occur or have the potential to occur within the planning area. They are discussed below.

Gray wolf (Canis lupus): There have not been any sightings of gray wolf within the planning area. The planning area is currently developed as a golf course, athletic fields and student housing in an urban area that is not suitable for gray wolf habitat. This area is currently heavily used by recreationists for hiking, biking and as a hang-gliding launch area.

Canada lynx (Lynx canadensis): The Canada lynx occurs in subalpine conifer forests between 3,900 feet and 6,880 feet elevation with protection from human disturbance (MAFG 2007b). There is no habitat for the Canada lynx within or adjacent to the planning area.

Wolverine (Gulo gulo): Wolverine habitat consists of montane forest types protected from human disturbance (WF 2007). There is no habitat for the wolverine within or adjacent to the planning area.

Grasshopper sparrow (Ammodramus savannarum): MNHP (2007) identified the grasshopper sparrow as having the potential to occur on Mount Sentinel.

Western skink (Eumeces skiltonianus): In Montana, the western skink has been reported in Mineral, Missoula and Ravalli counties. These sites were characterized by southwest facing, grass-covered foothills of less than 20% slope to forested hills up to 30% slope. Soils were typically rocky and spotted knapweed was often present.
in moderate to high densities (MAFG 2007c). The only portion of the planning area that represents appropriate habitat for the western skink is the slope of Mount Sentinel.

Westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi*): Pattee Creek contains 99% genetically-pure westslope cutthroat trout. The habitat is of moderate quality for fish but the genetics of the cutthroat is protected by its disconnection from the Clark Fork River, which contains rainbow trout and other non-native fish that could hybridize with the cutthroat (MFISH 2007, Knotek pers. comm.). The stormwater pond located at the southwest corner of the planning area contains a population of Pattee Creek cutthroat trout (Knotek pers. comm.).

Cave Obligate Amphipod (*Stygobromus tritus*): *Stygobromus* has been identified in shallow well casings (8 feet to 21 feet deep) in Missoula (MNHP 2007).

Obscure evening primrose (*Camissonia andina*): Obscure evening primrose occurs on dry, sandy slopes. It is only known to still exist in Montana in Carbon County (MFPG 2007). One observation of obscure evening primrose was reportedly made within the planning area in 1934 (MNHP 2007).

**Impacts from No Action:** There would be no impacts to TES species as part of the No Action alternative.

**Impacts from the Proposed Action:**

Gray wolf (*Canis lupus*): There is the potential that wolves may occasionally migrate to the Mount Sentinel area via Lolo National Forest lands to the east of Mount Sentinel. Wolves in Montana have demonstrated a greater tolerance of human presence than previously thought (MAFG 2007a). The only portion of the planning area that has the potential for use by gray wolf would remain open space and would not impact gray wolf.

Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*): There is no habitat for the Canada lynx within or adjacent to the planning area; therefore, there would be no effect on Canada lynx.

Wolverine (*Gulo gulo*): There is no habitat for the wolverine within or adjacent to the planning area; therefore there would be no effect on wolverine.

Grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*): MNHP (2007) identified the grasshopper sparrow as having the potential to occur on Mount Sentinel. This area would remain as open space and would not be developed as part of the Plan; therefore, the grasshopper sparrow would not be affected.

Western skink (*Eumeces skiltonianus*): The only portion of the planning area that represents appropriate habitat for the western skink is the slope of Mount Sentinel. This area would remain open space and would not be developed as part of the Plan; therefore, the western skink would not be affected.

Westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi*): The Proposed Action would not alter or modify Pattee Creek or the stormwater pond in any way. There would be no withdrawals of water from Pattee Creek. Stormwater from planning area parking lots would be designed to discharge to dry wells within the planning area and not discharge off-site. There would be no direct discharges to Pattee Creek or the stormwater pond; domestic wastewater from South Campus buildings and facilities would be discharged to the municipal sewer. There would be no disturbance of the existing riparian area from the Proposed Action. Therefore, there would be no impacts to westslope cutthroat trout as part of the Proposed Action.

Cave Obligate Amphipod (*Stygobromus tritus*): There would be no impact to the wells located within the planning area; therefore, there are no impacts to *Stygobromus* anticipated as a result of the Plan.

Obscure evening primrose (*Camissonia andina*): Areas that would be developed as part of the Plan currently are developed with a golf course. Therefore, there is no potential that obscure evening primrose could exist in portions of the planning area that would be developed.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
   Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Existing Environment:

Native American sites: A 2007 investigation by Western Cultural, Inc. (WCI 2007) did not identify any evidence of cultural sites within the South Campus planning area.

Historic districts: There are two historic districts located adjacent to the planning area: the University Area Historic District and the UM Historic District.

Historic designed landscape: The UM golf course was not determined to be a historic designed landscape and is not eligible for listing with the National Register (WCI 2007).

Impacts from No Action:

Native American sites: There are no Native American sites; therefore, there would be no impact as a result of the No Action alternative.

Historic districts: The two historic districts would not be affected by the No Action alternative.

Historic designed landscape: The South Campus planning area is not an historic designed landscape; therefore, there would be no impact as a result of the No Action alternative.

Impacts from Proposed Action:

Native American sites: There are no Native American sites; therefore, there would be no impact as a result of the Proposed Action alternative.

Historic districts: The Proposed Action would not have any negative visual impact on either historic district based on the heavy vegetative growth, power lines and structural interference that are currently in place between the historic districts and the South Campus (WCI 2007).

Although UM would promote and encourage alternative transportation as part of the Plan, the availability of vehicle parking related to the South Campus would likely result in an increase in cars accessing South Campus whether it is for classes, housing or to park at the Park n’ Ride parking lots. There would be an increase in bus traffic between the South Campus and the Mountain Campus. The roads that would most likely see traffic impacts would be Arthur Avenue, South Avenue and Higgins Avenue. Spill-over parking would increase on these roads and others that are within walking distance to South Campus.

Historic designed landscape: The South Campus planning area is not an historic designed landscape; therefore, there would be no impact as a result of the No Action alternative.

11. AESTHETICS:
   Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Existing Environment:

Visuals: Dornblaser Stadium and athletic fields are present on the north end of Higgins Avenue within the planning area. The Park n’ Ride parking lot and hurricane fencing blocking views of the athletic fields is located at the corner of Higgins Avenue and South Avenue. Student housing communities have been constructed along Higgins Avenue (Lewis and Clark Village) and South Avenue and Maurice Avenue (Elliot Village, Toole Village and Craighead/Sisson Apartments). Each of these housing communities is between two and three stories high.
Three greenhouses and the ASUM community gardens are located adjacent to Pattee Creek and Pattee Canyon Drive. The interior of the planning area is developed with the nine-hole golf course with its associated facilities.

Observers from these roads and the neighborhoods beyond them can see the structures along the roads; beyond and above these structures Mount Sentinel is visible. The amount of Mount Sentinel that is visible increases the farther one gets from the planning area. Clear views of Mount Sentinel and the interior of the planning area can be seen from Pattee Canyon Drive and the corner of Higgins Avenue and South Avenue. Recreationists on Mount Sentinel have a clear view of all of the planning area.

Noise and Light: Local residents currently experience noise from student residents traveling to and from their housing via vehicle and bus. Athletic events such as track meets generate noise from announcers, crowds and additional traffic related to the event. Light is generated from the housing communities after the sun sets.

Impacts from No Action: There would be no impacts to aesthetics as a result of the No Action alternative.

Impacts from Proposed Action:

Visuals: The golf course (open/green space) would eventually be phased out for student housing and academic buildings at some point during the 50 year development period. Observers from Higgins Avenue, South Avenue and Maurice Avenue would not have significant changes to their viewshed due to the current presence of buildings along most portions of those roads. People walking or biking within the planning area would, over time, have a change in their view from mostly open/green space to UM buildings with some open/green space (Figure 2). The view of Mount Sentinel from within the planning area would not appear as open as it does today due to the gradual increase in the number of structures.

Architectural design guidelines have been developed as part of the Master Plan for The University of Montana-Missoula (Mountain Campus) (UM 2002). New construction on South Campus must "respect the University's rich architectural heritage and provide appropriate flexibility and space to meet University needs". The design of new buildings on South Campus must provide a visual tie to the Mountain Campus and the existing buildings on South Campus. The height of new buildings should not exceed the profile of the dominant tree height on South Campus at the time of construction (UM 2002). New buildings would be limited to three stories in height.

Noise and Light: All South Campus new construction would occur on the interior of the planning area. New buildings would address noise level thresholds. Lighting would be directed downward. The majority of additional noise and light from new UM academic, recreation and housing facilities would be buffered by the existing structures on the perimeter of the planning area. There would be an increase in vehicles accessing South Campus; therefore, there may be an increase in traffic noise.

The Proposed Action, in conjunction with previous development on the planning area, would have cumulative visual effects when viewers are looking down on the planning area. This would represent a change in the viewshed from a golf course to a UM campus-style development and could have a negative, positive or neutral impact depending upon the viewer. Observers from surrounding roads would be able to see additional structures from some locations but much of the perimeter is already developed with two to four story structures.

**12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:**

* Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

NONE - Non-renewable fuels would be used during construction of the project. Buildings would be designed to be as energy-efficient and "green" as financially and technically possible. New landscaping would be efficient and water-wise.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:
List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.


There are no other private, state or federal actions in the area that would result in cumulative impacts in conjunction with the Proposed Action.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:
Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Existing Environment:

Traffic safety: The planning area is surrounded by residential neighborhoods on the north, west and south and City of Missoula open space (Mount Sentinel) on the east. Primary roads (Higgins Avenue, South Avenue and Maurice Avenue) border the planning area on the west, northwest and north, respectively. Pedestrian crosswalks are painted at intersections. Student housing communities lie on the west and north edges of the golf course.

Hang gliding and golf course: The Missoula Hang Gliding Club currently has a designated landing site located on the northwest corner of the golf course. This site is identified with signage and is fenced on three sides. Hang gliders also occasionally land on the athletic fields to the west of the golf course. There have not been any collisions with hang gliders and people using facilities on South Campus in 25 years (Shook pers. comm.). Safety nets are in place to prevent golf balls from entering the housing communities from the golf course. The public can walk on the golf course; therefore, ball strikes are a threat.

Petroleum products and hazardous substances: The golf course formerly utilized two underground storage tanks (USTs) to store diesel fuel and gasoline. The USTs were removed in 1993 and a release was discovered associated with overfills to the gasoline tank. The impacted soil was removed and the MDEQ closed the release in 1994 (NRIS 2007).

The golf course no longer has any USTs. Diesel and gasoline is stored in two 200-gallon ASTs at the maintenance garage. The ASTs are concrete, double-walled and secondarily contained by a concrete berm. Less than 5 gallons of herbicide used for spot-spraying is stored at any one time within the maintenance garage. One 55-gallon drum is used to store motor oil in the maintenance garage. Waste oil is collected in a 25-gallon drum and is disposed of at the Mountain Campus motor pool facility (Burt pers. comm.).

Impacts from No Action: There would be no change to threats of human health and safety as a result of the No Action alternative. Petroleum products and hazardous substances stored at the golf course are stored appropriately and do not pose a significant threat of release in their current storage.

Impacts from Proposed Action:

Traffic safety: There would be a small increase in the threat of traffic accidents adjacent to the planning area that corresponds to the increase in vehicles accessing the planning area. Similarly, with more students and UM
staff walking and biking to South Campus there would be a corresponding greater potential for injuries to pedestrians and bikers from cars, especially at the intersections.

Hang gliding and golf course: There would be a small increase in the danger related to the hang gliding landing site because it would not be fenced or identified in its new location (Section 20). The golf course would eventually be replaced as part of the Proposed Action; therefore, the danger of golf ball strikes to people would be eliminated.

Petroleum products and hazardous substances: The golf course and its associated facilities would eventually be removed along with its petroleum product and hazardous substance storage. There would be no underground storage of hazardous materials or petroleum products as part of the Plan. Natural gas would be used as a heating source; however, fuel oil stored in ASTs would be utilized as a back-up heating source. ASTs would be secondarily contained.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:
   Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

NONE – The Proposed Action would not add to or alter industrial, commercial or agricultural activities and production.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:
   Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Existing Environment: UM currently employs maintenance and other support staff specifically for the student housing and athletic facilities on South Campus. The golf course employs three full time staff members and up to 23 seasonal student workers each year (Public meeting notes February 5, 2007). The number of faculty and graduate students that UM can recruit is currently limited by a lack of adequate research and office space.

Impacts from No Action: There would be no change to the status of jobs or employment related to South Campus. The number of faculty and graduate student positions for UM would continue to be limited by a lack of adequate research facilities and offices.

Impacts from Proposed Action: Adequate academic and research facilities would aid in attraction and retention of qualified faculty and graduate students. Additional jobs would be created related to support and maintenance staff for the new academic and housing facilities. The Proposed Action would result in an increase in UM-related employment.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:
   Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Existing Environment: UM, as a state institution, does not pay taxes. There are currently no commercial entities within the South Campus planning area that generate taxed revenue as a result of student services. Students that currently live in the UM housing generate tax revenue from their use of services located in the surrounding area including restaurants, coffee shops and retail stores.

Impacts from No Action: There would be no change to the local and state tax base or tax revenues as a result of the No Action alternative.

Impacts from Proposed Action: There would be more students that live and take classes on the South Campus; therefore, there would be an increased demand for student services within the planning area and the surrounding area. There would be an increase in tax revenues generated in the surrounding area.
18. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

Existing Environment:

Traffic and parking: South Campus is bordered by two high-use primary roads: Higgins Avenue and South Avenue. Maurice Avenue is a residential secondary road. These roads are already influenced by UM-related traffic since they are major routes to the Mountain Campus. Mountain Line provides free bus transportation from all points around Missoula to Griz Card holders. Park n' Ride, a UM bus transportation service, provides rides from the South Campus, COT South Avenue Campus and East Broadway transfer stations to the Mountain Campus. The UM Park n' Ride shuttle began in 1999 and provided 3,860 rides between the transfer stations that year. Ridership has continued to increase since that time and in 2006 Park n' Ride provided 635,000 rides (N. Wilson in public meeting notes January 22, 2007).

Traffic related to South Campus is related to those parking at the lot for Park n' Ride, students living in the South Campus housing and those attending events at Dornblaser Stadium and the athletic fields. Limited amounts of vehicle traffic occur from the community garden, greenhouses and the two trailheads for Mount Sentinel.

The Park n' Ride lot on South Campus normally fills to capacity each weekday. Parking at the Mountain Campus has been over capacity for several years and there is no available land to create additional parking.

Government services: The South Campus is served by the City of Missoula Fire Department, Police Department and other Missoula services since it is in the city limits. These services would remain the same under both alternatives.

Impacts from No Action: Mountain Line and Park n' Ride would continue to provide rides to the Mountain Campus. UM has purchased two additional buses to accommodate the increasing demand for alternative transportation to the Mountain Campus; however, parking at the South Campus lot for those using Park n' Ride would continue to be limited. Parking at the Mountain Campus would continue to be over capacity. UM would continue to encourage alternative modes of transportation to the Mountain Campus but UM-related traffic would persist on Higgins Avenue, South Avenue and Maurice Avenue. Ridership on Park n' Ride would likely follow current trends and continue to increase.

Impacts from Proposed Action: South Campus would be developed with academic facilities, additional student housing (as demand dictated) and additional athletic facilities. The UM transportation would be required to provide all members of the campus community with safe and convenient access to the South Campus. This would include sidewalk and multi-use paths, bike lanes, transits and shuttles. Improvements would be emphasized that do not negatively impact the campus or surrounding neighborhoods.

Residential parking facilities would be constructed in conjunction with student housing construction. Parking lots would be constructed to accommodate student and UM staff/faculty parking; these parking lots would be serviced by Park n' Ride buses to provide transportation between South Campus, COT campuses and the Mountain Campus. A parking lot would be constructed on the south end of the planning area for the community garden, greenhouses and south trailhead to Mount Sentinel. All parking lots would be designed as major pedestrian walkway destinations.

Ridership on Park n' Ride would likely follow current trends and continue to increase. Although UM would promote and encourage alternative transportation as part of the Plan, the availability of vehicle parking related to the South Campus would likely result in an increase in cars accessing South Campus whether it is for classes, housing or to park at the Park n' Ride parking lots. There would be an increase in bus traffic between the South Campus and the Mountain Campus. The roads that would most likely see traffic impacts would be Arthur Avenue, South Avenue and Higgins Avenue. Spill-over parking would increase on these roads and others that are within walking distance to South Campus.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:
List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

Master Plan for The University of Montana-Missoula (UM 2002): The South Campus Plan would fall under the goals and requirements of the Master Plan for The University of Montana-Missoula. All architectural design guidance would be taken from the Architectural Guidelines presented in the Master Plan for The University of Montana-Missoula 2002).

30-Year Missoula Transportation Plan (in progress): The future South Campus as proposed would be considered in the 30-Year Missoula Transportation Plan under development by the Missoula Office of Planning and Grants.

Missoula Parks & Recreation Open Space Program: The City’s Open Space Program has been very successful in protecting Mount Jumbo and Mount Sentinel. The South Campus Plan would be consistent with the goals of the Open Space program by leaving the UM-owned land on Mount Sentinel as open space and maintaining the two trailheads to Mount Sentinel within the planning area.

The University of Montana Farm to College Program: University Dining Services and four UM graduate students teamed-up in the spring of 2003 to create the UM Farm to College Program, dedicated to buying more food locally and regionally to feed the campus community. Implementation of the Proposed Action would likely eventually require an expansion of Dining Services onto South Campus. Dining Services on South Campus would continue implementing the Farm to College Program (R. Brunell in public meeting notes January 22, 2007).

Missoula County Growth Policy 2005 Update: The goals of the Proposed Action would be in line with that of the Missoula County Growth Policy 2005 Update.


20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:
Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Existing Environment: The planning area includes two trailheads to access Mount Sentinel, a nine-hole golf course and a designated hang gliding landing site. The South Campus is currently used for multiple athletic uses including soccer fields, track, intramural sports fields, sports camps and general public access.

Trailheads: One trailhead is located on the northeast corner of the planning area and one is located on the southeast corner. Both trailheads provide access to the Mount Sentinel "Fire Road" and Missoula Open Space. There is limited parking available at each trailhead. The trailheads are used by both mountain bikers and hikers.

UM golf course: The nine-hole golf course includes a putting green, driving range, pro shop, maintenance garage and clubhouse. The golf course was first developed in 1916 and was modernized in 1955. It is used by both student and public golfers, cross-country running teams and cross-country skiers in the winter. The golf course is considered a good public course because it is affordable, relaxed and has a flat terrain that is suitable for all ages and skill levels. Use of the golf course is approximately 80% by the public and 20% by UM students and staff. The UM Golf Team uses this course primarily for practice and holds meets at all of the public courses in Missoula (C. Anderson in public meeting notes February 5, 2007).

Hang glider landing site: Missoula hang gliders have a designated landing site between the golf course and the athletic fields. The landing site is identified with signage and is fenced on three sides. There is a local hang gliding club with 28 student members. There are 12 to 20 landings on this site on a busy day. This landing site is the only suitable site in Missoula (B. Shook in public meeting notes February 5, 2007). There have been no
hang glider collisions with people on the ground in 25 years. The majority of hang gliding in Missoula occurs in June, July and August when UM athletics are not active, but care is taken during school-year athletic events to land appropriately and in a safe area (Shook pers. comm.).

UM athletics: The athletic facilities on South Campus include soccer fields, intramural fields, Dornblaser Stadium and track. The locker facilities are currently inadequate to meet need. There is no indoor sports facility (J. O’Day in public meeting notes February 5 and March 19, 2007).

Impacts from No Action: There would be no changes to recreation or athletic opportunities within the planning area. As enrollment grows there would be a corresponding increase in students and UM athletics using the athletic facilities and they would become over-crowded. The lack of indoor sports facilities would continue to cause indoor conference events to be held at competing universities.

Impacts from Proposed Action:

Trailheads: There would be a paved parking lot constructed at the Mount Sentinel trailhead on the southeast corner of the planning area. The trailheads would remain and would continue to provide access to Mount Sentinel.

UM golf course: The golf course and its associated facilities would eventually be replaced as part of the Plan. The area currently occupied by the golf course would be used for academic and research facilities and student housing. This use of the UM-owned lands would be more appropriate and would have a greater benefit to the UM students and faculty.

Golfers that currently use the UM golf course would need to choose from one of five other public golf courses in Missoula: Larchmont, Ranch Club, Canyon River, Highlands or Linda Vista. They would likely spend higher green fees than those at the UM golf course. With the exception of the Highlands golf course, these Missoula golf courses offer similar flat terrain.

Cross-country running meets would no longer be held on South Campus. Cross-country skiing would still be allowed on and adjacent to walkways, but it would occur within a campus environment or on the trails on Mount Sentinel.

Hang glider landing site: The hang glider landing site would be moved to a location on the proposed athletic fields on the south end of the planning area (Figure 2). Because the site would be located within the athletic fields there would be more times unavailable for landing due to UM athletic practices and events. Additional care would need to be taken by the hang gliders to avoid people on the ground since the landing site would not be fenced or identified (Shook pers. comm.).

UM athletics: The Plan includes the gradual construction of additional athletic fields and an indoor practice facility.

There are no cumulative impacts to recreation related to the Proposed Action.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Existing Environment: The South Campus planning area currently has four housing communities: Lewis and Clark Village, Elliot Village, Toole Village and the Craighead/Sisson Apartments. These communities are currently between 92% and 94% full. The student housing on the Mountain Campus is 100% full. No future plans exist for housing on the Mountain Campus. One housing site is left on the Mountain Campus but is not considered an acceptable site due to space limitations and student needs (R. Brunell in public meeting notes January 22, 2007).
Impacts from No Action: The current UM student housing is near or at capacity. As enrollment increases there will be a corresponding increase in students that can not be provided housing by UM. This does not meet UM’s obligation to provide housing for UM students.

Impacts from Proposed Action: The 120-unit Craighead/Sisson Apartments would eventually be replaced. The Plan would construct new student housing on the planning area as enrollment needs dictate. There would be a significant portion of the UM on-campus students that would live on South Campus by 2057. Therefore, an increase in population would occur within the planning area and the residential area. There are no estimates of the maximum number of students that could be housed on South Campus at this time. Housing would be constructed as the student population grew and is dependent on the future increase in enrollment.

There is no land within the surrounding residential neighborhoods that is available for development. Therefore, there is no anticipated cumulative change to population as a result of the Proposed Action.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
   Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

NONE – There would be no disruption to native or traditional lifestyles or communities as a result of the Proposed Action.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
   How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

NONE – The local residential areas around South Campus are accustomed to UM housing and athletic facilities on the planning area. The addition of more UM structures and facilities onto UM-owned lands would not cause a change in the character of the local area. According to the Lewis & Clark and Farviews Neighborhood committees, the housing communities currently on South Campus are “outstanding neighbors” with “very little impact” (Gullickson and Hendrix in public meeting notes January 22, 2007).

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:
   Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Existing Environment: Revenue generated by UM comes from student tuition, alumni donations and research grants. Funds from student tuition continue to rise due to increasing enrollments and tuition costs. Alumni donations are variable from year to year and cannot be predicted. Research grants are dependent on adequate research facilities and research staff and are currently limited by the existing facilities on the Mountain Campus and COT campuses. The UM golf course is fiscally responsible and adequately pays for its own operations; however, there is not typically a balance of funds produced from the golf course that are available for other needs (K. Glaes in public meeting notes from February 20, 2007).

Impacts from No Action: Revenues to the state from undergraduate student tuition would likely continue to increase at approximately the same rate regardless of existing limitations on housing and academic facilities. Tuition generated by graduate students may decrease due to inadequate research opportunities. Research funding would continue to be limited by a lack of adequate research facilities and research staff.

Impacts from Proposed Action: Revenues to the state from undergraduate and graduate student tuition would continue to increase, and may increase at a greater rate due to more attractive academic, research and athletic facilities. Research funding would be enhanced and encouraged by the expansion of research facilities and the ability to attract well-qualified faculty and graduate students. There would be no net loss to UM revenues by removing the golf course.
V. FINDINGS

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Proposed Action: Implement the South Campus Plan as described in the South Campus Master Plan (UM 2007)

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

There would be a loss of golfing on the South Campus to UM and the Missoula community due to the removal of the golf course. Golfers would need to use one of the other five public golf courses in Missoula. However, utilizing UM-owned lands for academic, research and UM housing would be more appropriate and would have a greater benefit to the UM students and faculty.

There would likely be increased traffic on Arthur Avenue, South Avenue and Higgins Avenue as well as an increase of parking on these streets and others within walking distance to South Campus. Alternative transportation would continue to be encouraged and provided to mitigate traffic and parking impacts. Regardless, an increase in students living on South Campus and taking classes would result in some increase in traffic and parking in the surrounding area.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

- [ ] EIS
- [ ] More Detailed EA
- [X] No Further Analysis

REFERENCES:
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The University of Montana-Missoula South Campus Plan EA
# The University of Montana South Campus Plan Scoping Content Analysis

*Public Comments and Concerns Identified in Public Meetings held December 18 – October 15, 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic Addressed In Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Action/Purpose and Need | - wants to include the College of Technology in the South Campus  
- South Campus should only be used for academic buildings, does not want to see increased housing  
- Would be helpful to know how plan will be 'phased in'  
- Recommend 'map' be clearly noted as to the intention of the gardens  
- Look at South Campus in the "context of the greater community"  
- Don't split programs  
- South Campus is a good place for research facilities  
- Interface Mt. Sentinel, City, and University  
- Consider easements with the city  
- Encourage committee to 'look at best assets of the land' when planning  
- Recommends doing an overlay of the vision map with a topography map in order to see how the existing land will impact, preserve, or use existing assets  
- Insure a good balance with community  
- University needs to plan for future  
- University needs to build credibility regarding use of 'open space'  
- Recommends incorporating all 3 master plans together; South, Main, and Ft. Missoula  
- Encouraged committee to 'look at whole plan'; are we selling south campus as an entity to itself?  
- housing needed for future increased enrollment  
- need for additional room for research and academic space to accommodate programs that are at capacity  
- Forestry program has a freeze on new graduate students and professors because they have no more room  
- the University needs to factor in that there is a drop in Montana high school aged students  
- percent increase of student housing should match percent increase of student enrollment  
- There was talk of enrollment caps; why does the University have to grow? Are we going to accept everyone?  
- keep disciplines together  
- Asked for careful consideration of what to locate on south campus. Recommend the integration of programs so people/students don't have to run back and forth between campuses | Section I. |
| Alternatives                  | - Look at all possibilities before South Campus  
- University should "look at other options first"  
- Use area more effectively; no new oval                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Section II.3 |

*PBSJ*
- Don't fragment open space; do away with the oval idea
- Build out Mountain Campus first
- Locate research activities to Ft. Missoula
- Maximize Mountain Campus first
- Use of 5th & 6th Street revenues and gateway designation
- Discussion of single level US Forest Service buildings located on southeast corner of campus. Could this area be better utilized with multilevel buildings and request US Forest Service to vacate?
- Since the tennis courts (bubble) at the Missoula Athletic Club are for sale, why doesn't the University make that purchase?
- Are there plans for the Alumni Center to be built on the existing tennis courts? Would propose to build Alumni Center on the River Bowl
- Public needs to know why 5th & 6th Streets can't be used first
- Why not utilize the 5th and 8th Street properties first? University could "clear the area, sell the houses, and utilize first", before the South Campus
- Proposes to conduct a "new study to swap land with the city" for academic needs and leave golf course 'as is'
- Other UM-owned properties should be utilized before tearing out golf course
- Fort Missoula and land north of Clark Fork River should be looked at prior to the South Campus to avoid getting rid of golf course

<p>| Soil and Geology | No comments | Section III.4 |
| Water | Identified 2 ponds on 3rd and 8th holes of golf course | Section III.5 |
| Air | No comments | Section III.6 |
| Vegetation | What will happen to the existing flora/fauna in the area (trees, plants, and animals)? | Section III.7 |
| Terrestrial and Aquatic Habitats | FWP would like to see the pond on the southwest corner of the planning area protected and used for educational tool | Section III.8 |
| TES Species and | No comments | Section III.9 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Habitats</th>
<th>No comments</th>
<th>Section III.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Aesthetics**                  | • Encouraged University to keep area 'beautified' at the request of the neighborhood councils as this is a gateway to their neighborhoods.  
• Recommends gateway corner to be developed as 'healing gardens'  
• Concerned about looking down on parking lots at the south end of plan as is currently identified on map  
• Improved practice and intramura fields are an attractive neighborhood amenity | Section III.11 |
| **Demands on Enviro. Resources**| • Plan is 'old fashioned'; use opportunity to design green buildings  
• New buildings should incorporate the highest LEED standards of highly insulated, green building, in order to reduce future demand for energy while making good use of new building materials. This coupled with also employing highly innovative Net Zero designs, including those of Walt Redfield's, that undertake to use forward thinking use of underground heat/cooling systems, and less costly methods of wall construction, would place this campus into the foreground of new thinking and design.  
• Power generation from photovoltaic panels and wind power could be planned into the complex. Since the South Campus could be recognized as a new customer, not yet involved in Northwestern Energy’s customer base, it could generate its own power, lease lines from Northwestern, but not have to sell its power to Northwestern under House Bill 25 as passed this year. This means that the South Campus could serve to be a worthwhile example of the possibilities of wind and solar power by having such power systems fuel the entire South Campus | Section III.12 |
| **Pertinent Enviro. Documents** | No comments                                          | Section III.13 |
| **Health and Safety**           | • University-developed student housing is better quality and safer than private sector housing options  
• Encourages streetlight installation at corner of Higgins and Pattee Canyon for the safety of school children | Section III.14 |
| **Ind, Comm and Agric Activities** | No comments                                          | Section III.15 |
| **Employment**                  | No comments                                          | Section III.16 |
| **Tax Base and Revenues**       | No comments                                          | Section III.17 |
| **Transportation and Traffic**  | • concerned that including new housing in South Campus would increase congestion in residential areas nearby  
• Mountain Line will upgrade to support full service to the new South Campus area  
• Parking should be located at edge of boundaries  
• Parking appears to be at capacity now. Look at other options (M. Kress indicated city | Section III.18 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plans and Goals</th>
<th>Section III.19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria programs on campus should buy their food products from local organic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmers in order to help broaden the market base for these non-oil dependent food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation and Access</th>
<th>Section III.20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>against removing the golf course, golf course is precious commodity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flat golf course is necessary for exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM golf course is reasonable price with all the elements needed (club house, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf course provides open/green space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf course provides way for local golfers to interact with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf course provides good first impression of UM to visiting parents/students for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school track meets at Dombisser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf course has a relationship to the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hang-gliding landing space is compatible with open space and is not associated with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry to see golf course go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course is a 'soft spot' for many people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time, there was a plan to add an additional 9 holes to the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course is very intricate part of Missoula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail systems should be expanded upon and tied into the full city's system of trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course is good PR (public relations) for the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Section III.21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>housing needed for future increased enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent increase of student housing should match percent increase of student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-developed student housing is better quality and safer than private sector housing options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed solution to 'use X's space first. What is the Occupancy Vacancy rate of the X's? These do not meet code and would be too costly to retrofit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Structures</th>
<th>Section III.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Uniqueness</th>
<th>Section III.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economics</th>
<th>Section III.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cost recorded on deeds for cost of South Campus properties not indicative of actual cost to University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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