

All Public Comment (4/13/09 - 5/4/12)

Date	Name	Comment

Phase: Adoption

5/3/2012	Hankey, April Interested Public	Thank you for your thoughtfulness during this process and for sensibly supporting the plan. If you do change something, I would like to see connectivity in South Park reinserted and if you really wanted to get feisty, adding density to the Aspens and Wilson would be lovely. But the most important thing is for you to PASS the plan, and begin to put an end to the stratification some in our community are carelessly, and maybe unknowingly, promoting. Thank you, again.
5/3/2012	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	Before the last meeting on May 8th I would like to express my opinion that the 60/40 in the growth managmetn plan overreaches and will not work. Realistically it needs to be changed to 50/50. Also, I hope you incoproat the Statement of Intent into the plan. It succinctl summarizes the gist of the plan and would go a long way towards giving people some reassurances about the intent of the plan and unifying the public benind the plan while having no downsides. Thank you.
5/3/2012	Roscoe, William Interested Public	I support this plan. While it may not be perfect and certainly does not incorporate a magic carpet between Wilson and Jackson, it does establish a plan that individuals and businesses can pivot off. Think about all of the great public and social spaces and infrastructure in the world that would not be there if someone hadn't planned. Golden Gate Park in San Francisco, the MTA in New York, and Yellowstone in the Rockies are all examples of successful results of planning. Then think about the places that are the result of not planning and see where you'd rather live. Let's all get behind this vision!

Date	Name	Comment
5/3/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Thank you for your attention to these comments, and for your work throughout this planning process on behalf of the community. In advance of your May 8, 2012 hearing, we wanted to share our overall position on the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan as well as provide some recommendations for improvement to the documents and for next steps. Overall Comments: Cautious Support with Outstanding Concerns and Recommendations The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance supports the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and the core values that it expresses. Those values include: the concept of concentrated development footprints; the goal of an economy not dependent on population growth; and the focus on sustainability, natural resource protection, and scenic vista preservation. Therefore, the Conservation Alliance cautiously supports the adoption of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, while stressing the need to address the following public concerns in a timely manner. 1. The methods and tools for shifting development patterns in Teton County remain unknown. This is one of the key concerns that the Conservation Alliance and community members have raised over the course of this process. The community needs to see immediate progress made towards figuring out how to shift development patterns, as well as towards the broader goal of conserving land in rural areas. A public discussion of next steps and research opportunities, including many options in addition to revising the PRD, is necessary to ensure that shifting development patterns, which is one of the central goals of the Plan, is both achievable and achieved. This is crucial for the success of the Comp Plan. 2. Up-to-date estimates for the amount of development that will be allowed in each character district have not been provided. We expect to see estimates of the amount of residential and non-residential development that is anticipated in each character district calculated and released in the next phase, as part of the update to the LDRs and zoning maps. We are not requesting a change to a numbers-based plan. Rather, we are acknowledging that numbers are invaluable in planning for infrastructure, envisioning the future of the valley, and planning with an overall goal in mind. Checking in on the ability of the community to accomplish the goals of the plan (e.g. shifting development) is a critical role that these numbers must play. 3. Improvements and adherence to the Implementation Plan must be assured, which will require allocation of adequate funds. We also hope to see a real commitment to the priorities set forth in the Implementation Plan in the form of significant budget allocations and commitment to meeting the relevant deadlines. (See below for more detailed comments on the Implementation Plan). Statement of Intent As you know, 360 town and county residents signed the Statement of Intent over a period of just over a week. The request was that a statement of intent be added to the Comp Plan to clarify the community vision and intent and help guide decision makers in the future. A primary focus of the Statement was preserving the small town character of Jackson, with the other components of the document highlighting specific ways to manage new growth and development in Teton County within our small town context. The Alliance was a partner in creating and advocating for this Statement of Intent, and we continue to believe that the points included therein are important. We would like to see the elected officials discuss the components of the Statement of Intent and support and address each of the issues it highlights. We would also encourage the officials to consider including a statement of intent, as amended by your joint boards, into the Comp Plan. Implementation Plan The Conservation Alliance strongly supports the concept of an Implementation Plan as well as the budgeting of necessary resources to achieve the goals laid out within the plan. Because the Implementation Plan is an explanation of how the goals of the Plan will actually be achieved, committing the needed resources is paramount. The community has invested an enormous amount of time, energy and resources into this process to date, and we have the responsibility to follow through with the Implementation Plan. While recognizing that it is a living document, elected officials should formally affirm their commitment to the Implementation Plan concurrently with the adoption of the Comp Plan. Moving Forward: the LDR process As the LDRs are crafted there will be room to interpret the policies in a variety of different ways. Certain policies conflict with one another, and must be appropriately balanced as regulations are written to avoid piecemeal or solely discretionary decisions in the future. We expect that the elected officials will take into account the intentions of the community, specifically the desire to not have additive growth and to preserve our natural resources and community character, and interpret the policies to reflect those values. We also expect that many of the hard discussions that were postponed until after the Plan was completed will actually take place in the LDR process, including but not limited to: shifting development potential, appropriate locations for workforce housing, a comprehensive transportation plan, and a revamping of the NRO regulations. Reaching a community consensus via these discussions will be critical in determining the future of the valley.

Date	Name	Comment
		This should not be a brief or hurried process. The expectation was established that the LDRs will be where “the rubber meets the road,” and the community and the elected officials have an obligation to ensure that the decisions are made responsibly. The Alliance will continue to work to ensure that the policies are interpreted in the best way possible for the creation of effective regulations. Final Thoughts The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance has been engaged in this planning process since the beginning, submitting countless pages of comment on the policies and maps. Our comments centered on the themes of responsible planning, managed growth, natural resource stewardship and protection, affordable housing, community character, smart and proactive transportation planning, an economy not dependent on population growth, and many more. We were pleased to have been a productive collaborator in this process, and we are grateful to all of the volunteer planning commissioners, taskforce members, planning staff, elected officials and dedicated and passionate members of the public who helped to shape the process and the product. The Conservation Alliance recognizes the social, economic, cultural, historical and environmental value of our incredible region, and appreciates planning that manages our resources in a responsible way. When the concerns outlined in this letter are addressed both prior to adoption and as the Land Development Regulations are crafted, we are optimistic that this new Comprehensive Plan will make significant strides towards achieving the community’s vision. Thank you for your work and your attention to these comments.
5/2/2012	Hershberger, Bonny Interested Public	The current Plan document has been well crafted to balance a wide variety of viewpoints and interests, while maintaining core objectives for wildlife, transportation and worker housing, to name a few. It represents 4+ years of public hearings, meetings and public surveys and the participation and voice of over 1,000 people. It represents the MAJORITY voice, and it is a fair and balanced document. As such, I urge the electeds to ADOPT THE PLAN and move forward with the next phase of work, review and modification of the land development regulations, as soon as possible. I also urge you to NOT approve ANY language within a proposed statement of intent. This language CONTRADICTS provisions within the plan and in no way should be part of the Plan approval. I am extremely pleased that the JHconservation Alliance has taken a stand in support of the Plan adoption and believe it shows great strength to support what you believe is right regardless of how loudly the minority opposition may squack. Please also use whatever tools are available to you to approve the plan by a mechanism that protects the approval from referendum. Those who would try to derail the process will use whatever tactics they can, therefore our electeds must be equally (if not more) strategic to protect the approval.
5/1/2012	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce appreciates the extensive time, dedication, and work of the public, planning, staffs, planning commissions, and you on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We are aware that there has been significant community involvement and input in the successive drafts of the comprehensive plan over the course of five years, including from the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce. We believe that the comprehensive plan as it is currently presented does represent a consensus of the community. The comprehensive plan is a good foundation from which further determination of land development regulations can begin. We believe that the plan is ready for approval with whatever minor modifications from the planning staffs are necessary to make it ready for final approval. There needs to be predictability in governmental policy in order for business to effectively and successfully manage their businesses. Since the comprehensive planning process began five years ago, there has been uncertainty. Passage of this plan will provide greater predictability at a time when our economic recovery is improving but not assured. We recommend that you approve the plan in your May 8th adoption hearing and begin the time for our community to refocus its attention upon other important matters at hand.

Date	Name	Comment
5/1/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	As we head to the May 8 full comprehensive plan adoption meeting I wanted to restate and clarify my position. The Themes and Policies and Character District Maps have responded to community feedback over the years and the plan is a great, and needed, improvement over the 1994 plan. These improvements have been forged out of vigorous and passionate debate. I fully support the themes, policy and maps produced to date but cannot support adoption. In February I was asked by the chair of the County Commissioners, along with a diverse group of interested parties, to clarify what it would take to endorse the full plan at adoption. The thirty of us from all neighborhood groups, citizen planning leaders and valley advocacy groups forged a concise list of items to be addressed in the plan in order to gain our support at adoption. That document is known as the Statement of Intent. The first two bullets in the statement asked for greater clarity in the plan – not the Land Development Regulations (LDRs) - on HOW the shifting of rural development potential would be achieved to permanently protect open space. The second bullet requested a range of build-out potential by district and in aggregate – to assure it reflected and adhered to the stated Vision in the Plan for density neutral solutions countywide. Neither of these primary requests has been dealt with in a meaningful way as we head to the adoption discussion next week. I stand behind the requests in the Statement of Intent that nearly 400 valley residents signed. They are central to ensuring that the community's intent prevails when competing values create opportunities for differing interpretations by current and future decision makers as we move into the ongoing LDR phase that follows plan adoption. I want to make absolutely clear that although I will not support the plan at adoption unless additional clarification is added I appreciate, and fully support, the work completed to date. It is a great improvement over the 1994 Plan. I offer my sincere thanks for the efforts and countless hours spent by the Town and County Planning staffs, both Planning Commissions, the Board of County Commissioners, Mayor Barron, the Jackson Town Council, numerous county organizations and concerned citizens.

Date	Name	Comment
4/28/2012	Young, Tim Interested Public	I would like to submit the following comments on the Comprehensive Plan, specifically on the Common Value 3 Community Character, Section 7. Multimodal Transportation from the most recent April 2012 version of the new Jackson/Teton Comprehensive Plan. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. At the 30,000-foot level this plan has been designed at, I am generally supportive of the Principles and Policies in Section 7. However, I would like to request several changes that I think would improve and clarify these very general transportation concepts. One of my principle concerns is the lack of any metric to measure success. How do we know when we get there? There is reference to “a year round mode shift” in Principle 7.1, but the plan lacks any specific target numbers. Several policies state there will be a “mode shift”, Principle 7.2 states it will “encourage mode shift”. But there is nothing that states how much per mode. Policy 7.1.a states the next step is to develop a community integrated transportation plan, effectively pushing off meaningful transportation planning into the future, without setting any measureable goals now in the Comprehensive Plan to guide that important plan. This should be fixed as part of your final edits and adoption process. Appendix B is referenced, but that provides extremely limited data (see B-22), some that is a decade old. This new Section 7 Multimodal Transportation does not have recent history or targets of any kind, and it’s not in the Appendix information either. For example, how have motor vehicle counts changed with the recent financial downturn? Perhaps counts are down on some corridors, but there is no data. START Bus data in Appendix B is five years old. There are no counts whatsoever for pathways, and no data of any kind on pedestrians. I recommend the Town and County adopt forward-looking measureable goals for transportation mode shift in the final Comp Plan adopted. This is possible - Many progressive local governments in America are setting high goals and achieving significant mode shift changes. Jackson Hole’s Plan should as well. Goals such as the following should be considered: Proposed 2030 Goals: Jackson Hole Mode Share goals for all transportation trips: •10% Walking •10% Bicycle •10% Transit •10% TDM Reduction of motor vehicle trips •10% Ride Share reduction of motor vehicle trips •50% Total Alternative Mode share of all Jackson Hole trips by 2030. Another short-term way to address this would be to fix Appendix E, which unfortunately the current draft removed all the existing target goals, even while ironically it states (page E-3) “Each goal is supported by objectives, which are specific and measurable ends that can be achieved by implementing this chapter.” Unfortunately, that is not correct, since the objectives were in fact removed. The key ones should be put back. Those existing goals from the 2000 Trans Plan, while in need of review, are certainly better than no goals. It would be a mistake to remove them entirely from the Appendix E as it sits now. In summary on this point, I recommend that you either (preferably) add specific forward-looking goals like above, or at least make an amendment to the plan and reinsert these portions from the existing Chapter 8 back into the new Appendix E. (Blue text that follows) Goals and Objectives Goal No. 2: To decrease the rate of anticipated vehicular traffic growth in the community.

Objectives:

2.A.Decrease automobile reliance by shifting resident travel mode shares as follows (percent of daily resident person trips in July:)

1996 Actual	2020 Objective	Percent Change
Drive alone55%	42%	-13%
Rideshare29%	30%	+1%
Walk9%	13%	+4%
Bicycle6%	10%	+4%
Transit<1%	5%	+5%

2.B.Reduce projected year 2020 summer average daily traffic volumes by the amounts listed below by shifting the resident travel mode shares:

Roadway Segments in the County	Summer 2020	Summer 2020	Anticipated Change
Projected Average Daily Traffic	Projected Average Daily Traffic	Projected Average Daily Traffic	Anticipated Change
With no intervention	With implementation	With implementation	Anticipated Change
South Highway @ Rafter J	31,000	29,000	2,000
WY 22 @ Snake River Bridge	41,900	31,000	10,900
WY 22 West of WY 390	19,900	15,000	4,900
Spring Gulch Road @ WY 223	5,003	5,000	3,000
WY 390 @ Nethercott Lane	26,600	20,000	6,600
WY 390 North of Aspens/Teton Pines	15,500	9,000	6,500
US 26, 89 @ Wildlife Museum	27,000	23,000	4,000
High School Road	11,000	9,000	2,000
Roadway Segments in the Town			
South Park Loop Road	10,500	9,000	1,500
West Broadway @ Maple Way	52,000	43,000	9,000
West Broadway @ the Flat Creek Bridge	62,200	56,000	6,200
West Broadway @ Town Square	26,200	24,000	2,200
North Cache @ Town Square	24,400	22,000	2,400
Millward Street on Truck Route	14,200	13,000	1,200
Maple Way – Snow King	14,700	13,000	1,700
Pearl Avenue	14,200	14,000	200

Goal No. 3:To improve the safety and efficiency of the transportation system in Jackson and Teton County.

Objectives:

3.A.Maintain or reduce existing accident levels, and reduce accident severity by 10 percent.

3.B.Reduce pedestrian and non-motorized vehicle accidents by 10 percent while increasing the amount of pedestrian and non-motorized vehicle travel.

3.C.Provide a safe, convenient, appealing, and reliable transit system.

3.D.Design roadways and streets that ensure safe and efficient traffic flow while providing reasonable and adequate private accesses that minimize the deterioration of roadway capacity.

(End quote from Existing Transportation Chapter 8)

Comments on Strategies for Section 7 - Multimodal Transportation: [CV-3-24-25]

Another concern I have is the 7.2.S.1 strategy was changed from "Adopt" to "Consider adopting" in this April 2012 draft compared to what was adopted last June 2011. Please change it back to the more action-oriented word “Adopt”. There is no reason for this topic to be “considered” any more, it has been considered, and Complete Streets are agreed to be a key strategy in the Comp Plan for transportation. The Plan should be specific and clear on this point.

The general statement at the top of the Strategies page CV-3-24 is more than adequate to provide room for future decision makers, where is states

Date	Name	Comment
		"The community should undertake the following strategies in initial implementation of the policies of this Common Value. This list is only a starting point, and is not all inclusive." That is fine, but the word "consider" in 7.2.S.1 should go. June 2011 version – please revert to this: 7.2.S.1: Adopt "complete streets" and/or "context sensitive" policies and updated road design standards for all roadways. April 2012 version – please drop the word "consider" 7.2.S.1: Consider adopting "complete streets" and/or "context sensitive" policies and updated road design standards for all roadways. I also recommend that one additional Complete Streets Strategy be added to Principle 7.2 to address the need to evaluate and enhance Town, County and WYDOT maintenance standards for local and state roads. This has been an overlooked but critical aspect of the transportation plans. Complete Streets concepts must extend beyond just the design and construction aspects to also include the maintenance components of the transportation system. A strategy such as the following would be very appropriate to include: Proposed New 7.2.S.7: Reevaluate road and street maintenance standards including sweeping, road sealing, paint striping, crosswalks, and snow removal on all local and state highways in the context of complete streets, meeting the needs of all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders and motorists. -- In closing I thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please contact me if you have questions or wish more information on any of the points and issues raised.
4/28/2012	Markason, Steve Interested Public	I wanted to write to support the Comprehensive Plan and thank you for all your efforts and leadership during this process. This has not been an easy exercise and there has been a great deal of public and political criticism of your work and the outcome. I feel that this is a solid plan and that it focuses development in the Town of Jackson and limits the sprawl of growth. It has been recognized by many organizations in town that you have designed an appropriate vision and balanced approach for growth, wildlife habitat concerns and affordable housing that will have a positive effect on our community. I applaud you in your efforts and thank you.
4/27/2012	Greenwood, Rich Interested Public	I am writing to encourage you to approve the proposed County Comprehensive Plan. It is a good plan and it is good for our community. It builds on the principals of the 1994 Plan. In particular, the clustering provisions of the proposed plan are an important refinement of the 1994 Plan principals.
4/26/2012	Resor, Miller Interested Public	I strongly support the planning department's effort to look to the future. I strongly believe in consolidating our growth to nodes. I've seen this town change a lot. Change seems like an inevitable circumstance of living in a beautiful place. Despite all the change, Jackson still feels like Jackson to me. I think it is a no brainer that planning for the long term is an important step. Pass the plan!

Date	Name	Comment
4/26/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance has established the following formal position on the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan: “The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance supports the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and the core values that it expresses. Those values include: the concept of concentrated development footprints; the goal of an economy not dependent on population growth; and the focus on sustainability, natural resource protection, and scenic vista preservation. Therefore, the Conservation Alliance cautiously supports the adoption of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, while stressing the need to address the following public concerns in a timely manner: •The methods and tools for shifting development patterns in Teton County remain unknown. •Up-to-date estimates for the amount of development that will be allowed in each character district have not been provided. •Improvements and adherence to the Implementation Plan must be assured, which will require allocation of adequate funds. When these concerns are addressed as the Land Development Regulations are crafted, we are optimistic that this new Comprehensive Plan will make significant strides towards achieving the community’s vision.” Next week the Alliance will be sending more a more detailed explanation of our position, as well as some specific recommendations. We greatly appreciate the effort that all of you have put into creating this Comprehensive Plan, and we commend the public for their commitment and insight during this long and important process.
4/26/2012	Bates, Jeff Interested Public	As a taxpayer, homeowner, resident, stakeholder, professional engineer, and business owner I am writing to ask that you as an elected body, please vote to adopt the “approved” comprehensive plan on May 8. Further debate and comment will only continue to delay the plan and will not add appreciable value. This comp plan has been in the process for 5 years. Please provide the leadership necessary to adopt the plan, and move the community forward by getting to the business of creating the land development regulations. Thank you all for your efforts.
4/25/2012	Day, Candra Interested Public	I'm writing to express my support for the proposed Comprehensive Plan. I believe the current document represents the best efforts of hundreds of people over an extended period of time -- and it's time to approve it and take the next steps toward implementation. I'm sure it's an imperfect document and I also believe that local government is only one part of the community partnership needed to protect our beloved place. So this Plan is only one piece of a complex puzzle. However, I'm deeply grateful to all of you for the enormous time, effort and care which you've dedicated to developing this Plan and hope you will approve it enthusiastically.

Date	Name	Comment
4/23/2012	Campbell, Tom Interested Public	As we get closer to the official adoption of the revised Comprehensive Plan, I wanted to take the opportunity to offer you my accolades for the monumental task Teton County has undertaken and the tremendous job you, the Planning Commission, and your staff have performed in getting to this point. The entire Planning Department, especially Jeff Daugherty and Alex Norton, have in my opinion performed their responsibilities in the complex rewrite of the 1994 version with the utmost professionalism. The Planning Department has done a superb job of informing the public every step of the way and truly reached out to the public in a legitimate and repeated attempt to get their input by listening closely to what they had to say and taking these comments to heart. Now, in the face of loud opposition by a very vocal minority in our community, I encourage you to be strong, to recognize the good work Teton County has done, and to persevere in your efforts to adopt this important guiding document for our future in the valley, as written. Whether you adopt the comprehensive plan by resolution (preferable) or by ordinance (less preferable, if can the County even do this), let's just get this thing done and move on to the next important task, the rewrite of the Land Development Regulations.
4/23/2012	Halpin, Mike Interested Public	As the May Date approaches, please stay the course and adopt on time ...The community needs this completed and move on, its been way to long already Thanks for all your hard work so far
4/22/2012	Collins, Bill Interested Public	Thank you for hanging in there and finishing the comp plan. It is a huge improvement to the current 1994 plan and I fully support its adoption on May 8th.
4/19/2012	Black, Pete Interested Public	This email is to serve as strong confirmation towards to the Teton County Comprehensive Plan in general and those participating in such a committed fashion. The time, dedication and focus that our elected officials are delegating towards this blue print for growth is admirable and deserves genuine respect. Nothing is perfect, however I strongly support the current direction and future potential of the plan itself. My hat goes off to all involved, thank you.
4/18/2012	Cheek, Rob Interested Public	Please pass the plan as currently presented; it may not be perfect, but is a well-crafted document that deserves consensus and support...NOW!! Thank you for your consideration!!

Date	Name	Comment
4/17/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	Someone just sent me the attached article on "smart growth" planning, and its impact in urbanizing small communities. I look at this as a local concern not a concern about the United Nations and conspiracies or left/right partisan politics. But the article is an interesting perspective, which describes the current local Jackson Hole planning effort. A boon for urban developers and planners, but the resulting problems do unite many people across the political spectrum. Most Americans are unaware that one of the greatest threats to their freedom may be a United Nations program known as Agenda 21, The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development created Agenda 21 as a sustainability agenda which is arguably an amalgamation of socialism and extreme environmentalism brushed with anti-American, anti-capitalist overtones. A detailed history on sustainable development, definitions, and critical actions can be found here. Section III of the Agenda 21 Plan addresses local community sustainable development. The Preamble and Chapter 28 discuss how Agenda 21 should be implemented at a local level. The United Nations purposely recommends avoiding the term Agenda 21 and suggests a cleverly named alternative: "smart growth." The United Nations Millennium Papers - Issue 2 (page 5) says this of Agenda 21 and smart growth: Participating in a UN-advocated planning process would very likely bring out many of the conspiracy-fixated groups and individuals in our society such as the National Rifle Association, citizen militias and some members of Congress. This segment of our society who fear 'one-world government' and a UN invasion of the United States through which our individual freedom would be stripped away would actively work to defeat any elected official who joined 'the conspiracy' by undertaking LA21. So, we call our process something else, such as comprehensive planning, growth management, or smart growth [emphasis added]. Undoubtedly, residents of any town, county, or city in the United States that treasure their freedom, libelty, and property rights couldn't care less whether it's called Agenda 21 or smart growth. A recent example of this can be found in Carroll County. Maryland, where a smart growth plan called Pathways was drafted by the County Planning Department. The plan, if enacted. Proposed a breathtaking reshuffling of land rights: • Rezoning of thousands of acres of beautiful, low-density agricultural farmland and protected residential conservation land into office parks • Downzoning of agriculture land to prevent future subdivision by farmers • Up-zoning of low-density residential land around small towns into higher density zoning to permit construction of hundreds or possibly thousands of inclusive housing units, including apartments and condominiums • Inclusive housing with placement of multi-family construction on in-fill lots within existing residential single family communities • Endorsement of government-sponsored housing initiatives (subsidies) to ensure healthier, balanced neighborhoods Carroll County, Maryland is one of 1,168 cities, towns, and counties worldwide that are members of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) - Local Governments for Sustainability, which is an international association of local governments as well as national and regional local government organizations that have made a commitment to sustainable development. The ICLEI mission statement closely resembles that of Agenda 21. In fact, the ICLEI has Special Consultative Status with the UN Economic and Social Council and coordinates local government representation in the UN processes related to Agenda 21. Community leaders working together in Carroll County recently defended their county against overreaching smart growth initiatives. Richard Rothschild, a candidate for Commissioner, emphatically remarks, "Smart growth is not science; it is political dogma combined with an insidious dose of social engineering. Smart growth is a wedding wherein zoning code is married with government-sponsored housing initiatives to accomplish government's goal of social re-engineering. It urbanizes rural towns with high-density development, and gerrymanders population centers through the use of housing initiatives that enable people with weak patterns of personal financial responsibility to acquire homes in higher-income areas. This has the effect of shifting the voting patterns of rural municipalities from Right to Left." Smart growth plans usurp property rights and constitutional rights. Local officials, at the behest of State Government, revise zoning laws to fit into a "smart code" zoning template. A massive reshuffling of property rights ensues. Farmers may lose subdivision rights; conservation land adjacent to population centers may be rezoned into commercial employment centers; and low-density land in small towns is re-designated as growth area and rezoned to accommodate diverse housing including high-density apartments and condominiums. Finally. A healthy dose of federal- or state-sponsored housing initiatives is embraced to ensure communities are properly balanced. The net effect of these plans is to create highly urbanized population centers throughout otherwise-rural counties, while simultaneously limiting the availability of land for suburban and estate subdivisions, as these are considered an unsustainable waste of land by Agenda 21 disciples. Clearly, smart growth plans will impact Americans' future choices in where and how they live. Furthermore, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other federal and state agencies may attempt to deny grant funds to states and cities that do not adopt smart growth plans. Most Americans will remain unaware of the implications of smart growth and Agenda 21 until after it is promulgated in their own backyards. Ironically, these plans are more insidious than the Eminent Domain ruling by the Supreme Court in the case of Kelo v City of New London. Under Eminent Domain

Date	Name	Comment
		rulings, property owners usually receive compensation for their losses. Conversely, Smart growth municipal plans, required by statute, enable municipalities to change zoning laws and engage in other regulatory actions that devalue property, restrict off-conveyances, and otherwise erode property values without payment of any compensation to the property owner. Smart growth has another interesting unintended consequence: it can disrupt conventional alliances and lead to strange political bedfellows. Rural urbanization plans may raise the ire of environmental groups while simultaneously stirring the wrath of both conservative and liberal residents that want to maintain the rural fabric of their communities. Conversely, developers, sensing opportunity, may side with government smart growth bureaucrats in support of these plans. Regardless of political orientation, two indisputable facts remain. Agenda 21 is a direct assault on private property rights and American sovereignty, and it is coming to a neighborhood near you. [Indeed]
4/13/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	Before paying outside consultants over \$330,000 more this year alone after Comp Plan adoption next month, coupled with an additional "massive amount of staff time" (see attached), it would make sense for the Town of Jackson to honor the referendum right set forth in our Wyoming Constitution and statutes -- in order to see if Town voters are on board with the new Comprehensive Plan scheduled for adoption by the electors on May 8. See attached April 11 [JHNaG] article.
4/12/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	I still have not heard from the Town Attorney, other than her comments in yesterday's newspaper article. The specific Wyoming Supreme Court case she cited--the local Town/ Brew Pub case--works strongly in our favor: a Town comprehensive plan is mandated under our statutes, zoning must be utilized in accordance with a comprehensive plan, and land use will be guided by the community plan. See attached. Hard to see the Wyoming Supreme Court defeating a public vote by calling the new Comprehensive Plan a "mostly ministerial" resolution! Obviously the Plan is extremely important as the necessary framework for Town zoning, and the referendum right applies.
4/11/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	Dear Kevin: I just read your page one article "Girding for Plan Fight", quoting me. You had called me yesterday afternoon, asking about the next step on the Town referendum issue. I said that the next step was for people to assess the Town's response on the referendum vote, to review the final Plan revisions when approved, and then (as a possible next step after that) to try to obtain signatures on a referendum petition. As noted in my letter and in our discussion--which at the go-off I said was "off the record" -- I was not some critic commenting on the merits of the proposed Town Plan, but I do believe that a democratic Town referendum vote would be legally proper on the very important Comprehensive Plan revisions. I believe that is required by our Wyoming Constitution and statutes, if a sufficient referendum petition is obtained. Moreover, to me every Town voter is a "stakeholder" who should have a say--not just the government planners, politicians, media, advocacy groups, those who have the time and inclination to go to meetings, people with vested interests, hired outside consultants, etc. Some local potentates seem to feel threatened by the local democratic process. Maybe they should be worried, but that should not stymie a referendum vote. Two extra months for a public Town vote on this important matter is not much of a delay, after 5 years of meetings. Whatever. For what it is worth.

Date	Name	Comment
4/4/2012	Wang, Louis Save Historic JH	Together with the Teton County Commissioners, you have been working on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan for five years now. Much time and energy has gone into the plan including: meetings, professional survey, use of outside contractors, joint planning and zoning committee work, public comment, workshops, thousands of staff hours, etc. You would probably agree it has been the single most time consuming and important task that Jackson Hole government has tackled in the last five years. Yet, my understanding is you plan to use a 'resolution' for your final adoption of the plan. For what is probably your most important and impactful work product of the last decade, you plan to use a resolution for the final approval? This just doesn't seem right. The Wyoming Supreme Court has ruled that "a resolution, generally speaking, is simply... ministerial in character and relating to the administrative business of the municipality." The dictionary defines ministerial as "requiring the following of instructions, without power to exercise any personal discretion in doing so." Plan approval will hardly be "ministerial." On the contrary, it will be a hugely impactful act of personal discretion. After adoption, Land Development Regulations will flow from the new plan and each of the new/revised LDRs will be adopted by ordinance. Wouldn't you want to adopt the plan by ordinance as well? Since it is the new plan that will trigger the rewriting of the LDRs throughout town, the plan appears to be more impactful than the LDRs. For the reasons stated above and to avoid possible legal complications, we strongly urge you to adopt the new plan by ordinance.
4/1/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	This correspondence is in regard to guest and dude ranches hosting wedding receptions, dinners, and board meetings. Being a Wyoming woman, I know for a fact that important life events are celebrated and local, national and world decisions have been made at ranches in Wyoming. My sister's reception was at Goose Wing Ranch. Life long friends' receptions and memorials were at Moosehead, Lost Creek, Heart Six and Red Rock and Turpin. Believe it or not, ranching is hard. I know because my grand parents were ranchers in Idaho. My granny would tell me," You really don't have a working ranch unless it supports itself. If it doesn't support itself you are just a large property owner." Hence, the "Guest Ranch". It works. Five years ago my beautiful daughter thought a wedding in the shade of Tetons was the answer, so I looked into the Lazy Moose for a reception. I've been there for various non-profit occasions but never a wedding reception. This isn't a chuck wagon, although I love them. This is fine dining with fresh vegetables, grown in the green house and garden, served on granny's china. This is linen and crystal that people like me only take out of my china cabinet to dust. This is fresh flowers grown in the green house, good whiskey and intelligent conversation. Lazy Moose ranch is a wonderful small guest ranch, and former bed and breakfast, that has made its own nitch in the valley for 15 years. Let's not fix something that is not broken.
3/28/2012	Carson, Nancy Interested Public	The Jackson Hole News and Guide is shining a bright light on the county's misguided efforts to allow reception sites as a Conditional Use in the Rural Zoning District. Large acreage doesn't insulate neighborhoods from the noise and traffic and other intrusions big parties create. The party site may be a mere few hundred feet from neighboring homes. Such misplaced commercial development is just plain wrong for homeowners (who are constrained from renting their "facilities") and wildlife and peoples' expectation of peace and quiet at home. Tell the commissioners, COMMISSIONERS@TETONWYO.ORG please shut it down before you create a monster. I could never vote for a commissioner who votes for this horrible idea.
3/22/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	Louis-- You hit the nail on the head in your recent letter to the electeds. Being human (as we all are!), some electeds may have invested too much in a fundamentally flawed Plan re-write. Maybe some as promoters. Maybe some looking to go-along-to-get-along. Most probably counting too much on the planning staff. And yes, it is very difficult when a lot of the more independent nonprofit public input comes at the tail end of a long process, even though that is when most of the public sees what is actually being proposed. Not many citizens can spend 5 years in meetings, so they have to wait and see what is the actual proposed "deal". But what matters for these public servants is the public interest, not personal ego. They should not be saying that the public is too late, so the flaws will prevail.

Date	Name	Comment
3/22/2012	Wang, Louis Interested Public	I don't mind that you may personally favor transforming town; that's your right. But you should have been up-front about it. That way we would have had a real dialogue. Disguising your initiative as a green proposal was tawdry, beneath you. You're better than that. Now you don't want to be seen as having wasted 5-years. Worse things can happen. Do you really think spending the 4-extra years produced a better product? The fact that a 1-year job took 5-years is a sign of poor management and a questionable product. The nation forgave Clinton, who lied under oath, when he came clean. They didn't forgive Nixon, who was too proud to admit his error. You've been lead down the wrong path. Don't keep going on the wrong path. The community is justifiably upset. Simply say you're uncomfortable with the lack of unity. Say we need a plan that brings us together. You will be heroes. Keep hunkered down, pushing blindly ahead, and you may end up zeroes. Unfortunately, creating the plan yourselves turned you into 'advocates' and you lost your objectivity. It's human nature. You love your baby. You can no longer function as "lady justice" holding the scales. Make the right choice for the community, not for your egos. You have tough jobs. On a personal level, I wish you well. While local officials advertise the wonders of their new comp plan, the truth is it's a five-year central planning fiasco. The effort started out well enough with the hiring of an outside planning expert, Clarion Associates, to update the current plan. The work was to be completed in 2008. Clarion was fully paid, over \$250,000, but an updated plan was never finalized. Our local electeds have never told us why. Without explanation, they decided to do an entirely new plan and to lead the effort themselves. When politicians personally lead an effort for which they have little if any schooling, a politicized outcome is to be expected. Now, four years later, we have a proposed big growth plan that's more egregious than the one voters already rejected. In a referendum vote, the town's Downtown Redevelopment District plan was rejected two-to-one. The new plan isn't consistent with polling surveys. It's not what people want. Maybe our electeds don't believe in the democratic process? If truth be known, it took the extra four years to twist enough arms and create enough smokescreen to manipulate the outcome that the local oligarchy wanted all along — a town that will begin to look more like Aspen or Vail. There are occupational hazards in every profession. In politics it's arrogance and the conviction that you know more than those you serve. When politicians isolate themselves and hide what they're doing from the public, it's a sure sign they're on the wrong path. The public has repeatedly asked for clarity and predictability: Tell us how much growth is in the new plan. Recently, the News&Guide reported our electeds felt "releasing specific estimates could throw residents into a panic." Where, other than politics, is manipulation and deception so openly embraced? It's a rerun of the movie "A Few Good Men" with Jack Nicholson, as the Marine colonel, shouting, "You can't handle the truth!" There's a reason why congressional approval ratings are at an all time low of just 10 percent. When politicians deceive to accomplish hidden agendas, people lose faith. The new plan claims to save the rural areas by transferring development to the nodes, now relabeled as Complete Neighborhoods. It's simply not true. There is no guarantee of permanently protected open space in the plan. The best way to limit rural growth is for our county commissioners to stop encouraging it — stop granting development plusups. Density transfer is a ruse. So what's really going on with the new plan? In ancient Rome, they had a way to cut through political intrigue. They asked a simple question: "Qui Bono?" For whose benefit? Who will gain? Politicians have been trying to remake Jackson into an urbanized high-end resort for years, and they've mostly failed. Voila, the new plan remakes town with huge new density — so much they're afraid to tell us how much. If you're afraid to have people know what you're doing, you probably shouldn't be doing it. So who will gain? The property owners that flip their parcels to developers and the well-connected few will gain financially at the expense of the community at large. The price is our small-town way of life. To bring in the new development, you need to tilt the playing field so it's attractive to the outside big money that will own those glitzy four-story hotels. They'll need lots of cheap labor for those low-paying hotel service jobs, so low-cost housing and transportation will be an enticement. And guess what? The new plan requires 65 percent of the workforce to be housed locally, and politicians now propose a new \$40 million bus barn. Get ready for higher taxes and more publicly subsidized affordable housing. It's one thing to house the workforce we have now, but it's quite another to subsidize the outside developers that will destroy our small town way of life. Lastly, the new comprehensive plan isn't comprehensive. The whole reason to do a comp plan is to uncover the hidden impacts of what may otherwise seem like good ideas. But this plan ignores those impacts. It's a shallow and deceptive plan. Traffic and roadways are essentially ignored in the new plan. It's already tough to drive through town in the summer. How will we do it if traffic doubles? A genuine plan needs to address the real issues. How many guests will there be? How many cars and buses? How wide do the roads need to

Date	Name	Comment
		be? How many new employees, kids, schools, AH units, grocery stores? Does the valley have the carrying capacity? A real comp plan addresses these and other pertinent issues. Well, if it's not a real comp plan, what is it? It's an enabling document to grow the town. It's a commercial initiative disguised as a green proposal. The details aren't provided because if they were, the public wouldn't stand for it. The new plan is not on the up-and-up. To the politicians who initiated and promoted this deception: You should be ashamed. And to the majority of our electeds who simply went along: Stop going along. A "no" vote on the new plan acknowledges the truth — it's a misguided embarrassment.

Phase: Character Districts

3/22/2012	Crawford, Jackie Interested Public	I have read through the comp plan and am a bit confused. My neighbors have mentioned to me that a plan is being discussed to build a road through Melody Ranch to connect to Rafter J. I am opposed to this and want to voice my concern of increased traffic noise, wetland disturbance, and child safety. I really do not see a benefit that would be great enough to make up for the loss.
3/19/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Kristine O'Brien, I just wanted to thank you for the changes in Section 10 with roadway connectivity based on proposals, existing neighborhoods, so thank you for that.
3/19/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, thank you for your comment. On the motion that got amended multiple times with Commissioner Phibbs, I just want to reflect back what I heard and I'll just start with that, and there's two sections it'll be in—via pathways and potentially via roadway—and what I heard was connections between existing neighborhoods based on proposals from affected neighborhoods. Okay, so I just wanted to have Staff hear... Of connections between existing neighborhoods based on proposals from affected neighborhoods. Very good ?? and I thank you for that. Two things, especially for Commissioner Schwartz, just a reminder on the Area 10.2, which is Northern South Park and that kind of the north road, it's in the preservation goal, and I think the main language in there talks about wildlife movement throughout that area and agricultural viability, and so a north connector, I never envisioned as being current in that; I don't think it's in the language. And the Seherr-Thoss, via 10.1, that's in a conservation ??, which is two major goals in open space and then clustering adjacent to transition areas. So it also mentions wildlife movement and permeability, so when we talk about this north/south connector, it starts becoming in conflict with the goals we're setting aside for those areas. So that's just a ??. Thank you.
3/19/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Gail Jensen, thank you very much for the changes in 12.2; that really helps with...and I really agree that the changes, it recognizes extreme differences in that subarea, which are extreme. Thank you.
3/19/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, members of the Commission, just two quick things. One is actually to reconsider the issue of having three floors in 3.4. It's unfortunate that Planning Commissioner Allen was not present...or, well, she was present but didn't talk about it. I think she gave the most eloquent argument for that, and I think the issue really came down to, as I think Councilman Miles pointed out, there are three-story buildings there, but the question is what is your vision for that? Do you want that whole thing as three stories, which perhaps will overwhelm some of the two stories there, or do you want to keep it and say what's there is there as three stories? And I'm probably not doing as good a job as she did on that. She, being a resident in that area, I think she did a good job. And ask, since it was late, you were tired, I think that didn't get as good a discussion on that, maybe to talk about it one more time, if you have a little bit of time today. And the other one is also the issue of increase in intensity in 13.1 and 13.2, in the Village. I think that's also important. The committee has been pretty I think consistent in their statements of desire, and you've captured part of it with locking the footprint, but I think allowing an increase in intensity there is not a direction that most people wanted and perhaps you could spend a couple of minutes to talk again to make sure...you were tired the other night...if that really is truly what you wanted to do. And thanks for what you've done so far.

Date	Name	Comment
3/19/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	In advance of your continued meeting on the Comprehensive Plan this afternoon, I wanted to let you know that as of this morning, additional names are still be added to the Statement of Intent. This collaborative effort on the parts of many community members yielded nearly 360 names in only 10 days, and names continue to come in. Thank you for taking the time to discuss the Statement of Intent today, and for all of your work on this Comprehensive Plan.
3/19/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Trevor Stevenson, speaking on behalf of the Conservation Alliance. First I wanted to thank you for agreeing to a workshop discussion format for these larger issues. I think that'll be a great way to address it. Secondly, with regard to specific maps...sorry, with regard to specific maps that you're working on at the moment, there was a recommendation that came out of the Wildlife Assessment around stormwater that you all decided not to include as a text change within the maps, and I understand your reasons for that and I think that's fine. When we looked back through the Wildlife Assessment, one of the things that it's very clear on is that although the policies today talk a lot about stormwater treatment, making sure that we're adequately dealing with the stormwater that we generate, they actually don't do a particularly good job of talking about stormwater reduction, how do we reduce the amount of stormwater in the first place. This is something that is a rapidly growing field ?? I suspect. A lot of these folks don't hear much about it. You may want to sort of keep that on your radar, now that it's not a text change in the maps, as a possible addition or clarification in the policies when you get back to that. I think in general that Wildlife Assessment has some limited applicability to what you're doing on the maps at the moment but will be more useful in probably issuing the zoning as well as in the future. Thank you.
3/19/2012	Hawtin, Bruce Interested Public	When I ask my friends about the Comprehensive Planning Process, and I do ask them on a regular bases, I can collectively share with you this common response, "I know this process is important but frankly, I don't understand planning in general. I read an article and it just goes beyond my comprehension and the terms are a bit foreign. I am concerned about open space and wildlife protection, and I want everyone's property rights protected. But, I have a great deal of confidence in the County commissioner and the Mayor and the City Council to what is in my and the whole community's best interest. What do you think Bruce?" Funny they should ask! All of our closest friends own property in Jackson Hole, they have raised families here and all their kids have graduated from Jackson Hole High School, and most have had or still have employees. They have a big stake in Jackson Hole and they are very concerned about it's future. These folks represent the huge, and I mean Huge, silent majority that support you and what you are doing. On the other hand, the opposition wants no growth, and it is all about them. We all have been a part of, or read about those small groups of people who make a big difference one way or another, but this well organized, well funded, visible and verable group wants this county to head in the wrong direction. Can you possibly imagine living in a community with no growth? That is unimaginative, boring, and gives us nothing to look forward to! I look forward to a well managed, controlled and sustainable growth. I know each of you support that. The current plan before you does all of those things and much more. I don't need numbers. That is a scare tactic. The numbers will unfold as we move forward. There are safeguards and a review process in the plan to monitor numbers. I am not fearful that our growth will ever get out of hand. Please pass the plan before you. Then I recommend taking a deep breath, go on spring break, and then lets get started on the LDRs. After all, those are really the meat and potatoes of what this is all about. I promise, for better or worst, to be fully engaged in the LDR process. Again, thank you for what you do for this community.

Date	Name	Comment
3/18/2012	Fenn, Jon Interested Public	I had the pleasure of meeting with Paul Vogelheim last week to learn more about the new Comprehensive Plan. It was great to learn that the PUD provisions of the old plan have been repealed and wont be included in land development regulations under the new plan. If I understood Paul correctly, that means that private land in most of the County (other than in town, resort districts and the area by High School Road) can no longer be subdivided into parcels smaller than 35 acres. I think this is a major achievement that the BOC should bring to the public's attention! Congratulations on the big step forward in terms of protecting rural areas of the County. However, it would be great to see this more clearly spelled out in the new plan language: "there will not be any subdivisions permitted in the county which results in any lot sizes that are less than 35 acres in size" so there is no room for misinterpretation. In addition, this change should be made permanent because the plan is increasing density in some areas in exchange for this. Once the density is increased in certain areas there is no chance of "the increased density areas" being down zoned to lower density in the future. This makes it critical that there is a mechanism in place that permanently protects the rural areas of the county and permanently restricts them to no more density than one parcel per 35 acres. Without this, there is nothing to stop future elected officials from undoing what we are all trying to accomplish now for wildlife, conservation, rural character and open space. The Conservation Alliance language and concept makes sense on this point: the community deserves legally binding permanent protection of open space in rural areas in exchange for increasing density in other areas. Please try to make this happen. Despite the PUD accomplishment that Paul pointed out to me, I still have major concerns about the lack of clarity in the plan and the wording in the document. The summary sheet Paul provided me with which compares the Conservation Alliance Statement with the Comprehensive Plan Language worries me because the language in the Approved Comprehensive Plan is so ambiguous that it permits future elected officials, planners, conservation groups, developers and attorneys, to interpret the language differently based on conflicting interests and objectives. Lawyers are the only ones that benefit from this lack of clarity. The language in the summary sheet is ambiguous because it specifically says "it is designed to be a living plan. Able to proactively adapt to changing conditions and community needs" and then it goes on to say "As we identify our successes and failures in achieving our vision we will adapt our policies and implementation-continuously progressing through the cycle". To me this says that future developers and their attorneys, elected officials, planning staff and conservation groups can all try to change the plan and interpret the plan in the way they see most fit to achieve their objectives. This means there will be no certainty and that politics as usual will determine how decisions are made in the future. The comprehensive plan should increase certainty whereby homeowners, developers, neighborhood groups and elected officials should know exactly what is permitted in an area. If the plan is continuously "living", "adapting" and "changing", there won't be any certainty. Please try to incorporate language that eliminated this uncertainty. Please make it your goal to make the plan a binding contract for the community with as much clarity as possible so everyone knows what to expect in the future with the highest degree of certainty possible. Thanks again for your time, commitment to our spectacular valley and insights.
3/17/2012	LaRoche, Lynette Interested Public	I am a frequent visitor to the the Jackson Hole area and am currently considering purchasing a property there as a second home. Jackson Hole as you know is a very special place for all of us including the wildlife. We need to continue to protect the open space. Please resist the urge of some planners to transition this valley into a more urban community. PLEASE protect this beautiful gift of the earth. PLEASE don't allow greed to get in the way. We'll not be able to undo the resulting damage it will cause.

Date	Name	Comment
3/16/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	I have previously written you as a citizen of South Park and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Melody Ranch Homeowners Association to express my strong opposition to the inclusion of any language in the Comp Plan update that supports " road connectivity" in the South Park Character District. I see that the latest Staff Report includes such language. Should you decide that this reference should remain, I ask that you also consider including the following sentence: 'Roadway connectivity will be pursued only based upon demonstrable need and overwhelming support from affected neighborhoods.' This would be more reflective of public testimony and written input, more respectful of potentially impacted citizens, and entirely consistent with the intent of the document. Thank you for considering my request and for your considerable efforts on this planning tool.
3/16/2012	Stout, Dick Interested Public	Thank you for your continued support of the Teton County Housing Authority and the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally. I wish you the best as you proceed with the difficult task of adopting the comprehensive plan.
3/16/2012	Stoltz, Keith Interested Public	I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations. Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states: "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented." It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development." Page IV-53 states: "Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area." "Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered..." "Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance..." How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling. While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives. I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development. However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed. In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.

Date	Name	Comment
3/15/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Thank you for your discussions on the Comp Plan at last night's hearing, and your willingness to continue debates on some of the big topics facing our community right now, including the Implementation Plan, the numbers and the Statement of Intent. Attached is an electronic version of the Wildlife Assessment, prepared independently for the Alliance by Alder Environmental, which I passed out to you last night. This version has one small correction, changing the reference to Highway 390 in Alta to Ski Hill Road. The rest is the same. As I mentioned in public comment last night, the Alliance believes that it is important to analyze whether or not our vision and policies, as illustrated in the character district maps, can and will uphold community priorities, specifically the protection of wildlife and natural resources. In contracting with Alder Environmental, we were able to look at the maps and the natural resources and provide a check-in to see if the desired future condition of the community, specifically the transitional subareas, will result in any direct or indirect negative impacts to ecological resources. I will highlight one of our key policy recommendations, informed by the Wildlife Assessment, which is to amend Principle 1.2 to reflect the goal to reduce, as well as treat and divert, stormwater through encouragement of building practices that reduce impervious surfaces. Prior to adoption, we hope that you will add some language to address this. Thank you again for your attention to this study and the recommendations contained therein. Please let us know if you have any additional questions.
3/15/2012	Vaughan, R H Interested Public	I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations. Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states: "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented." It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development." Page IV-53 states: "Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area." "Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered..." "Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance..." How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling. While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives. I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development. However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed. In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.

Date	Name	Comment
3/15/2012	Hankey, April Interested Public	I believe that without civil discourse we as a species would have become extinct a long time ago. There is, however, a difference between civil discourse, and yelling. Adults are expected engage in the former, small children the latter. When I read certain ads in the newspaper that are attacking the credibility of the comprehensive plan I have a visceral reaction to the methods being employed and the amount of influence certain groups have had over the comp plan process. Purposefully propagating misinformation, falsely characterizing your tactic (ie – a statement which seeks to fundamentally change the comp plan document), as a compromise is not only offensive, it's also audaciously arrogant. Leave those tactics to the national parties; they're pretty good at them. You as elected officials were chosen by popular vote to represent your community. I urge you to avoid pandering to special interest groups who continue to try to hijack this process. Please don't abdicate your responsibility to the people who have the most time to show up at meetings. Please don't disenfranchise all the people who participated in design workshops this past fall. I've seen the data; the loud minority at the comp plan meetings does not fully represent the community's will, despite what they may say. You were chosen and are paid to represent the entire community and most of us don't have time to spend at public meetings, or educating ourselves about every nuance of this vision plan. The community voted you into office for a reason, and, quite frankly, did not vote others into office because their viewpoint was not representative of the majority (see: 2010, 2008 local election results). Do I agree with everything in the Plan? Absolutely not. I want there to be more development in the Aspens and in Wilson, for example. What I do believe is that the process by which we came to this plan has been solid and open and it's now up to you to see it through it's last phase. Support the plan! Thank you for your time and your thoughtfulness on this.

Date	Name	Comment
3/15/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	A few concerns: Ben, you did an excellent job last night, both with the public comment period and also the period following when the electeds were to discuss the input from the public in regards to the character districts. However, it was obvious to the public that by the time the discussion had reached the bottom 5th of the first sheet of notes, that no one was really engaged and extremely fatigued. The level of non-discussion was startling following 5 years of hard work on everyone's part. The discussion on the second page was almost absent. One commissioner even mentioned that he had not even paid attention to one entire item. And when you discussed Teton Village, I really do not believe that it registered that there are some 600 units to yet be developed under the existing plan. Please reread the letter from Grand Teton National Park dated June 11, 2009 to refresh your memory on the Park's view on increased density in the Village in regards to the jewel of Grand Teton Park, the Moose-Wilson Road. I would like to recommend that at minimum that the last page be revisited. I expected much more vigorous and dynamic discussion about such important issues. And we need specific numbers and clarity of design. Also, not one letter from the public was included in the discussion. Not everyone can attend the meetings and letters to the Board is the only way to communicate. I believe that the public had written in regards to 8.1. (reference letter dated February 29, 2012 from Bland Hoke, Jr.) I believe that staff brought up early in the meeting that there was great confusion regarding the "Rains Property". Why is it called the Rains Property, is it not also owned by the County? The public and residents of the area call it the Raintree Development. The confusion is that Kennel Lane is the natural division between the Aspens and the Raintree Development....not the buckrail fence through the middle of the Development. One part of Raintree is in Section 9, the other in Section 12-2. All of Raintree should be in section 9. Historically, visually and as it is now populated, it fits section 9. Thank you for your time and your service.
3/14/2012	Knopp, Jia Interested Public	I am writing to thank the people that have devoted their time to the comprehensive plan. As a long-term and potentially permanent Jackson employee and resident, I appreciate any efforts that would make home ownership a viable option. I love this town, but have long considered that I would be unable to settle here as I begin the family stage in my life, as a standard professional salary is insufficient to fund home ownership on the open market. I applaud your efforts to house 65% of the workforce locally. I foresee the comp plan making a huge difference in the quality of both residents and employees that Jackson can maintain.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mayor and Council members, Commissioners, thank you very much. I appreciate the focus that I just now received on character districts and transitional, or transects and transitional zones. <<inaudible>>, but it sounds like you're open to comment on those areas at a later time, if you don't do it tonight. It showed on one of the slides 7 percent of private land is in the transition or stable situation. Where's all the rest of it? I guess that's my question. And what that leads to is where is this going? And I think I'm competent to understand this, but I don't understand it and I think that's for lack of the kind of specificity that Tyler spoke to on that one area. We've had a lot of work on the Comprehensive Plan. Actually, the planning efforts have gone back some 50 years by my recollection. You have a very educated constituency and that's good and bad. It's good on one hand; on the other hand, they're interested in everything you do regardless of the fact that you put in incredible numbers of hours, as do the Commissioners and Staff. I think you owe it to your constituents to make this so that they understand it in as briefly a fashion as possible. Nobody likes to come up here and wonder if this is the last chance to talk or when the final decision is going to be made, so the more you can do to tighten this up and stick to timelines, I would appreciate ??. Specifically, character district maps, I'm glad to see the maps got developed. I think they'd be much more meaningful with numbers on them. And you can develop numbers fairly easily with GIS systems and the types of multipliers or bonuses you would like to include. You could develop a series of options with graphics like you do in each of several scenarios. I think that would be very meaningful, particularly in the County. I don't mean to slight the Town, but I think, from what I've heard, there are no nodes, no economically sustainable complete community nodes, whatever the term is, in the County, except in the Town and perhaps Teton Village. If I'm wrong, I think a lot of people share that misunderstanding. But, if that's the case, kind of specific things that were talked about in the Town, is just the numbers of stories in which you can develop population numbers, I think that would be very helpful in the County. It certainly would be helpful to me and I think to you. But the main point is that the impacts that we're uncomfortable with in this community, whether it's the width of the highways, the number of vehicle trips, the need for hospital expansion, or jail expansion, or more rapid transportation on certain streets—those are all proportioned to population. I don't know what the equation is but there is a mathematical relationship, and I think attempting to hone in on that a little bit would help us all. I recently have been made a Commissioner on the Wyoming Schools Facility Commission and I've become aware of the fact that, as the population increases, the state is mandated to consider capacity and build new schools where there's capacity need. Now, when you build a new school, you need land and you need ?? and you need transportation. And part of the long-term Plan, based on the buildout number of population, would be how many schools are you going to need. I understand it's a guess but make an educated guess. Or make two guesses if you have educated. And that's something meaningful to work with. I think the community understands that LDRs are really important, but some guidance, some sideboards, if you will, as well as <<inaudible>>. In Town, I think at some point in this process...I appreciate everything you've done...at some point you're going to have to ?? the process, take it back to Town and County. I think the County is easier to deal with. I would hate to be in the Town's position because, I'm not sure to what extent, but density, some folks feel they have a right to, if it's extinguished or not recognized as a legal property right in the County, it's going to be hopeful it can be accommodated in the Town. I think part of that accommodation is what do you do in the north end of South Park. I think that property is the only contiguous piece of the Town of Jackson that is ideal for annexation and development <<inaudible>>. It has all the qualifications. But I believe the County, in your Plan—I'm assuming you'll get something done first—that you'll designate that that's an area for further annexation by the Town when desired by the landowner. I know it gets more complicated as landowners get more numerous, but I think the sooner the better. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom and I will speak to the maps, but I have some other thoughts here initially. I've given a lot of thought to what I wanted to say to you tonight. It was with us last night and I'm reminded again of the serenity prayer: Grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference. Knowing the difference is always a challenge, as I've had a lot of faith in our system of government, but often I've been disappointed in how it plays out. Frankly, my faith in a fair process, even at our local level, has been an issue over the past several years during this process. That is not because of the quantity or quality of public participation, but instead because of some of the insincere response on some of the electeds to points of view on our position that differ from their own personal world view. The public participated at an overwhelming level with diligence, dedication and understanding. The Plan has moved significantly to better reflect the common vision for the Valley and has many times balanced appropriately to ???. But on many key issues, such as limiting buildout, defining the amount and type of growth in ranges by district, or committing any shifting development potential, to working with rural landowner stewards to find equitable and clear pathways to permanent open space, many of you have been intransigent and worse a few have crossed the line by denigrating the very citizens that pay your salaries and have faithfully participated in the public process. So tonight I want to speak to the overwhelming public that has participated in this planning process over the last four and a half years. I want to ask you to respect the public and not dismiss or denigrate them. I have so often invited the public to participate in this process, assuring them it would be fair and transparent. I must admit that it has been severely undermined by a few of the electeds at various times. That is not meant to be a global condemnation of either the Plan, or the process, or each of you, so please keep my comments in context. We can argue the facts and have intellectual arguments on shifting densities and defining future growth potential, but tonight be careful not to insult the public by saying they do not understand, or they have been misled, or their opinion is a minority opinion. That is inaccurate and disrespects your fellow residents and taxpayers. I reviewed all the public comment over the last four years plus this last week. The public has been consistently and overwhelmingly commenting about the same issues time and again, and to say that the recent Statement of Intent approach is a minority perspective of this community is simply not truthful. To say that of the public who has followed this process intensely, participated in comment, as over 90 percent of those 360 citizens on the petitions have, is disrespectful and irresponsible for any elected official, so please do not go there. Debate the issues, but please do not question the public's integrity. We are very close as a community having a vision in the Comp Plan that can be accepted, at least by most of the community. The Statement of Intent is an effort to clarify and re-emphasize some of the community's primary values in an effort to clarify the Plan to the max. Please leave the language as slightly amended by the Joint Planning Commissions for Subarea 5.6, Northwest South Park, as it is presented to you. I think it fairly accommodates the public's vision and comment while also respecting the dual desires of Town to have a growth trigger so it does not compete with Town Core and reinvest in revitalization, while acknowledging the rural property owners with estate planning timelines to help them come forward with their own plan to resolve their land deals and clustering options, so please don't change 5.6. Think where they are to be a compromise. In District 10, the language is much improved and now represents a balanced vision of the public's input. I would ask that one last time for you to add a qualifier or pathway to the interconnectivity goal on the maps in this district. I will not repeat the comments you already have from our two homeowner associations—Rafter J and Melody Ranch, representing some 900 homeowners—but please take road connectivity off the table for the next 10 to 15 years and focus on pathways. Transit is simply not an issue, as we have functioning and efficient school bus routes in both Rafter J and Melody Ranch that operate twice daily. START can simply map those routes tomorrow. Building on the connector pathway section for Melody Ranch, or Three Creeks Ranch, and South Park Loop Road, along with creating the extensive existing pathway system in Melody Ranch are large enough initiatives for a viable Plan, so please enter that thought. Thank you for considering my thoughts and my requests.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	My name is Jim Wallace. Commissioners, Mr. Mayor, all Commissioners and Councilmen, I thank you for this opportunity, and first I would like to commend Jeff and Tyler. They were always professional, always courteous, and always had an ear. I'd like to talk about the Willow Street corridor, which is District 2, Subarea 2.7. I believe that the vision is accurately illustrated. It is...I've lived there...September will be 30 years. I know that area very well and I've seen the transition and I believe to have that corridor with...now in...the vehicle traffic is minimum 2000 upwards of 3000. It is no longer...it's a hike, it's a hike, and so either it brings us to the discussion of do we want that as a residential area, or do we want that as a highway? I think that the dye has been cast. It is and it probably will continue to be a major north/south connector. I live right on the street. It is what it is. I understand ??; it is what it is. The vision now to have that corridor where it can offer neighborhood services and to build on the property line as a fencing then for the residential in the rear, so both east and west is most prudent. I think with that and with sidewalks to provide for safety, and then my wife, Lenore, who came up always with innovative thoughts, is that maybe one day it could be a one-way street—maybe Cache going one way, Willow Street the other way—would permit for smooth traffic flows and give you the parking, perhaps diagonal, that would be necessary for all of the activities that happen here, at Snow King, the events constantly, plus that wonderful, I think attractive, walkway from downtown to Snow King, which all of us use, it's wonderful. And then also the opportunity to have some economy there, to have small offices, and persons could live above, their families could live there, and the protected backyards would be shielded from all of the traffic. So, thank you.
3/14/2012	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Mr. Mayor, Council members and Commissioners, thank you. My name is Bill Resor. I live on my family's ranch south of Teton Village. I've lived here over 35 years and I was on the Planning Commission for the County for nine years. At the end of that period, I helped draft the 1994 Plan, and the first thing I'd like to say is you guys have done a better job than we did. I think it's been a better process; I think it's been more locally controlled and outside consultants were helpful but not driving it, and I think that's been a very positive difference. So, congratulations to you and to the Planning Commissions and to your Staff for very good work. In particular, I'd like to say the Planning Commission changes they made in the last round, I think were all very positive and moved, you know, really got the Plan tightened up a lot. And without going through those, I think they did a very good job. I'd like to make four comments—I was going to make three, but I'm adding one back in, even though Ben was telling me not to. [Laughter] You know, there's a well-meaning effort to try to add a Statement of Intent to the Plan, but I don't think it's needed. You approved the executive summary last summer. You've got character districts, you've got other pieces, you have Regulations that come out of this, and I think you've got a good solid structure. I don't think you need that additional level. As a former Planning Commissioner, I think it would be confusing, it wouldn't be helpful. It's better to have a Plan with this kind of structure that you can really use as a Planning Commission effort to look back to and if that helps you give, you know, set the vision for the community. The other general comment I'd like to make is on the tone of the Plan in the character districts. Please direct your Staff to, wherever possible, try to make the Plan really aspirational and positive. The Plan is what we want to be. It isn't...we're not going to get everything in the Plan done, but that's more useful to Planning Commission members. The Regulations specify what is and what is not allowed. But the Plan should be, as much as possible, a positive statement of what we want for our community. Also, those positive views are quite helpful when you're trying to get funding or other ways of protecting open space, so having a positive statement of what you would like there, I think is very beneficial. My last two comments relate to specific districts in the County. District 8, the River Bottom, Commissioner Phibbs has proposed a rewrite of Section 8.1 that I've seen, and that covers John Dodge and similar areas. I think that's a significant improvement over the existing language, and one reason, it is a much more positive statement and also accurate statement of what's going on in that...this is an area that's mostly built out. I remember the Dodge place when it was one large pasture that we used to lease. I didn't like seeing it developed but it was done very well. Wildlife deluge are as good or better in what used to be the, you know, what is now John Dodge and Wilderness Ranches than they were 55 years ago—that's for elk, mule deer and moose. I don't want to go into details of why that is, but it's definitely true. A lot of it has to do with good covenants, and I think we should look at that and use...really study that, look at everything from ?? from 1970 until now, look at what's changed there and why did that, you know, why is there more wildlife there than there used to be. And there's roughly one house for six acres and one for ten, so it's a good model. My last comment is on District 9, the County Valley, and it also applies a little bit to District 15. This is...it's good, it's well written but it needs a little more clarity. I suggested specific edits, sent it to your Staff and also specifics on a few other areas. The most important thing about this district is a lot of it is still in ranching and you need to emphasize protection of scenic vistas and agriculture. It's in there but it's not weighted out in front as it should be. Locals and visitors alike enjoy seeing open, working ranchland. These vistas are hard to preserve. In some ways, they're harder to preserve than wildlife areas. So, in District 9, the priority should be to maintain scenic vistas and agricultural viability. Parts of District 15, I think you could have that same emphasis, you know, for the parts of it that are in ranching or dude ranching. Thank you very much for your work, and good luck.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Smith, William Interested Public	Thank you. I also happen to be in District 9 and I echo that last comment. Oh, my name is William Smith. As I read, you know, the description and that kind of thing, ultimately, I or any property owner is going to read the Plan in terms of what can I or can I not do on my property, what freedom do I have to choose things, and right now the way the character district is described, it doesn't tell me very much about that, so it's hard for me to say, well, this is a good step in the Plan, or it's not a good step in the Plan. It's almost like I don't have enough information. I don't know what's coming in a sense. Therefore, I see, as a worried citizen, just a bit, every one of these planning type of exercises ultimately results in and culminates in regulations and ordinances and codes and things like that. I'm going to say that Teton County right now has one of the most bizarrely restrictive energy conservation codes that exist outside of anywhere but the People's Republic of Boulder Colorado. And I thought if I designed and built a house here 15 years ago, it'd cost me about four hundred bucks to get a building permit. That same building permit, according to the code that exists today, would cost me over a hundred thousand dollars. Now, that hundred thousand dollars of course is paid to Teton County. Do any of us believe that that is going to stop global warming or anything like that? Of course not, it's not. It's nothing but an extortion from the citizen and a limitation on that citizen's choice about what they want to do with their property. Now, as I read the documents, there was mention of private property rights way back in one of the earlier phases of the Plan, and I can't do a word search easily on the documents as they exist on the website, but there were two mentions of private property rights in one of the early vision documents. After that, I can't find it mentioned anywhere. So, all I'm saying is it feels to me like the whole idea of private property rights and the freedom of citizens to make decisions about the property for which they have worked and paid over a very long time, in most cases, is not obvious. In fact, it is noticeably absent from the planning documents as they exist right now. Of course, I realize that it's difficult to introduce another party into a planning function, such as we have now, but I guess I'm suggesting would it be useful to have a person along the planning or involved in the planning who is there as nothing more than a property owner, and as each of these things, as the numbers do take shape and as we do take these inevitable steps toward codes and ordinances and that kind of thing, have that person there to offer the perspective of, gee, I'm a property owner, am I willing to give up what they're about to take away from me here. I think that would be very, very useful. Finally, again the progress of a planning exercise like this...and, by the way, I'm a fan of Planning. I compliment you and Tyler and Jeff and the planning groups, so I think it's been done rigorously and I think it's been done competently, with the exceptions that I've so noted. But as we move toward these more...I've never seen a planning exercise result in less ordinance, or less code, or less regulation. It always tightens those bolts even tighter. And if I look again at this UN-drafted International Energy Conservation Code that is operative right now, implemented in our County, Teton County Wyoming, I would say how much worse can this get? Where is this all headed if that's our present code and the whole aim of this is to tighten the bolts even further? I want to live in the People's Republic of Jackson, folks. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Murphy, Katie Interested Public	I am writing to you today to express my appreciation for all of the hard work that you've put into the Comprehensive Plan. It is a necessary project and one that I feel will allow for a thriving and aesthetically pleasing community for years to come. I especially want to provide positive feedback for your efforts to house 65% of the workforce locally. I have lived in an affordable home since 2009 and have enjoyed working and volunteering in this community since 2004. This valley is my home and I am so proud to be able to actively participate in it's economic and social success. If it weren't for the TCHA and the affordable housing program, I would not call this valley my home. Housing 65% of our workforce locally will enrich our lives and allow us to truly be a community. Thank you for working so tirelessly toward this goal! Thank you for all that you do.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Good evening, my name is Trevor Stevenson, speaking on behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance this evening. First I wanted to say that I really appreciate the many years of hard work that all of our elected officials have dedicated to create a Comprehensive Plan that should better achieve the goals of this community. I do believe that your goals, as elected officials, largely reflect the goals of the public, and I know that it is frustrating to find that many members of the public do not yet fully support the work that you've done on the Comprehensive Plan. The Alliance is a public interest organization and we strive to bring good information to you from a wide range of perspectives, to better inform your decision-making about the Comprehensive Plan and other critical issues. In the last year, we have brought you presentations and reports that have included one of the authors of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, a leading expert on tools to achieve the shift in development patterns that you all are looking for. We've recently had a presentation by a local expert on the market forces that are driving development in Jackson Hole, and tonight we'll also be presenting you with an independent study that was done by a pool of experts on the expected wildlife impacts associated with the character district maps. In addition, we provided you with timely recommendations at each step of the process and we've worked to get as much public involvement as possible, especially in the recent design of the character district maps, so we try to come at this from as many angles as possible. Most recently, the Alliance has supported the recommendation for a Statement of Intent, and we recognize that this highlights a voice that perhaps is the one you want to hear the least. This is the voice of people who are not yet convinced that this Plan is on the right track and people who are seeking some additional assurances and clarifications before you adopt the Plan. We at the Alliance do feel it is important to try to clarify those concerns, bring them to you in a succinct and understandable manner, in addition to bringing you a wide range of other perspectives. The Statement of Intent is a very short list of concerns that are shared by a broad range of residents, and I know the request was to not speak to this this evening but, as I've mentioned to you before, without some clarity about the public process from here to adoption, I have no choice but to use this as potentially the last opportunity to address this. Please note that the many signatories who have asked to be listed publicly in support of this Statement of Intent include many of the people who have been closely following this issue for years and years. Their opinions should matter to you. We believe it is important for you to address their concerns and we hope that you can do this in a way that builds broader community support for this Plan. For the most part, the Statement of Intent is a request that you clarify and re-emphasize some of your core objectives that may not yet be sufficiently clear to the public. This would serve as a safeguard against future misinterpretation until you complete the new Land Development Regulations. There are at least two requests in the proposed Statement of Intent that may be different from your actual intentions at this point. We recognize this and I want to highlight those briefly. First is the question about when you will define the desired amount of growth in each district. Last spring, you all decided, as a joint board, that the desired amount of growth would be addressed when numbers would fall out of the maps. This was your approach to it, that numbers would fall out of the maps and the character district process understanding was we would be sort of answering this question. And so we all thought that was the plan up until recently. If you're not planning to address the amount of growth within the character district process, which seems likely at this point, I would ask that you please clearly explain why and when you plan to address the desired amount of growth and how you plan to address that. So far, we've mostly heard that you don't trust the public to understand the numbers, and we don't think that's a good rationale, especially when you haven't really explained how and when you will be addressing this. Second, within the Statement of Intent is the concept of linking any increases in development to decreases elsewhere. We're aware that there is a lot of debate, and legitimately so, about what sort of regulations you think would be able to achieve this and even the degree to which this objective of linkage is possible. We expect that all of this will get worked out when you get into the LDRs. What is lacking so far is a clear negotiation and an agreement between the Town and the County that your objectives generally to achieve some balance between increased development and decreased development and that you will seek to promote as much permanent conservation as possible when you get to these LDRs. I hope that you can reach a clear agreement on this in writing before adopting the Plan, because I think it's fundamental to a joint Plan is to have that agreement about balance and the role that each of you as Town and County officials play. I do recognize that the Alliance's support for this Statement of Intent has not been popular with some of you. I know that you would like to have the full support of the community and you'd like to have the support of the Alliance, and you may think that the Plan already deserves that support. I hope that having a succinct list of major concerns is nonetheless helpful to you. I don't expect you to adopt the proposed language verbatim, but I do trust that you will find a way to address these concerns as much as possible. Thank you for continuing your work for a Comp Plan that should not only be stronger than the 1994 Comp Plan but should also be understood and supported by as much of this community as possible. Becky Tillson will be presenting you later this evening with the independent study we've done on wildlife impacts and with the Alliance's specific recommendations on the character districts. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I'm Cindy Stone. I'm concerned about all of <inaudible>. What I just handed out to you is a copy of the Statement of Intent and I'm wondering which parts you don't agree with. And so I've given you all a highlighter and you can highlight on that sheet I gave you what parts you don't think should pertain to this Comprehensive Plan. So, be sure to put your name at the top so the whole Valley will know what you think. And then we want to know is it the part that says we are to permanently protect wildlife habitat, scenic and agricultural land? Is that not your intent? Or is it the part that says the amount of growth will be predictable and calculate? Now, I'm pretty good at math. I know that the sum of two unknowns is unknown and that 5 percent of an unknown is unknown. And so I think you need to start tallying into that and come up with some hardcore numbers. Now, this is the fourth time I've stood up here and said, boys and girls, we need to come up with some numbers here. I'm still on that track. Do you think developers should pay the cost of development, or do you think we the people should? Now this next one is hard for me because I believe subsidized housing should only go to first responders and teachers, but this next part isn't about affordable housing. It is if commercial development comes in and let's say brings 2000, 4000 or more workers than we have in the Valley, they shouldn't be able to come in unless they can provide housing to their employees. And last, do you think we should have an implementation plan, or do you think we should just trust all you guys to do what's ever right? <<inaudible>>.
3/14/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Yes, sir...Gail Jensen and I know you don't want to hear this presentation, but this is what...I'm a messenger from a very large group of people, so bear with me and then I'll have one other more specific comment, specific to one of the character districts. Chairman Ellis, Mayor Barron, Commissioners, Town Council, I represent all individuals with regards to this Statement of Intent. We currently have 390 signatures and the numbers of supporters are growing daily. This was a collaborative community process which reached out to all areas of Teton County. Residents from all backgrounds took part. It is a compelling list, which includes past electeds, appointed officials, past Town and County employees, conservation leaders, biologists, small business owners, regular citizens, second homeowners, builders, real estate agents, ski legends, you name it. This demonstrates the broad community support for the Statement of Intent. The News and Guide editorial said it best last Wednesday on the Statement of Intent and its need. The Statement will clarify ambiguous language that could be interpreted incorrectly by developers and decision-makers in the years to come. The Statement underscores the community's top priority, permanently protecting wildlife habitat, and recognizes that adding development potential to one area must be offset by permanent conservation elsewhere. It asks for a simple accounting of how much development will be allowed in specific areas, a critical omission in the Plan so far. The Statement of Intent also recognizes the cost of development and asks that residents not be made to subsidize it. Local governments also need to explain the amount of commercial development that would take place under the proposed changes, something that also has not been done. That accounting would show whether the goal of housing 65 percent of the County's workforce here is realistic, or whether commercial allocations should be reduced. Finally, the Statement calls for an implementation schedule that sets priorities. Town and County officials have heard these requests time and again but have opted not to include them. Instead the response has been trust us in an arena that demands predictability and certainty. Elected officials have given lip service to the Statement's principal points, which a broad spectrum of residents support despite a weary, complex and long ordeal. Adopting the Statement would do nothing but strengthen the Plan. Now I have one more comment and it has to do with a specific character district, and that's 12.4, 390 Residential South. It has to do with clarify that the stable character is that of one acre or greater lot size. I'm having a problem with this added language, because the very southern part of this 2.4 [sic] is very high density, much higher density than one acre. It starts at the two restaurants and then it goes towards the affordable housing, which is close to nine units per acre, and then the campground, which is now about ten units per acre, and then it backs up to one-half-acre and one-acre lots. So, there's no fettering there whatsoever in that, and I feel that throughout the Plan there has to be fettering between really high density and not as high density, and there's nothing there that works that way. So, I hope you can consider that. Did they combine the 12.4? Well, anyway, I'm talking about the very southern end there in that, so. Thank you very much for listening to my comments.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Rauch, Sasha Interested Public	The time I spent growing up in Jackson has led me to appreciate the unique balance that exists in the valley. The endless offering of exhilarating activities combined with the peace and tranquility derived from communing with nature and wildlife sets Jackson apart from other ski communities. I fear, however, that the proposed changes to the comprehensive plan will alter this balance irreparably. Though I recognize that the valley has changed significantly from the early days of my childhood, I believe that further development and increased population density along the village road would ultimately harm the valley much more than it would help. As a young person hoping to continue to live in Jackson, I understand the desire to develop areas that would provide affordable housing. However, the proposed plan would alter the character and authenticity of the valley to such a point that it would no longer be the place I grew up loving and one day hope to raise a family. The very plans meant to enable young people like myself to settle in Jackson would instead detract from the areas appeal and prompt me to look elsewhere. Finally, Jackson, as a largely tourism based economy, relies on the continued desire of outsiders to experience all of the wonder and beauty the valley has to offer. The undeveloped, small town feel of Jackson is what sets it apart from resort towns such as Park City or Aspen. I believe the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan would detract from the many aspects of the valley that appeal to tourists, leaving the newly constructed hotels in Teton Village largely unoccupied. Again, I am reminded of the careful balance that we, as residents of the valley, must seek to maintain.
3/14/2012	Ritter, Merrill Interested Public	The Comprehensive Plan, which has been in effect for 18 years, has worked very well and most people are pleased with it. Actually, most people are unhappy that something so successful is being reworked on so many levels. When one reads the public input on the Comp Plan website almost all of the comments are against increasing the density in existing neighborhoods. Please consider not doing any major revisions to support the temporary agendas of a few groups
3/14/2012	Huff, Laura Interested Public	As an individual who was born and raised in this valley and has recently moved back after graduating from college, I am very disturbed to hear of the proposed changes to the County's zoning plans. I see the proposal of additional nodes as being absolutely detrimental to the character and charm of this town I have called and hope to continue to call my home. Please do NOT allow these changes to the current Comprehensive Plan to go forward.
3/14/2012	Osler, Ian Interested Public	Dear Commissioners...it has come to my attention that language in the comp plan is ambiguous and confusing in different sections. After reviewing it, I agree, and I would like to hear more about the specific language in regards to the areas where development is earmarked to understand exactly what I'm signing up for. I live on the Village Rd. and had a dead Moose at the end of my street last month; it brought tears to my eyes. Now we have 5 or more wood statues of Moose scaring pedestrian drivers into slowing down, how many Moose will be dead on the side of the road with more clustering of houses on the Village Rd? I'm an advocate for smart growth and development in the nodes of town that can support them, but I'm also a huge proponent of the natural wildlife corridors that have less density in order to preserve our open spaces of Jackson Hole. I would like to see growth in the northerly S. Park area where we currently have clusters of apartments and affordable housing, and which has been reviewed as an area interest. I would also like to see development at Snow King, there're many private acres of land that can be pursued, it's close to town, and there's a great commercial area that can support more community interests. Why not develop Snow King like Teton Village, where there could be a new pipe and park snowboard training facilities with the JH SKI Club. There could be a summer training facility for our future snowboard and Alpine Olympians; I know several of these snowboard and Alpine racers that have moved to Park City to train. Why don't we have a summer concert series like, Telluride, Park City, Aspen etc. where housing and jobs can support the new residents to town. Lastly, I would like to see Teton Village grow more into a community with shops, stores and housing that's a sustainable community. Please reconsider the 390 corridor as a rural area of town that should NOT lose its current rural characteristics with increased housing density. And finally, I lived on the Westbank for 15 out of 16 years since I moved here, and I've NEVER seen a dead Moose in town, in the north area of S. Park, or in town by Snow King, but I've seen many at the end of my street on the Village Road. Thanks you kindly for your time!

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Wolf, Jim Interested Public	Hi, I'm Jim Wolf. I haven't been before you since about 1999 trying to get more investment in the residential areas in northern Jackson. The Comp Plan is about...and I'm not talking much about older residential areas. I'm basically talking from Willow to the Fairgrounds, from Simpson down to Snow King. And when I look at what's happening is the Comp Plan, as it's now written, puts this area in play. It's the downhill area. It's where everybody wants the density. It's everybody's got plans, and they forget that this is an area of active homeowners, it's an area that has been slowly re-establishing itself over the years in spite of the regulatory trends and up zonings and everything else that scavenge into that area. The Comp Plan is a problem right now in that it doesn't...it allows lot aggregation without being very specific about where you can take aggregated lots in there—two, three, what is a large parcel lot? That needs to be defined. It does not talk about abutting the commercial interest. How far can the commercial interest abut into existing neighborhoods and existing lots? What happens at the abutment between a commercial structure and say along the Cache somewhere and the adjoining residents? How are the residents protected? As it's now structured, ask yourselves the question, who is going to invest new money into the residential structures in this area? Very critical question, because this is an area that has not had a lot of new investment over the last couple of years. Right now, who will build a new single-family home there with the uncertainty that you've got and with the regulatory ?? that you've got even in the Plan? My worry is that you're going to get another, almost a Gregory Lane, kind of density slowly over the next 20 years enveloping that area. Is that what you really want? Or do you want a mixed balance of slowly growing accessory units, single-family homes, multi-families? I mean, because your Plan right now is not going to take us in that direction. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Jern, Ken Interested Public	I am writing this letter as a land owner and member of this community for the last 36 years. I came here to climb in the Tetons back in 1968. The Tetons have been my play ground: hiking, climbing, skiing and working as a professional mountain guide, sharing these scenic treasures with many others. I have worked as a builder here in this valley. I have seen very few changes looking up into the mountains from the valley, but have seen lots of changes to the valley. Living in and near the Aspens, I have seen a decrease in wildlife and an increase in traffic and congestion. You as elected officials have spent many hours reading and listening to our concerns as community members. The new Comprehensive Plan does not represent the desires of our community as shown by much public comment. We need a plan the gives us real numbers and actual types of development set forth on character district maps and we need transparency of actions that create open space protection. We as a community need a plan that is understandable, predictable and that we can be assured that elected officials and developers will not exploit this valley in the future. I have many friends and employees who either drive over the pass, up the canyon or rent here in the valley; they do not feel they are entitled to disrupt the character of existing neighborhoods with increased density. Now is the time for you, as our elected officials representing us as a community to listen and to act upon our wishes to "protect our environment and wildlife". You have a responsibility of stewardship of this valley for now and for future generations! Thanks for all you time and energy.
3/14/2012	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	Please give consideration to tabling "The Plan". What is wrong with the existing plan? Who wants this new plan? With the recession why do you need to hire someone else to work on the plan if it is near completion? How can you all live with the amount of negative feedback that you have and continue to receive? Don't you feel like you owe the very people you work for some answers? I have been asking for 4 years who the "WE" is that wants all this change. Bigger is not better. As a citizen that is experiencing a change in zoning in my back yard, from what I originally thought would stay relatively the same, I find it appalling that you want to do that all over Teton County. I can tell you it is very unfair to treat the people of Teton County in the fashion you do with such disregard to peoples love of this valley. How would any of you like it if a subdivision popped up next to your home? TABLE THE PLAN

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Yasrobi, Zia Interested Public	I am writing to you concerning the petition being circulated for consideration and for inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan. I not only think that the proposal is unnecessary but sincerely believe that it will hinder any future planning efforts in the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have elected officials in the Town and County government by popular vote and de facto bestowed our trust in their ability and judgment to lead our county and town. These officials have employed capable employees and consultants and have drafted a plan that has painstakingly taken every comment and suggestion (despite its relevancy) into account to develop the final comprehensive plan. Adding another advisory group as this petition suggests, is nothing short of ludicrous. We all know that governing by committee has never worked, and won't work in this scenario either. Only 350 of our more than 20,000 citizens (less than 2%) have signed this petition. The vocal minority should not be allowed to subvert the comprehensive plan at this stage. More than ample opportunity was provided for comment – let's be done with this and move on. Contrary to everyone's belief, the comprehensive plan is merely a tool and is NOT a fit-all, fix-all solution. Therefore, I reiterate that we should keep our trust with our elected officials and town/county staff to implement the new plan and help protect our valuable resources as well as our individual and property rights. I do not think it is appropriate for any "citizen's committee" to have a say on their neighbor's property rights merely based on their personal and financial beliefs. I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting, but would appreciate it if you would pass my comments on to the other elected officials.
3/14/2012	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Please include copies of attached letters (dated December 3, 2011) with additional signatures, all property owners in the Cache Creek and Upper Cache Creek and Snow King Estate area. The original letter was submitted to be a part of the public comment for the Comprehensive Plan on December 3rd. Between the initial submission of this letter and this meeting, we have continued to obtain supporting signatures, and submit additional letters with those signatures. This letter supports the Future Desired Characteristics of District #6, as published by the Town and County Planners on December 7th. We appreciate the recognition by the planners of the importance to retain a part of the Town of Jackson as only single family units with larger lots, and the recognition of the importance of wildlife permeability. Many thanks to the planning staffs, the planning commissions, and you, the electeds for the countless hours of work on the plan.
3/14/2012	Centrella-Meiter, Dana Interested Public	Soon you will be making a decision which will impact the population growth and density in Teton County. My parents moved to Teton Village Road 36 years ago and I was lucky enough to spend my childhood there watching the Moose crunch the snow as I made my way to the bus during my school years. After marrying a pilot in the United States Air Force, my home was made away from the valley for the last 17 years. But, my husband and I have always planned and been patiently waiting for his retirement from the Air Force so that we may finally return to our real home in Teton County. We have continued to vote in Teton County and remained residents of Wyoming for these many years. Now, life outside the Air Force is less than two years away and yet we fear the decisions you are about to make will drastically change and effectively destroy that which we have so patiently waited to return. Our life in the military has allowed us to live in Asia, parts of the Middle East, several areas of Europe and in many "planned" communities in the United States. Those experiences have firmly taught us that nothing destroys the local character of neighborhoods and towns than planned nodes and instantly created communities. It is the corridor of natural wildlife and landscape along with lack of population density and planned neighborhoods that make the Teton Village Road community so unique. Increasing the population in this area will massively disrupt if not destroy the wildlife corridor. The comprehensive plan that has been in place for many, many years has served the valley well and will continue to do so. Please do not alter that plan and take irrevocable steps to manufacture communities and population increases which will turn our wonderful valley into just another planned and replicated place thereby losing its rugged and wild Wyoming character.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	Hi, I'm Becky Frisbie, and I had written a letter earlier, which I think the Commissioners got. My one question has to do with workforce housing. I think that no one wants to get rid of workforce housing, but the main point is, what is workforce housing? I think a definition is something that would be very helpful. When we talk about having 65 percent of the workforce housing here, the important thing is to know what that number is, 65 percent of what? I think workforce housing is multi-layered, starting with apartments, which over the years we've gotten rid of, converted them to condominiums. I think that could have been a tragic error. So, we've got apartments, we have affordable housing, we have free-market housing, which is more affordable because the lots are perhaps smaller. So I think just a good definition would be helpful, because it's a term used throughout the Plan in all the character districts. The second thing that I wanted to talk about was Character District 8, which is the John Dodge that has been referred to in the past. I think there was just a lot of ambiguous verbiage there, leaving things open to somebody's decision and not just spelled out completely. And I think I'd like to see what Hank's written, because apparently that's been worked through a little bit better. And the third thing is the Aspens up zoning again. I think the stable, the stability should stay there, that the Commissioners or the Planning Staff did recommend, or the Planning Commission recommended. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Vletas, Stephen and Ki Interested Public	At Plan JH, in the Blog for March 14, 2012, Bill Collins asks, “So what is the problem”...with the plan? There are many, and we detail some below in our comments to the Commissioners. We are writing with serious concerns about your District 8 comp plan (12-17_comp_plan_district_8-5). After reading this plan, and carefully looking at the language, it is clear that wildlife takes precedence over human life, and that humans may in fact have to give up their current homes to make more room for wildlife. That is clearly what the language says, or at the least, how it could arbitrarily be interpreted in the future by a handful of officials who should never be allowed to exercise that sort of power. So our question is, is this really your intention? If it is not your intention, then you need to make significant revisions to language like: Development potential will be directed out of this district (8 River Bottom) and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented. Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount of impact of development. This language says that planners intend to change existing rules, take away current rights of home owners and land owners. That is not acceptable. The entire language of Section 8.2 is demeaning, regressive, vague and ambiguous and needs complete revision. Planners must specifically define which complete neighborhoods they are talking about. Define exactly what they mean by “improves the function of habitat and habitat connections”, and give specific ways that they will measure this. Specifically define “small structure”, with specific sizing and requirements. Specifically define “limited disturbance and be located to protect the function of the overall network of habitat through the community.” This is vague to the point of being meaningless, so if not specifically defined this language should be removed. Specifically define “Habitat will continue to be protected and restored.” What do the planners mean by “restored”? Restored how, where, at what cost, and how is this determined. Restored as it is used in 8.2 sounds like the planners intend to take away the rights of current home owners and land owners, therefore this language is unacceptable as written. Further, one of the most troubling words used throughout the document is “responsible”. Who gets to decide what is responsible, and what is not? Certainly, no public official should be allowed to arbitrarily decide this. Therefore the word “responsible” needs to be replaced with much more specific language. Examples: Promote responsible use of Public Lands. “Responsible public use of eco-tourism that maintain or enhance the wildlife viability could also be future characteristics of this District.” “The levee system along the Snake River provides an opportunity for residents and tourists to appreciate the ecosystem and engage in stewardship. Public and commercial access will be pursued responsibly with emphasis on conservation of wildlife habitat and movement.” Once again this language illustrates the planners desire to place more “emphasis” (read importance), on wildlife as opposed to human life. Other ambiguous language that must be changed or removed: “Less impactful to wildlife.” Seriously? Whoever wrote that line should be removed from the committee writing this document as they clearly have no idea what happens day to day in District 8. We live in one of the areas designated 8.2. Elk, deer, moose, and a myriad of other smaller animals, eagles, ospreys, birds, regularly use our yard, and the yards of neighbors as if it were their own. This “wildlife” lives in harmony with us in every way. They are used to us and we are used to them. Less impactful? That language is not only useless and regressive, but it is an insult to all of us who live in these areas, and who respect wildlife voluntarily. Other language to remove or clearly define: “Incentives to reduce density and human impacts....” Once again the planners seek to take away rights we have now? We request that each commissioner and planner specifically answer this and say one or the other: Yes, I think the role of government is to change laws in order to take away people’s rights, or, No, I do not believe the role of government is to change laws in order to take away people’s rights. We are aware of other comments to the commissioners and would like to comment ourselves on a letter from G. Bland Hoke, Jr., to the commissioners, dated February 29, 2012. Mr. Hoke writes regarding the District 8 language: Regarding Protection: “I am not sure I fully understand what the planners have in mind. In studying

Date**Name****Comment**

this language it would appear that they envision adopting new regulations that would change these neighborhoods in ways that no one, except the planners, has ever contemplated. What they clearly imply is that for any land use application in District 8, they will insist that homes be downsized, clustered or, in the worst case, removed – all in the name of protecting wildlife. This is just ridiculous and frightening.” We agree, and have sited our own examples above.

Conclusion: “I respectfully request that the current language be replaced with language that states that existing neighborhoods within District 8 will be considered “stable” areas.” While we agree that this would be a good start, we request even more specific definitions as described above.

“Finally, clarify the intent of the wording in Section 8.1. As it now stands it is vague, contradictory and ambiguous at best. At worst, it leaves the door wide open for homeowner uncertainty and bureaucratic mischief.” We agree with this, and request that the same be applied to Section 8.2 as we have stressed above, and really to all of Section 8. Further, Mr. Hoke is being diplomatic in using the term “bureaucratic mischief”. We do not feel so diplomatic toward officials and planners who would even consider presenting the current language in Section 8. To us, people who would believe that such language could work in a productive way for Jackson Hole, are people not to be trusted, and that is why we have asked each planner and commissioner to clearly state their intentions.

Our own conclusion is that the existing Comprehensive Plan has worked very well and wildlife has been more than adequately protected. Why fix something that is not broken, especially when it will clearly come at a cost of humans giving up rights and lifestyle in the “name” of enhancing wildlife movement and habitat. And if you really believe in this movement to enhance wildlife, we invite you to visit us at our home in Section 8.2 to see for yourself that everything is working just fine now; for wildlife and for us humans too.

3/14/2012 Huff, Mercedes
Interested Public

Hi, Mercedes Huff and I just have one comment that is the biggest concern to me, and I think Becky Frisbee addressed it a little earlier—it’s the definition of workforce housing. And I’m very, very concerned that it’s part of that with the 65/35 split. I’m not sure you can really bracket these people. You know, as I’ve asked before, my part of workforce housing, I think mistakenly it often, when it’s used in all these chapters of character districts, it’s really saying affordable housing, and I think that’s a big mistake because are we saying we need to put 65 percent of affordable housing here? But it needs to be clarified. It really needs to be clarified. The other...when I say I don’t think you can bracket people, the other 35 percent supposedly of people who are not part of the workforce, you know, I’ve heard that one of the most important things about having labor force or workforce here is the volunteer aspect that it gives to the community. I personally feel and know, first-hand knowledge, that many of these people who would be considered to be in the 35 percent are some of our biggest contributors, by hours, volunteers, nonprofits. So I think we’re sort of going down a dangerous road when we start saying we need 65 percent of these people and 35 percent of those people. I think they’re too many overlapping things without clear definition. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Kolsky, Eddie Interested Public	My name is Eddie Kolsky. Firstly, I signed the Statement of Intent. I've lived in this beautiful Valley for 35 years and it is truly difficult for me to express the words that I feel about this place I love so much. I realize that a certain amount of growth must occur, but I also realize that we as stewards of this incredible landscape must have keen foresight and enormous sensitivity as to how that growth occurs. To urbanize Jackson would be a tragedy, nothing less. After all, we live here. And people come here primarily for the wildlife resources, the beauty, the open space, and the small-town rural character. This is what Jackson's about. This is what is important. Above all, those are the things that must be preserved, above all. There is an area in Provence in southern France called the Luberon Valley. I spent one month there last April. I bicycled through there ten years ago but wanted to return because it was so beautiful, undeveloped, tranquil and pristine. The Valley is made up of beautiful farm houses and vineyards, fields of poppies, groves of olive and cherry trees, and numerous medieval hilltop villages that attract many tourists. There are outdoor markets every day of the week in a different small town or village. There are no massive housing developments. There are no golf course developments. There are no big highways. And you know what? Ten years later it's essentially the same. The industry that keeps Luberon going is tourism. That is its golden egg. It is alive and well there and I'm going back. My question is, do we have the foresight, sensitivity and imagination to do whatever it takes to retain the remarkable character of this Valley like the powers that be in the Luberon Valley in France have done? My answer is, we must. It is absolutely imperative. Do we have the will to restrain from trying to squeeze every possible dollar out of this Valley? Does the Town of Jackson really have to have such an aggressive commercial growth agenda that will greatly increase the need for employee housing? Do we really need that much growth? Does it have to be about dollars? When is enough enough? In the end, isn't it really about the wildlife, the beauty, the small-town character? Most of us here know the real answer. That is why we live here. That is why people come here. I think that ?? in the 1994 Plan are a mistake. Although there are several aspects of the currently proposed Plan that I would like to address that I do not support, I am narrowing the rest of my comments to the effects of the large up zoning proposed for the land adjacent to the Aspens on the Teton Village Road, and I realize the Planning Commission has made recommendations but I realize the County Commission has not founded those recommendations. If the land adjacent to the Aspens is up zoned, it will mostly likely doom the Village Road to widening similar to a rural interstate, four or five lanes. Can you imagine that? Consider the negative effects on wildlife populations. Cars killing moose is already horrific. Picture for a moment how that will make that beautiful corridor look for residents and tourists. Say goodbye to beautiful golden cottonwoods in the fall. Think about the effects of increased noise on local residents and their property values. Imagine traffic volume and the poor air quality as a result. If the elected officials are truly there for the goals and desires the community has overwhelmingly and repeatedly expressed, then the proposed Aspens up zoning should be off the table for good. Please listen to the community with respect to wildlife preservation and open space as its top priorities. Please listen to Mary Gibson Scott's concerns regarding the Village Road and its potential effects on the Park. If the degradation of quality of life is the direction we are going, then we are going in the wrong direction. Please do what you need to do to keep the character of this Valley in tact. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Hanlon, John Interested Public	Thank you, Council, Commission, Mayor and Chairman. My comments go to all character districts. Oh, I'm sorry, John Hanlon. There are more than a few amenities in our community and I ??, everybody has their viewpoints and you can't satisfy all of them. But there is one thing that many would like in their backyard and that is to be able to have a guesthouse or auxiliary unit, however you want to describe it. And many of our workforce rent, some because they don't have a down payment for a house, some because they prefer that. We're seeing our entire nation change from fewer owners to more renters. We're going to have a lot of people who lost their homes and won't be able to buy a home for several more years, so renting will be for some people their only option. An auxiliary unit, it provides a little income to the homeowner who owns that auxiliary unit. It takes some pressure off them in their mortgage payments. This is an expensive town and it'd be nice to have a little bit of help. It helps to avoid the building of unattractive, large-scale projects and it distributes the workforce population in developed areas, which speaks to the nodes. If somebody on Simpson Avenue puts a guest unit in the back and is allowed to rent it, you don't have to go develop a new part of the County. And its single landlord/tenant relationships, I think are just healthier. They tend to suppress...if I have a renter in a guesthouse in my backyard, he's not going to have a caterer, he's not going to have a huge party. It's going to be a...it's a healthier relationship. And that concludes my comments. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	I'll be very brief...Steve Harrington. I would also like to address the numbers fight and I know exactly why nine out of ten of you voted not to have numbers. The number is scary. If one comes up with a number, it would be like an earthquake, because some of these posted on the board, whatever that number is and everybody can take shots at it for one reason or another. However, the other side of that is, you, as all public officials and subsequent public officials to come, could benefit from that number because you are always looking for how do we...do we have a capital facilities plan? The number allows you to have a capital facilities plan because suddenly you know what that number...what you need to accomplish that number. And I would suggest also when you...if you did, and I hope you do, come up with that number, that you add to the what we might call the permanent residential number, you add to that the transient population, which is what we have in our condos and hotel rooms and motel rooms, because those folks obviously affect transportation, sewer, water and other, you know, Fire Department, Police, whatever. So, you have a combination of transient and permanent and those two numbers are...who knows what the difference is—it could be quite considerable—but I think that number would allow you to then, as most people could easily do, back off from that number, back out from that number, anything that you would like to come up with, because once you have the top number, you can figure out anything from there. So I would encourage you to take a look at that number and don't be afraid of it. I mean, it is what it is because eventually it's going to happen, you can't hide it, you have to...it has to come out, and that makes life a lot easier for everybody. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. A specific...the only general comment I'll make is permanent protection permeate all three common values. Specific to the Village, just because I don't know what you guys are going to discuss tonight, don't open up that Pandora's box, please leave that development potential as is. Wilson should be confined to the Wilson Commercial District as is. Northwest South Park should be confined to existing clustering available incentives as is. And if you're going to foist the Aspens up zone in 12.1, on that area, at least give it the same right as the Wilsonites had to form their own commercial district the way the ?? program. There was a demand in the...simply the demand isn't there, the road capacity and all these other issues. I'm going to take my best shot at trying to tie all these disconnected decisions that we've made throughout this process together. You've answered a lot of questions, and I know that's arrogant but ??, but I invite anybody to improve upon it and hope that somebody does. I think initially the Town should receive a measured and deliberate upfront allocation of units to seed the program and prime the pump, so to speak. Thereafter, Town receives an annual approval allocation of units commensurate with third-party-certified unit extinguishment to conform to that permanent protection clause, which would become an annual indicator for Staff to simply present that indicator at the annual meeting. This extinguishment could occur by any means available. If the Mayor and Town Council worry about that upfront allocation, which would take care of the numbers argument, it would take care of the permanent protections argument, we have 330 units available for extinguishment when the Park...or the state school section is transferred to the Park potential. We have the same potential with the aggressive program, the great program of the Land Trust, a ten-year program with 1500 acres of acquisition over in Alta. We could use some more foundation. We could use the Rendezvous Conservancy extinguishment, we could use ??, we could use it by whatever means necessary, tax and grant. This would make an absolute tie, satisfy the community's request for permanent extinguishment to occur prior, with the exception of that free allocation of units to Town. Again, if you can come up for a better way to do this, I'd love to hear it. Town would then use these units as currency to stimulate or to incentivize the government exactly where we want to see it. So, in essence, what would we be doing? We wouldn't negotiate this; this will be implied upfront. Town would have locational flexibility, whereas the community would benefit from the numerical predictability component. This would satisfy...once again, the two words that are hanging people up on this wonderful Statement of Intent the community came up with, which are linkage, or nexus, in bullet number one and predictability in bullet number two. It will also satisfy the numbers request and make the numbers calculations very easy. Who benefits from this? There's a market response in this component to this, an elasticity almost, that allows the units to be available because they're approved at the exact time when the market demand is there. That would be an attractive...the Mayor and Town Council also could acknowledge that one of their goals in this process is to reduce the increasing disparity of sales-tax revenue allocation. Every additive unit that gets built in the County, there's two units Town has to build based on the current potentialization to try to reverse that disparity. It also would avoid fighting battles that we don't need to fight. The public has been satisfied with permanent protection and a logical, doable way to achieve that, plus the predictability component. The County Commissioners don't have to fight that PRD battle, which will be brutal. A down zone proposal would have...politics make strange bedfellows. It'll be...so that's a battle we don't need to fight. We don't have to fight all the nodal battle and we don't have to fight all the externalized cost from Town to County. And Staff should love this program because it would create essentially the nation's first realistic TDR, this TDR program. We don't need to fight off the TDR complexity and contemplation of battle. (Okay, okay then.) The...and again I challenge the community. It's a hopeful challenge; this isn't an arrogant challenge. Please, somebody come up with a better way to tie this thing together, to try to do more with less. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	Good evening, I'm Scott Pierson. I thought this was about the pathway ?? [Laughter] A couple of quick comments, specific. I'm a little concerned about the Periphery zone, that some of these smaller parcels, like Pacific Creek, Camp Creek, Ditch Creek, ?? Creek, and ?? neighborhood up there, that are actually included in the large parcels in the Periphery, that they don't fit that equation, and if there was something added to address those. It doesn't have to be much because there isn't much there, but I'm afraid they're going to large parcels, ranch-size parcels, like the Pinto Ranch, up in that area. So, I'm a little bit concerned. There should be some kind of ?? in those parcels up through there. Also, in the District 9—that was District 15, this is District 9—it says at one point no additional nonresidential development, and I know that the Stillson Parking Lot is in that district and so is the new Rendezvous Conservancy Park, and if they're considered nonresidential, I'd hate to see both of those get too constrained because I know there's some ideas in both of those places. And also the Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis Club is in there. So, some of those broad goals in that County Valley District 9 I think are a little misstated. They're restated later under the 9.2s and 9.3s, but the beginning part might misrepresent that. And the maps, I hope the resolution to those are a little bit better when they do come out because the legend that 8½ by 11 is hard to determine what you're trying to get at and the visual card or arrows are very confusing. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Stennis, John Interested Public	I'm John Stennis. Good evening, Mayor, and Town Council and Commissioners. I support the Comprehensive Plan, because when my grandparents moved here in 1970, they moved here because they liked our beautiful scenery, our open spaces, and our rich and vibrant community that we have. And, as a young person, I spent a lot of time with my grandparents here; I've worked all of my summer jobs here; and after graduating college, I moved here to work in the architectural profession to help shape this community into something that I feel like we can all be proud of. And I support this Comprehensive Plan because I think it rights a lot of the wrongs that perhaps were implemented in the '94 Plan, because I think we look back on maybe we're not terribly pleased with some of the results. I think the '94 Plan did a lot of good things, preserved a lot of open space, but I think what we have here in this new Plan is going to do a lot for our community. In the five years that this has been going on, we've been pretty stalemated waiting for this Comprehensive Plan to move forward, and I feel like we're finally there and very close and I encourage you to pass ??. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, and members of the Commission and members of the Town Council, Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I have a couple of things here, some of them are because I think this is our last chance to talk. One is I would urge you to reconsider the goal of the 60/40 split. Very quickly, one of the things that that means is, if you actually think about it, from an historical perspective, you're going to have to increase the Town development by 50 percent of historical average and decrease the County at the same time by 50 percent to get that 60/40 split. That's a...I don't think that's realistic. It drives a lot of bad things, it causes a lot of problems, which is where a lot of the mistrust comes from. Your own facilitator recommended a 50/50 split, and I urge you at some point before you're done to reconsider that. Also reconsider the 5-percent trigger. I think at the current rates, we believe that may be too high. People would be more comfortable we believe with a re-evaluation every two to three years, perhaps going with a fixed time, rather than with this percentage, and then we can extend it later as we have more confidence in the system, you know, it'll just come to that. And then also I want to talk then about the character district maps. It was asked by someone to estimate what was possible in a specific character district, and I think it illustrates what is still a major flaw in what has been done so far. In the one district, it clearly defines what heights, stories, but there's no real definition of intensity or coverage. So, if we assume the same FAR is there, then that means that we're going to go higher, we're going to squeeze it down so that there's no net increase in square footage, which I don't think is what you're intending to do. So, there is some mention in the...I can't remember the name now for the little map that goes...but it's not very good at describing what is...now we can look at stable and transition and get some ideas in terms of it, but it's really hard to convey then to this person, well, is it going to look like it is now, if we go look at this thing that's maybe built under the current FAR, or built out, is it going to look like that, or what is it going to look like? So, that's...one solution to that would be—I hate to say it—but it would be to provide numbers. Unfortunately, nine of you have decided that we can't be trusted with numbers. I know I personally am a little confused on that because society as a whole trusts me to handle guns, alcohol, and cars, but I'm not allowed to be trusted with numbers. [Laughter] And I don't mean that as a joke; I'm trying to make a point, that numbers are important. And, you know, one of the...as we squeeze into the next point, which is that while the Plan has sort of a pseudo promise to try and stay under rough doubling, that only applies to dwelling units; it doesn't apply to commercial. And that flaw becomes obvious when we talk about this previous example. As you start going around in an area, it's easier to envision what's going to happen with residential, but with commercial, it's not. So, we hope that you will consider trying to address what I see as some of...or we see as some of these flaws before you go through to the final adoption. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Biolchini, Robert, Jr. Interested Public	Good evening, Robert Biolchini, Jr. I want to thank everybody for all the hard hours you guys have put in. I don't want to make you feel as though I don't acknowledge all the hard work from all of you guys with regard to this Plan. I want to start off with something that somebody said to me the other day—what's the difference between a conservationist and a developer? And the answer is a conservationist has their cabin in the woods and the developer wants one. And so as we move forward and try to balance all of this stuff out, we do have the push and pull with regard to growth of our community and those that don't want to see it grow. And the interesting thing that I've noticed about this whole process—and I can definitely be corrected if I'm wrong here—I think a lot of the public input so far has been about 1 percent in terms of moving through this visioning statement, to mean I don't know that we're necessarily hearing from the entire public at large, mostly because of confusion or misunderstanding of what this Plan really represents. So, I was thinking last night, character districts, what the heck are character districts? And I thought, who cares, maybe this is just a fairytale notion. And what do I mean by that? Well, I don't know how a character district is going to directly affect me, in my neighborhood, what's going on, specifically. So, as this process moves forward, it's tough to really get a hold of where we're going. And again I don't want to say that all this hard work goes without merit. We've been working through this consensus process. It's been very, very slow, four years in the making. The goal I thought was originally the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, making it less restrictive and easier to understand along the way. I feel as though this kind of builds on Mr. ??'s comment that this is becoming...the new Plan is more restrictive, more complicated, and more bureaucratic in that the more regulations you put down on the books, the more people you're going to have to staff to go out and make sure that everybody is staying within the confines of what those regulations are. I know you guys are voting tonight on the character districts to move forward, and this is the part that really bothers me. In this process, I guess, this is what's bothering me. Once you guys vote, apparently we can't go back to it. We can't go back into the Plan and say, well, we've already considered that so we can no longer look at that. And I think that that, over time, is not a good idea. And I'd like to use just a car analogy. So far, as I can tell, you all have created the body of a car and it's restricted in size and scope, yet we don't know the size of the motor, the transmission, the electronics, the suspension, and so we're going to take all of this and we're going to try to jam it in this little body, ?? Body, we don't know yet, because as this process moves forward, we're just trying...we the people are trying to garner a better understanding of how this is specifically going to affect each and every one of us. So, what I came to was recommending or asking you all if you would move forward quickly, very quickly to get all these maps defined. Define them so we know what we're up against. And I'm talking about neighborhood by neighborhood and street by street and all of those aspects so that we have a better understanding of exactly how this will impact. The second part of it...and the reason that I say map it out neighborhood by neighborhood is we're going to see this discriminatory process move forward. We've heard language tonight of people saying the nodes are too thick in the Aspens. Or other language of 3000 home sites are going to come from Teton County into the Town of Jackson. Without our knowing what this really is, it makes it very difficult for us to get onboard with the Plan and understand what the Plan really is. And I know that you're all working towards that goal; I do realize that. The other thing that I have is constitutional responsibility. And...I will, thank you very much...constitutional responsibility, I've asked for you all to consider a schedule of values, something, anything we can grab, and I guarantee we're going to make mistakes, you're going to make mistakes, we've got to hash this stuff out. Because when you go in and you're going to cut private property with nodes or open space or whatever those things might be, and putting them into, for lack of a better term, socialist collective, what about the private property owner? What about the individual and what kind of compensation they get from that, along with where does that source of compensation come from? And the last thing I would ask for you to please consider... Okay. My final point would be to please take this, the Comp Plan, to a referendum for us to vote on after you get the maps done before this November election. The reason is so that we have a better understanding of how quickly we can get this process done so that we can see exactly what's going on. And one last comment, with all due respect, clapping in a public forum is our First-Amendment right.
3/14/2012	Jern, Ken Interested Public	County Commissioners, Council members and community, members of this community, this fine community, we all have a vested interest here. I've lived in this Valley for 36 years in the Raintree Subdivision adjacent... Ah, Ken Jern, excuse me. And to elaborate on...living in and around the Aspens for 36 years, I've seen wildlife come and go and lately they're ??, and traffic and congestion has increased hugely. Myself and my neighbors have invested in the Raintree Subdivision under the assumption that it was one house per three acres. Well, the County and the Housing Authority have bought five acres for well above the market value and that five acres I do not think is going to be one house per three acres. We don't know the numbers. It could be like the Millward Subdivision. And the Aspens right now is very congested. Getting in and out of there as a pedestrian, as a bike rider, in a vehicle, is hugely...it's a giant hazard, it's a safety issue. And when you put another big development in there, it's going to impact the Village Road, and trafficwise it's going to change this character, the Aspens character district. So please think about what you do today. Thanks a lot.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance <<inaudible>>. Thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight and for your years of dedicated work on this Comprehensive Plan. Thanks to the Staff as well and the community for showing up tonight and over the course of the last five years. The first thing...I have two things to cover tonight, but the first I want to cover is the implementation plan. You guys have received comments from us about that and we look forward to engaging more with you and the Planning Staff and the community as this is developed. Tonight I have a couple of requests for you. I guess the first is to clarify your intentions with regard to this implementation plan in terms of what it's going to address and how deeply it will delve into these issues and to which issues it's going to cover, just clarify that, as well as commit to having it available for the public review as soon as possible. I also ask that you commit to approve the implementation plan when you adopt the rest of the document. If it is approved at the same time, at adoption, it will be able to serve as a roadmap for the next few years of LDR updates and planning work and will allow the community, all of us, to hold our local officials accountable for the implementation of our goals as presented and spelled out in the Comprehensive Plan. The second thing I wanted to raise as well, and that's something that I just passed out to all of you and we'll make it available for ?? as well, and that was prepared by Alder Environmental for the Conservation Alliance. We at the Alliance believe that it's important to analyze whether or not our vision and policies, as illustrated in the character district maps, can and will uphold community priorities, specifically the protection of wildlife and natural resources. So, we contracted with Alder Environmental to take a look at the maps and the resources, the natural resources, and provide a sort of check-in to see if the community, specifically in the transitional areas, is built out to the desired future condition, then what would the potential direct and indirect negative impacts to ecological resources be. I hope that you'll all have a chance to look at and read this document over the next couple of weeks. For now, I guess I'll highlight quickly the three primary recommendations from the report that we think you guys could take action on tonight included in the character district maps. First of all, references to Policy 1.2 should be included in the Town districts, as well as in West Jackson and Teton Village, and that's air and water quality. Specifically, those districts should mention minimizing impacts on water quality through reductions in impervious surfaces, encouraging or requiring design practices, such as vegetated roofs or rainwater tanks, and then also continue to practice stormwater practices, which are excellent and just build on them in the future. The second recommendation is the boundary of District 6 point...or, excuse me, 5.6 should be moved off of Flat Creek a little bit to provide a meaningful buffer between the riparian area and potential future development in that district. A good example of the functionality of that sort of buffer is the 150-foot buffer in Rafter J—that was an example stated in the report. The third recommendation would be for the Town districts, as well as West Jackson and also in Teton Village. These districts could benefit from additional language regarding the importance of wildlife permeability. Many areas in our community are within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public lands, even if they are on private lands themselves. The use of riparian areas and more broadly open spaces and natural areas provide important wildlife habitat and corridors. Development that occurs in or near these amenities must account for wildlife movement and permeability. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated this evening. And I'd like to thank everybody again, all you guys, for your years and years of service and your work on this Plan for the future.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Ross, Ty Interested Public	Hello, my name is Ty Ross. I represent the Ross family. We all do live in District 7.2, often known as Hog Island. Our family owns significant sites, parcels of land located in this district. I also represent the Robertson family and the Evans family, both of whom also own large tracts of developable land within that district. I believe the representatives of each of these families have been outspoken and active throughout the current planning process. And based on our review of the vision statement for District 7.2, it seems much of our input was either not received or poorly translated in the Plan document. However, in recent discussions with County officials, it's apparent that significant alteration of the version that was certified by the Planning Commission is highly unlikely. With that said, I would like to at least propose some minor modifications to the language within the vision statement for District 7.2. We first direct your attention to the statement that development should be pushed toward Munger Mountain. Since protection of wildlife is a primary common value, above all others, addressed in the planning process, and since the primary ?? migration corridors skirts the base of Munger in this area, it stands to reason that development near the corridor should not be encouraged. Therefore, we propose the language pushed toward Munger Mountain be stricken and other language be added, encouraging concentration of development elsewhere. Secondly, we would like to address the scenic nature along Highway 89 and changes to 7.2. Anyone can drive this segment as it currently exists and comment on the natural scenic value of existing development adjacent to the highway. For the most part, it's absent. While we would prefer removal of the entire sentence referring to the gateway to Jackson, we realize that that's likely not an option. Therefore, we would propose adding language to the statement qualifying you require screening of future development to be similar to existing uses. And lastly, we would like one other sentence different from the vision summary for Hog Island. The statement that multiple residential units per lot, industrial, office, retail or community convenience uses are not being envisioned in the future character of this district. It seems to leave little room for imagination of what might actually be allowed. When development actually occurs, the developer generally weighs all available options. The current vision for District 7.2 severely limits those options, in fact reducing them all to a single alternative of live/work. If the Plan is approved as currently written, the County may well miss out...or may well miss more environmentally friendly and aesthetically pleasing development opportunities that might otherwise be proposed, primarily as a result of the limitations imposed by that single sentence. In closing, I'd like to say this vision statement is the first building block in the final design and ?? government all development on Hog Island for the next 15 to 20 years. As primary landowners in District 7.2, we implore you to implement it properly and wisely. Thank you.
3/14/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	I'm Kristine O'Brien. I too would like to see some numbers along with the maps. If you don't have the numbers, how do you know what you're approving? How do you know if it's feasible or consistent with the vision? So, I realize there are variables and so you can do ranges to take account of the variables. And then I wanted to say that, as far as the clustering on 35 acres for the transect, I think that's a good change and I would like to see that stay so that we can use the PRD tool. For Section 5.6, I like those changes as well. Ensuring that any development there is consistent with the adjacent neighborhood I think is a good idea. For Section 10, the interconnectivity of existing subdivisions, I'd like to see that changed to pathway connectivity, because if you make it vehicular connectivity, it would involve the taking of private property, and I think that's indicative of a top-down, heavy-handed Plan. It's not economically or legally feasible, so I'd like to see that pathway connectivity. That's all my comments. Thank you. Oh, I did want to say, sorry, I also signed the Statement of Intent and I share those concerns.
3/14/2012	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	My name is Patty Ewing and I'll be very brief. I'm just resubmitting a letter which we started in December, actually December 3rd is when the original letter was dated, and this deals with character district, the Town Periphery, Character District #6. And basically the Planners...and many thanks to the Planners for recognizing the importance for having one section of the Town of Jackson that has a little larger lots and is permeable to wildlife, and that pretty much is covered in the character district there that's now described, and I just want to thank you and I'll just submit these to you. They're more signatures. You already have a number of letters with signatures on them; it's the same letter. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Cresswell, Anne JH Community Housing	Hi, good evening, Anne Cresswell, speaking on behalf of the Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust. Thanks to everyone on the Staff, Commissioners, Councilors, for all the work you've put into this. I started this process many moons ago, it feels like now, as a member of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. And one concept that we discussed in depth in this committee and one that I've spent considerable additional time looking into and researching is the TDR concept. Affordable housing is often and quickly pitted against wildlife and because of this the TDR concept looked incredibly attractive because it suggests that you can have a win-win where everyone is satisfied. And right there I should have known better. Unfortunately, right now, TDRs do not have a good track record and the economics appear to be unworkable, especially in a community with extreme values that we have in Jackson. The failure of TDRs to deliver certainty should not, however, be ?? to our community to stop moving forward. The interesting relationship that I've come to appreciate over the years between affordable housing and wildlife is that affordable housing allows us to be a community first and a resort second. It ensures that in the face of rising values that we have a whole complement of dedicated, committed, permanent residents. These are residents that pull miles of unfriendly fencing, they teach our children about ecology, they are the reporters that update us regularly about the meanderings of the wolves, and they populate...they're the biologists who make all this possible to populate the Forest Service, the Park Service, Game & Fish and the Elk Refuge. You have a Plan before you that tons of people have put huge amounts of time into. I'm not going to tell you it's a perfect Plan, but I do believe it's a Plan that balances wildlife with the social and economic needs of our community. We hope you will adopt this Plan, the character districts, so that we can get to the real work that is yet before us. Thanks.
3/14/2012	Cheremy, Ed Interested Public	I'm Ed Cheremy. Mr. Mayor, Commissioners, and Councilors and other Commissioners, I have two comments. One, when the Staff gave their presentation, Tyler mentioned that there were four key principles in the 1994 Plan; three of those were carried forward, one was not. The one that wasn't carried forward was flexibility and discretion. And my view is that's wrong. I believe that you, as a group, should retain flexibility and discretion and that should be written into the Plan. To eliminate it, ties our hands, ties your hands, and just puts too much in the hands of a document that can get stale over the, you know, 10, 15, 20 years that it's in existence. My second comment deals with private property rights, and that is when Commissioners Phibbs and Perry made a presentation last week to the Chamber board of business over breakfast, they talked about property rights being a key to their belief in this Plan. And I would add it to the Plan. And, specifically, again Tyler mentioned there were three common values outlined in the Plan—ecosystem stewardship, managed growth and community character. I would add a fourth to that and say respect for private property rights. That's the place to put it and I think it would be clear then to all of us who have those concerns that that's one of the core values that's shared by our entire community. Thank you.
3/14/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Hi, Dave Coon. I sent you a letter this morning <<inaudible>>, but what I want to focus on as it relates to character districts, all character districts. So, in reviewing the character districts, I went through the growth management plan and I see ambiguous language that has key policies in there. The macro policies of 9.1 versus the micromanagement policies of 9.2. I think you really need to be careful how you set these triggers and monitor your growth. I think you could end up with an overmanaged policy that isn't allowed to run its course. And that goes to all character districts, too, especially the ones that have nodes or County up-zone growth areas. I think that's a big concern and you really need to look at the language and how possible up zoning occurs. Ultimately, ?? in the room here tonight, as you've been through five years with the character-based plan, let's do some numbers. This can't go on without numbers. Numbers are important. They are the accountability and measurability part of the growth plan that will eventually involve all these character districts, everything that goes on here. And it's not just the numbers of growth but its, you know, its ??, it's everything. Yeah, I think you guys know that. I think you know some numbers are out there and I think it is definitely time to take a look at them. There's a lot of good stuff in the Plan. It is good. It's just there...it isn't as well defined, it's a little ambiguous. I think there's ways around things and you need to look at that. Let's see, there's just so much to say, but I do have concerns on the growth management, and I'd like you to take a look at what I've written and if you have questions, call me; I'd be happy to talk about it. As a citizen, I spend every day dealing with numbers. I wake up at a time, I know I can make this much money that day, I can spend that much money, I need that much money to retire. Our lives are based around money and numbers, and to have a Plan with no numbers, what's it going to cost? I think Mayor Barron was quite aware of that, that this thing has exponential costs associated with it. You just eventually have to put numbers in there and start talking about this stuff. I know it's not popular but it is important. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2012	Woods, Becky Interested Public	Good evening. I again, like everyone else, acknowledge all the work and time you put into this document, both you and your Staff. I can assure you an equal amount of hours have gone into it at our home as well. My name is Becky Woods. I haven't prepared any formal comment so forgive me if this is just a little bit rough. But once you guys release numbers for different character districts, which I assume you are going to do, I would like to see a follow-up modeling document as to what those numbers mean in terms of schools, jails, hospital, roads, who's going to pay for it, and where it's all going to go. And the reason I want to see such a modeling is that the Plan is the guiding document for the next step in this process, which is the LDRs, and if you're going in unarmed with accurate information as to what you're looking at with these numbers, the Plan is essentially useless. So, I hope to see the numbers; I hope to see the modeling as to what those numbers mean. Thank you very much for your time.
3/13/2012	Rauch, Susie Interested Public	I bought property in Jackson Hole in 1987 in search of peace and community and to enjoy the outdoors and the simpler, healthier life style that was not available in more urban places and other ski towns such as Aspen . Since then, the character of the Valley has changed tremendously, and I fear that what you are considering for the new Comprehensive Plan will only make it worse. Please do not pass these measures that will encourage growth and trigger more traffic, noise and loss of wildlife. I appreciate the amount of time and effort that have gone into developing this plan over the last four year, but am convinced that other approaches can be found for dealing appropriately with housing for teachers, nurses and the younger generation that will not destroy what has made this Valley so special in the past. The idea of more development in a node at the Aspens makes me heartsick. Over the last 20 years, the Village Road has become dangerous for humans and wildlife. And I would sympathize with residents elsewhere in the Valley who do not want to see such development in their backyards.
3/13/2012	Spence, Kent Interested Public	The Comprehensive Plan needs to work in a way that fits with Jackson Hole's character. It should serve to guide development in a direction that leaves the character for which we are known. The proposed changes in the plan do just the opposite. I am strongly against moving the density from the rural areas into three or four nodes in the valley. This will do harm to the wonderful feel of Jackson Hole. Planned neighborhoods will ruin the open, natural feel of this valley. The Comprehensive Plan has always done its job well, leaving most people happy with the way it has worked for many years. It appears from my observations and reading that the majority of folks in the valley would rather the plan stay the same. Why fix it if its not broken? For example, the comments on the Comp Plan website are generally against increasing the density in existing neighborhoods. This has never been the way this valley has developed and the best plan is the way it presently exists. Why change it to fit with the minority of people who do support increased density? If the zoning is changed it will forever change the way things develop. This will attract developers to maximize these areas of increased density and they will be the major beneficiaries of such a change. Thank you for considering my opinions on this important matter.

Date	Name	Comment
3/13/2012	Huff, Mercedes Village Road Coalition	As we near the end of this process which you have been so actively involved in for over four years, we urge you to be ever mindful of three guiding principles for our Valley: stewardship, stability, and predictability. Perhaps the most crucial thing before voting to increase or subtract density from any areas is to define the term workforce housing. That term seems to be very loosely used, yet it is called out in every single chapter of the Character Districts. Does it include every person who works in Teton County regardless of where they live and how much money they earn? Or is it a narrower definition, restricted to people who might live in affordable housing, or just want to rent for two years? Whatever the definition, it has to be transparent and able to be substituted in any sentence where workforce housing is used. As the Plan is written right now, that's not the case. It's critical that our neighborhoods be kept as low impact areas and not changed into "character villages" with a very disingenuous and phony feeling. Trying to move most of the density from the rural areas into three or four nodes is something that will spoil the natural and authentic feeling that people love about this valley. Thank goodness we don't have planned neighborhood upon planned neighborhood the way Park City and Vail do. To do that would be ruinous. The Comprehensive Plan, which has been in effect for 18 years, has worked very well and most people are pleased with it. Actually, most people are unhappy that something so successful is being reworked on so many levels. When one reads the public input on the Comp Plan website almost all of the comments are against increasing the density in existing neighborhoods. Please consider not doing any major revisions to support the temporary agendas of a few groups – your decisions are irreversible when it comes to the growth and development of this valley. Once something gets up zoned, there's no turning back – the developers will arrive and the small town character of those areas will be gone forever. One final thought is that Teton Village should be a pedestrian village where visitors will want to stay and "hang out" after a day of skiing. If it's just hotels and ski shops, they will lose interest very quickly. This would also help reduce traffic on Highway 390 because tourists would be spending their après ski time in Teton Village.
3/13/2012	Ottman, Jayne Interested Public	I'll make this short because you have heard from me in the past. My concerns have never varied. In a nutshell-please be respectful of existing neighborhoods, keep them stable; please don't add higher density to these areas. The impact would be substantial and negative. The idea of transferring development rights to these areas in exchange to keep other areas less dense is simply wrong. Provide viable mitigation options for wildlife in areas with human congestion/traffic. Nothing has been put on the table so far. Is the tail wagging the dog here regarding affordable workforce housing. It appears that way. Also, I don't ever recall SPET monies being allowed for land banking/speculation, especially without oversight. Is this even legal? This department should not function on its own without county oversight.

Date	Name	Comment
3/13/2012	Kolsky, Eddie Interested Public	Firstly, I have signed the "Statement of Intent." I have lived in this beautiful valley for 35 years. It is truly difficult for me to express in words how I feel about this place that I love so much. I realize that a certain amount of growth must occur, but I also realize that we, as stewards of this incredible landscape, must have keen foresight and enormous sensitivity as to how that growth comes about. To urbanize Jackson Hole would be a tragedy -- nothing less. After all, we live here and people come here primarily for the wildlife resources, the beauty, the open space, and the small town rural character. This is what Jackson is about. This is what is important. Above all, those are the things that must be preserved – ABOVE ALL There is an area in Provence in southern France called the Luberon Valley. I spent one month there last April. I bicycled through there ten years ago but wanted to return because it was so beautiful, undeveloped, tranquil, and pristine. The valley is made up of beautiful farmhouses and vineyards, fields of poppies, groves of olive and cherry trees, and numerous medieval hill top villages that attract many tourists. There are outdoor markets everyday of the week at a different small town or village. There are no massive housing developments. There are no golf course developments. There are no big highways. And you know what, ten years later it is essentially the same. The industry that keeps the Luberon going is tourism. That is it's "Golden egg." It is alive and well there and I am going back. My question is, "Do we have the foresight, sensitivity, and imagination to do whatever it takes to retain the remarkable character of this valley like the powers that be in the Luberon Valley in France have done?" My answer is, we must. It is absolutely imperative. Do we have the will to restrain from trying to squeeze every possible dollar out of this valley. Does the town of Jackson really have to have such an aggressive commercial growth agenda that will greatly increase the need for more employee housing? Do we really need that much growth? Does it have to be about dollars? When is enough enough? In the end, isn't it really about the wildlife, the beauty, the small town character? Most of us here know the real answer. That is why we live here. That is why people come here. I think that major revisions to the 1994 plan are a mistake. Although there are several aspects of the currently proposed Plan that I would like to address that I do not support, I am narrowing the rest of my comments to the effects of the large up-zoning proposed for the land adjacent to the Aspens on the Teton Village road. If the land adjacent to the Aspens is up-zoned it will most likely doom the Village Road to widening similar to a rural interstate (four or five lanes). Can you imagine that? Consider the negative effects on wildlife populations (Cars killing moose is already horrific). Picture for a moment how that will make that beautiful corridor look for residents and tourists. Say good-bye to beautiful golden cottonwoods in the fall. Think about the effects of increased noise on local residents and their property values. Imagine the traffic volume and the poorer air quality as a result. If the elected officials are truly adhering to the goals and desires that the community has overwhelmingly and repeatedly expressed, then the proposed Aspen up-zoning should be off the table for good. Please listen to the community with respect to wildlife preservation and open space as its top priorities. Please listen to Mary Gibson Scott's concerns regarding the Village road and it's potential effects on the Park. If the degradation of quality of life is the direction we are going, then we are going in the wrong direction. Please do what you need to do to keep the character of this valley intact.
3/13/2012	Gronberg, Don and Sue Interested Public	As 38 year residents of Teton County we are concerned that as we near the end of the process of working on the Comprehensive Plan that what has been effective in the current plan will be thrown out with the bath water. Please act responsibly. Do not yield to the desires of the few and set us up with a future for the valley that we all will regret with no way to turn back. It's critical that our neighborhoods be kept as low impact areas and not changed into "character villages" with a very disingenuous and phony feeling. Trying to move most of the density from the rural areas into three or four nodes is something that will spoil the natural and authentic feeling that people love about this valley. Thank goodness we don't have planned neighborhood upon planned neighborhood the way Park City and Vail do. To do that would be ruinous. The Comprehensive Plan, which has been in effect for 18 years, has worked very well and most people are pleased with it. Actually, most people are unhappy that something so successful is being reworked on so many levels. When one reads the public input on the Comp Plan website almost all of the comments are against increasing the density in existing neighborhoods. Please consider not doing any major revisions to support the temporary agendas of a few groups – your decisions are irreversible when it comes to the growth and development of this valley. Once something gets up zoned, there's no turning back – the developers will arrive and the small town character of those areas will be gone forever. Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
3/13/2012	Robinson, Steven Interested Public	I know a great deal of time and effort has been put into development of a completely new comprehensive plan. Although this was done with the best of intentions, I join a large number of concerned citizens that feel it does not represent the basic principles continually expressed by everyone again and again. "Protect wildlife, maintain our friendly small town values, and control growth with mechanisms and incentives for development with permanent open space". Having lived in the valley since 1975, I thought the old comprehensive plan was doing a pretty good job of representing those basic principles. It was my understanding that the new plan would further define those guidelines in a reader friendly, understandable format. It does not! When the idea of "nodes" made the headlines, my neighbors were "up in arms" over the idea of increasing the density of our small town neighborhood. The impacts on Teton Village Road, the wildlife on the West Bank, and potential infrastructure demands would be tremendous. A quick reversal was articulated by the planners. However, as it turns out, the actual change was only in the wording of "nodes" and not in limiting "density up zoning" which is what the new plan continues to recommend. We live in a unique valley in this great country. What makes it so special are the people and the unspoiled beauty. Even before I arrived so many years ago, the community was concerned about protecting the valley for future generations. The community developed the original comprehensive plan to protect this valley. The revised comprehensive plan should further strengthen that plan, not change it to a plan that will have a permanent negative effect on the valley. I urge you to consider the negative effect approval of this "new comprehensive plan" will have on our neighborhoods, our landowners, our small town values, and our community.
3/13/2012	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	15.5 Small Outlying Parcels This CONSERVATION SUBAREA is characterized by small lots in areas that have limited or no services. These clusters of small parcels are surrounded by larger ranch and public lands. Typical parcels are , lots along Ditch Creek, Pacific Creek, Camp Creek, Lost Creel and parcels along the County Road in Buffalo Valley. Bla Bla Bla Maintain existing character..... No expansion Future development limited to like kind

Date	Name	Comment
3/13/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Attached is the Statement of Intent for the Comprehensive Plan along with the 360 signatories. Please accept it as public comment on the Comp Plan from the community/neighborhood groups, not just the Alliance. Thank you for your consideration of this important document. Community Support for a Statement of Intent in the Comp Plan Many committed community leaders have helped to craft a Statement of Intent for the Comprehensive Plan, which is intended to clarify the goals and next steps, and prevent misinterpretation in the future. This is something that we would like to see inserted into the Plan as a documentation of the intent of the Plan and the community. Whereas current regulations allow for decades of growth and a doubling of the built environment we see today; we, the undersigned, respectfully request a statement of intent be added to the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan that reflects the following: Statement of Intent Purpose: To ensure that the community's original intent prevails when competing values create opportunities for differing interpretations for current and future decision makers. It is the community's intent to avoid expanding the urban footprint and to maintain our small, rural, mountain-town character; our quality of life; our unique sense of place; our established neighborhoods; and our stewardship ethic as the gateway to our unparalleled ecosystem on which both our visitor economy and our way of life depend. • It is the community's top priority to permanently protect wildlife habitat & connectivity, scenic viewsheds and agricultural open spaces through permanent protection of these resources. To that end, density increases beyond base property rights will not occur in any location until mechanisms are in place to link that development to permanent conservation. These mechanisms must ensure that any density increases will be phased in slowly over time in small areas. • It is the community's intent that a community-supported and clearly defined amount of growth will result in locations and intensity of development that are predictable. This amount of growth will be calculated prior to adopting the new Comp Plan for each Character District and must reflect and adhere to the stated Vision in the Plan for density neutral solutions countywide. • It is the community's intent to manage growth in a fiscally responsible manner. Developers must pay their costs for public facilities, services and infrastructure created by new development. Costs of development should not be subsidized by or passed on to residents. New development should not be permitted until an adequate level of infrastructure is in place. • It is the community's intent that employee generation resulting from commercial and nonresidential development should not overwhelm the ability to house 65% of our workforce locally. • It is the community's intent that a multi-year implementation plan that is annually updated must include and adhere to a detailed timeline, budget and a prioritized strategy list.
3/13/2012	Smith, Robert Interested Public	Sirs...I am very supportive of the thoughts reasonably expressed in Mercedes Huff's letter to the commission
3/13/2012	Close, Tina Interested Public	I have lived in the Nethercott for 30 years, so feel qualified to comment on the plan, especially along the Village Road. Please do NOT put any more density along the Village Road. I can barely turn left out of Nethercott as it is and more importantly, out wildlife is highly impacted along that road. More density, more cars and more animal/car hits. We are used to having moose, fox and many birds in our neighborhood. They need room too and were here before we were. I fully support and am a member of The Village Road Coalition. PLEASE listen to our voices. The valley has changed enough and we are in danger of changing it's character forever. THINK OF ALL THE DAMAGE THAT GREED AND OVER POPULATION HAS DONE TO OUR WORLD. PLEASE DON'T LET THAT HAPPEN HERE. HAVE SOME GUTS TO SAY NO TO MORE GROWTH!

Date	Name	Comment
3/13/2012	Shatz, Doug Interested Public	I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations. Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states: “Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented.” It further states that “Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development.” Page IV-53 states: “Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area.” “Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered...” “Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance...” How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling. While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county’s wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives. I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development. However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed. In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.
3/12/2012	Check Into Cash, Inc. Interested Public	We are writing on behalf of Allan Jones, Chairman of Check into Cash, Inc. Check into Cash, Inc. owns the parcel commonly known as Tract 12 at Crescent H Ranch. Tract 12 is currently undeveloped, but has for many years been approved in the Crescent H Ranch CC&Rs for the construction of a single family home. The Crescent H has a very strong and comprehensive set of CC&Rs, and in fact the homeowners have a long history of protecting their investments by enforcing those CC&Rs when necessary. This process of private rulemaking and private enforcement has served the Crescent H very well over the years. The CC&Rs have done a more than adequate job of protecting the Crescent H, its property values, its open spaces, its view corridors and its wildlife. And importantly, they have done so without needless government interference or infringement upon private property rights. The "Vision" that has been proposed deviates greatly from decades of successful development at the Crescent H by suggesting a taking of private property. The proposed taking suggests a material impact upon the enjoyment and value of private property rights. On behalf of Tract 12 and all of the private property owners likely to be damaged by the taking of private property rights inherent in your Vision, we respectfully suggest that you consider alternative ways to achieve your results. At the Crescent H, for example, the existing CC&Rs are more than adequate to protect that Vision. Your support of the existing CC&Rs is something that we would applaud. But moving to take away the rights of private property owners in favor of government intrusion is something that we may be forced to oppose in order to protect our investment and our private property rights. We appreciate your consideration of less intrusive ways to realize your Vision and to protect Teton County in ways that we can all support.
3/12/2012	Morse, Richard P. Interested Public	I am a homeowner at Crescent “H” Ranch, and am OPPOSED to the Teton County Commissioners’ “Comprehensive Plan, Illustration of our Vision”. Please add my objections to those of other Chescent “H” homeowners (and, I suspect, to the objections of other potentially affected home- and lot-owners in The Valley). What I and others purchased (about 20 years ago for me) already contains much of what the County wants in its Plan.....such as wildlife access, keeping our area natural, etc. We certainly do NOT want The County to impose new restrictions on our Ranch properties relative to fencing, size of houses, or interferes in any way with our basic rights as Homeowners.

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	LaJeunesse, Debbie Interested Public	Thank you for all your hard work and efforts on behalf of our community to come up with a new land-use plan. I know that the end of the process is nearing and that some in our community are trying to make a last ditch effort to stop and/or amend the conclusions that have been reached so far. I urge you to continue down the path that you have been on, and not get sidetracked by a few vocal groups who, in my opinion, are only worried about their own backyard and not the greater good of the valley. I am talking about the South Park neighbor group and the Village Road Coalition. In my opinion, both the South Park area (District 5: West Jackson and District 10: South Park) and the Aspens/Pines area (District 12) are very logical places for allowing workforce housing, which is one of the most important goals of the current or future land-use plan. This is also where these groups are formed and as typical of most people, they do not want their neighborhoods to change, but these are the most sensible places in the valley to support more development (along with the town of Jackson). These areas are already dense or have undeveloped areas that are adjacent to other built-up neighborhoods which supply housing for the local workforce, and therefore, are logically the place for future density. These complete neighbors have or will have all the necessary characteristics/infrastructure that are needed and can be developed more easily while protecting wildlife with bridges, underpasses and open space/clustering. Housing 65% of our workforce locally is an important goal. Some seem to believe that you all need to define the exact numbers allowed, and I think that this is just a distraction and would allow for even extra arguments and debates; the proposed plan allows for flexibility, which is a good thing. Do not be distracted by this tactic. I believe that the proposed plan, character districts and policies/regulations already in place can be used to create and continue a well-thought out community, one that protects wildlife habitat and natural resources, along with housing. The proposed plan does not go against community will, as some are suggesting, rather, it goes against the NIMBY group's will. They have not yet accepted, or do not want to accept, that there are many more people coming to this valley and they will have to be housed somewhere and that logical place is in the areas of the valley that already have the most development, including the town, South Park and the Aspens area. Some are being unrealistic by suggesting that we protect the rural parts of the county from future development but also limit development of already-developed parts of the county. As you all know, it's hard to have it both ways. Many parts of the proposed plan show continued "Rural areas" which is as it should be, but this means development has to happen in areas where development has already taken place. This is as it should be. Also suggested, is that workforce housing mandates should be thoroughly defined and researched, and one the first steps necessary to implement this, is the Housing Nexus study that is already in the bidding process as instructed by you to the TCHA. The comprehensive planning process has been going on for a number of years and the amount of public input has gotten you and the proposed plan where it is now, please do not let the last minute/special interest groups distract you from the overwhelming input from the rest of us and most especially the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally. I am writing to you as a private citizen (and as a real estate appraiser who knows the valley intimately, which has helped me to form the opinions that I have developed and express to you today), and not as a member of the Teton County Housing Authority Board (but I take their goal of housing 65% of the workforce locally very seriously). Thank you again for all your hard work and vision,
3/12/2012	Farmer, Jim Interested Public	18-20,000? I seriously doubt it. It's time for our elected officials to shut their mouths, open their ears and listen to people who care and have lived in the valley for a very long time. It's simple. No new density increases in rural areas of the valley. You can't seriously say that you care about the wildlife and migration corridor while approving density increases. They don't work together. You elected officials are messing with the very reason most of us have lived here for so many decades. That reason being the urban character which we so cherish. The future of Teton County is at stake here and it's our responsibility to insure that further development does not degrade our wildlife, scenic and lifestyle values.

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	Luczo, Stephen Interested Public	I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations. Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states: "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented." It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development." Page IV-53 states: "Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area." "Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered..." "Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance..." How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling. While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives. I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development. However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed. In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.
3/11/2012	Sinclair, Nigel Interested Public	Seconded

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Watsabaugh, Carla Interested Public	ARE YOU LISTENING?? From article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide, March 7th, 2012 Quote from Mark Barron: “the push to get elected officials to adopt the statement of intent is not indicative of most county residents’ sentiments and does not outweigh other opinions. Does their voice count? Absolutely. Does it count more than 18,000 or 20,000 other people? You tell me.” With all due respect, I am going to tell you. You have not received 18,000+ letters of support in your favor!!!! You have no business insinuating the 18,000+ residents are not in favor of adopting a statement of intent. More than likely, 16,000 of those people you are talking about have absolutely no opinion whatsoever. Not only are most of them unable to understand the comprehensive plan, most of them have not even read it. Do not include the SILENT majority as a group that agrees with you or your plan. Silence often means apathy. I would be interested to know how many LETTERS or EMAILS you have received that support your thinking, Mark. I have lived in this valley for close to 50 years and have watched the birth and the death of comprehensive plans. I have also watched variances, up-zoning and down-zoning destroy the very fabric of the plan’s intent and goal. The untold amount of hours and the amount of money it takes to write a plan is absurd considering how it eventually becomes eroded. What I don’t hear from ANYONE are the numbers....the Housing Authority has numbers, the Alliance has numbers, the planners have numbers, the developers have numbers. No one wants to talk about REAL numbers. Let’s hear a number! I am going to keep my letter of opposition simple: I am opposed to anything that will change my neighborhood or its character. Not in my backyard??? You bet. I’ve had 50 years of development taking place in my backyard. When it comes to discussing the protection of wildlife in and around the Aspens, Wilson and Teton Village, your talk of design to manage and protect wildlife viability is, frankly, absurd. Many of us have spent the last 6 weeks attempting to reduce the slaughter of wildlife on 390. WILDLIFE ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH HUMAN DENSITY. Increased traffic over the years, due in most part to added density, is the reason for this. I do not want a four-lane highway on 390. As it currently stands with just two lanes, we aren’t able to manage the speed of traffic and the decimation of our wildlife. What I find absolutely glaring is....I don’t see the county stepping in to help in the efforts to improve this situation. As the editorial in the NaG stated, we are NOT hired guns. WE HAVE ALL LIVED HERE A LONG, LONG TIME. Longer than most of you. We are invested in our community, we have been involved, we have been vocal, we have done our homework, we have witnessed past history. WHY DO YOU CHOOSE NOT TO LISTEN!!!! I regret that I am beginning to see our elected officials playing a huge part in a slogan going around, RAMP UP....RIP OFF AND CASH OUT!! Nothing says it better: The future of Teton County is at stake and it is our responsibility to insure that further development doesn’t degrade our scenic, wildlife and lifestyle values. I EXPECT YOU TO DO IT RIGHT THIS TIME AROUND.

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Paulson, Bob HOA: Teal Trace	I am writing to you as the Secretary/ Treasurer and a Director of the Teal Trace Homeowners association. After much discussion and review by our board, we want to formally notify you that we oppose the new language included in the Comprehensive Plan that would introduce new and more stringent land use controls over our Teal Trace properties. We have clear and recently approved CC&Rs for Teal Trace and we follow these rules carefully. We also have a stable neighborhood with good respect for nature and proper access to the Snake River. We are concerned that the proposed new language will change the rules on our existing residents and could upset our established community. Also this language could introduce new and unnecessary restrictions on our few homeowners who have not yet built their homes. We only have two properties that have not been constructed but we are concerned that you new restrictions would be unfair to these members of our community. In essence, please leave District 8 rules and regulations as they have been and as they are today. Our community works very well. There is no problem to be solved for us but these new proposals could create unnecessary restrictions and problems for us all. The current plan works for us and everyone understands the rules. Please leave the county rules and our Teal Trace community alone. Thank you.
3/11/2012	Seidler, Stan Interested Public	I am very concerned re. the language and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, illustration of our Vision. While I certainly am passionate about preserving the environment and safeguarding the access for wildlife, several of the statements in the Plan regarding Character District 8.2 are very troublesome. I have owned property at the Crescent H Ranch since 1990, and presume it falls into this District. The language I am referencing is: ☐ "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented" ☐ "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development" The Crescent H has very stringent restrictions in our CC&R's relating to home size, building envelop, etc. Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of the Crescent H is the free flow of wildlife, which we cherish and protect. However, the proposed language at leasts hints at infringing on my basic property rights, which I would zealously protect. I sincerely hope that you will revisit the issue, and revise the Plan with the input of affected homeowners. We all share the same basic vision, but this Plan, as it is written, jeopardizes the Vision it is designed to protect. Thank you very much for your consideration.
3/11/2012	Finch, Larry Interested Public	Bob, Great letter.

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Siewert, Marylyn Interested Public	My husband and I are visitors to the Jackson area several times a year. We come for the beauty and openness of the scenery, the wildlife and the general rural ambience of the area. After talking to locals and reading the editorial in the "Jackson Hole News and Guide", we were astounded to learn that new land use and density regulations in the County Comprehensive Plan were being contemplated by County officials without giving to the populace specific details of the land use and densities in the plan. The community and the neighbors must be included in the deliberations and must know the proposed densities and land use. This in not Syria but the United States of America where the people are involved in making intelligent decisions that involve them personally and create the communities in which they will live. From what we have heard, the specifics of the Plan are being withheld. From an outsider's point of view, it is mandatory that the rural atmosphere be maintained in the Jackson area. Specifically the drive on Highway 390 to Teton Village is beautiful with its gorgeous vistas and should not be cluttered with high density building and overwhelming commercial development. High density gives an appearance of clutter, degrades views and probably degrades property values as well. High density contributes to intolerable traffic. It appears that the Jackson area already is having major traffic problems. Wildlife habitats and migration corridors must be maintained. Converting private open space to high density will not enhance the community. Please include the citizenry in the decision making and include their ideas in the Plan. Strive to keep the area beautiful and rural so that we visitors will come back. Please maintain the wildlife habitats and migration corridors. Thank you for all the work you have put into this project. I know it is a big job since I was twelve years on a planning commission that wrote a new general plan for our town of Tiburon in California. We look forward to many years of visiting the Jackson area.
3/11/2012	Lupo, Patrick Interested Public	In respect of the pending review of the Comprehensive Plan for Teton County, we would be grateful if the County would continue to recognize Lake Creek Ranch as a "specially recognized project" as in the Prior Plan. See Section 1450 of the Land Development Regulations (LDR's) of 1977 and Docket #06-0001, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order, Dated 6th July 2006. The above reflects the fact that there is a pre-existing Master Plan for Lake Creek Ranch approved by the Board of Commissioners, that the entire ranch (approximately 480 Acres), was placed under a Conservation Easement in favor of the Nature Conservancy, save and except for certain building sites, and that the final plat of Lake Creek Ranch was approved at a regular meeting of the Board of County Commissioners held on December 17, 1996.
3/10/2012	Bloom, Rich HOA: Melody Ranch	While reviewing the on-line staff packet and public comment for the March 14 Character District meeting I noticed it did not include the attached March 1 Rafter J HOA board letter to the commissioners - formally opposing road interconnectivity in district 10. I also have attached the Melody Ranch HOA more complete board position of February 21 - that we copied the Rafter J HOA. I wanted to make sure the Town electeds and planners saw the attached March 1 Rafter J HOA board letter - and for staff to include it as part of public comment under district 10. This issue is easily clarified by the addition of "pathway" in the various district 10 locations where the goal of "interconnectivity" is mentioned. This is consistent with other character districts which have qualifiers for example of "pedestrian" and/or "pathway" on interconnectivity goals. Upon review of the public comment I also noted owners in South Park Ranches and Big Trails subdivisions in southern South Park (which do not have functioning HOAs) have also strongly opposed the concept of forced roadway interconnectivity of their respective private road systems - separated I may note (along with Melody Ranch and Rafter J) by very large parcels of undeveloped rural lands in our sub-area 10.1. I will remind you that Rafter J and Melody Ranch HOA's represent the interests of some 900 homeowners - so trust you will make the requested clarification change by adding the qualifier of "pathway" to the interconnectivity goal in district 10. PS Note Kristine O'Brien has recently be elected to replace David Kauffma on our board

Date	Name	Comment
3/10/2012	Dorros, Myra Interested Public	I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts. And I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations. Addressing Character District 8.2. Page IV-51 states: "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented" It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development" Page IV-53 states: "Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area." "Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered..." "Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance..." How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling. While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife. Our wildlife habitat and our open spaces. At Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives. I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas~ areas that are not currently platted or planned for development. However. Any effort to re-regulate. Re-configure or re-develop existing. Permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed. In summary. I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2012	Stennis, John Interested Public	Below is an e-mail I have been circulating to my friends and colleagues in support of the comprehensive plan and to clarify what I feel are inaccuracies in recent advertisements by special interest groups. I hope this helps with your upcoming review of the Comp Plan. Dear Friends and Colleagues, Many of you will pick up the weekly paper and find a number of articles on the Comprehensive Plan along with full page ads paid for by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, Gail Jensen, South Park Neighbors, Village Road Coalition, Wilson Advisory Committee, Cottonwood Park Neighbors and Save Historic Jackson Hole. These community organizations are asking for a "Statement of Intent in the Comp Plan" among other things. On the surface this may appear a good idea but in essence binds the hands of elected officials and planning staff and essentially turns the current version of the draft Plan into a no growth Plan, making it much more restrictive than the 94' Plan currently in place. If you think current development standards make projects difficult, I can assure you that the conservation for growth approach will make any new project immeasurably more difficult and add immense bureaucratic hurdles. As a member of the design community and a Town of Jackson Planning and Zoning Commissioner, I would like to lend my perspective to a couple of the key views these organizations are asserting: 1) The Comp Plan should include calculated numbers for each character district so that the community knows exactly how much growth will occur. The Comp Plan does include documented numbers prepared by Town and County planning staff that are the basis for the rough doubling of units proposed in the current Plan and are based on base property rights of 1 unit per 35 acres. As many of you will understand, it is impossible to make the accurate numbers these organizations are requesting because of the many variables involved in developing on any property. These variables include road and wetland setbacks, hillsides, flood plains, overlays, and most importantly the goals of the property owner who may choose not to fully develop their property as many owners have. These organizations, though well-intentioned, are taking a myopic perspective of this issue by asking that mechanisms be put in place so that we know exactly what development moves where and that all growth is met with dedicated conservation somewhere in the county. For example, if a mixed-use project is developed in town that contains more units than what is allowed under base zoning, the development rights of a corresponding number of lots in the County will be required to be extinguished in order to develop those units. As anyone involved in the Comp Plan understands, these mechanisms are very complicated and binding elected officials' and planners' hands with this kind of language will ensure that this Plan becomes the no growth Plan these organizations so readily seek. More importantly, other tools to limit development in the rural county will likely be more effective than requiring a direct linkage. Not only will a direct linkage stifle any desirable redevelopment in town, but it may preclude the exploration of more effective and community-wide efforts to preserve rural lands. 2) Development must pay its own way. As many of us professionals know, it does! Developments are required to pay sewer capacity fees, water tap fees and provide other infrastructure as necessary depending on the project type and location, and we know that landowners pay dearly for these types of mitigation. All of these fees are assessed by the Town or County based on the type of project and are intended to do exactly what is being requested. It's not necessary and it's too specific. The Comp Plan is a vision statement and should be viewed as such. Weighting it down with this type of detail is unnecessary and does not acknowledge that there are already many mitigation measures in place. If such measures need to be adjusted, or if new measures need to be added, then this discussion should occur when considering new regulations, not in a visionary document. 3) It's a downzone, be scared. The current Com Plan is not a downzone. Base property rights are 1 unit per 35 acres and this will not change under the current Plan. As elected officials and planners will tell you it is not legally possible to take away development rights. However, tools may not be allowed to be used in some areas such as a Planned Residential Development (PRD) or Non Contiguous Plan PRD. All tools are discretionary and can't be counted as a base property right. I encourage everyone to support elected officials and request that all current tools be kept as these tools have allowed for permanent conservation across our valley and will be important tools moving forward into the future. It is my opinion that the community members behind these advertisements and ideas do not constitute a majority of the valley as they would have you believe. I personally have facilitated many public workshops where the vast majority of opinions expressed were incongruent with these organizations' stated intentions. Though they tend to be very vocal and well-funded, they nonetheless represent a minority view in our community, and talking louder shouldn't make their opinions any more valid than yours. I think everyone has the right to express their opinion, but I don't think it's fair to try and foist their self-serving "Statement of Intent" policy upon the community at the eleventh hour. I do encourage everyone to read the Comp Plan, talk to planners and elected officials and form your own opinions about the Plan based on the actual Plan. For the first time, I genuinely fear that this minority opinion will throw such a wrench into the process that the Comp Plan will continue indefinitely (after 5 years of preparation) and do our community a great disservice. As many are aware, many planning tools have been put on hold that are vital to continued redevelopment and revitalization in town along with improvements to town zoning districts such as the AR Cottage House, a policy which failed upon its third reading during Town Council because of the pending Comp Plan. There are many other examples like this where much-needed policy changes are not considered because of the prolonged Comprehensive Plan review, something that may benefit ivory-tower special interests, but do great disservice to the

Date	Name	Comment
		community at large. If this Plan continues to languish our community will continue to languish along with it. The next meeting for the Comp Plan is March 14th, where the Town Council and County Commission will begin the process of reviewing the current Plan with the goal of adopting the current Plan in May. I encourage everyone to take the time to provide comment to the Town Council and County Commission in support of the Plan. Though the deadline for written comment has passed, I believe it is worth your time to give verbal comment at the meeting. It may be an inconvenience now, but without your involvement, I fear our community will not be able to move forward.
3/9/2012	Hubbard, A.C. & Penne Interested Public	We are in complete agreement with Mr. Hoke and hope you take this into consideration.
3/9/2012	Taylor, Ken HOA: Crescent H	I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations. Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states: “Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented.” It further states that “Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development.” Page IV-53 states: “Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area.” “Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered.....” “Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance.....” How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling. While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county’s wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives. I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development. However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed. In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is very grateful for all of your hard work throughout this Comprehensive Planning process. As this process nears its conclusion this spring, we wanted to submit the following comments regarding the Implementation Plan. In a 2011 report, “Technical Analysis of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan,” Alan Richman provides the following specific recommendation: “Strategies should be organized into an action plan that establishes priorities for next steps and lays out a timeline for completing projects.” The Alliance is glad to see that the creation of such a plan is a priority for the Town and County. As you continue to craft and then finalize this Implementation Plan, we hope that you will address the following comments. Implementation Plan Scope and Format An implementation plan should account for the whole process of Land Development Regulation (LDR) updates, data collection, and monitoring, and be more than a 1-year plan. It should include responsible parties and timelines (for both initiation and completion of various tasks), and serve as a road map for the community to the accomplishment of the goals and implementation of the policies in the Comp Plan. Richman’s report also states that an Implementation Plan can come in the “form of a tabular summary of proposed actions, with dates identified for when each will be accomplished and by whom, or it could be in the form of a timeline, with actions shown in the order in which they are intended to be accomplished.” Either of these would be a good starting point for our local Implementation Plan. Prioritized Issues This is a prioritized but not exhaustive list of areas to be covered in the Implementation Plan. 1. The first priority of the Implementation Plan should be the development of tools for shifting development potential and achieving permanent open space conservation. As a central tenant of the Comp Plan and the concept upon which the achievement of many of the Plan’s goals hinge, research and debate about tools to shift development potential should begin immediately. This includes an analysis of the existing tools, specifically the PRD, as well as improvements to our current toolbox. 2. Zoning should come after an analysis of the tools that we want to use in this community to shift and direct development, so as not to constrain which tools might be effective in achieving permanent open space, a top community priority. 3. Funding sources identified in the Comp Plan (for housing, open space, transportation, etc) should be further explored and initiated immediately. 4. Various studies and data collection efforts must be initiated in the near future, including but not limited to an economic analysis of the market and the intersection of the market and the Comp Plan, the housing legal nexus study (underway), and a countywide transportation analysis. 5. The lodging overlay in Town and the changes to the boundary suggested in the character district maps should be explored and debated prior to the formal establishment of the overlay. Other outstanding regulatory updates include house size restrictions, incentives and their structure, mitigation fees, and the many other issues called out in the policies for future discussion. Updating the current regulations with regard to these issues to bring them into compliance with the new Comp Plan should be prioritized within the overall LDR update process. 6. Baseline data for the Indicators section should be developed and included in the Comp Plan prior to adoption. Growth Management Plan As a part of the Implementation Plan, the Growth Management Plan should be addressed. Specifically, the monitoring program should be further developed to identify additional triggers or timeframes for revisiting how well we are accomplishing our Growth Management goals, such as the northern South Park development trigger. Additionally, the corrective actions, outlined in the Plan, should be more fully explored. Adoption of the Implementation Plan This Implementation Plan should be adopted along with the Comprehensive Plan with the intention that it serve as a road map for the next few years of LRD updates and planning work. Again, as stated in the Richman report, “Prioritization of the actions in the Comprehensive Plan will go a long way towards informing citizens as to what they can expect and will allow them to hold the Town and County accountable for whether progress is being made in Plan implementation.” This is an important piece of the final product that will be up for adoption this spring. Lastly, attached [see actual comment for attachment] is the Action Plan for the Aspen Area Community Plan, which you have no doubt seen. This is a specific example of an action plan with clear responsible parties, timelines and priorities that could serve as a model for our local Implementation Plan. Again, thank you for your continuing hard work on this issue. We look forward to engaging with the staff and elected officials as we draw this planning process to a close and launch into the fulfillment of the Implementation Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2012	Hawtin, Bruce Interested Public	I am satisfied that the current comprehensive plan is well crafted and after five years of listening to every single person that is willing to speak up, or email you, I urge you to pass it. I believe the current version provides the safeguards and flexibility to manage and control our growth and meet the challenges of the future. The "Statement of Intent" is a no growth statement and I urge you to not to insert it into the plan. Thank you for your continued efforts.
3/9/2012	Donnelly, Susanne F. an Interested Public	We are very much against the idea of upzoned "nodes." Such increased density is not in keeping with the character of the Valley. The 1994 Plan is one which we would like to see DECREASED! We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Aspen, Sun Valley or Park City. Please keep Jackson Hole STABLE and resist the urge of some planners to make this Valley into a more urban community. Density impacts the wildlife which makes Jackson unique!
3/8/2012	Warner, Bill, Kathy, & T Interested Public	We are coming out! The developmentally disabled population of Jackson is looking for a place (residence) in our community - our hometown. We are especially intersted in the new Comprehsnive Plan Section 5: Local Wrkofce Housing. As part of our local workforce we wish to have the opportunity to own affordable housing (it is poassbile), rest and work here for the rest of our lives. Or request/needs are atypicla and not within the scorp of this note. So, we would gladly meet with you or your representative to discuss our "specal situation." I have included an attachement [below] showing our popoulation agin out of the School District over the next ten years. 2012 - 3 adults 2013 - 3 adults 2014 - 0 adults 2015 - 2 adults 2016 - 4 adults 2017 - 1 adults 2018 - 4 adults 2019 - 2 adults 2020 - 5 adults 2021 - 3 adults
3/8/2012	Rosenberg, Vicki L. Interested Public	You all have insisted that our community's top priority is to permanently protecting wildlife habitat. You have all insisted that you recognize how adding development potential to one area must be offset by permanent conservation elsewhere. Concerned citizens are merely asking for a simple accounting of how much development would be allowed in specific areas, something that none of you have been willing to publicly address. We need to know how much commercial development would take place under the proposed changes, and how much local citizens will be asked to contribute to such development in increased taxes or levies. We need to know if it's realistic to expect that we can house 65 percent of the county's workforce here; if not, commercial allocations should be reduced. All citizens, regardless on which side of this issue they stand, need to see a defined schedule that sets priorities and timelines for expected implementation of not only development plans, but also of conservation and wildlife protection efforts. Please read and carefully consider the Statement of Intent -- it doesn't ask for miracles... only for respect.
3/7/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	As a property owner in both Big Trails subdivision and South Park subdivision I totally oppose the idea of interconnectivity and vehicular road access between subdivisions in South Park. The roads in Melody Ranch, Rafter J, South Park Ranches, Big Trails and South Park are all PRIVATE roads. Please change the language involving connectivity in the new comprehensive plan, district 10. I find it offensive as do others.

Date	Name	Comment
3/7/2012	Fodor, Stefan Interested Public	It was with great surprise that I read earlier this week, and again in today's weekly paper, that several "advocacy groups" are requesting that you add a statement of intent to the Comprehensive Plan. I urge you reject that request. The Comprehensive Plan review has taken the better part of five years and provided our community with numerous opportunities for written and oral public comment. Workshops have been held throughout the valley and the process has been shepherded along with consultants to be as inclusive as possible; all with the goal of having a comprehensive, well thought out planning document that represents what is best for the community, not any one special interest group. There are reams of public comment available online and the deadline for citizen input has passed. Why should one or several special interest groups get another chance to attempt to put their imprimatur on the plan? Is the latest draft of the Comprehensive Plan perfect? No. Do I agree with all of it? No. With a document affecting such a large cross section of Teton County, some people are inevitably going to be unhappy. However, I look at any collaborative process like being a cook. You can't please everybody. You have been elected by the public with a mandate to revise our comprehensive plan. Please don't delegate that privilege and authority to special interest lobbyists. Reject the "statement of intent". I thank you for your consideration of the above and the great lengths you have gone to in order to get the document to its final stages.
3/7/2012	Cerruti, Alberto F Interested Public	I fully agree with the content of Bland Hoke Jr. letter to you dated February 29. This is the last and worst example of superficial behavior by the Board. I believe we should expect a more by our elected politicians.
3/7/2012	Fenn, Jon Interested Public	What a long strange trip it has been to get to where we are with the Comprehensive Plan (CP). From the start, the community made it clear that the priorities should be open space and wildlife habitat. Now we have a proposed new CP that provides for increasing density in certain areas without creating binding commitments that will permanently decrease density in other areas. I would urge you to vote against the proposed CP since it does not commit to permanently decreased density in high priority conservation areas to offset the areas of increased density. The proposed CP is ambiguous and not specific enough with regards to how density will be reduce in hi-priority conservation areas. Given the historical pattern of development in the County and how political the development approval process is in Jackson, the CP needs to be crystal clear with regards to exactly what (how much in terms of exact #s) density will be permitted in what areas. This lack of clarity is particularly noteworthy in Section 8.1 of the Illustrations of Our Vision (IOV) which sets forth how District 8 would be viewed under the new CP. I was surprised to learn that Wilderness Ranch, where we live, isn't included in this description while some of the surrounding subdivisions (John Dodge, Tucker, Linn Ranch) are included. The IOV goes on to say that the goal is to RECLAIM as much open space as possible. Please think about the practicality of reclaiming developed land in subdivisions. I would urge you to think in realistic terms and focus on permanently protecting existing open space and not waste tax dollars on trying to reclaim subdivided land. Then Section 8.1 goes on to speak of increasing public access to the Snake River in this area. How is increasing public access (i.e. foot, dog ,& skier traffic) along the Snake River going to help wildlife? By having contradictory objectives and ambiguous language in the proposed CP, the commissioners are opening the door to various competing interpretations. This means politics and a very cumbersome bureaucratic process will rule the day as future decision makers wrestle with the lack of clarity in the CP. To satisfy the community priorities of wildlife habitat and open space the CP must have specific binding mechanisms that tie any increased density rights, above the current base level, to permanent conservation through less density in other areas. Unfortunately, for any such mechanism to work effectively and create some degree of certainty for planners, homeowners and developers, it has to quantify the amount of development (how much in terms of exact numbers and exact densities) that will be permitted. This is the only way that the tradeoffs can be assessed accurately and not be left to the interpretation of parties with conflicting interests. I am urging you to vote against the CP unless the language is changed to address the issues noted above. Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
3/6/2012	Smith, Barbara Interested Public	Sirs...I am deeply disturbed by descriptions and conclusions of Section 8 of the plan. As a layman I find the word confusing and unclear and frankly end with no idea of what is intended or what this plan might mean. I would encourage broader and more complete definitions and a discussion with all those impacted by the plan. It seems to have been developed in stealth without the usual discussion and inclusion of the parties most affected. I am total support of the comments mentioned in the letter to you from G Bland Hoke.
3/6/2012	Lyons, Fred and Dee Interested Public	As residents of Lake Creek Ranch and former residents of John Dodge, we are extremely concerned with Section 8.1 of the Comp Plan...We respectfully request that the current language of Section 8.1 be replaced with totally rewritten language clarifying that at no time for any reason will the rights of property owners of District 8 be compromised by any such plan. The current language puts us at risk of future imposition. Certainly both of our residences in these areas were specifically oriented to wildlife habitat through stringent building codes.
3/6/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	Please be aware that we, as 16-year residents(owners) of property in South Park Ranches, oppose any attempts to connect our subdivision with any others, either in existence now or proposed in the future. Clarification in the language of anything passed by you-all would be helpful since we doubt that anyone else would be in favor of it either. Increased traffic in our quiet neighborhood is not something any who lives here would relish; after all, most of us live here because it's quiet and peaceful. Though we cannot speak for our neighbors we are letting you know our thoughts and hope you take them into consideration in formulating clear, concise language. Our property values, along with everyone else's, would most assuredly be affected in a negative way. No one would want this. Thanks for listening, and please pass this on to the Jackson Town Council and Teton County Planning Commission, since I don't have their addresses.
3/5/2012	MacMillan, Kip HOA: Rafter J	We wish to restate the position we made clear in our e-mail of March 12, 2008 that the (Rafter J HOA) Directors reject the idea (vehicular road access) through Rafter J and Melody Ranch subdivisions in the strongest possible terms. Rafter J owns its own roads and our HOA Board unanimously stated that we do not want access from Melody Ranch under any foreseeable conditions. Doing so would increase traffic and adversely affect the quality of life in Rafter J. In addition, our roads are too narrow to meet Wyoming Department of Transportation standards for public streets. In summary, we request that in your future discussions, please keep in mind that Rafter J is not supportive of any direct connection with the former Teton Meadows development or Melody Ranch.
3/2/2012	Stoker, Troy Interested Public	I would like to express my thanks for your work on the Comprehensive Plan, specifically for voting to house 65% of the community's workforce locally. I am the Lift Director for Jackson Hole Mountain Resort. I oversee all of the maintenance for the lifts and the Tram at the mountain. This winter, as with every winter, I struggle with my workers who live on the other side of Teton Pass or down south in Star Valley. I am very thankful that a few of my workers have been fortunate enough to purchase an affordable home here in Teton County. This winter, when a big storm came in, Teton Pass was closed, and many of my workers were unable to make it to work. Of course, lots of snow means lots of skiers, and of course that was the moment when a couple of the lifts on the mountain began having problems and wouldn't start. If I had not had the guys who live locally, there would have been a long delay in opening. I have now resorted to purchasing hotel rooms for my workers when a storm is in the forecast because it is imperative that they make it to work to open the mountain and keep it running. However, this gets costly. I appreciate your support of Workforce Housing, and hope you will continue to find areas within the Character Districts to build more.

Date	Name	Comment
3/1/2012	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	I am writing you with concerns I have about some of the verbage in the Illustrations of Vision. After having Hank and Paul Vogelheim at our office meeting yesterday morning, Hank felt an email to you would be justified. First, one point that was brought to everyone's attention is the phrase "workforce housing" which prevails throughout. What exactly is "workforce housing"? I and many others, feel this needs to be specifically clarified as it can be construed many ways. One, for example, could say our home in John Dodge is "workforce housing" as both Tom and I work. I doubt this is the case, but a specific definition needs to be included so everyone is on the same page. Secondly, the next area of concern is in Character Defining Features of the area 8 which includes John Dodge. Most specifically stated as ..."This Conservation Area is characterized by an exiting built form that will become less impactful to wildlife in the future. Subdivision and new development is not appropriate in this area. Redevelopment will result in a reduction of the number and size of buildings, elimination or reduction of fencing, clustering of buildings among exisitng lots, buffering of waterbodies and wetlands, and other methods of reducing the human impact on wildlife habitat. The goal of this area is to reclaim as much open space and natural landscape for wildlife as possible. Where additional public access is achieved in this area it will be managed to protect wildlife viability." To me, this verbage leaves it very open to many ways of interpretation, including not allowing a lot to be developed or redeveloped! This is quite frightening to me as I feel I live in a wonderful area that has been developed with both wildlife and humanlife in mind. We must not forget that the plan is for the humanlife and making development responsible in a way that allows all creatures to live together! Please remove this sort of verbage as I think it is detrimental to the process. I think the plan should be concerned with the parcels of land throughout the valley that have not been developed and those which have been developed responsibly should be left alone. Thanks for your consideration and I would appreciate a response.
3/1/2012	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	Thank you for your dedication and service to our Community; and for reading this comment. RE: Willow Street Corridor The Willow Street Corridor Certified Character Distict designation, as District 2, Subarea 2.7, is absolutely appropriate and visionary. This designation reflects keen subjective study; an acute understanding of Community Character; considers movement by all transportation modes; envisions the "Complete Neighborhood's" needs & wishes; promotes an attractive& welcoming visual appearance; cleanly enhances local commerce and our tourism economy, and promotes general welfare and over-all human & wildlife safety. Well done! Thank you,
3/1/2012	Howe, Rick Interested Public	I had to leave to prepare for the NER Centennial Meeting. I just wanted to clarify what I may not have come across clearly as saying. For an elected official to put so much passion as you all do into something like the Comprehensive Plan update, my statement is simply please take the necessary steps to ensure there will be solid enforcement of those Policies that are adopted. It is an insult to your efforts, and the communities vision if what you adopt has no teeth, or the staff that will be willing to enforce it. I probably understand more than most about pre-platted parcels prior to any new adoptions, as referred to with Saddle Butte. I am referring to specifics where someone who may approach a new development, or even redevelopment and look at a 30-50 thousand dollar fine as chump change, vs following the development regulations in the first place (in other words I may chose the the fine as an option to get what I want). This is not an attack on anyone wealthy, as I am happy for anyone who has accomplished success and wealth in their lifetime in order to live their dream. It is not worth going backwards, Bruce mentioned that things are working much better in current situations. Thank you for all of your valuable efforts,

Date	Name	Comment
2/29/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	the maps for character district 10 in the latest draft just released have left out mapping the extensive pathways in Melody Ranch whose access easements were granted to the County long ago and finally recorded by the County against all homeowner's properties in 2010. Most of these pathways were completed over ten years ago. These pathway easements were conveyed to the County (who never recorded them until 2010) in 2001 and 2006 by the developer. All of these sections were constructed long ago. One easement was also conveyed in 2008 upon releasing the developer from all future pathway obligations – this included the one unbuilt section along the north side of South Park Loop road (SPLR) in the western section and a small unbuilt connector piece from an existing pathway which brings the total pathway connections to SPLR to three. I note staff's legend says the mapping is based on the Pathways Master Plan of 2007. Since these maps show both built and to-be-built pathways - I fail to understand why the pathways (which are public) were not mapped in the recent character map release? Given that our HOA board has made certain arguments to the joint electeds on the wording of "interconnectivity" being constrained to non-motorized pathway connections – I would hope you can clarify staff's error to the joint electeds as they reconvene on March 14. I have copied Brian Schilling as he has the most current mapping. Brian I am sure can go over all of these pathways and easements with planning staff if there is any confusion. Again 90% of the pathways are built with two unbuilt pathway easements granted – one redundant section along South Park Loop road (SPLR) in the western half of the subdivision - and one additional short connector to SPLR from an existing pathway - making the southern connections to the SPL road a total of three – two in the west and one in the east. Of note there is also a public pathway easement across the agricultural open space that traverses Flat Creek between our two housing areas recorded at the same time (2010) conveyed to the County by the owner Paul Von Gontard. That is not noted in the attachment as that is not the HOA's property – it was built many years ago. In summary I want to emphasize that the pathway easements already granted - and not mapped on the recent character maps: connect the entire subdivision (pathways completed), stub out to the north in the western section (pathway completed), and in three locations (two completed) connect to South Park Loop road in the south on both sides (east and west of Flat Creek) of our subdivision. In addition the pathways (pathways completed) run continuously to the local convenience along HWY 89 - completing our connectivity via pathways to those amenities. Please clarify staff's oversight in not mapping the various extensive built public pathways and easements in Melody Ranch to the joint electeds before March 14 since our HOA has made a specific request for changes to the map language on interconnectivity that relate to these pathway systems. I have copied the joint electeds on this message. I am sure this is just an oversight given the complexity of the maps and volume of work - but the correct mapping is crucial to the joint electeds understanding our repeated requests to them on constraining interconnectivity in district 10 to non-motorized pathways.

Date	Name	Comment
2/29/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex – thanks for verifying the inadvertent slip on mapping the Melody pathways. On interconnectivity - staff may want to consider a global solution since the term - and the yellow circles - are used on a majority of the maps – although the unique language in area 10 and subarea 10.1 is more specific than any other character district – and strongly infers roadway interconnectivity. Most other districts talk about pedestrian interconnectivity. I would hope the electeds will adjust district 10 language emphasizing pathway interconnectivity. The term interconnectivity and the yellow symbol is perhaps confusing as in various areas it can mean, or infer, either pedestrian, pathway (includes equestrian and bike – not just pedestrian) – along with the most controversial for southern South Park - roadway. Assuming the commissioners agree to the change - especially since some felt it had already occurred – area 10 language could be adjusted to clarify pathway interconnectivity. Meanwhile staff may want to think whether elaboration of the legend on what the yellow symbol means would help interpreting its use in various districts. Currently the legend only has the following brief explanation: •Improved Interconnectivity: An area that will be characterized in the future by increased interconnectivity. There is an exponential jump when one moves from the goal of pedestrian - to pathway - to road interconnectivity.

Date	Name	Comment
2/29/2012	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	In reviewing the Illustrations of Our Vision (IOV) I have taken note of Section 8.1. This sets forth the planners' vision of what they would like to implement in the District 8 area, specifically calling out the residential areas of John Dodge, Tucker Ranch, Linn Ranch and Solitude. The language in the paragraph states: 'This CONSERVATION subarea is characterized by single family homes on multiple acres adjacent to the Snake River. While this subarea is largely developed, it is increasingly inhabited by wildlife. The goal of this subarea is to reclaim as much open space and natural landscape for wildlife habitat and movement as possible while respecting existing property rights. The built form should become less impactful to wildlife in the future. Subdivision and new development is not desired and incentives to reduce density and human impacts on wildlife habitat through redevelopment should be explored. Additional public access to the Snake River should be designed and managed to protect wildlife viability.' First, OMISSION? Why does Section 8.1 only reference John Dodge, Tucker, Linn and Solitude? According to the map, District 8 includes the following subdivisions and land parcels: RLazy SSubdivision, Yodeler, Lake Creek Ranch, Rocking H, John Dodge, Homestead, Wilderness Ranch, Tucker Ranch, River Springs, River Hollow, Pine Meadow, Wildwood, Teal Trace, Crescent H, Fish Creek Meadow, Eagle South fork, River Meadows, Ely Springs, San Rodo Ranch, Indian Springs, Bar-B-C, Bar-B-Bar, Bear Island, Woodside, Snake River Woods, KKR Ranch, Solitude, Owl Creek, and North Meadow subdivision. Why are these areas not mentioned? Second, CONTRADICTION? Is the goal for wildlife habitat not already being achieved in this friendly habitat? Your document's words: "While this subarea is largely developed, it is increasingly inhabited by wildlife." Even more puzzling: "Additional public access to the Snake River should be designed and managed to protect wildlife viability." Yes, additional people and lots of loose dogs certainly enhance the wildlife experience. Is there any doubt the County can successfully design and manage the impact? Third, PROTECTION? I am not sure that I fully understand what the planners have in mind. In studying this language it would appear that they envision adopting new regulations that would change these neighborhoods in ways that no one, except the planners, has ever contemplated. What they clearly imply is that for any land use application in District 8, they will insist that homes be downsized, clustered or, in the worst case, removed -- all in the name of protecting wildlife. This is just ridiculous and frightening. When the County and Town embarked on this new plan, I do not believe there was ever any input from citizens in all of these residential communities that would have given a shred of credence to the planners to justify proposing these radical actions for solidly established neighborhoods. In addressing the John Dodge Subdivisions specifically, these parcels have been developed over forty years with some of the strictest covenants in the county -- small building envelopes, restrictive fencing requirements, limited domestic animals - all for the purpose of wildlife protection and quality of environment. People have bought and built on their lots with the peace of mind that they know how the neighborhood will look, now and in the future. I can't conceive of what the planners could dictate to make this area "less impactful to wildlife" and find "incentives to reduce density and human impacts" except to forbid any redevelopment and remove the human element entirely. This would support the planners' axiom: "Subdivision and new development is not desired". If this is the direction the Commissioners are willing to bless and authorize, then Nelly Bar the Door. Our community will really have something to discuss. CONCLUSION: I respectfully request that the current language be replaced with language that states that existing neighborhoods within District 8 will be considered "stable" areas. Either remove the specific reference to John Dodge, Tucker Ranch, Linn Ranch and Solitude or put in all of the names of the residential areas in District 8, including the unplatted but developed areas. Finally, clarify the intent of the wording in Section 8.1. As it now stands it is vague, contradictory and ambiguous at best. At worst, it leaves the door wide open for homeowner uncertainty and bureaucratic mischief.

Date	Name	Comment
2/28/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	I have just reviewed the "Illustration of Our Vision" document posted late last week on the Comprehensive Plan website. While I have a number of concerns about various aspects of your latest effort to revise the Town of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, I wish to highlight one area of particular concern. Regrettably, the concept of encouraging 'connectivity' between subdivisions remains in your draft plan despite numerous critical comments during this lengthy process from me, from my neighbors and from various Homeowner's Associations in South Park. Your latest draft still speaks obliquely about a goal of 'connectivity,' and in particular, in Policy 7.3a of "transportation connectivity." Section 10.1, defining the features of Southern South Park, states: "In the future, residents should be able to travel between existing subdivisions and access nonresidential amenities on the highway WITHOUT USING THE HIGHWAY OR SOUTH PARK LOOP RPAD." (Emphasis added.) Once again, I urge you to remove ALL references in this plan that urge or suggest an 'interconnection' be developed between subdivisions in South Park such as Rafter J and Melody Ranch. While the general concept of walking pathway interconnections may well be appropriate in the Plan where technically feasible and legally permissible, I and my neighbors in Melody Ranch are vehemently opposed to applying the concept to these two established neighborhoods in the form of a roadway connection. Doing so would ignore the established wishes of the residents of South Park and would unlawfully ignore established property rights. I continue to strongly believe this concept to be an unworkable, divisive and unrealistic goal. It would require a very costly, questionable and controversial "taking" of private property and recreational open space. It also certainly invite costly and protracted litigation. The Melody Ranch Homeowners Association already conveyed to the County a non-vehicle access easement to our pathway system with connections both on the north and south for any future pathway connectivity. A fundamental premise of the revised plan from its inception, as I understand Commissioner Phibbs to have continually emphasized, has been to respect existing private property rights. Broad and vague "connectivity" language does not accomplish and indeed flies in the face of that goal. As I have consistently advised you in my written comments, I sincerely appreciate your efforts to preserve and protect the unique and special qualities that have drawn all of us to Jackson Hole and that has drawn my neighbors and my family to South Park. Where ever it has come from, please strike the roadway connectivity concept from the final version the Comprehensive Plan. Thank you for your consideration.
2/28/2012	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	i have read thru the Aspens character district. When do you actually put the policy objectives into numbers of and types of residential units to be allowed going forward? And where will this activity take place?
2/28/2012	Ross, Slade Interested Public	I am surprised to see this called "Our Vision" when those of us who live in this district have not been listened to! My family is one of the largest landowners in this area and thus we will be impacted substantially by these "visions" which are not ours. This area is one of the last and best places for more complete neighborhoods. If we were allowed to have some conveniences in this neighborhood, it would reduce fuel usage, animal/vehicle incursions and allow the working people of this county a place to live and work. This plan is too restrictive and needs to be expanded. The scenic overlay also needs to be removed! This is one of the least scenic areas, especially on the west side of the highway in 7.2. This plan completely ignores the uses already in place!

Date	Name	Comment
2/27/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is deeply grateful for your efforts to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan prioritizes the protection of wildlife in Teton County. Preserving wildlife is central to the mission of the Alliance, and the new Character District Maps provide a unique opportunity to do a quick evaluation of the expected impacts that the planned development pattern might have on our wildlife. The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is pleased to announce that we have contracted with an expert team from Alder Environmental to conduct a wildlife impacts assessment based on the Character District Maps. Our objective is to provide you with an overview of how wildlife might fare under the new Comprehensive Plan. We intend to provide you with the findings of this study prior to your March 14th meeting, and we encourage you to address any recommendations made in the report. We believe that the Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board has the expertise to review this study on behalf of Teton County. The Alliance would like to provide you with science-based information on wildlife at each step of the planning process. Although this first study will be fairly general, we are willing to continue to refine this work when you are ready to review and adjust the current zoning maps. Please contact me with any questions or suggestions about this rapid assessment.
2/27/2012	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	As I listen and talk, and travel around listening to neighbors, guests, life time residents, I continue to hear the same thing over and over. Who is the WE that wants all this up-zoning, who is the WE that can't get along with our existing plan? As I drove to Teton Village the night of February 8th and saw the freshly killed calf moose, I was trying, as I have been for the past 6 months to think of my comments to you all after attending one of your plan meetings, my comments began to form. It wasn't until I arrived at Shooting Star to be greeted with the foulest sewer odor, I am not kidding when I say it made my eyes run and my stomach turn. Then I went to the Mangey Moose where the smell permeated the entire building. It was disgusting. My comment was born. Until we upgrade our Sewers at both the Pines and the Village, and do something about the carnage and traffic on the Village road and 22 you have no business up-zoning any areas on the west bank. We have been good stewards to the HA, we have both affordable and attainable in Wilson and Teton Village. We as tax paying citizens have done enough to help provide housing. No one bought me a house, or gave me a subsidy. Enough. The people of Teton County are speaking loud and clear, we like our little county as it is, some of us can say you are all in our back yard. We were here first. There is not one property owning citizen in Teton County that deserves to have the zoning changed in or around their neighborhood. PLEASE KEEP THE WESTBANK STABLE.

Date	Name	Comment
2/27/2012	Harrice, Melanie Interested Public	This plan, if adopted and followed, will create a homogenously overdeveloped Jackson Hole; one where the fate of each development will remain at the whim of the elected officials who approve or deny it. Who wants THAT?? Maybe a corrupt developer or greedy landowner who stands to benefit from an upzone, but not your local residents who actually live and work here, and who make up most of this valley's community and most of its homeowners. In this version of the Comp Plan, I do not see any real protections, especially for rural and conservation areas, which are in need of the most protection. The Plan's content when you get right down to it is pure fluff with no teeth and no way to enforce any its the zoning districts, proposed rules, concepts and ideas. Put some teeth into this document and you'll finally see what real community support feels like. The Planning Commission should not have given in to pressure from above and recommended approval of a plan it wasn't completely comfortable with. This plan should not be forced through the political approval process until it is truly a document this community can contentedly live with. Currently, most people who live in JH believe this plan is severely flawed, vague and a generally useless document that has no enforcement provisions, too many development loopholes and no protections for the subdivisions they live in and have invested in. As you have heard countless times, people currently feel a sense of instability and have no idea what to expect for the districts they live and work in. They have no idea whether their home will soon be surrounded by more dense development, whether the quality of life they purchased when they bought their home in a subdivision will continue. Whether their zoning will change at the whim of elected officials at any given time. Zoning that exists should remain static; upzoning an already approved, existing subdivision or area is ethically wrong for the people who purchased homes there. And for the values determined by the original subdivision and covenants. Homeowners buy the type of home and quality of life they enjoy. Changing the rules on people who have invested everything they have in their home and property is purely WRONG. We're not talking NIMBYS or folks who have second homes here. So, please don't even bring that up. We're talking about YOUR AVERAGE WORKING RESIDENT OF TETON COUNTY! What is the point of a rule or a zoning district if it can be changed? Ask someone you know who is religious and you'll never hear that the doctrines, rules and commandments they live by are changeable. They are set in stone. Or in books that are considered sacred. The basic, fundamental laws that citizens follow in this country are not changeable - burglary, assault and battery, homicide, these crimes will continue to remain just that, crimes. Comparing zoning to the weighty issues mentioned above may seem trite. But please remember that people treat zoning as a RULE, a fixed rule, put in place by their government. It is not viewed as something that is changeable. Only those who have witnessed an unwanted upzone where they live get wise to this practice and become wary. Unfortunately, many in this valley are now wary of a toothless, weightless Comprehensive Plan that allows these kinds of fundamental development changes to a place we live in and cherish. It is appalling how much money has been spent on this Comp Plan process and how little political will exists to create a document that has teeth and enforcement capabilities. The money would be well spent if our community ended up with a document that guides our valley's future development with enforceable rules.

Date	Name	Comment

Instead, if this document is approved. Our valley will be in the same boat as always; each and every development decision will continue to lie solely with elected officials' interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan, whatever that may be at the time.

There IS one consistent feeling among people who live in our passionate community: DISLIKE OF THIS CURRENT INCARNATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. And a thorough distrust of the political process this plan is moving through.

It would be great if, for once, decision makers actually listened to these consistent shouts from the community.

2/26/2012 Stone, Cindy Hill
Interested Public

I have recently seen a "Statement of Intent" document that should be included in the new comprehensive plan. It is intelligent, simply states the goals of the valley, and brings to light the achievements that you and the community have been working on for the last four years. It should be added right after the acknowledgement page. (I searched but my name is not acknowledged)
This is a no-brainer guys. As this "Statement of Intent " circulates in the valley and builds momentum you all are going to look like cross eyed dragons for not putting it in.
What are you going to say? Gosh, I didn't understand it, or that is not our intent." Please.
Take the high road boys (and girl) and let's get on with it.

2/25/2012 Cronin, Tom and Nancy
Interested Public

We want to express our deep disappointment with the plans for further growth and increased density in Jackson Hole, especially along the Village Rd. As frequent visitors to Jackson, we can tell you that destroying what appeals to us and the thousands of other area enthusiasts would seriously hurt your tourist trade. Perhaps even more importantly, we believe the effect on wildlife would be disastrous. Jackson Hole has always been a retreat for us. It is a place for us to unwind and truly appreciate the beauty of this great nation. A significant part of that is seeing the wildlife that abounds. Where will these awesome creatures go?

How can you bow to the self serving interests of developers and ignore the people who live and work in the Jackson Hole area? How can you justify making Jackson unattractive to its loyal visitors? How can you live with the responsibility of destroying the habitat of some of the most beautiful animals on earth?

We believe the 1994 Comprehensive Plan should more than suffice and that the Commission should abide by that plan. Please think about this carefully.

2/23/2012 Round, Phil
Interested Public

It's hard to resist big money - especially in this country, and more specifically, in this county. But we are fast destroying what we love in this valley. I know you're faced with development pressures and the developers are the ones who populate your meetings. Please be steadfast in your convictions to preserve this valley. You've all paid lip service (at a minimum) to this philosophy, and some of you have certainly done more than that.

The bottleneck that inevitably occurs with growth is certainly a mighty uncomfortable thing for planners to deal with. But it is a necessary part of HOLDING THE LINE. We've lost so much already. The eutrophication of Fish Creek is a reality, and just a few years ago it was held up as a shining example of small town, pristine waterway health. How many dead moose have I personally witnessed on the Village Rd. (dozens)? The Snake River levy has become the stomping ground of paid dog-walkers. They have displaced all but the aquatic and avian wildlife, but negatively affected those populations as well.

Hold the line! I don't really care how it's done. It doesn't matter in the long run. Lots of damage has already been done. No more.

2/23/2012 Denny, Joshua
Interested Public

I am writing to express my appreciation of and support for local workforce housing efforts such as that of the County Housing Authority. I have worked at the Jackson Hole Mtn. Resort year-round for over twelve years, and being able to purchase an affordable home on the Village Rd. two years ago allowed me to stay here in the Valley. The expense and hazard of a long commute likely would have driven me from the area. I hope local elected officials can continue to support this much needed option for workers who wish to remain in this beautiful area.

Date	Name	Comment
2/22/2012	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I HAVE READ AND RE-READ THE CHARACTER DISTRICTS AND STILL DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY MEAN FOR US. CAN YOU GIVE ME SOME IDEA OF WHAT IS GOING TO BE ALLOWED ON OUR PROPERTY?
2/22/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	Thanks for taking the time to read my comments. Pam and I have attended numerous meetings, written multiple letters and comments and voiced our concerns on repeated occasions. The "node concept" was soundly rejected after the release of the 2009 maps. It was recently repackaged under the label of "transitional" character district in the release of the Vision Maps. Thankfully, the Joint Planning Commission has rejected the attempted up-zoning of our neighborhood, District 12.2, and has recommended the preservation of our STABLE neighborhood. We appreciate the Planning Commission's consistency and urge the Board to preserve our neighborhood character. Pam and I have lived and owned property on the Teton Village Road since 1977, have raised our daughters here and have always volunteered our time and efforts towards making Jackson Hole a better community. Since 1978 our Raintree neighborhood has been zoned Single Family Neighborhood Conservation. We have invested our resources based upon this zoning. Our neighborhood is comfortable, modest, charming, and typifies Teton Village Road character. Re-zoning our neighborhood to "transitional" would hold us hostage to the angst, uncertainty, divisiveness, and prolonged battles as speculators attempt to overturn existing private covenants and restrictions, subdivide platted lots, abrogate dedicated open space, and ignore other legal impediments. Private contracts and land restrictions will always prevail over the zoning power unless the County intends to condemn property rights. One of the central tenants of the proposed Plan is to preserve community character. Teton County neighborhoods represent the fabric, charm and uniqueness of our community character. It is a huge mistake to shoehorn contrived urbanized neighborhoods into existing successful rural neighborhoods. We feel strongly that you should leave density where it exists today and allow the market place and private voluntary negotiations, with proper regulatory incentives, to achieve protection of the values we all cherish. Market forces will properly address cyclical housing gluts and shortages. There is no need to panic and artificially disrupt existing neighborhoods in an unrealistic attempt to achieve short term social goals. Finally, we all know that the Housing Authority made speculative and imprudent, perhaps illegal, land banking investments. Please do not try to vindicate their bad behavior with the stroke of a pen. It is disingenuous to upzone an entire neighborhood dominated by platted and restricted lots just to upzone an isolated parcel property purchased by the Housing Authority. Doing so will only encourage spot zoning and the destruction of existing neighborhoods. We, like you, are exhausted by this arduous planning process. However, we hope you will carefully consider the enormous impacts your decisions will have for years to come. Thanks again for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
2/22/2012	, HOA: Melody Ranch	Unclear and Problematic Character Map Language for District 10 - South Park: In the introduction of the character district maps for area 10 (South Park) the following phrase occurs: • "Future character will also include improved interconnectivity and internal connection to the commercial amenities along the highway. " In the written description for sub-area 0.1 - Southern South Park - the following phrase occurs: • "Residents will be able to travel between existing subdivisions and access nonresidential amenities on the highway without using the highway or South Park Loop Road. " On the map for this district a very large circle in Southern South Park is placed - the legend indicates this circle to represent: • "Increased Interconnectivity" Melody DOA Request for Change: The Melody Ranch HOA board, on behalf of its membership, once again requests that these three sections be clarified so that interconnectivity clearly is identified as non-motorized pathway, and not vehicular road, interconnectivity. Rationale for Change Request: Our board submitted verbal and written comments in June 2011 to change the language to clarify that pathways are more suitable than roads to achieve interconnection between the various neighborhoods in Southern South Park. In addition last June two members of our HOA legal subcommittee, Marv Heilesen and Andy Salter, also delivered public comment on this issue. Our HOA board supports the premise from a design standpoint, of having new subdivision roadways interconnected. A premise of the plan though was to respect existing private property rights. Our concern is from a legal perspective - does the County intend to put as a policy goal a contemplated action that would require eminent domain takings and condemnation? The Melody Ranch HOA has opposed in the past any takings to achieve road connectivity going back to Teton Meadows Ranch. In reality connectivity would require the use of eminent domain by the taking of dedicated open space, scenic trust preserve properties, wetlands, several home lots and homes - as well as the purchase and taking of the entirety of the private roads within the Melody subdivision. Not only is that financially unachievable - is it clearly legally challengeable. Interconnectivity Opportunities Already Exist: Non-motorized pathway easements already exist both north and south in Rafter J and Melody Ranch subdivisions. Our HOA has already conveyed a non-vehicle access easement to our pathway system to the County with connections both on the north and south for any future connectivity. That easement does NOT allow for any vehicle traffic except as related to pathway maintenance. We do not want the County to consider changing that easement, through a takings process, into a vehicle easement - even if it was for transit. In addition we do not want any of our recreational open space, scenic trust preserve lands, wetlands, private lots and narrow private roads to be taken for what would become through traffic from South Park Loop road to Rafter J. You cannot force a taking of private property after the fact. The reality is there is no way to interconnect our Melody Ranch roads without taking both private homes and crossing permanently protected recreational and scenic trust preserve open space lands and the filling of wetlands (eastern section) - while dumping traffic onto a narrow private road system. Meanwhile an opportunity already exists in both Rafter J and Melody Ranch with connections both north and south for future connectivity to their public non-motorized pathways systems. In closing we request that you clarify the maps for district 10 so that interconnectivity unmistakably is identified as non-motorized pathway, and not road, interconnectivity.
2/21/2012	Murray, Don & Carol Interested Public	After looking at areas like Park City, Vail, Lake Tahoe, etc., and having a home in Mammoth, Ca, my husband and I found Jackson Hole. It is the pristine, beautiful mountain area we were looking for. Not over-developed with so much density that ruins areas like this. Please keep the character of the valley special and do not support the increased development of the New Plan.
2/21/2012	Walker, Mark Interested Public	As a business owner here in Jackson I would like to thank you for your work on the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. I know it has been a long process and I appreciate your time and efforts. The current plan keeps in mind the wishes of our community while allowing Jackson to continue to grow and prosper. We must balance our need to protect our wildlife and scenic landscapes with allowing our local economy to grow and businesses to thrive. I believe the comp plan accomplishes this. I ask that you stay the course and support the plan as it is written.

Date	Name	Comment
2/20/2012	Hayek, Brady Interested Public	Thank you for your work in laying out the new and improved Comp Plan for the valley. As a business owner and resident, I feel it is a good fit for the valley, particularly, the critical balance between wildlife and the economy. I thank you for your time and would encourage you to approve the plan in it's current form.
2/19/2012	Wilbur, Janice Interested Public	I want to thank you for all of your work on the Comp Plan, and in particular for supporting housing 65% of our work force locally. I am a retired university professor who has been living in Teton County for the past several years. I volunteer for several non-profits and government agencies and therefore personally find it difficult to attend your public meetings on this plan. I am writing to assure you that my lack of attendance is in no way an indication of any lack of support for housing our work force locally since I appreciate and understand how it enhances our community. Thank you for continuing to support housing 65% of our work force locally.
2/17/2012	Watsabaugh, Carla Interested Public	The moose death last week. This morning a little calf moose was hit, dismembered and killed by a vehicle. I have lived here and am furious. This is just one reason why I am opposed to increased density in the Aspen's. You are talking development where you will remove people's property rights by down zoning, transferring, etc. to PRESERVE OUR WILDLIFE??? Are you kidding me??? We are currently destroying our moose population due to development and increase in traffic. I am convinced that you are far removed from wanting to maintain the character of Jackson Hole. I think you are unaware of what further development means to our wildlife. One of the reasons people visit here. Currently it takes 7-8 minutes for me to get out on to the Village Road at 4:30. Just who is it you claim you are representing in this community? What happened to the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and it's population cap? When are you going to stand up and say NO? I will be in touch once again, when I am not so upset!!
2/16/2012	Brodie, Allison Interested Public	Thank you for all your hard work on the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. I know this has been a long and difficult process and that there were many volunteers. I had a great experience at one of your meetings and I'm happy with the hard work and decisions that have been made.
2/16/2012	Walker, Karen Interested Public	I write today in support of the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. As a mother and member of this community, I want Teton County to be a place where my children can come back to, be successful and raise their own children. I believe this plan will help us achieve this goal. The plan is very much representative of the views and wishes of the majority of us in the community. I hope you will support the plan as it is written and pass it in March. I would also like to thank you for time, hard work and commitment to seeing this plan through. I know this has been a long and difficult process and I very much appreciate all that you do for our community.
2/16/2012	Barlow, George Interested Public	I'd like to commend you on the work that you've done with the Comp Plan. I believe it to be well balanced, on track, and most of all, fair. Thank you all of your hard work and diligence. It is time for all Teton County residents to support it. And for you to pass it. Congrats on a job well done.
2/15/2012	Dykes, George, M. Interested Public	My name is George Dykes and I've been a resident since January 2007. I'm writing to thank each of you for your hard work on the Jackson/Teton County comp plan. I'd also like to encourage you to pass the plan as is. I think the plan is balanced and fair and think you're on the right track. Thanks again for what you do

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2012	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Over the past four years I have attempted to stay involved in the process of developing a new comprehensive land use plan for Teton County, a task that has been quite arduous. Now that the process is nearing completion, it seems that there has been a complete reversal of the planning commissions' recommendations in 2011. We are now back to the "nodes" concept, disguised by the name "community character districts". This, with its attendant concept of downzoning rural lands, just does not make sense. I acknowledge that the Planning Commission has modified some of the areas, but I would be remiss to fail to speak to these issues as they move to the Commissioner's desk. While I understand the desire to move density from the rural areas to the developed areas (nodes), I believe that the impact on established neighborhoods far exceeds the benefits gained by moving that density. This is particularly true for the Aspens/Pines node that seems to float in and out of the planning crosshairs. The Aspens' area that the planners have designated as transitional is anything but transitional. It has been a stable area for more than forty years thanks to consistent zoning regulations applied since the adoption of the first plan in 1978. It is characterized by grandfathered commercial and single-family homes, all of which have functioned well for the community over the years. The only thing transitional about this neighborhood is the pen that the Commissioners can wield that would, in all likelihood, destroy whatever character our community now enjoys. If this occurs, it will unleash a series of unintended consequences on the residents of this area. First, it will undermine the predictability of what is going to happen to every neighboring property. This will immediately cause a chilling of the market because each property will be changing character - transitional. Uncertainty is the devil in any market. The buyers attracted to this type of market will be the speculators; this will further undermine our community and cause enormous conflict and angst for the residents. I have seen the rendering in the report, "Illustrations of Our View," that shows a neat, orderly development of multifamily units within a new road system. What is tragically absent is any acknowledgment that there are probably 30 different landowners involved in this tract of land, all with different objectives. To accomplish a comprehensive plan for this area, all parties would need to be in agreement. The likelihood of this happening is almost zero. The unfortunate consequence will be sporadic spot zoning and hodgepodge development. One might cynically say that what exists there now is hodgepodge, but it is stable and predictable. It is a mature, comfortable and highly likeable community. In the absence of a Teton County Redevelopment Authority with condemnation powers and a lot of money, this whole experiment of large scale redevelopment will be a colossal mess. Also I seriously question the safety of proposing an urban node with a main highway arterial running straight through it with a design that encourages east/west pedestrian traffic across this major north/south highway. We already kill a lot of wildlife on this road, and with this plan it looks like we may just add a few pedestrians to the mix. This is very poor design and planning. Besides the impracticality of the plan there are also the macro problems with this proposal. There will be added traffic congestion on the Village Road; pressure on the already-crowded Wilson School; demand for more commercial services due to increased population; impacts to water and sewer services on a system that was not designed for this size population. In short it will be shoehorning density into an area that was zoned and built for the existing population. This simply is not what these families ever imagined. This is an irreparable cost to these folks and it is not worth the perceived benefit to be derived from the protection of other rural areas. I believe the whole premise of moving density from the rural areas is misguided. Responsible development in the rural areas can be done without damage to the wildlife. What is required are good covenants, reasonable County Regulations and enforcement designed to encourage peaceful coexistence with wildlife and people. I began developing the John Dodge subdivision areas 33 years ago and have lived in the area since 1979. Over that period of time I have seen the wildlife thrive, even as the lots were sold and houses built. When I first moved into the area there were no roaming elk; now there are herds of over 100. It has been a constant habitat for moose. When I moved in there were no trumpeter swans; now there are regularly 5 to 10. I have observed grizzly bears, black bears, river otters and cougars that I have never seen before. The idea that you have to move density out of the rural zone to

Date	Name	Comment
		preserve and encourage wildlife is simply not valid. What has worked for land preservation are the Land Trust and the Teton County Scenic Preserve’s activities, and one of their major tools has been the PRD. If this is taken away, one of the few tools that really accomplish land preservation will be taken away. As elected officials I recognize the countless hours you have spent on this planning process. I would only remind you that many, many county residents have also invested time and effort to inform your decisions. Now it is with a sinking heart that many of us feel our input, and that of your planning commission, is being dismissed at the eleventh hour. Please take a careful look before you adversely impact our “community neighborhoods” forever.
2/15/2012	Walker, Kristin Interested Public	I would like to thank all of you for your continued efforts on the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. I know how much time and effort you all have put into updating this plan and ensuring it meets the shared goals and values of the community. I believe the comp plan in its current state does just that. It is a fair, balanced and measured plan which will serve our community well for many years to come. I encourage you to support and pass the comp plan as is. Once again, thank you for all of your efforts.
2/10/2012	Hawtin, Bruce Interested Public	As far as all the issues you deal with, I guess the comprehensive plan floats to the top these days. Even though I have attended several sessions over the years and spoken to several of you personally, I have been very remiss in not being either more vocal or corresponding as often as I should have. I apologize for that. Overall I am very pleased with the process, although lengthy, and with what the final product will look like. At the joint planning meeting last night, I left early as I had heard most of the comments before and it seemed as though there are those that just have to be heard even though they repeat themselves. The usual players were there. On my way home I thought of two comments that I wish I had thought of at the meeting. Other than thanks for the many hours spent by the planning commissioners, I had thought it would have been interesting to pole the audience with two particular questions. One: How many people in the audience have employees? There were three that I could identify; Two: When you leave the meeting tonight, how many of you will have to drive over the hill into Idaho or down valley to Alpine or beyond to get home? I don’t know how many hands would have gone up, but I suspect not many. I know you understand my line of questioning; being able to afford to live in Teton County and absolutely no need for workforce/employee housing. I have had literally hundreds of opportunities to discuss the planning process and those discussions have always been in support of the need for a comprehensive plan. We will have growth in Jackson Hole forever and I want that growth to be sustainable, managed, and controlled. I want the planning document to be firm, but fair and flexible. When I am told that our “Our property rights are being taken away!”, and there is some conspiracy to undermine our rights by the UN, HUD and other federal and international agencies and groups, the answers are too numerous to share and my responses likewise. The bottom line is I am not intimidated by fear and when I feel there is something remiss, I have the freedom to take that concern to one of you knowing full well that something will be done. I may not always like the result but the point being, that my rights are not being ignored. When living in town I was asked years ago about running for the city council and now as a county resident, the same, and my answer has always been, “Thanks for asking, but no!”. I can always give the time element as a reason, as so many do, but the more accurate reason is that if I could be allowed to make decisions only in those areas that I am comfortable with, I would do it, but you all have to wear far too many hats and I could never do that. I respect your willingness to serve this community in your capacities and I sincerely thank you for that.

Date	Name	Comment
2/10/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance greatly appreciates the efforts you have made to more effectively solicit public participation in the Comp Plan process during the last several months. The workshop format that you used for the Character District mapping was accessible to the general public, and generated excellent feedback that have informed your recommendations in each district. The Conservation Alliance believes that it is important to conclude the Comprehensive Planning process with robust public participation. Currently your schedule of activities seems to limit public input to either being submitted in writing, in personal meetings with decision makers or delivered from a podium in 3 minutes or less. This format effectively excludes many people who are informed and interested, but are not willing to engage in such a formal structure. Public input in this formal structure is inherently less of a dialogue in which people seek to reach mutual understanding, and more a statement of positions that may polarize the community. Continuing to only provide a formal format for the public at this stage in the process will make it very difficult get strong community support for the new Comp Plan. Therefore, we recommend that you redesign your meeting that is scheduled for March 14th. Please use an open workshop format, in which participants may come and go, and have the opportunity to sit at a table with elected officials to discuss their questions and concerns. We believe this opportunity for conversation will be greatly appreciated by the public, and it will provide you with final round of valuable input before you make your last recommendations. You may then convene the formal meeting later that evening, or a few days later. We recognize that this will require some readjustment of your schedules, either to add a few hours on the 14th, or to schedule a second day for your final recommendations. However, we strongly believe that it will be well worth your time. Thank you for considering this recommendation as you look for ways to maintain strong public participation and build support for the Comp Plan.
2/8/2012	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	I would like to echo previous Commissioners' acknowledgement of Staff and the outstanding job you've all done I think throughout this process. This is the third version of this update that we've worked on and each one has been better than the last and all three of them were better than the Plan we have in place now, so I'm generally very happy with the direction it's all gone. I'll make one comment to the public in general. In the context of this Plan, there's been a lot of public comment about additive growth. And in the context of this Plan the words permanent conservation and additive growth are almost synonymous. Additive growth is only a byproduct of permanent conservation, so it's not something that we should be afraid of, it's something we should be embracing, because any additive growth means that somewhere else there's some permanent conservation, and that's our number-one priority. So, I'm...overall, I wish...the only way I think this Plan could have been better—it's the best we're ever going to get and it's a consensus-based Plan—I wish we could have done a little bit more for the large historic landowners who have been such great stewards of our Valley up until now. But they still have the options they had in the last Plan and the door is not shut on developing new ones yet, so I'm optimistic.
2/8/2012	Moyer, Robin Interested Public	I have lived here off the Village Road, first in the Aspens and then on Cheney Lane, since 1981 when we first moved to the Valley. I have seen the traffic on 390 get increasing more problematic and difficult to maneuver since the expansion of Teton Village. Each time major development has occurred the loss of wildlife and the rural character of this area has suffered. The idea that has been proposed by the planners about adding more density to the Aspens area makes no sense at all. It will place an even greater burden on our road and no one wants to see a 5 lane highway leading out to Teton Village. The plan was supposed to uphold the county's scenic and wildlife values, not dump density in areas just because it "needs somewhere to land". I applaud the planning commission for their recent vote in keeping this area "Stable". The task now is to convince the electeds to reconsider this misguided proposal that would dramatically change this neighborhood, Character District 12. Please do your best in having them understand the long term wisdom of keeping any increase in residential density out of the Aspens. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Sturgis, Mindy and Greg Interested Public	I am writing as a concerned resident regarding the proposed re-do of the current Comprehensive Plan provisions. My husband and I are part time residents and own a home in Melody Ranch. We are extremely fortunate to spend half the year here. We've owned property in Jackson since we were first introduced to the area in 1986 and fell in love with the enormous beauty, wildlife, small town charm and especially the vast open space that is so unique to Jackson. I was born in N.Y. and then moved to Ft. Lauderdale in the 70's. Our primary residence is still there but mainly because of close family ties. We have seen the city go from a small town to an unplanned explosion of high rises, traffic and congestion all in the name of "progress" and "economic development". We couldn't disagree more. Increased urbanization of Jackson would be a crime whether it is on the Westbank or Southpark where there is existing infrastructure. Please keep Teton County a sanctuary for humans and animals alike. It truly is a very special place and it would be a shame to see it destroyed by short sightedness.
2/8/2012	Lockhart, Kelly Interested Public	My name is Kelly Lockhart and I live in South Park. Thank you for <<inaudible>> because of an issue that I have and that is you received comments I think three different times from the Jackson Hole Land Trust and they probably conserve more open space in this Valley than all of us combined, and what they asked you to do was let them stay in business. And what that amounts to is work with landowners to preserve conservation or property conservation easements forever. And what they told you is that the PRD that allows conservation on 35-acre pieces in larger works. It has a long history of working. It works now. It will continue to work. What that means for you is...I guess last meeting, I wasn't here, you took out the 160 acres and you left that open. And what I would urge you to do would be to insert 35 acres where you removed the 160 acres. And while some of you say that is better left to the LDRs, I will tell you that there will be a lot of mischief that will be caused by you removing that and not putting it in the Comp Plan, because the Comp Plan will guide those LDRs, and it's in the current Plan, it's worked, it has kept the Land Trust in business, and it has preserved exactly what you say you want to preserve, which is open space for forever. If you don't do that, you may eliminate a few houses; you may require them to be moved here or there. That won't work. You may down zone it. That won't work. What will happen is you'll eliminate a few houses for a little while until the people change, until the votes change, and then there will be a zone change. There have been two of those since the '94 Plan that have resulted in more development in the Valley than anything else. This is because there were three votes, not three votes at your level but three votes at the County Commission level. So I urge you to just do one simple thing and put 35 acres in where you removed the 160. Now, that will allow the LDRs to continue to allow clustering options, movement of density, and the protection of open space, which is what we all say we want. And I want it as much as the next person. I did note in one of these comments where you talked about down zoning, but the Staff assured you that there wasn't any in this document. I can assure you that if I read it, it is a down zoning, and it is a down zoning to those families that have protected the open space. I have some other specifics. Town, I don't think you should be down zoning Town and I think there are some things that do do that. I mentioned, or I see some language, I'm not sure what having a half circle under future abundance of landscape over built form as the current character to be maintained exactly means, but that has to do with Town, and if we're not going to have built character in Town, where are we going to have it? So, language like that, even if it is in Town for every district, I think should be removed. My comments from the opening is basically to leave density where it lies. Everyone knows where it is. They seem to be relatively happy where it is. We've accomplished a lot of good things since 1994. So, if you leave that, then a lot of the anxiety that you've created about where that density might go and might land will be removed. And, at the same time, again, you get 70 percent in a conservation easement and the wildlife appreciate it. I noticed one thing and I haven't read it all, I noticed that...I will. I know that in Kelly you want to ensure that it's clear that live/work is not discouraged and I wonder if we might want to not discourage it in the rest of the County also. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Biolchini, Robert, Jr. Interested Public	Good evening everybody, my name is Robert Biolchini. I've got a couple, well, concerns over this Comprehensive Plan and where it's going and I'm here to make some comments, but more importantly I'd like to ask some questions of all of you. And in the past I asked to have not only you but our County Commissioners and the elected body to assimilate and give back an idea of costs, and I'm not necessarily talking about dollar costs. I'm talking about costs to I guess we the people. This Plan...or in seeking that response I never really got anything that gave me an idea that people were really looking at what this was going to cost us in terms of a community. Most of the people that I've talked to with regard to this planning process really aren't for it. They weren't for the '94 Plan; they're not necessarily for this Plan. And so I started to go and investigate a little bit more. And in that journey I found out that, as we all know, 97½ percent of Teton County will never be developed. And as I start to listen to the language of how this thing is being sliced and diced along the way, all I'm hearing is nodes and open space and let's take from the people and put it into the collective within the confines of how a committee is trying to determine individual property rights without just compensation. Where I'm going with all of this is, if this Plan was left to a free-market society, all good ideas would surface and all bad ideas would go away. However, what we're finding is that, if this planning process was a good one, it would have been adopted quite awhile back. However, where I'm starting to see problems and directives on why these processes, meaning the planning processes, get clogged up so much is something that I think some individuals already commented on tonight, which is UN Agenda 21, how it's infiltrated all levels of planning nationwide, and I would encourage all of you to educate yourself on exactly what UN Agenda 21 really is. It is, in essence, a goal that is put forth by the UN to strip the United States people of their sovereignty slowly over time by way of the planning process. We even have an example here recently that I'd like to bring everybody's attention to where the people of Teton County are now required to adhere to international codes derived by the UN 21 Agenda and then taxed by these codes, when these codes were never voted on by we the people. And what I'm speaking to specifically, and this is the one example that I found, is the 2006 International Energy Conservation Code amended and adopted the 21st of July 2009 here in Teton County, and this is in fact taxation without representation. Where do these taxes go? What do they go into? Can we have an audit to see where they went, if you are in fact going to take those from us? In my opinion, each piece of property, private property that is, has its own unique merits and it's the right of the owner of that property to develop within reason—and what I mean by within reason is obviously not to have a pig farm or something like that within city limits—but within reason. And those merits should be drawn upon the free-market society, not by a committee trying to tell you how big your house is or what color it should be or how tall it should be. So, as we start to go through this process, this planning process, that you all are embarking upon and kind of forcing upon us, if you will, what we're dealing with is the situation that becomes discriminatory. Okay, thank you. It's discriminatory in that when you all pull out a map and you start to draw lines on a map, you have winners and you have losers, and those winners and losers are...well, you can draw it out in dollar terms if you want...but when it's subjective, when it's private property and you're trying to dictate what people are to do with their private property, I would refer you back to what is referred to in the Constitution as just compensation. And if you all are stepping in to say, well, this development over here gets commercial and this one's open space, with no regard for the individuals involved, where is the just compensation? And where do you derive that compensation? Does that come from another governing body? Excuse me, does that come from a tax derived from a governing body that we're supposed to pay along the way? Sure. I'd like to just say that this is a free-market system that we're in and when I start to look at a lot of the things that we have in front of us, I'm asking this group to adhere to and pay attention to anything that has to do with Agenda 21 and the UN and take it out of this Plan a hundred percent. And with that I thank you for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park neighbors. I just wanted to start out by saying that I really appreciate your patience and all your good work and lots of long nights. Beautiful views and wildlife don't stop at West Jackson. You also can't separate the negative impacts of a condensed Town density level subarea 5.6 from established residential neighborhoods and schools by a two-lane road. In Northwest South Park at Town density will degrade the character and integrity of Cottonwood Park and the schools along High School Road. Policy 4.3.a, aims to protect established neighborhoods. It states in the last paragraph character districts will aim to enhance these areas as complete neighborhoods without significantly increasing the allowable density. I think it states that and Northwest South Park is in our district now, District 5, West Jackson, and this policy should apply to Northwest South Park and how it affects our adjacent neighborhoods, because it's a lot of density if this thing goes through as it is. And, like I said, it doesn't stop at High School Road. We urge you to take mixed-use small lots and grid, alley terms out of District 5.6 that is Northwest South Park. This language opens the way for Town-level densities and at best a hopscotch inappropriate development that will seriously impact the schools and existing family neighborhoods. Please also delete any extra added industrial to Gregory Lane other than what's already entitled. I can already see the outcome of these details in 5.6 if they're not deleted. Investment money will go to projects that look great conceptually but will fail in reality because the funding will end at the street edge. We have seen this in the past, that people in blue-collar working-stiff neighborhoods, like mine, get nailed from both ends with higher taxes and failing roads. We end up with complicated out-of-proportion denying buildings for abandoned holes in the ground that don't do a thing for safe, walkable streets and a small-town feel. I walked back from Smith's yesterday on High School Road, which is, by the way, it is point eight miles from my front door, and I live at the west end of High School Road near South Park Loop Road. We are still sharing, through the years, to this day, through this process, we're still sharing High School Road this time of year with at best two feet between us and the traffic. We will be wasting millions of dollars on new infrastructure in Northwest South Park so I can drive past the convenience store across the road to go to a real store that has more than cigarettes and beer. If and when Town infill is mostly completed and Northwest South Park is needed to permanently preserve other lands in South Park, there should be a residential neighborhood that complements Range View Park density. But first, and I really, really think this is really important—but first make High School Road more welcoming to pedestrians and cyclists so we can walk or bike to the schools, Smith's and other businesses along High School Road. We are a heartier, healthier breed than the usual run-of-the-mill Wal-Mart shoppers in other cookie-cutter green-field developments. We don't notice the extra point three miles. Thanks a lot, guys, and again I really appreciate your hard work.
2/8/2012	Spitzer, Horton Interested Public	My name is Horton Spitzer. I see very few...I'm from Wilson...I see very few familiar faces. At the last Comprehensive Plan meetings, Rich beat me—my wife and I attended a hundred meetings. You haven't seen me because I felt very frustrated. Everybody worked very hard on these and within months of that being accepted, there were variations, there was a lot of jams with developers, some with projects that had merit that went for years. This cost us money. This cost the community I think a great deal of lost patience. I suggest that everybody has their day in court, but if you don't have something in the Plan that says you're given so much time to present a plan, it may require a variation of some sort, a variance, and okay. But I think something should be considered that you get so many hearings, depending upon the size of the project. Once you pass that, when you come in the next time, [fist knocking] 10,000 bucks there and we'll hear you. You go back a second time, [fist knocking] 25,000. We have fallen prey to developing and they wear you down. They wear the public down. They wear the Planners down, the Commissioners. And it's I think a flaw. And we get run by the developers. I'm not saying we shouldn't develop, but I think the ruled should be firm. I'm not going to name the projects. You know them, the ones that went on for years. I want to...end of that subject. And, lastly, I want to thank you for the consideration you've given on the West Bank along the Village Road based upon the feeling that wildlife is our major business now. It's not construction. It's not manufacturing, obviously. It's people come here to see the wildlife. I live in John Dodge and I think that whole corridor is precious. We never had elk migrating through our property but starting at C-Bar-V, the past two years, to wakeup in the morning and find 40 or 50 elk bedded down in your yard is common. I've seen migrations of a hundred animals moving through the property. Why that's happened, I'm not prepared to say, but I think the migration route has changed, so we do have a heavy migration going through that part of our County. And I hope that's taken into consideration when a development is considered. Thanks for your job, you did a good job. And I do know Mike over here and it's good to see a familiar face, but let's not go through what we did before. Let's learn from our past and figure out how do we keep the Plan you've worked so hard for, whether we agree with it or not, from being a Ping-Pong ball when it comes to, oh, here's just another variance. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Hi, Rich Bloom for South Park neighbors. A hundred and seven meetings, four and a half years, I think I've been to 105 of them. Two things. One is just on the record Staff has promised to correct 10.2 to match 10.0 on the importance of the district's open space for wildlife movement. This will fix the incorrect statement in 10.2 that wildlife move solely along Flat Creek, so I just wanted to get it on the record, but Alex assures me that it will already be done. Staff has also promised to correct 10.1 to match the changes Staff has put forward on 10 and 10.2, that whole into and adjacent to existing developed areas. Is that the ?? language? I think Staff is planning new language. Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space. So that will apply to all those three areas that have that alternate language. I think that's a good compromise language. I think it respects all of our existing private property rights and it gets to the intent to let those landowners in central Northern South Park to cluster on their own properties. The big mistake and the thing we didn't get to in 5.6 is this clause that's on your modification that says, insert that it develop the subarea should include redundant streets, grids, alleys, small lots and a small area of mixed-use. Let's put mixed-use aside. The rest of that language should be removed, as it's in direct conflict with the existing language. The existing language says a possible location for residential development has a similar density to the adjacent West Jackson neighborhood. And it also says should development be needed, it should be the subject of a neighborhood planning effort so it will get to those details earlier. I talked to Alex at length Monday. I talked to Ben Ellis Thursday afternoon and we just had a hallway discussion. And what really happened there was Commissioner Ellis brought up the idea of shrinking 5.6 considerably by half or more, and perhaps increasing the density as a concept. And that's where he brought in the words of grid and alleys under that concept. It was discussed with that joint group and the group did not push either the grid, alleys forward or a change in the footprint. Unfortunately, Staff made the mistake of letting that language slip through. And by putting through that, and we'll go through these, redundant streets isn't really needed because 7.3.a, says all new developments have to have connectivity, interconnectivity; they won't be dead-end cul-de-sacs, so we have that covered. What grid, alleys and small lots infer to use that in Town, that's AR zoning. That's 16 to 18 dwelling units per acre. By referring to the neighborhoods across the street, you're looking at 4 or 5 dwelling units per acre. And what Ben Ellis—and he's here if you want to ask him—but I think what we were talking about is keeping that same amount of usage. Four to five is eight to a thousand homes. That's all of Melody Ranch, Rafter J and Cottonwood Park put together, which is half the amount you're trying to move around. If this language goes through, especially with the character-based Plan versus a numbers-based, it could infer AR zoning, which is 3000 to 3600 units. So the simplest thing to do is just to take out the grid, alleys and small lots and let that conversation come in in its entirety with the joint electeds so Ben Ellis can talk about reducing the footprint and looking at more density and have that conversation. So, the last thing is...and the same with redundancy. Redundant streets is covered in policy 7.3.a, and we also have that neighborhood planning effort coming up. Meanwhile, Barbara Allen brought up the idea about the adjacent neighborhoods and what that meant. I'm comfortable with the language as is, but I think for clarification you could say, for example, Range View Park, say you weren't talking about the apartment complex that's 24 dwelling units per acre for Ellingwood. So I would hope you would consider that. And then there was a conversation—it was very convoluted, Paul Duncker can fill you in if you want—about how we got to mixed-use. Well, by having mixed-use, that's ??. Mixed-use is commercial on the ground floor; we all know that. And yet we talk about this area being a residential use as its character. So the area is already within walking distance to local convenience. There's no need to have commercial. It would drive traffic into that area, through a school zone, and it would also pull the center of gravity from downtown by having commercial out on the periphery. So I think I would ask that you drop mixed-use. That came out of a County conversation from that because it's incompatible with the rest of the description in that area. That's it. I left that on your paper and thank you for your time as always. And I'm glad you're at the last of your 100 and some meetings.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. We'd like to thank you guys for your efforts; I know you guys put a lot of time into it and we're close to the end. Thanks for what you've done. I'll focus my comments on items that were discussed last meeting where we feel we've gone off track. Area 3.2, District 3.2, Core District, public opinion favors two stories and you've gone to three, really question where that came from. Area 4.1, once again, public opinion, 70 to 80 percent favors three stories. This is all from the surveys that started back...and then I heard repeatedly during the open house meetings, and so again I think you've strayed off of what the public has asked you to do there. Five point six, redundant streets, grids and alleys, and mixed-use are not compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. There's no alleys, I don't believe, west of Millward, so I'm not sure why all of a sudden we're going to jump to alleys in that area. That seems like again a ???. And the real question there is why is there so much detail on this when everything else was supposed to be at a higher level? This isn't supposed to be a Master Plan. I would suggest you go back to the previous statement, which was that it be compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. That's a good statement, and when the time comes to develop it, then we can address the detail issue there. Teton Village, we would suggest that you not just limit them to footprint but also put in a statement that any increase in residential must come out of the Master Plan, as Commissioner Schwartz pointed out before. There is a Master Plan that's also binding, and so just to increase the density there would be a violation of that Master Plan. So, we ask you to go ahead and certify this and pass this along with the comment that you've heard the public has concerns about the issues that are not all resolved in the character districts, such as timing of the zoning discussions and decisions, and ask that the electeds resolve that at the next level. Thank you. Keep up the good work.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	Well, I, too, definitely want to acknowledge Staff. They've done a huge amount of work. I want to really acknowledge the public. Those that have been engaged have been critical for me, very helpful, and I appreciate that. I certainly want to acknowledge our elected officials. They have no easy task yet ahead of them. And I also reflect all the other Commissioners' thoughts on the tremendous tension in this community between allowing people to exercise their property rights, at the same time, acknowledging the ecosystem that is so valuable to all of us and to the community. And in thinking about that, I jotted down some notes and the notes kept growing, so I'll read them here. But on any given day of the year any of us can experience the wild of our surrounding public lands, expect to see wildlife, inhale clean air, dangle a line into crystal-clear water, shop at a locally owned store, quaff a locally brewed beer from a locally owned brewery. We have it good. Furthermore, we have a strong and diverse community. From the dishwashers, to the teachers, to the real estate brokers, to the builders, to the financiers, to the third- and fourth-generation landowners, to the retired professionals, there is a place for everyone. This document enshrines balance between our environment and our community. I really believe it does to the extent possible. This document recognizes that ecosystem stewardship is preeminent, that therefore growth should be managed, and that those two efforts taken together will preserve our character. We all recognize that every additional square foot, every additional vehicle on the road, every additional human in Teton County, has an ecological cost. This document recognizes that cost but, more importantly, it recognizes that that cost, foot per foot, car per car, human per human can be reduced, that the ecological cost of someone moving here tomorrow can and should be lower than someone moving here today. On the other hand, this document recognizes the right to property owners. The exercise of those rights can incur ecological and social costs. The exercise of private property rights can compromise the ecosystem, generate growth, and impact community character. Past development did. Past development, under past Plans, placed 70 odd percent of the dwelling units in our County within wildlife habitat and scenic vistas, the very backbone of our ecosystem. Past development and past Plans placed the vast majority of development in the County. In the past, property owners were allowed to exercise their rights without mitigating the cost to the ecosystem and to our community character. This Plan envisions the ideal that new development and redevelopment will recognize and mitigate ecological costs and will strive to enhance community character. To be clear, under the vision of this Plan, development of any degree of intensity can only occur within limited portions of Town and, to a minor degree, in Wilson, the Aspens, and Teton Village. Located on a strong network of public transportation, supported by local services that will be enhanced over time, largely outside of crucial wildlife habitat, these are the areas where it just plain makes sense to have the development that houses our workforce and binds our community together. This Plan strives to conserve the maximum amount of open space possible in our rural County without diminishing the underlying property rights. This Plan does not down zone, though it does ask a lot of our community's large landowners. Under this Plan, they will be asked to address not just the economic cost of new development but the ecological and social cost as well. Opportunities to cluster exist in this Plan but only when the initiatives to open space are identifiable and substantial. And when all is said and done, this Plan, as structured, envisions an overall buildout less than what the '94 Plan allows for. Vital to this Plan is that it will be monitored and assessed. Managed growth means that every five years the fundamental tenets of this Plan to mitigate our ecological costs and preserve community character will be evaluated. Key metrics include the 60/40 ratio, development in complete neighborhoods, versus in rural areas, and a 65/35 ratio of in-County to commuting workforce. Many, as have I, recognize that the vision represented in this Plan is just that, a vision. Can it say more? Can it give us more certainty? Can it give us something more substantial to work with, some numbers, something to ponder, some costs and benefits? But let's consider where we are, what we have, what we are striving for. Our wildlife, our vistas, our elbowroom—these things we take for granted. They are communitywide benefits free and open to all. I can enjoy the open space as I drive south out of Town. You can enjoy the open space as you drive south out of Town. Anyone can enjoy the open space as you drive south out of Town. There's only one way we can be excluded from enjoying that view. A landowner can exercise their constitutional right to utilize their personal property. Yet, the Constitution also recognizes the right of the community to ask, even to require, that the landowner acknowledge and address some of the costs incurred to the community when exercising those rights. Alas, such costs are often diffuse, intangible, and without price. In other words, they are highly subjective. At what point does the size of one's house simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? At what point does the intensity of a clustered development simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? How many houses built next to mine are too many? One? Three? Five? Ten? How many houses built on the opposite side of the Valley from mine are too many? How long at a stop light is too long? How many dead ungulates on our roadways is too many? Should the span of sagebrush between my house and those houses yonder still be called open space if transformed into the ninth fairway of a golf course? Should a campground populated with small cabins on wheels still be called a campground? Wouldn't each and every one of us here tonight love a 10-page, double-spaced document that answered those questions in plain English? But I challenge any of us to find even as few as five other people in this room to sit down together and produce such a document. Let's be clear. It may cost money, plain and simple, for a landowner not to develop their property. Yet, when they do develop, it can inflict ecological and social costs on our community. While these costs may be diffuse and hard to quantify, they are costs. If we as a community want to address them, or avoid them, we can. We can monetize them and compensate landowners for the preservation of open space and wildlife habitat. We can make them temporal and accept slower travel speeds, longer waits and the use of public transportation, even

Date	Name	Comment
		when it's inconvenient. We can personally internalize them by building smaller houses and living in tighter quarters with our neighbors and controlling our dogs and scooping their poop. In reality, all this and more probably has to happen, but none of it will without two things. The first is a vision, which I believe we now have. The second is action, action that must be taken communitywide. This Plan is as much yours as it is mine, or the Planning Staff's, or our elected officials. If this Plan says one thing is that we are all in this together. Let us act as a community.
2/8/2012	Stennis, John Interested Public	Well, I would reiterate Dana's thanks to all the public who's turned out to comment on the Comp Plan, the Staff for their immense amount of time that they spent developing this, and then to all the fellow Commissioners for all the volunteer time that they've put in. It has been a long process, but I feel like the product that we're getting from this is really moving us a huge step forward and it is improving a lot of things that we really didn't like about the '94 Plan. And things that we see in the Valley now, that I think there's a sense that we don't...you know what you have, so you don't...you're worried about what the change will be, and I think we're doing a lot of good things in this Comp Plan that we probably shouldn't be so fearful of. You know, unfortunately, I think, to reiterate Michael's point, that no one Plan can encompass all the ideas presented by the community, but I think we've done as good of a job as we possibly can. And I'll just submit the rest of my comments in writing.
2/8/2012	Stewart, Peter Interested Public	I also want to reiterate my gratitude to the Staff and to the public. I definitely didn't know what I was getting into. [Laughter] And I had been to a lot of public meetings before, and I appreciate what I've learned. And tonight's public comment really illustrates to me the polarity of opinions in this community and affect the impossibility of creating a Plan that has everything that everybody wants in it. It's just...it's impossible, I mean, that doesn't mean what we have is a poor product—I think it's an exceptional product—but I do think it's time to move it along to the next phase, to the electeds, and to a discussion of the details of how it's going to impact the LDRs and that type of thing. But I also I do think the character district maps, though imperfect, are a useful tool, because they address one of the public's main concerns, which is predictability, where it's going to be. You know, we're not putting numbers on it, but there's been really good conversations, you know, ever since we started discussing the character district maps. So, though imperfect, I think they're a nice tool. So, that's all I've got to say.
2/8/2012	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	I am also one of the original members and I also chaired a year of these meetings, and while Michael and I often agree, and I do think that the Planning Commissions have done a great job, and we've listened to so much from expert testimony to public comment, etc. It's been great. It's been super informative. It's been wonderful. And I think we all benefit from the different perspectives that these Commissions have, and I think we've done a great job talking out those differences. Tonight I think we made great strides. Unfortunately, and I've struggled with this since this whole process started, I can't support these character districts, because I can't support the inherent philosophy behind them, and I don't see how a 40/60 goal can be accomplished in any other way than by padding the 60 and taking from the 40. And so, while I think there's been a lot of great discussion and I support a lot of the things that have been brought up, I inherently stick at that and I think it's inherently depending upon a philosophy of transferrable development rights, and so I can't support these character districts that I don't believe are based on something that works.
2/8/2012	Hammer, Mike Interested Public	I was not involved in this process. I came here when the electeds were finalizing the words, but I have worked on the '94 Plan and I worked on the 1978 Plan. Interestingly enough, I had a project in 1980 under the PUD Regulations, then the County Plan. They were three pages long and that was it. It's gotten a little more complicated. I read the character districts as implementing the words of the Plan, as proposed, and as driving future zoning and Land Development Regulations. I'm anxious to see LDRs that incent owners and developers to ?? remarkable things that encourage what ought to be done, rather than saying what can't be done. And I think this is going in the right direction.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Vanillin, Anthony Interested Public	Hi, my name is Anthony Vanillin. First, I want to thank you guys for your public service. Lord knows I don't have the time or probably want to take on the task that you guys take on. The previous gentleman here had quite a bit of stuff that I wanted to ask you guys about as much as is supposed to be commentary. I do have one or two questions to whit. One, the Plan that you guys vote on tonight, is that set in stone? I would like to see it be...that's my big problem with this. If you guys vote on a Plan and say, here's the Plan, we're going to do this, and then six months down the road, we have somebody else come in, well, we'll just move it over here a little bit and then move it over here a little bit and then we'll add this and add this and nobody else gets to comment on it, what's the point of all this? Maybe you guys don't see what I'm trying to drive at. It scares me that you guys would put together a wonderful Plan, however you may change it, and then just be able to change it later on without the public saying, yes, we want it changed this way and this way without going through this whole process again. And then the second thing is my problem with the Housing Authority. How much authority does the Housing Authority have in this Plan? And then how do we, as taxpayers, hold them accountable? Or how do we hold you accountable to hold them accountable? Because they're not elected people, am I correct on that? They're appointed? You guys appoint them? So, who of you guys oversees them that we can say, okay, you're the person or you're the person that holds the Housing Authority accountable? Who do we come after to get changes? With that, I know, you guys, it's supposed to be commentary and you can't really answer questions, but a couple of points that need to be brought up. Thank you.
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Smith, William Interested Public	Hi, I'm Bill Smith. I'll start with almost an apology that I've only dug into the planning documents strenuously in about the last two weeks. I've absorbed as much as I can. You, of course, are very conversant with them; I am not. I live in Character District 9 and as I read and reread the text there about Character District 9, I'll say that things were a bit ambiguous to me. There was little there that I could really say, YES, or NO, to, you know, it was...and also there was a table in there, and I saw other comments about this, that had, you know, solid bullets and half bullets and things like that in the table and, to be honest with you, I couldn't make sense of that. I didn't understand what that was trying to say to me. If it said, you know, there were bullets that said this is the way Character District 9 is right now and bullets that, you know, mark certain intersections and that kind of thing, and then a separate table that said this is the way we're planning it to be with also bullets and proper intersections and that kind of thing, that would have made some sense to me. But I couldn't discern whether the table that was there was showing me the way it is right now or the way that you would like to plan it to be. Unclear. And that was a general comment about the way this is drafted at this point. To the average reader like me, and I consider myself a decent litmus test, not really easy to read and interpret. The use of acronyms and things like that as well, I would encourage you to, you know, my question, what is a PRD and that kind of thing, go ahead and spell them out. If these are intended to be, again, reviewed by the public, then don't use a lot of acronyms and jargon that the average reader will not understand. Now, that said, the PDF that you sent out, the packet, or what was on the website there, I perused that pretty carefully and of course most of the content was a compendium of written documents or written comments that had come in, apparently at the January 26th meeting, is that true? And again my earlier question, apparently those comments have not been interpreted nor incorporated into anything that is available to me yet. So, for us making comments tonight, we're kind of behind the eight-ball to start with in the sense that we're not seeing the latest and greatest version of the documents. And again a comment for the future, if you do, you know, want public to comment and that kind of thing, take pains to give us the latest and greatest so we can see where it stands right now, not, uh, we'll get this stuff into it later, you know, that kind of thing. The...tonight of course there will be more public comments that are going to be gathered, including mine, and likewise those are not going to get into the documents tonight obviously and yet immediately following this meeting, apparently there's a vote of some kind to approve the documents as is. To me that feels strange that there's an approval of something before it's in a final form or a final draft form at least. It seems like there ought to be, you know, one feedback loop rather than a rush to vote tonight. I think we all agree that intelligent planning is a good idea as long as it's done fairly and competently and in keeping with constitutionally limited government. And as I read the documents, of course that was my first reaction about is the government sticking its horns too far into the rights of citizens to control and to use their property. The...neither the...well, the U.S. Constitution, the Fifth Amendment, protects property rights of people who own property. And things like requirements on the part of any government, local or whatever, that say you can't use a certain proportion of your property, or whatever, folks, it's a taking of the rights of that property owner. There's just no two ways about it. And if you say, Bill, you've got to reserve 80 percent of your property for an elk migration corridor, personally, I love elk. I've got elk all over my property, no problem whatsoever. On the other hand, why should I pay 100 percent tax, property tax, on that property when I can't even use 80 percent of it? So, it feels like, you know, if we're going to play that game of putting restrictions on property use, then somebody's got to pay the price of that and it shouldn't be the property owner. I'm giving up already. Oh, I'm sorry. Last couple of comments here. This planning process, I'm aware that it does proceed from general to more and more specific and more and more stringent, if you will, in terms of ultimately we're going to get building codes and ordinances and that kind of thing that are all going to come out of this. And, you know, there is some nervousness on my part about that. Already today we have a UN drafted, drafted by bureaucrats of the United Nations, an International Energy Conservation Code governing what we can do here in Teton County Wyoming, folks. And I'm saying if you observe what the UN does around the world, I'm saying, why is this in my backyard? Why is Bill Smith being governed by a document that was ultimately drafted, or initially drafted by the United Nations, or a bunch of bureaucrats in the United Nations? Aren't we smart enough to come up with building codes that are particular and right and correct for the place where we live? If that's where this is heading, I think you're going to get more and more headwind from me and a lot of other people like me that are saying, wait a second, what is the UN doing in my backyard specifying the building code? I think that's it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	Sorry, I'll be less windy...Peter Moyer from the Village Road area. Just starting at the north on the character districts—and I'm only speaking for myself—Teton Village, instead of dumping more residential density up there, it would make sense to me...what they've missed up there is having a real Village. And frankly I would love to see more really appropriate commercial zoning, so you don't just have hotbeds up there dumping into other parts of the Valley. I think it makes it a much more quality experience up there, plus in some ways it takes pressure off the roads if you do it right. So, that's one thing. The Aspens, I won't repeat, we've been through all that. I really appreciate, and I think a lot of people really appreciate, your decision when it was time for stability, which is what so many of these neighborhoods want to encourage. Wilson, it's the same thing, you know. You look at Wilson and the Aspens and in terms of creating a lot of new up-zone density in areas that are about 12 to 15 feet beneath the bed of the Snake River right on the Teton Fall just never made a whole lot of sense to a lot of us. I mean, those of us who are there, yes, it's a risk you accept, but in terms of future up-zone density for Wilson, the Aspens area just never made sense. Teton Village is much higher, it's not a problem, even though it's on the Fall. Moving down to other parts of Town, South Park, the Town, to me the key thing is sort of honoring as best you can the sort of wishes and desires of the people in those neighborhoods, so you're not just dumping density from on high from the Ivory Tower where it's really doing it right and making it comfortable for them. You look at what's gone on here and we have a pretty severe recession. What people love is stability. In hard times like this, stability is really important. So, sort of zapping neighborhoods with sort of up zoning decrees coming from on high, I just don't think it's proper at this time, plus the free market actually has been working great along those lines. There's less of a demand on the workforce, we've lost thousands of jobs, plus prices in a free market have come down dramatically. And I've always seen, and I think a lot of people see, Victor, Driggs, Alpine as being part of our community. That's part of our workforce, too, and it just seems nuts to think that by creating new up-zone density, we can compete with prices in Driggs and Alpine and areas like that where they're not deed restricted. They don't need public subsidies. The prices are low. They've got, what is it, 17,000 unbuilt lots over in Teton County Idaho in that region. You know, for us to think we can meet some artificial 65 percent workforce thing just seems crazy, common-sense wise, plus, according to the Housing Authority, the Fall 2010 Report, 68 percent of the households here in Teton County Wyoming work here. That's doing pretty good. I mean, it's really doing well right now and the market has done well as it stands right now. And the second homes, they're not the enemy. I mean, that's part of Jackson Hole. It's a big part of our economy, second homes, and to come up with some artificial workforce housing thing as the driving force to meet some artificial standards just doesn't seem to make sense and it just creates this tension where you're dumping density in neighborhoods. So, thanks, and I apologize if I went too long the last time. Thank you guys for your public service. I mean, it's really appreciated. I mean, we just sort of show up in a cameo appearance; you guys do the work. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	On any given day of the year, I can experience the wild of our surrounding public lands, expect to see wildlife, inhale clean air, dangle a line into crystal clear water, and finish the day having a locally brewed beer at a locally owned brew pub. This thanks to our unique and sound environment. Furthermore, on any given day I might run into friends that include dishwashers, teachers, real estate brokers, builders, guides, financiers and third and fourth generation land-owners. This thanks to a community that has a place for everyone. This document enshrines balance between our environment and our community. This document recognizes that ecosystem stewardship is preeminent, that therefore growth should be managed, and that those two efforts taken together will preserve our character. We all recognize that every additional square foot, every additional vehicle on the road, every additional human in Teton County, has an ecological cost. This document recognizes that cost, but more importantly, it recognizes that that cost, foot per foot, car per car, human per human, can be reduced, that the ecological cost of someone moving here tomorrow can and should be lower than someone moving here today. On the other hand, this document recognizes the rights of property owners. The exercise of those rights can incur an ecological and social cost. The exercise of private property rights can compromise the ecosystem, generate growth and impact community character. Past development did. Past development under past plans placed 70 odd percent of the dwelling units in our county within wildlife habitat and scenic vistas—the very backbone of our ecosystem. Past development and past plans placed the vast majority of development in the rural county, not in town. In the past, property owners were allowed to exercise their rights often without mitigating the costs to the ecosystem and to our community character. This plan envisions the ideal that new development and redevelopment will recognize and mitigate ecological costs and will strive to enhance community character. To be clear, under the vision of this plan, development of any degree of intensity can only occur within limited portions of town and to a minor degree in Wilson, the Aspens and Teton Village. Located on a strong network of public transportation, supported by local services that will be enhanced over time, largely outside of crucial wildlife habitat, these are the areas where it just plain makes sense to have the development that houses our workforce and binds our community together. This plan strives to conserve the maximum amount of open space possible in our rural county, without diminishing the underlying property rights. This plan does not downzone, though it asks a lot of our community's large landowners. Under this plan, they will be asked to address not just the economic cost of new development, but the ecological and social costs as well. Opportunities to cluster exist in this plan, but only when the additions to open space are identifiable and substantial. And when all is said and done, this plan as structured, envisions an overall build-out less than or equal to what the '94 plan allows for. Vital to this plan is that it will be monitored and assessed every five years. Managed growth means that every five years the fundamental tenants of this plan—to mitigate our ecological costs and preserve community character—will be evaluated. Key metrics include the 60/40 ratio of development in complete neighborhoods vs. in rural areas and the 65/35 ratio of in-county to commuting workforce. Many, as have I, recognize that the vision represented in this plan is just that, a vision. Can't it say more, give us more certainty, something more substantial to work with? Some numbers to ponder? Some costs and benefits? But let's consider where we are, what we have, what we are striving for. Our wildlife, our vistas, our elbow room—these things we take for granted—are community-wide benefits, free and open to all. I can enjoy the open space driving south out of town; you can enjoy the open space driving south out of town; anyone can enjoy the open space driving south out of town. There is only one way we can be excluded from enjoying that view. Land-owners can exercise their constitutional right to utilize their personal property. Yet the constitution also recognizes the right of the community to ask, even to require, that the land-owner acknowledge and address the costs incurred to the community when exercising those rights. Alas such costs are often diffuse, intangible and without price; in other words, highly subjective. At what point does the size of one's house simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? At what point does the intensity of a clustered development simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? How many houses built next to mine are too many? One, three, five, ten? How many houses built on the opposite side of the valley from mine are too many? How long at a stoplight is too long? How many dead ungulates on our roadways is too many? Should the span of sage-brush between my house and those houses yonder still be called open space if transformed into the ninth fairway of a golf course? Should a campground populated with small cabins on wheels still be called a campground? Wouldn't each and every one of us here tonight love a ten-page, double-spaced document that answered those questions in plain English? But I challenge any of you to find even as few as five other people in this room to sit down together and produce such a document. Let's be clear. It may cost money, plain and simple, for a landowner not to develop their property. Yet when they do develop, it can inflict ecological and social costs on our community. While these costs may be diffuse, intangible and hard to quantify, they are costs. If we as a community want to address them, or avoid them, we can. We can monetize them, and compensate landowners for the preservation of open space and wildlife habitat.

Date	Name	Comment
		We can make them temporal and accept slower travel speeds, longer waits and the use of public transportation, even when it's a little inconvenient. We can personally internalize them by building smaller houses and living in tighter quarters with our neighbors (and controlling our dogs and scooping their poop....). In reality, all of this, and more, has to happen. But none of it will happen without two things. The first is a vision, which I believe we now have. The second is action, action that must be taken community-wide. This plan is as much yours as it is mine, or the planning staff's, or our elected officials. If this plan says one thing, it is that we are all in this together. Let us act as a community.
2/8/2012	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	Good evening, I'm Scott Pierson. I live and work here in the Valley. I was just listening to Trevor about putting numbers on every area, and if you put numbers on it, you might as well put a bull's eye on it. Just as with the Aspens, you'll see each neighborhood rise up and target those areas. I can see the ad in the newspaper, Jackson Hole target over here, 2400 units, target over there, 2400 units. So I'd encourage you not to do that unless you want all this work that you've worked on five years just to fall apart, because it will be a reason to protest in each part. It's just going to happen that way when it happens. It happened already at the Aspens and you pulled back from the Aspens. The reality is the numbers at the Aspens that were projected to be there, it takes two things, at least. One is a willing developer and the other is somebody with the land that's willing to let it happen. And then you have to have the economy to make sure that that happens as well. None of those three things is here now and I don't see all three of those things coming in the short-term future. So, when you're looking 20 years out with those numbers, it's all going to fungible move around a little bit, so saying 400 here, 800 there, is I think the wrong direction to go. Thank you.
2/8/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I couldn't disagree more with Mr. Pierson. This is a very intelligent demographic of public. We understand the numbers at least as well as some of the decision-makers and we should be trusted with that. I've heard elected officials recently say this isn't a numbers-based plan, it's a character-based plan. That's utter hogwash. That's a derivative of the facilitator. Every facet of planning is a derivative of a number. Even if you're looking at wildlife, you're looking at percent above or below an objective, if you're looking at vehicle miles traveled, if you're looking at capital improvement plans, population projections—everything is based on a number and we should be trusted with those. The problem with the outcry of the community is the community said from day one they didn't want additive growth because the need wasn't there, not because we're all evil misanthropic mimics. You made a mistake last week by leaving 12.1 at the Aspens as a naked node, a commercial core that will simply create inflow radial traffic. It doesn't stand alone; it's ?? should actually retake, quite frankly. There's a lot of questions brought up by individuals in the community here, Kelly and...I agree with almost everything Mr. Lockhart said, amazingly. Bill also brought up some interesting...and I'm glad some electeds are here tonight, because this illustrates how inefficient this process has been. We're still asking and attempting to answer the same questions that we did five years ago. We don't know the difference, and we haven't had the studies, and we haven't had the substantive discourse to determine what is a taking, what is a performance-based incentive, and performance-based property right. But yet we're talking about all this shifting around and we're missing the boat on the base premise of this entire Plan, sought from the beginning, and that was permanent protection for our wildlife. In working with landowners who are the stewards of that, I suggested four years ago, and continually suggested, that we have a PRD/transfer mechanism task force so that we could have simultaneously, concurrently, gathered this information, but in the infinite wisdom the electeds saw not to do that out of sheer conflict ??, not because it made sense. Someone could walk up to this podium with a grand unified theory of Teton Village planning and it would be rejected because of political considerations, etc., etc. Anthony, I think I caught the gentleman's name, brought up one of the big fears moving forward with this Plan and that's instrumentalism, that we won't hold to what we say we're going to do. We've seen it happen so often in the past that items that we write in will be selectively interpreted, etc., etc. So, there's a lot of good comments. One specific request, besides the 12.1, is glossary. Commissioner Mr. Duncker brought this up day one at your...we don't want to see permeability defined as a five-foot-wide space for a four-foot-wide moose to get through it. We want an actual community-accepted definition. Walkability would be another example. And acronyms that someone from the community mentioned also would be...You know, I brought it up last week about Staff's numbers. The overage from 6800 base property right, how do we arrive at that 11,100 number? There's about a 45 percent overage in phantom density there, and the only way to refute that is to release the numbers. There are state school sections we know are going to the Park Service. We have NC-SF, RA6, RA3 lot split that don't have a conducive historic utilization rate to equal these numbers, so it would be nice for you to direct Staff to parse those numbers out so that we can not transfer at the highest level of the scale. There's one more problem...I could go on all night...but there's one more main problem and that is the assumption that we're going to go from 40/60 to 60/40 without going through 50 percent. We're at 55/45 now. By adopting that 60/40 aspirational goal, it pins us down to operating at the high end of the number scale. Staff's draft pointed that out, their continuum of choices. The electeds ought to conform to existing policies of going to have to make those high-number choices because of an over ascribing to an aspirational goal of 60/40. Fifty percent would be well within the realm of this Plan. I honestly don't think by pulling the numbers apart that we can get there, so that's another substantive change. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Good evening, I'm Trevor Stevenson, speaking for the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. You all have a number of very specific things you're going to be working through this evening and I know you've just gained a number of other specific things that the public has brought up. I want to put you back at a couple of the really big issues that I think it's really important that you all, as a Joint Commission, weigh in on, recognizing that ultimately these will be decided by the elected officials but nonetheless that your input is very valuable on this. The first one is to make more clear in the Plan, and in particular in the character districts, that the intention is to shift development around, not to simply increase it in some of the areas, where we're seeing that clearly illustrated in the maps, but the intention is to balance that. There will be increases and there will be decreases associated with that. Sort of a statement of intent, clearly put within the character district maps, would again alleviate a lot of concern within the public that they're not seeing clearly illustrated there the intent to balance increases and decreases in density throughout the County, which I think is an idea that everybody supports. And you'd gain a lot more support for the Plan if that were stated more clearly in there. The second piece that I think is important for you to weigh in on, and I'm not sure really got addressed in your last meeting, was that the Alliance has made a recommendation that you consider more clearly stating the intent around the amount of development in each of the character districts. What we're talking about here is not buildout numbers, and I know you talked some about buildout numbers last time. But essentially the character districts describe the intent of the future of each area in the County and they describe it in textual terms. It sort of says, you know, the type of development that will be there. We think it would benefit the community greatly and benefit the Plan greatly if you could also give some direction, essentially a recommendation, to the electeds that it would be useful to also include the amount. You hear this consistently from the public and we heard a lot last time about the confusion about the amount of development that was being called for in the Aspens and that caused an uproar. Now there's confusion about the amount of development that is potentially called for in Northern South Park, Area 5.6. And we can kind of run into this over and over, but I think it would be useful to kind of explicitly name an intended amount, not a restriction, just an intent. So I would ask that you speak to that a little bit. And those are just a couple of the big issues that I think are really important for all of you, as a Joint Planning Commission, to weigh in on, and thank you for your insight on all this.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Pruett, Michael Interested Public	Yeah, I'll start. I am one of those people who have been in on the process since the very beginning, since the first meeting at St. John's, etc. I chaired those meetings for awhile, so it has been a long process, and I think it has been sometimes painful but a very positive process. I know the public has gotten tired of a lot of this stuff and they've made a lot of comment about that, but overall I think that having two boards combined like this, although it's been very difficult, I think ultimately we brought up some very, very difficult issues that we've had to work through with the public. And I think these Planning Commissioners, all of the people who have been involved now and in the past, really have done a good job of working through those. I would say that not...a sign to me of a good Plan is when you don't get everything that you want, and I can personally say I've not gotten everything I want out of this Plan, but I can say that I've gotten a lot of what I would like to see for this Valley. And my feeling about that is that I think the two planning boards have listened very carefully to the public opinion. We've...boy, have we listened to a lot of public opinion and public comment. And I think overall we've done a very good job of taking the Plan that was given us from day one and really, really scaling it back. I know that might not feel that way to a lot of people, but I think that is the overall end result of where we are today, because what we had before is very different from what we have right now. So, overall, I can say I'm overall very happy with moving forward. I think there are...I think this Plan does fix a lot of transparency and clarity problems that were in the '94 Plan. I think it is a step forward. I think the challenges that we've faced with the public is bringing these issues to light that weren't identified in the '94 Plan. So, by bringing those to light, it causes controversy and question and I think we've done a good job overall, the public, Planning Department and our boards, of really addressing very, very difficult issues. I don't think we've fixed everything. I don't think this is a silver bullet by any means. I don't think this will carry us for 20 years, but I think it is a very good step forward. A couple more final comments—I know I'm a little long-winded, I'm sorry, but this has been a long process...[Laughter] I do...I think that there's two things that I would say I'm a little bit...I have a little bit of angst about. My first one is that we didn't put a little bit more emphasis on property rights overall in the Plan, both in the County and the Town. I think we took a very long hard look at housing, wildlife and things like that, and I think we probably could have gone a little bit stronger on property rights. And my hope in this Plan, and with the electeds specifically, is that, when they look at this, they really take a hard look at those and make sure that those are protected for the public. My other feeling of angst I would say is I think we need...and my advice or solution...my advice to the electeds and looking forward is I think we need to take a really, really strong look communitywide at our housing program. There's been a lot of public opinion about housing when that came up. We spent a lot of time on that chapter. I know it was a new chapter as of the '94 Plan and we have come a long way since '94, but I think we've gone off our path and I think we need to really take about three steps back on our housing program and the way it's set up today, and look at how we can come up with some very strong market-rate...or market solutions, free-market solutions. I know there's members of this public that are here who are on a housing committee that I think came up with some super suggestions on how we can take our program today and make it better, and I think we really...and I would strongly encourage our electeds to take a really hard look at that and make some very, very big changes to our housing program. I think we can accomplish the goals that we want but still have a free-market solution and still get what we want from the public. Overall, I think that's really pretty much my comments. Overall, I am pleased with where we've come. It has been difficult and frustrating, but overall I'm pleased with what the public has done and their input. And I know the faces that are in here who have been here as much as we have as well. Thanks to the Planning Department and thanks to all the board members who are here and the prior members who served from day one.
2/8/2012	Buchwald, Dana Interested Public	Okay, I just wanted to thank the public and Town and County Staff and fellow Commissioners for all their effort and ideas. And that's it.
2/8/2012	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	I agree with Rich Bloom and Kathy Tompkins that the trade off for more development in Town and South Park is not adequately guaranteed for more conservation protection. The plan could lead to more development than the community really wants. Hold growth levels to no more than what's currently allowed. thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Lewis, Richard Interested Public	My name is Richard Lewis; I'm a broker with Sotheby's International Realty and many of you guys already know me. And there are just two things that I want to address. You mentioned one of them up here with regard to a PRD and changing that acreage. Over the years, doing a lot of business in this Town, I've gotten to know and work with a lot of property owners and I've been involved in doing some of the PRDs, and I've also become very familiar what values are associated with being able to do one with regard to being able to have multiple home sites and the hoops that you have to jump through in order to accomplish these clustered sites on a PRD. And when I start seeing things like 160 acres, even in consideration, right off the bat, I can tell you there's not that many 160-acre parcels that are even available or exist here, so it almost eliminates any kind of development or PRD situation of any sort. And then if I was an owner of a 40-, 35-, 40-, 50-, 60-acre parcel, acre of land in Teton County, and I see this being considered, I can see that, say, for instance, the number you guys decide is 75 or 80 acres, whatever it is, it's equivalent to coming in and putting a...the County putting a conservation easement on the property and devaluing it right off the bat, I mean, as much as half, if not more, depending on where it is. And if that was something that was seriously being ready to be voted on, I'd be interested to see all those owners in Teton County what they would really think of their property being devalued right out of the gate, you know, with an action such as that. And the second thing I wanted to speak to is the Housing Authority. I really don't quite get...I started looking at the money that is...the tax money that's being given to the Housing Authority just to manage the Housing Authority, not even including the cost of some of the construction and things that the Housing Authority is spending our tax money on. And then I start looking at, as a realtor, I don't just sell the high-end stuff here, I sell stuff in Teton Valley. Looking for a place for my kids right now over there. I know what's going on in Alpine. You know, we're missing the boat I think on this. Those communities should be extensions of us. And, you know, depending on where you are in this community, you're anywhere from 35 minutes to maybe 45 minutes on average from downtown Jackson. I mean, most people who live in cities, just that's their average commute anyway. I don't understand why we don't sit down and look at the numbers and what is being spent. I mean, you could upgrade the transit system to each one to make it easier and transport more people and spend far less money than we're spending as taxpayers and burdening current property owners. And especially with the market the way it is right now and as cheaply as you can go over the hill and buy a three-bedroom, two-bath, two-car garage setting on 0.4 of an acre for \$110,000/\$120,000 right now, and these people would actually own their property without any restrictions. It just seems like a mismanagement of funds and not taking advantage of these communities. And by taking this step, you're also encouraging the market in those communities, and when the markets come up, you're going to have more people investing in infrastructure in those communities, which will ultimately make it more attractive to the people who are working and commuting here. Okay, so that's all I have to say. Thank you.
2/8/2012	Nash, Paul Interested Public	I, too, want to kind of mirror what Michael had said. I do believe that a Plan that shows a lot of compromise is a Plan that shows how diverse we are as community, so I would like basically not get into where I think we could have done better or could have done...we definitely could have done worse, but kind of stick to that. What I do want to focus on are going through three sets of thank you's. First and foremost would be to these committees. I think actually getting involved is the best way to adjust the system, and try and get what you want out of a system is actually to get involved. And seeing what, you know, not necessarily myself, but what everybody else has done and given up, as far as their evenings, I applaud that and I think it's certainly noteworthy. The second would be to Staff, both Town and County. I think they took most of the heat on a lot of the issues and they bared all of the burden of putting together verbiage and keeping us informed, keeping us on track, and ultimately, in my opinion, providing us with a good document. One suggestion I would have moving forward is that they take this experience and take the time to put together what they think in the future would be a better way to move forward, so it doesn't take a long time, so we don't burn out the public, like it's been obvious, and just so the people that are sitting in our positions right now have a better way. Or maybe this speaks to predictability, a more predictable way of how we're going to move forward on this Plan in ten or so years in the future. And then the third would be mostly to the public, you know, the dedicated few that are here every night and then also the 500+ others that provided us comments and talked to us on the streets and wrote, you know, wrote in what they were thinking and work, jobs, things like that. So, I think that is ultimately what creates this community, this County, and turns it into something more than just a bunch of people living in an area, that we actually are a community. So, I'll turn it over to Mark.
2/7/2012	Kayem, Curtis and Kelly Interested Public	Please visit Sinclair, Wyoming. It is an ugly mess from overcrowding! Is that what we want Jackson Hole to look like? Visitors will not want to invest in a remote place that loses its soul! Please think responsibly, Curtis and Kelly Kayem, homeowners in Wilson and Jackson. Thank you

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2012	Nolan, Ellen Interested Public	I am writing to ask you not to change the comprehensive plan to increase density in South Park adjacent to Cottonwood Park neighborhood and the schools. This whole area is already very, very dense from Indian Trails, through the Blair House apartment complex, the affordable housing developments, Cottonwood Park, the schools and on to Gregory Lane industrial complex, and Smiths shopping center. In the past 12 years alone, I have seen traffic increase and the night sky dim with night light pollution. I understand that the landowners of NW South Park already have the right to develop their property as a residential neighborhood, but the changes you are discussing could increase the allowable density as well as permit light industrial or commercial development. In today's persisting economic climate, I do not understand why anyone wants to change the existing plan when there is apparently plenty of room to develop both residential and commercial space in town under the existing plan, and while sales of existing homes and vacant land have plummeted. Whose interests are you serving? I don't know anyone who thinks it is a good idea or even needed. I cannot improve on the following points, so please accept them as if I had written them. - o We do not want additional density dumped into South Park from anywhere else in the valley. - o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our South Park rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their lands in South Park. - o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density in NW South Park. We do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of South Park ranch lands. - o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the in-fill potential in Town is completed. - o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Rangeview Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park. - o We do not need any additive industrial over what the entitlements already allow in the future on Gregory Lane that would worsen the safety issues for students and families using High School Road. The industrial areas just south of town are the more appropriate place for future light industry. - o Most importantly, High School Road should be a residential and school campus road, period. We do not want it turned into a congested highway collector that would endanger the safety and lives of any school student or family residents living nearby. Thank you for taking my concerns into serious consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
2/6/2012	Creel, Margaret Interested Public	Thank-you for all the work that you have put in over the last number of years to make sure that you come up with a comprehensive plan that speaks to the needs and wants of this community. It has been a long process, one that I have paid close attention to, and one that simply seems to be in constant flux. Although I applaud you in your recent recognition of not increasing densities in the Aspens area, I strongly urge you to not add that density to other areas in Teton County, simply because you “have to put it somewhere”. This is clearly not good planning. In particular, South Park in its entirety is not nor has it ever been the logical place to dump density although there are forces that are arguing to the contrary. As you move forward towards the conclusion and subsequent adoption of the new comprehensive plan, please uphold the map descriptions and delineations that affirm the scenic, wildlife, and ranching heritage values for all of South Park (District 10). In addition, do not even consider putting more density in the NW corner of South Park until infill in the town of Jackson has occurred. This alone could take years. As at least a half century of growth is already entitled here in Teton County, I would say it’s a slippery slope to put together a plan that encourages more density and more development especially given our current economic climate. As much attention has been given to the fragmentation of South Park into the NW portion and other parts, let me be clear in stating that there needs to be significant clarification in the plan that ties any development in the NW portion of South Park to the permanent protection of the rest of South Park. Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. To be quite honest, I do not support any kind of development in South Park. The recent deaths of moose along the Village Road has led to an outcry from many in the community. Why is it that the death of moose elicit more emotion than the death of deer, elk, coyotes, foxes, skunks, owls, hawks, mink and others? These are the animals that I have either seen killed or dead along High School Road, South Park Loop Road, and South Highway 89 over the years that I have lived in Rafter J. These animals are all using the corridors between the Snake River and the foothills to the West and East as well as moving both north and south in annual patterns. They do not understand delineations and designations. Although laudable that you are looking at the importance of the Flat Creek riparian area to wildlife, do not fail to recognize the importance of the larger land area of South Park and the habitat and food resources that it provides. I bet the wildlife that have no voice, will appreciate it. Again, thank-you for the time and effort you have put in towards coming up with a plan that speaks to the better good of this community in the future. Your attention to the importance of wildlife and their movements needs to continue to play a major role in what you decide as you move forward.
2/6/2012	Lyons, Fred and Dee Interested Public	We have owned property in Jackson Hole since early 1970's, first in the Aspens then over 25 years in John Dodge and now are permanent (and voting) residents in Lake Creek Ranch. All of these locations involve travel on highway 390. It is inconceivable that planners and officials can think about, let alone initiate plans, to increase the density of homes and especially traffic in this area. One only has to travel on the highway to understand that additional traffic is not only undesirable but also risky to wildlife, the safety of persons and the character of the area. We do not want to simply transfer this problem to other areas of the valley. It is an extremely bad concept looking for a place to land. ALL of this valley is a special place and should NOT be subject to urbanized plans.
2/6/2012	Strawbridge, Robert Interested Public	Jackson Hole is what it is because men like Albright, Roosevelt , and Rockefeller had the vision that this place had a unique combination of natural assets which should be preserved. More growth is threatening to these assets. We are here because of these unique assets and the expansionists want to expand because of them. However, expansion will endanger the very assets which attracted the expansionists and ourselves in the first place. The plan to increase density in the Aspens is only one poor growth idea. Please oppose it. I urge you to vote against all schemes to increase population density in our valley.
2/5/2012	Rockwell, Donald and L Interested Public	We share the concerns of neighborhood groups about your redo of the Comprehensive Plan for Jackson Hole. We implore you to KEEP JACKSON HOLE AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS STABLE and to curtail the development of the Valley into a more urban community.

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	I know you're hearing a lot these days - and I thank you for listening - but it's the same, familiar-by-now story that ordinary people have been trying to get across, since the early days of '08. Wildlife, wildlife crossings, neighborhood character, keeping rural places rural, and of course, my favorite, dumping of density, specifically into South Park. So, at the risk of redundancy, please uphold the map descriptions that affirm scenic, wildlife, wildlife crossings and rural heritage values of ALL of South Park. Also, any development in northwest South Park needs to be solidly linked to the large rural land stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Please, Please no dumping of density from places like Buffalo Valley or anywhere else into South Park. NO infill from town should be allowed anywhere until the town infill potential has been satisfied, nor any commercial in S.P. The people are just not into the rampant growth that could happen. Sorry to be a broken record here but these things are important and we've all slogged through 4 years of this comp plan revision process, to the tune of I've-forgotten-how-much public money. We've lived here 33-34 years, respectively, and have seen so many changes. Please, once again, listen to the common people and take these thoughts into consideration in your deliberations. At the moment we are out of the country and not able to attend meetings, but we have been to so many over the years, and are currently being kept up to speed via emails. Thank you again for taking the time to listen to 2 more residents of Teton County, and for considering what we've said. We look forward to resolving these issues soon, as we're sure you do as well.
2/5/2012	Greger, Art Interested Public	I am reading the Illustrating our Vision document on the comprehensive plan. What a beautiful picture of what I believe to be Phelps Lake. This illustrates very well what most people have indicated they want I this comprehensive plan... conservation. The nodes concept has been changed to complete neighborhoods, but the idea is the same. Growth in these areas has been consistently opposed - witness the opposition to growth in the Aspens just this week. I live in Rafter J and love the quality of life here; I oppose any development of South Park. It is probably the most scenic area that everyone sees coming into our tourist town. It needs to be preserved for its scenic and wildlife values as it is. I don't believe growth is really needed at this time. How long will the old Valley Feed sit empty? How long will the land west of Staples be for sale? How long will it take to sell the old Mojos, or the old Bubbass? How long will the new lots developed in Rafter J sit empty? When will the hole that is McCabe Corner turn into a swimming pool? How many people are trying to sell existing homes and can't? Infill and improvement are much more needed than more sprawl and area to be developed. A well developed line to the beginning of town exists at High School road, and should be preserved as such. I see in the plan increased connectivity with roads in the Rafter J area. This has been consistently opposed in the past (when the New Neighborhood was proposed) and will be opposed in the future, I am sure. No one I have ever talked to in Rafter J wants this. There is too much traffic here as it is. The process has been dragging on for years, and it is still uncertain how many homes, of what type, are going to be put in certain areas? A goal was predictability, and I don't see it. The comments made at the beginning of this process have been consistent, and should still be considered. Most working people don't have the time to follow this lengthy process, but their opposition to increased growth in South Park still stands. Please focus in conservation, infill of existing areas, and improving existing areas. Please conserve the beauty and character of South Park (and the whole valley for that matter) as it exists. Don't make South Park a dumping ground for unneeded and unwanted development.
2/5/2012	van Roijen, Bea Interested Public	Please reconsider your decision to increase the density on Village Road. We do not want more housing along this corridor. Thanks for your attention.

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2012	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	We would like all of you to know that we very much appreciate the careful thought and intensive energy that has gone into revising the Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long, hard process, but the final drafts seem to be much improved from the originals. With specific regard to South Park: We are pleased with the maps that acknowledge the importance of special qualities in South Park (scenic, wildlife, and ranching). Please hold firm to these positives in the final draft of the Plan. We do not want growth in South Park beyond what is currently entitled, however we support the idea of clustered growth in South Park that is directly tied to permanent open space protection of other land WITHIN the South Park area. We are concerned about the types of development that may be proposed for the NW section of South Park, and feel that it should be appropriate for a location that is close to existing neighborhoods and schools. This would eliminate any industrial and some commercial activities. Thank you for considering our comments.
2/4/2012	Brooks, Susan Interested Public	Everything I read suggests that the city and county are in the pockets of the real estate and building businesses. A shame. I moved here from an upscale NJ suburb with NO open land. The real estate and building businesses did just fine because real estate was in demand and sold quickly and there was a big business in remodels, additions and tear downs. They did not try to tear down big houses and build condos. They respected the character and quality of the town. I suggest that you all do the same for this county and stop trying to make it into a city.
2/3/2012	Heilesen, Marv and Juli Interested Public	As you (finally!) finalize the Comprehensive Plan revision, please do not give up on South Park and treat it as the County's unloved stepchild. It would be totally unfair to use South Park as the density dumping ground for more development that no other neighborhood wants either. A lot of us have been reluctantly willing to tolerate some limited additional density in the northwest corner of South Park, so long as it 1) was only used to preserve rural land elsewhere in South Park, and 2) was consistent with the density of the surrounding neighborhoods. But any such development should not precede development in town; otherwise, the whole goal of "Town as Heart" would be meaningless. When Leland Christiansen was a County Commissioner, he stated at a South Park public meeting that "this is the community's plan." Planning Commissioner Patricia Russell said essentially the same thing at a meeting last month. Over the last four years, the community has said over and over that they don't want more density added to the valley. We already have zoning enough to double the growth we have now; if this is really the community's plan, how can it identify more "spots" for additional density? The only people that would benefit from more growth are the few large landowners/developers that want to make money at the expense of everything else, including residents, wildlife, and ultimately the economy of Jackson Hole, which is so dependent on the quality of its environment – both natural and built. The proposed plan started out by offering up South Park as a sacrificial lamb to growth. Over the last four years, thanks to vigorous input from the community, and responsiveness from the electeds, it has been changed to be more responsive to preserving the qualities that make South Park a primary contributor to the overall special quality of Jackson Hole. We're almost there; please stay the course, preserve the character of South Park and in turn the valley as a whole.

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Thank you for your public service and hard work. Current events around the world, and especially in the Middle East today, are a reminder of how fortunate we are to live in a place where public participation is an expected part of the political process. Below are comments on the Comprehensive Plan Draft. A letter similar to the below was submitted to the New and Guide's editor for this week's paper. When the Aspens was delisted as a density target, Planning Commissioner Paul Duncker's response was "we need some other spots", referring to neighborhoods to which planners could ADD density. It appears the Comprehensive Plan process has become a game of whack-a-mole. Why? The community does not want additive growth nor do we have the funds to pay for the associated roads, sewers, law enforcement and other infrastructure costs, not to mention the costs that are off the books such as the degradation of our environment and loss of small town, rural character. There is already room for a doubling of both commercial and residential development in the pipeline, not to mention a backlog of unused commercial space and a glut in the residential housing market. Who could possibly benefit from adding additional entitlements? The concept of preserving wildlife habitat and open spaces by shifting actual density into already developed areas is constructive and I believe one the community supports. They key is to shift actual density potential, not simply add new density. Adding density accomplishes nothing but sprawl. Right now Middle and Southern South Park are on the maps as rural areas with important scenic and wildlife value to preserve by moving development rights from these areas into a corner of Northwest South Park. If this is done right (i.e. without bringing in growth from elsewhere in The County), permanent conservation can be achieved by clustering units into a residential neighborhood, consistent with Cottonwood Park, the adjacent neighborhood and, most importantly, without adding density. It is important to keep in mind that conservation is the driving force behind clustering neighborhoods, not adding density. No one wants added density of any sort and that includes phantom density. Please instruct the planners to throw out the density you intended for the Aspens. It has no community benefit.
2/3/2012	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	As we near the end of the long Plan process I want to re-emphasize a point I have made over the past few years, and raise a new concern. First, the primary goal of this Plan should be to play defense, to control, limit, regulate, and indeed discourage development. This is not because development is bad. It is not. It is because intense pressures to develop Teton County are inevitable. Current development rights are large; the County is uniquely attractive for lifestyles, recreation, and scenery; and growing global growth will fuel demand. Combine that thought with the expressed will of the residents and you have a clear objective. Second, I have been disappointed to see signs that the Plan process may be trying to drive wedges among neighborhoods and communities by looking for "someplace" to put density. The character district approach has value in allowing the Plan to consider local issues and concerns. But it must not be used as a tool to divide. So far, community groups have recognized this risk and reinforced their solidarity. But I would welcome clear and emphatic statements from planners and elected officials that they understand this danger and will oppose any efforts to set district against district. Finally, I want to thank all of you for the work you have done. It has been a long process, but much has been and can be accomplished from it.
2/3/2012	Jennings, Marc Interested Public	Have you not learnt the message about greed and stupidity yet ...Nature is the only thing left to create any sense of well being , to think and to put some perspective to our existence....More houses means more people which dilutes any chances for nature ...Visiting Nature is one thing and yes should be accessible for all to behold ,but to build is just plain dumb ...I now we will be told Jobs Jobs Jobs well create them out of preserving and visiting this place and not enriching a few to build yet more hideous and polluting dwellings forever spoiling the views and beauty for everybody.....

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Swope, Linda Interested Public	You may remember the photo collage I sent you a few weeks ago - wildlife roaming through my yard in Melody Ranch... I have been pleased to see further progress made in the Comprehensive Plan to protect and value our truly unique resource. Thank you for listening to public input and acknowledging that our valley residents as a whole do treasure our wildlife. And for some of us in business here, we know that our clients are drawn here because the abundance is distinctive to Jackson Hole. The wildlife brings the families. The families book our services. We pay our taxes. Simple, really. And you know how we feel in South Park: Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park. South Park is a VITAL area for wildlife migration into our valley and beyond! The historic ranch district is the gateway... The danger now is writing in more growth. I don't know one valley resident that wants MORE growth. Please keep your ear to the ground. That rumble is us, the taxpayers who you represent. Let's keep the progress we've made and know when to call it good. Thank you for your time!!
2/3/2012	Bocker, Carol and Dee Interested Public	Please take into serious consideration to resist a transition to this Valley and make it more urban. We have chose to live here because of its uniqueness; it truly is a special place. We came and stayed because of its open space and small town characteristics. We appreciate our wildlife and that they have room to live a natural life. Neighborhoods should not grow - if anything they should downsize. And as far as the tourists and the benefits from them, they too come because we have remained special and held our size. Please dump this re-doing of the Comprehensive Plan - it is fine the way it is and our Valley needs protection.
2/3/2012	Levy, Allison Interested Public	I am reading the full page ad in Friday's Daily. I have to speak up because I have lived here for 25 years and fail to understand why county officials continue to think and act like real estate agents. Population has tripled since I moved here but the infrastructure to support that increase has not. Why do you continue to not think basic needs such as widening the roads such as 390 and 22 but instead push more building and concentrated populations. Don't you work with Wydot? I have no clue. But I don't get why you continue to allow building yet don't address increased traffic. There is more money in your virtual pockets to develop. We are busting at the seams. Can't anyone see that? The Aspens area is one of the last places to change the least. Put your egos aside and listen to the people. Traffic, wildlife, the RV's and Fireside resort already are a mess - then you are going to add construction workers and trucks to the equation. And isn't there enough for sale that you don't have to build more? I just don't get it. Thank you for your time. I know this won't make any difference but it helps get it off my chest how frustrated I am with how this town has grown. Its a bummer.

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Zardus, Heidi Interested Public	Please don't ruin Jackson Hole! Please protect wildlife and open space in the new comprehensive Plan. I don't want more urbanization of Jackson Hole. There is only one Jackson Hole. It's special. It needs to be protected. It can't accommodate huge urban development, and there is not reason it should. There are many other places that are not national treasures, where development is appropriate. Not here. Please protect the qualities of this valley that most people come her for.
2/2/2012	Mortensen, John and P Interested Public	We wanted to communicate our support for the views expressed in the advertisement in today's paper run by all the community and neighborhood groups here in our valley. We have lived here over twenty years, and have constantly expressed the save views of open space and wildlife resources protection. Each new plan promises to embrace these values and then ignores them. We have enclosed a photo [see email for photos of moose/deer] of some our favorite neighbors and residents where we live in downtown Wilson. At the last town meeting in Wilson planners promised we would remain the same, and wildlife and current open space would be protected. But now it sounds like adverse pressure in other areas and the planning department may change that here, and the entire west side where we have limited infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, schools, etc). Please listen to us and fellow residents who value our historic Jackson Hole character, wildlife and open space resources. We do not want to risk what we all have expressed we hold most dear.
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more? When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning. I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park. I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Dunlap, Dave Interested Public	I am opposed to using the South Park area as a dumping ground for the rest of the county. Adding anywhere near 1000 homes is shortsighted and voids any concern for wildlife and responsible growth. I have been participating for four plus years in this process – I expect you to UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (called district 10). • We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today! • Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. - o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. - o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. - o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. - o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.
2/2/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I am writing again as a very concerned citizen about the Comp. Plan. I know this is a critical time and many important decisions will be made very soon. The decisions will effect our lives for many years to come. I am asking you to not upzone the village road/aspens area. Living here for 35 years I know the wildlife that resides here. This is not a place that should be considered for increased density. The Aspens are should remain STABLE.
2/2/2012	Sandvig, Louisa Interested Public	My name is Louisa Sandvig, I live in Tucker Ranch off the Village Rd. I am very concerned about your desire to increase the density around the Aspens for the following reasons: 1.If you increase density, you will have to enlarge the Village Rd., which is already very difficult to cross during “rush hours” around 8:00am & 4:30pm. 2.More wildlife will be killed with a wider road to cross. 3.More wildlife will be disturbed with more traffic & people. 4.More retail development on the Westside would decrease Jackson’s & Teton Village’s retail business revenue. If you think you need more density, I suggest keeping it in Jackson. Why do we need more density? Real estate sales are down, there’s a lot of vacant rental space in town. What are you all thinking? Please pay heed to those of us who live on the Village Rd. We DON’T NEED OR WANT MORE DENSITY in the Aspens or around the Village Rd.

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Close, Tina Interested Public	I have lived here 30 years and seen the wildlife go down in population. Please, please; please NO MORE Density anywhere! We have enough human population in the valley. Add more and takes away our good life here. Have some guts to say NO to more development and more density.
2/2/2012	Vito, Kristin Interested Public	For four years, community members have consistently asked for one thing in the comprehensive plan--keep the character of South Park rural. The sole reason for any density increase in NW South Park should be for permanently protecting open space in the remainder of South Park. Please note this community request in the appropriate map descriptions.
2/2/2012	Muromcew, Alexander Interested Public	I wish to support the message in the ad in today's JH Daily by the Village Road Coalition and the Wilson Advisory Committee: Please keep our neighborhoods stable. I am against the urbanization of Jackson Hole.
2/2/2012	Karahadian, Kathy Interested Public	Please do not upzone these neighborhoods in order to create more density. I moved here 23 years ago from California to escape the onslaught of development. The village road cannot support any more traffic than is already there. The wildlife will never survive it and neither will the character of our neighborhoods!
2/2/2012	Whitmire, Bob Interested Public	As I understand the goals of the community, preservation of wildlife is #1. We already have a significant problem with the slaughter of large and small animals, particularly moose, on the Village Road. The road bisects moose habitat and water sources, so movement of wildlife across the road is inevitable. No one seems to understand why the moose population seems to be declining severely. It's hard to see how the addition of 300 or 400 families in the vicinity of the Aspens and the consequent increase in traffic on the Village Road will help to preserve wildlife in general or our apparently endangered moose population in particular. I'm sure you are familiar with all of the preceding points. How do you justify the proposed build-up around the Aspens?

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	For four long years, elected officials and the Jackson Community have been working on the draft Comprehensive Plan which, when completed, will establish the future character of the Jackson Hole Valley for generations. It has been a long and exhaustive process which remains unfinished yet is being scheduled for completion early this year. It is ironic, despite the long hours devoted to such an important document, that the draft today is hardly comprehensive in the sense that maximum densities are still not established and thus, residential areas including Jackson, the Aspens, South Park and Teton Village fear that additional density from the more remote reaches of the County will be visited upon them in the new Plan, robbing them of their cohesion and unique character. These neighborhoods are in competition with each other to remain relatively rural and open. The Plan must mandate that infill development first be approved in Jackson, but only to a point where the town is able to preserve its Western frontier character as the "Last Best Place" in a rapidly urbanizing nation. However, if growth limits are established for Jackson, it is also necessary to limit the growth in the above neighborhoods at the amount entitled in 1994 which presently allows doubling of the built environment! For elected officials to permit additive growth in these several residential areas in the new Plan is madness. Additional densities can be left to future generations if the situation so dictates well into the future. In the South Park neighborhood, as an example, good planning would dictate that High School Road, which bisects the Northwest corridor of this neighborhood, remain rural to encourage walking and bicycling and minimizing automobile traffic. If development of the northwest quadrant of South Park results in residential growth in view of 1,000 homes it would exceed the size of Cottonwood Park, Rafter J and Melody Ranch neighborhoods combined! Moreover, any density approvals in northwest South Park must be linked to and contingent upon large landowners and the Jackson Hole Land Trust securing permanent conservation easements on the southerly part of South Park which not only functions as a scenic gateway to Jackson but an important wildlife corridor as well. A truly Comprehensive Plan, which has the primary objective of keeping rural, more distant and detached parts of the County, hardly is intended to accept growth from other parts of the Valley such as Alta and Buffalo Valley, at Jackson's expense nor to encourage additional commercial, industrial or mixed-use projects which additive density would demand. Density maximums must be established in the Plan so that growth is sequentially established in Jackson and its several residential communities consistent with their historical character. This is the key component of the Plan that the public has demanded of elected officials for four years and which is still not clarified in the latest draft. The community has spoken plainly that it does not wish additive growth. Nor does it have the funds or inclination to pay infrastructural costs of such growth. If elected officials recognize this fact and institutionalize it with growth limits and density maximums it will become abundantly clear that Jackson has 'men who match our mountains' who have served this community faithfully and well.
2/2/2012	Boynton, Bryan Interested Public	Please keep Jackson Stable. My wife and I live here for the small town character, wildlife/open space and community. Lets not change it since a few greedy developers want to get richer.
2/2/2012	Hocking, Scott Interested Public	Please stop adding density to Teton County.We need a stable community of a small size to not further impact or destroy the wildlife that lives in Teton County. High density housing belongs next to cities,not in this remote corner of our state. Please include buildout population numbers in your forecasts.These allow for rational discussion about future population,and allows residents to envision what size this county can or should become. If we are at 20,000 residents today,we need to take a long look at our waste transfer station,associated costs,and what will be done with that trash as more housing and people are encouraged to reside here. The road system and trash system should be at the front of these discussions,not after they are impacted and turn out to be insufficient.

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	When I attended the meeting on January 26, I heard one of the county planning commissioners say "no one wants density in their back yard and the growth at Teton Village will break 390's back anyway, so why not break it now." I disagree on many levels. Increased density in Teton County, for me is not relative to just my personal backyard. I consider all residents of Teton County to be my neighbors and all of Teton County to be my back yard. I (and many others) also believe that the thousands of homes allowed to yet be built under the 1994 Comprehensive Plan is all that our "neighborhood" can physically support. To use the term " NIMBY" promotes division and prejudice when you are assuming to know the beliefs of residents working to protect this Valley for all of their neighbors now and into the future. Increased density in any area affects us all.
2/1/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Whoa there pard, After four grueling years of dealing with planners, and elected officials I think the valley is tired of your rhetoric and BS. DENSITY? "Where are we going to put it?" ---- Really Paul? Every iota of this valley has been platted and planned for. Right now in South Park if all the large rural land owners decided to cash in there would be another 500 homes. Along with those 500 homes would come a lot of permanent open space. ---Permanent----. And there is nothing you could do about it. Not to forget the 73 homes in Melody Ranch 2 that are still on a piece of paper in someone's file cabinet, or the 32 vacant lots in Melody 1. Is Shooting Iron built out? Three Creeks? You are not the density commissioners. You are the elected officials and planning commissioners. Yup,----- that's we the people you hear hollering boys. "We The People" are herding up and we don't like the color of that horse you're riding.
2/1/2012	Gilmore, John Interested Public	Simply, be careful! I live in John Dodge, and drive 389 daily, and wouldn't look forward to more traffic and/or a 4-lane road. I have always thought (a 22-year resident) that the density should be mostly in town, with high-rises if necessary. Save the views for rural areas. A hard job - good luck.

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	RE:The Basic Problem and Issue -- Social Engineering It was interesting to read the Ben Ellis quotes in today's front page article. The Jackson Hole community has said over and over again, that we want STABILITY in our neighborhoods, and permanent protection of wildlife/open space resources. Yet Ben and some others have taken that clear message and turned it on its head. Fictional and temporary down-zoning would be used as an excuse to up-zone immediately for "work force housing" levels advocated by the Housing Authority. That would be pure social engineering by some politicians and government planners. Coupled with Ben's threat to dump up-zoning density in other neighborhoods, if removed from the Aspens! To me that is a bullying "divide and conquer" tactic by Ben, and it is dead wrong. We already have a Valley where 68% of the people who live here, work here. The remaining second home people are an important part of our history and our economy, not the enemy. Do we really need to up-zone and urbanize Jackson in order to ward off second home owners and to bring in more people from Driggs and Alpine? I think not. I have enclosed the 2010 Housing Authority "Blue Ribbon Panel" findings which are the basis for Ben's current up-zoning and subsidized housing campaign. P.S. -- Great Letters to the Editor today. Thank you Kristine, Justin and Kathy. Teton County and Jackson planners have been pushing a basic re-do of Comprehensive Plan provisions which have been in effect for 18 years. Neighborhoods would be targeted for commercial and residential up-zonings. The only additional protection of open space and wildlife resources would come from selected down-zoning-- with no permanent protection of these valuable open space and wildlife resources. Unlike the existing clustering/open space provisions in our Plan. We believe that this approach is unwise, and would lead to increased urbanization of Jackson Hole with an adverse impact on wildlife, on open space, and on the great community character which attracts so many residents and visitors to our Valley. Much of the vitality of our community comes from the intense protective feelings so many of us share, for this very special place. Please contact our Teton County Commissioners at commissioners@tetonwyo.org and the Jackson Town Council at electedofficials@ci.jacksonwy.us and urge them to keep Jackson Hole and its neighborhoods STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because errors of this kind really cannot be undone. Please take some time to comment. It is very, very important. We hope that you join all of us in caring deeply about our community, our wildlife/open space resources, and our friendly small town character. Village Road Coalition Wilson Advisory Committee South Park Neighbors North of Town Neighbors Cottonwood Park Neighbors East Jackson Neighbors
2/1/2012	Rogers, Nancy and John Interested Public	Please, please, please, keep Jackson Hole Stable. We do not want a more urban community!!!

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and listen to my comments. I know this has been an arduous process and it's close to the end – which is why it is SO critical to get it right and not ruin our precious valley. I am writing to you today because there is a strong inclination on the part of some of you to increase the density in the area of the Aspens by 300+ residential units. That is not to say that I'm not enormously concerned about the Valley as a whole. This same thinking will be replicated in other areas of the Valley. The product of four years of planning was given to you last March and you overturned what the public had so strongly asked for. Through many public hearings and letters written to planning commissioners it was agreed that the idea of upzoned "nodes" was not the direction the people of Teton County wanted to go. But lo and behold, you decided to do that anyway. Under the guise of preserving wildlife, you're proposing to remove people's property rights in the more rural areas by downzoning them and transferring those development rights to these "nodes" or "character districts" which will become very dense towns of their own. I can't think of anything less in keeping with the character of the valley. How can you take away someone's property rights (without guaranteeing any permanent protection of those areas for open space) and then shove them into another area where they aren't wanted? The basic problem here is that too much density is being created. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan had a population cap which most people have expressed they would like to see DECREASED. What this New Plan proposes to do will actually INCREASE development. Much of the vitality of our community comes from the protective feelings so many of us share for this very special place. We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Park City, Vail or the like. I strongly encourage you to keep Jackson Hole STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because this kind of error and bad planning will have disastrous results that can't be undone. Some might ask why, as a real estate broker, I am opposing this dense development. THE ANSWER IS SIMPLE – IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO. LESS IS MORE!
2/1/2012	Fossel, Scott Interested Public	Unless you can First show what the huge increase in the Aspens will look like AND address current traffic congestion on the Moose Wilson Road, I strongly strongly urge you to STOP further development. With development already underway at Teton Village, we do not have the capacity to add to the Aspens.
2/1/2012	Leet, Melissa and Ken Interested Public	I am writing to say that I strongly oppose any increase in the Aspens area. We are new to Jackson. We chose it as our community because we appreciated that it wasn't overly built-out in the way that most mountain communities have become. Significantly increasing development would erode its character and its beauty.

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches. With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town. Important to me are: The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP. A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek. Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains. Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching. No additive development rights to those already existing. A decrease in allowable commercial development. Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required. I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.
2/1/2012	Costello, M. E. Interested Public	I have a home at 2665 Tucker Ranch Road on the West Bank This is email is urge you not to allow our wonderful community to become pockets of high density development. Jackson is the most wonderful community in the west and to change its character in this manner would be disastrous.
2/1/2012	Coelho, Katherine and Interested Public	In regards to the growth plan, we need to permanently conserve the large rural ranches in the NW area of South Park. These ranches help make Jackson Hole one of the most beautiful areas in the U.S. Since the majority of our economy is tourism, it is of them up most importance to preserve the beauty of the area. If it becomes necessary for some small development of this area to help the ranchers conserve the rest of their property then the development should be only in the NW corner and in the same density and character as its neighbor Cottonwood Park. As to any other increase in density in South Park it is totally unnecessary as we have 50-70 years of lands of entitled growth all ready planned for. No leep froging - in fill must be done first. We also must preserve the linkage for the wild life. In all the meetings I have attended the audience has said that the wild life of Jackson Hole is one of its most important attributes for residents and visitor alike. Lets keep Jackson as what it is know for; wilderness, wild life and the old West.

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	Most residents in Teton County made a personal choice, really, a commitment to live in this splendid place. We could have stayed in cities or the ‘burbs and perhaps enjoyed greater monetary reward, but we made the choice to be near nature and live here. I am concerned that density “spots” continue to be a moving target in our Comprehensive Plan. If one targeted zone has the good fortune to be “saved” because of its perceived intrinsic value, then the thinking seems to be that another area must open up. Why? As far as the wildlife are concerned, this is one ecosystem that they live in and travel through all year. Maybe it’s time to stop aspiring to be Boulder/Austin/etc., and appreciate where we are: living in a relatively unwrecked ecosystem with healthy wildlife yet abiding. In short: please uphold our rural values with the highest priority to protect wildlife. Teton County residents have strongly expressed and supported this throughout the CP process. ALL neighborhoods are valuable, we don’t want more density, we are asking for predictability and conservation. When can enough be enough?
2/1/2012	Dawson, Ted Interested Public	Please protect the south corridor and entrance into our Valley! • We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today! • Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. - o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. - o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. - o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. - o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park. The guests to southern entrance of our Valley should not be met with a whole lot of development and really impacting our animal corridors!
2/1/2012	Winder, Philip Interested Public	Please keep the Aspens and the West Bank open and do not allow the natural beauty of our valley to be overdeveloped. Listen to the voice of the people who elected you. No new housing in the Aspens and do not allow more density and development in the neighborhood.

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	When residents of the Aspens, Westbank and other areas say they don't want to be targeted for growth, I support their concerns for sprawl and over development 100%. Being from Cottonwood Park we too have the same concerns about green field development and traffic congestion, especially on High School Road. Throughout the Comprehensive plan process, residents of Cottonwood Park have demanded that there should be no dumping of additive growth anywhere in the valley. The focus for preserving open space should come first. Then town infill should come next. Northwest South Park should not be the dumping ground for the valley's growth problems. The only clustered development that should be transferred to NW South Park is the minimal development rights from the South Park area itself by working with South Park's large land owners and the Land Trust using the proper incentive tools, to permanently retire the desired open space there. To think that dumping town density growth into the North West corner of South Park will protect other areas like the Aspens and the Westbank from growth is a fantasy. We can't afford additive growth anywhere in the valley when we have 50-70 years of growth already entitled. We must not rely on up zoning NW South Park and down zoning other areas. All it takes is a simple vote in the future to change it. We will only end up with additive growth on top of the already entitled growth without solving the problem the Aspens and other areas are worried about. It will be too late then. South Park will become a sprawling unwelcome place to live. We will lose the great middle class family neighborhoods to industrial traffic and unsafe streets around the schools. Then, after South Park is ruined, the Aspens and other areas of the valley will be once again, targeted, because we didn't have permanent protection of sensitive areas, we didn't have a plan with real numbers, we didn't have a plan that stated any density increase should be balanced with density decrease, we didn't have a plan that followed through with town infill first, we didn't have a plan that said no to zoning changes that can be easily reversed at the whim of whoever is in office. I know there will be a neighborhood across from us someday. It should be complimentary to Cottonwood Park at a similar density to Rangeview Park with open space along High School Road. High School Road should be a residential road to encourage walking and biking. There should be no industrial or commercial development along High School Road or in the NW corner. It will end up a failing; congested road that not even a connector road will help unless we only allow a small residential neighborhood in the NW corner. Being from Cottonwood Park I could easily say no growth in NW South Park. Put it in the Aspens, put in the Westbank. I won't, because they too are great neighborhoods that deserve protection of their rural character and small neighborhood atmosphere. Cottonwood Park and the neighborhoods around High School Road should not be excluded from that same protection.

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers. While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so. As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers. We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern. We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.
1/31/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	The attached policy ad will be running in the Daily this week, and the two weeklies on Wednesday, February 8 next week. Peter Teton County planners have been pushing a basic re-do of Comprehensive Plan provisions which have been in effect for 18 years. Selected neighborhoods would be targeted for commercial and residential up-zonings. The only additional protection of open space and wildlife resources would come from selected down-zoning- with no permanent protection of these valuable open space and wildlife resources. Unlike the existing clustering/open space provisions in our Plan. We believe that this approach is unwise, and would lead to increased urbanization of Jackson Hole with an adverse impact on wildlife, on open space, and on the great community character which attracts so many residents and visitors to our Valley. Much of the vitality of our community comes from the intense protective feelings so many of us share, for this very special place. Please contact our Teton County Commissioners at commissioners@tetonwyo.org and urge them to keep Jackson Hole and its neighborhoods STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because errors of this kind really cannot be undone. Please take some time to comment. It is very, very important. We hope that you join all of us in caring deeply about our community, our wildlife/open space resources, and our friendly small town character. Village Road Coalition South Park Neighbors Wilson Advisory Committee North of Town Neighbors

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Delorme, Carrie Interested Public	i would like to comment on the article in the jackson hole news & guide today about commissioners removing the Aspens from the "high-density" area of growth. they are wondering now where to put the additional housing they approved in the plan. i say NOWHERE. reduce it and remove it from the plan. who says you need growth and development? development should be capped almost completely. the town of jackson and the surrounding areas are congested and over-developed to begin with. ever try driving through town??? growth inevitably means higher property taxes, higher cost of living, and lower standard of living. it's not necessarily a good thing. continued growth leads eventually to places like chicago, new york, los angeles. i know nobody wants to say it but everyone is thinking it - NO MORE GROWTH!
1/30/2012	Balogh, Holly Interested Public	I am a resident of Melody Ranch where my family has lived for the past 11(!) years. As a concerned citizen about growth and most importantly about the wildlife and wild lands in this region, I wanted to provide some comments about the planning process. I took time out of my schedule to attend one of the mapping and planning workshops in Rafter J back in October. Prior to that, I had participated in other planning discussions over the past several years. From these discussions, I expect that the commission will uphold the descriptions that were discussed and commented on for all of South Park – district 10. It was very clear that the majority of residents at the mapping discussion holds scenic, wildlife, and wildlife connectivity as sacred and fully expects that these values will be addressed and not compromised in the final plans. It is extremely important to me that there is no additional growth placed in the valley when we already have 50 plus year of growth already entitled. It is also extremely important to me that development in Northwest South Park be linked to the large rural land owner steward in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage the entirety of South Park could be developed – completely destroying the values we all hold so dear. Moreover, I think it extremely important that development be completed in town and any potential development be finished their before expansion into other rural Teton county areas. If we do develop part of the NW corner of South Park, let's be smart. Let's develop it like Cottonwood or Indian Trails and not destroy the residential areas with commercial or other mixed use that makes parts of Town, and areas behind Smiths look like a total junk show from any outsider's observations. I'd like to remind you about our wildlife. We must make these steps to protect our animals who share our space. We choose to live here and want to keep our wildlife alive. Providing them room to roam is critical to their long term survival. This month alone I have had two different mom and baby moose sets, bald eagle, fox, and trumpeter swans in my back yard. Help me help them by protecting this crucial. Thank you very much for listening. Please feel free to contact me for further discussion.
1/30/2012	Muschaweck, Erika and Interested Public	we congratulate you all for the conscientious and diligent work you have done for such a long time in planning the future for Jackson Hole. In a few weeks the new comprehensive plan will be decided and we hope you will consider these last points in your decision. We have been participating from the beginning in this process and want you to uphold the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of the whole of Jackson Hole, and especially all of South Park without raising the possibility of development to more than is already allowed in the existing comprehensive plan. We do not want additive growth in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled. Observing the wild animals in Jackson Hole is the most important and talked about happening. We live on the North end of Indian Trails. There are still several moose visiting our neighborhood, there is still the bald eagle's nest on high school butte, but the elk herd which was also coming through every winter does not appear anymore since the Teton Science School built their buildings in the canyon North of 22. Please cast your votes confirming the voluminous specific and consistent comments from this community and you will be forever gratefully remembered.

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	I write to you as a resident of South Park. I have been attending meetings and following developments on the Comprehensive Plan over the past four years. I have written to you previously to share my viewpoint. I respectfully urge that you UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10). Please do not burden South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today! In addition, I request that any development in Northwest South Park be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park. oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park. To date, much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley. Thank you for considering my input.

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Rhea, Rebecca Interested Public	I have owned a home in Single Tree Ranch Subdivision for the past 7 years and lived in many different places in Jackson Hole since 1978. For more than 3 decades I have witnessed many failed planning efforts in Jackson Hole. It seems like the developers always win. I think it is finally time to set reasonable growth limits and once and for all to protect neighborhoods so the quality of life, social, scenic and wildlife values that make Jackson Hole a desirable place to live, work, and vacation are not sacrificed. I believe it is important to keep population growth and development at reasonable levels so there is adequate infrastructure. Infrastructure needs must be able to be met within the current and projected tax revenues. I have a particular interest in District 10 (South Park) where I live. This district is significant habitat for wildlife and is particularly important for migrating elk and wintering moose. I have personally observed more than 100 elk at a time spend several weeks in the ranch land adjacent to my house, observed elk in my backyard and migrating through my neighborhood. I frequently see moose, coyotes, fox, bald eagles, and osprey from my house. Trumpeter swans, Canada geese, Great BlueHerons, numerous other birds and mammals live in or pass through South Park. I have been participating in the latest comprehensive plan effort for the past four years. I strongly believe that it is not appropriate to increase the density of South Park is a trade off for reducing density elsewhere. South Park has already been developed to a level that should not be exceeded after buildout of existing lots is complete. Sub-area 5.6 should be strictly tied to the minimum amount of growth so there can be permanent conservation of the large rural landowners other South Park Lands. Development of this area should complement the existing development there, particularly the three school campuses. The South Park Loop road cannot handle increased traffic without being widened which would destroy its rural character and recreational values. This planning effort needs to be finally completed so that the time and energy of elected officials and landowners can be better spent on preserving what is best about Jackson Hole and meeting the other challenges of the future. Thank you for your consideration of my position on this matter.
1/30/2012	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I HAVE ATTENDED A LOT OF THE PLANNING MEETINGS AND STILL DO NOT KNOW WHAT ALL OF THIS MEANS FOR OUR PROPERTY. WE STILL HAVE PEOPLE INTERESTED IN BUYING TO ESTABLISH CONSTRUCTION YARDS. IS THIS SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE ON OUR PROPERTY UNDER THE NEW DISTRICTS? I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO SELL SOMETHING AS LANE AND I HAVE BOTH HAD MAJOR HEALTH PROBLEMS IN THE LAST FEW YEARS. I MYSELF HAVE HAD 5 MAJOR SURGERIES IN THE LAST 18 MONTHS. IF YOU CAN HELP PLEASE LET ME KNOW.

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	I am a resident of South Park, I have been closely following your efforts over the past four years to revise the Comprehensive Plan and I have written you previously to express my views. PLEASE UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10). Please do not saddle South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today! Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. - oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park. - oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. - oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park. Much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.
1/30/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	A nice result Thursday and a nice article today (attached). But we are just getting started. Semper vigilis, or whatever the proper spelling should be. Peter
1/30/2012	Van Gelder, Bill Interested Public	With much frustration it has been brought to my attention that South Park is again back on the table for additional unrestricted density. I feel frustrated as over the course of this very long, drawn out process, it has been made consistently clear by the community by that south park should not be the place for unrestricted development in the new comprehensive plan. Now it appears, at the very last minute, the language previously agreed to preserving the rural nature and scenic value of South Park is going to be significantly weakened. I am not opposed to developing of South Park, and feel that north western south park is appropriate for higher density, however I STRONGLY urge this upzoning of northwest south park needs to be tied to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help the rural land owners of south park achieve permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage I do not support any additional density in South Park, and I do not support this upzoning of North West South Park until ALL of the in Town potential infill is created. Furthermore if the development of NW south park is needed, it should be residential in nature (similar to Cottonwood Park), not commercial or industrial. We don't need town and south park to morph into a mini metroplex of urban sprawl seen from Colorado Springs to Fort Collins.

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Outcomes related to PRD, District's 5.6 and 10 from Thursday's meeting. I hope to see some clarification on several of these decisions before the staff report - not only by the joint planning commission meeting on Thursday but also the County meeting on January 12 - as I do not believe you have captured the strong intent on some of these decisions – especially on the intent of 5.6 and its linkage to 10.1 and 10.2. So here is what I heard from the joint planning commission meeting (plus some additional notes in a few areas from the joint electeds/planning commissions meetings of the County on January 12 and Town on January 11): PRD and clustering tools: •PRD and clustering options were re-affirmed Thursday as critical to large land owner options. That will be incorporated into the plan body more clearly. •The direct reference in the tables of clustering – thus PRD option on properties only at 160 acres and above – was removed Thursday. Everything from 35 acres up should have clustering incentives. Area 5.6 •Area 5.6 — now a clear direct link to these two owner's other properties in 10.2 and also district 9 (Snake River bottom properties below Shooting Iron). •Clarifying the intent of 5.6 is to use the PRD and non-contiguous PRD (with these land owners disconnected other properties along the Snake River) to achieve permanent open space throughout South Park - and other rural areas if a TDR tool is ever successful. - oThis is the key point also confirmed by the County Commissioners – which has yet to be made clear. I expect language that shows the clear linkage here as both bodies where clear in their direction. You can leave an opening to transfer from other rural lands outside of South Park – but we know there are significant barriers to that being realized. •In-fill priority to town remains first – but should not preclude a meaningful proposal from the families (Gill and Lockhart) that protects important scenic, wildlife and wildlife connectivity - as well as agricultural heritage - parcels in South Park – especially as controlled by these same owners. - oThe County also took this position but, like the above, you have not captured their clear intent. I expect to see that clearly stated. •On cutting the reason for “before in-fill” – the planning commissions clearly cut “workforce housing” and “other community benefits” – not because those do not have value – but they should not be reasons to move forward on 5.6 before Town, and other complete neighborhoods, achieve in-fill. - oThe joint County meeting January 12 – again it was not discussed about other community benefits period, meanwhile Hank Phibbs got no other elected support on adding workforce housing as a reason to proceed on 5.6 before in-fill in Town. In fact Paul V. opposed that idea. - oMeanwhile the Town joint meeting from January 11 clearly stated in-fill first period – tied to the growth management plan – with no other conditions or triggers. District 10, sub-area 10.1 and 10.2 •10.1 language will stay the same on the intent is to preserve these critical open space areas – clarification will be added that if clustering development is needed to do that – that it should be directed to the north into area 5.6. This is an aspirational goal that does not preclude Seherr-Thoss by clustering adjacent to either South Park Ranches or Melody Ranch – but the big idea of the plan is to see if there is a way to transfer development potential to the north into area 5.6 •10.2 – again both the joint planning commissions and the County meeting from January 12 clearly responded to the obvious link since 80% of 10.2 are the same land owners that own 100% of area 5.6. I expect to see clear language and direction recognizing that both groups affirmed this. So very clear language on preserving the area is the intent – and if some development is necessary to achieve that due to clustering incentives – then to the north into area 5.6. Again this is aspirational so does not preclude Lucas from doing an independent PRD and have that clustered potential move next to South Park Ranches in the southern portion of his parcel. But the big idea of course in the plan is to see if that potential can be moved to the north into area 5.6.

Date

Name

Comment

•The focus is on achieving permanent protection through the PRD and possible TDR – and not through zoning alone in 10 and 5.6. District 5.6 is truly unique in its potential to use existing tools on the books to achieve the plan’s goals. I would remind you also that there are 35 acres zoned Suburban in the NW corner of 5.6.

•10.2 – Both language and mapping on wildlife movement throughout the district that matches the description in the general introduction mentioned in 10. Both groups by default affirmed that – and staff has said they already intend to correct those biological mistakes that claim the only wildlife movement of large mammals is along Flat Creek. Alex has assured me these green changes have been captured (E-W and N-S) - and will be made - but I have yet to see them listed in a list of proposed changes.

oNOTE: when I drove home late Thursday evening another elk had just been killed on the Lockhart side of HWY 89 just ¼ mile south of Smith’s. This is the same area between Smiths and Rafter J that has been shown for thirty years to have the highest wildlife collision rate between Smiths and Hoback junction on HWY 89. The group of elk had traversed from west to the east across sub-area 10.2 to reach the Snow King highlands – and one member was killed as they crossed Thursday evening.

I also felt the discussion well after the 9pm cut-off perhaps did not allow the joint planning commissions time to address the issue on “mixed use” in area 5.6. If they do not revisit that – then it will be raised again with the electeds in March as I see mixed use not only not compatible in this residential area – but also a clear threat to redevelopment and reinvestment in the Town by bringing those uses so far out to the peripheries of Town. Clearly the public has said if 5.6 becomes necessary to achieve open space protection in South Park – that they expect 5.6 to be residential, with a mix of housing types and a density that reflects the Cottonwood Park neighborhood across the street. Staffs’ addition of “gridded streets and alleys” – which has not been brought up by any electeds or planning commissioners – could be misinterpreted that you are suggesting a character different from what the citizens have clearly articulated.

I appreciate staff’s work on the plan – but I am also frustrated that staff seems to not be fully recognizing both public input and electeds/planning commission directives without adding their own personal bias. Perhaps that is unavoidable - so I hope you take my perspectives and comments in the spirit they are offered. If need be I would be happy to have a few score of residents at the February 8 and/or March 12 meetings to reinforce their passion for these changes - at the same level you have recently heard from other areas in the valley.

1/27/2012 Moyer, Peter, F.
Interested Public

Thanks to all of you who showed up at the County/Town meeting last night. Very productive and most appreciated!

There were many who spoke for the public. The only speaker who strongly supported the Staff and "nodes" was Bill Collins, the private planner who had been the County planning director.

There is something very important to remember there, particularly for people in South Park and the Village Road area, relating to Teton County government ownership when combined with its up-zoning power, and the inherent conflict of interest. That is the current situation with the 5 acre Rains parcel next to the Aspens, which is owned by the County Housing Authority. The Rains parcel has one unit of density and the recorded plat prohibits subdivision. Yet County Staff would ignore that restriction, with a vast up-zoning.

When Bill Collins was planning director, the County Housing Authority contracted to buy South Park acreage from Roger Seherr-Thoss. The County's initial plan was to up-zone for commercial plus 350 to 400 residences, even though the Plan's normal clustering rules only permitted a small fraction of that residential density with no commercial. The County kept trying to justify the very high land cost of this "New Neighborhood" project so the up-zoning target kept going up and up, eventually to 1,100 residential units plus commercial. County consultants even pushed for 1,400 units to justify costs. The deal later cratered, and the County forfeited its \$350,000 earnest money deposit. South Park -- and Jackson Hole -- could have become far more urban with that up-zoning.

Anyway, just by way of perspective. Not too different than what some County people want on the Rains property. A terrible precedent for all of us, due to the inherent, extreme conflict of interest which can exist when ownership and zoning power are both in government hands.

If an individual County Commissioner used his or her power in government to up-zone their own land, that would be an egregious conflict of interest. Is it really okay for the County government to do the same thing on the Rains parcel? I do not think so, and hopefully we can all be united on this point.

Date	Name	Comment														
1/26/2012	Sharkey, Steve Interested Public	My name is Steve Sharky and I live in South Park. I love this Village Road Coalition. It's like fresh troops getting sent into a battle, you know, when you're getting beaten and all of a sudden they send in new troops and that's kind of fun. I really just want to thank you for the great job that you did. The Plan that came out of the Planning Commission after...was a good plan, it really was. And it's tragic, in my opinion, what the electeds did to it. I don't have a lot of confidence you're going to be able to have much influence with them, but with ditto to most of the comments that have been made tonight, I really think you did a great job. It's a huge amount of work; you don't get paid for it, and I really appreciate it. You know, if I was going to suggest anything, I'd say flip the process. These guys decided to have nodes and decide where they were going to put a lot of growth and saying it's all going to be density neutral. Let's then flip it. Let's figure out where the density's going to come from first, you know. Do TDRs work? Maybe not, based on what we've heard. Can you down zone it? Figure that out. There's really some density there and if you get some of that, give it to I think Jay's left...I'd give it to Jay and let them upzone his property. But thank you for your efforts; you did a great job, I appreciate it, and I hope you can influence the electeds.														
1/26/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Over the last four years a tremendous amount of effort, thought and expense has gone into the re-write of the Comprehensive Plan that will be the guide our future growth, development and preservation of this great place I am privileged to call home. The whole process has been long, involved and tenuous. The results are good and I applaud all the participants, but some "tweaking" is still required. Let's look at the key words and some definitions: Comprehensive: Wide in scope; inclusive. Plan: A scheme for making, doing, or arranging something. For most of the current re-write, the intentions and wording reflect what the desires of the community were in terms of scope and inclusion, but some areas are not specific enough, too general or simply too vague to meet the true definition of a complete Plan. Before you recommend or approve this document, please consider the following points: •The current proposed language doesn't address the fiscal impacts (costs) of growth. Even with the entitled development already on the books, realistic infrastructure improvements could be astronomical. Here are some very basic estimates: <table><tr><td>-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Transportation</td><td>\$150 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Schools (6 more @ 30m)</td><td>\$180 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Sewer/Water Improvements</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Power Grid Improvements</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)</td><td>\$100 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)</td><td>\$150 million</td></tr></table> As you can see, we will be looking at some serious future costs to provide basic services for anticipated growth during the next 40 to 50 years. Additional language pertaining to fiscal review, an implementation plan/schedule, etc., is warranted in this document. Don't expect people to keep voting for the SPET! •Current language doesn't adequately address the costs and impacts of additive growth to select character districts. Please allow only "already entitled" infill development in all character districts. Remember the pleas for predictability, preserving rural/neighborhood character and NO additive growth! •Current language doesn't clearly address an incentive mechanism for preserving wildlife/open space by transferring development to more appropriate areas. Please keep in mind that anything you/we do regarding our human needs has a greater effect on the natural environment than one can imagine. The Rockefeller's were looking forward into perpetuity with their vision; our Plan has an intended lifespan of only 10 to 15 years. Let's make John D extremely proud by approving the best plan possible. Thanks for all the great work!	-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation	\$200 million	-Public Transportation	\$150 million	-Schools (6 more @ 30m)	\$180 million	-Sewer/Water Improvements	\$200 million	-Power Grid Improvements	\$200 million	-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)	\$100 million	-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)	\$150 million
-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation	\$200 million															
-Public Transportation	\$150 million															
-Schools (6 more @ 30m)	\$180 million															
-Sewer/Water Improvements	\$200 million															
-Power Grid Improvements	\$200 million															
-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)	\$100 million															
-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)	\$150 million															

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	My wife's waiting at home. Peter Moyer, I live on the Village road and I spend my working hours in Town. Whatever I say here is really directed to the County Planning Staff and the County Planning Commissioners, because it relates to the jurisdiction ?? and that jurisdiction is the County, not the Town. I've spent most of my working life, waking hours, in Town but I don't get to vote for it and it's really a County issue to me. So again, Town guys, I mean nothing critical whatsoever towards you. By way of perspective, the County Commissioners, a number of years ago, appointed a TDR Task Force, Transferrable Development Rights Task Force. Steve Duerr was the Chairman; he did a wonderful job. It was all over the spectrum. We had Kelly Lockhart and others on the landowners side. They had Alliance people, Nancy Hoffman and others, and a lot of people in between. We looked at models of transferrable development rights, which is essentially exactly what's being proposed by the Staff now. It's exactly what's being proposed. It's transferring density out of open space, wildlife areas, into places that are already built. That's what's going on. We looked at that in detail. There were good things, because under that model we looked at, it was permanent conservation easements from the sending areas. It wasn't subject to rezonings or anything. It was permanent protection. And then for landowners it wasn't a down zoning, which is highly controversial for a lot of landowners. It wasn't that. It was purely voluntary and they got compensated. If they wanted to transfer development rights, they could; they could get compensated if they wanted to and it was voluntary. We looked at the down side, though, and it was unanimous. There were about 14 of us. It was unanimous all across the spectrum. It was unfair and unworkable to use this model because a lot of the transferred development rights were fictional. They were phony, phantom, whatever you want to call them because they never would have been developed anyway. And some landowner could sit there and get money for development he never would have done on his own, or her own, property and send it into other neighborhoods far away, which was highly unfair. Again, it was unanimous—no! The County Master Plan that came in, what, 1994, had a much more responsible and less ambitious version of it, which was cluster, where for a given parcel, the benefit of the burden is right there, on that parcel, and it was permanent protection. Yet, the landowner was voluntary and they got compensated. The landowner got additional development rights if they had permanent protection of open space areas and cluster. And it's worked for almost 20 years now. SRA started out as something like 42 acres of dedicated open space. Finally, they went to that model that the Billy Resor actually come up with on the Planning Commission and it was over...I believe it was over 1,400 acres of permanent dedicated open space is where it ended up, up in Teton Village. That worked and it's worked for a lot of landowners. I look at what's going on now and what's being proposed and have gone through all of this stuff, all of this stuff. You can hardly...I read the report and it's like the Internal Revenue Code, or it might as well be written in Russian. What's actually going on here is, if you look at the three key groups, if you look at landowners, if you look at conservationists, if you look at old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods, and you look at the overall community, too, in terms of not many people want this place urbanized. So how does this parse out? For landowners, if government need it, it's a down zone. It's not voluntary for these landowners, whether it's down zoning it in NC zones or eliminating or reducing the clustering. The landowner gets nothing in terms of compensation. And if like government need it, they are down zoned. Not a good thing for landowners. For conservation, there's no permanent protection. It's just zoning. It's down zoning. And that could be changed a day later, or a week later, two weeks later, two years later, five years later. There's no permanent protection. And I have not heard one single detail from the Planning Staff of how they plan to have real permanent protection. It doesn't exist on this...yeah, I'll get there in a second. From the conservation side as well, a lot of what fueled conservation easements, which is great, is the clustering rules, because then you've got federal tax deductions, estate and income tax deductions, gift tax deductions, and it's a huge incentive. This proposal would essentially devastate that whole model. And then for the neighborhoods, I think you probably have a sense now that it's not real popular in the neighborhoods where you want to dump this density. And a lot of the density is phantom density. It's phantom. You look at who benefits. Who benefits? Well, landowners don't; conservationists don't; old-time neighborhoods don't. Who benefits? Well, look at the receiving areas. There's a tiny little bunch of landowners who benefit. Who is the major landowner who benefits from these up zonings? It's Teton County itself, County government, because they bought five acres, five acres by the Aspen, right next to the Aspens on March 17th, 2007; they paid 1.95 million dollars for it, which was a million dollars over the then current appraised value at the height of the market...[Crosstalk]...I know, I'll be right...in just one second more. And they have a lot of... I know, but this is...it's an enormous conflict of interest, because the government is looking to up zone itself. This is a fundamentally flawed scheme that's being promoted by some people with very little transparency. It's hide the ball, and it's fundamentally an enormous conflict for interest for the government. That is what is going on. You are all public servants. You don't get paid on the Planning Commission; the Planning Staff does. It's public service; it's serving the public. It's not, you know, it's not your own personal agendas. It's serving the public and that's what matters. This is that letter. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. I'm also a member of the Teton Village Road Coalition. And we grouped up because we feel...we all are feeling the same thing—it's called the urbanization of Jackson Hole. I moved here, and most of us moved here, because we wanted a rural lifestyle. That's why we moved here, and that's what we want, and that's why people come here. It is not the intense dense development of the resource. I really am appalled that that looks like the direction we're headed. Town, the up zoning in Town is immense. I have always ?? in Town, Town Square, right off of Town Square on Center Street, and I am pleased that you have taken a step back for the two-story around Town Square, but immediately behind that is three and possibly even more stories. And if you add up all those areas that you ?? your Town Plan, it's immense growth, and it doesn't relate to what the residential densities can be in Town. So, I take a different look at it. Where are you going to put all the employees and all the people that are going to have to work in those commercial areas. But you're going to have to have the nodes outside in the County to house them. So, I look at it in the opposite direction, and a couple of other people have spoken about. But my main problem is is the urbanization of Jackson Hole. It's not what I want. It's not what a lot of people in the community wants. And I really think you need to take a step back and follow what the community wants. It's, you know, it's our souls, we're selling our souls. Are we selling it for the dollars? I don't see the dollars coming into the community with this growth. I don't know where the motivation really is. I don't know where it's coming from, because it's certainly not coming from the community at large. Please, please reconsider...please. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Hi, Dave Coon; I currently live west of Town on East Bank. Just first I want to say thanks to the immense amount of effort. A lot of new faces I haven't spoken at for awhile, but thanks to all of you. I'm aware of what's going on in a lot of the Plan. Not a lot gets through my household without some review. I'm not going to speak on real specifics on character districts, things like that, but probably on a broader scale. I'm horribly concerned about how we're going to pay for this growth. And I'm just talking mainly entitled growth that's already on the books. It doesn't come free; there are costs for infrastructure and such. I sent some wild estimates that...Paul Nash said wild. So, you've got some serious planning to do. I'm not talking just in the light of this next Plan for ten or fifteen years, but I'm talking the next Comprehensive Plan and the next Comprehensive Plan. Some of this stuff is 50 years out, but you have to pay for it. And these are big things that go along with this, so I'd like to see some direction and language, maybe an implementation policy, in the Plan that looks that way at least. There's not much in there that really deals with these fiscal aspects that are way down the road. So, just consider those and again thanks. And actually thanks to Staff and the diligent public out there that...a lot of new faces. It's been a process. I don't agree with all of it. I agree with a lot of it and it's a good process. So, thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jern, Sherrie and Ken Interested Public	I would like to specifically address the upzoning issue in Raintree. Ken and I moved from Vail, Colorado because we could not afford to own a home in Vail on our ski instructor and Outward Bound wages. (We lived and worked there for 10 years.) But we saved enough money to relocate to Jackson in 1976. We bought a lot in the Aspens for \$17,000. We designed our own house, cut down the logs, hauled them out of the woods. We built this house by hand and by ourselves. We had one daughter, born and raised in Jackson. She now lives in Corvallis, Oregon where she is a teacher and has saved her money and last summer bought a house...on her own. In 1988, we sold our home in the Aspens and bought Lot 13 in the Raintree Subdivision, where the zoning was one home per 3 acres. We again built and designed a log house. We have invested all of our money and ourselves into this land and house. We purchased this lot because of the rural lifestyle and the wonderful neighbors up and down the village road. This is home. We love the abundant wildlife, the trees, the water, the quiet. This area is a special spot with horses, sheep, goats, chickens, barns and buckrail fences in addition to moose, both mule and white tail deer, fox and coyotes. The great horned owls, eagles and birds are numerous. When the new Sally Rains Subdivision was finalized, it stated on the Plat Map that "This Subdivision Shall Not Be Subject To Further Subdivisions" This was stated on the Map even with all of the principals knowing that the County would purchase 5 acres in this subdivision through the Housing Authority in a two week time period for the very purpose of up zoning it for affordable housing in the future. Not only did the County pay far more than the appraised value of this land, but they stated that it was for "Land Banking" Although records clearly show much discussion by Christine Walker in regards to future affordable housing on this land. (Staff Report February 13, 2007-) County buys the Land and then later the County upzones it to suit their vision. Not our vision. Not the vision of the majority of nearby residents. When we retire, we will not be able to afford our home. And we probably will not be able to own a home in Jackson again. That is our problem, not our neighbors, not yours....but ours. We believe that there is enough growth built into the 1994 Comp Plan. We do not need more. We do not need to ruin our neighborhoods anywhere in the Valley. We do not need to change the lifestyle of families who have lived here for 30 years or more. We do not need or want the change. We have something that the rest of the world envies. We do not need to become them. Planners want to plan....you went to school for this. But sometimes, things are best left alone.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am hopeful that you will do right by the people of Jackson Hole who have worked hard to make this plan fair to all. Under Illustrating our Vision it states that “Realizing our vision means proactively planning for what we want – rural open spaces and high quality complete neighborhoods – and identifying where we want them. Our Vision and Common Values describe how we will direct development toward suitable areas in order to preserve and protect the ecosystem and design development to enhance our quality of life. The Illustration of Our Vision identifies where those suitable areas are located. As important as location, is the type of preservation or development desired. Unlike the past, a principle of growth management in this Plan is predictable implementation. By defining the desired character for each area of the community, all community members know what to expect as a result of preservation and development regulations and incentives. In areas suitable for development, the Illustration of Our Vision describes how we will protect the character we love while ensuring that the development contributes to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Illustration of Our Vision also describes how we will preserve and enhance all other areas to provide wildlife habitat, wildlife connectivity, scenery, and open space. The community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location, and type. This can only be realized if we define desired location and character for the preservation and development. Adapting our implementation also requires rigorous analysis of our successes and failures. The Illustration of Our Vision defines existing, baseline character in addition to desired future character; allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory. Our community’s many districts share common values, but also have unique identities. While each of our community’s policies is important to achieving our Vision, not all policies apply community wide. Each individual preservation and development project should be a contributing piece in the community wide plan for achieving our Vision. The Illustration of Our Vision is the community wide picture of where we will place all the pieces – ensuring that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten.” We can improve the district maps by including what our community has always called for and has stated so in OUR vision above. If we don't, the latter part of the above which states that "allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory" will be in fact the opposite. Without the projected growth numbers for each district and over all for town and county, we will be theorizing our way into a quagmire that only developers could love. Please focus on decreasing development in desirable areas rather than focusing on where growth should go. Focusing on just growth areas will lead to careless development planning and cost overruns that will hurt everyone. Also work with the Land Trust and large land owners by providing incentives to permanently retire development rights. The Land Trust is very important to the success of the comprehensive plan. Being from Cottonwood Park I would like to repeat the some of the recommendations that JHCA has submitted to the process. District 5: West Jackson a. Recommendation: Section 5.2 should be amended to recognize that this area is already trending towards housing and complete neighborhood attributes, and should be encouraged to continue to do so, given the close proximity to schools, a grocery store, pathways and Flat Creek. This is an ideal location for “complete neighborhood” attributes, but given recent developments, it is no longer a particularly good location for industrial uses. Industry should be focused into District 7. b. Recommendation: Section 5.4 should commit to repurposing High School Road primarily as a residential access road and not a highway. c. Recommendation: Section 5.6 needs to be clarified with regard to the lower priority of development in northwest South Park. You can either ruin High School road with theories or go by the numbers. You can't have industrial growth and have a safe environment for school zones and the neighborhoods around them. Hopefully you read my letters in the past pushing for a campus road that promotes safety and less traffic on High School Road. It is so important now that the district map is calling for expansion of the school zone on High School Road. Please respect our wishes as property owners with rights too. We are not looking to make money off of it. We are just looking to preserve our land and it's value as a great family neighborhood.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Good evening, Rich Bloom, representing South Park neighbors. You know my comments, you know my public positions and my overarching concerns which ??, but I want to give you the specifics, so please take some notes. In area 10.2 and in 10, I think Staff's going to make these changes already, but we have some incorrect mapping of the elk and deer movements. Elk and deer do not cross the Highway and come down through the forest and then march along Flat Creek through Melody Ranch and through Rafter J. They actually move throughout the district. And so the introduction in 10 talks about wildlife moving through the district, and in 10.2, you just need to clarify that and reinforce the what's already in here. If lines are to be on the map, too, I think through a lot of districts some L-shaped lines that show east/west and north/south movement ?? is appropriate for that district. Again, the ?? and that's green changes. But the big one is I want to look at 5.6. I think all of you have read the Land Trust letter and this is the big idea that is in this Comp Plan. This is about how to protect permanent open space, you know, in rural areas. And so the whole point was not the shifting of the numbers or ?? . It was using that as an ends to a means, or a means to a end, and the end is conservation. And the greatest opportunity we have in the Plan, and probably the only one that's really realistic, are the current zonings in the LDRs is in South Park. It...the 5.6 area is about 200 acres, about equally split between Rob Gill and Shelly Lockhart. Those two landowners just south of that have another 350 acres. In addition, both of them own another 600 acres below Shooting Iron, so we're talking about 2200 acres. So, both of them have great ability, without having to cooperate with anybody else, to shift that density up into a location that makes more sense. And so in 10.2, about 90 percent, 80 percent of that is those two landowners. There is a parcel by Wilson near Rafter J; he's already conserved about half of it. And then there is the Lucas parcel, about 200 acres, meaning Rafter J, Three Creeks and South Park Ranches. So, there's some language you're going to be dealing with tonight about moving development into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the ones to the south, which leads to complete confusion. That could be simply corrected about moving it in area 10.2 to the north into area 5.6. It's very clear. It gives those landowners and the Land Trust and the public clear direction to see what can be accomplished. The County did affirm that in their discussions. As far as timing, the County actually affirmed the idea of infill first in the Town, because area 5.6 could be a threat to investment in Town. But what they're really trying to say is the big idea was how do you conserve permanent open space? And the clock ticks on these families because of estate planning needs, and if those families have an opportunity to resolve that land and do a PRD amongst themselves, I think they would be ?? out any development and over time it wouldn't be a threat. So I think there's accommodation between what Town said, which is completely valid, about linking it to the growth management plan but allowing the opportunity. What is a threat is language that Staff added in where they linked an earlier timeline on area 5.6 to not just the open space protection but to a workforce housing opportunity, which would happen by default anyway, or other community benefits. And so I think you open the door by saying we want to do infill first unless we get another Teton Meadows Ranch that shows up there. Well, that would be a direct threat to investment in Town I think to those coming in contradiction versus achieving permanent open space. So think about that and just link it to the permanent protection. That's the idea. You just need to recognize this parcel is very unique because of the ownership and the control there. By doing it just to the north into 5.6 does not leave the Lucas's out. They could work with the family or they always have the right to cluster themselves on their own parcel down by South Park Ranches. I think you want some aspirational goals here. We all agree I think we'd like it up there by Cottonwood to achieve permanent open space. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Kane, Raye and Jim Interested Public	As ten-year residents of Forest Edge and taxpayers of Teton County, Wy we strongly support language in the Character District Maps connecting State Line Road across South Leigh Creek. We drive an additional 20 miles a day to get to Targhee. Same with our school children attending Alta School. Services are not available to us simply because we are not connected; such as, dust coating our roads and regular road maintenance. We oppose any change in the language that might prevent these improvements to State Line Road. We have been waiting a long time. Please do not sidetrack this plan. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Fuller, Lee and Jim Wov Interested Public	We live in the Forest Edge subdivision in Alta and are for the proposed extension of State Line Road for the following reasons: 1) We have 7 children who need to ride a school bus to the Alta School. 2) Fire protection and other emergency vehicles 3)Utility vehicles These are all ESSENTIAL reasons, not frivolous nor indulgent reasons. Thank you for all your hard work and devoted time on behalf of the citizens of Teton County, Wyoming.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Parker, Lizbeth, and Sea Interested Public	Our family has been visiting Jackson Hole regularly for over twenty years. We have made good friends with Ken & Sherrie Jern, and stay with them at the Wildflower Inn whenever we come to visit. When we come to Jackson, we love to observe the abundant wildlife (often from the deck of our room at the Wildflower Inn!), spend time on the Snake River with one of the excellent Westbank Angler guides, hike and bike in the national park, and dine at the Snake River Grill as well as Jackson's other fabulous restaurants. Together, we have climbed the Grand Teton, and Sean has summited other peaks in the Teton Range with Ken. But most importantly, we enjoy spending time in Jackson to get away from the increasingly crowded front range of Colorado. While the front range continues to experience unfettered growth, with the increasing traffic, density, infrastructure, strip malls, noise and crowds that go along with it, we appreciate each time we visit the quieter, more spacious environs of Jackson. We enjoy spending time not only with our friends Ken & Sherrie, but also enjoy experiencing the wonder of the Tetons and Jackson in a less crowded, less congested, and less hurried environment. We wanted to write to let you know that in our opinion, any additional building, beyond what is envisioned by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan would have a very negative impact on our perception of Jackson Hole as a place we love to spend time. Adding 500 more homesites along the Village Road, above and beyond the 7,000 still available in the County, seems excessive, and would almost certainly negatively impact the fabric of the community we have come to know and love. Unlike in Colorado, we feel that Jackson planners have done an excellent job of keeping unnecessary growth at bay over the past twenty years. The additional growth would certainly impact wildlife and the already-congested Moose-Wilson Road, and would undoubtedly bring the general noise level up considerably. These negative effects would certainly make us think twice about continuing to consider Jackson our second home, and we would be less likely to plan regular vacations there from our home in Colorado. In short, we love to come to Jackson precisely because it is not the front range of Colorado, and doesn't have Colorado's increasing traffic, density and sprawl; we would hate to see what we love and appreciate about Jackson coming to an end. Thank you for considering our thoughts on the proposal for additional growth beyond the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and please feel free to contact either of us if you would like to discuss our thoughts further.
1/26/2012	Frederick, Bud Interested Public	It seems the cart is in front of the horse...I urge you to work to rescind the current school district ban while the legal issues and a new plan are under way.
1/26/2012	Boll, George, A. Interested Public	My wife and I have been coming to Jackson and Grand Teton National Park almost every year since approximately 1994 when we first came and fell in love with the area. We have on occasion brought family and friends and now also bring the newest addition to our little family, our daughter Gabi. We have also talked up the area and know for a fact that many of our friends have taken our advice and took an initial trip, also fell in love, and have since often returned with their families and friends. Unfortunately, our disclosure to others of our love for such a beautiful area, blessed with comparably wonderful people, may also have contributed to the beginning of its undoing. Specifically, we have noticed over the past years what seems to us to be a tremendous increase in traffic along the Teton Village road and along the Moose-Wilson road into the park with commensurate road kill and other deleterious effects as a result. Some of this is likely due to close access the roads present to the newly opened Laurance Rockefeller Preserve Center. However, we have also seen significant development along the Teton Village road since our first exposure to the area which must also be significantly contributing to the increase traffic. We were therefore very concerned to read of the proposal to open up the area to even more development. Certainly, there must be long term plans already in place that when originally drawn up were forward looking with regard to future development yet balanced with restrictions to achieve the laudable goal of protecting what makes the area so special. If so, my family, friends and I would ask that due weight be given thereto so as to not further destroy the beauty, serenity and habitat for wildlife this area has historically provided. Progress coupled with development can be a good thing for business and community. However, depending upon location and scale, and if left unchecked, it can also be terribly destructive with diminishing returns to all but those who profit thereby. In this case, my family, friends and I fear allowing up to 500 additional homes is more the latter than the former and, if allowed, would truly benefit only a privileged few to the detriment of the many. I hope that you will listen to this learned voice from Texas who lives in a vast sea of homes and businesses. There is a reason we come to places like Jackson. Reasons that make it special. The more it grows to look like where we live, crowded and full of rooftops blocking the view and access to the mountains, the less likely we are all to return. Memories are usually more clear closer in time to the events to be recollected. Deference should be given to the planning visionaries who initially must have sought reasonable restrictions upon development along the Teton Village road undiluted by the following years of change. We pray you will keep the area special for yourselves and your out of state friends and restrict such further development accordingly.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Quinn, David Interested Public	David Quinn, I've lived in Wilson for the last 15 years and my family's lived in Teton County for a long time. First of all, I'd like to sort of ditto the last comment. I sat through, I don't know how long, a couple of years of planning meetings and I think that both Planning Commissions presented a very extraordinary Plan to the County Commissioners, and I think a lot of good thoughts were put forward. You know, a lot of public comment very similar to public comment that I've heard tonight from the Land Trust, from many conservation groups, from many landowners, landowners coming from, you know, many parts of the Valley, including Alta, and I think there was a consensus that, you know, the PRD tools, noncontiguous PRD tools, and many other tools should be left on the table. The nodes, you know, clustering in appropriate areas close to existing development. I think the language actually in the ?? as far as clustering goes north and south next to existing development, I mean, I agree with. You know, even Rich Bloom's comment that, you know, north is an appropriate place. I think that he also mentioned other landowners have moved their density north, that certainly next to existing development, you know, in certain parts of South Park in southern areas should be acceptable. You know, I was quite pleased, very pleased actually, with the document you presented to the County Commissioners. And, you know, I was totally floored, shocked, I don't know what you want to say, when this mapping process started with these nodes all of a sudden—you know, call it what you want—came about, and I don't know exactly how it happened. And I don't know what can be done. And I don't know what influence you can put on the County Commissioners maybe to pull the mapping away, go back to the Plan that you presented, because I think, you know, the community is hysterical at this point. You know, I don't know what else to say, but, you know, I do appreciate your efforts. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	I'm sorry, Pete Jorgensen and I live in Town. First, I've been involved in planning here since the '50s, having served as the local coordinator for the RUDAT study focused on South Park. Very simple and very straight forward; none of the recommendations in here were involved. I'd like to comment first on the fact that I don't know as much as you folks do <<inaudible>>. But I do appreciate these opportunities to make comments. I submitted written comments a couple of years ago, which I tried to review at your last public comment meeting ??, so I will keep this very short. And any comments I make tonight should not be taken personally, certainly not by these boards; the County Commissioners, that's another thing. I saw the first diagram you put up and it reminded me of something I saw in previous business, not here, somewhere else. The company I was working for did projects in Vietnam and somebody got and they drew three overriding circles or interlocking circles and tried to explain it that way. And, I'm sorry, I'm probably getting more dense as I get older, but I just don't understand where this is going, when the County has made such a commitment to open space, wildlife preservation, 97 percent federal land, which we hope is protected, conservation easements over 10,000, and I don't know exactly how many. I was a member of the three families who did the first nature conservancies in Wyoming at Skyline Ranch, four hundred dollars and 600 acres permanently preserved. I don't think we got anything out of it; we didn't have enough income to take a tax credit. But that's the history of this Valley. And I guess I don't want to say we shouldn't grow, but I will say the County shouldn't grow. We should split the County and the Town apart for purposes of long-range planning. The Town as Heart makes a lot of sense, but when you look at the implications of growth anywhere, and ultimately that's what happens right through the Village, it's easy to understand why WYDOT says, you've got to have the three lanes or five lanes. They project traffic 20 years in the future. Every projection that has been made in this County has been met or exceeded. There's no effort, no meaningful, serious effort by the planning entities, and again it's not you folks—it's the County Commissioners who have that authority to limit growth or control what happens. They were spending 80 percent on construction that was federal money; they have requirements that it meet certain standards. That's their job. They will do their job eventually. The second thing...and the third thing is the districts. And that's...15 districts is fine but the ones that make up the Town, Town as Heart are the important ones to consider more density. I don't know whether it should be there or not. We'll talk about that when you get to that point. But I urge you to try and take care of the County lands. Things Peter spoke to, there are not many properties left that have not been developed that would lend themselves to a large development where you would actually gain a conservation easement in exchange for density. So I would urge you to look carefully at the map and see what you're really talking about. You're clearly talking about the north end of South Park. That's been kicked down the road for 20 years, 30 years. And I'm not sure waiting for infill in Town is doing anything more than just delaying some definitive action that shows some limits. The timeline is another thing I would like to see, and I keep thinking these meetings are a chance that somebody is going to say that this is the deal and recommend it and the elected officials adopt it. But so far I don't have a sense of where we're going and when we're going to get there and I'd really like to have that. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Moore, Steve, R Interested Public	In 2003 I purchased property in Forest Edge Subdivision north of Alta. At the time, I was informed improvements were being done on Stateline Road, and within two years the South Leigh Creek crossing would be re-established. Since that time I have built an affordable and highly efficient home there, and now commute to my job at Grand Teton N.P. Co-workers live in the Alta and Ski Hill Road area, and should Stateline connect, the opportunity to carpool would be significantly enhanced. The current situation leaves me feeling somewhat disconnected from my community in that what would be a short bicycle ride or walk to visit friends and neighbors, or join up to commute, is now a lengthy and hazardous trip involving travel to and down Highway 33. It seems these issues would be resolved if the following Policies of the Comprehensive Plan were to be fully implemented. I would like to be on record as being strongly opposed to any alteration or interpretation of the plan that would not include a timely completion of Stateline Road connecting the South Leigh Area with the rest of the Alta community. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Policy 7.2.a: Create a transportation network based on “complete streets” and “context sensitive” solutions The Town and County will adopt and implement “complete street” and “context sensitive” roadway design standards. The construction of complete streets and context sensitive roadways will serve as the backbone for a community wide transportation network that supports a significant mode shift to alternative transportation. To achieve the community’s transportation vision, improvements should safely accommodate all users of the public right-of-way, including: pedestrians, bicyclists, automobile drivers, trucks and transit riders. Public safety and reduction of crashes and fatalities (motor vehicle, bike, pedestrian, and wildlife) is a core transportation goal to be considered in the application of all strategies. Policy 7.2.b: Interconnect all modes of transportation Our alternative transportation system will provide a means to connect all alternative modes of travel. Park ‘n’ Rides, bicycle parking, complete streets, transit, and pathways will be incorporated into an integrated alternative transportation system. A system of trails to connect our parklands and trailheads should be considered as part of the transportation system. The Town and County will work jointly to identify opportunities for connections between various alternative transportation modes. Policy 7.2.c: Maximize interconnection, redundancy and hierarchy in the transportation network The development of an interconnected and redundant network is critical to the assurance of a safe, efficient and complete transportation system. In the event that a road or bridge is closed due to a natural hazard or other event, interconnection and redundancy will ensure continued access between and within locations in the community. It will be important to strike a balance between adding new roads and widening existing roads to provide for this community need. The Town and County will consider the need for interconnection, redundancy, and hierarchy when planning for an integrated transportation network. Policy 7.3.a: Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity A goal of this plan is to interconnect existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson with a multimodal transportation system. Within existing County and Town complete neighborhoods, alternative modes of transportation are viable for daily trips year-round, and these opportunities should be maintained and enhanced. Outside of complete neighborhoods the Town and County will promote a land use pattern that supports alternative transportation by requiring interconnectivity of future developments and existing development to the best extent possible.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I want to start off by saying I think the product that you guys did when you had the Plan originally was excellent. You guys listened to the community. It wasn't...we didn't get everything we wanted, but I think the work was good. Staff did a good job. Unfortunately, when the electeds took over, the emphasis shifted from get it right to get it done now. Your efforts resulted in a Plan that we refer to as "our Plan." Right now, it's referred to as "their Plan." There is no ownership. This should be cause for concern. I'd like to talk to some of the reasons now why that there is this lack of ownership right now. A lot of discussion in the meeting two weeks ago on how many stories are okay. What I heard was about not being able to see stories. All the talk was about hiding the stories so that we can't see them, but there was no talk about the impacts. That is really why people are asking for numbers. That is where the concern comes from. What do we need to accommodate the growth? WYDOT, as an example, we challenged...Save Historic Jackson Hole challenged the WYDOT figures for South Highway 89, which were based on numbers that came from the elected officials. It turned out that the numbers were way, way higher, the growth numbers, for South Highway 89, so we're not doing what we said we're doing. We're hiding when we ignore these numbers. We vilify WYDOT when all they're doing is responding to the growth that we allowed to happen. What we end up with is bigger schools on a road...build schools on a road that's failing, the bigger bus line. When Bruce gets up here, he's probably going to throw on his cute cheerleader outfit, fire up the smoke machine and tell you what a great Plan this is. No parent thinks their child is ugly. The reality is an analysis of the Comp Plan by Alan Richman identified a number of issues, some of which Trevor mentioned, that need to be addressed before we can claim this is truly a visionary Plan. Almost nothing has been done to resolve these issues. One of them is this issue of an implementation plan. The community has asked for numbers because they want to see some kind of accounting for the hand waves. Right now, it's we're going to put a little more here and take a little away there. And we'd like to see more than just the hand waves. That's why we've asked for the numbers. The growth management plan is reactive, it's not proactive. It gives no assurance that you can achieve the goals during the Plan and that's why we'd like to see the numbers. You might achieve the 60/40 split. Can you hold it to the economy? We don't know and maybe it doesn't matter anyway because the Comp Plan is only aspirational, it's not legal. We ask that you tell the elected officials that the Plan is incomplete without some sort of implementation plan that identifies the timeline for major changes that are planned to accomplish the goals in this Plan, and this must include some kind of numbers facing the County for these hand waves. When isn't as important as how much. If you fail to provide numbers, you have failed to plan. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Good evening, I'm Trevor Stevenson, I'm here to speak on behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. And, Planning Commissioners, I'd like to begin by thanking you for your many years of collective work on the Comprehensive Plan. What I'd like to do tonight, there are some overarching issues that I'd like to bring to your attention, so that you can keep the big picture in mind as you work tonight. First of all, the character district maps define goals for the future more specifically than the policies did by describing the desired future of each specific area of Town and County. We need to be clear that actually achieving any of these goals is very far from sure. Success hinges on coming up with effective regulations to guide development in a way the community desires. And therefore the Alliance has requested that a detailed implementation plan be developed which should outline major tasks ahead and include a timeline and a budget explaining how we get from describing goals to actually having the regulations needed to achieve them. As you work tonight, please take some time to flag issues that you think need additional work after the Comp Plan is adopted, so that these can be incorporated into the implementation plan. Since we don't yet know how we're going to actually shift development, we don't actually, therefore, know how much development we can really shift. And you're likely to run into this problem repeatedly tonight, as I expect you'll hear from many members of the public that's concerned. Next I would like to say that a much clearer statement of intent is needed, explaining that it is a actual shift in development that is desired, not simply an increase in additive growth in some areas. First, please recommend that a statement be added to the introduction explicitly saying that any increases in development should be accompanied directly, or linked directly, to decreases in other districts; otherwise, they simply don't match the intent of the Plan. We do believe that this is already the intent of the Plan and we feel that it should be a green change to add that additional language, but it is extremely important because it's not yet clear enough. Finally, I would like to clarify why the Alliance believes it is important to provide information about the amount of growth that is actually desired in each district. Clearly stating approximately what the intention is in terms of the amount of growth would provide much greater predictability for the residents in each area and would enable a broader conversation about what this Plan really means. The Alliance believes that explaining the amount of development desired in each district is important for a wide range of planning reasons; however, this is also the best way to illustrate how the Plan will achieve community goals and we think this is the best way to increase residents' understanding of and support for the Comp Plan. We recognize that some of you believe that releasing this information would cause a community uproar and derail the Plan. And we disagree. The Alliance believes that being transparent with this information is the best way to address the clear concerns that have been expressed by residents for many years. As you work through the character districts this evening, please take time and think about how much more clear all of this would be if the amount of development was much more clearly explained. So, in a nutshell, three things—implementation plan, look for things that need to go into that; second, link increases to decreases much more explicitly throughout the Plan; third, look at the how more helpful it would be to have the desired amount of growth in each district, rather than just a description of the type of growth. Thank you again for considering our recommendations.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Thank you for letting us give another public comment in this process. My name is Patty Ewing...excuse me, I'm a little horse. I've lived in Jackson for quite awhile and I'm focusing...during this whole process, I had great hopes that the planning work plan would be revised, not fully rewritten. And my general feeling is to echo much of what has already been said. But I want to limit my comments to East Jackson, to the Town Periphery, District 6, and I have written a letter, or we have a letter that was submitted on December 3rd, and you may or may not have read this in your public comment, but I'd like to read it to you now. And this was addressed to the electeds. This letter documents the future character of the Town Periphery district which we, the undersigned, desire and expect. We have used simple language to make comparison with the forthcoming land-use Regulations straightforward. The Town Periphery is a low-density residential neighborhood which borders the undeveloped public lands of the National Forest and the Elk Refuge. It is not unusual to see deer, fox, moose, ?? in our yards. It is a quiet neighborhood with large yards and open views of the mountains. We want it to stay that way. We ask that you design land-use regulations which are predictable and preserve our existing neighborhood character and we look forward to the review of your efforts in the coming months. And these are the things that we asked for on December 3rd: large lots (at least a minimum of 1/3 of an acre); more open space than structures; permeable to wildlife; Planned Unit Development subdivision not allowed, such high density is not compatible; properly maintain the Cache Creek Drive, do not make it a complete street like Redmond is; horses will continue to be allowed; and no new commercial enterprises are needed or desired. And I will submit copies of that letter signed by property owners in the Cache Creek, Snow King Estate, and Upper Cache Creek area. We so far don't have all of them, except the few we could get. But my cover letter is here and I'll just make one copy of all of these; I'm assuming you can make copies if you like. And this is addressed to those of you who are the members of this Joint Planning Commission. Please include copies of the attached letters dated December 3rd of 2011 with additional signatures, all property owners in the Cache Creek and Upper Cache Creek areas. The original letter was submitted to be a part of the public comment for the Comprehensive Plan on December 3rd. This letter supports, for the most part, the future desired characteristics of District 6, as published by the Town and County planners on December 7th. We appreciate the recognition by the planners of the importance to retain a part of the Town of Jackson as only single-family units with larger lots, and the recognition of the importance of the permeability of wildlife. We will continue this effort to obtain more signatures and at that point we'll submit those later. So, if you don't mind, I'll submit this and you all can make copies. There will be more signatures coming. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Genzer, Jim Interested Public	I'm Jim Genzer; I've lived in the community for 40 years, 38 of that right next door on Snow King Drive. And I would like, first of all, to say Patty Ewing's comments for Southeast Jackson is very appropriate to keep it as single-family housing. I think our numbers are very, very unrealistic, as Bill has mentioned. Doubling the size of the number of residences in the community is absolutely wrong. The double the size of commercial is absolutely wrong. Increasing areas like the Aspens and the Village by little pieces and then turn around and dumping the rest of the growth in the Town of Jackson is absolutely wrong. That is not the way things should happen. We...in the Town, the core commercial and resort areas to be expanded out to the...it used to be the Y, now the X, is a silly, silly thing. It will eliminate the western flavor, the western atmosphere that we have had for generations in Jackson Hole. That is not what we should be doing. If we want to be in step with a western community and the rest of the State of Wyoming, we will not do that kind of development. Can you imagine driving from the Y into Town with three-, four-story buildings in a dead zone? The only thing you can see is the antennas on top of Snow King. We're no different than any other city USA. If we want to keep the character of Jackson Hole, we do not allow the Town of Jackson to become the dumping ground for the community. None of this three-, four-story housing. We keep the character that we have right now. I think that, in order to do that, we have to eliminate the idea of having 65 percent of our employees housed in Teton County. That will not work. If we expect growth, 65 percent is wrong, and at a maximum, I would say 45 percent of employees that live in Teton County. And I thank you for the time that you have taken to listen to us and I really hope it engenders some revisions and attitude changes within our County and Town officials. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	Hi my name is Sherrie Jern and this will be a little more personal. To kind of keep up with what Peter was talking about, <<inaudible>>. We had many developers coming to us before the County purchased this property, wanting to develop it but realizing there wasn't our support and the support of other neighbors that ???. And we basically all said, no, we don't support development on this five acres. And so these developers went away. They decided that they couldn't do it without the support of the neighbors there. So, we finally sold the five acres to the County. We knew that the County was purchasing this land and that they would up zone it. They were purchasing it in order to zone it for density with disregard really to what the neighbors want. By putting a lot of density on this property, you're going to affect the entire Village Road. We're going to have congestion. Our wildlife is not going to have as much room to roam. A lot of times I feel like you're looking at these services at the Aspens, this little market, which is extremely expensive, is not a neighborhood market. No one's going to be going there and doing their weekly shopping. There's still going to be a lot of traffic going into Town. So on the really small, personal, out-of-neighborhood ranches, a development here is going to be detrimental to the entire Village Road. And also I think it's kind of expensive to the County. When I got all the minutes from the meetings, it talked about affordable housing before it was zoned, and yet on the plat now it says that this property couldn't be subdivided any further. We all knew that was going to happen and I think that's where you're going, and we don't want it. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Collins, Bill Interested Public	Good evening, my name is Bill Collins and I live in East Jackson, Wyoming. I'm going to give you a bit of a different note tonight, I think, from a lot of the comments you've been hearing; I'm going to speak very generally, but I'm also going to speak very positively. I think this Plan that's on the table before you is a huge, huge improvement over the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. And having attempted to administer that Plan for more than a decade, it didn't influence a single decision the entire Town made, in fact. This Plan is really a very good step forward, and it actually does a lot of the things that we said for a decade that we'd like to do, and that is to de-emphasize and discourage development in the outlying areas and redirect it to the areas where there's infrastructure, where there's existing development. This Plan really does that and I think it's a very good step forward, and I think it ???. We all have our own things we can find in there we don't like. Mine is I think the character maps are far too complex and cumbersome and difficult to understand. I don't think they should be that way. There's been a concern throughout this process about additive growth. I've never understood this Plan to be one that attempted to increase the overall growth as currently allowed. I've never understood that to be an objective. And I don't think it ever has been. And what I would suggest to you, in an attempt to sort of respond to that, is to put a policy in this document that says that, as the LDRs are revised going forward, the maximum theoretical buildout of this County will be increased. It will just simply be increased from what it is today. It's going to work that way anyway. I mean, the whole process of rewriting the LDRs will have that effect; the marketplace is having that effect; existing development, prior to the great recession when there really was somebody proposing something, was taking advantage of that approximately 80 percent of maximum density allowed anyway. So, let's just sort of lower the temperature and put something in the Plan that says that we are going to lower the theoretical buildout of Town. I actually think that will respond to a lot of the comments that we're hearing and a lot of the fear that people have. I'm not sure how much density is proposed in each of these character districts or districts. I actually think that the amount of new development that could result from this Plan along Highway 390 should be very ???. And one of the objectives the community has had for a long time was to try to avoid a five-lane Highway 390 and that's been sort of an ongoing discussion with the Wyoming Department of Transportation. There's some very extensive transportation demand and management techniques that's in place in Teton Village, all sort of calibrated to try to avoid tripping five-lane requirement Highway 390. I would encourage you to keep that in mind when you think about the Aspens and Pines and what else you may do on that, along that corridor. This issue of down zoning versus TDR, well, I don't know, that is a difficult one. I never believed that TDRs is going to work here. The transfer of density from Buffalo Valley to the northwest corner of Herford Ranch, you've got to multiply that by 25 or 35 times before the economics begin to make any sense. And this community will never do that, ???. I just don't see how that's going to work. I think that the harsh reality of trying to put this Plan into effect is going to be done through zoning changes. I think that's the practical, realistic technique that we're going to find ???. But let me end where I began—this is a giant improvement from the 1994 Comp Plan. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	Hi, my name is Phelps Swift. I know many of the people who have spoken here tonight are truly the all-time real leaders of the community, so I'm gratified that they're here, and I know you guys are here doing your job and you're probably sick of it just as we are. But we were passionate about where we are and where we're going and you're hearing from that firsthand. We built a...we moved to Teton Village Road in the 1970s, so I've lived in ??, ended up buying property in Melody Home in Raintree subdivision in 1985, which is part of your Aspens/Teton Pines, District 12, I think it is. And the first thing I want to talk about here just briefly has been the process, and it's been a long and flawed and very confusing process. I'm glad Pete Jorgensen was here ?? . It's been hard to follow where we are, where we're going, and what the timeline is, so it would be very helpful. And I kind of think I'm involved, I'm a local lawyer, and I read the LDRs, but it's been hard for me to follow the iterations, imaginations. In one week the nodes are soundly defeated—I think they were thrown out by you guys. Suddenly, they're revised in character district maps under a different camouflaged name. So, except for the professional planners and a few very diligent watchdogs over here tonight, Staff members and those with an agenda, like affordable housing and the Housing Authority, the public, the real stakeholders, haven't been here. Now, they've been worn out, they've been divided, they've been conquered by the process. And so what we have is not really a community plan, in my opinion. I think it's been contrived by the Staff and please don't...I don't fault you; I'm kind of in Pete Jorgensen's camp. I think it's their Plan and it's hard to get an audience with them, and I've tried to be respectful and not bother them at home. So, in any event, the 2009 map, you'll remember, was released and there was a great outrage by the public, then they pulled the maps, everything became fluff, warm and fuzzy. Then there was calm, nobody knew what was going on. It kind of made sense. Now you've released the character maps more ?? and, you know, we're not going away. So, I really think what the Staff and the electeds need to do is measure the quality of the comments and the people who the comments are coming from, not just the quantity. And you've got some real leaders here tonight saying a lot of good things. And I respect them and I appreciate them. I know there are both sides, but I really think the comments you're hearing tonight are meaningful. I'm part of this new group called the Village Road Coalition. We didn't think we needed to organize a campaign. We thought we could do it individually, you know, we're still Wyoming and we're pretty independent. Obviously, the Housing Authority has had a campaign over the five acres. We haven't done that. We've been kind of easy targets. We're a small group; we're not a gated community; we're not a berm community. We don't even have an owners association. We're not ?? by SPET or other public money. We're only organized now and I think that's a sad, sad statement. I talked to one of the electeds the other night and he said I'm glad you finally organized and why don't you start a PAC because then we'll listen to you. Listen to these individuals. We don't need to be organized. We don't need a PAC. I think you're...the ivory tower approach to this thing—I need to make this point—it really fails to account for what's going on on the ground. You've got 15 acres in this so-called transitional space in the Raintree subdivision. Mind you, this is a platted subdivision, three-acre lots, it's been that way for 35 years. This is only for 35 years; these are platted lots; they can't be divided, some even have open space on them; they've got private restrictions. I think it's just driving this Housing Authority agenda for this mistake they made to buy this five acres. I think what's been happening out here is tantamount to a condemnation of our property, our values, our lifestyles. And one of the real centerpiece common values in your Plan is to preserve community character. Again, 34 years our neighborhood's been zoned the same way, three acres, neighborhood conservation, and by the stroke of a single pen, overnight, you want to convert these—not you but the Plan would convert these—into neighborhood destruction, not conservation. It will be the biggest density dump in the history of the Teton County right in our residential subdivision. And I think you've heard enough tonight—we don't want it. So, I, for one, am very skeptical. I haven't trusted the planning process. I don't think I'm alone. I think existing, conserved neighborhoods should be preserved, and then if you want to change them, you should have an open process so the debate can happen and negotiations can occur just like they did at Shooting Star and you end up with a good project. You just don't want to ?? . So, to be very specific, I'd like you to reclassify the Core Residential from the Aspens/Pines—I think it's section 4.2—into a kind of a conserved, I think it is, maybe stable, I'm not quite sure of the terminology, but leave it how it has been and let us go on with life. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	I think I will be less than three minutes. <<inaudible>>. I was going to make specific comments, but I did want to say that I agree with ?? concerns that too many members and organizations like Save Historic Jackson Hole and the Conservation Alliance have expressed and have written to you and the elected officials about those. I wanted to make a comment about District 5.6. The fundamental principle behind increasing density in this district is conservation of the open space in middle and Southern South Park, and let's not lose sight of the fact that conservation of wildlife and open space is the justification for increases in development elsewhere in the County. There's a unique opportunity to work with large landowners in South Park to do this. And people before me have mentioned how effective the PRD tool has been in the past and how beneficial it has been to the community. So, just the section there should read do not preclude the opportunity for meaningful permanent conservation of open space in rural areas, period. Workforce housing may benefit from this increased density, but is not the driving force behind it. And also the term other community benefits is vague and effectively a loophole, so I don't think that should be in there. Also, mixed-use does not belong in District 5.6. There's a commitment to make this neighborhood consistent with the adjacent neighborhood, Cottonwood Park, where there's mixed housing, not mixed-use. I don't think that belongs there. And then for sections 10 point...just 10 in general and 10.2, the goal for District 10 is to try to preserve permanent open space in middle, southern and other areas of South Park by directing development to northwestern South Park. This is as simple as encouraging the two largest landowners in this district to concentrate development on their respective properties in Northwest South Park. So, a statement which more accurately reflects this goal would read something like any development that might occur in South Park will be directed to Northwest in subarea 5.6, something like that. And then also about the wildlife movement in District 10, I think that needs to be...well, Section 10.2, wildlife movement in this district occurs throughout, not just along the Flat Creek corridor. Someone mentioned that before. So, add language to describe that it's east to west, as well as north to south, movement of elk and other species, and this would provide a more realistic description and it would be consistent with the overall description mentioned above in District 10. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I'm Sami Robinson and I'm a member of that Village Road Coalition as well and the ??. I've been a resident of the Aspens for 35 years and I've seen firsthand the impact of continued growth and development in Town on the Village Road in the wildlife corridor. The Village Road should be the last place to consider up zoning and growth, adding growth. The wildlife trailer actually sits right in the middle of where you all are talking about adding growth, saying, caution wildlife crossing. And it's very unique, prime wildlife habitat. The idea of nodes has been met with complete resistance from all the residents. People don't want urbanization of that and lose our small community character. The increased density and up zoning in Teton Village Road should be eliminated from the Comp Plan. And I thank you. Consider that the moose are really important to all of us. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I am Mercedes Huff and I have been a full-time resident for the last four years and I've sold real estate for the last 33 or plus years, and I have to say that one of the things that made my job so enjoyable is that I've always been proud to show off our Valley and talk about how responsibly it's been planned and how it will be maintained with the same stewardship in the years to come. Right now, I think that's being threatened; I don't feel that way. I think it's critical that we, you know, keep its unique value or we're just going to be Park City, ??, Aspen, and even Sun Valley. It's a huge thing that we're looking at here and I'm very, very concerned. I was standing here tonight talking on my own personal behalf but also for the Teton Village Road Coalition, which has been recently formed to...so that we can get a group voice out here to you. I've not addressed this board before. I have talked to the County Commissioners and written letters. You know, I just don't feel that it's been heard, so I feel...we all feel that, as a group, we hopefully can have a stronger voice. There are a lot of people obviously who couldn't get here tonight; either they're out of Town or the weather prevented it. But I would ask the same question I've asked the County Commissioners and everyone else—Why are we here? Why are you insisting...or why are they insisting on completely redoing this Comprehensive Plan? And as you've been reminded many times, the mandate was to make ??, not to completely rewrite this Plan, not an overhaul. When I first asked one of the planners years ago why we had to come up with such overarching rules and new concepts for these density nodes, I was told it was too cumbersome in its current form to have to ask for variances whenever a property owner might want to do something a little outside of what was currently permitted. What could be more cumbersome, expensive, stressful than what we've all, whether Staff, Commissioners, or the populace at large, have experienced over the last four to five years? Personally, I think the variance method was a terrific built-in checks and balance system. Neighborhoods got input and there were no overreaching node themes or character districts to ruin large slots of the Valley. I'm very troubled by the concept of down zoning the rural areas and transferring that to proposed nodes. That seems to be a taking—I'm not an attorney—but it seems to be down zoning these landowners. The right to cluster on larger parcels and receive some density bonus in return has been a part of the Plan for a long time and it has real, real value to an owner. How can we just remove that right and tell the owner he now has to shift it to a node? Although my concerns are really about our Valley as a whole and how the vision you're contemplating seems very flawed and very detrimental to people and wildlife, I'd like to address one specific area, and it's been brought up tonight, and it is the five-acre parcel, which the Housing Authority bought on a gamble, with taxpayer money, that it would get up zoned. And they borrowed money, which I am...my understanding is it's against the rules for a public Housing Authority. Totally inappropriate and I hope you won't give any consideration for new zoning based on that and it shouldn't be a reason for you to contemplate adding enormous density to the Aspens. That would only be rewarding bad behavior and I think we've seen too much of that in the last few years...I think a lot of it. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ???. Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ???. In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ???. In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ???. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Varley, Jay Interested Public	My name's Jay Varley. I own property <<inaudible>>. I'd like to talk a little bit about Town as Heart, which was in the last Plan, and also about downtown as, let's say, heart of the heart, because I think that the density of the downtown area ought to be convenient to alternative modes of transportation. And actually the biggest one of that is walking. And so I think that we need to try to concentrate that development close to the center of Town. And when I talk about walking, you have to consider topography, too, because when there's some big elevation being like there is from down the Highway coming up, that discourages walking, too, so people won't walk as far. It also makes the bus transportation to be more effective as well. And that bus transportation also takes people to the supermarkets and other places that you ?? that you have downtown. So I'd like to encourage that. And I'd like to discourage too much development...to consider the Highway too much as the appropriate places for development. And it does encourage sprawl; it encourages people to drive to these places. I'm not saying you can just freeze the whole thing, but don't be highway oriented. That's just a typical American suburban type of development, so it needs to be more concentrated ???. And hopefully the areas that are not really on the Square, that they can develop as mixed-use and put people living there. And also in a way we can start getting the kinds of businesses, once there's enough critical mass in that area, to serve those people and we can have the kind of businesses that would attract the whole community at various times, as well as people living down there. I'm really looking more for a kind of a European village-type model. Usually very pedestrian oriented and relatively hard lines when you get out of it. That's my vision as to what I'd like to see. And I think there's a lot of advantages to it, you avoid sprawl, and it just is a more sensible way to live, and I think that's the way it's going to occur in the future anyway, like Town, of course. Oh, I'd also caution another thing, too. It's when the area gets too big, we take a risk of having development on the fringes where often the land is larger parcels, easier to develop, and we could end up with gaps between that...big gaps between that and the core downtown, which are like dead zones and people don't really want to walk through. It needs to be interesting through the whole thing for people to want to walk to it. So that's one of the hazards of getting too far out of the core with big developments. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Five years, five hundred thousand dollars plus, 105 meetings plus. Are we really better off than we were five years ago? I say not. We've got so much of the big substantive discussions we need to have. We keep putting it off, we keep putting it off, it's at the next phase, it's at the next phase. Everyone pretty much acknowledges outside the ?? the psychology of the economy. I got into this process for one reason and one reason only, acknowledging that wildlife and open space. We can't have any substantive long-term beneficial or benefit to our wildlife without protecting more of the habitat they need to not only migrate but to move around on a daily fashion. We can't do that without permanent protection. This Plan is just completely turned on its ear from a permanent protection perspective. Everything hinged in early days on two issues primarily—affordable housing and the PRD, because without the clustering incentives, without some dedicated funding source, without a myriad or a mountain of some methodology to create this open space and to keep it...to perpetuate this little song of stewardship we have, everything else falls by the wayside. We can't do that without ??. Several people have spoken to this issue already. The ?? isn't about anything other than preventing the additive growth without having that ??, that nexus. To add to growth anywhere in the County cannot be achieved without permanent reduction elsewhere, or else we will end up essentially with the four horsemen of the overdevelopment apocalypse and that is density, sprawl, increased verticality, and the one nobody talks about, concentric expansion, which is exactly what's occurring now because they proposed expansion in the Aspens and in Northern South Park. It's absolutely ludicrous. I have a specific suggestion. I also count on Staff's numbers. It'd be nice if you guys would parse out the 4300 overage in the 6800 base entitlement and how that was arrived at. We were originally told the max PRD potential is 2900. I'd really like to see that parsed out, that number, that 4300 number that gets us to 11.1. A specific suggestion would be to eliminate...of the four categories, only have transitional and preservation. That's what people understand and most people think now that stable doesn't mean stable, it's simply the holding pattern for you'll be transitional next. So, if we're really serious about that, let's just have two categories—transitional and preservation. And that includes small town, community character, wildlife, scenic resources—the preservation of everything. There's been a stunning lack of acknowledgement throughout this process about amount of growth. Amount of growth is much more important in a constrained environment in which we live than location of growth. A lot of planners and architects, I understand all these principles as well as you guys do. I'd have that discussion with anybody in the room. In the constrained footprint that we're under, a lot of these new urbanistic and smart-growth principles have diminishing returns. That's not my opinion, that's actual data analysis. The quintessentially high and low development, sea of wilderness in public lands, assuredly as we're ??, we are constrained and islands have carrying capacities. They have carrying capacity both on qualitative and a quantitative standpoint, but we need to acknowledge that. The amount of growth is more important to the majority of the populace than location of growth. We should have adhered to the better-not-bigger premise and work with an existing footprint. Six point six million square feet, we're acknowledging a lack of critical thinking and critical problem-solving ability, if we can't work within that footprint. Six point six million square feet of commercial outstanding and 6800 base entitled units, especially in this economic time, we should be able to work within that footprint. There's also a lack of acknowledgement about the cost of growth. We keep projecting these growths, this growth and this growth pattern without considering a strong linkage to the cost of growth; most prominent among those are commercial and employee generation rates and our inability to house them where we want to, and that contribution to the commuter rate also should be considered.
1/25/2012	Rogers, Marcia & Beryl Interested Public	We are visitors to your wonderful area and it has been brought to our attention that you have plans for more homes in the area of the Moose Wilson Road. We have been coming to Jackson and the Tetons for over fourteen years. We come to get away from congestion and the city atmosphere. We have loved the Moose Wilson Road area and the thoughts of more over priced homes does nothing for us. The wildlife will suffer and the God given beauty of the area will be gone overnight. Please I beg you to leave the area as it is...you have plenty of homes and entertainment already there. Let us enjoy the peace and beauty that you have without more clutter. When we this country ever learn that some things simply need to be left alone!!!!
1/25/2012	Koster, Ken Interested Public	Just received an email from Alan Monroe with the information about tomorrow evening's meeting. Really short notice and I find myself at St. John's tomorrow morning for a 10:00 a.m. procedure. I am sure I will not feel like staying around for this meeting and will return home here in Alta. Briefly, my concern and real interest is that the State Line Road project be completed to 6000 North. You have been provided ample reasons for such completion and I will not repeat them.

Date	Name	Comment
1/25/2012	Quinn, David Interested Public	First and foremost, I would like to thank you for your efforts over the past several years of working with the community and all interested parties on trying to accomplish the goal of making Teton County a place with the highest wildlife and scenic values of any place in our Country. In regards to the current Comprehensive Plan draft; I would like to make the following suggestions for the South Park area: First, the goal of wide open spaces and abundant wildlife can be achieved with the right efforts from our community. As the Land Trust stated in a recent letter to the county, it is critical to keep as many tools available for large land owners in order to preserve the character that everyone has been accustomed to. If tools such as the PRD are eliminated, many of the remaining ranches will be divided into the minimum 35 acre parcels that are allowed by State laws, and eventually the wide open spaces that everyone has been accustomed to will slowly vanish and we will be left with views of ranchettes or large second homes, with no community benefit. Over the past two years, various conservation groups have continued to recommend keeping as many tools available for conservation of large open spaces. Recently, it seems, with the advent of the mapping of Teton County; that many of these important thoughts have been displaced or forgotten about. It seems, as there has been strong pressure from a few minority residents in the community to put a layer of green (conservation) and blue (preservation) over any remaining rural lands in the community, disregarding that these large green areas have a base development right of one house, guest house and barn per 35 acre parcel. These same people are pressuring the county staff and elected officials to have landowners conserve their remaining lands by moving their development rights to town or a small node next to the High School Road. I am not sure if a suitable tradeoff is being suggested. In reality, and financially there are many problems with this concept. The value of the density of large tracts of rural land in the middle of South Park has a lot more value as 35 acre pieces than multiple small town sized lots next to the High School Road. Allowing landowners to cluster development on their own lands may be a better alternative. There are many areas throughout the County, within or next to existing development, where non-contiguous PRD's could be successful without limiting land owners to town or a node in Northern South Park. No one knows if the town or landowners in these nodes will accommodate additional density. All landowners have to be given the same opportunity to preserve their lands and cannot be confined to moving their rights to specific areas. In the last public comment period, 37 residents of Teton County; many that live in South Park, commented that that they would like to see additional development in Southern South Park. Many people commented that it would be a good area for equestrian use possibly with riding areas to accommodate the equestrian community that exists in South Park and the rest of the community. These residents have also expressed having a small grocery store, or amenities that would be advantageous to eliminating additional traffic to Town and beneficial to the residents of Southern South Park. It is important to provide landowners with different preservation options to choose from. Again, this is what the Land Trust has stated in their recent letter. My final point is that we have all been working on a character driven Comp Plan. Many people are trying to blend a number driven plan into the character plan. Please keep on track with defining the character of each district and do not fall into past mistakes of trying to add numbers to the plan. Numbers will only confuse and complicate the process beyond what people can comprehend. I have been told that a numbers plan was unsuccessfully tried in 2009. In closing, I appreciate your efforts and hope you can stay on track with your goals. Please see the attached copies of the comments that 37 individuals made in the last comment period. There are many concerned citizens in Teton County that believe that proper planning is the key to the livelihood of our community. Please do not let a few people pressure you into making the wrong decisions.

Date	Name	Comment
1/25/2012	Bowditch, Fred Interested Public	I wish to comment on the current Master Plan and suggested revisions, in particular to the Re-zoning of Rural Properties and Planned Unit Developments. I am very concerned that Teton County residents will not be able to subdivide or create a PUD on acreage that is less than 35 acres in the future. There are areas in this County where many residents have subdivided larger properties into 10 or 12 acre parcels, leaving a larger (35 or 40 acre parcel) literally "land-locked" by these smaller parcels. In the case of some of these parcels, the owners may have intentions to subdivide or create a PUD in the future, for investment purposes or future (retirement) income. To maintain continuity in a Homeowners Association, it would be odd and not in keeping with area character to have one single parcel of 40 acres surrounded by smaller 10 acre parcels. To eliminate the possibility of future PUD's would be to disregard a Homeowners Association's character, as well as the owner's future intentions. I respectfully request that you review your possible elimination of future PUD's on acreage of less than 35 acres. One extreme zoning regulation does not necessarily work for all of Teton County, and would be unfair to many land owners. I am asking in particular to review the zoning requirements of the Horse Creek Mesa plateau [see attached map], and leave the zoning as is, with the possibility of future PUD's. I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your response.
1/25/2012	Monroe, Allen Interested Public	I have had an opportunity to review briefly the January 26 Joint Planning Commission Meeting Agenda Documentation at http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/files/2011/09/120126-Packet.pdf on the County's Comprehensive Plan web site. It is indicated that public comment will be invited at the workshop. However, with the forecast for another 1 1/2 feet of snow and the recent closures of Teton Pass due to Avalanche control, I anticipate it will be difficult to attend the meeting. I wish to comment on the changes to the draft wording of the Character District Maps / Comprehensive Plan. To provide some background information relevant to my comments, the packet for the January 11-12 planning workshop describes the following transportation-related objectives under the heading "Implementation of the Approved Policies in the Character Districts:" •7.2.c Maximize interconnection, redundancy and hierarchy in the transportation network •7.2.d Complete key Transportation Network Projects to improve connectivity •7.3.a Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity I see from the packet of information provided prior to the 1/26 workshop/meeting that it has been proposed to make a clarifying (coded color green) change to the draft plan wording: •Remove 7.2.c as an objective, and to Add 7.3.a as an objective. In view of the considerable public comment which has been offered, it is unclear as to why this is being proposed, as existing transportation "connectivity" is a bit of a hodgepodge. Objective 7.2.c would appear to make it a goal to rationalize the roads and trails network, and therefore would be worth keeping in the Plan. It also would be worthy of consideration to add: •7.2.d Complete key Transportation Network Projects to improve connectivity to the Objectives for Alta, as that would relate directly to an objective of completing State Line Road, as originally planned and funded several years ago.
1/24/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I am writing for myself and my neighbors in the Aspens first filling. We re absolutely opposed and appalled by the recent information on up zoning the village road near the Aspens. We have been attending meetings and plan to speak on Thursday evening. This is a very inappropriate place for up zoning. It is obvious this is where the wild life habitat is. Many animals have been killed this winter already without the up zoning. We urge you to not proceed and listen to the residents. This should not even be considered as an area for more development.
1/24/2012	, Design Review Committ	5.1 Highway Corridor: Encourage measures to marry curb cuts and create stronger street walls with landscaping. Broadway continues to be a true eyesore for most of its length; only by creating an environment that is more comfortable for pedestrians with better street walls, proportions, safety and landscaping, will it become a vital street. 5.6 Northwest South Park: A traffic study to identifying the impact of an additional connector between HWY 89 and South Park Loop would be helpful in understanding the appearance and character of such a road.

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012	, Design Review Committ	2.3 Downtown: The vision of this district is strong and appropriate, and the integration of lodging with residential uses is a very good objective that would boost town's vitality. Completing the strong link between Snow King, the Center for the Arts and Town Square is an important priority. Projects should be supported that add to the vitality of this linkage. A concern to be noted is the proposed expansion of the Lodging Overlay to the 5-way. We hear a lot of complaints at DRC meetings from lodging owners about the hardships of having hotel rooms next to busy roads - thus leading oftentimes to very non-urban proposals. The parking requirements also make this an additional challenge. We would like to avoid seeing suburban development patterns in this area. 2.5 North Cache Gateway: The character of a 'key gateway' needs to be more precisely determined and explained in a manner that stresses the equality of importance to that of the Flat Creek redevelopment. It may need to be a more comprehensive description than "should take the form of 2/3 story buildings that address the North Cache and Flat Creek corridor."
1/24/2012	, Design Review Committ	How will the definition of "Western character" be determined? As a committee we are concerned about the standards with which a regulation to commit to a western character will be identified. Is there the possibility to include a limited amount of residential, mixed use in this model as exemplified by Davies Reid? This will make the Town Square more vital to our community and more regularly occupied with amenities that support a neighborhood.
1/24/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	Dear Ben, Your inflammatory remarks in last week's newspaper deserve a response. Peter Moyer was speaking on behalf of himself and other Village Road residents ... the stakeholders who have lived, worked, and raised their families in the Aspens/Teton Pines district. Peter's comments are not "from afar;" rather, his comments are from the ground and have widespread support from his Village Road neighbors. To the contrary, you are attempting to engineer our neighborhood "from afar" by imposing your ivory tower, closed door planning ideas on us and our neighborhood. Our neighborhood works and we wish to preserve its character. The Village Road residents have dutifully followed your process by attending numerous public meetings and writing comments over the past four years. I personally attended at least five (5) public hearings, three (3) workshops, and wrote a letter dated June 8, 2009 which is attached. Nothing has changed and my comments, questions, and suggestions are still applicable today. The "node" up-zone was soundly rejected and has now been revived by the release of the character maps. Its new name is "transition area". No matter what the label, it still spells TURMOIL. During the overheated real estate bubble, the Housing Authority panicked and recklessly speculated on land. Its purchase of the Rain's parcel, at twice its appraised value in 2006, once only looked foolish ... but now appears to have been illegal. Those bad land deals have costs the tax payers millions and violated the public trust. It is not reasonable to try to vindicate bad investments by dumping density with the stroke of a pen. For obvious reasons, I have not been invited to your private planning meetings. Your grand experiment to dump density into a single-family platted subdivision is ill founded, unfair, and destructive. See you at the public hearings. Thanks for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
1/23/2012	Springer, Kim Interested Public	I'm writing you to protest new plans for growth and development along and at the end of Highway 390. I understand several of you are in favor of growth in these areas which seems astonishing. As residents of Jackson Hole we have a unique opportunity and responsibility to help protect the National Lands at our County boundaries. Wilson and the West Bank also happen to be below the level of the Snake River. From a safety standpoint, it makes no sense to add development in just the place scientists predict to be "ground zero" if the river floods. This is not to mention grim predictions of earthquakes and floods from world renowned geologists, hydrologists and other scientists. Mary Gibson Scott, Superintendent of Grand Teton National Park has communicated the Park's resource concerns to the County Planners. She says "Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the Park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors." She further points out the Moose-Wilson portion of the Park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park. Therefore she asks that transportation strategies and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. A wildlife rich dead-end road should be an immediate red flag for future development. As residents of Teton County we have more influence on decisions in Grand Teton than most other tax payers, even though the Park belongs to all of us. We need to help influence wise decisions for every American. The current Comprehensive Plan allows for plenty of new growth, 7000 units I'm told. Who can justify the need for more? It's clearly poor planning to suggest such a need without looking at the impacts and providing justification and extensive new plan and all these comments have been ignored. Who's driving this process and why? Where are all the people who want to scrap the old plan and add to growth? It's very hard to be supportive of a new plan while knowing the old plan's zoning and LDR's haven't held up, certainly not in our neighborhood. We need to know buildout numbers and how development in rural areas will be decreased. If this information isn't available we'll be worse off with a new plan than with the existing plan. Planning means making decisions and commitments and producing documents people can actually understand.
1/20/2012	LaJeunesse, Debbie Teton County Housing	The Teton County Housing Authority (TCHA) Board would like to recognize and commend you for the work you have done on the Comprehensive Plan. We applaud you for making it a truly public process, and incorporating the passion expressed by the community to craft a plan that works to preserve our values. In particular, the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally will help ensure stability and vibrancy for this community. The TCHA Board looks forward to helping you implement the many policies articulated in the document as they relate to housing our workforce. The TCHA Board is grateful for the hard work that both Town and County Staff, Planning Commissions, and Elected Officials put into making the approved Comprehensive Plan a successful plan for the future of this valley. Thank you for your service and commitment to this community!

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept. This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides. I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO: • The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanent protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike the pending proposal. • The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clustering provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors. • The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away. Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!! II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons: • The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning. • Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jackson Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character. • Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits. • The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning. •••• The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors. The concept sounds okay on the surface, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.

Date	Name	Comment
1/16/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	Interesting headlines Monday, January 16. I have been attending meetings for over 4 years regarding how the residents of Teton County actually want the new, updated Comprehensive Plan to look. What I heard and stated at these meetings does not mesh with what the Teton County Commissioners and Planning Commissioners are quoted as wanting in this article. More growth at Teton Village? With more growth, it will become more like a village? Excuse me...it is Teton Village. It was more like a village prior to the Four Seasons being built. Where will the traffic go? Down the already crowded Highway 390? Through the underdeveloped, seasonal Moose-Wilson Road? The park will love that. And I believe they will close it or make it one way if traffic becomes even more congested than it is already in the summer. What happens in a disaster? I have seen the traffic backed up to our house which is north of the Aspens on busy ski days, when there is an accident near the bridge and even with accidents on 22. What happens if there is a major earthquake? How will an evacuation happen? We only have one bridge and one road 6 months of the year. Have you been at the intersection of Highways 22 and 390 when residents are commutting to/from work or school? Let's put more cars on the road? And believe me, there will be more cars. It is idyllic to think that it will be a self-contained "village". Even if one person is employed in the Village, you can be certain that the other will have a job in town, a class to take, a meeting to attend, a dentist appointment, a movie to see, a child to pick up from school. The Aspens area...ditto for the above. "Coupled with a push to allow for more residential development?" I would like to invite those persons who are pushing for more development to please write their desires here...because I did not hear their voices at the meetings I attended. I heard neighbors wanting to retain the quality of their neighborhoods, to protect wildlife and a way of life. More density in the Aspens area? Why? It is a congested mid-stop on a busy highway already. And just because we have a few small, local services like a neighborhood market, coffee shop, bank, dry cleaning drop off; you feel we are primed for a larger population? Or are you suggesting that we need additional new commercial development? Last I heard, we have undeveloped existing commercial lots and spaces in the Pines, the Aspens and Teton Village. I can see it now...a new Smith's across from the Aspens! Growth. It is really a good thing? Maybe it is time that we do better with what we have and stop wanting more.

Date	Name	Comment
1/16/2012	Karns, Pete Interested Public	One of the dowfalls of creating land use rules and regulations is the "law of unintended consequences". Unfortunately, we already have some unintended consequences as a result of the Plan that is currently in place. Every day there are hundreds of our Jackson Hole workforce that commute from Star Valley and Idaho to get to their jobs. These commuters waste hundreds of man hours while on the road. They burn thousands of gallons of fossil fuel. They create tons of CO2. Many of them have been seriously hurt in accidents getting to and from their jobs. Some have even died. I am sure that our planners did not create this scenario on purpose when they were creating the current land use plan. However, I do consider this a failure on their part not to foresee what was going to happen. The unfortunate thing is that many of these workforce people would not be making this commute if they could find rental housing in Jackson Hole. During the boom years leading up to the economic downturn in 2007, apartment projects had waiting lists and people with jobs had no choice but to go outside the valley to find housing. Today, the problem is not as bad but still exists. If their is such a large demand for apartments in Jackson Hole, then why hasn't the private sector stepped up and built more apartment buildings? The answer is simple. There is not a zoning district in our current plan that adequately provides for the building of apartments. The only zoning district where apartments are feasible also allows condominiums and townhouses in the same district. It is far more profitable to build condos and townhouses and therefore they win out over apartments. Whatsmore, even if a developer were to consider building apartments, the current zoning doesn't allow high enough density to make apartments economically feasible. There is a solution to this problem but it would take a major change in the direction that our planners are headed. The first step would be to create an entirely new zoning district in the Plan. This district, lets call it Workforce Housing, would need two major components. First, it would need to allow very high density multifamily housing. Secondly, it could not be subdivided. This would prevent it from being converted to condos at a later date. These two components would separate Workforce Housing from the current AR Residential zoning where condos and townhouses would continue to be built. These two components would also provide the opportunity and would carry the financial incentive for free enterprise to then step up and create the housing. The second step would be to find an area suitable to build such a project. I do not believe that there are any opportunities within the Town of Jackson to build such a project (except maybe the Rodeo Grounds if it were to be moved out of town). This leaves the north end of South Park as the next possibility. There may be other areas in the valley that could be considered. Some would say that building large apartment complexes in Jackson Hole would bring unwanted growth. I look at it differently. We would not be adding more people to the valley. Instead, we would be bringing home those people who already work here but are forced to live elsewhere. At the same time, we would be saving the environment, cutting back on pollution, reducing the use of fossil fuels, eliminating wasted man hours and possible even saving lives. Lets get our workforce back in Jackson Hole where they belong.

Date	Name	Comment
1/14/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex – thanks – I hope the public sees the changes at least several days before the January 26 meeting. Two green changes I hope staff will suggest based on the meetings we just had – and also since it is likely now that all “attributes” will be stripped from the maps including wildlife migration corridors. First green change: •In the existing general text introduction to district 10 you note on page IV-63, first paragraph “however the intensity of wildlife vehicle collisions on South HWY 89 shows the importance of the District’s open space for wildlife movement as well.” •In the area 10.2 specific description on page IV-65 (last paragraph) you get the basic biology incorrect by stating “The most important of these open spaces is the area between Flat Creek and the highway. This area not only provides the scenic gateway in Town, but also provides an open area for a wildlife crossing of the highway that would feed wildlife into a preserved Flat Creek corridor.” •I already pointed out the science demonstrates elk and other large ungulates actually move east and west across area 10.2 (also similarly through area 10.1) - as well as north and south throughout both area 10.1 and 10.2 – not just along the Flat Creek corridor. This was discussed tangentially at the County meeting by Paul Vogelheim on the inconsistency of wildlife corridor mapping across the districts. •Green change suggestion would be to align the statement on page IV-65 area 10.2 (last paragraph) with the statement on page IV-63 (first paragraph). I would suggest a biologically more correct replacement on page IV-65 be: “The most important of these open spaces is the area between Flat Creek and the highway. This area not only provides the scenic gateway in Town, but also provides an open area for a wildlife crossing of the highway to move through the district. that would feed wildlife into a preserved Flat Creek corridor.” •If corridors are mapped in an illustrative way (versus 100% accurately) then I believe Paul Vogelheim noted early in the meeting that they be consistent across all districts – by default that would include areas 10.1 and 10.2. I think if you do drop the wildlife corridor illustrative mapping (I would like it to stay) – you should still identify the known, and verified, wildlife collision hot spots on the map’s highways which do line up to JH Wildlife Foundation’s previous documentation and mapping, along with the recent WTI report the County helped to fund. The three district 10 mapped crossing hotspots (termed “wildlife crossing”) - do in fact line up with both of these reports - so no changes would be needed beyond clarifying that they are “wildlife crossing collision hot spots”. Second green change: •Given the discussion at the County of not fully understanding “If development does occur, the agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south.” I suggest in 10.2 on page IV-65, last paragraph (staff also suggested something similar at the County meeting) that the awkwardness of “into or adjacent and existing development” be addressed. The County also unanimously affirmed to tie 5.6 earlier timing (before in-fill) to opportunities of a PRD that would preserve the adjacent lands to the south. •Logically then I would simply change, as staff suggested at the meeting to the commissioners, to along the lines of: “If development does occur, the agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south. into area 5.6. Map corrections already noted to staff – also green changes: •The map on page IV-62 has left out the entirety of northern Flat Creek to HWY 89 portion of the Lockhart’s property. •The map on page IV-36 incorrectly locates the possible school zone expansion line on the southern boundary of the existing High School. Simply bring it up to match the boundary.

Date	Name	Comment
		I hope this is helpful and fully consistent with green changes and/or the electeds direction.
1/12/2012	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	Regarding the suggestion by Ben to constrain all districts with number limits there is a plan to disembowel any flexibility by policy makers in the future as the Plan evolves over the next 5-10 years.
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex and Bruce – I know you have the tapes etc., but following is my take on where the County landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong. Area 5.6 •In-fill first discussion – Outcome = the in-fill language stays. •PRD addition discussion on earlier “opportunities” oOutcome = redraft in-fill section – “promote infill, leave open opportunities resulting in permanent conservation of open space via the PRD - if applications come before “in-fill” (Town and other complete neighborhoods) is accomplished.” ☑Hank added “unique workforce housing opportunities” in addition to earlier consideration before in-fill occurs – but emphasis remains on permanent open space conservation - and workforce housing secondary. •Outcome = Paul V. said no on the housing addition suggested by Hank, I do not have in my notes of any other electeds agreeing with Hank (just Paul Dunker and Peter) – not sure where this ended? oUses in district – residential only – other? – Outcome = residential focus – but a “little bit” of mixed use. oNot sure where staff’s suggestion for discussion on: “Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed” ☑Outcome = These ideas were never discussed by the group according to my notes – and they are red changes. •Boundary of district – Outcome = no change Area 10.1 •Outcome = leave as written Area 10.2 •Outcome = leave as written Good luck the next few weeks compiling all of these “agreed” upon changes – along with what remains as written – plus your green changes.

Date	Name	Comment
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex and Bruce – I know Shawn took notes and you have the tapes, but following is my take on where the town landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong. Area 5.6 •EW connector (South Park Loop to HWY 89) –Tie to development of 5.6. Split on need, intersection with HWY 89 causing problems, whether it would encourage development.... - oSummary conclusion = soften language and mention it as "one of several possibilities" for traffic challenges in the area if that area is developed. •High School road – Summary conclusions = strengthen language to focus more improvements for pedestrians safety, school zone, reduce speed limits, traffic calming etc. as traffic “will always go there” - oBasically that HS road needs to be addressed as both the EW connector and Tribal trail connector will not solve the problems on HS road •Tribal trails connector – Summary conclusion = no changes in language – leave as is •Timing of considering 5.6 for development – - o“Infll first” language should be considered in all new areas (Mark O) – unsure that was generally agreed to or not? - oTie are to growth management plan, urban growth boundary – all generally concurred - oClarify “if necessary” language – make firm, defined, conditional - Melissa - oClarify density - not just “adjacent neighborhoods” – which neighborhoods, Cottonwood Park or Ellenwood (Babara) - oSummary conclusion of Bruce = “tighten it up more, tie to growth management plan” Area 10.1 •Sunmary conclusion = leave as written Area 10.2 •Summary conclusion = leave as written – let the County review •Bob’s comment – connectivity between subdivisions language “too aggressive” – not sure where that conversation ended? Misunderstadings I noticed: Things I learned that you should consider in your introduction to the County group this afternoon: •Clarify that all growth management goals are meet in the indetifed transiton areas while seeking conservation/preservation of the identified rural areas. - oThat an improatnt portion of the paln is to stay within “no more then twice the build environment” •Rodio grounds – current location is committed under a 24 year lease to the fair board. •That the Tribal Trails connector and the east-west conector in area 5.6 are two different road sections. - oThat there is an easment for Tribal Trails but not one for the therotical east-west connector in area 5.6. •That the unmapped exsiting wildlife movement corridors east-west and north-south (apart from the identified Flat Creek coridor that you did map in areas 10.1 and 10.2) is causing some confusion (I know this is a green change I have pointed out – but the current missing wildlife corridors did influence the 10.2 discusson. Items of importance to staff that were never brought up for discussion: •You never brought to disucssion in 5.6 two red items of staff that should be discussed with the County: - o“Add allowance for location of PRD development” - o“Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed”
1/11/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Just wanted to forward this red dot comment list from SHJH. I agree with these comments and strongly urge you to incorporate these logical and forward thinking comments in the character district maps. We need these clarifications that have been supported by the residents of Jackson Hole through out the 5 year comprehensive plan. The more clarification up front will prevent costly arguments and drawn out disagreements over future land development proposals.

Date	Name	Comment
1/9/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	If Save Historic Jackson Hole were allowed to participate in the “Red Dot” exercise this week, the attached list is where we would place our dots. After each dot is a brief explanation of why we would place our dots there. •The Plan must include building and density numbers. - oA Plan without metrics isn’t a real plan. •Any density increase must be balanced with density decrease. - oPermanent Protection of sensitive areas was and is the objective, not town growth. - oProtection of sensitive areas is what was sold to the public and the promise needs to be kept. •No Zoning changes and density transfer until a mechanism is in place. - oWith 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, we have time to get this right. •Protect rural character and small town atmosphere everywhere. - oJackson Hole is all about small town rural character; that’s what we are. - oThe current draft only extends this protection to the Town Square. •Eliminate contradictory and confusing definitions. - oWe can provide a list, but start with “stable” and “complete neighborhoods.” •Do not encourage development in Northern South Park. - oInfill in Town before we sprawl south. - oWe do not want to refight the Porter Annexation battle. •Do not expand the Lodging Overlay. - oThe existing overlay already allows for more lodging, where’s the need to make it larger? We are rarely at full occupancy now. •No Density increase in difficult/sensitive areas. The following areas all have access problems and are adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. They should not see increases in density. - oBetween Broadway and Flat Creek in Midtown and Town Commercial Core. - oSteep hillsides at the “Y” - oCommercial development at the Aspens should not expand across 390.

Date	Name	Comment
1/9/2012	Andrews, Laurie JH Land Trust	In recent weeks, we have received numerous requests from community groups, citizens, and elected officials to comment on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Update, which is now being considered for adoption. We are neither experts on community planning, nor advocates. We do, though, have over 30 years of experience in partnering with landowners to conserve open space in Jackson Hole. Drawing on that experience, we offer the following perspective on the areas of the plan that pertain to open space protection. Our last public comment on the plan, a May 14, 2009 letter, made three recommendations: 1) consider establishing a dedicated funding source for land conservation; 2) preserve development potential in rural areas as a strategy for conserving those areas; and 3) include provisions for clustering and/or transferring development rights. We stand by those recommendations and make the following additional observations. The plan makes many Key Points that align perfectly with our experience of how open space and wildlife habitat are conserved in Jackson Hole: the relationship between agriculture and open space protection; the importance of our valley's private lands in providing habitat and movement corridors for wildlife; the attributes of permanence and active stewardship that are essential to conservation easement-protected open space; the key role of ranchers and other private landowners as valuable stewards of these lands. These are all themes that we know from experience to be true and that we are encouraged to see reflected in the plan. The plan appears to wrestle with a tension between protecting open space through incentives versus through restrictions. In our experience, the best way to conserve meaningful open space is through incentives. This is how we work in a market based environment, with willing landowners. Setting aside the question of fairness, because of the base density rights that private landowners possess, we think it is impossible for this community to zone its way to strategic, high-quality open space. The plan expresses a goal of directing growth into areas of existing infrastructure and services, which the plan identifies as less than 5% of the private land in the county. Insofar as the purpose of that goal is to preserve high-quality open space and wildlife habitat in the remaining 95%, we think it is important that the plan recognize the market preference for base-density development and preserve and create incentives for the conservation of those areas that are capable of counteracting that preference. To put it another way, if you want something other than one unit per 35 acres in the rural area, the only way to get it is through incentives. These incentives should be both strong and diverse, as what works for one landowner in a key habitat area may not for his or her neighbor. Finally, we have increasingly found that smaller-scale conservation represents an important component of our land conservation strategy. Done thoughtfully, the conservation of smaller parcels both complements the protection of adjacent, larger parcels and over time can develop into a pattern of conservation that is greater than the sum of its parts. We have seen this play out in the conservation of numerous smaller parcels along the Snake River, for example, which today constitutes a meaningful network of conserved lands along this key natural feature in the valley. The Planned Residential Development (PRD) tool has been key to this work, as it is the only meaningful incentive for conservation on parcels smaller than 70 acres in size. As the land trust, we can bring to bear capital from private, state, and federal sources, as well as facilitate the federal tax incentives that have helped bring about so much conservation in the past. But to be successful in conserving open lands in Jackson Hole in the future, it is critical that the policies we identify above be included as other legs of the stool, so to speak. Thank you for the opportunity to provide our perspective at this important juncture. We are grateful for the work of the town and county planning commissions, elected officials, and staff and all of the citizens and community groups who have contributed to the planning effort.

Date	Name	Comment
1/6/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Thank you for the intensive work all of you have been doing with the Comprehensive Plan in the last several months, and for your commitment to community goals. I am writing to explain why the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance believes it is important to verify that the new Character District Maps accurately illustrate overall community goals. We agree with your general approach to the Comprehensive Plan: 1.Develop broad policy objectives 2.Generate relatively detailed maps based on those objectives 3.Crosscheck that the maps do in fact match up to the overall objectives We are now at the point in the process where checking the maps against the overall community goals is vitally important, and we would like to provide suggestions on what additional information is needed to conduct a thorough crosscheck. The Alliance agrees that an important first step is to generate a detailed description of the goals for the future of each Character District. You have already identified the location and type of development desired in each area of every district, and determining the desired amount of this development will complete the picture. This is an important step because: •Determining the amount of development desired in each sub-district would enable the community to immediately verify whether the maps are in line with the concrete goals we have established in the policies, including the goal for a 60/40% split on rural/complete neighborhood development, the goal to house 65% of our workforce, and the goal of not exceeding a doubling of current development. •This information forms the foundation for analysis of a range of other issues, including the projected impacts of this development on wildlife, the expected effects on traffic, the fiscal impacts of new development, and the economic viability of commercial endeavors in the area. •Numerical objectives for future development in each district would provide greater predictability, and would make the Comp Plan more understandable to the general public. We understand that the discussion about buildout numbers became very heated in recent years. We recognize that this is not intended to be a “numbers-based plan,” yet the public was told that numbers would “fall out of the mapping process.” There is now an opportunity to provide numerical objectives as part of the description of each sub-district in the Character District Maps. We encourage you to ask the planning staff to provide estimates of the amount of future development that is desired in each sub-district. This step would reduce the confusion that will be generated if people make their own independent estimates, and will clearly illustrate what the plan means for our future. Over the next few days, you will see a newspaper ad by the Conservation Alliance asking whether the maps accurately illustrate the community’s overall goals. Answering this fundamental question is now within reach, and clearly providing answers on the expected amount and location of development is vital to getting the support of the community before the adoption of the Comp Plan. The Conservation Alliance has advocated for responsible planning for 33 years. In order for the Alliance to explain to residents why development regulations are important to the community’s ability to preserve wildlife, scenery, and community character, we need to be able to show people how some trade-offs in their neighborhood contribute to achieving the major priorities of the community as a whole. We believe that residents will support the Comp Plan if they can see how increased development in some areas enables conservation of other areas, and achieves overall community goals. Please give the planning staff the green light to provide this information to you, and to the community, to foster better understanding of the Comp Plan, and better decisions based on that data.

Date	Name	Comment
1/6/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Paul – thanks for the talk this morning. On the corridor mapping – and misses – attached [see acutal comment] is a suggested marked-up map (similar to what was done for other districts) of two general wildlife movement corridors (east-west and north –south) that were missed. I did that with red penciling. There will be some slight language changes needed below also so the focus is not solely on Flat Creek. I have pasted some of my previous comments in again below. The attached again has in red some ideas of mapping that is consistent to other areas. I pasted to this PDF the area by Albertsons (the Y) in Town and also Teton Pines/Aspens maps - for similar examples of how mapping the wildlife corridors was done in other areas. Hope this clarifies what I am suggesting. I pasted the comments [1/3/12 comments] on the two topics we discussed this morning – missing corridors and shifting development to the north (not south) in area 10.2. I am copying Alex as I discussed this with him – along with my other suggestions - at the open house. I have also copied Ben since I reached out to him also. Rich PS I also attached two photos on elk moving through the Seherr-Thoss properties in area 10.2 – this is the movement “corridor” I described that occurs form the north, east and west –then heading south to, or north from, the winter feed grounds along the snake river.
1/5/2012	, Interested Public	Consider moving the old Sage Brush Motel site into District 2.3 to be included in the lodging overlay. This property would be a perfect gateway property into the Downtown district creating a distinctive western edge to the downtown. The site is approximately the same distance from the Town Square as the Rustic Inn anchoring the northern end of the district. The site would be excellent for a high end short term lodging facility taking advantage of its location along West Broadway for easy access for visitors with a development focused on Flat Creek and the views of Snow King Mountain, the Karns Meadow and Saddle Butte.
1/4/2012	Fuchs, Tim Wyoming Game and Fis	The Wyoming Game and Fish Department (Department) has reviewed the document: Illustration of Our Vision- Teton County Comprehensive Plan and offer the following comments. Listed on page IV-47 is a Policy Objective (7.3.b) to “Reduce wildlife and natural and scenic resource transportation impacts”. While we applaud this policy as drafted and feel it has merit, the map on page IV-48 depicting locations of the 2 northern wildlife crossing structures across U.S Hwy 89, raises concerns for our Department. These proposed wildlife crossing structures could funnel elk onto private lands where cow/calf feeding operations take place during the winter months. These crossings could place elk in direct conflict with domestic cattle, greatly enhancing the possibility of elk/cattle commingling and raising concerns for disease transmission (i.e. brucellosis) and damage to privately owned stored hay crops. The Department is responsible for compensating landowners for wildlife damages to stored crops and the location of these crossing structures have the potential to create negative economic impacts to landowners and the Department by funneling wildlife onto private livestock feeding operations. An additional concern we have regarding the construction of wildlife crossing structures in this area is the construction of several miles of wildlife proof fencing in order to funnel wildlife to the crossing structures. We believe the construction of several miles of wildlife proof fencing may force animals into the Town of Jackson. The north terminus of the any wildlife proof fence, would likely end in the vicinity of Snow King Mountain and would undoubtedly funnel animals into more urban areas. The Department requests Teton County reconsider the location of the northern 2 crossing structures. If we can provide you with any additional information, please contact me at the Jackson Regional office, at 307-733-2323. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	District 5: West Jackson 5.6 Northwest South Park area Positive language changes that should stay: •Density now to be similar to adjacent West Jackson neighborhoods •Priority before considering this area is “infill and redevelop other existing complete neighborhoods” Recommendation: We all understood that the intent of the development in section 5.6 was that this area will be developed more intensively in exchange for eliminating development rights on the open lands in the greater South Park area. This should be stated explicitly. Otherwise it implies a massive upzoning of this area while still permitting at least 1 unit per 35 acres in the rest of South Park. Our understanding is that the PRD or other transfer tool is envisioned to conserve the open space, and that the development in 5.6 is seen as the best place to concentrate development to achieve that goal. Please clarify this so that this can’t be read as an upzone in addition to already existing rights on the open space you’re hoping to preserve. Remember also that there are only five large land owners in South Park – dominated by the largest two of Robert Gill and Kelly Lockhart that own and control the entirety of area 5.6 – Northwest South Park. In addition to these 200 plus acres in area 5.6 each owner owns – they also each own another 350 acres in Central South Park (area 10.2) as well as over 600 acres each along the Snake River next to Shooting Iron (greater South Park now in district 9). In summary - area 5.6 could resolve some 2,200 plus acres in greater South Park owned and controlled by these two land owners alone. Corrections: the map on page IV-36 incorrectly locates the possible school zone expansion in on the southern boundary of the existing High School. Simply bring it up to match the boundary. Overarching Misses in Character Maps and in the Themes and Policies: 1.The Character District Chapter needs to indicate potential build-out ranges for both residential and nonresidential development by district. Once released, the community needs to support the ranges in order for them to be approved. This was promised to the community when we got to this stage of the mapping and it is extremely disturbing that those ranges are not already included on these maps. 2.Both the Character District Chapter and Policies must state that a transfer method to enable permanent protection of open space must be in place before increased density in populated areas is allowed. Increasing development potential in certain areas should be a planning approach to uphold the priority of conservation, not for the sake of growth alone. The community firmly understood this is to be the core of the plan – and the electeds have generally agreed this is their intent. This statement of intent needs to be added to both the Themes and Policies as well as in the introduction to the character district maps.
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Eliason, Bert Clair Interested Public	We appreciate the opportunity to make a comment regarding planning for Teton County. We live in Alta, a part of the county that is somewhat removed from Jackson, and also removed from the town of Alta. It is in South Leigh Canyon, directly east of Tetonia, Idaho. We have 1 rather simple need. The need to complete state line road connection to our part of Alta to the main town of Alta Wy. The state line road now stops short of our subdivision. This requires a lot of extra travel for us to get to the main town of Alta. Children attending school in the town of Alta have to be transported to Driggs, Idaho and then back up to the town of Alta. This is an added expense and inconvenience. The completion of state line road would not be very difficult or expensive and would be a great service for those of us living in this part of Alta, Wy, Teton county. Thank you for your consideration.
1/3/2012	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Monroe, Allen Interested Public	I wish to submit comments regarding the Draft Illustration of Our Vision [Character District Development Phase III], which I downloaded at: http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/files/2011/09/111205_District14.pdf . I attended the workshop held at the Alta Library on October 27, and in Jackson this past September. Numerous Alta residents and many of my neighbors were present at the October 27 meeting. I understand each of the subgroups at the meeting mentioned a desire for State Line Road to be completed, across South Leigh Creek to its northern terminus, where it meets up with Beard Road, providing access to South Leigh Canyon trail heads and to various homes in the vicinity. I will elaborate on the specifics of that issue below. But first, I notice that there are three sub-sections of the Character District Development document which pertain to District 14, Alta: •14.1: Alta Farmland •14.2: Alta Core •14.3: Grand Targhee Resort A brief paragraph for each of the sub-districts summarizes key aspects of the vision of its citizens. The following statement is included in section 14.1: Alta Farmland: "A key transportation project for this area which will improve connectivity, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and improve the sense of community is completing the connection of State Line Road to South Leigh Creek Canyon." As chairman of the Roads Committee for our "Forest Edge" subdivision, I applaud Planning for its good job of synthesizing the many comments which have been made by Alta's residents, and including the above language in the draft document. There are some other matters which would be worthwhile to include in the final version of the document, which may warrant a fourth sub-section, 14.4: •The farmland to the north of South Leigh Creek and to the east of Forest Edge subdivision are within wildlife migration corridors, and may be worthy of consideration for conservation easements if the present owners are amenable. Any significant sub-dividing of said farmland would considerably increase the pressure on the Beard Road / South Leigh Road, and could degrade well water quality and availability in Forest Edge. •Additionally, it would be in the community interest to improve the availability of water for fire suppression. •Lastly, because of the high value of the low-gradient gravel road access to the South Leigh Creek trail heads and eastward to the Wilderness boundaries, consideration should be given to the development of pathways connecting the rest of Alta to the area. The foregoing summarizes my comments, and the following provides further background and detail as to why completing the connection of State Line Road to South Leigh Creek Canyon is of great importance to Alta residents on both sides of South Leigh Creek. I am a resident of the Forest Edge subdivision, and am concerned that the bridge on State Line Road that used to cross South Leigh Creek has not been replaced. Since Teton County, Wyoming and Teton County, Idaho entered into an agreement whereby Teton County, Wyoming maintains the stretch of State Line Road which runs from Ski Hill road to the northern terminus of State Line Road, and whereby Teton County, Idaho agrees to maintain the stretch of State Line Road south of Ski Hill Road, the northern part of the section to be maintained by Teton County, Wyoming seems to have "fallen through the cracks." My neighbors who have been present for more years than myself indicate that Teton County, Idaho originally put in the bridge in, and that lack of regular maintenance caused extensive degradation. When a hay swather was attempting to cross the bridge, it got stuck in rotting timbers, according to Bill Beard, who owns property adjoining South Leigh Creek. The timbers on the bridge were removed by Teton County, Idaho, in 1979, and the rest of the structure was removed at a much later date. The frame of the bridge was still in place in 1993 according to Pete and Leslie Mead, who own an adjoining property. Some of my neighbors were informed several years ago that funds had been appropriated for improvements to State Line Road to its northern terminus, including a crossing over South Leigh Creek. But actual construction work stopped about a mile south of the crossing. Some of the residents 1/2 mile or more north of Hastings Lane, who had granted easements across their properties, were never officially informed as to why the work was not actually performed. From what I have garnered in discussing this with the County Commissioners, there were a couple of residents who were unwilling to grant easements.

Date	Name	Comment
		Many of those who are anxious that the bridge be replaced are willing to engage in discussions with these residents to see if common ground can be reached, and with the County Engineer to examine modest re-routing possibilities if other solutions cannot be found. My discussions with the County Commissioners indicate that maintenance of State Line Road north of South Leigh Creek is not performed by the County due in large part because it is not connected to the remainder of State Line Road across the creek. And that the road would be maintained properly if there were a crossing over South Leigh Creek. Currently, due to the lack of a crossing, there are numerous problems: •"Official" maps, as picked up by such mapping sites as Google Maps, Mapquest, and Yahoo, show State Line Road as being continuous across South Leigh Creek. Therefore various people who use such maps try to take the route, and cross the creek. Some of them get stuck in the creek, and at high water, there are risks of being swept away. •Possibly because of the problem with maps as referenced above, the local Fire Department has failed to respond to a fire in the subdivision in a timely manner. A crossing over the creek would improve the timeliness and reliability of emergency responders, and better-protect life and property in our part of Teton County. •When the Forest Edge subdivision was first approved by Teton County, the assistant superintendent of schools testified that: "For purposes of our education impact analysis, we used an occupancy factor of .25 and a student population multiplier of .25. This analysis would indicate when the total development is achieved the student population generated would be 1.6875 students. It is important to note that this is the first subdivision development that has been located in such an area that these students generated from the development would be unable to attend the Alta Elementary School. In accordance with Wyoming statutes, we would therefore have to provide isolation payments to all students K-12. If our student analysis proves to be in error, the school district would have to request from Teton County a possibility of opening the road going north from the Alta Elementary School." [State Line Road] It should be noted that there currently are 4x as many K-12 students north of South Leigh Creek as had been projected using the formula described above. oVehicles crossing South Leigh Creek at State Line Road cause petrochemicals to enter the pristine trout stream. Discussions with Friends of the Teton River indicate support for removing this source of pollution to a key tributary of the Teton River. oVehicles which try to take State Line Road but which don't cross South Leigh Creek due to high water or other perceived danger often cross Jim Price's adjoining property without permission, and cause damage to crops and potential damage to Jim Price's private bridge. oThe lack of a crossing wastes a lot of fuel and time for residents who wish to go from places situated south of South Leigh Creek to places north of South Leigh Creek. For example, Google Maps shows that the "preferred route" from my house at 4240 Leigh Lane, Alta, WY to 1040 Alta North Road, is 4.9 miles long, takes 19 minutes, and crosses South Leigh Creek. The actual route out to Hwy. 33 is 16.3 miles long, and takes 35 minutes. oBicyclists need to have safer routes. For those wishing to access South Leigh Canyon from parts of Alta south of South Leigh Creek, it is necessary to use Hwy. 33, if they don't wish to cross private property or go through the creek. There have been a number of recent fatalities on Hwy. 33 to bicyclists, and a safer route is needed. oTeton County, Wyoming recently improved the South Leigh Road, eliminating drainage problems which plagued local residents every spring and fall. But the section of State Line Road north of South Leigh Creek remains a morass during the rainy season. Photographs are available. We are most appreciative of your efforts in crafting a workable vision of the future for Teton County. We hope these details, though a bit lengthy, will be helpful in achieving that goal. I have volunteered my time and presently serve on the Teton County, Idaho "Teton 2020" transportation subcommittee. Idaho residents also have indicated a strong desire for completion of State Line Road and improved road maintenance, and we are hopeful that the two Teton Counties can begin a constructive dialogue in that regard.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•The reference to preserve workforce housing stock does not make sense. •Wildlife crossings are critical for wildlife permeability.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•Any structure to divert or direct the flow of any river or creek to enhance private property should not be allowed. •Snake River Sporting Club should be restricted from expanding this resort.

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•Wildlife concerns should be the #1 priority. •Visual screening to and from the Hwy should be a priority •Workforce housing in the industrial area 7.1 has not been successful. Heavy business and Industrial use areas do not mix well with residential.
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•Further subdividing of this area should not be allowed unless the property is surrounded by similar density that is proposed. •Indian Trails Subdivision should not be dissected into 2 different districts. They are controlled by the same covenants, HOA, etc. The fact that the northern part is just outside the radius for schools should not be a determining factor. This makes no sense. •Policy 5.3.b. Preserve existing workforce housing stock. How does one control the sale and purchase of independently owned homes? Putting limits on the FAR allowed may keep the homes in a more affordable price range that appeal to a working class of people.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•The Northern Broadway area should not allow greater density than is entitled. This is inconsistent with Comp Plan vision. The increase of development surrounding the Karns Meadow is not compatible with a wildlife crossing and wildlife movement corridor. Preservation of wildlife habitat, permeability, scenic and ecological values should be prioritized above recreation and development. There may be too much human activity to encourage wildlife to migrate through the Karns Meadow area. Fencing the hillside above North Broadway so that wildlife can not cross Broadway below, should be considered.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•The redevelopment into 2 to 3 story buildings where one story presently dominates has the potential of increasing the densities and driving growth over and above current entitled development. This will change the character, bulk and scale, of the district. Where is the tradeoff to neutralize in another district? •There is no mention of western character in this district, why not? •Preserving scenic and ecological values of Flat Creek and Cache Creek should be the #1 prioritized goal verses recreation.
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	General comments that are consistent with all districts: •I support and agree with the overall comments made by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance and Save Historic Jackson Hole. •Without a transfer mechanism or specific mapping of the districts where density will be decreased, there is no reason to map potential density increases over and above current entitled development to any district. Passing this part of the Comp Plan without at least an amending the themes and policies to clearly reflect the commitment to keep growth at the same level of 1994 entitlements. •Show us the numbers that reflect the decreases in the areas where a decrease in density can be accomplished and where the resultant increases should be made. How will this be implemented – on a case by case basis? A “score card” needs to be kept as a commitment to the community that this plan does not produce unwanted additive development. •The PRD tool is the elephant in the room and needs to be dealt with immediately. •Every district has lofty goals that will involve funding. Who will pay for these improvements? Will these costs be spread among all districts via property taxes? Will new or re-development pay excise and connection fees that represent the investment the community has to make? •An analysis of our roads and infrastructure must be done to see at what level of development unacceptable levels of service, county-wide and district wide, will occur. •The maps are too vague and without numbers no one can predict what will be in their back yard – predictability.

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Attached are Save Historic Jackson Hole's comments on the Character Districts/Illustrating our Vision December 5, 2011 Draft. The comments are organized in three categories. The first are General Comments and Recommendations that apply to multiple districts or the overall strategy of this chapter. The second category includes comments and analysis of each District with a summary of the proposed changes as we understand them, our concerns and questions, and our recommendations for improving the document. The third category is a detailed analysis of each District with our recommended changes. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. [actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Gorney, Robert Interested Public	My reason for writing is for the completion of State Line Road from 5000 North to 6000 North. I have lived here in Forest Edge Leigh Canyon , Wyoming, just north of 6000 North State Line Road, since 1995. The residence in this area have been trying for over fifteen years to get the road completed. The original plat for Forest Edge was approved with certain provisions being met. One of those provisions was for the completion of State Line Road. Allen Monroe, a neighbor, has made a more detailed comment to Jeff Daugherty for the reason for completion which I have inserted below;
1/3/2012	Jordan, Tom Interested Public	Having reviewed the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance Character District Comments (and recommendations), I support those recommendations. I agree with the need for more specificity and clarity regarding growth and growth caps. I am concerned that the cost of growth will be placed on existing tax payers. I am concerned that the Plan in defining Character Districts fails to adequately integrate those districts with adjoining districts and within the Town as a whole.

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	I would like to express additional comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan Character Districts specific to Districts 5 & 10, West Jackson and South Park respectively. One key point going forward is the definition of the Plan matrix which defines, in circle form, (Existing Characteristics Chart IV-2) the weights of attributes of each district. I would contend that Both Districts 5 & 10 receive a "full circle" on viable wildlife habitat connectivity and natural scenic vistas. If you do not live in this wonderful part of the community perhaps you would not see our abundance of wildlife each and every day, or appreciate our vistas as we go about our daily lives. This recognition alone provides the platform on which the residents of these districts have been working so hard to protect from build out and density earmarks. It is the cornerstone of our plea for the continuation of open space and what is left of the rural nature of these two districts. With that said, I do support the most recent Alliance letter to the above parties on recommendation #6 & 7. "Recommendation #6: Execute a rapid assessment of wildlife impacts of the proposed development pattern, or authorize the NRTAB to do so. Recommendation #7: Insert more explicit considerations for wildlife permeability in the following districts: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13 (I would include district 10). Why have we not commissioned the expertise of the NRTAB to provide such an analysis so we may look at the issues for wildlife permeability ? Given the public outcry for wildlife preservation as priority number 1, I would think this study would have already been completed in conjunction with recommendations for future growth. Taking a look at District #5 in the Comprehensive Plan (5.3), it is recognized that this stable district already supports the majority "of community workforce housing and every effort should be made to ensure this neighborhood retain its vitality, cohesiveness.... An important goal is to maintain a strong sense of ownership and community in the area." Given these facts, it would be in everyone's best interest to continue to support safety and integrity of this vital area for both it's residents,school children, and wildlife. By the continuation of support for a connector road (Tribal Trail Connector) through the very heart of this district (pg. IV-35), we would destroy the very neighborhoods we are trying to envision and maintain. Currently, most traffic in this area is school demand at peak school hours. The best solution is to provide enhancements to High School Road for residential, pedestrian, and school access priorities. It is not in the best interest of our community to divert daily commuter traffic though and around town intersections into our neighborhoods as a connector road would certainly do. Last, attention to Comp Plan section 5.6 must be clarified. This section does not provide the necessary definition and direction for the future of Northwest South Park areas. Growth Management goals must be clear and concise and not determined at a later date"if necessary" . This area holds some of the best remaining parcels of open space which can define our valley for future generations. The Plan (Existing & Future desired Characteristics IV-35) talks about the "enhancement of the southern gateway into Town with improved visual appearance" as a key goal of importance. Now is the time to clearly define that gateway so that existing open space and scenic value remain permanent for all to share and enjoy. As always, thank you for your time and dedication to this process.
1/3/2012	Kosydar, Christine Interested Public	My husband and I own a lot on South Leigh Road that we hope to build on in a few years. After reviewing the plan, we support it. In particular, we support the preservation of farmlands with development encouraged in the core area of Alta. We purchased our lot to avoid the developed areas of Driggs. We intend to preserve as much as possible of it in its natural state, and we hope and expect that our neighbors will do the same. Had we wanted to reside in a development, we would have purchased a home at a far lesser cost in a one of many existing neighborhoods with less expensive homes in the Driggs area. Driggs is an example of what we don't want. It has failed to develop an appropriate plan and as a result, it is a scattered hodgepodge of developments that have destroyed many beautiful and valuable acres of farmland.

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	[photo also attached] The two districts I will be commenting are in greater South Park. Clearly the community cares deeply for this region given that citizen input tallies are greater for the South Park district by a factor of two, or more, than any other district in the County. The character district descriptions for this region are now much more responsive to community input then the previous versions. I have some overarching concerns that remain in the plan but would like to offer some very specific corrections, clarifications and suggestions for improvement of Districts 10 and 5 – South Park and West Jackson. Overarching Misses in Character Maps and in the Themes and Policies: 1.The Character District Chapter needs to indicate potential build-out ranges for both residential and nonresidential development by district. Once released, the community needs to support the ranges in order for them to be approved. This was promised to the community when we got to this stage of the mapping and it is extremely disturbing that those ranges are not already included on these maps. 2.Both the Character District Chapter and Policies must state that a transfer method to enable permanent protection of open space must be in place before increased density in populated areas is allowed. Increasing development potential in certain areas should be a planning approach to uphold the priority of conservation, not for the sake of growth alone. The community firmly understood this is to be the core of the plan – and the electeds have generally agreed this is their intent. This statement of intent needs to be added to both the Themes and Policies as well as in the introduction to the character district maps.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•The clear up-zoning and density increases for this area of significant to heavy wildlife use is not appropriate. •There appears to be an attempt to re-zone the “Rains Property” and the area purchased for investment by the TCHA to high density affordable housing by just this mapping. •Hwy 390, is not designed and cannot handle the level of development suggested in all of the sub areas. WYDOT has taken any timeframe for re-design and re-construction off the table. •The opportunity to create redundancy for road connections does not exist so the intersection of Hwy 390 and HWY 22 will degrade as more development occurs.

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	District 10: South Park Identifies 10.1 Southern South Park and 10.2 Central South Park South Park Neighbors is extremely supportive of the important recognition now included in the text and maps of this areas scenic, open space and wildlife values. All of that should remain as is. Improvements and Recommendations Missed Existing Wildlife Corridors: Recommendation: Identify the east-west wildlife corridor across 10.2 (Central South Park) associated with the already mapped wildlife crossing on HWY 89. •Add the existing east-west wildlife corridor through the northern end of Central South Park (10.2). Also expand the language in the text to identify the more diffuse large wildlife movement corridors north-south in areas 10.1 and 10.2 that exists beyond just the Flat Creek corridor. For the last thirty years of wildlife collision data the highest mortality on HWY 89 from Smiths to the Hoback Junction is the section from Smiths to Rafter J. The text recognizes this important wildlife crossing and partially the associated corridor - but has misstates some basic biology. The map of this district should also identify this important east-west wildlife corridor in area 10.2 (Central South Park) west of Flat Creek. Collisions in this area on HWY 89 include mule deer, moose and elk. A large percentage of the collision data show that elk use this area to cross. Clearly this species is not traveling down along the important Flat Creek riparian corridor but rather from the north through South Park and east across to the Snow King highlands - as well as back and forth between the Snake River and across the district (east- west) and HWY 89 to the Snow King highlands. Movement also clearly occurs diffusely north to south to their winter feed grounds. See attached photo to this email that documents one of these crossings last winter. In the existing general text you do note “the intensity of wildlife vehicle collisions on South HWY 89 shows the importance of the District’s open space for wildlife movement...” In the area 10.2 specific description you get the basic biology incorrect by stating “The most important of these open spaces is the area between Flat Creek and the highway. This are not only provides the scenic gateway in Town, but also provides an open area for a wildlife crossing of the highway that would feed wildlife into a preserved Flat Creek corridor.” Recommendation: This needs to be corrected to acknowledge the existing movement corridors that are actually east and west – and also occur much more diffusely through the open spaces in the entire district north-south (not solely along Flat Creek). •The Flat Creek riparian strip is of critical ecological importance but the primary large ungulate movement corridors are actually the open spaces outside of this stream – again east to west and north to south beyond just Flat Creek. Shifting Development in Section 10.2: In the 10.2 section, it states that "agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south." Why north and south? Recommendation: This should be stated simply “to the north”. Given the 200 plus acres identified in Northwest South Park (area 5.6) – now part of District 5 (West Jackson). •This is especially true when the two primary land owners Robert Gill and Kelly Lockhart own and control both the lands in Central South Park (sending areas) as well as the receiving area next to Cottonwood Park in northwest South Park (area 5.6). Interconnectivity of Subdivisions in Area 10.1 (Southern South Park):

Date	Name	Comment
		Recommendation: This section should clarify that pathways are more suitable than roads to achieve interconnections between the various neighborhoods in Southern South Park. •Pathway easements already exist both north and south in Rafter J and Melody Ranch subdivisions. In Melody Ranch the HOA has opposed in the past any takings to achieve road connectivity. In reality that would require the use of eminent domain by the taking of dedicated open space, several home lots and homes - as well as the purchase and taking of the entirety of the private roads within the Melody subdivision. Not only is that financially unachievable – is it clearly legally challengeable. The cost of this action would be in the neighborhood of \$8-10 million dollars. Over Reaching: •START and a future potential new Elementary School are probably not realistic given the current and future density in this area. Corrections: •The map on page IV-62 has left out the entirety of northern Flat Creek to HWY 89 portion of the Lockhart’s properties.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•I believe it is a mistake to allow condominium/penthouse type of residential or non-residential whether it is for tourists, second home or full time use in the town square area. I think it is more appropriate outside of the Town square district. At least, limit this to a small percentage of the building. •I agree with limiting the square to 2 stories above grade. •Please keep the western character theme of the town square. Departure from the “cowboy” theme for more of a western, mountain rustic theme may reflect more of what blends with the current age of the various buildings around the Town Square. •I hope that any redevelopment will encourage and hope to require back door deliveries in the design of the buildings. Large semi’s delivering products blocking traffic during busy times has been a problem. •Limiting the first floor throughout the Town Square area to only types of businesses that generate sales tax will limit a property owners rights and may be discriminatory.
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	General comments on all Districts: -Without estimated build out ranges by District the Plans and Character District Maps are worthless. If fails to meet the most basic requirements of planning. How can we Plan when we do not know where we will end up? -There is no need to upzone any areas during the life of this Plan. We have sufficient capacity under the current regulations to allow growth for the life of 3 to 5 Comp Plans. (At 10 years per plan and 5 years to update) During the life of the next Plan we can determine methods to achieve the Community Goal of permanent protection of open spaces. This protection should be linked so that any increase in density is offset with a permanent decrease in another location. -The Character District Maps should commit to protecting of historic western rural character and small town atmosphere in all Districts, not just the Town Square. -Lodging overlay should not expand. We only fill all the lodging in the Town and County a few weeks of the year during the summer. Adding more lodging will make it more difficult to achieve the goal of increasing tourism during shoulder seasons. -Higher densities are not appropriate along Flat Creek. The narrow strip of land does not allow enough room for setbacks from the Creek. Development close to the Creek will cause problems with runoff into the Creek. -It is a contradiction to say that several districts are complete neighborhoods, but have no defined character. -It is inconsistent with the Policies to state that Resort Districts will not increase in size or density, but say that they are "transition" areas. -It appears the Plan calls for the taxpayers to fund public parking so that developers do not have to provide parking. This is not consistent with the public's desire to have development pay its own way. -The diagram showing the transition of development from Town Center to Rural County in both Plan and Elevation views is very confusing and needs to be reworked.

Date	Name	Comment
1/2/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	After exploring your vision of the character districts of Teton County Wyoming, I encourage you to provide an appendix or glossary for the entire Comprehensive Plan. A layman, such as me, has a hard time understanding your meanings of the following terms in the context of this plan. Corrective actions Enhancement High quality Complete neighborhoods Predictability Community Character Explore Exemptions Encourage Vibrancy Compatible redevelopment (Is this not an oxymoron?) Local downtown Local convenience commercial Stable Transitional This document is at best vague without definitions. Does stable mean the same thing in Chapter 5 as it does in your Character district chapters, or does it mean, without change, as in the dictionary? I found that the Character Districts "Illustration of Our Vision" read nicely. It resembles a Hallmark card, "Wish You Well." Assuming that there are 20 thousand tax payers in the valley today and you have spent \$500,000 on this plan, that is 25 bucks a taxpayer. Who could complain about that? I would have probably taken that 25 bucks and thrown it away on groceries. Perhaps I would have bought open space, but I'm now in the hole. This comprehensive plan process has truly affirmed my understanding of politics. Thank goodness that most of the large land owners have been such stewards of the land and wildlife. I applaud their patience, the communities continued involvement, and of course your politics.
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	-Higher density is not appropriate for steep hillsides at the Y. This area is isolated from the rest of the community by the Highway making access for vehicles and pedestrians difficult. Any solution that attempts to resolve the isolation will be very expensive and will require the community to pay to assist development. It also further encroaches on critical wildlife habitat. It is not consistent to allow dense development adjacent to an area in the County that is identified as an area to preserve. -Making this area "the local's downtown" is not consistent with the vision that the downtown area be shopping for tourists and locals. If the goal is to make this the local's downtown then take out statements that we want locals to go downtown. -High density around the perimeter of Karn's Meadow diminishes its value for wildlife. Town should be permeable for wildlife, this point is especially important for Karn's Meadow.
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	-Given that current regulations allow sufficient growth for 50-75 years (much longer than the Plans expected life of 10-15 years) there is no reason to develop the Northern portion of South Park during the life of this Plan. It should be identified for the future, but we should be clear that it will not be developed until we have built out Town. That allows time to investigate methods to achieve the community goals of permanent protection of open spaces. -An East-West connector should be completed prior to any development in Northern South Park. Attempting to build it after development will be difficult.
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	-Snake River Sporting Club should be discussed in this section. It should not be ignored because it failed.

Date	Name	Comment
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	-Increased density at the Aspens is not appropriate. It is already very dense and increased development will make traffic problems on 22 and 390 worse. -Increasing density at the Aspens east of 390 is not appropriate. It will require expensive solutions to link the two areas for both vehicle and pedestrians. These solutions will require taxpayers to subsidize the cost of development.
1/2/2012	Koster, Ken Interested Public	This is so typical. I made comments about ten days following the meeting held in Alta. Since then, nothing after having provided my name, address, telephone number and email address at the meeting. Now here is a last minute request for a response! I will make my comment very brief. State Line Road needs to be completed up to 6000 North. Reasons were presented at the Alta meeting and do not need to be rehashed here.
1/2/2012	Miller, Lorna Interested Public	I am writing to express concern about the overall treatment of wildlife in this plan. I'm having a difficult time trying to figure out how to make my comments relate to the way the concepts are organized because virtually the entire valley floor is wildlife habitat in one way or another. Just because you identify an area as a Complete Neighborhood doesn't mean the animals will stop trying to move through. We see this all the time right now with deer in town or various species of wildlife in Teton Village. I divide my time between Teton Village and Butler Creek. I must tell you that I see more varied wildlife, more frequently (Moose, deer, foxes, coyotes, porcupines, bears) in the residential area of the Village than I ever do at the Fall Creek Road location. I feel strongly that addressing "permeability" should be an overarching goal in all character districts. The ecosystem is interwoven through the entire valley not just in the areas that have been identified as Rural: to think otherwise is wishful thinking In the character defining features section, I find the "design for wildlife AND/OR scenery" to be problematic. Does this mean there are scenarios envisioned where scenery is given priority to the exclusion of wildlife? A great deal of public comment on the plan did, I thought, put wildlife at the top of the priority list. Why is it not "Design for wildlife AND scenery?" This section also refers to "Agricultural Exemptions" under Special Characteristics (IV-6). I sincerely hope you do not intend to enshrine the current agricultural exemption for "wildlife friendly fencing" in this new plan. It is a false notion that you cannot contain livestock with fencing that is "wildlife friendly". To retain this exemption means that the concept of permeability will not be effectively supported in this Plan. The most egregious wildlife Unfriendly fencing in the valley has been constructed under this exemption. A couple of examples in 2011 are: The Pinto Ranch in Buffalo Valley where a 52" height top rail, FOUR rail buck and rail fence with a minimum 42" spread was constructed between the Buffalo Fork and the Park Boundary; This fence is exclusionary not permeable. The Doshay Property between the Gros Ventre River and the Kings Highway /Queen's Lane area. Most of this property is now fenced with exclusionary style buck and rail fence. The newest construction this fall placed the 52" high buck and rail fence along the edge of a deep irrigation ditch. On the south side of King's Highway. In effect this is total exclusion. This property also has a conservation easement on it with the JHLT. So, at the moment, the current Teton County Ag exemption for fencing allows wildlife exclusionary fencing to be constructed on lands that have conservation easement for wildlife values! There are numerous other examples: Spring Gulch. The 4 rail 52" high buck and rail fence along the west side of Spring Gulch Road on JH Land and Cattle property, some of which is JHLT conservation easement. The 52" high Buck fence on the east side of the road is built of steep slopes making the effective height much higher. The 5 strand barbed wire fence with a top rail at 52"+ that runs east-west across Spring Gulch Between JH Land and Cattle and the Box L (Lucas) Note: This is also conservation easement on the JH Land and Cattle property but the easement is held by the Teton County Scenic Preserve Trust!! It is ironic that the image chosen to illustrate the "Rural Neighborhoods with Conservation Opportunities" on pg IV-4 features most prominently a buck and rail fence! I hope that permeability and connectivity will be given serious consideration as the Plan moves forward and not merely lip service. Wildlife cannot know where the boundaries between Rural and Complete Neighborhoods are. It is up to this community to figure out a design and a plan that allows us to live compatibly with wildlife. Thanks for the opportunity to comment
1/1/2012	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Lodging overlay should NOT include narrow strip along Flat Creek. Too many issues. Not existing lodging. Too narrow. Threat to already threatened Flat creek, no parking, etc. Cowboy Village Resort SHOULD be in it's entirety

Date	Name	Comment
1/1/2012	Cummings, Kathy Interested Public	The character district "County Valley" makes no mention of the airport and its impacts on the valley and the wildlife. The airport generates considerable noise and light pollution, plus ever increasing traffic on the roads. To ignore it in the Character District leaves the district description incomplete, and makes it difficult if not impossible to implement mitigation measures.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We support the limited growth in this district, as well as the recognition of wetlands, wildlife values and community character.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: In section 7.1 we have to be sure to plan so that we can fit the light industry in this district and not focus excessively on this as a mixed-use area, in an effort to keep light industry from overlapping into other districts. Since we are recommending that the Gregory Lane area transition away from industrial use in the future, we would need to be certain that we can accommodate all future light industry needs for the county within district 7. This might mean less emphasis on residential use in 7.1. b. We are supportive of the wildlife considerations in section 7.2 c. Recommendation: In section 7.2 it will be important to clarify that habitat concerns trump scenic concerns. That is, development in this area should be predicated on finding a place with less wildlife impacts not on finding a place with less scenic impacts.

Date	Name	Comment
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Thank you for the extraordinary amount of work that each of you has put into the Comprehensive Plan and Character District Mapping processes. As we near the conclusion of this public process, we are appreciative of your commitment to the community's goals and values. To assist in this process, we would like to provide you with some detailed feedback on the draft Character District Maps that were released in early December. Enclosed is a memo that highlights some of the principle concerns, questions, and recommendations that we have about the Character Districts maps overall, as well as some thoughts on many of the individual districts and subareas. Also highlighted are areas that we believe the Character District Maps cover quite well. We look forward to continuing to engage in the Comprehensive Plan process in the coming months and working towards a product that the community can embrace. Thank you for your work. Comprehensive Plan Character District Maps: Overall Comments There are several overarching questions we have about the Comprehensive Plan Character Districts, and we have identified some topics that could benefit from additional analysis and exploration. Broadly, our primary concerns are outlined here along with recommendations that we think will improve the final product. Many of these broad concerns and suggested actions also apply to many of the distinct character districts. More specific comments and recommendations about each of the districts that are not covered in the broader points are included in the next section of this report. Implementation Plan and Regulations: An Implementation Plan will be a critical component of the finished product, set for adoption in April. We have made several recommendations in our November 30th letter and report with regard to this Implementation Plan, and specifically with regard to the Character Districts. There are several additional issues that warrant consideration. There are many sections of the Illustration of Our Vision document that implicitly call for specific regulations to be developed. The forthcoming Implementation Plan should prioritize these regulations so that they are developed and implemented as soon as possible. Examples of such regulations include: agricultural exemptions, density transfers (some districts mention strategies that appear to be district specific, some county-wide), clustering tools, mitigations, building permit timing allocation systems, definition of local convenience commercial, lot consolidations and associated allowances, minimum and maximum lot and structure size, wildlife protection standards (fencing, ponds, etc), among many others. Second, as part of the Implementation Plan, a feasibility study for START should be executed. For example, the Character District descriptions mention bus service to Kelly, but without the relevant data we cannot be sure that that is a realistic goal given the small population and relatively remote location. Shifting Development Patterns: One of the primary tenants of the Comprehensive Plan is the goal of directing development potential from the rural areas in the County to the Complete Neighborhoods, identified in the Character District descriptions. The question remains, how will we achieve this shift? It is important to answer this question as soon as possible to let the community know what they can expect from future development and conservation efforts. Without knowing how this shift will take place, the goal is merely aspirational and leaves us without any answers. This fall, the Alliance brought Mark White to Jackson. Mr. White is an expert on regulatory tools to shift development patterns, and suggested several approaches that are suited to our particular community. The timeline for acting on regulatory tools should be outlined in detail in the implementation plan. That said, the Illustration of Our Vision section covers quite well the locations and types of development increases throughout the valley. However, the opposite side of the equation, the decreases, are not as well described. Often, they come couched in the goal that with redevelopment of certain areas, density and intensity of development will be decreased. This may discourage reinvestment and redevelopment, and is not satisfactory as the primary tool for decreasing development in undesirable areas. This decrease must be clarified and described such that the community can understand where development will not occur in addition to what the maps lay out as places suitable for growth. Recommendation #1: Within the implementation plan, create a clear timeline to explore and implement regulations that can meaningfully shift development patterns. Recommendation #2: In the Character District Maps, provide a better description of where decreases in development are most desirable, rather than focusing primarily on where increases in development are planned. Amount of Growth: Additionally, the community has asked repeatedly for numbers associated with the proposed development pattern in the Character Districts. In fact, the introduction to the Illustration of Our Vision section states "the community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure that preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location and type." This is laudable goal, but without a more accurate estimate of the amount of development that is desired or expected, it may be an unachievable goal. The community was told that the numbers would

fall out of the mapping process. The commitment to a rough doubling, the 60/40 split and the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally are good starts, but are not sufficient. This section should also clarify what “rigorous analysis of our successes and failures” means with regard to implementation of our goals.

Recommendation #3: Provide estimates, on a district level as well as a countywide level, of the approximate amount of residential and commercial development that can be expected from this Plan.

Recommendation #4: Clarify that the overall amount of growth is not to exceed what is currently entitled, and demonstrate that the plan is working towards this goal by providing rough projections for each district.

Recommendation #5: Clearly define the “rigorous analysis” that you anticipate doing.

Wildlife Impacts and Considerations:

A rapid assessment of the projected wildlife impacts of the development pattern illustrated in the Character District maps should be completed and incorporated into the maps section prior to adoption, and perhaps some changes should be made to the maps depending on the outcome of the assessment. With this, we can begin to understand the impacts of our desired development amount, type and location on our areas’ wildlife.

Wildlife permeability in new and existing development needs to be an even stronger consideration throughout the Plan. Certain districts, like the Town Periphery, cover the idea quite well while other areas would benefit from more explicit commitments to wildlife permeability. Many areas in our community, even in Town, are within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public lands. Buttes, riparian areas, and more broadly, open spaces, provide important wildlife habitat. Development that occurs in or near these amenities must account for wildlife movement and the resulting regulations for these areas, when they are written, must also respect wildlife permeability.

Recommendation #6: Execute a rapid assessment of wildlife impacts of the proposed development pattern, or authorize the NRTAB to do so.

Recommendation #7: Insert more explicit considerations for wildlife permeability in the following districts: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13

Predictability:

The document as a whole needs an increased focus on actual predictability. For example, on the page “What Does the Illustration of the Vision Address”, point number 6 suggests a lack of predictability, whereas it is

one of the central tenants of the Plan according to the introduction. Further exploration into this idea is warranted. Additionally, without estimates of the amount of development proposed, this plan lacks the predictability it aims to achieve.

As we explained in Recommendation #3, we recommend that you provide estimates, on a district level as well as a countywide level, of the amount of residential and commercial development that can be expected from this Plan.

Prioritization:

The first page of the Illustration of Our Vision references ensuring “that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten.” It is important at this point to clarify that the community values enumerated in the Vision are prioritized.

Recommendation #8: Clarify the language to prioritize the community values as the policies do.

Definitions:

The definitions of areas of stability, transition, preservation and conservation are helpful and indicate a commitment to achieving community goals.

The gradient on the page entitled “Character Defining Features” is a key component of the Plan, and needs to be improved upon somewhat. The “clustering” image should better illustrate allocation of open space, as the current image implies a landscape dominated by structures with very little open space. Also, it will be important to clarify whether clustering tools will be available on parcels smaller than 160 acres; a formal review of the PRD tool as well as other density shifting or allocating systems would help to answer this question.

Recommendation #9: Correct the misleading graphic of “clustering” on the gradient map,

Recommendation #10: Determine how to best review the results of the PRD tool, and include a timeline for this review in the implementation plan.

Costs of Growth:

Recommendation #11: The costs associated with the growth described in the Character District should be addressed in introduction to the Illustration of our Vision section. Growth must pay its own way, and the direct and indirect costs of development must be considered.

Enforcement:

Recommendation #12: The introduction to the Illustration of Our Vision section should mention the importance of enforcing as strict as possible adherence to the intent of the district maps.

Recommendation #13: The introduction should clarify that the transition zones between character districts should not cause incremental encroachment of the character of one district into a neighboring district. In other words, character district descriptions should be closely adhered to, regardless of the character of a neighboring district.

Date	Name	Comment
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: In the diagram on the first page of this district, we should aim to make “viable wildlife habitat and connectivity” a “half circle” in the future column, and clarify that enhancements to Flat and Cache Creeks should be explicitly ecological b. It will be important to ensure that excessive lodging not overwhelm housing and other commercial development in this district c. Recommendation: Flat Creek corridor enhancements in this district should be focused primarily on ecological enhancements, and setbacks and other considerations should be explicitly mentioned in this chapter. Future enhancements should focus on the creek as a community amenity that prioritizes scenic and ecological values over recreational opportunities. d. Recommendation: Section 2.2 should include a commitment for new development in this area to take into account existing neighborhoods and work to integrate into them rather than overtake them with inappropriate bulk and scale.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: In section 3.5, the statement “parking should be minimized” should be replaced with “surface parking should be minimized.” This leaves more options for other approaches to dealing with parking. b. Recommendation: Also in section 3.5, the reference to “some limited local convenience commercial” should be more tightly defined. You may be referring to the often-discussed idea of a small grocery store, but “convenience commercial” could mean a wide range of other uses.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are very supportive of the references to natural resource values in this district b. Recommendation: In section 4.2 it would be helpful to add a statement with regard to keeping bulk and scale down. We are also supportive of a wildlife crossing in this sub area. c. Recommendation: In section 4.5, the last sentence should be amended to read, “Moving forward, wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational amenities in this sensitive location.”
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: Section 5.2 should be amended to recognize that this area is already trending towards housing and complete neighborhood attributes, and should be encouraged to continue to do so, given the close proximity to schools, a grocery store, pathways, and Flat Creek. This is an ideal location for “complete neighborhood” attributes, but given recent developments, it is no longer a particularly good location for industrial uses. Industry should be focused into District 7. b. Recommendation: Section 5.4 should commit to repurposing High School Road primarily as a residential access road and not a highway. c. Recommendation: Section 5.6 needs to be clarified with regard to the lower priority of development in northwest South Park. We are supportive of efforts within the Growth Management Plan to proactively allocate development to certain areas of the County before others. D. Recommendation: In section 5.6 there is mention of a “neighborhood planning effort.” This term must be better defined to include plans for roadways, public areas, pathways, and other components of development in such a large area. The neighborhood planning should happen prior to accepting any development proposal, and should include a rigorous review of any major development application by the public and the elected officials, beyond that required by an ordinary development application. This is extremely important given the large scale of proposed development in this area. E. Recommendation: We believe that the intent of the development in section 5.6 is that this area will be developed more intensively in exchange for eliminating development rights on the open lands in the South Park area. This should be stated explicitly. Otherwise it implies a massive upzoning of this area while still permitting at least 1 unit per 35 acres in the rest of South Park. Our understanding is that the PRD or other transfer tool is envisioned to conserve the open space, and that the development in 5.6 is seen as the best place to concentrate development to achieve that goal. Please clarify this so that this can’t be read as an upzone in addition to already existing rights on the open space you’re hoping to preserve.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are supportive of the mentions of wildlife corridors and permeability in this district.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. District 8 is excellent overall. In particular, we support the emphasis within 8.3 on future redevelopment being designed to enhance scenic and wildlife values of the area.

Date	Name	Comment
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are supportive of the important recognition of scenic values as well as open space and wildlife values in this district b. Recommendation: The description of this district should also identify important East/West wildlife corridors as areas that should be protected c. We are supportive of the wildlife focus of Flat Creek, as it is not a suitable area to prioritize recreational amenities. D. Recommendation: This section should clarify that pathways are more suitable than roads to achieve interconnections between the various neighborhoods in South Park.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: Please clarify that there should be no increased commercial development on the east side of highway.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. This district description is particularly aspirational, specifically with relation to the needed amendments to the Resort Master Plan. How will this take place? b. Recommendation: This district should include explicit mention of the goal to ensure that future commercial development serves the resident population at the Village and does not generate additional vehicle trips. Without immense increases in the local convenience character of current and future commercial development in this district, the residential development will merely generate a significant number of trips on the already busy Highway 390.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. This district description is good overall.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: In the diagram on the first page of this district, it seems that natural scenic vistas warrant a completely filled in circle in the existing and future columns b. We are supportive of the focus on scenic values in this district c. Recommendation: This description should clarify that the transportation goals are centered on improving existing roads and access points and not building new ones. d. We are supportive of and encourage environmentally sensitive roadway design. e. Section 15.2 says “future development will be clustered in and around existing neighborhoods.” Since we believe that the intention is not to expand the neighborhoods within each of the four areas identified as 15.2, some clarification is needed. Otherwise this could be read as creating new “nodes” within these rural areas, especially since the maps also show “Workforce Housing” as a goal within each area of 15.2. If possible, it is probably preferable to shift development totally away from District 15 and into Complete Neighborhoods and section 15.2 should probably say something to that effect. Of course, we would need some new regulatory tools to enable that sort of shift to take place, as we have said before.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are supportive of the mentions of both wildlife crossings and wildlife permeability in this district

Date	Name	Comment
12/20/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Thanks for the opportunity to spend a great deal of time chatting about the Town Periphery District #6 at the December 7th open house. I very much appreciate the courtesy and time accorded my questions and comments. One of the primary goals of land use planning is PREDICTABILITY, not vague language which allows flexibility. Use clear, unequivocal language which demands future land use be predictable. Following are additional comments based on the published (December 5, 2011) Existing @ Future Desired Characteristics of District 6, Town Periphery. 1.IV-41 Eliminate: "Further subdivision of land should ("should" is an enabling verb – use "must") be in keeping with surrounding character but is appropriate in order to further the growth management tools of the plan". What does the verbiage in italics actually mean? I think it actually means that anything goes if it furthers the growth management tools of the plan, which are fuzzy at best. The plan must be absolutely clear that subdivision MUST be consistent with surrounding character and DENSITY, i.e. single family homes on large lots. Either eliminate the entire statement to be consistent with the statement which later appears in Upper Cache 6.2: "Future subdivision will be in keeping with the traditional development pattern with no increase in density than exists on the ground today. On each lot, only a single family dwelling will be allowed", or use the exact same verbiage both places, the second statement is clear and concise. 2.IV-41 Eliminate: "Pedestrian/bike amenities such as pathways will be added to connect these areas to surrounding district with Complete neighborhood amenities and to connect the community to adjacent public lands." Where can pathways be added? Currently, there are three accesses to public lands up Cache Creek and this statement is redundant because of the following: 3.IV-41 "Consideration of alternative mode improvements will be made on collector streets such as Cache Creek Drive. These improvements will serve to enhance safety and provide connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians to surrounding districts with Complete neighborhood amenities and to connect the community to the adjacent public lands." Simple suggestions for improving the shared use of Cache Creek Drive: #1- post speed limit of 20 miles per hour and enforce it; #2 - speed bumps which are effective for cars and bikers (both often come down Cache Creek Drive at high speeds) ; #3- trim the willows back on the corners to greatly increase visibility. 4.IV-44 6.2 Upper Cache: Eliminate: "while other commercial uses producing large amounts of traffic and high impacts should be reduced." What commercial uses produce large amounts of traffic and high impact currently? There are none!
12/16/2011	NeVille, David Interested Public	I was at this meeting and do agree with Paul [Cote] that this was the discussion and general consensus of the community in Moran. Please know that this is a voice embracing Paul's concerns for our community.

Date	Name	Comment
12/14/2011	Cote, Paul Interested Public	My concerns revolve around the lack of specific response to the concerns of the citizens of Moran as expressed at those earlier meetings. As I recall, the primary concern of the citizens was to maintain the viability of the community here in face of the changing demographics. Mainly, that we are losing our middle class families and being populated with older part time residents without children in this community, nor the same level of involvement in community affairs. Maintaining the viability of the community should be a specific goal for the Moran/Buffalo Valley area, but nowhere do I see that mentioned. An essential part of this goal would have to include affordable housing in the Moran area, since working class families with children are priced out of the housing market, even now, when prices are reduced. Where is the affordable housing plan for Moran? Having families with children is essential to the community since a certain school age population is required to keep the Moran Elementary School open. The MES provides a cultural core for the community, and also makes it viable for our largest employers (Grand Teton Lodge Company, Park Service, Forest Service, and Signal Mtn Lodge) to attract and retain employees. Representatives from both GTLC and NPS spoke directly to this issue at the last meeting. The other part of the families with children issue is that that demographic also provides the most volunteers for the Moran Fire Station, another important institution hovering on the edge of extinction. There are currently only about 10 members, barely enough to keep it going. I would like to see a plan by the County to identify and purchase properties to be used for affordable housing with some requirement that residents of such be involved with the MES and/or MFS. There are also partnering possibilities with the GTNP in the Moran area itself. This might include the Park providing the land and utilities for housing, and the County, using affordable housing funds, to build the structures. Of course, such units would be rentals, but even so, the goals of bringing in families and populating the school and fire department would be addressed. The other glaring problem of Moran is the lack of commercial zoning to provide basic services to both residents and visitors on a year-round basis. The only such existing area is the Grand Teton Park RV Campground. This property makes the most sense for this type of activity since it is more centrally located than other possible sites, and it is already a developed site. Oddly, it is partly zoned BC and partly rural, in a fashion inexplicable to me. I feel the zoning issue on that property should be clarified with the intent to encourage such uses. As an alternative, the County should identify what other areas of Moran it feels would be suitable, if not this one. The preservation/conservation goals, while having some merit, seem out of place to me since Moran is already 99.9% park, forest, and open space in conservation easements. How much more do you want? Can you point out any significant parcel that is wildlife impermeable? With the existing SRO and NRO overlays (which I presume are not going away), this goal has already been met, and should not override the goal of maintaining the viability of the community. Really, though, I don't see some small expansion of commercial activity and 6 to 8 units of affordable housing as being threats to the conservation and preservation goals. If properly done they will coexist quite well. So, to recap, this is my best recollection of the bulk of the discussion at that meeting, yet I see almost none of it reflected in the plan. If we were to have another meeting, it would be to find the black hole into which our input disappeared, and to reiterate our resolve to get the County to respond to our needs as we, the residents, have expressed them. I am cc'ing this to other folks who, as I recall, were at the public hearing referenced by Alex, so they might comment on line, since it appears we will not have the opportunity to do so in person. To those of you receiving this via cc, please feel free to add your comments or forward this note along to others who may be interested.

Date	Name	Comment
12/13/2011	Hagen, Audrey Interested Public	First, thanks to all who have been tireless in their involvement in this public process. Wow! Whatever the zoning outcome, I hope we can have work, shop and living all together in the "greater" downtown area. I wish it could be flexible and encourage (instead of hinder) small scale projects that create more living/working/shopping spaces. I hope that the zoning changes allow our family the economic viability to continue to live on property that has been in the Hagen family for 80+ years. I want S. Cache to be busy and vibrant and livable for our family all at the same time. I must admit that sometimes this whole process has seemed so overwhelming and filled with such conflicting viewpoints that it is hard to see the end! Audrey P.S. I love everything about living downtown except the front end loaders and plow trucks at 3:30 AM!! -- I think the public works department does a great job, I just wish it wasn't so early in the morning!! I hope that part of this plan defines how town services (lighting, plowing, etc.) can coexist with residential as well as commercial.
12/13/2011	Wolf, Jim Interested Public	The proposed character for the 3.2 district is very unfavorable to the existing neighborhood residents. It would basically open up the old AR-2 zone to wide 3-story multi-family development throughout, with fewer restrictions than the very undesirable PUDs The continued mixed-use content content is satisfactory However the plan does not recognize the several quite-different nieghborhood pockets within 3.2: Glenwood vs Historical vs Art Center periphery vs Karns, etc On the smaller lots, the principles are satisfactory: 3 units with alley, 2 without, 2 stories On the "larger residential lots and along mixed-use commercial corridors" ...multi-family... "in order to replace existing commercial uses and to blend the borders of the Commercal Core with the Residential Core", you open Pandora's box. Probably 70%+ of the 3.2 lots could be argued to fall in this category. Recommendation: make the definition stick to "existing commercial uses" and to the "MHPs and Urs" and preclude the accumulated 3- and 2-lot current residentail uses. This will reduce some of the speculation in this zone and will offer mid-block protection for existing residents while permitting eventual conversion of the large nonconforming parcels. Second, completely avoid going to 3-story structures. These are totally incompatible with this area and do not exist elsewhere. Even the pre-1994 multifamilies went only to 2 stories. There is no way an existing 1-lot existing resident can abut comfortably with a new 3-story structure. This appears to be a naked sop to the developer/speculator group. Recommendation: apply the same guidelines to the new multi-families as to the mixed use office, e.g. "same bulk, scale and intensitiy". There is enough lateral flexibility to create multi-families at the existing density of about 17 units/acre.
12/13/2011	Prugh, Greg Interested Public	I echo Jim's [Wolf] conversation. However, there needs to be a reason to renew this category and for people to reinvest in town. What is the reason?
12/13/2011	Adams, Justin Interested Public	The town still has a chance to redevelop along the lines of Anne Frame's example. Officials need to stop talking about upzones that encourage landowners to hang on for a higher selling price and let the town develop. End the affordable housing exaction and the energy exaction and give yourself a competitive advantage against the county. Also, the threat of an affordable housing ghetto going in next door diminishes the incentive to follow Anne Frame's example. The officials seem quite content to preside over a town of resort employees, affordble housing, and illegal workers. This does not build value for anyone.

Date	Name	Comment
12/12/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Below are my written comments concerning the Planners' open house on Thursday. Thanks to the Elected officials and staff who dedicated so much time to explain the Plan and listen to community concerns. First, I appreciate the steps taken towards conservation in Middle and Southern South Park, the affirmation of its scenic, rural and wildlife connectivity values as well as its value as the gateway from the south. And I like the commitment not to develop the Northwest corner of South Park before infill in town is complete and also to require potential development in that section to match the character of the existing, adjacent neighborhood. The acknowledgment of a need to address the highway wildlife crossings is commendable (although I would like to see the widespread East-West wildlife connectivity drawn on the map as is the North-South corridor along Flat Creek). These kinds of positive steps towards conservation and preservation serve the community well now and for the future. Second, as a general principle, it is best to err on the side of too little development as opposed to putting as much as possible in targeted areas. Development does not need a head start. All development has social and environmental costs associated with it. The Comprehensive Plan should do as much as possible to ensure that the doubling of development now on the maps pays its own way as it is obviously unsustainable to use growth to solve growth related issues. Future generations will have to defend this ecosystem against the weight of an increasing wealthy global economy. The Plan must foster permanent preservation of open space, wildlife habitat and scenic vistas as large profit margins will always tempt us to overdevelop in a piecemeal fashion. In many parts of the world clean air and enjoyment of nature are already so rare they are available only to a privileged few. Let's not let that happen here. Finally, for the sake of clarity, predictability and transparency of government, please release the build-out numbers for each district. Ranges are fine. The community is smart enough to understand the difference between a worst-case, maximum build-out scenario and what is likely. People are aware that there is already a huge amount of development potential embodied in current property rights. That's why we've all agreed not to add new potential. People can't know what their neighborhoods will look like or what the overall impact and cost of growth could be, without knowing the amount and type of development possible in each district. In addition, business decisions are better made in a predictable environment. At a time when trust in government is at an all time low, it is important to be as transparent as possible in the process.
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Where quality public space has been identified as a core characteristic, LDR's need to reinforce integration of design professionals at the earliest phase in the development process if we are to benefit from public art that have been thoughtfully integrated into the design and serves a function in the development.
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Our culture and heritage are a core component of what makes Jackson Hole a quality place for people to live, work and visit. To encourage the future vitality of creativity in our community and to continue to benefit from the positive economic impact creative professionals have on our community, live-work spaces need to be planned for and even subsidized as part of our affordable housing pool. The cost of property is a key factor in young talented creative professionals moving to other communities. Live-work spaces also reduce traffic and add character to our neighborhoods. Developers in the Town Square and commercial core should be given incentives to include live-work spaces for creative professionals who may be producing visual arts (fun to watch artists working from ground-floor studios open to street/level), who are producing creative intellectual or digital capital or who work for arts and culture organizations.
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Cache Street is a major artery anchored by the physical features of GTN Park and Snow King with the Elk Refuge in the middle. These natural wonders connect us directly to our lifestyle of recreation and environmental conservation. Our culture and heritage institutions exist along this artery, the NMWA, Historical Museum and the Center for the Arts. This artery also supports visitor services such as Home Ranch Welcome Center and the GY Visitor Center. Building added value into development along Cache Street will allow for a greater economic impact and connection to our commercial core, the town square. This artery should visually demonstrate, through well-designed public space and the inclusion of public art, the unique values we share as a community.

Date	Name	Comment
12/8/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	Hi! I'm just writing to reiterate a couple points I've made in person. 1. I'd love a bus stop at the PO in Wilson that is for local travelers to and from town, not just folks commuting over the pass. 2. I think the bike path from Wilson to Jackson should be made a top priority. The section needed over fish creek would get used all the time by foot traffic in Wilson as well. 3. If there must be more development in Wilson, I think the style/density of the attainables on 3rd street could be expanded to several more blocks headed north. 4. I love the idea of a median in downtown Wilson, as well as pulling buildings to toward the road so that parking is behind them, creating a little commercial plaza. Thanks for all your hard work!
12/7/2011	Jesse, Dennis Interested Public	5.2 and 5.3 Redevelop to more intense uses with more stories; highway enhancements make sense; like Redmond; landscaping. 5.6 More residential single-family; allow affordable units for younger families; better as wildlife habitat and also has a view corridor but fences prevent wildlife; the road as proposed makes sense, critical; South Park Loop should not connect to 22; path along the creek should be public on either creek whether there is access by people or not.
12/7/2011	Blann, Jerry Interested Public	Character should be western, not Bavarian. Allow non-residential (non-profits) in Village Core. Future commercial buildout?
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	1) ingress egress important 2) walkability focus - great 3) community convenience and visitor commercial should expand opportunities 4) make a more complete neighborhood, local convenience 5) transportation and walkable focus is good 6) mix use is good. Don't allow too much height.
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	Districts 2 and 3: Include Cowboy Village completely in district 2. Make sure we have options--put into L.O. entirely. Maintain drive width along South Cache--don't narrow. Leave Pearl as it is. Elk Country Inn. Maintain and expand sales tax base. Need more people in 2 and 3.
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	Maintain equine use on Cache Creek neighborhood. No sidewalks necessary. No further improvements to Cache Creek Drive--keep as is.
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	Leave development incentive tools in place to protect Spring Gulch; otherwise we condemn it to 1 per 35 ranchettes if we strip PRD incentives
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	1.1 Like 2 story limit on town square; interesting active pedestrian; regulate uses on the first floor--no banks/office; pocket parks and interesting; crabtree hotel location; pull people off square; gallery association; more events
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	Keep incentive tools respect property rights while achieving 60/40 goal.
12/7/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	Move district 2 South Cache boundary up to and including both sides of Willow. Mixed use along Willow corridor. Need a sidewalk along the west side of Willow all the way to Snow King. Consider Willow and Cache as 1-way streets. 0' front yard setback.

Date	Name	Comment
12/7/2011	Baur, Donna Interested Public	5.2 Like the Gregory Lane concept. 5.6 Road makes sense. Should similar same as single family. Like range view which is more stable or affordable. No commercial.
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	Galleries are a good use in downtown bring in sales tax and attract people to the area, support the tourist economy.
12/7/2011	Dietz, Bruce Interested Public	Allow commercial uses along Willow Street. Traffic volume already to high to support residential uses.
12/7/2011	Varley, Jay Interested Public	Need to reduce size of lodging overlay to concentrate around the Town Square. Create a gateway to downtown at the Flat Creek bridge using the bridge and water as a theme. Utilize alleys to allow more density and reduce curb cuts on the street.
12/7/2011	Johnson's, T. Interested Public	Continue sub-district 4.1 to the east to include all the AC zoned property fronting West Broadway. Add a stop light along West Broadway at Virg. to increase pedestrian connectivity between north and south sides. Slow the speed along West Broadway to 20 mph to address wildlife issues instead of an expensive over/under pass. The mule deer herd in this area is shrinking or gone no need for an overpass/under pass any longer. Deer cut outs and statues attract the deer should not be allowed. Address commercial uses in residential areas.
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	5.2 restore Creek - no trail, wildlife corridor 5.6 restore Creek - no trail, wildlife corridor 13.1 Drawing - remove soccer field, expand rec center
12/7/2011	Washut, Harry Interested Public	15.3 Why has Buffalo Valley/Moran community been left out as its own district? Like Alta, it is its own unique community and should have a say in its own future. The local blend of resort, local commercial and dude ranches should be able to upgrade and offer the latest needs of the tourists winter and summer which helps preserve the local community. The existing commercial development associated with the resorts in the area should be given resort (small) designation with lodging overlay which would allow rebuilding of existing commercial to meet the current needs of the traveling public, helping out the foundations of our community.
12/7/2011	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	Need Snake River bridge redundancy
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	1.1 Like the 2 stories. Western/mountain rustic is the correct word. Pedestrian mall is good.
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	5.2 Makes sense to redevelop industrial buildings. Pedestrian amenities make sense. Restoration of Flat Creek makes sense. 5.6 Like east-west road
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	2.3 Flat Creek concept makes sense.
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	6.1 Combine with 5.5, development could occur in conservation easement beyond, wildlife crossing is a challenge 6.2 Agree with this description 6.3 Makes sense
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	3.1 and 3.2 Encourage owner occupied housing; "ownership and community;" corner lots could be multi family large house

Date	Name	Comment
12/7/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	NO complete streets. Increase wildlife permeability in other areas, particularly Snow King Estates, east of Rancher
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	10.1 Some connectivity makes sense; some open space should continue (correct in document). 10.2 Like scenic corridor near 89 up to gateway; do not want South Park Rd to be widened; continue bike path on south park rd; like preservation designation because flood irrigation has positive impact on 3 creeks area for trout
12/7/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	11.1 Like concept, workforce housing limited to 2 story, should be designed differently to avoid cookie cutter; too much industrial modern look; more in character with the area. Add text about bus stop and infill near general store. Bike path from Wilson to town. 11.3 Continue the small lots into 11.3. Wilson medical and associated park could be better used with smaller lots and affordable units. Walkway ends and should continue to town.
12/7/2011	Baldauf, Jill Interested Public	Wilson character district is reflective of comment offered to date.
12/7/2011	Dietz, Bruce Interested Public	Adjust the boundary between Districts 2 and 3; move District 2 boundary to Willow and enhance Willow in the same fashion as South Cache; new boundary should include both sides of Willow Street. 3.2 Allow office uses, especially when proximate to existing office uses.
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	5.6 Like open space corridor as gateway; should be less dense than Cottonwood to transition into rural preservation; lower density on south edge and higher density to the north; road east-west is ok to get people to highway and reduce traffic on south park road to south; stream enhancement for wildlife
12/7/2011	Waldrup, Jim Interested Public	Along Broadway to Glenwood/Milward north side consider 4-story stepped back
12/7/2011	Walker, Christine Interested Public	12.1 and 12.2 Like concept. 12.3 and 12.4 Like year round workforce concept
12/7/2011	Wang, Louis Interested Public	"Predictability" is not provided--implication that plan provides predictability is "dirty pool;" if it is more predictable say more predictable. "Stable" don't label something stable if its going to change--confusing to the layman. "Complete" neighborhood--complete implies continuous adding; remove complete
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	12.1 Not a problem except concerned about wildlife. 12.2 Still have a problem with that, there is a lot of wildlife there. 12.3 Concern about fencing; good about pedestrian connection across 390 but NOT necessarily within Pines and Aspens just an expense that isn't necessary
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	8.2 need bridge to cross river to get to Fall Creek Rd
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	13.1 Need to be clear that there is an expansion of commercial/residential; like description but needs to be its own community to decrease driving
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	3.1 Should have Buds drawing and small commercial, bar, restaurant
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	4.1 Like START bus location. 4.4 Like description

Date	Name	Comment
12/6/2011	Koster, Ken Interested Public	Received notice in mail today (12/6) which certainly does not allow for planning to attended your 12/7 workshop. Please recall one of the primary topics discussed at the Alta meeting. Completion of State Line Road from 5000 North to 6000 North.
12/6/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex - Yup – saw it finally go live during the JIM. Thanks. I will have some input, suggestions and corrections naturally. With that aside - having skimmed all of it (all districts and introduction) – I do want to thank the planning team as this approach on finally putting lines on the ground – and the detail within the descriptions (at least verbally and visually – as we are still missing the extremely important “Appendix I”) - is the right direction forward. We know the rub is how we actually move development from rural to existing or new expanded centers – while leaving the incentives in place to permanently reduce the development potential in those critical rural areas (via permanent open space easements) – all within our cumulative existing remaining development potential (approximately double our current built environment). But that has more to do with some stronger affirmations and commitments within the body of the themes and policies – so it is clear on where the LDRs changes should be focused - and what goals are to be achieved. Kindly let me know when the one-page 60/40 spit build-out numbers summary (as Jeff explained to the electeds yesterday afternoon) is ready for public consumption - as I know you will have it for the open house. Also please explain the timeline for an updated “Appendix I” with build-out ranges by district – and in aggregate. I would hope we have that well before the January joint meetings (electeds and planning commissions). We all expected that to be part of this phase of the maps. Again – I want to acknowledge the amount, and quality, of work the planning staff has put in – and the responsiveness to public feedback that I do see in character districts 10 (South Park) and 5 (West Jackson) especially. It is appreciated and noted. Although I, along with my neighbors, continue to still have specific concerns – we have come a long way to improving the characterization for the future of the greater South Park region. As your lead in sentences for the South Park district states so well: “The South Park District is, and will continue to be, the agricultural southern gateway to Jackson. The existing agricultural open space that defines the character of the district provides a scenic foreground for Teton views, wildlife habitat connectivity, reference to heritage and stewardship ethic, and a quite rural setting for residents.” You can pass my positive reception on to the planning team.
12/6/2011	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	I do not think you have the wildlife corridors plotted correctly. You show them in Green running sort of North East to South to South West through the Aspens/Pines district. My place is in the Berry Patch and from what I have observed and seeing other areas directly North of the district, wildlife moves more East West through the area. I pointed this out to a planner this fall during an open house at the Art Center.
12/6/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	Hello, I saw an ad in the paper (run by Save Historic JH) decrying the recent community meetings as "manipulative" and I just wanted to write to let you know that I found them to be exactly the opposite. The meeting I went to was open, informative, and extremely well run. The planners are doing everything they can to get people's feedback and interpret it in the context of what is possible. I felt my voice was heard, and I found it an interesting and engaging process to be involved in. I was honored how seriously they took my feedback, as a fairly recent transplant with no city planning experience. The planners are a tremendously thoughtful, positive, motivated bunch and they deserve a ton of credit for the work they are doing.

Date	Name	Comment
12/2/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	[Petition submitted by Patty Ewing signed by 20 others. See comment for signatures] This letter documents the future character of the “Town Periphery” district which we, the undersigned, desire and expect. We have used simple language to make comparison with the forthcoming Land Use Regulations straightforward. The Town Periphery is a low density residential neighborhood which borders the un-developed public lands of the National Forest and Elk Refuge. It is not unusual to see deer, foxes or moose in our yards. It is a quiet neighborhood with large yards and open views to the mountains. We want it to stay that way. We ask that you design Land Use Regulations which are predictable and preserve our existing neighborhood character and we look forward to a review of your effort in the coming months. Desired Future Character of “Town Periphery” District •Large lots (1/3 acre minimum) •More open space than structures •Permeable to wildlife •Planned Unit Development subdivision not allowed, such high density is incompatible •Properly maintain Cache Creek Drive, do not make it a “complete street” like Redmond •Horses allowed •No new commercial enterprises needed or desired

Date	Name	Comment
11/30/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance believes that the community, the planning staff, and the elected officials have made great progress towards completing a valuable Comprehensive Plan to direct development in the coming decades. The policy document that you have approved is not as detailed as the Alliance recommended over the last several years, yet we recognize that it is an acceptable way to approach Comprehensive Planning, and it may very well achieve the community's goals if it is accompanied by strong Land Development Regulations. We appreciated the opportunity to work with staff on the Character District mapping and help to reengaging public participation. We look forward to the results of this productive process. Still, much remains to be done in the next several months. As you move towards the ultimate adoption of the Comp Plan, the Alliance will continue to provide you with information and recommendations. Our goal is to be a valuable asset to the community and the elected officials in this important work. We strive to provide recommendations to help achieve the ambitious goals of the new Comp Plan, as well as recommendations that we believe will help address the primary concerns of the community members that you represent, many of whom are members of the Alliance. As always, we welcome any feedback on our work. In the next several months, we strongly encourage you to look for ways to continue to actively engage the community in this important discussion. The participatory methods you have used recently have made this process much more accessible to the countless people who are intimidated by microphones and formal letters. As you review and solicit public comments for each Character District, we ask that you continue to use methods that keep the discussion open to wider range of participants. We suggest working on individual districts to inform your choices as you make hard decisions about which issues and opportunities to pursue. The Alliance would be happy to refine suggestions on how to best do this in discussion with the planning staff. We are including a detailed report with this letter, which outlines our primary objectives for the Comp Plan process between now and the eventual adoption in the spring. Our two broad recommendations are: 1. An Implementation Plan should outline exactly how meaningful progress will be made towards achieving the priorities of the community 2. Maps should illustrate community priorities and provide details on the desired future of Jackson Hole Much more detail on these recommendations is provided in the accompanying report. We feel it is important to provide you with this information at this point, as you consider how to best plan your work for the coming months. Please take some time to read through our proposals, and contact us if you'd like to discuss any of these ideas further. The Alliance would love to see these next steps implemented so that the community can support the final adoption of the Comp Plan. Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance Position on the Comp Plan Theme 1: An Implementation Plan should outline exactly how meaningful progress will be made towards achieving the priorities of the community Overview: The Alliance recognizes that the Comp Plan serves primarily as an aspirational document that outlines the primary goals of the community, but doesn't resolve how we will actually achieve those goals. Assuring that the community's priorities actually are achieved has been central to the last several years of Alliance comments, and widespread public mistrust of the Comp Plan process seems to largely revolve around a lack of confidence that the Comp Plan will result in meaningful change. The Alliance is well aware that much of the specificity and predictability that the Comp Plan is supposed to provide will be addressed to some degree with the maps, but will primarily be achieved via upcoming revisions to our Land Development Regulations. However, in order for the community to trust that this Comp Plan will lead to truly effective LDRs, we need to clearly see that steps are being taken to achieve the priorities expressed in the Comp Plan. In addition to responding to public concern, we believe that outlining these next steps will enable more effective implementation after adoption of the Comp Plan. The Alliance recognizes that creating LDRs that implement the community's vision will take considerable time and expense, yet we all know that doing this well is a top priority for the public. Before the adoption of the Comp Plan, we strongly recommend that a detailed and realistic Implementation Plan be created, presented to the public for comment, and included as an integral part of the final adoption proceedings. The timeline of this

Implementation Plan could stretch over several years, to match the needed scope of work to available planning staff time and budgetary constraints. Detailing and publicly committing to these next steps prior to adopting the Comp Plan will not only allay the concerns of residents, but it will also provide a roadmap for action to ensure that we ultimately achieve the community's objectives over the coming years. There are many key points that should be addressed in this Implementation Plan, and clearly some issues must be addressed very early in the process, since other decisions will need to rest on a strong foundation of the core LDRs. We will briefly highlight key points that the Alliance believes should be addressed in the Implementation Plan.

Key Points:

1. Regulatory tools to shift development patterns are vital to the success of the Comp Plan. Rigorously researching a wide range of potential tools should be a top priority, as these tools lay the foundation for achieving many of the major goals of the Comp Plan.

The Alliance sponsored a presentation by land use regulation expert Mark White to illustrate 16 different regulatory tools that could be used to achieve the desired development pattern in Teton County. Mr. White strongly recommended that research and development of these policy tools begin immediately, to provide a better sense of what sorts of development shifts might be achievable in Teton County, and to reduce the delay between the adoption of the Comp Plan and the implementation of regulations that can meet the objectives established in the plan. For a link to the Alliance letter on this subject, a summary of the presentation, and a copy of the full presentation, please go to:

<http://jhalliance.org/Library/Comments/2011/CompPlan11/ShiftDevPatternsComments.10-21-11.pdf>

It is vital that a clear plan of action is prepared to explain exactly how you will proceed to develop LDRs that will direct development in ways that meet the ambitious goals set by the community and by the Comp Plan. The Alliance does not expect a consensus in the immediate future on which regulatory tools to use in Teton County, but we would very much like to see clear progress and commitments towards this important goal. That should include drafting a request for proposals from qualified experts on this subject. We also recommend scheduling a detailed review of the effectiveness of the current PRD tool, perhaps as part of the broader work of exploring possible regulatory tools.

2. Identify how and when unresolved issues within the Comp Plan will be addressed.

As we discussed last spring, many policies in the Comp Plan essentially say that key issues will be "explored" or figured out later. That may be fine, but a formal list of these unresolved issues should be created, and should identify who is responsible for figuring these issues out, by when, and with what budget. We're aware that you may not get to some of them for years, but these unfinished policies should be addressed systematically, and in the order of priority that seems most appropriate to you.

3. A permanent funding source for the preservation of open space, scenic areas, critical habitat, and migration routes must be established.

We hope that the work the Alliance is doing with the Land Trust and the Trust for Public Land will lead to the creation of this funding source for Teton County. However, if that initiative doesn't work out, it would be very important to create a different mechanism that will generate funding for the implementation of the priorities of the Comp Plan. This will provide you with flexible funds to use as needed when other options don't work.

4. A more detailed plan to improve our natural resource regulations should be developed

There are many approaches that we could take to improving our natural resource regulations, and the Alliance is pleased that the NRTAB can provide guidance on how to best review and improve our natural resource management. Broadly speaking, we believe that the NRTAB could better serve the community if it is given a clearer mandate and a small budget for exploratory work. We encourage you to work with NRTAB to build a timeline for review of natural resources regulations, and a modest budget, into your implementation plan.

5. Greater specificity is needed on the scope and methodology the Growth Management Plan.

The current Growth Management Plan is more reactive than proactive. In addition, within the existing policy document, the Growth Management Plan doesn't clearly explain what sorts of "Corrective Actions" might be appropriate if the next few years of development don't meet the objectives established in the Comp Plan. Different people seem to have very different understandings of what "Corrective Actions" might entail. Since the Growth Management Plan is central to the success of the Comp Plan, the Alliance recommends that you review this section of the policy document, and consider adding more proactive elements to this important portion of the plan, as well as additional detail about what sorts of corrective actions you envision.

Theme 2: Maps should illustrate community priorities and provide details on the desired future of Jackson Hole

Overview:

Community members and planning experts agreed that the inclusion of detailed maps as an integral part of the Comp Plan is extremely important to increase the specificity and predictability of the plan. The Alliance is pleased that you agreed to complete the maps and include them in the final adoption of the Comp Plan, and we want to make sure that these maps provide details that accurately reflect the community's priorities.

Maps provide an important opportunity to generate a clear picture of the desired future of Jackson Hole. The public has been told that the maps will produce a detailed illustration of the land use changes and community character changes that people should expect to see in the coming decades. We

have also been told that “numbers will fall out of the mapping process,” and that projected growth will stay within a rough doubling of the population and will be distributed so that no more than 40% of new growth will occur in rural areas. The maps are the opportunity to clearly spell out the amount of expected future development, and thereby demonstrate that your plans are working within the boundaries that you have committed to. At this point we have not yet seen the maps that illustrate the public input from Phases 1 and 2 of the Character District Mapping. There are several basic components that we would like to see addressed in the final maps, and we are hopeful that several of these may already be sufficiently dealt with in the maps that will be presented on December 7th. We expect to send you more detailed feedback on the maps once the draft maps are available for public review. Meanwhile, below are some key points that we believe the maps should cover.

Key Points:

☐ Maps should illustrate the location, type, and amount of growth in each character district

The public has requested this level of detail for quite some time, and the maps make it within reach of completion. Since the maps will illustrate the desired future character of all areas of Teton County, they will inherently show the location and type of growth that is planned. It is a relatively straightforward matter to calculate an estimate of the number of new residential units that can be expected in each area. This would clearly respond to the desire of residents to see some details on what is planned for the future of their neighborhood, and would enable a more comprehensive look at how much growth we are planning for overall, and where most of that growth might be.

Providing as much detail as possible on the expected location, type, and amount of growth is foundational to any efforts to plan effectively. Generating estimated growth projections for each Character District would provide valuable information for use by the public and for frequent use by elected officials and planning staff.

☐ Overall plans for growth should not exceed the amount of growth currently entitled

Demonstrating that future plans are in fact working within existing entitlements, rather than creating additive growth, will be simple once the amount of growth is identified as explained above. This will also demonstrate your commitment to not exceeding a doubling of the current population of Teton County.

☐ A rapid assessment of the projected wildlife impacts of this development pattern should be completed before adoption

The Alliance has already submitted a request that the NRTAB provide guidance on how to best conduct this type of rapid assessment. Since the County Commissioners rejected that proposal, we request that you find another way to get some sense of the projected wildlife impacts prior to adoption. Minimizing impacts on wildlife is a top priority for the community, and it seems wise to get a sense of expected impacts to respond to this overriding concern. The Alliance is interested in working on this rapid assessment using whatever methodology seems most appropriate.

☐ “Issues” and “Opportunities” for each Character District should be discussed in detail by elected officials, and preliminary decisions should be made regarding which issues and opportunities will continue to be pursued in greater detail.

Public comment has generated an extensive list of issues and opportunities for each character district. To the extent possible, elected officials should review these options and begin making the hard decisions that are needed. Public input on the ideas for each Character District should be solicited to better inform these decisions.

☐ Clearly connect the Comp Plan policies to the maps.

The current policy document does not clearly explain the important role of the maps. Legally defensible language is needed in the policy section of the Comp Plan to clarify the degree to which all future land use decisions must align with the maps.

Date	Name	Comment
11/29/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	As you prepare materials for Phase III of the Character District Development process, we ask that you consider the following comments and suggestions. Phase III needs to provide clarity and predictability Predictability on the amount of growth has been a key request for years – Phase III must respond to this. Without this predictability, the needs of the community will not be met in what will be a five-year planning effort. Phase III needs to be consistent with Community Vision and Good Planning ☐ In order to respond to requests for predictability and clarity, the revised Character District maps need to indicate potential buildout/numbers specific to each district. (You can't really plan without numbers. In order to plan for basic infrastructure, transportation and parking capacity, and set up a system where new development pays its fair share of the costs, the community needs to clearly understand potential amounts of growth in various districts. Without a clear picture in mind, we could just make incremental changes, year after year, to the detriment of the community.) ☐ In order to respond to community concerns about the level of development already in the pipeline in both Teton County and the Town of Jackson, the Character District Chapter should not support additive growth in any districts. (We already have enough development potential in the pipeline, 50 to 70 years! There's no need to add more now in what is supposed to be a 10-15 year plan. We have yet to see the impacts of what is already a given, and on the way. Prior to any expansion of county nodes, the goal should be to support infill of the Town.) ☐ In order to protect the unique assets of Jackson Hole, the plan must demonstrate a clear commitment to the protection of historic, western rural character and small town atmosphere in ALL planning districts. ☐ In the case that you promote density increases in certain "complete neighborhoods", the following conditions should be met: - o a real commitment to shifting growth, not just adding growth (plan should state that any density increases in this plan must be contingent upon permanent density reductions elsewhere and must result in permanent conservation) - o level of density increases and development types must be acceptable to community members and neighborhoods. - o a commitment to identify information gaps and conduct important planning analyses such as transportation capacity and fiscal impact studies before density is increased. ☐ The Character Districts chapter needs to highlight the importance of planning for the valley as a whole and not as isolated planning districts in a vacuum. (Cumulative, incremental impacts matter. Transportation is just one example.) ☐ Contradictory and confusing definitions specific to the Character District Chapter need to be modified. For example, "stable" areas should mean stable. It is confusing that the current policies indicate that stable areas will see increased density.

Date	Name	Comment
11/23/2011	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	First of all, many thanks for the hours and patience as well as diligence you have demonstrated throughout the Character District workshops. I have received positive comments on how that format worked better than the formats employed the previous three years for gaining public participation and input. The following are the comments submitted by the Chamber concerning the Character Districts. While I believe you may have captured a good number of these from my individual Board members during the workshops, there may be a few that are new or presented differently that could be good input your revising of the Character District descriptions: -Maintain/preserve open space in Teton County wherever possible while protecting property rights of land owners and developing tools for transferring development density to the Town of Jackson -Integrate land use planning with transportation planning -Support initiatives or incentives that will help facilitate filling existing commercial space, responsible new development particularly where there is not already existing commercial space that could be utilized, and expanded commercial zoning to create thoroughfares connecting commercial sectors. -Maintain current 1994 Comp Plan total non-residential, commercial square footage level -Conduct research and analysis on enhanced pedestrian areas on or around the Town Square -Maintain Town Square integrity, including current zoning, building height limits, and building requirements/codes on the Town Square -Conduct research and analysis on building heights accommodating a third floor in the commercial zones other than the Town Square -Emphasize incentives rather than regulations to mature current commercial zones -Encourage complete neighborhoods and streets wherever possible -Locate parking behind commercial buildings wherever possible to strengthen accessibility and pedestrian friendliness -Decisions concerning zoning, building height, architecture, and landscaping for entrances to gateway communities should take into account best practices in the industry in order to create a welcoming sense of arrival to Jackson consistent with community character -Split Highway 89 Character District into two zones/districts to accommodate (1) commercial/light industrial development and (2) wildlife -Create an economically sustainable base village (Teton Village). -Integrate land use planning among the Aspens and Pines -The Wilson Character District should take into account the results of the Wilson Charettes -Avoid the use of the term "Midtown" since very few people understand where that is. Use the term "West Jackson" instead to cover the areas referred to as "Midtown." Do not refer to Cottonwood Park as "West Jackson" since it is located in Teton County. Refer to it as "Cottonwood Park." Thanks for taking the time to review these comments and seeing where they may strengthen the Character District information.
11/15/2011	Miller, Eddie Interested Public	Hi there! My name is Eddie Miller. I'm recently stopped in the area, fallen in love with the scenery and wild of the Teton and, have a plan that I think will fit well in the Comprehensive plan. We should keep, conserve, and mow the slope with a small herd of Elk! They would stay in the trees mainly, water is already set up (?), long-term permaculture is designable on national forest there! Existing populations of red deer there have been getting killed also going across the road.. I bet we could both save two birds with one action if we put some fence up and kept them in there.. if we keep that area as forest and put some elk there to give the businesses something to talk about! If the Conservation Alliance would like to put it on the agenda for support/funding the meeting of the 8th, I'm just the hands-on man for tracking them, shepherding some elk in, and filling up their water bowl... Love, the Jackson Elk Shepherd, Eddie Miller blog: http://eddiemill.wordpress.com/ article one: http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/03/garden/sheep-lawn-mowers-and-other-go-getters.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=sheep%20lawn%20mowing&st=cse article two: http://www.oberlinreview.org/article/cuff-eddie-miller/ article three: http://www.fearlessandloathing.com/2011/10/sheep/

Date	Name	Comment
11/15/2011	Haberfeld, Ralph and Lo Interested Public	1)Thank you for the time and effort you and the county's staff have put into developing the new Comprehensive Plan. 2)We have read articles and editorials in the newspapers and attended a meeting about South Park hosted by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Our conclusion is that we will never know enough to comment about specifics of the plan. We have to trust our elected commissioners. 3)As you consider the tradeoffs between private interests and the general interest, please place maximum value on wildlife corridors and habitats and try also to protect the wonderful views of the Tetons people enjoy as they approach from the south on US89. 4)Concentrating existing residential development rights around the intersection of High School Road and South Park Loop is probably the lesser of evils even though it may necessitate the extension of Tribal Trails Road to WY22. We hope that day will never come.
11/14/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	The reason to look back is to learn from mistakes. We've learned that an economy based on construction and building is not sustainable, and that growth cannot solve social issues. Let's not be left behind while the rest of the world moves into the 21st century. Wildlife and open spaces are rapidly disappearing from the planet and risk becoming a rarity only a few can enjoy. We have a chance to stop that trend right now with our comp plan. South Park has abundant scenic and wildlife values. Please come down and spend some time here and you will see for yourself that the rural character of South Park remains very much intact. It has not yet been irreparably ruined, but it could be without forward-looking leadership.
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] include with purple Melody Ranch Rafter J other neighborhoods similar density (1/4 mile north of Rafter J from Highway to SP Loop)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] similar to purple (1/4 mile north of Rafter J from Highway to SP Loop)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Planned Communities with protection included. More 1 house per 35 acres - a piece - no mega houses. (central South Park)
11/11/2011	Wilde, Randy Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Like Rafter J (northwest South Park) Commercial (northeast South Park) Like South Park Ranches (central South Park west of Flat Creek) Parks Open Space (Flat Creek east to Highway) Like Melody (Seherr-Thoss)
11/11/2011	Steirt, Clint Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Possible future development similar to Rafter J/Melody (1/4 mile north of Rafter J from Highway to SP Loop)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] .3-.5 lots (1/2 mile x 1/2 mile in northwest South Park) .5 -1+ lots (1/2 mile east of SP Loop) Open (remainder of northern and central South Park) .5 lots (Seherr-Thoss)
11/11/2011	Hall, Keith Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Residential Expansion Neighborhoods (northwest South Park) Residential Neighborhood Expansion (central South Park west of Flat Creek) Commercial Expansion Area (northeast South Park) Open Space/Community Park (Flat Creek to Highway) Rafter J Development (Seherr-Thoss)

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2011	Price, Troy Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Access Roads (1/2 mile and 1 mie south of High School Road) Cottonwood Neighborhood (northwest South Park) Future Town Type Neighborhood (west of Flat Creek 1/2 mile south of northwest South Park) South Park Ranches Type Lots (mile N/S by 1/2 mile E/W in southwest central South Park) Rafter J Neighborhood (1/2 north of Rafter J, west of Flat Creek) Commercial (northeast South Park) Open Space (between Flat Creek and Highway)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Cottonwood Park Continuation (more affordable, smaller lots) (northwest South Park) Commerical (northeast South Pak) Rafter J typer commjunity with centralized light commercial, parks and bike paths. Open space % with in community. (central South Park west of Flat Creek) Open Space (between Flat Creek and Highway) South Park Ranch neighborhood with 1 acre to 3 acre parcels (horse property) (area west of Rafter J to SP Loop) Mix like Melody with condos, affordable and 1/2 acre signle family with parks and % of open space (Seherr-Thoss) Community coffee shops, retaraunts and pubs promote walking and biking. Pahtways to tie the communities together - safe routes to schools
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Additional Housing Development (northwest South Park) Additional Housing Development (central South Park, west of Flat Creek) Commercial Area (northeast South Park) No Development (between Flat Creek and Highway) Additional Housing Development (west of Indian Trails)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Cottonwood .2-.3 acre lots (northwest South Park) Commercial (northeast South Park) Rafter J lots .3-.5 acre (central South Park west of Flat Creek) Open Park (along Flat Creek and Swan Ponds) Open Space (along Highway) South Park 1+ acre lots (1/2 mile by 1/2 mile west of Rafter J) Melody .4-.6 acre lots (Seherr-Thoss)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Cottonwood Park Neighborhoods (northwest South Park) Rafter J Neighborhoods (west of Flat Creek, central South Park) South Park Ranches Neighborhoods (1/2 mile square between Rafter J and SP Loop) Melody Ranch Neighborhoods (Seherr-Thoss) Park (Flat Creek and Wetland area) Open Space (along highway) Commercial (northeast South Park)
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Open for single homes, kids close to school (nortwest South Park) Commercial area (northeast South Park)

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Leave Wilson, Teton Village, Aspens/Pins as is. Develop (area west of Rafter J to SP Loop) as a community area.
11/11/2011	Lewis, Angela Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Residential with affordable (northwest South Park) Commercial with locals in mind (northeast South Park) Melody Ranch Style to north, Residential with larger lots with space for horses if wanted to south (central South Park west of Flat Creek) Park recreation area (along Flat Creek) Open Space between Flat Creek and Highway Melody Ranch Style (Seherr-Thoss) Finish bike path (along South Park Loop)
11/11/2011	Mackay, Jamie Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] The area by the highway would be great as a scenic corridor Seems like infill zoning in an appropriate place (along SP Loop, 1/2 mile east) Middle area wildlife corridor
11/11/2011	Robertson, Stan Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Better suited as a Rural Neighborhood with Conservation Opportunities (Area 10.2)
11/11/2011	Carhart, Jane Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Jackson will always need to expand. I am a proponent of responsible development! In the area I have indicated on the map (10.2 - Central South Park) I feel can support a small subdivision which is comprised of large lots 3-5 acres, with lots of "green space" and Protected View corridors! Development will occur so let's do it responsibly!
11/11/2011	Wiley, Cynthia Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Smart Growth !! Development south of Town is a must. Also, the County should push for this. This area (10.2 - Central South Park) should not be included as preservation land.
11/11/2011	Prugh, Greg Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Rural Areas of Preservation needs to be rethought. Equestrian properties, pathways, adequate buffers preserving corridors, access for the community may contribute to preservation.
11/11/2011	Vaughn, Collin Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] (northwest South Park) makes sense for density Make higher density! (1/4 mile north of Rafter J from Flat Creek west to SP Loop) (Business Park hillside) Too Steep.
11/11/2011	, Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] A good area for future development and open space with medium density (1/2 mile north of Rafter J from the highway to SP Loop)
11/11/2011	Wilde, Robin Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Higher Density Housing (northwest South Park) Commercial (northeast South Park) Medium Density Housing (central South Park west of Flat Creek) Open Space (Flat Creek east to Highway) Low Density Housing (Seherr-Thoss)

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2011	Hedges, Tom Interested Public	[David Quinn Maps] This (area 1/2 mile north of Rafter J west of Flat Creek to SP Loop) seems to be an appropriate location for additional housing, and commercial development. Multiple friends and associates would agree, that by offering additional commercial amenities, as developr would create a better, more efficient quality of life for residents of South Park area
11/11/2011	O'Shea, Cathy Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] County/Town does not have the right to dictate to private landowners that their land will be preserved (central South Park).
11/11/2011	Hill, Jane Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] increase density (1/2 mile north of Rafter J from Highway to SP Loop)
11/11/2011	Crothers, Mary Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] I support the development of a rural neighborhood with conservation opportunities and simlar density to Melody Ranch (1/4 mile north of Rafter J from highway to SP Loop)
11/11/2011	Quinn, David Interested Public	Jeff, I have attached thirty-four maps with various comments from a broad spectrum of Teton County residents. It was not difficult to find people to comment on the existing plan and maps. I feel the great majority of people I came across represent the sentiment of the people of Teton County. Many of these people find it impossible to leave their jobs and families to attend meetings, even if the results of the meetings are going to change the direction of Teton County. I have included their wishes and I hope that you include their comments with the ones that you currently have. As you will see many of the people who commented are either business owners or working people who have a significant stake in the future of Teton County. I think there are strong feelings towards a mix of development in the South Park area that encompassed both the County's definition of complete neighborhoods and real areas. I think after studying the County's website that we can all find a happy medium. I look forward to your thoughts and, as I have said all along, I appreciate the great effort that you have made to make this process transparent and open to all.
11/11/2011	Rankin, Pamela Interested Public	[David Quinn Maps] I would be proponent paricularly of a density development (area within a 1/2 mile of South Park Loop Road to east)
11/11/2011	Dornan, Will Interested Public	[David Quinn Maps] This area (1/2 mile north of Rafter J west of Flat Creek to SP Loop) of Jackson Hole needs to be available for increased density and future growth in Teton County. We need extension of communities similar to Melody Ranch and Rafter J that provide housing and amenities for all classes of Teton County residents. As a business owner in Jackson Hole I wish that my staff could live in the valley and maybe be able to buy a home.
11/11/2011	Wright-Clark, Skip Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] (Area between Flat Creek and Highway) Scenic. This area (1/4 north of Rafter J west of Flat Creek to SP Loop) of development makes good science and expansion for housing and small families with tax revenue. Elk Migration (through central South Park)
11/11/2011	Frantz, Gaylyn Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Good area (central South Park) for future growth with similar neighborhoods to Melody and Rafter J. Equestrain use a great plus!
11/11/2011	Choo'Ijian, Greg Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Planned communities with open land adjacent to neighborhoods (in central South Park) would be beneficial. As a construction worker this would provide work and houses to locals and further help our community.
11/11/2011	Neishabouri, Mina Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] Keep the same density as purple areas such as Rafter J or Melody Ranch (1/4 mile north of Rafter J, Highway to SP Loop)

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2011	Smith, Taylor Interested Public	[David Quinn Map] More density close to layout of the Aspens (area 1/2 east of SP Loop)
11/8/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex – quick question that I have gotten. Will the next draft of the character district maps have build out ranges attached – plus a net summary? I am pretty sure the electeds committed to this in some manner.
11/8/2011	, Interested Public	We would like to reiterate our past comments on the proposed Comp. Plans for the Alta Community. We look to Planning and Zoning for future reliable predictability, and are counting on County officials to come through for us with votes on policies that stand firm. Our priorities are preserving scenic corridors, wildlife corridors, quiet neighborhoods and open space (especially the historical agricultural space). In conversations with our neighbors, we believe that these priorities represent the majority of ideas circulating in Alta. Allowing for business zoning in Alta is promoted by some as a good idea “because business atmosphere for growth is much more favorable on this side of the State Line”. As true as that may be, if we look to the future, that is precisely why zoning for business is a bad idea. A bustling business community in Alta is not appropriate. People bought property here for the ideals listed above (scenery, wildlife, and quiet rural atmosphere), not for more convenient access to stores and businesses (which are a mere 5 miles down the road now). We also want to voice our support for the inclusion and use of P and Z tools which would allow for the shifting of development density away from rural areas like Alta. Policies which would allow for compensation to our historic agricultural producers for not selling out to developers makes good sense and preserves the open spaces for both wildlife and people.

Date	Name	Comment
11/7/2011	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	We are writing with regard to the upcoming Phase 3 review of the Character District Maps, the products expected to be reviewed during that phase, and the role of public input. First, we would like to express our appreciation for the incorporation of our suggestions for Phases 1 and 2, and for successfully reaching out to the public for input. The Alliance worked hard to increase the public involvement in the process, and to prepare people to be productive participants. We were pleased with the number of folks who participated and impressed with the depth of their suggestions. Effectively incorporating the public's suggestions is extremely important as this character district review process nears completion. We would like to continue to provide recommendations on the process moving forward to try to ensure that the public's will is represented and reflected in the maps. To that end, we have several suggestions for the upcoming Phase 3. First, the meeting on December 7th seems to be designed around a particular mapping product for each of the 15 character districts. Building upon what was tentatively outlined in the scope of work for AECOM, that product should: 1. Include specific written descriptions of the future character of each district and each subarea within the districts 2. Provide an expanded list of issues and opportunities, while making clear that many of these may be options for the future, not commitments 3. Include decisions on all options that fall within staff jurisdiction, and clear identification of issues that require a decision by electeds. It should also indicate which items need to be decided before adoption, and which will need to be decided in the future. As much as possible, decisions should be made now, and not put off until the LDRs. 4. Contain an explanation of the methodology for determining which issues and opportunities were included in the district descriptions. Also, include an explanation of how you determined who is responsible for decisions on each issue, and how you determined the timeline for that decision. 5. Include the number of new homes (including type: single family, condo, etc) and nonresidential square feet that are to be expected in each of the districts if they are fully developed according to the character district maps (i.e. Appendix I). If we "buildout" in the pattern indicated on the maps, what would this really mean for increased residential and non-residential development in each district? Second, there is likely to be public input that will be discarded or rejected due to being unrealistic, or conflicting with a Comp Plan policy. In these cases, we would suggest that staff summarize the input from the public and explain why it isn't included. For example, if a comment was not incorporated due to a conflict with a policy, a clear statement as to which policy it conflicts with would be useful. The rationale should be available to the public in writing, which will enable the public to review policies that don't match public sentiment. Third, we would like the public to be able to review these products prior to December 7th to best be able to contribute constructive comments at the open house and in the weeks that follow. We always welcome any conversation about these points if that would be helpful in clarifying why we feel these products are so important at this phase of the process. Thank you for your continuing work and commitment to a product that reflects the community's vision for this valley. Best of luck with the coming months of public comment review, and we look forward to continuing to engage with the planning team, the elected officials and the public as this process progresses.

Date	Name	Comment
11/6/2011	Wade, Louise Interested Public	[see comment for picture] Please Say No To Future Development Jackson is a very special place. It is the jewel of Wyoming. It is America's Serengeti. There are few places where we are privileged to live amongst the wondrous wildlife and be able to view an avian paradise & even hear the sweetest sound of their wings as the trumpeters fly overhead. The glorious mountain scape of the surrounding Tetons and Gros Ventre Mountains and the ever changing light are of constant delight. The Grand Teton National Park and nearby Yellowstone are a call of the wild to visitors globally. The Tetons steal your heart and make you long to stay forever. Many do come back to fulfill their dream and move here both part and full time. It is a place of unlimited recreation for biking, hiking, mt climbing in summer and skiing in winter. The bike trails wind round the town and go all the way through Teton Park. There are golf courses all around. Currently the residential neighborhoods are in and surrounding the town in all directions. These neighborhoods are far from finished being built out, as there are numerous lots to finish being developed in time. Actually we have 50-70 years of residential and commercial development already approved – but unbuilt – an approximate doubling of the built environment we see today. Town has another approximately 1,200 housing units approved but unbuilt under current zoning. The County about 4,000 potential homes (including apartments, condos and houses in the wings) - without even counting the open space clustering tool that could be used on rurally zoned lands. Simply stated the County has 4,000 more homes to be built in the County NOT including the rurally zoned lands, which includes all of South Park that is at play. Then there is already a doubling of all the commercial square footage siting collectively in the Town and County. So the question is why do we need to be planning for more future development when that is already designated for the next 50-70 years out? See clearly now that when you drive through town these days you see more dump trucks and earthmoving equipment than wildlife sightings. Could this be a precursor to loosing our drawing card , the wildlife, to over development? In planning for the future preserving the wildlife and maintaining open spaces should be our primary aim. Open spaces for hiking and biking and wildlife migratory paths are our number one priority. More subdivisions are just not a need for many,years to come. We should finish out what we have already designated for development before we take on further plans to develop any more. At age 9 Helen Mettler said"GOD BLESS WYOMING AND KEEP IT WILD. Lets do just that and say NO to future development. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! [see comment for picture]

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Policy 7.3.a was modified in the June 22 release to: Policy 7.3.a: Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity A goal of this plan is to interconnect existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson with a multimodal transportation system. Within existing County and Town complete neighborhoods, alternative modes of transportation are viable for daily trips year-round, and these opportunities should be maintained and enhanced. Outside of complete neighborhoods the Town and County will promote a land use pattern that supports alternative transportation by requiring interconnectivity of future developments and existing development to the best extent possible. See my public comments previously in June below – where subsequently the commissioners modified the language and took out the direct reference to Melody Ranch and Rafter J. Likewise as you review the District 10: South Park descriptions – I encourage you to keep this in mind as your review the current issues and possible opportunities sections. “Opportunities” certainly should not be expanded to pursue the connectivity of the two subdivisions (beyond pathways where that opportunity already exists – even there care should be taken so it does not presume a specific land use pattern on the Seherr-Thoss property that is not congruent with the current mapping) – but rather use the less specific language you are using below probably is more appropriate. Meanwhile an opportunity that does exist is both Rafter J and Melody Ranch do have non-vehicle access easement to their respective pathway systems already conveyed to the County - with connections both on the north and south for any future connectivity in both subdivisions. So that is an opportunity - versus road connectivity which has serious private property and condemnation, along with financial implications not appropriate to this document. I just wanted to point this out to you. Review my previous comments on the subject below and attached. I believe both Marv Heilesen and Andy Salter delivered legal public comment on this also around the June 7 period. In closing I would point out another strong opportunity in District 10 is that all of the rural land in play is owned by five large landowners. The northern two thirds are controlled by two landowners that both have logical “sending areas” and “receiving areas”. Rich ISSUES • Lack of connectivity + walkability in dead-end subdivisions • Limited access to transit + lack of walkable complete neighborhood amenities • Impacts of development on wildlife, open space + rural character • Compatibility of commercial + industrial with residential character • Development of South Park should only occur following infill of already developed areas OPPORTUNITIES • Additional schools, convenience commercial, parks + other amenities • Additional workforce housing • Preserve rural character + agricultural open space • Preserve wildlife movement corridors + Flat Creek corridor • East - west connector between Highway 89 + South Park Loop south of High School Road • Improve connectivity between developments by complete streets

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2011	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	After reading the October 26 Jackson Hole News and Guide's wonderful Guest Shot by Kathy Tompkins and numerous well-crafted Letters to the Editor, there can be no further doubt that the citizenry of Jackson Hole have lost all faith in the ability of the County Commissioners and other elected officials (and their obsequious staffs) to deliver a new Comprehensive Plan that accedes to the community's expressed demand for specificity that guarantees controlled growth and the preservation of Jackson's unique, small town character. What good are numerous workshops for community input, hundreds of letters and testimony, and years of "planning" if the electeds simply ignore the public will? At the Rafter J workshop, for example, Hank Phibbs was absent, as were two other County Commissioners and all Town Planning Commissioners save one, while 75 citizens, the media, and representatives of Save Historic Jackson Hole, the JH Conservation Alliance and the JH Land Trust once again attempted to make the cases they have done so many times earlier. Attendees noted that the Commissioners asked the same questions, hid behind Bruce Meighan, their hired lead facilitator and other staff, in a further effort to distance themselves from the people elected them. You all are discredited and a frustrated public has no redress other than to vote Commissioners out of office. But of course by that time the damage to Jackson will have been done and the finger (middle?) will point directly towards you, our last best hope. A shame really.
11/4/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	You have probably gotten a fair bit of verbal comment on South Park and certainly do not need any more words from me at this moment. As the true gateway from the south to both Town and the resort facilities, South Park has long been epitomized by its scenic hayfields and long-range vistas of the mountains. It is one of the most widely noticed and clearest materializations of our rural character. Maintaining these scenic view sheds is an important community objective and should be prioritized for our district. Rural development, agricultural fields and open space provide for a sense of scenic small town character at the southern gateway to the Town of Jackson. Along with its wildlife, wildlife movement corridors (E-W and N-S), riparian resources and habitat connectivity values – its scenic and agricultural values are unique – as so many experience them each and every day. For a visual review of some of the scenic and agricultural values please spend two minutes and visit photographer Hamish Tear's South Park photo essay at: http://photos.htphotographics.com/southparkbook It will only take a few minutes of your time to quickly scroll through the photos of what we all experience every day throughout the year – and our visitors experience as they enter the southern gateway to our town and valley. We owe a huge debt of gratitude to the five families that have quietly preserved the open space in South Park that we all value so highly. Without them we would not even be having these discussions. They are also central as we move forward to solutions that meet their desires and needs.
11/3/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	There is a lot of unnecessary anxiety that the current approved (but not accepted) policies and themes are somehow to be less binding than the 1994 plan. I am quite fluent in the role of a comprehensive plan versus zoning and land development regulations. I also have pointed out that if the LDRs and comp plan somehow are in conflict – the LDRs trump as they have the rule of law. Still when LDR's and/or zoning is modified or changed – or variances or changes in zoning are considered – they currently do need to legally link back to the policy document for the changes or additions to be approved. In fact in our LDRs currently in the County - LDRs always link back to the policy document. I would simply like to take the suspicion off the table that somehow the 2011 Comp Plan – themes and policies and character district maps – are any less binding in giving direction to the future LDRs and zoning than we currently have. Below is the 2011 statement from the recently approved themes and policies. In red is the section that has a bunch of folks alarmed. I am personally not that concerned. Could one of you in simple words just tell me (so I can definitively tell others) that the applicability section in the current approved comp plan version (2011 – Themes and Policy) effectively is not different than what is in the 1994 plan? For me it is fairly simple – a jointly approved comprehensive plan is the approved policy direction – so is binding as to direction and compatibility of the LDRs and zoning – although the LDRs and zoning always trump if there is an unintended conflict since they have the force of law. To others they unfortunately think the clause below is meant to be an "escape clause" so electeds can do what they want when it comes time to modify the LDRs and/or zoning to align with the new plan. I find that unwarranted - but this belief is strengthening unfortunately. Sorry I cannot find online the similar clause in the 1994 plan – perhaps someone can provide it.

Date	Name	Comment
11/3/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Thank you for responding. I really appreciate that you are reading and responding to your constituents' concerns. I am glad you agree about not having them below Cache Creek Drive in family neighborhoods. I would say neighborhoods like the Gill Addition and Cottonwood Park that are made up of families and chose their neighborhood for it's safety, lack of urban noise and lack of urban night life should not have convenience stores. I am afraid that if the northern South Park area were developed, they would try to put it along High School Road or in Northern South Park. I would not consider neighborhoods along High School Road a good candidate for convenience stores because we already have a great supermarket within walking and cycling distance. Most people including myself stop at the supermarkets on their way home from work to avoid having to go out again. I would rather hop on my bike, in my car or walk to Smith's, save some money and get quality products than take my chances on expensive out of date milk and eggs at a local convenience store. I would take the bus if we added opposite loop service and weather protected bus stops (That would be awesome!). Adding local convenience stores would not be profitable for the retail investor for the same reasons that local convenience in East Jackson did not work. The store in East Jackson has now reduced it's service offerings to cigarettes and alcohol. We definitely don't need that kind of store in any family neighborhood. I use to support the idea of Mom and Pop stores, but have backed away because I have yet to see a neighborhood Mom and Pop general store proposal let alone one that succeeded in our town of high rents. Those days are gone along with penny candy and one dollar milk. Can we force one over the other? Can we guarantee success for someone to try a Mom and Pop store? It will end up being a chain store version that basically caters to the transient over family and push alcohol and cigarettes over milk and eggs. I hope that clarifies Number five and explains my opinion on number seven. One quick comment on the Tribal Trails connector... more roads equals more traffic. To get people out their cars, you don't need more stores, you need to be serious about alternatives like traffic calming, increased and improved bus service and narrower roads with safe pedestrian and bicycle paths that puts the pedestrian and cyclist equal or above importance to the motorists. Here's a list of questions for you Greg, all of the elected and staff that might help in answering our worries over unwanted increased density. 1) Can we have a plan with no transfer of density until it clarifies how much is transferred and from where (no phantom density transfers from unbuildable rural or unaccounted for sites)? Maybe a proven mechanism that clearly produces the goal of permanent open spaces and wildlife protection during the life of our comp plan. We already have adequate supply that outlasts the present comp draft plan, so there is no emergency to increase density (commercial or residential) above the present level allowed. 2) Can we have clear statements instead of just considerations for achieving our goals? 3) Can you give the public a clear estimate of what changes in development will occur as a result of the district mapping? 4) Can you give the cost and impacts to our community and impacts on wildlife, any new infrastructure will have? 5)What infrastructure is required to support the proposed growth for the life of the Plan? What is the cost? 6)Can you show commitment to wildlife by putting off any decisions until we have all the information on impacts? (that also includes the first question about TDRs) 7)Can you omit the statement in the administration section that says the Comp Plan is only a vision document with no regulatory effect? If this statement is to bridge the time between adoption of the new comp plan and the old plan, the LDRs should clarify this. Thanks again for listening and responding,
11/2/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	After attending 3 mapping sessions (one in South Park and 2 at the hub with Bruce Meighan and Lindsay Travis(?)) I felt that the mapping sessions were set up in a way that reaffirmed unwanted additive density in places that shouldn't be touched until town infill is completed. It was difficult to communicate what the map should like when you leave it to staff to translate what was suggested. In some cases for instance, with Lindsay, she tried to limit us in what we could remove from the map like the large area of the NW Porter Estate across from Cottonwood Park that was pegged as a transition/complete neighborhood. She did finally relent and took it out of play. I don't fault Lindsay, I think she was trying to do what she was told and I believe that was to direct the public into agreeing with the map that was put in front of us with the predetermined growth areas. Therefore, I would like to resubmit the comments below [see 10/27/11 comments] concerning the future land use plan being developed for the Teton County/Town of Jackson Comprehensive Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
11/2/2011	Salava, Kevin Interested Public	As the Teton Village Fire Department Chief the sustainability of well trained emergency workers at Teton Village is a concern. TVFD currently has 6 housing units that provide affordable rental housing, provided by the T.V. Fire department. TVFD has 17 1st responders of which only 1 has afforded to purchase a home in this community. To be sustainable, having affordable housing to purchase for the 1st responders is essential. It takes 1-2 years of training to get an emergency worker prepared to respond. The fire department needs oportunities for 1st responders to purchase a home so they become a lasting citizen, rather then a couple year renter and then leave. The Housing Trust offers no viable oportunities for Teton Village 1st responders. The Housing Trust has homes only if you would live in town, which does not support Teton Village emergencies. The Housing Authority has some possible plans for affordable purchasing but is challenging and probably not viable for what businesses pay full time workers at Teton Village. There seems to be a disconnect on what workers who volunteer are really making vs. what the county says the average worker makes, at least at Teton Village. I am concerned that in the years ahead Teton Village Emergency Services volunteers will find it difficult to provide the great services we have in the past becasue of the lack of volunteers being able to afford to live here and the growth of Teton Village. So my 2 concerns are the availability of affordable buying oportunities for 1st responders at Teton Village and the figures that the average worker makes in income is skued and does not accurately reflect what the workers of the community are really making. That in turn makes affordable home prices in Teton Village out of reach of the 1st responders. Teton Village continues to grow and I want TV emergency services to grow with the Village. I believe the community currently supports volunteers and wants to support emergency workers but we need to reevaluate where we are and what the future will be. Thank you for this oportunity to express my thoughts on our future.
11/2/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	For public art to be successfully integrated into complete streets, complete neighborhoods, school zones, civic spaces, gateways, parks and transportation projects guidelines need to be established, as a step in the design review process, that help project stakeholders identify if a project is appropriate for the inclusion public art. Planning departments should work with the Public Art Taskforce to draft guidelines that outline if a project is suitable for public art consideration. Identifying projects very early in the design process allows for the public art to be integrated and for artists to participate as part of the design team, resulting in more creative outcomes, better integrated and functional art. If a project is not suitable for the inclusion of public art, the resulting budget should go into a pool for maintenance, education and or use on projects where public art is identified as highly beneficial.
11/2/2011	Wineman, Wade Interested Public	It seems eminently logical to me that the perfect solution to the problems of congestion and vehicle/wildlife collisions on Highway 390 would be to revisit the so called, "North Bridge" crossing of the Snake River again and press forward with all haste its construction. This bridge would solve not only the above problems, but also immeasurably enhance tourism in the valley by eliminating the arduous and circuitous journey required from the airport through town by visitors destined for the Village.

Date	Name	Comment
11/2/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	The affirmation of the scenic and wildlife habitat values in Middle and Southern South Park is great to see. Please give this point clear emphasis in descriptions of our Character District. However, I would prefer to see an even stronger commitment in Middle South Park, and the area of high density in Northern South Park is a particular concern. This transition area seems to contradict the stated goals for the rest of the South Park Character District. It is not clear how the goal of preserving or enhancing open space, scenic resources and wildlife habitat in Middle and Northern South Park will be achieved while planning for dense development in a half-mile wide area in the same district. Moreover, it is not clear there should be a "transition area" at all when many years of growth can be accomplished with infill in Town. Also, the conditions under which it would provide any benefit to the community are missing. The transition area should be half as big at most and it should have setbacks and parks to make it livable and so as not to negatively impact adjacent neighborhoods. Below is a list of questions and concerns I have concerning the transition area. -- Is it necessary? Would it actually benefit the community as a whole? -- If the transition area is intended for dense development, allowing 1,000 or so homes, how would the traffic issues be resolved and who would pay for that, both in dollars and in externalities such as noise, pollution and roads operating at over, possibly, unsafe capacities? --Is enough attention paid to preserving the unique Flat Creek corridor? It seems too close to the slated, densely developed transition area. --What of impacts to adjacent neighborhoods such as the schools and Cottonwood Park? Adequate setbacks and parks must be built so existing neighborhoods are not overwhelmed. Who would pay for these? How can we be sure they will be built? --Most importantly the maps as drawn seem intended to provide ADDITIVE DENSITY. This is what the community has stated many, many times it does not want. Increased density in one area of South Park should be paid for with permanent open space preservation elsewhere in South Park. That would help to achieve the conservation goals in the other two areas of South Park. --Why take redevelopment dollars out of town? Why add sprawl into rural areas before infill in Town is complete? I appreciate what this draft map does to show intentions to preserve open space, scenic resources and wildlife habitat in much of South Park, but urge the planners to do more to meet community goals. The foundation of the plan should be to create permanent open space and conservation easements to permanently preserve scenic vistas and wildlife habitat, the assets that set Teton County apart. The Community is not interested in planning for rows of houses and shopping centers with tools intended for urban communities to connect them together. And don't just plan for conservation on the outskirts of the community where few will experience it. Plan it throughout. Consider the enormous benefits provided by the permanent open space in Wilson, The Hardeman Meadows. It is a tremendous asset to the community and is enjoyed by many on a daily basis. Jackson IS different than anywhere else in the world. Let's keep it that way.
11/2/2011	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	I'm curious as to why the NW Corner of South Park is pink in the mapping process. I'm gathering everyone is in favor of developing the in-fill prospects of Town - "use what we already have" - your numbers state there's up to 50 years worth of in-fill in Town (and isn't the Comp Plan maybe golden for 20 years?) but, there's still this piece of candy sitting on the table (the NW Corner of South Park) that is drawing attention away from the in-fill issue. Why not keep the NW Corner of South Park green until we need it - perhaps in 30-50 years (an issue for the NEXT Comp Plan review)? Seems counter-productive to me. The NW Corner of South Park is a pretty sexy thing to look at. Easier to build on than an in-fill piece (and more expensive) ... what I'm saying it's an easier 'way to go' (not the best, just easier). The Town's in-fill properties will be continually ignored and rot and decay for decades to come - I've seen it happen in the Midwest. Sad, sad sight indeed.

Date	Name	Comment
11/1/2011	Siverd, Nancy, John Interested Public	Hello....I am a resident of Alta and participated in the comp plan gathering at the Alta Library last week. I was at Shawn's table. When I spoke with her by phone with some followup comments and questions, she suggested that I send you an e-mail, in order to have my additional comments in writing. Further, I got some clarifications from her that were helpful in my better understanding of the comp plan, subsequent processes, and things that are already "on the books." My further comments are: •We stressed in our group the importance of maintaining the rural character of Alta and minimizing population growth. I urge that incentives of various kinds be considered, so that the farmers can keep their land in agricultural use. There are many mechanisms for doing this and I hope that the comp plan and subsequent codes will employ these (eg, conservation easements with PRDs allowed; transfer/sale of development rights; issuance of conservation bonds). •It is important to me, my husband, and many of us that wildlife corridors in Alta be protected, while we have the chance to do so. Teton County Idaho is an example of how wrong things can go, if there is not an adequate comp plan and not adequate zoning/planning tools. We need to prevent this in Teton County Wyoming, especially in a rural area such as Alta that has a specific character of its own. Therefore, I urge the careful consideration of significant set-back requirements on all of the creeks in Alta. They should be protected, where they can be for the future. I believe that this can and should be done without much, if any, disruption of individual land owner rights. •View corridors should also be protected. •In our group, there was a suggestion that any commercial, light industrial, or office zoning in Alta have architectural review of proposed buildings. The person suggesting this recommended that the Alta Advisory Committee be charged with this responsibility. For consideration are the following concerns. Do the current codes provide enough "oversight" to assure that new buildings of this sort in Alta will fit in appropriately? If architectural review is desirable, what is the best mechanism for this? Is such a mechanism possible? I don't think that the Alta Advisory Committee is the appropriate oversight for this, for quite a few reasons. However, there may be a more appropriate way to take these things into consideration. And, maybe the current or future building codes are enough. I don't know. •It is difficult/impossible to get the same information or "story" about why State Line Road does not any longer or yet connect the south and north ends of Alta. Accurate clarification of the State Line Road connectivity issue and its feasibility or lack of feasibility would be much appreciated by Alta residents. We have all heard numerous iterations of the history, current situation, efforts that have failed, and so forth. We would appreciate clarification as to what may or may not be possible and why. Alta is isolated from Teton County, as it is. It would be beneficial for many reasons to have the south and north parts of Alta connected. Please feel free to contact me by e-mail or phone. Thank you for your time.
10/31/2011	Goldfarb, Joan Interested Public	I am currently not in JH so cannot attend the meetings. But I feel the Aspens is fully built out and wildlife is very prominent in our area. The roads cannot hole and maintain integrity if we continue to increase traffic on a two lane road. In addition the property on Kennel Lane owned by the Housing Authority should be build with affordable housing but hopefully not the density they have south on the Village Road.
10/31/2011	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	Unfortunately I have been out of town for the entire span of the local meetings about the comp plan so have to resort to sending this message. I want you all to know that as I understand the current thinking on your parts is that once again the desires and needs of the community are being disregarded. What's up with all the "nodes"? I thought this concept had been scrapped because of all the folks who don't want them. Why is the preferred alternative of filling in all the places in the town of Jackson first being shoved aside? I don't know who this consultant is who has been paid such large amounts of our money, but it appears that he wasn't listening to what the people want and need. Shades of Wall Street and our congressional "representatives", but that's another problem. Please stop now and listen to what most of us who live in Teton County are saying: Slow growth is not what you're proposing. Forget about identifying additional sites in the county, especially in South Park, since projections for buildout on existing sites are 50-70 years down the road. Get rid of the unpredictable and unwieldy additive density tools. Protect the wildlife and scenic open spaces that we all said were so important and what make our valley unique. I've been attending meetings off and on for years about this stuff and it seems we're back where we started 4 years ago. Listen to the people! After spending half a million more dollars (at least) why are we still harping on the same subjects? Please, please, do the right thing now. Thanks for listening,

Date	Name	Comment
10/31/2011	Marquis, Linda Interested Public	Please consider everything, most importantly, the preservation of the corridors for our our wildlife here in South Park. Why do we have to grow? Let's do this right and be go stewards for the future residents, but do it for the WILDLIFE! SAVE MORE OPEN SPACE!
10/31/2011	Tyrrell, Dorothy Interested Public	I can't see boundaries on map. [to determine if chracte district boudnaries are appropriate] Commercial aspects make Hog Island unique I would like smaller lots [in my character district] See commercial allowances as an opportunity for my character district. My district is Rural today. I'm not a very good visionary but I would think anything that was good or beneficial to everyone should be OK.
10/31/2011	Hatfield, Connie Interested Public	This letter is in response for information regarding zone 7 of the new planning plan. I am okay with zone 7 in our area. I would like to see commercial zoning and smaller lot sizes ofr the light industry lots. I would also like some rural, as this is currently rural.
10/31/2011	Fillmore, Jim and Ella Interested Public	I would like a definition of "Character District." To me it sounds like a name applied to an area that has developed on its own, or been allowed to develop to a certain level with natural characteristics already in place - ie open spaces, commercial aspects, rural aspects, wildlife and residential. If South Highway 89 has any unique points it would be in my opinion that it is a conglomerate of all the characteristics of a developed area, with the exception of perhaps sewer and water. It has heavy industrial, light industrial, light commercial, residential, open areas, wildlife, recreation and has certain neighborhood/community characteristics and qualities. Yes there are issues with South Highway 89 District. The number one issue, in my opinion, is the County imposed moratorium placed on new building in Teton County. This directly affected property in the South Highway 89 district. This has taken the ability of any and all development away from the property owners in that area. As stated before, South Highway 89 already has all of the characteristics listed, heavy industrial to open spaces. All aspects of what you list as desirable are in place in this Character District, with water and sewer being the only exception. I would think that any development in this District would be appropriate and blend with what is already there. I would describe South Highway 89 as a Complete Neighborhood. It has the unique quality to absorb any development because most all aspects of development are already represented.
10/29/2011	,	(Incentives) ADA access and adaptability
10/29/2011	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	Hi Tyler: Thought the meeting at Café Boheme last night was a success. Loved the vibe and the format. Having a dialog with county and town reps is much better for the public than that blasted podium. I felt like I was truly listened to ... and having feedback (an actual dialog) from a rep (county/town) gave me the feeling I just became a person to them and wasn't a dollar sign or a number anymore. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2011	Swope, Linda Interested Public	I am a 23 year resident of Jackson. After 17 years on Snow King, I reluctantly moved to Melody Ranch. I thought my days of wildlife moving through my yard were over. Happy to be wrong, we see everything from baby geese to baby moose... foxes to owls... elk to raptors... and all with regularity. There are over 30 mallards on the pond here today. So I spent my Saturday afternoon collecting some of my South Park wildlife photographs to show you how wonderful this place is! Please look at the attached collage. Every image was taken in Melody Ranch. [see file for pictures] I understand South Park may get some protection as an "Open Space Preservation" area. I praise and encourage any designation that respects and promotes the value of our wildlife. I have made my living here all these years as a photographer – not of wildlife, but of people. And I know my clients, 90% of them tourists, are here because they too value the wildlife. These families are drawn to the pure dose of nature they get here and can't get at home. Please don't destroy our southern gateway... our visual entrance into the valley and an important wildlife corridor. Don't bite the hand that has fed us all these years. I know this is a tough job and you can't make everyone happy. I appreciate your thoughtful consideration for our future. Thank you for your time!
10/28/2011	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	I live on High School Road in Cottonwood Park. And, thanks to the closure of the Flat Creek Bridge, I already know what High School Road is going to be (sound) like once the building of homes starts in South Park. I have the pleasure of being wakened each morning now, Monday through Friday at, oh let's say, 6-6:30am from all the traffic due to my South Park neighbors using High School Road in the morning to get to 'wherever' they are going. Never thought I'd rather hear my alarm clock go off at 6am than being wakened by dual exhausts, humming tires, giant trucks and the THUMP-THUMP of Jay-Z each morning. And each and every day now, my day gets worse ... because after I'm suddenly awakened, I soon realize that there hasn't even been one house built yet due to the Comp Plan and it's 'maps'. Please, please consider a neighborhood of good and honest working people you will be affecting (their property values, their health, their safety ... their SLEEP ...) with your 'maps'. Allow the neighborhood of Cottonwood Park and High School Road to stay just that ... a neighborhood ... and an access road for its families ... and not allow this road and neighborhood to become just a thoroughfare for South Park residents and others from "infinity and beyond". Before "mapping" South Park for housing, "Fix" High School Road first - add an east-west connector road south of the High School, and utilize the in-fill properties of the Town while you still have the chance. The Valley doesn't NEED South Park for housing - at least not for the next 50 years. By then, you'll want to do another Comp Plan anyway... and then decide.

Date	Name	Comment
10/28/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	As you may already know, the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance facilitated seven “Alliance Neighborhood Discussions” during the last two weeks. The purpose of these discussions was to help reengage the public in the Comp Plan process, and to prepare people to participate effectively in the official Character District Discussions that are going on now. Within the Alliance Neighborhood Discussions, the Alliance staff briefly presented on the current status of the Comp Plan process, and what the focus of this phase of public input is. We very specifically did not present the Alliance positions or analyses at these meetings, in order to avoid overly influencing participants. Nonetheless, we were pleased that participants independently prioritized many of the same issues and objectives that the Alliance is most concerned about. We hope that our efforts will help make public comment more relevant and specific during the workshops that run until next Tuesday. We will keep our members and the participants in our neighborhood discussions informed as to how their input is incorporated into the plan after this phase is completed. For your interest, I am attaching the full notes from all of the Alliance Neighborhood Discussions. This document includes the key ideas brought up by residents. When we sent this document out today, we also included the key recommendations of the Alliance as an organization, since we did not address those during the discussions. I hope that this document provides you some insight into the work we’re doing to support community involvement in the Comp Plan process, and I think you’ll enjoy seeing some of the ideas that were brought up in each neighborhood. I look forward to seeing all of you at the workshops over the next few days. Summary of Alliance Neighborhood Discussions in Teton County In October, the Conservation Alliance facilitated 7 neighborhood discussions in the Town and County to discuss the Comprehensive Plan and the character district maps. We asked people discuss their goals for the future of their neighborhood, and the future of Teton County. Several key themes arose from those meetings, and are outlined below. The Town and County are holding meetings until November 1st to solicit public comment and input regarding the future of our community. Please go to the meeting nearest your home or to the hub location (details below) and make your voice heard. At the meeting, be sure to verify that the facilitator in your group discussion is recording each of your ideas in writing so that it is included in the public record. Follow-up emails and letters to the planning staff and elected officials are a great way to make sure that your opinions are heard. Key Recommendations of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance: The core objective of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is that our new Comprehensive Plan must respect that Jackson Hole’s identity, community character, quality of life, and economy all depend on sustaining our precious wildlife, landscapes and natural resources. To achieve this objective, the Conservation Alliance has several recommendations for next steps in the Comp Plan process. 1. Work must begin now to identify how we will ensure that permanent conservation is achieved in exchange for increased density in some areas. One of the primary goals of the Comp Plan policies is the shifting of development potential away from rural, ecologically valuable areas to areas of existing development that are more suitable for future growth. However, there has been virtually no progress towards identifying effective methods to achieve this shift in development. There must be assurances that this objective will be met and details as to how it will be met before the Comp Plan is adopted. 2. No net additive growth should be allowed. Before completing the Character District Maps, the county should report back with the amount of future development we could expect to see if the maps became reality, so we can gauge whether we have a plan that would enable a drastic change in the character of Teton County. 3. Wildlife migration corridors, habitat connectivity, scenic vistas and open space preservation must be clearly illustrated as priorities on the final Character District Maps. 4. An “Action Plan” must be developed to detail how and when unresolved issues in the Comp Plan will be addressed, and how the conservation objectives of the Comp Plan will be funded. Many policies within the Comp Plan essentially say “we’ll figure this out later.” Before the Comp Plan is adopted, the community needs to see a concrete plan for how and when we’ll resolve these issues, and how we’ll fund community priorities. Key Community Ideas: Below are themes that we generally heard echoed by almost all participants in the Neighborhood Discussions, in all areas of Teton County. 1. Wildlife connectivity and habitat, scenic corridors and land conservation are critically important to protect and maintain our wildlife populations and community character. 2. Road development and expansion often has negative effects on the surrounding neighborhoods and should be avoided. Reduced speed limits, increased safety, rural character and the risks to wildlife should all be considered when new or expanded roads are being proposed. 3. Additive growth is unacceptable. If development potential is shifted into or otherwise increased in already developed areas, there must be a

mechanism in place to ensure permanent conservation in rural areas.

4. Limit the overall amount of growth in the valley and within each of the districts.

5. This Comp Plan needs to focus on predictability in terms of the amount, type and location of growth, and the regulations need to be stricter when awarding variances.

6. There is largely adequate commercial development in many of the out-of-town districts and no additional commercial zoning is needed.

7. Infill and redevelopment is preferable over suburban sprawl, but is only appropriate in certain areas.

8. Workforce housing is important but must be located in appropriate areas.

9. The Comp Plan needs to be more specific about how it plans to accomplish its goals.

10. The discussions about each of the districts should include their context within the county and relative to adjacent districts.

Official Neighborhood Workshops Schedule:

October 27

11 am - 2 pm Nick Wilson's, 3265 W. Village Drive

5 - 8 pm Jackson Senior Center, 830 E. Hansen Avenue

6 - 8 pm Alta Library, 50 Alta School Road

October 28

7 - 10 am Bar BC Ranch House, 4745 N. Spring Gulch Road

5 - 8 pm Café Boheme, 1110 Maple Way

October 29

10 am - 1 pm Rafter J Childcare Center, 3105 W. Big Trail Drive

2 - 5 pm Old Wilson Schoolhouse, 5655 W. Main Street

October 31

3 - 6 pm Teton Pines Clubhouse, 3450 Clubhouse Drive

November 1

12 - 2 pm Snow King Grand Ballroom, 400 E. Snow King Avenue

"Hub" hours

9am-4pm, Oct. 27, 28, 29, 31, Nov. 1 at the 4H Building (south Miller Park)

Appendix A: Neighborhood Discussion Summaries

Below are the detailed notes generated in each of the Alliance Neighborhood Discussions. The points presented here do not necessarily represent a consensus among participants, but document ideas that were brought up.

South Park – October 12, 2011

Values to preserve:

- Scenic vistas and hay meadows
- Wildlife habitat and connectivity for small and large animals (Nature Mapping (citizen scientists) should be better incorporated into wildlife assessments throughout the County and in South Park)

o Connectivity both north to south and east to west

- Flat Creek as a riparian corridor (particularly valuable for birds)
- Importance of agricultural lands and vistas - especially Flat Creek to Hwy 89
- Do not widen South Park Loop Road

o Any development as a result of obtaining permanent conservation easements should be set back from South Park Loop and High School roads to provide a visual buffer.

Ideas on growth management:

- The Plan should help facilitate the five large landowners to preserve land and develop clustered developments that are well planned out.

Landowners should also be able to get value for their land.

- As a landowner it is frustrating to have your land use decisions dictated by elected officials
- Do not transfer in any new density to South Park from outside of South Park
- Do not grant any additional density within South Park without associated permanent conservation
- No more growth is appropriate for South Park

- Maintain current rural zoning and prioritize permanent conversation
- Do not identify any additional large developable sites in South Park
- High School Road is currently accommodating more cars than it was designed to, and this must be taken into consideration if any new development is considered for South Park
- Future growth in South Park should be concentrated where it already exists
- Do not mix residential and business uses in South Park – people appreciate being able to leave town behind to come home.
- Use a limited number of new sewer hookups every year as a way to limit growth
- Put apartments and multi-family units instead of single-family units in the suburban zone in the north-west corner of South Park; single-family homes already exist elsewhere

• Downzoning South Park is a possibility

Additional opportunities for transition:

- Finish the bike path from Rancho Alegre to Melody Ranch
- Get rid of the two gravel pits
- This is a rural area, not a complete neighborhood
- Build a wildlife underpass under Highway 89

The Aspens – October 17, 2011

Values to preserve:

- Wildlife is the character of this area, and it is why we live here
- Protecting wildlife habitat, habitat connectivity, migration corridors and pockets of space for them to rest is very important
- The Aspens is a “complete” neighborhood – and in this case “complete” means finished. Basically, it is a stable area
- Keep the Teton County Housing Authority’s 5-acre parcel zoned single-family
- Keep the area west of the Aspens/Pines zoned rural Ideas on growth management:
- Do not build a 4-lane highway where 390 is right now
- No more commercial development
- Require large employment centers, like the Village, to provide adequate housing and thereby reduce traffic generation

Additional Thoughts:

- Predictability is very important, and we should move away from making exceptions on land use decisions. This Comp Plan is a moving target still, and not predictable
- Don’t ask us to make decisions in a vacuum. We need to bear in mind the context and the surrounding areas, such as Teton Village

Indian Springs/Cottonwood – October 18, 2011

Roads/Transportation Issues:

- The proposed Tribal Trails connector road should not be built because:

1. It will degrade scenic views
2. It will reduce nearby property values
3. It will bring unnecessary traffic into the area
4. It is unsafe to add more cars where there are so many schools and kids
5. It will bisect important wildlife habitat
6. Added infrastructure would not preserve the character of the area
7. It will encourage people to get into their cars rather than biking or walking, particularly the traffic to and from the schools
8. It will inevitably be used as a regional cutoff road and not only by local traffic
9. It is simply moving the burden of increased traffic from the “Y” intersection to the tribal trails area – a connector cannot be built to save the “Y”. There are many solutions to that intersection that warrant further exploration
10. It would not help to further the Comp Plan’s goals of wildlife and character preservation
11. It will be expensive for taxpayers

- South Park Loop Road north from High School Road could be improved by reducing speeds and making the pathway crossings safer. There are a lot of homes and families directly on the road.
- The character of South Park Road should be protected, particularly the cottonwoods, which would be threatened if the road were to expand. We should also be conscious to plant new cottonwood trees to replace the old ones.

- Speed limits on highway 22 should be 45 mph year round.
- We need better signage on the highways to alert motorists of wildlife activity in the area.
- Wildlife crossings should be a priority.
- High School road should be preserved for its aesthetic, scenic, academic, neighborhood, and rural appeal. It is not a highway. A bike path should be added on the south side of the road to make travel to and from school safer. Traffic calming methods such as trees planted on a median to create a boulevard feel should be explored.

Wildlife/Scenic Values

- The whole greater South Park area has wildlife habitat and corridors.
- The haystacks across from Smiths create a cool view.

Character

- The school area as it exists today is a great place to educate our community's children, with all of the open space, the wildlife and the views of the mountains.
- We should preserve the rural, neighborhood feel of the greater South Park area, which is currently perpetuated by both the physical surroundings and the layout of the neighborhoods. We should also maintain the family feel of the area, and recognize that it houses much of the workforce, which is one of the backbones of this community.
- People appreciate being able to leave Town "behind" when they go home to their neighborhood at the end of the day
- Northern South Park is an extension of Cottonwood: when planning the future of both of these areas we should consider the context and the valley as a whole, not individual neighborhoods in isolation.
- If development happens in northern South Park, there should be a buffer zone planned for the northern most portion along High School Road to South Park Loop Road to help maintain the rural feel of the area, and it should be community oriented open space.

Development/Redevelopment

- Gregory Lane would be a great place to redevelop into workforce housing, and transition the industrial uses further south.
- The entire corridor surrounding Sunrise and the old Feed Store could be redeveloped to more closely resemble the Smiths Plaza (i.e. mixed use) and maintain a livable, Town-like feel. This is the gateway to Town from the south and should be redeveloped
- Infill in Town and revitalization of already developed areas should be prioritized over new development.
- This community should continue to provide workforce and affordable housing opportunities.

Wilson – October 19, 2011

Five Main Concerns:

- No additive growth in Wilson, limit to existing by-right
- Preservation of wildlife habitat, connectivity, and corridors by maintaining openness
 - o Wildlife and human activity work together in Wilson with the existing density – residential areas can be wildlife habitat – they are not mutually exclusive
 - o Conserve existing open space directly adjacent to Wilson (Waldron Property) and distant from Wilson (Fall Creek Road)
- No more commercial zoning – there is already 30% of available commercial vacant, Wilson does not need more.
- Preserve Wilson's character, perhaps with Wilson specific standards or codes
- Planning staff and elected officials need to check back in after the next round of public comment with residents to make sure they heard what we said.

Other comments we heard:

- Stay the way it is now
- How do we accommodate more growth and stay the same – incompatible goals
 - o How (form) to develop is important – formed based code – specific design standards – need finer plan codes
- Traffic Calming measures are needed
- We need predictability
- Fencing – aesthetics, predictability, a sense of openness in Wilson and wildlife permeability
- Limit light pollution – dark skies initiative
 - o Codes not up to the whole county, smaller scale
- We have a lot of wetlands and wildlife habitat, even in downtown Wilson
 - o Tradeoff of wetlands in Wilson for wetlands in Buffalo Valley or elsewhere are not acceptable

- Nature mapping and other citizen science should be incorporated
 - Include specifics in the Maps – deal with issues now, don't delay
 - Community and neighborhood standards – be clear on what you want
 - o Wilson character – informal, livable, flow, human & wildlife activity, lack of density, integration of different lifestyles, wildlife corridors, openness
 - o Maintain scenic, low density on Fall Creek Road to the southern end
 - We need a report back from the elected/planners to make sure they heard what we said
 - Wildlife corridors, connectivity, crossings (WTI study integrated in the plan)
 - One valley – what happens in Wilson affects elsewhere, what happens elsewhere affects Wilson
- Alta – October 20, 2011

Key Points:

- Maintain rural atmosphere & character, scenic nature
 - Preserve wildlife corridors & open space, while balancing private property rights
- Other Points & Comments:
- Connect Alta to Alta with improved roads, pathways & bridges
 - Large landowners might change, need clustering, zoning, TDR's to plan for this
 - o Protect open space by clustering development
 - Split on the issue of needing commercial, retail space
 - o Might be nice to have home based offices or some commercial so residents can conduct business in Wyoming, not Idaho
 - o Office complexes should not interfere or conflict with existing character
 - Protect the water supply
 - o At what point does development impact water?
 - o Planned future population limited by viable water supply
 - o Residents do not want a municipal water supply
 - Stable areas include around the church, school, existing subdivisions
 - Alta is stable just as it is right now, allow as little development as possible
 - Nothing should ever change, period.
 - Transitional areas include south of Teton Creek, north of Golf Course, East of State Line (across the street in Idaho is planned for denser development). East of State Line might be appropriate for light industrial
 - Any industrial/office/retail needs specific design guidelines
 - Question: if BLM or other public lands are sold within the character district, what zoning/rules would then apply?
 - Maintain Teton Creek and South Leigh Creek as areas to preserve for wildlife
 - Finish park in Targhee Town
 - Pathways to connect with Forest Service trails
 - Preserve views through conservation easements (Wilson property)
 - Incentivize Wilson property to maintain agricultural uses
 - Preserve farm land on Alta North Road and North State Line Road
 - Commercial would have to be 'handpicked' in order to align with the community's desires and needs for what the business is and what it looks like
 - Teton Teepee area is a transitional area
 - Predictability of what 'it' will look like and how 'it' fits into Alta

o Alta specific building standards

East Jackson/Town Periphery – October 25, 2011

Future growth and development

- No commercial development, including resorts, in the Town Periphery district and down Cache Creek Drive, as it would just draw people there. It is not a complete neighborhood. Also it would not be viable.
- No high-density development in the Town Periphery district
- Transition mobile home parks to single family zoning
- The Planned Unit Development (PUD) too is the largest threat to this district as it offers higher densities
- Tighten the regulations so that there are not so many variances granted; ensure that variances are granted in accordance with state law (stipulates that there must be a hardship to receive a variance)

Character

- East Jackson is already overdeveloped
- Current SR-1 zoning and FLUP descriptions were appropriate, including allusions to landscaping predominating over buildings and a peaceful, quiet, tranquil, wildlife permeable neighborhood with larger lot sizes.
- Leave the area alone: it is fine as it is. It is a stable, rural area.
- Plow the snow promptly, including the sidewalks transportation
- The roadways are already overloaded and cannot take more cars, so no more development is appropriate
- Redevelopment of Redmond Street was a bad idea. However, the sidewalks on Redmond do make the road safer for bikers and pedestrians.
- Explore reducing the speed limits to 20mph
- Lack of parking is a big problem, particularly with the added density that the PUD tool affords; increase the parking requirements
- Building sidewalks takes away parking spots and eliminates safe places for people to walk in the winter because they are not plowed and reduce the width of the road; don't build any more sidewalks
- Don't expand Cache Creek Drive or make it a complete street – this would only make it more of a safety hazard for bikers and pedestrians. Maintain or increase on-street parking. Add speed bumps or mirrors to increase safety. Encourage the use of nearby trails instead of the road.

General comments

- Increase predictability and accountability in the process as a whole
- Question the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally
- New voices are needed in this conversation

Three primary points

1. Maintain the single-family nature of the neighborhood
2. Maintain larger lot sizes
3. Do not allow the PUD tool to be used

Wilson/County Valley - October 26, 2011

- If we want to achieve a society-wide shift to less single-occupancy vehicle dependence, we will need increased density
- Population based on sustainable community and sustainable economy
- Don't even allow people to consider building in 'rural' 35-acre ranchettes
 - o We all know it will grow, and we all don't want sprawl, this requires density
 - o Town, East Jackson, Wilson, Melody Ranch infill
- ☑ Infill existing areas within their boundaries, do no sprawl outward
 - We can't say we don't allow people here
 - Gregory Lane is an appropriate area for more density or redevelopment
 - Do we need more housing? (There are a lot of vacancies)
 - Affordable housing exactions should be more progressive
 - Redevelopment vs. keeping 'low class' affordable rentals & housing
 - Housing authority to buy existing housing stock rather than develop new housing stock
 - Development restrictions may alter prices because they exclude certain types of development – this can force new development in certain directions and may have contributed to the current housing stock available.

10/28/2011 Smith, Emily
Interested Public

Please protect the beautiful area of South Park. We all love the country feeling of driving down South Park Loop Road lined with the beautiful cottonwoods. There is no need for additional retail as we have a grocery store, gas station, medical center, dry cleaners and much more already available to us within only minutes.
Please uphold the 1994 Plan with emphasis on the importance of protecting scenic, wildlife and open space values in our area.
Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
10/28/2011	Verna, Diane, and Jeff J Interested Public	We are Alta residents. We have lived over in Teton Valley, Idaho for 20 years. We do not want to see any further development on Alta North Road. This area has become too developed with increased traffic from what is was 12 years ago when we moved into our home. We want to see Alta retain as much of it's rural character as possible. We want to see the ski hill road in Alta remain rural. This is winter range for wildlife. We could use more signs for people to slow down in winter with the wildlife. Development in Alta should be centered around the already dense area of Targhee Town. The rest of the zoning should be 3 acre lots or larger and farming should predominate the area.
10/28/2011	Daly, Meg Interested Public	I support public art being part of the comp plan. Public art helps add identity to neighborhoods and districts, and helps brand the town and county in a unique and creative way. Public art demonstrates our commitment to a creative economy and enhances civic projects, parks, and transportation.
10/27/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	Willow Street Neighbor – Especially from Kelly to Snow King Streets Willow Street Today: Ninety Percent Commercial/Government offices. Only Five Family Occupied Homes ion entire Eight Block length of Willow. Brunn Way connector, about 20 yrs ago transformed Willow to Major North-South connector. Vehicle Traffic daily: 2,200 to 3.300; ten times greater than allowed for residential zone. Due to traffic and noise, not suitable or safe for family living or residential. Willow is a dense center of activities due to ski resort, park, resorts and government. Motels and multi-family units, MR4 + also border within one half block of Willow. Future Vision: Willow Street: No need to use South in title. There is only one Willow Street. Commercial and Lodging over-lay zoning for lots bordering Willow: 50 to 75 feet deep. One-Way Street: North to South traffic only. one-way traffic can be effective and less costly than re-development of the street. Two to three stories, like corner of Willow and Parl. Ridgelines running North and South. Professional offices and Boutique shops on grade floor: Short-term rentals/apartments above. Small food and service shops on grade permitted. No set-backs on Willow: yards/open space in rear. "Fencing" of Willow will permit safe and suitable residential areas behind. Fencing = two to three story front of building bordering Willow Street. Side-walk and Bike pat on West side of Street: Diagonal parking. West side because Side-walk only needs to extend from Kelly, where presently ends, and Eastern exposure will aid in melting snow in mornings. Move Government offices/Jail, vs. remodel and develop area as tourist/person attractive. OR Close Brunn Way. Reduce and restrict traffic to local only: Not trucks and no more than 200 vehicles per day. Thank you for accepting our vision ofr the practical and wholesome use for our neighborhood and the good of our town.
10/27/2011	Ewing, Patty and Frank Interested Public	The "Town Periphery" character, particularly as it relates to the southeast perimeter: Single family dwellings only with large lots. The dwelling has open space instead of the lot being dominated by large structures, and the lot is permeable to wildlife. This is an area of town where the rural character must be retained by not allowing urban density/PUD; the rural character of Cache Creek Drive be maintained as is; and horses are allowed. If the existing Mobile Home Park is re-developed, it should revert to single family SR zone density. No new commercial enterprises/schools or whatever else fall into the new comprehensive plan, definition of "complete neighborhoods" is needed or wanted. We view our neighborhood as good as it gets and we want to keep it that way.

Date	Name	Comment
10/27/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to submit the comments below concerning the future land use plan being developed for the Teton County/Town of Jackson Comprehensive Plan. 1) Before directing growth anywhere we should recognize that there is valuable wildlife and scenic agricultural open spaces to preserve in “all” of South Park. 2) Do not add anymore density in Northern South Park or anywhere else in the valley until town infill is completed. We need to exhaust the 50 to 70 year supply for building with current zoning. We should build out Town (at current limits) before we start developing new areas like South Park or increasing density in nodes/complete neighborhoods. 3) Work with organizations like the Jackson Hole Land Trust and landowners to “ensure perpetual restrictions on development while allowing for private ownership of the land”. It’s been successfully done already on thousands of acres in and around Jackson Hole. Let’s help them create even more permanently protected open space. 4) Eliminate density tools that create unchecked and unwanted transfer of growth without getting any permanently dedicated open space in return. 5) Long established residential neighborhoods and school zones should be declared “off limits” to urbanization. 6) That means no to the Tribal Trails connector that transfers traffic problems from the Y intersection of Highways 22 and 89, to and through residential neighborhoods and school zones. 7) It also means no to light industrial and convenience stores. This would degrade the neighborhoods we have now. We already have Smith’s and Gregory Lane businesses that round out our district. Our hardworking community members deserve some peace, what’s left of the quiet and quickly disappearing star filled nights at the end of their work day. 8) The community wants a strong, non-contradictory plan to prevent unwanted, unchecked growth that will “Preserve and protect the area’s ecosystem in order to ensure a healthy environment, community and economy for current and future generations.” This quote is our vision statement from the first part of the comprehensive plan.
10/27/2011	Mishev, Dina Interested Public	Just wanted to write to let you guys know that I do NOT agree with the Save Historic Jackson Hole ad on page 7 of Thursday's (October 27) JH Daily. The ad states that "Most of us want the small town lifestyle we have now, with rural not urban development." Downtown Jackson has already been developed. I'd rather see future growth concentrated there and our rural landscape saved.
10/26/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Reviewing now – also trying to understand what the structure is. Wish we had been given more time to review before the first workshop. Also know how much work went into these updates.
10/26/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex – clarify the scale (legend) in the lower right hand corner (see attached) – I think you mean this to apply to the insert maps? Bottom-line the ¼ mile radius circle does not line up with the two mile line below in the legend – a bit confusing. Question – it appears you have the NW South Park (complete neighborhood) transition area basically from High School Road to about one half mile south– then clearly east to Flat Creek – correct? Second – I believe these maps show your thoughts in how the character district edges may shift – along with the summary to date on what in the sub-district areas – and there descriptions. This is really then a draft future character district map is a way to look at it – correct? It may just how you are dividing out the four sub-types of stable and transition. Anyway this is a good summary of where the draft is at this point with lines on the map for the four types of stable/transition descriptions. Then the second attached (just the one page I parsed) is the existing conditions for South Park – with a summary of current conditions and public input to date. This is the verbal component that marries to the map. Correct? So really these are the two most important pieces for folks to review, form an opinion and offer feedback on? The summaries of all the input from various sessions BTW is nicely organized. My confusion remaining is the third board which would be the outcome of all of this – the future character – that is not part of the materials but could be inferred (the draft proposal at this stage) from the map of areas of stability and transition (first attachment) and where the current conditions and opportunities boards may lead you to think. Correct?

Date	Name	Comment
10/26/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Tyler – are the three boards available for the districts yet? I have navigated the comp plan web site and see nothing new. There should be updated – or for me first look – for the boards that cover: 1.Current conditions and public input 2.Areas of stability and transition 3.Future character I am most interested in South Park but also Cottonwood Park area in addition. I would like to review before the sessions start tomorrow morning.
10/26/2011	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	I am a resident of South Park and am again writing you out of concern that the final version of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan will designate the South Park area for substantial future development. As such this scenario would threaten the unique character of Jackson Hole and its ecosystem which no thinking person wants to do. Your actions and votes are thus critical to our 'last best place' and future generations. The process of approval has been long and in general good intentions abound. But everyone involved must recognize that the 1994 Plan permits significant development potential despite an economy that presently cannot fulfill this potential. This allows you the opportunity to address the overall amount of growth and location of development over the next two decades or so to assure that Jackson can control its own destiny and thereby retain its unique character. The Jackson community has spoken clearly and nearly unanimously in support of 'least growth' solutions which preserve the rural character of our area. While the production of Character District maps are a step in the right direction they need to include specific numbers rather than simply directing allowable densities going forward. South Park has at least five large landowners whose plans must be factored into the area's future since these properties constitute the southern gateway to Jackson Hole and the west bank resorts. At present there is little confidence that, unless the permissible amounts of growth are finalized, along with permanent open space and wildlife corridors linking South Park to both north-south and east-west connector systems, the Comprehensive Plan can institutionalize the values expressed by the community and supported by local government. The Highway 22 corridor open space, made possible by the heroic efforts of the Jackson Hole Land Trust and others, represents the finest example of smart growth and conservation. A similar plan is needed for South Park because of its gateway qualities, rural character and scenic view watersheds. The draft Comprehensive Plan was initiated because land use planning has proceeded apace since 1994. As the process winds down specific growth numbers must be set that are constrained by openspace and habitat necessities and which together guarantee Jackson's rural future. People choose to live and work in Jackson and its environs for specific reasons, many of which concern uncontrolled and unwise growth. You cannot overlook this fact in your growth deliberations. The Commission simply must take the final step of specificity through zoning that restricts 'additive growth' rather than passing on the problems to future commissions. Make the Plan truly Comprehensive and enforceable; make it reflect the community you represent and the Commission and other electeds will have accomplished something meaningful for Jackson and future generations who live and visit here.
10/25/2011	Salter, Andy Interested Public	Thank you for your considerable time and efforts in connection with the development of revisions to the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. In the many hours of public testimony and the reams of paper submitted to you over the past few years of this process, a few points should have been unequivocal and clear: Preserve South Park. It has scenic and wildlife values that are treasures in our community and should not be lost. These values exist now, are enjoyed daily by my neighbors and my family and cannot be replicated. The scenic vistas over South Park are unique and unmatched. Place strong and enforceable limits on the residential and commercial development that may be allowed in our area in the future. There are 50 or more years of residential and commercial growth already in the pipeline. There is little demonstrated need for more. Existing development in South Park has already strained our transportation system, South Park Loop Road is not capable of handling any significant additional growth. Repairing the bridge over Flat Creek is just the start of what will be needed if more growth is permitted here. Uphold the 1994 Plan's emphasis on the importance of protecting scenic, wildlife, and open space values in the South Park area. I have personally witnessed Moose, fox, coyotes and countless birds ON MY OWN PROPERTY. There is a very significant wildlife presence here. Please allow me and my neighbors to continue to enjoy these priceless resources. REJECT the nodes concept and the additional unneeded and unwanted growth it would spawn. Instead, the Plan should promote "least growth" solutions and the preservation of the rural character of our area. Permanent open space must be established in and around South Park. Our area has a unique character that caused my family and our neighbors to choose to live in this part of the valley. Please help us preserve and protect what we have.

Date	Name	Comment
10/24/2011	Pyle, Owen Interested Public	I have been following the endless evolvement of the new plan. I am concerned of the return of county nodes and the additive growth they represent. The growth needs to be exactly defined.If 1500 housing units in the South Park is still in the Plan,I want you to know that I am strongly opposed to this level of development. Lets get this plan done right!!!!!!!!!!!! Thanks for your consideration,
10/24/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Tyler - We were lead to believe that the revised maps would be ready by the 21st. I know this is a lot of work for a reduced force planning staff but the public has a right to see what has been incorporated with enough time before the next phase. Frankly Tyler there is a lack of trust that has only built in this process. We cannot see what you have heard – and/or how you have interpreted what folks have said - in outcomes on the maps unless we see those changes. Meanwhile folks I am sure will weigh in – and have – that they do not fundamental support the shift – and watering down – of polices approved by the electeds. That is their right. Your comment that you are only incorporating comments “based upon the overarching policies adopted by the elected officials” only fuels that distrust. Since the plan has been watered down – many things could be interpreted in its language. In ways I know also that you are between a rock and a hard place. Simply let me know when they are ready for the public at large to review.
10/22/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	BRUCE, Preconceived notions, of what Jackson Hole is and what Jackson Hole isn’t, were stamped onto your forehead before being employed by the Jackson Hole Town Council and the Teton County commissioners. Your first public presentation said the same thing as it did after months and months of meetings and work by the community of Teton county Wyoming. We get it..... You are employed by the elected officials and not the community. At the end of the comprehensive plan process, I remind you that we are not Fort Collins. We are not Aspen or Vail. We do not compare to Telluride or Pagosa Springs and we are not Sun Valley, Idaho. We are unique and to pull us out of a folder that you obtained in graduate school is uneducated. ELECTED OFFICIALS, That said (see above), the people of Jackson Hole realize that, Bruce, your facilitator is running interference so you do not have to interact with the everyday hicks that elected you, me included. What really chaps me is that you have used my tax dollar to pay him to do your job. The planning commission volunteered their time to come up with a comprehensive plan which you turned down. It would be lovely to think that you read mailed or e-mailed correspondence but after years of first hand experience I am not so easily fooled. You keep asking the same questions and you keep getting the same answers. My conclusion can only be that you have memory loss or you really don’t give a shit. Either way your lack of concern for the residents of Teton County is a discredit to the people that elected you. VALLEY RESIDENTS The only fix to this situation is to vote. Next election let’s switch it up. You know what they say about Catfish and Politicians, Ones a bottom feeder-----Ones a fish.

Date	Name	Comment
10/21/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance greatly appreciates that many of you took the time to attend the presentation by planning expert Mark White to discuss potential tools to achieve a shift in development patterns in Teton County. I am writing now to provide you with a summary of the presentation, links to the full PowerPoint presentation, and a radio interview with Mr. White. I strongly encourage you to review these materials to refresh your knowledge of the many tools that can be used to achieve our shared goals. Achieving a meaningful shift in development patterns is a top priority for the residents of Teton County, and we have heard this point consistently reaffirmed by more than one hundred people in neighborhood discussions all over the county this week. Finding ways to achieve this goal has clearly been a top priority for our community for years, and as planning staff and elected officials, you have all claimed that this is a top priority for you as well. Action is needed now to achieve a real shift in development patterns, and to regain the trust of the people you represent. We currently have a limited set of tools to shift development, but they have not fully met expectations when we look at the results of development in recent decades. We need to strengthen our existing tools, and develop a new set of policy tools. As we interviewed leading national planning experts on this topic, all of them emphasized that many communities develop Comprehensive Plans that state shifting development patterns as a goal, but in practice, very few communities actually achieve this goal. In his presentation, Mr. White strongly recommended that we begin work on this keystone of our Comp Plan now. If we are serious about shifting development patterns in Teton County, we need to begin work now. For years community members and elected officials have floated ideas on tools that might work here, but there is no real consensus, and no meaningful progress toward selecting and developing tools that can do the job. As we near your planned completion date of the Comp Plan, this level of vagueness, and the lack of a plan for how to proceed, is not acceptable. The research and writing of consistent, functional, legally defensible regulations that shift development patterns will not be easy, especially given the relative land values in Teton County. It will likely take years of hard work by a firm with expertise in regulatory frameworks and coding. But this goal is achievable, and it should be a top priority. Other communities similar to Jackson have successes that we can learn from, and adapt to meet our situation here. We have the opportunity to become leaders on how to best achieve real shifts in development patterns. We are aware that you have said for years that beginning work on this complicated subject doesn't need to begin until after the adoption of the Comp Plan. As an expert in the field, Mr. White strongly disagreed, and for years the Alliance has also strongly disagreed with this postponement. Finally, the residents of Teton County seem to overwhelmingly disagree with the idea that they should trust you to figure all of this out later. If you do not begin research and development of tools to achieve your vision now, you will end up adopting a Comp Plan in March, and then have to rely on the same inadequate tools that we have had for years. We will fail to achieve our objective on development patterns until we have a complete set of cutting edge policy tools. We need to stop putting off this vital work if you want to see real change during your tenure. Perhaps more importantly, significant action is needed on this topic to regain the trust of the public you represent. In our recent neighborhood discussions, we consistently heard from residents that they support shifting development patterns, and they might even be willing to allow increased residential density in some areas, if that was offset by permanent conservation of critical wildlife habitat. But many of your constituents don't trust that this tradeoff will actually happen. They fear that you will zone some areas for increased density, and then fail to counterbalance that with conservation easements in rural areas. This could actually increase the overall entitled development potential in the county, which most residents clearly oppose. Given years without progress toward developing at least a consensus on the tools we will use, and without making a plan for when and how we will research and develop detailed regulations that are appropriate in Teton County, their mistrust seems justified. In the current Character District process, residents are now asked to identify where they could live with redevelopment and increased density, and where they would like to see conservation and rural character. Residents rightfully ask how you intend to achieve the vision they can draw for you on these maps. You urgently need a more concrete answer than what you have offered so far. The Alliance strongly urges you to begin this process now. Create a Request for Proposals on a regulatory framework to shift development patterns in Teton County Wyoming. Publicly commit to selecting an expert firm for this important work before the end of this year. The Alliance will help you in this process in any way we can. We are committed to the same goals you have reaffirmed for the future of Jackson Hole, and we want to make sure we actually achieve them. We hope that the presentation the Alliance organized on shifting development patterns was useful as an illustration of the many tools that are available to us, and as an indication of the sheer volume of important work

Date	Name	Comment
		that remains before us. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this further with each of you. Sincerely, Trevor Stevenson Executive Director The Executive Summary, PowerPoint presentation, and Interview with Mark White are all on our website at the following addresses: Summary of Shifting Development Patterns Presentaion: http://www.jhalliance.org/Library/Alerts/2011/MarkWhiteSummary.10-21-11.pdf Direct link to 10/12/11 "Comp Plan Uncomplicated" radio interview with Mark White: http://www.jhalliance.org/Library/Audio/2011/CompPlanMarkWhite.10-12-11.16kbps.mp3 Direct link to the PDF of Mark White's 10/6/11 PowerPoint presentation: http://www.jhalliance.org/Library/Alerts/2011/MarkWhitePresentation.10-6-11.pdf
10/21/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex and all – we were told that updated maps would be available today. So where are they? Cannot update interested residents if we don't see what you have incorporated from public comment to date.
10/21/2011	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	It seems very interesting that the two Wilson dates have major conflicts with Wilson families. October 29th is the Wilson School carnival where many parents volunteer to set up in the afternoon and participate in the evening event. I do not think you will get a good turnout on a day where families are focused on a big family event in our community. It also seems ridiculous that the other Wilson date for the Aspens at Teton Pines is on Halloween. Once again this is not a feasible time for families in our community to participate in this process. It is important that the members of our community attend our neighborhood specific meetings and I think that this is very poor planning on your part. Please consider a schedule change for these meetings.

Date	Name	Comment
10/20/2011	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	Thank you for taking the time to read the following, and the opportunity to voice my concerns regarding the final phase of our Comprehensive Plan. I would also like to thank all of you for your time and continued efforts to achieve that goal. I hope to see you all at one of the upcoming meetings. REGROWTH vs. NEW GROWTH: As the Comprehensive Plans draws to an end, the final discussions concentrate over appropriate growth. Significant agreements on wildlife preservation and scenic values have been solidly established as the first two priorities in the Comp Plan. These priorities are shared by our community citizens and elected officials, county and town alike. Given these two priorities, the remainder of the Plan should be straight forward. What remains is how to best carry those stated values into the planning process for potential future growth. The equation of growth vs. wildlife/scenic values must remain neutral at best to continue to keep our priorities in balance. With that equation, the only growth we should be planning for is re-growth, not new growth. Regrowth concepts allow for existing, underutilized footprints to be renovated to serve the potential needs of housing and commercial development. For example, two potential target areas for renovation/regrowth consideration could be existing commercial buildings on either side of Highway 89 south of the Kmart Plaza and the Gregory Lane commercial area. These two areas hold high potential for shared commercial /housing space without sprawl and excessive build out. The 5-way intersection in town also represents huge potential for regrowth capacity and design excellence. Sprawl would be our worst case scenario, and in direct conflict with our committed priorities. Renovation and revitalization of these existing areas meets a responsible decision for growth. Transportation also plays a crucial part of the equation. Upgrading the infrastructure of our existing roadways, Start Bus routes, and neighborhood street upgrades to include bike paths, pedestrian sidewalks and enhanced pedestrian cross-walks will allow for much needed enhancement toward public safety and the satisfaction of traffic flow demands far into the future for Jackson. This regrowth approach affords the protection of our wildlife and scenic values, while improving multi-use transportation ideals. Regrowth concepts can work in every district in the Jackson area, as its residents deem necessary. Improvements can be met without additional build-outs and road construction. Precious remaining parcels of private lands can protect their property rights structured through this process combined with permanent open space protection mechanisms such as transfer development rights (TDRs) and planned residential development (PDRs) guidelines. These tools need to be clearly outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Let us stay creative and keep Jackson magnificent today, and in our future.

Date	Name	Comment
10/17/2011	Hoffman, Nancy Interested Public	Hi All. Found the article below in the NY Times. Beware of returning Walmarts in the future. Probably reducing the permitted impervious surfaces for commercial development and no trades for added parking in the regulations might help. It may be a while before they look here, but another fight to drive them away may not be as energetic as before. Who knows. Also, I attended first time the S. Park group meeting last week to talk about our vision for the future. It was quite clear that everyone enjoyed the rural character of the area and felt a total community would not be appropriate, since so many services were close by. It helps to have a Smith's so close. Also the connectivity of the Snake to the buttes on the East are extremely important to maintain for wildlife. There is a lot of it as demonstrated by the animal road kill this past winter. There was also acceptance of some intense development in the northern portion of S. Park and working a win win with the two landowners was imperative. Sorry there is so much stuff here. Hope all is well with you. Cheers, Nancy Hoffman (Reuters) - Wal-Mart Stores Inc will shut its four Marketside stores next week, abandoning the concept after three years as it works on opening other small shops. Marketside marked Wal-Mart's attempt to give U.S. shoppers a quick place to buy prepared food such as roasted chicken and freshly baked bread for last-minute meals without the need for a trip to a larger grocery store or supercenter. The stores also carry produce, wine and other groceries. The world's largest retailer opened its four Marketside stores in the Phoenix metropolitan area in 2008. A year later, it started to sell some Marketside branded food in other Walmart stores, and it will continue to do so. The four Arizona stores -- in Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa and Tempe -- will close on October 21, a spokesman said on Friday. Wal-Mart is not the first U.S. grocer to abandon the concept of a small shop selling prepared food to consumers looking for quick meal solutions. Supervalu Inc shut down a similar upscale concept store in Chicago, Urban Fresh, in 2009 after just over a year. Now, Wal-Mart is banking on another small-store concept, more aligned with its roots, as a potential growth vehicle in rural and urban locations where its larger shops would not work. Wal-Mart's Marketside stores, at roughly 16,000 square feet, are about the same size as the Walmart Express test format the company launched in June. So far, Wal-Mart is pleased with the five Walmart Express stores in Arkansas, North Carolina and Chicago. It plans to have 11 such stores by the end of the year. "We continue to believe it will take multiple years for Walmart to perfect this concept, if ever," said Avondale Partners analyst Mark Montagna. The analyst said he does not expect the expansion of Walmart Express to hurt one of its strongest low-priced competitors, Dollar General Corp , which happens to be making some of its small stores a little bigger. Walmart Express, still in its infancy, recently came under new leadership. Anthony Hucker, who had been a Wal-Mart vice president overseeing Walmart Express, left to join Ahold's Giant Landover grocery division in September. Debra Layton, senior vice president for small formats, layouts and space productivity, is now in charge of Walmart Express. SHRINKING STORE SIZES Walmart Express stores, which range from about 10,000 square feet to 15,000 square feet, feel more like traditional Walmart stores than the Marketside shops. Walmart Express stores are stocked with groceries and some housewares. Pharmacies are included in some of the locations. Earlier this week, Wal-Mart said it would ramp up openings of its Neighborhood Market stores, which at about 42,000 square feet are much larger than Marketside or Walmart Express stores but much smaller than Walmart supercenters. The first Neighborhood Market opened in 1998. There are about 185 such stores now. Wal-Mart plans to open 80 to 100 small and medium-format stores in its next fiscal year. Most will be Neighborhood Markets. This year, it plans to open just 25 to 30 small and medium shops. The majority of Wal-Mart's new U.S. stores -- up to 120 this year and up to 135 in fiscal 2013 -- will continue to be supercenters. Even those are getting a bit smaller. New supercenters are set to be roughly 90,000 to 120,000 square feet. Walmart supercenters used to average about 185,000 square feet.

Date	Name	Comment
10/17/2011	Gridley, Mary Interested Public	I live in Indian Trails. When you do the connector road on Tribal Trail, it will become a speedway for young drivers heading to/from the high school and parents dropping off/picking up children unless you put in stop signs on Tribal Trail. The only way to make it a safe road for our families who live in Indian Trails is to make all three intersections with local streets (Cherokee Lane, Lakota Lane, and Seneca Lane) Three-Way Stops. Then the cars will have to stop at the stop signs, allow residents to exit their streets, and slow the traffic to a reasonable speed. Without the stop signs, there will be no reasonable way to slow cars and trucks down if a policeman is not there on duty.
10/17/2011	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	I'm concerned that upzoning will not result in saving open spaces as it is proposed to do. There is already a lot of development potential already approved. thank you.
10/13/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex - We were able to make copies for the meeting last night. Thanks again. Great attendance so late in the process – we spent close to two hours with around forty residents. Although we focused on the next plan steps the end of this month – and how to prepare them to participate – the overriding comment was: •“Why do we have to do this all over again – have they not been listening to all of our comments, polls, and mapping exercises over the last four years?” The cynical view also expressed last night was the planners and electeds: •“Keep asking the same question over and over again. They just don’t like our answers and are looking for a few people to finally tell them what they want to hear – so they can ignore the rest of us.” Anyway just being straight up – I understand their feelings - but encouraged them to still participate one last time. We spent our time reviewing their vision for South Park – and educating about where in the process we are - and how to participate next. I will say many have simply dropped out through communication to me (emails and/or conversations). Their reasons can be simplified to two general feelings: •“I have already told them what we wanted a number of times. I am not going to do it again.” •“We have already been clear what we wanted in South Park – they just don’t want to hear what we have to say.” You can pass along these thoughts to the electeds if you wish – I have copied the other planners and consultant. I am doing the best I can to keep people engaged – but nearly everyone I talk to is suspicious of this current phase – and want to make sure the “powers to be” focus on the very consistent public comment that has already been submitted in droves from our region – and from the public in general – over the last four years. What I fear is if the updated district maps before these late October workshops – or their final versions - deviate much from what folks have been saying for years – then you truly will see people irate. So to summarize I am asking folks to participate. The rate of participation has dropped off considerably – as folks are struggling to keep their homes, raise their families and enjoy our valley. Plus the majority that are still hanging in – and nearly all of those that have dropped out – have lost faith that the process is fair. You really need to emphasize that you are equally weighing all of the previous comments and polls – and that this last phase is not an end-run around the public. I truly believe we only get one more chance to show the public the comp plan process is fair and balanced. I continue to try to be part of the solution – and not part of the problem. Rich PS Again like all communication this is public – I do think the electeds should know my sense of the frustration I have now heard in the last few weeks from scores of residents. I probably hear more from the public at this point in the process - then the electeds do. The planning team is the one to consider my thoughts - and decide to share it with the electeds – or not.

Date	Name	Comment
10/13/2011	, Conservation Alliance	Chirp? It's time for our decision makers to hear more than just the sound of crickets chirping. This month is one of your last chances to tell planners and your elected representatives what you want Jackson Hole and your neighborhood to look like in coming years. The town and county are holding meeting on the second half of the Comp Plan – the Character District Maps – Oct. 27 through Nov. 1 (Visit www.jacksonstetetonplan.com for times and locations.) These maps are intended to show how the Comp Plan policies will be implemented “on the ground,” and will form the basis of the town and county zoning maps and land development regulations to come. That's why your input on them now is so important. Every voice is critical in the next phase as the Comp Plan policies are translated into these maps that will guide growth, development and conservation in the valley for years to come. Even if you haven't been involved, or if you have been but stopped, now is the time get engaged. Get ready for these meetings by attending one of the Alliance's neighborhood discussions being held in mid-October. Share ideas, and become better informed and prepared. Visit www.jhalliance.org for details. Remember, this is your community and your voice matters!
10/13/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex - We were able to make copies for the meeting last night. Thanks again. Great attendance so late in the process – we spent close to two hours with around forty residents. Although we focused on the next plan steps the end of this month – and how to prepare them to participate – the overriding comment was: •“Why do we have to do this all over again – have they not been listening to all of our comments, polls, and mapping exercises over the last four years?” The cynical view also expressed last night was the planners and electeds: •“Keep asking the same question over and over again. They just don't like our answers and are looking for a few people to finally tell them what they want to hear – so they can ignore the rest of us.” Anyway just being straight up – I understand their feelings - but encouraged them to still participate one last time. We spent our time reviewing their vision for South Park – and educating about where in the process we are - and how to participate next. I will say many have simply dropped out through communication to me (emails and/or conversations). Their reasons can be simplified to two general feelings: •“I have already told them what we wanted a number of times. I am not going to do it again.” •“We have already been clear what we wanted in South Park – they just don't want to hear what we have to say.” You can pass along these thoughts to the electeds if you wish – I have copied the other planners and consultant. I am doing the best I can to keep people engaged – but nearly everyone I talk to is suspicious of this current phase – and want to make sure the “powers to be” focus on the very consistent public comment that has already been submitted in droves from our region – and from the public in general – over the last four years. What I fear is if the updated district maps before these late October workshops – or their final versions - deviate much from what folks have been saying for years – then you truly will see people irate. So to summarize I am asking folks to participate. The rate of participation has dropped off considerably – as folks are struggling to keep their homes, raise their families and enjoy our valley. Plus the majority that are still hanging in – and nearly all of those that have dropped out – have lost faith that the process is fair. You really need to emphasize that you are equally weighing all of the previous comments and polls – and that this last phase is not an end-run around the public. I truly believe we only get one more chance to show the public the comp plan process is fair and balanced. I continue to try to be part of the solution – and not part of the problem. Rich PS Again like all communication this is public – I do think the electeds should know my sense of the frustration I have now heard in the last few weeks from scores of residents. I probably hear more from the public at this point in the process - then the electeds do. The planning team is the one to consider my thoughts - and decide to share it with the electeds – or not.
10/7/2011	Lee, Mira Interested Public	Support commercial development for communities south of town e.g. Melody and Rafter J. Retail, services etc.

Date	Name	Comment
10/4/2011	Flosbach, Amanda Interested Public	A note of thanks for inviting the community to participate in your feedback sessions last week. I attended late Thursday evening and was part of a group led by Mike, and I enjoyed not only the opportunity to share my vision for Jackson, but also the well-organized format and engaged facilitators - it was both effective and fun. I wanted to follow up by putting the thoughts I shared in writing and sending it to you. Here are my two cents, focused primarily on the Town Square business character district: •Preference for development up, not out - the land has already been "broken" so since it's very unlikely anyone is going to "undevelop" it and restore it to its natural state, let's do something interesting and ALIVE with it. •Desire to encourage complete neighborhoods whenever possible (walk to services, grocery, restaurant, activities w/in .5 mile radius) •Recommendation to expand zoning restrictions to encourage greater vibrancy in select neighborhoods of higher density: Allow for all types of mixed use to include Restaurant and other vibrant, people-filled businesses that serve visitors and locals (AKA not just vacant office space) from Broadway to Snow King along the King, Cache, Glenwood and Millward corridors, which would allow for more supporting businesses and activities to develop around the Center for the Arts and Brew Pub/Fitzgerald's. •Need for complete sidewalks the full length of above streets to make said corridors pedestrian friendly to encourage flow between these denser vibrant enclaves/nodes •Interest in creating a family friendly pedestrian mall on or around the Town Square for locals and visitors alike, such as an open space with playground or appropriate activity (successful example = new Teton Village Commons where the playground/water fountain combo allows kids to play while parents eat on the deck at Osteria. For many of my friends with kids, this is a favorite summer activity. Something like this would be totally possible on/near the Town Square.) •A need to clean up and create a welcoming sense of arrival at main entry points to Jackson, whether its landscape architecture affected by the Town or basic requirements of maintenance for frontage property owners Thanks so much for the opportunity.
9/30/2011	Krieger, Nicole Interested Public	I just wanted to say how impressed I was with the setup last night at the Center for the Arts. It is clear how much work has been put into the process. Thank you!!

Date	Name	Comment
9/23/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Thank you again for meeting with the Alliance last week, and for sending these documents for our review and comment. I'll provide some feedback here that I hope is helpful to you in designing and facilitating the upcoming workshops. First, I would like to point out that there is still a lot of confusion around what exactly each phase of the process will focus on. These documents help clarify, but please note that you have not been consistent in what to name each phase, which adds to the confusion. For example, your 3 documents give 3 totally different names to the first phase of the process: "Illustrating our Vision Workshops", or "Identifying", or "Existing Character Workshops". I'd encourage you to use consistent naming, and think that "Existing Character" and "Future Character" Workshops are the clearest names for what people should expect in each phase. Second, I'm unclear how many Character Districts there will be. You presented 15 to the electeds, but they decided to add one more, so don't you have 16 now? Your documents still say 15. Moving on to the Workshop Agenda, we have a number of concerns and suggestions. I'll present those point by point on the questions you present in your agenda: 1. What makes the District special? What sort of info are you hoping for here? What will you actually DO with this info? Unless you're clear how you would USE the answer to this question, don't ask it. 2. Where do people live and what are the housing types? 3. Where are the employment or commercial centers? 4. What amenities are present (trails, transit, recreation, schools)? We think that questions 2, 3, and 4 are largely a waste of the public's time, which should be used on topics where their perspective is more important. Planning staff already have extremely detailed answers to these questions, displayed on highly accurate maps. Don't ask a question you already have the answer to. 5. Where are the key sensitive wildlife and visual areas? This seems like an important question, because existing maps (NRO and SRO), don't have the fine level of detail that local residents can provide from their intimate knowledge of the area. What will you do with the answers to this question? Will you draw new areas on the map as being critical to wildlife and scenery, based on anecdotal input from residents? 6. Identify areas that are likely to change. What are some opportunities for these areas? 7. Describe improvements needed to preserve and enhance the character of the district as well as meet the community's goals. Questions 6 and 7 seem to clearly belong in Phase 2, the "Future Character Workshops." We don't think that adding these questions into a workshop on "Existing Character" makes sense. At the very least, it is extremely important that you focus these questions in Phase 2 even if people begin to talk about this in Phase 1. 8. Based on the definition contained in the Comprehensive Plan, is the District more suitable as a complete neighborhood or a rural area? Question 8 Seems to be THE major point of this workshop, and should be emphasized, not tacked on the end. Additional Questions we feel should be included: First, remember that you had previously talked about the primary purpose of Phase 1 being to adjust any Character District boundaries as needed based on public feedback. If so, we believe this should be an explicit question, and an emphasis of this Workshop. Your workshop agenda says "Actual districts to be determined", so please be clear in asking people to work on that. However, I will note that we are still not convinced that the actual boundaries of the Character Districts matter for much. Second, we feel the public could provide valuable input on their sense of the "Character" of each character district. You will capture some of the technical, quantitative information on character with your questions, but you haven't done much to gather information on the more nebulous QUALITATIVE character of each district. What is the social character of each district? Young families? Retired? Wealthy? Working class? Highly organized and cohesive? Individualistic? Tendency to use pathways, or only cars? This is data that may not be as readily available to planners, and can be useful in thinking about what issues to focus on in each character district, and how to approach the different audiences that live in each district. We would encourage you to ask questions that get at the qualitative social character of each district. Thoughts on Public Participation We do not anticipate broad public participation in Phase 1 of your process, due to very late release of a plan for the workshop, confusion about what the purpose of the workshop is, and a very skeptical and burned out public. The Alliance is interested in strongly encouraging public participation in Phase 2 of your process, but in order to do so we need much more detail on how you intend to conduct Phase 2. We would like to work with you in identifying exactly how you will organize and facilitate the workshops in Phase

Date	Name	Comment
		2. We need clarity on what questions will be asked, what workshop format will be used, and how participants feedback will be used to inform your decisions. We also need to know where these workshops will be held, and which character districts will be the primary focus of each workshop. Bear in mind that we need answers to all of these questions by the first week of October if you expect to engage the public meaningfully in Phase 2. The Alliance respectfully requests an opportunity to meet with planning staff and AECOM in the immediate future to discuss your plans for Phase 2 and provide you with suggestions before you finalize the design of the next workshops. Thank you again for your work on this vital step in our Comprehensive Plan, and we look forward to continuing to work with you.
9/23/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	Willow Street, from Snow King to Gill, is a Commerical through-fare, although in non-compliance:Vehicle traffic ranges 2000-4000 autos p/day, not including trucks & buses. The effects of such high activity preclude residential or AR zoning. There are only four owner occupied residencies on Willow; the remainder being primarily heavy commerical, mostly large Town & County bldgs. Commerical zoning of all lots which border Willow St. on the East & West, will preclude the requirements to re-route or restrict traffic; protect adjoining property occupants; add attractiveness & function; create a welcoming & friendly village style district & concretely illustrate our [Town] vision. I have lived & worked @ 450 Willow for 30 yrs., and know this district intimately. Our property @ purchase was zoned MR4. It was the Bruun connector & prior Town planning that designated Willow St. use as Commercial.
9/19/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the Conservation Alliance, thank you for your attention to this letter. We recently had a productive meeting with Jeff and Tyler, and wanted to follow-up with this brief memo outlining that conversation and the conclusions that we drew. We appreciated the clarification of the different phases of the process, specifically the emphasis on public participation. As you know, the Alliance will be working hard to motivate the public to participate if we believe that their involvement will result in meaningful improvements to the plan. We are encouraged that the planning staff intends to submit press releases to the local papers to outline the overall process, and then again in advance of each of the phases to alert the public to the goals and logistics of each phase. This process is complicated, and the more it can be explained to the public, the more likely they are to participate. Press releases are a vital part of your overall outreach and community engagement strategy. A more specific definition of a “character district” and what it means for an area to have lines drawn around it would also benefit your communications to the community. A key way to engage the public effectively will be to make sure that they understand the goals and content of this character district review process, and what their role in this process is. We recommend that you clearly explain why the public should invest time in this process. This is what we understand the first three phases of process to be; we would appreciate any clarifications if we are incorrect. Phase 1: Community Workshops We see that the primary contribution of the public in this phase is ground-truthing, or confirming that the existing conditions as laid out in the draft character district maps are accurate. Phase 2: Neighborhood Workshops This phase seems to be the most important for public involvement. This is the primary opportunity for the community to share their opinions on what their neighborhood (within the character districts) should look like in the future. This is also a time to bring forward new ideas for the desired future of each district. Phase 3: Open House This is one of the final opportunities that the public has to ensure that the maps will implement the community’s vision for the life of the Plan. This is the chance for the community to review the policies once they see them illustrated, and give feedback on whether the policies are generating the desired results as seen in the maps. The character district maps, as outlined in the Plan’s policies, are meant to be a reflection and illustration of the policies themselves, in map and text form. That said, one of the most important aspects of the resolution to accept the policies was that there be room for refinements to the policies if the character district mapping process revealed inadequacies in the policies. Allowing space for this final check-back of the policies is an important part of public input before final adoption of the new Comprehensive Plan. We continue to believe that effective community engagement is central to the success of this character district mapping exercise and to the overall plan. The community needs to be sure that their input is valued and has the potential to improve the final product. It will be important to not only inform the public but also solicit and incorporate their input. Thank you for your work on behalf of the community and your commitment to the success of this community exercise. The Alliance is eager to help you find ways to effectively engage the community, and we hope that you will be in touch if we can advise on how to best conduct this important final phase of the Comp Plan process.

Date	Name	Comment
9/16/2011	Petersen, Charlie, Jr. Interested Public	RE: 115 Nelson Drive, Petersen Living Trust Parcel # OJ-001547 The Petersen family has been in Jackson Hole since the 1890's after homesteading on what is now the National Elk Refuge. In the 1930's Charlie Petersen Sr. was on the work crew that hand dug the city water lines from Cache Creek to town. He worked as an outfitter, guide, bartender, manager and was part owner of the Cowboy Bar. The Petersen family, through their hard work, has contributed to the culture, spirit and development of Jackson for over 100 years. The property at 115 Nelson Drive was my Dad's residence since the 1940's. He recently passed away at the age of 101. When the Daisy Bush property was before the planning commission (Prugh), I appeared at the meeting and requested that our property be treated in the same manner in the future. Both Daisy Bush and the Petersen properties are currently zoned SR. The property to west is zoned AR (Rancher Street Condos), property to north is zoned NC-SF (Nelson Subdivision), to the east is USFS. The property is approximately 115' x 515'. It is 1.33 ± acres. SR zoning currently allows (outright uses), single family uses, planned unit development, condominium subdivision and townhouse subdivision. In the proposed "conceptual future land use map" for District 15: East Jackson, Daisy Bush and Rancher Street Condos are proposed for Single-Family Mixed Type and the Petersen property is inexplicably changed to Single-Family Low. Under the Future Land Use Plan chapter-Land Classifications of the proposed Comp Plan, SF-Low allows, one unit per lot, and only detached single family units. SF-mixed type, would allow single family, duplex, trip-plex and four-plex units compatible with the neighborhood character. Because of the narrow shape of this lot, SF-Low does not provide normal development options that would have been allowed under the CURRENT ZONING of SR. By down-zoning to SF-Low, the town is effectively creating a one acre lot with only one unit. The Petersen Family Trust requests that this parcel retain the land classification/zoning that is being applied to those properties that adjoin it and are currently in the same zone as this property (Daisy Bush). It should be included in the SF-Mixed Type zone of the proposed comp plan, 7500 square foot lot size.

Date	Name	Comment
8/2/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Back to talking about "small is beautiful" with the link below to better explain what I mean. They are called Pocket Neighborhoods. Has there been any small neighborhoods (with around ten to twelve homes in it) like this done or planned? I seem to remember a giant neighborhood plan with garages in the back of the homes and common area in front for Northern South Park back in 2000. The closest I've seen to pocket neighborhoods is the affordable small home neighborhood along South Park Loop Road with the garages along South Park. The paragraph I included below is from this site's codes page that has a PDF help guide to codes for pocket neighborhoods. There is still too much emphasis on getting moderate to low income people into tiny 2 and 3 story boxes covering lot line to lot line in an urban setting leaving the wealthy to keep building their mega mansions gobbling up energy, wasting materials and creating the need for more service workers (that need more housing) to look after their McMansion the 48 weeks the owners aren't there. Lets start downsizing everybody not just the little guys. http://pocket-neighborhoods.net/index.html Pocket Neighborhood Codes Pocket Neighborhoods are allowed to happen, or not, by the zoning codes that regulate development. Unfortunately, zoning regulations in many jurisdictions in America date back to the 1950s and 60s when suburban standards for single-family homes were the norm. Pocket neighborhoods may not fit these narrow prescriptions in a number of ways, making them difficult to develop. Many towns and cities, however, are writing new codes to accommodate a wider choice of housing options, including pocket neighborhoods. The Municipal Research and Services Center in Washington State has compiled links to several cities that have adopted cottage courtyard codes, as well as a synopsis of 'cottage housing' and related articles. Another useful site to go to for further information is The Housing Partnership. In 2001, after the success of early cottage courtyard developments in the Puget Sound Region, they wrote "Cottage Housing in Your Community" (download PDF), a guide to drafting cottage housing ordinances that provide general considerations and parameters for such codes. If your city or town has a pocket neighborhood, cottage housing or innovative housing ordinance, we'd like to know about it. Please write us. ----- ---- You notice that the pocket neighborhoods don't have convenience stores. There are a lot of great complete neighborhoods without having to throw everything and the kitchen sink into them. Have a great week! Kathy

Date	Name	Comment																								
7/20/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Town council and County commissioners, I read the article in the JHN&G about trimming costs on the comprehensive plan process to accommodate the consultant's fee. Please don't cut out the outreach (I like neighborhood input) meetings for the mapping part of the comp plan. That would be the final blow to public participation and faith in the process. Great article below on changing the way we view and act on our economy. (Scroll down to the comparison list) We can get a lot more done for the whole of the community if we follow the meta economic view instead of the destructive quantative. We shouldn't be competing with Teton Village for the high end dollar. It only rewards a few and punishes the many people who work hard to make ends meet. For instance... homes under \$500,000 are getting hammered with devaluation while the upper end is enjoying a stable market. It seems that all the safety nets are protecting the people who don't need protecting. One more thing... Don't forget "Small is Beautiful" !! The neglect, indeed the rejection, of wisdom has gone so far that most of our intellectuals have not even the faintest idea what the term could mean. But where can wisdom be found? It can only be found inside oneself. To find it one must become liberated. Through such liberation one can become relevant. Wisdom enables us to see the hollowness and fundamental unsatisfactoriness of a life devoted primarily to the pursuit of material ends, to the total neglect of the spiritual and the sustainable. The influence of economics upon the management of government has grown exponentially since the seventies. However, it is now being realized that the judgment of economics is a most fragmentary one. Classic economic theory deals with demand and supply but all contemporary demand and supply is exchanged through the medium of money; fiat money. Due to the importance of stable money supply to the correct stewardship of any economy no government should unduly tamper with its smooth operation. To do so invites mayhem. As a result of catastrophic error, sub-prime crises, derivative explosion, credit balloons, defunct regularity oversight, debt monetization, and private credit exploitation the money supply has become so corrupted it is almost impossible for anybody to make correct economic decisions. The historic" medium of exchange" model has been broken. Fidelity with the integrity and the sacrifices of our forefathers has been compromised by a shallow elite. To get out of this "economic crisis" governments must now start thinking in Meta-Economic modalities. Thus we must acknowledge that to sort out the mess we must go beyond "classic" quantative economic thought. In the new paradigm, wisdom must prevail. The fatal flaw of lack of adequate purchasing power, under the current "credit" model, must be acknowledged. Without this conceptual breakthrough the crisis will never be adequately solved. Current economic thinking only touches the surface of things and takes for granted so much that should be accounted for; i.e. clean air, fresh water, moral integrity of the majority, faith in authority etc. etc. In a sense this quantative model promotes total institutional selfishness and irresponsibility. This is all very well as long as there is no systemic failure but, unfortunately, systemic crisis is exactly what we are now faced with. Gross irresponsibility has taken the sacredness out of life. The macro crisis is not simply an objective one. It becomes personal in the form of depression, loneliness, isolation, meaninglessness, exhaustion, marriage break-up, atomization, pharma-medicinal dependence, addiction and suicide. To bring about change in this zeitgeist quality must be brought back into the quantative social model. We must strive to bring LIFE back to the process of living. The formula for this is to reintegrate simplicity, integrity and constraint into the functioning of our institutions, enterprises, thought processes and behaviour. Patterns of action must be championed that honor human satisfaction on all levels not just financially. To comprehend this "meta" concept, some examples of Meta-Economic mind-set principles V's those of Quantative Economics one are set out below: <table><tr><td>Meta-Economic:</td><td>Qantatative Economic:</td></tr><tr><td>Timely</td><td>Fast</td></tr><tr><td>Need</td><td>Want</td></tr><tr><td>Sustainable</td><td>Profitable</td></tr><tr><td>Community</td><td>Individual</td></tr><tr><td>Co-operation</td><td>Competition</td></tr><tr><td>Human</td><td>Mechanic</td></tr><tr><td>Capital Resource</td><td>Current Factor of Production</td></tr><tr><td>Practical Whole</td><td>Conceptual Sub-Set</td></tr><tr><td>Shared Purchasing Power</td><td>Private Credit</td></tr><tr><td>Medium of Exchange</td><td>Fiat Money</td></tr><tr><td>Local</td><td>Tans-National</td></tr></table>	Meta-Economic:	Qantatative Economic:	Timely	Fast	Need	Want	Sustainable	Profitable	Community	Individual	Co-operation	Competition	Human	Mechanic	Capital Resource	Current Factor of Production	Practical Whole	Conceptual Sub-Set	Shared Purchasing Power	Private Credit	Medium of Exchange	Fiat Money	Local	Tans-National
Meta-Economic:	Qantatative Economic:																									
Timely	Fast																									
Need	Want																									
Sustainable	Profitable																									
Community	Individual																									
Co-operation	Competition																									
Human	Mechanic																									
Capital Resource	Current Factor of Production																									
Practical Whole	Conceptual Sub-Set																									
Shared Purchasing Power	Private Credit																									
Medium of Exchange	Fiat Money																									
Local	Tans-National																									

Date	Name	Comment

Art	Design
Education	Training
Process	Structure
Authority	Power
Means	Ends
Order	Control
Tadition	Law
Common Sense	Central Ordinance

For economics to become valuable and relevant again to sustainable society its practitioners must realise the truth that economics is a social science and as such it deals with human beings, not atomised ciphers. Rationality must reconstitute itself with morality, ethics and philosophy. If national and international economists continue to lose these classical thought centres, social disintegration will spiral out, uncontrollably.

Governments and economists must begin to see the whole picture again. We have foolishly and recklessly abandoned our great Western-Christian heritage. The task now is one of metaphysical regeneration. Economics must stop being taught where awareness of human nature is lacking. We are suffering from a metaphysical disease and therefore the cure is meta-physical: meta-economical. It is time for economics and accounting to grow up and transcend there historical roots.

By Christopher M. Quigley
B.Sc., M.M.I.I. Grad., M.A.

Date	Name	Comment
7/11/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Attached are some suggestions from the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance on the Character District Mapping phase of the Comprehensive Plan. Since we're emailing this on the day of your JIM meeting, I'll also bring printed copies to the JIM meeting this afternoon. I request that you give me the opportunity to speak briefly on this topic during the public comment portion of today's meeting. On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the next important phase of the ongoing Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan rewrite – the “Illustrating Our Vision” Section. We are basing our comments on the information provided in the staff report for the “Character Districts Scope and Fee for Professional Services.” We would like to reiterate our goal of ensuring that this process is highly participatory and includes meaningful public input, which are vital to helping us develop well-designed plans for the future of Jackson Hole. To achieve that goal, we need to review the timeline of events to make sure that the public is given enough time before each meeting to review materials and provide well informed comments. It will also be important to review the structure of each meeting in the process to facilitate meaningful input by the public. We recognize that many of the details of this process will be worked out in the upcoming months and we request that you consider our input as your plans are refined. The Alliance will assist in the next phase by working to increase informed involvement for the public. Our detailed recommendations are included below, and we appreciate your careful consideration of our input as you design the next phase of the planning process. Form and Content of the Character District Section Data Compilation In the recent report “Technical Analysis of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan,” Alan Richman provides the following statement related to the Character District section of the plan: “So the stakes for the upcoming character district mapping process could not be higher... Completion of the character district maps is an essential part of this Comprehensive Plan. The initial step in the mapping process should be a rigorous analysis of the amount and locations of development that are proposed to be reduced in conservation areas and an equally detailed analysis of the areas proposed for increased development as complete neighborhoods. In other words, the maps need to be more than a pretty picture of a planning concept.” Based on the information provided in the scope of work, it is still unclear to what extent rigorous analysis will be used to inform the creation of the Character Districts. We urge you to recognize that many members of the public are looking to this next phase of the process to provide more predictability and specificity than the policy section of the plan currently provides. However, in order for this section of the plan to do this, and to do so in a positive, informed manner, it will be important to conduct thorough, analyses of the NRO, SRO, and the cost of growth at both the individual districts and valley-wide scales. Without these analyses, it is difficult for the maps to be more than “pretty pictures.” By the August JIM, we hope that you will commit to initiating strategies that would benefit the Character District mapping process, such as the creation of a task force to explore potential transfer mechanisms. We are pleased that information will be compiled and incorporated during the month of July. As part of this effort it will also be important to acknowledge data gaps, and possible implications of those gaps in terms of future planning decisions. In our June 24 correspondence, we highlighted several data inquiries that we believe should be immediately initiated: • Collecting the best available wildlife science that can inform policies and maps • Assessing the cumulative impacts of development on wildlife • Identifying key scenic resources • Determining which transfer mechanisms might work in Jackson Hole • Identifying growth boundaries that would inform the maps Also, in the case that information is outdated, or is lacking, it will be important for this plan to take a precautionary approach and err on the side of caution when proposing new development-based “enhancements” to planning districts. Illustrating our Vision – Including Individual District and Countywide Scales The final Character District Section should include a component that addresses the comprehensive picture of the valley, and not just focus on depictions and descriptions of individual districts. For example, the April 2009 Future Land Use Plan did not include an overall, comprehensive map of the county demonstrating how different districts are related at a broader level, nor did it illustrate a comprehensive depiction of the various town districts. The districts were only depicted individually, which detracted from an overall comprehensive look at the community vision. This comprehensive look is a critical component of a comprehensive plan. It is important to understand that all areas or “districts” are strongly interconnected in terms of planning at the valley level. What happens in one location has implications for planning issues in other locations. Specifically, impacts from development are direct, indirect and cumulative; all of these impacts must be considered when evaluating suitable locations,

amounts and types of new development. Overall, this concept of interconnectedness among planning districts must be strongly upheld within the maps and narrative of the new section of the plan.

Re-engaging the Public

The proposed scope of work includes a number of opportunities for public involvement. In order to maximize effective public engagement during the community's review of this section of the plan, it will be important to prioritize the following issues and either provide clarifications or make changes to the proposed work.

- Additional information should inform improvements to policies

The creation and review of the Character District section of the plan constitute the test of how well the policies and vision can be implemented. At the most basic level, a plan must be clear and its implementation must be feasible. It will be important to allow time for the planning team and the public to learn from this next phase of the process and to make suggestions for how the policies section of the plan could be adjusted based on additional information, prior to final adoption. Although the elected officials spoke to their intention to do this in the last JIM meeting, this component is currently not described as a potential need in the scope of work, and should be added. Overall, the scope of work should build in time to make final adjustments to not only the Character District section, but also the policies section to create an overall better plan.

- Clarification of the Expectations of JIM #1 with regard to public input

The scope of work states that the planning team will facilitate a JIM in August to "confirm the consistency of the preliminary character district boundaries, descriptions and classifications..." If public input will be accommodated in JIM #1, materials describing these preliminary boundaries and descriptions should be provided to the public well in advance – at least two weeks before the meeting. In general, it would be helpful to clarify the elected officials' intentions for desired public input at this stage of the Character District review process.

- Sufficient notice of the schedule of specific dates and times of public meetings and open houses

Many of the opportunities for public involvement include either condensed meetings in one week, or within one day. In order for the public to plan ahead to participate, it will be important to have the schedule of meetings confirmed early in the process (at JIM #1) as well as a specific description of what will be presented and discussed at each meeting. This is particularly important given that critical meetings are scheduled for November and December, a time of year when many residents are not in the valley.

- Sufficient opportunity to provide written comments after information and new draft materials are presented during meetings

If the planning team plans to utilize community workshops as a way to initially present materials to the public and to gather input, it will be important to allow for two weeks for the public to absorb the information presented at the community meetings and respond via written comments. Based on the scope of work, it is clear that the planning team intends to rework materials for subsequent phases based on public input from these meetings. However, prior to revisions by the planning team at all phases, it will be important to accommodate diverse methods for input, over a long period of time, given the public's diversity in schedules.

- Sufficient Consideration of Previous Public Comment

In Fall 2007, Clarion Associates initiated what appears to be a similar workshop process on character identification and preferences for future development in specific areas of the town and county. Considerable public input was gained as part of these meetings; it is important to include this previous input as the planning team works to define the new character districts.

- Sufficient opportunity for public review of final document (Vision, Common Values, and Achieving our Vision)

Prior to final adoption of the new plan in its entirety, the public needs a minimum of three weeks to review all sections of the plan. In the most recent phase of approving the policies section of the plan, the Alliance believes that the public should have been given more than one week to review the final draft prior to formal action by elected officials. It is unclear how the proposed schedule for January could accommodate all of the scheduled hearings as well as adequate time for public input and subsequent modifications.

- Additional Public Hearing

We appreciate that the proposed schedule for January 2012 includes two public hearings in January 2012, one with the joint planning commissions and the other with elected officials. The process, and the product, would also benefit from a larger public hearing prior to January. This would serve as an opportunity for citizens to gather with a countywide vision in mind, testify for the public record and hear from one another sometime during the process other than the final meetings.

In conclusion, the Conservation Alliance looks forward to the upcoming stage of the process and anticipates significant opportunities for dialogue among members of the public and decision makers. We will continue to encourage public involvement during this important time for our community. Thank you for your close attention to these suggestions and always feel free to contact the Alliance with any questions.

Date	Name	Comment
1/23/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	After attending almost all of the Comp Plan meetings and workshops over the last 4 years, myself and many other community members have come to the same conclusion: take the 1994 plan and improve and tweak it to better reflect the need to protect wildlife habitat and connectivity, keep our small town character, plan for the future already entitled growth, keep visitors coming to Jackson Hole and try to do all this in a manner that respects the environment. The Vision – Themes and Policies part of the document does an adequate job of outlining many of tweaks to the 1994 policies. The missing piece that is not clearly stated is the plan of how infrastructure improvements necessary to implement the policies will be undertaken. The updating of and expansion of infrastructure just to accommodate entitled but not yet built development is a major concern. Accurately analyzing infrastructure and their costs need to be presented to the community before policies or maps are approved. Commitments to supply infrastructure to already entitled development plus up-zonings whether located in town or the county could bankrupt our community. Please consider the following comments specific to the Character District Chapters: •The County The Character District maps are vague purposefully to allow a vast amount of additive growth in a number of Districts. Too many uncertainties exist which include what will be next door, how dense, how tall, what will this do to wildlife, roads, traffic, what will it cost. The additive growth that the Character District maps show does not retain the character of Rural Jackson Hole but creates urban nodes of high densities that the community has consistently rejected. Limiting growth to infill development following existing zoning and character throughout Teton County respects existing property rights and retains what we all love about Jackson Hole. We all know and accept these numbers and feel that this is the maximum build out that can be supported. Why not keep the Character District Chapters but eliminate all additive growth? Why not adjust all incentive based tools (PRD) to attain the goals identified in the Vision (Themes and Policies) for minimizing rural and greenfield development to better protect wildlife, open spaces, yet still respect property rights? Why not make the PRD more of an individual “CUP type process”? A letter dated 1/9/2012 from the Jackson Hole Land Trust states “These incentives should be both strong and diverse, as what works for one landowner in a key habitat may not for his or her neighbor.” The concept of feathering out density to and from drastic hard line changes in density should be a consistent policy throughout all town and county districts. This has been left out of numerous districts in both town and county. One particular example is the southern area of district 12.4 where a hard line of 10 units per acre (JH Campground) back up to now a hard fast suggested change for a policy of 1 unit per acre. The specific Neighborhood Form illustration is not accurate. A general policy of minimum lot size for the area with density feathering allowances would be more appropriate for the area. Districts along Teton Village Road. A letter dated 6/11/2009 sent to Teton County Planning and Development from Grand Teton National Park Superintendent, Mary Gibson Scott states “Accurate build out forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources.” “Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors.” “Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered.” Review of Appendix K (page 8-54) in the Vision document anticipates a Level of Service for Highway 390 to drop from high LOS E(1996) to a High F(possibly already by 2012 as no reconstruction has occurred as was anticipated by 2004). Additional growth beyond what was planned in 1994 will further degrade the LOS below the report used in in Appendix K. Any additive growth on Hwy 390 without improvements to a LOS of at least D as required by County standards is irresponsible planning. •Town of Jackson It is very clear that the Town of Jackson has a big growth agenda. I do not see much resistance from town residents. There is no effort to relate the

Date	Name	Comment
		amount of non-residential growth potential to what the resultant residential workforce housing needs will be based on the Character districts. Infrastructure improvements capabilities and costs must be analyzed. Will Town establish a new tax (property or sales) to pay for the massive additional and upgraded infrastructure needed for this expansion? Again feathering changes in density from one district or even within districts is a very important policy especially with the amount of growth that town is proposing. The area of Karns Meadow and surrounding properties appears to be trying to be too many things for many non-compatible uses. Is this area to be more for a wildlife corridor or a developed city type park? Is the park to be focal point for intense commercial buildings surrounding the park? How Does the Start facility fit into all of this? I hope the choice to develop Karns Meadow into a low key more interpretive park with minimal development except a pathway is more of the approved direction. Thank You for considering my comments at both the planning commission level and the commissioner/mayor/town council level.

Phase: BCC/TC Review

4/27/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	David Kuhn, Teton County at large. I have had the privilege of being a resident, a worker and a recreationist here for 30 years and we're all doing a great job on this—the electives, the community, Staff—I mean, everybody's working hard at it. We're not quite there yet but we're trying. I'm going to keep it brief. I am kind of a simpleton and a numbers guy and a budget guy. And a number is I think still missing, a build-out number, and I think it has so much direction to other things. It gives us a growth number to shoot for, which gives us the predictability we need of what we'll allow and where we'll put it, and what kind of density. It also goes...the predictability goes into our character district maps, how we define those. I mean, I'm also a map guy. I would never take a trip of any substantial size without looking at a map. You get halfway there and go, you're lost. You get reactionary then. You should have had that map of where you're going, putting it in simple terms. I'm also involved in Sewer & Water boards, and so my concern about infrastructure and transportation relates back to that number. How do you know what you need to provide without a number? I mean, it may sound real simple, but it is real simple. So, I think I know that build-out number has been...I don't know if you're afraid it as an election issue, or...it's not a bad planning tool, but it just, it will go a long ways to helping this and it just affects so much of the stuff. But again I want to say thanks for everybody's hard work on this. We have a ways to go still but we're getting there, and it's been a pleasure to be able to work on this with all of you. Thanks.
4/27/2012	Labelle, Ernest Interested Public	My name is Ernest Labelle. I'm a West Bank resident. You know, for thousands of years we have learned to live and survive in close proximity to the natural world. And that's...our quality of life has improved over those ions. We somehow have inextricably found ourselves moving away from that close proximity to the natural world that we once experienced. And sometimes it's I think helpful to step back and try to see the forest, rather than just the trees. And I hope that all of you hard-working, lovely men and women who are working on this Comprehensive Plan will do just that and will bear in mind that in the past hundred years or so, we have moved quite far from that close proximity to the natural world. We all feel that. We all cry for it. We die within ourselves every time a deer is hit on Broadway, every time we see an elk, a herd of elk, trying to move through a fenced area to get to its summer pasture. We feel those things. And what is going on here I think is that we also feel deeply that as we move into this Comp Plan, this Comprehensive Plan, we're dealing with those very deep and real truths about our existence. And I hope that in the process of getting through to the end of this Comprehensive Plan, we will also remember that there are not very many places in the world today where there are opportunities to reverse that inextricable move away from the natural world. And Jackson Hole is indeed one of those last many opportunities. So, please bear this in mind and realize that this is the opportunity that we have. I hope one day to read an article in the National Geographic and the New York Times Magazine about how Jackson stepped back...stepped up to it and addressed that truth and reversed that trend to the best interests of everyone in the human and the natural world here in our Valley. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
7/5/2011	Shuptrine, Sandy Interested Public	[My apologies] for my internet tantrum last week- looming Comp Plan deadline, lost input, counting characters, etc. all contributed to a bit of regretted comment on my part. Thank you for bearing with me and giving a courtesy reply. Let me see if I can summarize what apparently went into cyberspace last week: First, was a sincere compliment to all involved for listening and responding. Also for a professional quality work in progress- the graphics, format, etc. are refreshing and interesting. I also encourage special attention to river and stream setbacks which I understand no property owner wants, but neither do taxpayers want to assume the flood fight costs. When it comes to setback performance standards, I believe they should be much increased or adapted to specific situations, especially in light of recent intense weather events aggravated by climate change. Ask Bob Lucas where his house would be if he had built 150' from the Snake (ans.-Palisades Reservoir). Finally (for now), I wanted to state that my recollection is that it was not a GOAL of the 1994 Plan to have a 40,000 plus population. Instead, It was the best reduction that could be done at the time with the tools available and with which we could achieve consensus. For this reason, I encourage specifically identifying and detailing methods to secure the current Plan's values of less dispersed, more complete community, development. As I have mentioned, I believe the SPET is one possible resource, especially when it comes to implementing our Comp. Plan. There are others, but they seem elusive and perhaps difficult to implement. Voters have already supported ballot issues that include conservation easements (i.e. Valley Springs). This is now longer than the original so I'll stop here for now... Keep Up the Good Work,
7/5/2011	Morris, Bob Interested Public	Why not begin your Comprehensive Plan as follows: "We are stewards of the largest intact ecosystem in the Lower 48. This Plan seeks to protect its scenery and wildlife." Instead, your opening paragraph is: "As inhabitants of one of the nation's largest intact ecosystems, we must have a Comprehensive Plan organized around stewardship of our ecological resources. Wildlife, natural and scenic resources draw both residents and visitors to this special place and are at the core of our heritage, culture, and economy. To be responsible stewards of this area, we must protect and enhance the ecosystem in which we live." The thoughts in your Draft are really quite simple, but your writers try to express them in prose as complicated as possible, with as many unnecessary words as possible. Remember my offer to translate a page of your Draft from bureaucratese into sentences which are clear, simple, direct, forceful, lively, vivid -- even elegant -- and conversational in style. New Yorker Magazine is a good example. (I certainly don't mean "stream of consciousness.")

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	I'm writing to thank you for the serious consideration you gave to the Conservation Alliance proposals this week. As you know, those proposals were focused on many of the core issues that the Alliance has worked on for many years. Although you voted not to include the text proposals we submitted in the final policies, we greatly appreciate that you had a frank and substantive discussion of the issues we raised. Your discussions revealed that we are in fact largely in agreement on core issues. You have committed to creating a multi-year Action Plan to study the issues you have slated for further exploration in the Comp Plan. You also clarified that you expect some additional adjustments to the Comp Plan policies if those seem necessary after the mapping phase, and you have indicated that the studies that will be conducted will inform refinements to the policies. Those commitments give us confidence that we can continue to work with you to provide information that may improve the plan. We also hope to discuss how we can be most useful to the planning process as participants in the many of the issues that will be in your Action Plan. On the issue of permanent conservation of open space, the language already in the plan identifies this as a priority, and we trust that we will see this commitment put into practice. The Alliance is currently investigating ways to provide funding mechanisms and other support to open space conservation, and we hope to present potential tools to you in the future. Finally, we are pleased that you agreed to immediately create a task force to study potential transfer mechanisms that might work for Jackson Hole. I want to clarify that the Alliance is not tied to any one tool to achieve the community's objectives. We would like to assist on this task force as we search for the most practical policy tools for locating future development in the most appropriate places while also permanently preserving priority areas. We hope this task force will begin work as soon as possible, as this work will be critical in informing how you develop the character district maps. We understand that some of you do not feel that we have presented compelling enough evidence on how additional growth management tools could help you achieve the community's goals. We will continue to research relevant growth management tools as you work to finalize the plan, and we will have some solutions to propose when the current growth management monitoring system indicates a need for improvements to our growth management policies. The Alliance intends to work closely with elected officials, planning staff, and AECOM to further develop a highly participatory approach to the character district mapping process. I look forward to meeting with each of you to discuss how the Alliance can be most useful in achieving the community's goals during the important work that is now before us.
7/1/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Commissioners and Councilmen, OMG WTF I left the comprehensive plan meeting on June 29th feeling like a fool for believing that you all were going to pull it together in the end. What a slap in my little naive face. We don't doer like that out west, boys. When we start talking Character districts or nodes, we don't want to talk to your staff; we want to talk to you. Think about that when you're outlining your action plan. You need to get off that tall horse your riding and come to realize who is feeding that plug. You've spent a half a million of our tax dollars on this comprehensive plan and now your facilitator, in the middle of the job says he wants another \$90,000. Was that part of the action plan? When someone mows half my yard and then tells me he wants another hundred bucks to finish it I point him south and make sure my boot starts him on his way. You are all certainly intelligent folks. Please do not make a mockery of local government. You know the old saying: Fool me once shame on you. Fool me twice shame on me. Fool me three times take'em out behind the barn. Get your chaps on!

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to once again comment on the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is full of vague, ambiguous terms. However, because the Town of Jackson is the primary target for density and will be the “receiving” area for high density development, my comments are, for the most part, specific to Sections 3 and 4. (My written comments are in bold) Section 3.1 The overview states: “Complete neighborhoods provide: defined character and high quality design”. What does that mean? It is vague and open to very subjective interpretation. Is it price? An architect’s or developer’s vision of urban Jackson? Design which fits into the existing neighborhood? “Identifying specific areas for existing and future complete neighborhoods will enhance our community character and relieve development pressure in areas we wish to preserve.” Town currently has neighborhoods which are worthy of preserving to maintain a rural, small town character. Policy 3.1.c: Maintain rural character outside of complete neighborhoods “Outside of existing and future complete neighborhoods, it is the community’s goal to maintain our historic western, rural character.” Low density and quiet neighborhoods are certainly a part of our rural town character. “Complete neighborhoods” should also reflect the historic and rural character of town. Complete neighborhoods do not mean urban neighborhoods. What are the consequences of not maintaining rural character in complete neighborhoods? Existing and future complete neighborhoods should not be excluded from protecting the historic western, rural character of existing and future neighborhoods 3.2e Emphasize a variety of housing types. “Maintaining a diversity of housing types and styles (single family homes, duplexes, condos, small lots, small units, lofts and apartments), including deed-restricted housing of all types, is an important component of creating complete neighborhoods and meeting our community’s housing goal.” When lots are reduced in size to promote small houses, presumably for workforce housing, the lots should be deed restricted. Policy 3.2.e: Promote quality public spaces in complete neighborhoods . “Integrating fine arts professionals in the design of projects will be encouraged in order to create unique and visually engaging public spaces—including sidewalks and walkways, parks, outdoor squares, landscaped areas and public art.” 4.4.S.1: Coordinate with a public art task force to write a public art plan for the community. “Public art” should be confined to parks or the Center for the Arts” not placed along streets, sidewalks, walkways or highways. Art, as is beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. Policy 3.3.c: Provide predictability in land use decisions. “Performance-based incentives should be limited and have clearly defined intended public benefits and ties to indicators to evaluate effectiveness. While discretionary land use tools provide additional flexibility, they do not provide predictability and are not appropriate for managing growth and development in the community.” Predictability is critical and the community has repeatedly asked for predictability. I support this statement. Planning tools do not provide predictability. Policy 4.3.a: Preserve and enhance stable neighborhoods. “Character Districts will aim to enhance these areas as complete neighborhoods without significantly increasing the allowable density.” What does “significantly increasing the allowable density” mean? This statement is much too open. Density must be predictable. Who decides what is a ‘significant increase’? This is another example of vague wording which is alarming. Reference: Policy 3.3c. Policy 5.1.b: Focus housing subsidies on full-time, year-round workers. Some members of the local workforce can find local housing that suits their needs and is affordable for their household. For those who cannot, governmental and non-governmental subsidized housing programs will continue to provide deed-restricted affordable housing opportunities to ensure realization of the community’s housing goal. Affordable housing is housing for which the mortgage payment or gross rent and utilities does not exceed 30% of gross household income. Subsidized housing programs will focus on providing housing for those members of the community who work locally full-time, year-round, whether at a single or multiple jobs. I support the direction for governmental and non-governmental subsidized housing to be rentals. In closing, the Staff Report requests that amendments after today won’t be considered, however, it is important that, as the Character Districts are formed, the dialogue remain open.
6/29/2011	Shuptrine, Sandy Interested Public	I have tried to send a comment but keep getting a message re: 1000 'character limit'-my estimate, not counting spaces is that the comment was less than that. This goes to my biggest frustration....trying to make a meaningful comment and discovering 'the rules' after the fact!

Date	Name	Comment
6/24/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Thank you for considering the two major analyses of the draft Comprehensive Plan we recently submitted. We strive to provide you with timely and relevant information to help you develop the best possible policies for the future of Jackson Hole. We greatly appreciate the work planning staff has done to incorporate our recent recommendations, and there are some clear improvements in the draft that was released on June 22nd. Staff should be commended for their excellent work on this draft. However, we are concerned that the major recommendations made by independent expert Alan Richman and the Alliance have not been seriously discussed, and vital policies cannot be improved without explicit direction from elected officials. This is an important time for elected officials to decide how to address these recommendations. Our Comp Plan's policies should direct the upcoming maps and regulations to ensure that we will achieve the community's goals. It is important for us to reflect on whether we have created a framework that will accomplish the vision. Based on the analyses of the Comp Plan we submitted to you, we recommend: • Growth Management: Add language similar to Richman's recommendation that "...at a minimum the Comprehensive Plan be amended to recognize the need to explore these approaches [growth management techniques]. An action strategy should also be included in the plan committing to conduct this exploration and to adopting a growth management approach that will limit the overall amount, and if determined to be necessary, the rate of growth in the community." - o This commitment to explore growth management techniques could be added as a new policy under principle 3.3. • Permanent Conservation: Permanently conserved lands are noted as a priority, but this can be stated more clearly in the policies to help direct future regulations. Text should be added stating that "The permanent conservation of lands will be a primary land use strategy in the future." - o This text could be added to the chapters on growth management and ecosystem stewardship. • Transfers: Add language taken straight from the Richman report: "Density transfers must be accompanied by permanent elimination of development rights in sending areas." - o This recommendation is based on Richman's analysis that "...the Plan does not create enough certainty as to the overall buildout of the community. One way to provide some of this certainty would be to ensure that the development rights transfers out of the rural area as envisioned by Principle 3.1 are accompanied by permanent conservation easements or deed restrictions that eliminate development potential in perpetuity." Please take time to discuss and vote on each of these three proposals on June 29th. In addition, we need to more clearly articulate how planning work will proceed. In many ways the Comp Plan is on track towards excellence, but hasn't yet clearly defined how it intends to achieve overarching goals. Your discussions in recent months have identified topics that need more work and slated them for further exploration. It is reasonable to move forward with Character District mapping only if we are simultaneously working to research key topics and develop an Action Plan that explains how we will further refine the Comp Plan in the coming years. It is important that you acknowledge that the Comprehensive Plan includes important policies that are not yet fully complete. Although there is vague language suggesting that these issues will be explored further, there is no plan in place for any additional research into several key topics. The Alliance believes that the plan's policies cannot be adopted without a clear written commitment explaining when and how these vital issues will be adequately studied and incorporated into the Comp Plan. The Alliance will continue to submit detailed recommendations for how to best study these remaining issues, and will work to assist in this research. Attached is a summary of how you might proceed to develop an Action Plan, reach an informed decision on several of the core policies, and adjust the Comp Plan to incorporate these findings. Also attached is the Action Plan framework used in the Draft Aspen, Colorado, Area Community Plan, [see full comment] which we think may provide a good model as you work to develop a similar plan. We trust that you will commit to completing an action plan, and to revising any policies as needed to align with the results of further exploration. We note that past commitments for action have not always been completed, and we ask that you carefully consider the financial and time implications of the many issues you have slated for further exploration. This ongoing work is vital to achieving the community's vision, and must have the needed resources for completion. Feel free to contact the Alliance to discuss any of these recommendations further, and we look forward to seeing you in the meeting on June 29th. Sincerely, Trevor Stevenson Executive Director Below are the JH Conservation Alliance's Comments and suggestions related to the following two issues: A. Inclusion of an Action Plan & List of Prioritized Strategies in the new Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan

B. Initiation of some Strategies to help inform the Character District Mapping Process

Please consider these recommendations as you proceed with your review of the Plan's Policies and the Character District Maps.

A. JH Conservation Alliance Recommendations regarding Action Plan:

- Direct Staff to incorporate a Detailed Action Plan prior to the effective date of the new Comprehensive Plan, which would outline an approximate timeline for actions and identify the entities responsible for carrying them out.
- Direct Staff to incorporate a List of Prioritized Strategies in the "Achieving Our Vision" section prior to the effective date of the new Comprehensive Plan, which would highlight which strategies should be implemented first.

Background:

In the recent report "Technical Analysis of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan," Alan Richman provides the following specific recommendation: "Strategies should be organized into an action plan that establishes priorities for next steps and lays out a timeline for completing projects." Following are brief excerpts from this report outlining the rationale for this suggestion, and specific solutions:

"Prioritization of the actions in the Comprehensive Plan will go a long way towards informing citizens as to what they can expect and will allow them to hold the Town and County accountable for whether progress is being made in Plan implementation. This can be done in the form of a tabular summary of proposed actions, with dates identified for when each will be accomplished and by whom, or it could be in the form of a timeline, with actions shown in the order in which they are intended to be accomplished."

"A prioritized action plan needs to be formulated with a timeline identifying when, how and by whom (1) any missing or incomplete elements of the plan will be finished and (2) key implementation actions will be initiated and completed. This action plan should be inserted into the section entitled "Achieving Our Vision" and will provide a work program for the community in coming years."

Once this action plan is available, a prioritized list of the strategies to be completed prior to major June 2011 – JHCA comments regarding the need to prioritize Strategies in the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan updates to the land development regulations could be incorporated into the "Achieving Our Vision" section of the plan. This step will be critical in providing clarity and proactive consensus about how to proceed in the annual work plans.

Attached is a specific example for how an action plan could be created as part of the new comprehensive plan. (See the attachment "Aspen Area Community Plan – Appendix for Action Items.") Note that all policies to be adopted as part of that plan will identify an approximate timeline and responsible entities to carry out the described actions.

B. JH Conservation Alliance Recommendations regarding the Character District Mapping Process

- Direct staff to address the five specific recommendations outlined in the following pages

Note: While all strategies outlined within the plan are important to address, and many of the proposed strategies are strongly linked to one another across sections of the plan, there are some strategies that are so essential to the foundation of the plan, and to the success of its implementation, that they must be addressed immediately, prior to the adoption of the Plan. More specifically, addressing some of these key strategies now will help to inform the character district mapping process, which has become a very important component of the overall plan.

Given that this new plan intends to be organized around stewardship of our ecological resources (as described in the first sentence of the plan's vision chapter), those strategies most directly related to this goal are in need of immediate action. In practical terms, most of the policies in the plan hinge on the capacity for our community to address wildlife protection and growth management issues in a timely, effective manner.

Background:

In the recent report "Technical Analysis of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan," Alan Richman provides the following statement, as it relates to the plan's suggestion to use a transfer program: "The complete neighborhoods concept is a cutting edge approach to planning, but its success hinges upon work that has yet to be completed. If this part of the planning process cannot be successfully completed, the entire Comprehensive Plan is in jeopardy of failing." In brief, much of the success of the implementation of the plan hinges upon fundamental factors that have not yet been studied or discussed.

In Richman's words:

"So the stakes for the upcoming character district mapping process could not be higher... Completion of the character district maps is an essential part of this Comprehensive Plan. The initial step in the mapping process should be a rigorous analysis of the amount and locations of development that are proposed to be reduced in conservation areas and an equally detailed analysis of the areas proposed for increased development as complete neighborhoods. In other words, the maps need to be more than a pretty picture of a planning concept."

In summary, immediate action is necessary to inform the upcoming design of what will be a critical component of the community's new comprehensive plan – the character districts. To provide the level of predictability that the policy portion of the plan does not provide, it is imperative that the maps be based on the best information possible. To make this information June 2011 – JHCA comments regarding the need to prioritize

Strategies in the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan available, and to facilitate informed land use decisions in the future, immediate action is necessary on some of the plan's proposed strategies.

(See attached "Referenced Strategies for Immediate Action," page 7, for strategy language that is included in the most recent draft of the Plan, which is referenced below.)

Specific Recommendations:

1. Support immediate action to initiate and carry out strategies to obtain the best available wildlife science to inform future development and conservation policies (with an emphasis on strategies 1.1.S.1, 1.1.S.2, 1.1.S.5, 1.1.S.7, and 1.1.S.8)

a. Suggested Immediate Actions:

☑ Direct the Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board, with the help of local agencies and non-profit organizations, to address the specific strategies for native species protection. (Some are underway; some should be initiated immediately.) This effort should specifically address how existing data will be compiled to inform the character district mapping process, identify key outstanding data gaps, and provide an outline of research priorities to be completed in the next year.

In general, the best available science should proactively inform the character district mapping process, identifying the most important areas for permanent conservation and the most suitable locations for new development and redevelopment. It will also be important to identify the types of data that are needed prior to the revision of land development regulations, such as an updated Natural Resources Overlay.

2. Support immediate action to initiate a strategy to assess the cumulative impacts of growth and development on wildlife and natural resources (1.1.S.3)

a. Suggested Immediate Action:

☑ As part of the recommended action above, and subsequent to actions that are necessary for the character district mapping process, direct the Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board to identify how existing data and resources can be used to establish important baseline data for future monitoring of cumulative impacts. As part of a long-term work plan for this Board, it will be important to prioritize this strategy.

3. Support immediate action to address the strategy to identify key scenic resources (1.3.S.1)

a. Suggested Immediate Action:

☑ To help inform the character district mapping process, the planning team should immediately identify how "key scenic resources" will be defined. (It is unclear how the mapping process could be completed without these areas being identified.)

4. Support immediate action on the part of community members and the planning team to address the strategy "explore tools for transferring development potential from areas of ecological significance to existing and future complete neighborhoods in the Town and County." (3.1.S.2)

a. Suggested Immediate Action:

☑ At the broadest level, support an immediate community effort – in concert June 2011 – JHCA comments regarding the need to prioritize Strategies in the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan with the character district mapping process - to research appropriate transfer mechanisms for Teton County, Wyoming, in order to address the community priority for permanent conservation.

Details – We'd encourage you to take the following steps, to be followed-up with a commitment on the part of the elected officials to a best practices approach to transferring development potential that will work in Teton County:

i. Hire an expert consultant for a presentation on transfer mechanisms to highlight the successes and challenges of different approaches to transfers, including transfer of development rights programs

ii. Establish of a Citizen Advisory Committee or taskforce, to include a diverse spectrum of backgrounds and relevant expertise and include staff and elected officials, to discuss the best options for a transfer mechanism specific to Teton County, Wyoming

iii. Compile necessary analysis and research to inform discussions, including a feasibility study and detailed economic analysis for a transfer of development rights program

iv. Compile necessary analysis and research on alternatives to formal transfer programs that could work to ensure permanent conservation of lands in return for allowing more density in areas that already have some development

5. Support immediate action, as part of the character district mapping process, to address the strategy "explore growth boundaries, associated expansion regulations and criteria for complete neighborhoods in the Town and County" (with less emphasis on regulations) (3.1.S.5)

a. Suggested Immediate Action:

☑ For the character district mapping process to be effective, this strategy must be initiated now. For example, the concept of growth boundaries must be explored prior to proposing specific character district boundaries. As indicated in our letter, the potential overall amount of growth in the valley has consistently been a top issue of our community. Growth management techniques, such as growth boundaries, and others that are outlined in Richman's analysis, must be considered prior to the adoption of the plan and the revision of the land development regulations.

Overall, in order for the implementation of this plan to be successful, it is important that certain strategies are completed prior to other strategies, and some prior to implementation of the Plan. Some policies cannot and should not be implemented without a basic foundation that first and adequately addresses the highest priority of the community – wildlife stewardship.

Sincerely,

Kristy Bruner

Community Planning Director

Referenced Strategies for Immediate Action

Section 1. Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources and Scenery

Strategies to maintain healthy populations of all native species (Principle 1.1)

1.1.S.1: Create a vegetation cover map that can be used to help inform the identification of relative criticalness of habitat types.

1.1.S.2: Identify focal species that are indicative of ecosystem health and determine important habitat types for those species. Evaluate habitat importance, abundance and use to determine relative criticalness of various habitat types.

1.1.S.3: Establish a monitoring system for assessing the cumulative impacts of growth and development on wildlife and natural resources. Implement actions in response to what is learned to provide better habitat and movement corridor protection.

1.1.S.5: In the interim, as focal species are being identified, work with Wyoming Game and Fish and other partnering agencies and entities to update the mapping that provides a general indication of the location of the Natural Resources Overlay (NRO), based on current protection of critical “species of special concern” habitat.

1.1.S.7: Identify areas appropriate for public and private ecological restoration efforts.

1.1.S.8: Identify areas appropriate for underpasses and overpasses and speed reductions in heavy volume wildlife-crossing areas.

Strategies to maintain the scenic resources of the area (Principle 1.3)

1.3.S.1: Evaluate and remap the Scenic Resources Overlay based on accumulated knowledge of potential visual impacts and changes to scenic policy.

Section 3. Responsible Growth Management

Strategies to direct growth out of habitat, scenery and open space (Principle 3.1)

3.1.S.2: Explore tools for transferring development potential from areas of ecological significance to existing and future complete neighborhoods in the Town and County.

3.1.S.5: Explore growth boundaries, associated expansion regulations and criteria for complete neighborhoods in the Town and County.

Date	Name	Comment
6/20/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	As you begin to consider the Character District Maps for the Comprehensive Plan, we ask that you consider the following suggestions. After attending the Smart Growth talk sponsored by Plan JH, it is apparent to us that while many people advocate "smart growth" they do not follow all the principles. Communities that have been successful in managing growth all seemed to follow these key principles: 1)There was a clear benefit from any changes in density for the whole community, not just developers, that was obvious to all. This applies to both density transfers and density bonuses meant to incentivize specific types or locations of development. 2)Where density changed, there was a known increase for targeted areas so neighbors knew exactly what they were getting. No hand waving and nebulous numbers. 3)When density changed, neighbors were asked to determine where they would like to locate the transferred density in their neighborhood. The amounts were determined globally, but the locations were determined locally. The neighbors had input in the process of determining the proper location. Following all three principles is not easy, but failure to follow them will lead to failure. All character map discussions should make it clear what changes are proposed to neighborhoods. Another key concept of successful communities was that they did not hand wave and draw circles on maps to determine where to allow growth. They used a rigorous method to analyze the boundaries for areas deemed to be appropriate for growth. They also evaluated the amount of growth projected for the life of the plan in addition to the total amount of growth allowed. We would ask that Staff prepare overlay maps that examine the following items: 1)Distance from first response locations should be evaluated to determine estimated response times. Fire and ambulance response time should be noted as "acceptable in all conditions", "questionable in certain conditions", and "not acceptable." Areas that are "not acceptable" should be avoided. 2)Current START service. Show actual routes and current stops. 3)Location of current infrastructure (water, sewer, storm sewer, electrical power, schools, pathways and parks). We need actual locations, not comments that "this area has sewer." 4)Location of complete neighborhood components (commercial, day care, recreation, public space). This overlay should include grid lines at ¼ and ½ mile intervals to aid citizens in visualizing the goal of having these components within ¼ to ½ mile of their neighborhood. 5)Congested roads which should be avoided. 6)Open spaces that should be avoided. This can include areas under conservation easement in addition to areas targeted for protection. 7)Critical wildlife habitat that should be avoided. Not all habitat is critical for wildlife. In our high mountain environment critical habitat is often winter range and nesting/parturition areas. Summer habitat is not normally the limiting factor in wildlife populations. Also critical are travel corridors in addition to migration corridors. We have some data on migration corridors, but we have less information on travel corridors that link key areas. All these criteria should be weighted equally and overlaid on a single map to determine logical boundaries for growth within the boundaries set by our Comprehensive Plan. We ask that this information, most of which is readily available be used to show the public how boundaries were developed. We believe this method is superior to drawing circles on the map.
6/18/2011	Asbell, Penny Interested Public	I receive you news letter. I would like to know how long you must live in Teton County before you can apply for one of the houses? Any kind, low income, affordable whatever. Do you have to have a JOB in Teton County? Do you have to promise to live in the dwelling for a certain amount of time before you sell it? Can you buy one of these if you are on well fare?
6/17/2011	Thulin, Walter W. Interested Public	Gentlemen; As you well appreciate, the enjoyment of living in Teton County as well as the preservation of our property values is dependent on maintaining the character of our community. I have just read Alan Richman's review of the curren draft and am trouble about three aspects: 1. It appears we are not doing enough to limit either the ultimate population of the County or its rate of growth. 2. It apperas we are depending on transferable development rights to meet the different development goals of the Town and County. I do not believe this technique has been found widely effective. 3. It appears implementation depends on multiple studies and formulations which have not been sufficiently specified or scheduled. I urge that adoption of the plan be deferred until thes aspects are corrected.

Date	Name	Comment
6/14/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Thought you might like to read the article link below and look at the slide show link. The last meeting on the comp plan made me realize that most of you are still not dedicated to raising the bar and expecting more out of our comprehensive plan when it comes to future sustainability goals. Approaching Net Zero is not pie in the sky wishful thinking to be scoffed at and pushed down the road because it sounds unattainable. We can make jokes about the goal and brush it aside but in the end we will be paying a high price and playing constant catch up because we did not take our goals seriously. Seizing innovations and the day will yield much better results. As for the little guy not being represented at the comp plan meetings... Do I need a neon sign? Am I too old a demographic to be taken seriously? (Don't answer that unless it's complimentary) I might be one of the older members in my neighborhood, but I get plenty of positive feed back about the issues I harp on from my younger neighbors that have 2 or 3 jobs and young children that keep them from the meetings. I'm glad you will be taking more time to tweak the plan. Hopefully, it will resemble a document with clear, concise language and goals that represent what has been repeated over and over again by the majority of town and county residents.
6/8/2011	Hill, Megan Interested Public	Thank you all for your time last night. There are a few details that did not warrant time during comments last night, which I would like to see Staff include in their clean up work on the Final Comp. Plan. These include: -Re-phrase Policy 1.4.e Conserve open space to use public lands more responsibly – doesn't make sense, needs some plain English; -Re-write Policy 3.1b regarding the use of Transfer of Development Tools. -Contradiction in Policies 3.3e and 4.2b in relation to making policy decisions independent of economic considerations; -Strategy 3.2.S.4. Teton Village Master Plan + Principle 7.1 Alternative Modes of Transport – Westbank resident commuter solutions need to address the workforce not visitors. Essential to reducing SOV trips. -Generally, quantity of measures and indicators – there's still too many in the Plan to be realistic and cost effective.

Date	Name	Comment
6/7/2011	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	The following comments are submitted by the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce based on a review of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan draft dated May 20, 2011. These comments pertain to Section 6: A Diverse and Balanced Economy. General Comments (1)The recurrent citation of ecotourism as the focus of the tourism sector of our economy is very limited. Ecotourism is one aspect of a much greater current state of and opportunity for our community – Sustainable Tourism. Sustainable Tourism is defined as tourism that leads to the management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems. Ecotourism addresses the environmental or ecological resources of our community but not the cultural, arts, historical and heritage resources of our community. While there are references to “cultural tourism” later in this section, it would be more accurate of our current and potential tourism economy and consistent with the world-wide trend in tourism to use the term “Sustainable Tourism.” (2)Include a reference to strengthening the family orientation of our tourism economy. Jackson Hole and Teton County should appeal to a broad range economic demographic. A continued and new focus on middle class families should be integrated into the Comp Plan. Family visitation has been central to the success of our community’s tourism economy. Left unattended, current economics are driving new commercial development towards high-end business that is unaffordable for many families. In order to continue to attract families, commercial development policy should support affordability for visiting families. The policy and tourism goal of providing a high level of services and amenities is not limited to high-end development and high priced services. Specific Comments (3)Replace “Eco-tourism” with “Sustainable Tourism.” Replace “green” with “sustainable.” (4)Policy 6.2.a “Create a positive atmosphere for economic development”: Delete the first sentence that reads, “Attracting the right types of business will be essential to achieving a ‘better not bigger’ economy.” The usage of the term “right types of business” is subjective, ambiguous, open to conflicting opinions, and does not add to the quality of this policy. (5)Policy 6.3.b “Enhance tourism as a basis of the economy”: The reference to “retail-based tourism” in the last sentence could be interpreted to mean that the Comp Plan does not support our local retailers. Change the sentence to read, “The community will continue to avoid carnival-type attractions and outlet malls as tourism assets as they do not support our desired community character.” (6)Policy 6.3.d “Promote light industry”: The term light industry is ambiguous and open to conflicting opinions of what that includes. Provide greater specificity in the use of that term by either providing examples of what light industry might include and/or use a standard or common definition of “light industry.” (7)Strategy 6.1.S.1: Revise the strategy “Market the community as a ‘green’ location to visit, live and work, and promote business based on ecotourism” to read, “Market the community as a world-class sustainable tourism destination and a location to live and work.” The wording change recommended is more consistent with the emphasis on Sustainable Tourism than eco-tourism. (8)Strategy 6.2.S.1: The term “non-financial” is ambiguous and open to many different interpretations. Please provide greater specificity in the use of that term by either providing examples of what non-financial tools are and/or a definition of non-financial tools. (9)Strategy 6.2.S.2: The use of the term “appropriate types of business” is subjective, ambiguous, open to conflicting opinions, and does not add to quality of this policy. Revise “Evaluate and update the land use regulations to foster a positive atmosphere and attract appropriate types of business to the community” to read, “Evaluate and update land use regulations to foster a positive atmosphere and attract the types of business that are consistent with the principles and policies of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan.”
6/7/2011	Matthews, Heather Interested Public	Please incorporate comments and suggestions provided by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance and Alan Richman. We need a comp plan without loopholes. We need a proactive plan to keep Jackson Hole special for future generations of people and wildlife. The comp plan must have mechanisms to ensure permanent protection of open space and policies to manage growth and to protect wildlife. Doubling this valley's population will not sustain the ecosystem or community character, in fact it may destroy it. Please at least limit growth to current entitlements. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
6/6/2011	Faupel, Matt Interested Public	Regarding Sect. 7, Transportation, the Plan makes it clear we are looking to degrade the level of service to "D" in order to move people to public transportation. In theory, this is a good idea but as a local business owner, I am VERY concerned that with all the effort that local business owners put in to creating an "A" level of service can be wasted on a horrendous visitor experience due to traffic back ups. We (businesses) spend money & effort to create great guest experiences to welcome people, and even more important, to bring them back. If the first real visitor experience they have is a one hour trip from the airport to their hotel in Teton Village, this guest is already considering a different town to visit next time. This is a very strong statement and if executed on, could have severe & negative impacts to our financial lifeblood. Citizens saying they do not want a wider road must be balanced with the reality that all of our efforts to provide 1st class service.
6/3/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	http://dl.dropbox.com/u/21259626/Plan%20JH%20presentation%20052311.pdf Hi, Above is the PlanJH link to the Smart Growth Presentation at the Wort last week. If you scroll down to page 78/79 you will find a box on design review and it's restrictions on home size in McCall, Idaho. The presentation also has samples of overlay maps with "GIS tools to assess the lands inside the Urban Services Area as to their relative suitability for residential development." Design review • Process for using Design Guidelines • The City of McCall Design Guidelines is a separate document • Design review approval required for just about everything except a single family home less than 3,500 square feet that is not in the Scenic route or Shoreline zones • Subdivisions with design review procedures approved by the City would be exempt from this requirement Why couldn't we do something like this but start out at 2500 sq ft and combine it with the permanent retiring of 35 acre developable land for small increases in the size of a home? I think every square foot counts when it comes to reducing the burdens of service workers needed to maintain large homes. The carrot and stick approach would be more evenly spread out between townies and rural homeowners. Right now the rural homeowners get the carrot and the townies get the stick. I am also anxious to see the JHCA's comments today. I don't think it is about complete urbanization in a mountain setting. We need to know the limits on how much can be transferred to town areas through TDRs, so as not to degrade the existing neighborhoods with total urbanization. It's about unambiguous options and a well defined complete comp plan that get us to our goal of permanently protected open space, wildlife and a sustainable community with a small western town feel.
6/3/2011	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	In Principle 6.3 of the Comp Plan, Policy 6.3.b: Enhance tourism as a basis of the economy, the last sentence reads "The community will continue to avoid carnival-type and retail-based tourism, as they do not support our desired community character." How do you define "retail-based tourism?" I assume the statement is not meant to say that our community retailers will not be supported. Am I correct? Here is my comment or recommended change to the wording: Change text to read, "The community will continue to avoid carnival-type attractions and outlet malls as tourism assets as they do not support our desired community character."

Date	Name	Comment
6/3/2011	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	As you know, our community has a long history of dedication and commitment to protecting the values of Jackson Hole that make it world renowned – its wildlife, open spaces, scenery, recreational opportunities and small mountain town character. The Conservation Alliance believes that we have a unique obligation to protect this area for generations to come. Jackson Hole, and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, of which our valley is a fundamental piece, deserves no less. The local planning decisions that we make today will have consequences, both intended and unintended, down the line, which is why we need to ensure that we create the best possible Comprehensive Plan for our community. With this in mind, we request that you consider our comments on the most recent draft, attached below [see full comment]. While we recognize and appreciate movement in positive directions, we believe this plan needs some additional improvements before it is best able to achieve our community goals and is ready for implementation. Broadly, there are several overarching concerns, also addressed in our attached comments, which need to be addressed prior to completion of this portion of the review process: 1. The overarching, lingering concern in this Plan is the lack of a proactive approach to managing the amount of growth in our community. The Plan’s proposal for monitoring and reacting to growth is useful, but cannot be the central strategy to managing future growth. 2. Many of the Plan’s sections and policies rely heavily on the ability of an undetermined mechanism to transfer development potential from the rural county into “complete neighborhoods.” Without a clear explanation and exploration of this transfer system, it seems premature to hinge so many other policies on it. In the development of such a mechanism, it will be important to bear in mind that many members of the community expect real tradeoffs; that future development truly is offset by permanent extinguishment of development potential in other, more sensitive areas of the County. 3. The Plan also needs a more proactive approach to wildlife protection, recognizing that avoidance of impacts in sensitive areas is often preferable to mitigation of impacts. To this end, this Plan needs a stronger focus on permanent protection of open space. 4. This Plan generally lacks acknowledgement of existing conditions and the unique context of Jackson, and relies too strongly on cookie cutter concepts without a realistic understanding of how planning principles should best be approached on the ground. This general ambiguity in the vision of the future of Jackson Hole results in a scenario where many of the hard decisions about the location, amount and type of growth will be debated in a piecemeal way in the character district review process rather than in a proactive way in the policy document. 5. Throughout the document, there are far too many “to explore”s on fundamental issues, where there should be “will”s, to ensure that community goals are able to upheld by the Plan’s policies. 6. This Plan needs to set the top priorities for the next 18 months, as it is clear that many of the called for studies and work plans will not be included in the document itself. In addition, attached to this letter is the draft policy document. We have highlighted key policies and phrases that we believe warrant additional consideration or modification. Our comments are categorized by section and are in the form of footnotes; please reference the draft document when reviewing the comments and recommended actions. Some of the points we have raised over the years, and, given the significant changes in this new draft, some are new. We urge you to consider these recommendations as you undergo your review of the draft plan during your June 7th JIM. Thank you for your work on behalf of the community these past months. This community faces some unique challenges and the ongoing effort and commitment that have gone into this Comprehensive Planning process is remarkable. As we near the conclusion of the review of the themes and policies, we ask that you continue to represent the community’s interests and create the best plan that we possibly can.

Date	Name	Comment
6/3/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance appreciates this opportunity to provide you with two detailed analyses of the latest draft of the Comprehensive Plan. The goal of the Alliance is to provide you with the best available information and analysis to help you in developing the strong and effective comprehensive plan that we all want to guide the future development of Jackson Hole. For years, we have focused a tremendous amount of our organizational resources on assisting you in this critical work, and we have redoubled our efforts in recent months. We trust that you will recognize our efforts by giving serious consideration to the recommendations presented here. The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance has worked to identify and hire an independent expert on effective comprehensive planning for communities like Jackson Hole. We are delighted to present the analysis of Alan Richman [see actual comment for analysis], a renowned expert in this field who was also one of the key authors of our groundbreaking 1994 Comprehensive Plan (see Richman's attached qualifications). The Alliance, with support from Save Historic Jackson Hole and community members, has contracted with Alan Richman Planning Services Inc. to complete a technical analysis of the draft Comp Plan. Richman and his associates were directed to conduct a thorough, independent analysis of the degree to which the policies of the Comp Plan represent best practice in the field, and whether these policies are likely to achieve the stated goals of the community. We have been careful not to influence or pressure Richman towards any particular conclusion, and his analysis represents his expert opinion. As you read his analysis, you will note that he generally agrees with most of the points that the Alliance and other community members have been making, although he also differs with the Alliance's historical stance on some issues. We're certain that you will find this independent review interesting and useful, and we encourage you to discuss his recommendations and take action to strengthen our Comp Plan. The Alliance is also pleased to present a detailed, line-by-line review of the draft Comp Plan. This work was led by Alliance Community Planning Director Kristy Bruner, who has an advanced degree in this field and years of involvement in the development of this Comp Plan. The line-by-line review highlights numerous details and nuances in the document that can be improved, and also provides explanation of key issues that still need to be addressed within the draft. We ask that you reread the annotated Comp Plan that the Alliance is submitting. We would like to draw your attention to a few of the key findings of these reviews. It is important to note that, overall, the goals of the Comp Plan are clearly outlined in the current draft, and some of the policy text is quite good. Most of the concerns with the draft revolve around the degree to which many sections use vague language, and key issues are only partially resolved in the Comp Plan. Although many policies are fine, the fact that key components are missing from the plan will prevent it from fully achieving its stated objectives. In particular, we ask that you review consistent concerns that the draft plan still needs: -Mechanisms to ensure that the valley isn't open, rural spaces will be permanently conserved in return for allowing more density in areas that already have some development. -Stronger, more effective policies to manage growth, not just monitor and react to growth. -Policies to provide a more proactive approach to wildlife protection. The Alliance requests that elected officials give the planning team clear direction to address the detail-level recommendations in these two reports. -Give the planning team authority to incorporate all recommendations that are consistent with the intent and previous discussions of the elected officials. -Review the use of policy statements that include terms such as "should," "may," and "explore," and direct staff to replace as many of these weak terms as possible with stronger words like "shall" and "will." This will strengthen the applicability of the Comp Plan. We believe that some of the central issues of this Comp Plan need to be reviewed by elected officials to ensure that the plan will meet community objectives. -Please review the substantial recommendations on the content of policies related to impacts on wildlife, growth management, and transfer of development. Consider the recommendations of the Alliance and Richman as you work to strengthen these sections, as they are vital to the overall success of our community. -Work with the planning staff to develop a workplan that outlines how and when you will complete the additional work needed for a fully functional plan, to address sections of the plan that rely on further exploration, data collection, etc. Detail who will do this additional work, and by what date. Many portions of the plan won't work well until this supplemental work is completed. -Clarify what issues you expect to address in the Character District Maps and Land Use Regulations, so we can see what work is still ahead of us and make sure we aren't missing any essential components of good planning. This will reduce concerns that we haven't fully resolved many key issues in the policy section of the Comp Plan. We greatly appreciate your commitment to produce a cutting-edge Comprehensive Plan that will exemplify the priorities of Jackson Hole, and we trust that our work will help you develop a plan that fully achieves our shared goals.

Date	Name	Comment
6/3/2011	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	Do you have any maps or drawings showing the areas where development and at what densities will take place according to your draft plan? Its hard to visualize the intention of the written plan without an on the ground interpretation. I live in the Aspens and have seen a previous map showing future development making that already congested area even more so. I think the written intensions are good but without a map it is hard to comment. So I think that it would also be difficult for the Council and Commissioners to adopt a plan without giving enough time or discussion of the whole package. I guess what I am saying is that the meetings you are having now an the comments you are hoping to get will be pretty much meaningless without the maps or at least written specific designations of the areas and expected densities of future development.

Date	Name	Comment
6/3/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	There are significant improvements in this Plan and we want to recognize the hard work by all parties that got us to this point. It's been an arduous 3-year process. We support a considerable portion of the document and are pleased to see improvements such as a stated desire for smaller buildings, the need to preserve the character of some neighborhoods, and the limiting of Resorts to their current footprint. We also feel the goal to monitor our progress against our vision at regular intervals as a significant improvement from the previous Plan. In some instances we have copied passages from the Comprehensive Plan and all our comments and recommended changes are in red to make them stand out from the Comp Plan text. Because of the compressed timeline for review, we are concerned that many of our detailed comments could be lost. The issues we have raised are important and discussion in detail may be necessary to assure good communication. We are therefore prepared to meet with planning staff and/or elected officials as may be required and request the opportunity to do so. General Comments -Save Historic Jackson Hole and Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance collaborated to have an independent review of the current draft. The Richman Report should be available later today and will be submitted by us separately from these comments to meet the noon deadline. We support the conclusions and recommendations in the report and ask that you incorporate the recommendations in the final draft. -This Plan still needs more detail in a number of areas. Our detailed comments below list specific examples. Past experience has shown that lack of detail will result in controversy and confusion during the evaluation of specific projects. It is easier to be fair to all parties involved by providing the detail now rather than later. Once a project is brought forward the evaluation is clouded by the personalities involved and the economics of making a profit. -How do we resolve conflicts? We need guidance on how we are going to balance wildlife needs with human needs, and private property rights. How do we balance the rights of current residents with the rights of future residents? In the real world not all these decisions will be "win-win." How will we make the hard decisions? -Leaving the Transportation Plan separate to the Comp Plan repeats a mistake made in 1994. It should be an integral part of the Plan. They are interrelated. Keeping the Transportation Plan separate delays the hard decisions to later instead of tackling them now. -It is difficult to comment on the Plan without character district maps. How do we know we will achieve our vision without some detail of what we plan to do on the ground? -While complete neighborhoods have the laudable goal of reducing traffic and increasing livability, we are concerned that an unintended consequence is the urbanization of our community. Most people moved here for the small town atmosphere and the rural character. While complete neighborhoods might work in more urban areas with densities much higher than Jackson and Teton County, we are not convinced it is economically feasible to have convenience commercial, daycare, schools and other components of complete neighborhoods within ¼ to ½ mile of each complete neighborhood. This Plan should focus on things which we can control. We can allow an individual to pursue their dream of a business, but we cannot guarantee that it will succeed. We also can control what types of businesses are allowed in a specific location, but we cannot tell an individual what specific type of business to build. -We need to acknowledge we may not be able to transfer all development from rural if receiving areas are destroyed in the process. In this case the details (i.e. specific numbers transferred) are as important as the concept (preserving the rural county). -We have submitted a list of what we consider to be minor edits not related to policy to staff. We ask that you direct staff to incorporate those changes. Questions ES-15 "0.12% of County will handle majority of future growth." We understand how this number was obtained, but it should be explained to the public. Policy 1.2.d (CV-1-6) Improve air quality: How to measure? Are we concerned about ozone, particulates, SOX, NOX, or CO2? If we all drive less, but the population increases faster so total miles driven goes up, have we improved the situation? Specific Comments Policy 1.1.g (CV-1-5) Encourage restoration of degraded areas: Does restoration of degraded areas mitigate impact in other areas? This seems to be double dipping by giving credit to a new sin for rectifying an old sin. Policy 1.3.b (CV-1-7) Maintain expansive hillside and foreground vistas: "Through mitigation and development restrictions, the protection of scenic foregrounds and forested hillsides in the Town and County will be enhanced beyond the guidance of the 1994 Plan to the extent that it does not prohibit development of property rights or impact wildlife habitat, or wildlife movement." What does it mean? It is very vague and seems to set up a conflict between wildlife and property rights.

Policy 1.4.c (CV-1-9) Encourage rural development to include quality open space: "Possible incentives include density bonuses such as house size, locations, guest house and other options." These are not density bonuses. Change to be consistent with 1.4.S.1. "Consider incentives in addition to density bonuses including house size, locations, guesthouses, and other options."

Policy 2.4.e (CV-1-17) Encourage smaller buildings: "The community will explore regulations and incentives to encourage the construction of smaller buildings." This seems in conflict with the Town's desire to increase FAR but is consistent with the Communities desire for smaller buildings.

Section 3. Responsible Growth Management: Delete the sentence "Equally important is to develop our great stable neighborhoods and methods to preserve and enhance them." The sentence is confusing and seems contradictory to sentences immediately preceding it.

Principle 3.2 (CV-2-6) Enhance existing and future complete neighborhoods: It is unrealistic to think we can provide "childcare, commercial, recreation and other amenities within walking distance (1/4 to 1/2 mile)" of all neighborhoods. This is acknowledged on CV-2-15 "Not all components of a complete neighborhood can, should or need to be provided in every area of Town." The same needs to be said about other complete neighborhoods in the County. We should also acknowledge that in a free market, we can encourage business that we think will make a neighborhood complete, but we cannot require them.

Policy 3.2.b (CV-2-6) Locate nonresidential development to complete County neighborhoods: "County completer neighborhoods with lodging may also include visitor oriented commercial development that encourages a vibrant, year-round, pedestrian character." Simplify and be clear, we will consider commercial development at Teton Village and the Aspens that encourages visitors to walk instead of drive. This should not conflict with our principle that Town is heart. Visitors should not be able to stay at the Aspens or Teton Village and have no reason to go to Town.

Strategy 3.2.S.4 (C-V-2-11) Strategies to enhance existing and future complete neighborhoods: "Explore opportunities to amend the Teton Village Master Plans to allow for a more vibrant, year-round complete neighborhood that includes more locally-oriented nonresidential uses." This is in conflict with "Town as Heart." In addition to maintaining the footprint, it should not increase entitlements such as square footage and lodging units. This is consistent with Policy 3.1.d (CV-2-50 which says "No new planned resorts should be created, and existing resorts should be limited to their existing footprint."

Policy 4.2.a (CV-2-17) Create Mixed Use Districts: It is not clear what we are trying to create. This needs more explanation and definition.

Policy 4.2.d (CV-2-18) Create a Downtown Retail Shopping District: "Local sales tax collection within Town will be centered in this district and must be maintained and expanded to continue to fund basic public and community services." It is not clear what the goal is. We need to recognize that sales tax revenues may follow economic trends outside our control.

Policy 4.2.f (CV-2-18) Maintain lodging as a key component in the downtown: Maintain the current lodging overlay. The public has been clear they do not want to expand the lodging overlay. Except during the summer peak we have excess lodging capacity. The public has been clear any expansion should be in the shoulder seasons, not in overall capacity.

Strategy 4.1.S.1 (CV-2-23) Strategies to maintain Town as the central complete neighborhood: Evaluate and update base zoning requirements and performance tools consistent with Principles, Policies and Character Districts. This is not predictable and sounds dangerous if we are going to do this on an ongoing basis. Be clear that this strategy is a one time activity.

Policy 5.4.b (CV-3-7) Avoid Regulatory barriers to the provision of workforce housing: "This may include providing exemptions from certain regulatory requirements..." Needs to be more specific, will we exempt from life safety or zoning requirements? We need to acknowledge the community is not willing to give unlimited density bonus to workforce housing. It is not predictable and is damages existing neighborhoods.

Policy 6.3.c (CV-3-7) Ensure year-round economic viability: It is not clear what long-term lodging is as is not defined in the LDRs.

Section 7 Multimodal Transportation (CV-3-23) We should include South Highway 89 on the list of projects even though it may be complete before the Plan is done.

Policy 7.3.a (CV-3-24) Avoid Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity: "A goal of this plan is to interconnect existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson with a multimodal transportation system." This is especially important for new development. We should learn from our past mistakes and require any connectors to be complete before construction begins. This is a powerful statement to add to this policy.

Policy 9.1.a (AV-4) Trigger the Growth Management Program at 4% growth: "A goal of this plan is to interconnect existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson with a multimodal transportation system." There should be an explanation on why the trigger only includes residential and does not include nonresidential growth.

Annual Indicators (AV-9):

-Growth by type looks at a variety of categories, but the information will be flawed if only examine new construction and ignore changes in use. How will we handle changes in tenants that do not require redevelopment or new construction? (ex: Local retail to visitor retail, private office to nonprofit) Need to add another trigger for corrective action: failure to provide indicators or required annual report.

-Affordability of housing should decrease? How do we define affordability? It makes no sense, we have no control.

Date	Name	Comment
		-Increasing lodging occupancy by season is in conflict with the desire to not increase tourism in summer. It should read “increase lodging occupancy in shoulder seasons.”
		Applicability of the Comprehensive Plan (AV-12): “The Comprehensive Plan is a policy document that articulates the community Vision and does not have the force of law. The Land Development Regulations (LDRs) and other implementation mechanisms provide means to implement the community vision with the force of law. Where conflicts arise between the Comprehensive Plan and the LDRs or other implementation mechanisms, the mechanism with the force of law will prevail. Additionally, tools envisioned by this Plan but not implemented through a mechanism with the force of law are effectively unavailable until the latter occurs.” This is an egregious change from the previous Plan which required that all project approvals review the project against the Comprehensive Plan to be sure the project met the intent of the Plan. Despite our best efforts, conflict will occur. We expect our elected officials to resolve them by considering both the intent and vision along with regulatory mechanisms. All our visions in this document mean nothing with this statement. It sounds like the Comprehensive Plan is a throw-away item used to develop the LDRs then ignored from the point they are adopted rather than as a guiding document to be referred to at intervals in the future to determine if we are achieving our vision.
6/3/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	In addition to the comments we submitted before the noon deadline for inclusion in the staff report, we also wish to have the attached independent review of the Comprehensive Plan done by Richman included in the record of public comment. This was a collaborative effort between Save Historic Jackson Hole and the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. We agree with the recommendations in the JHCA cover letter and the recommendations in the Richman analysis. We hope the analysis be discussed at the joint meeting on June 7.

Date	Name	Comment
6/2/2011	Cresswell, Anne JH Community Housing	Thank you all for the thought and care with which you have considered the various issues germane to the affordable housing challenges of Jackson. We hope the following points of clarification, notes of concern, and recommendations for change will help tighten the work done to date on Section 5 of the May 2011 Comp Plan. 1. As discussed at the April 22 joint Information Meeting, the term Workforce Housing is a significant departure from the terms that we have been using for the last twenty years (affordable and attainable). While it is time for a new direction, everyone seemed to acknowledge the potential layers that could be included in the more encompassing term. For example, does the term include hedge fund managers; investment bankers? We believe the definition could be tightened by clarifying that "Workforce Housing includes local market and deed restricted housing occupied by people who currently earn their living in Teton County, Wyoming". 2. Policy 5.2.a: Zone for the provision of a variety of housing options. We agree that specific locations in the Town and County should be zoned to allow for a diverse mix of housing options. However, we believe that the concept of "zoning for housing" needs to be cautiously pursued for a few reasons: • First, zoning is not permanent. As the "zoning for housing" concept has been described by members of the Blue Ribbon Panel, we understand that in order for the market to function, zoning changes must NOT be coupled with any resale restrictions. In this scenario, where zoning is leveraged to create market workforce housing options, the community would not have any guarantee that the housing will remain affordable to our workforce over time. It is our strong belief that when our community is asked to make an investment in workforce housing - either financial support or the support and acceptance of neighbors and the larger community - that our community wide investment should be protected. • Second, we are concerned that it could take ten to 20 years for the market to adjust to changes in zoning. A change in zoning will only facilitate the creation of free market workforce housing once land values adjust and respond to the change. Beyond the great amount of time this approach could take, we are concerned that the pain this approach could cause many landowners in our community threatens the viability of this approach. For example, in 1994, the Comprehensive Plan down zoned much of the general commercial in Town by a factor of 12. It was ten years before the Town of Jackson started to see redevelopment. 3. Policy 5.2.b: As noted in Policy 5.3.b, over 90% of the current workforce housing is "market housing". Given this imbalance in the type of housing serving our workforce, it is hard to understand why both Policy 5.2.b and Strategy 5.2.S.1 are dedicated to the identification of areas that are appropriate for the provision of additional market workforce housing. 4. Policy 5.2.d: As currently worded, this policy suggests that incentives and regulations "will be" used to deed restrict existing market units. We appreciate that this policy has the potential to be a community sensitive strategy, but we believe the benefits of the strategy must be thoughtfully considered and balanced against the potential cost and long term liability that could accrue to the tax payers. Amending this policy to read: the deed restriction of existing rental units will be explored gives the Town and County additional time to assess the cost implication of this strategy. 5. Principle 5.3: We appreciate that Principle 5.3 acknowledges that there are a variety of factors that affect the affordable housing issue in Teton County. In lieu of using this Principle to introduce the forthcoming policies identified to implement Principle 5.3, we think it would be worthwhile to expand on Principle 5.3 to give weight to the importance of exploring all component parts of the problem. For example: In order to meet our housing goals, the community will need to regularly monitor the percent of the workforce housed locally and strive to understand what forces are shaping the evolving demographics of our households. This will allow affordable housing providers to adjust programs to the changing needs of our community and make sure that we are addressing the core causes of the housing shortage. 6. Policy 5.3.a: As was discussed at the April 22 Joint Information Meeting, the nexus study is critical for a variety of reasons. It is equally critical that the adopted 2011 Comp Plan not include language that presupposes the outcome of the study. The second sentence of Policy 5.3.a seems to be a holdover from the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. Stating clearly in this policy that the impact from new residential, commercial and other non-residential projects will be determined by the updated nexus study seems sufficient without suggesting an outcome. 7. Policy 5.3.c: This policy should clarify that when incentives and direct funding are used to create additional deed restricted housing, the housing must provide the community with permanent workforce housing benefits. 8. Policy 5.4.d: This policy provides two opportunities to clarify that incentives and density bonuses should be used so long as they result in the preservation of existing workforce housing that will serve the workforce in perpetuity. 9. Strategies: This section identifies almost twenty strategies that should be implemented to achieve our community housing goals. Some of these strategies are time sensitive and necessary to help inform future action and to ensure that forward progress is not put on hold while we wait for updated data. We respectfully request that the legal nexus study be prioritized and that the electeds aim to complete this study by 12.31.11. In addition, this nexus study will provide our community with updated information that will inform the development of the Housing Implementation Plan. For the same reasons, we respectfully request that the electeds commit to the creation and adoption of the 10-year Coordinated Workforce Housing Implementation Plan by 12.31.12. Most of the other strategies identified for Section 5 of the Comp Plan can be prioritized in the 10-year

Date

Name

Comment

Implementation Plan.

Thank you all for your thoughtful consideration of our comments as well as the tremendous commitment you have made to this critical planning process.

Date	Name	Comment
6/1/2011	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	I have read the updated draft Comp Plan. The document is better organized and clearer. However, I did see a number of points that I would like to raise with you: Housing Principle 5.1—Maintain a diverse population by providing workforce housing I question the use of the word “provide.” County and Town governments cannot and should not be in the housing business. First of all, you don't have the fiscal resources. Secondly, we have had a grim lesson over the past few years of the consequences of government involvement in housing markets. Could you do better? I understand why housing the County workforce in the County is important, but you should not view a simple percentage as the sole metric of success. What if someone prefers a detached house with some land in Alpine to a small condo in Jackson? Is that a failure of housing policy? Finally, be careful about committing to a broad entitlement program at a time when governments across this country are coping with the fiscal burdens of past promises. Be realistic. Many County residents don't have health insurance – isn't that more important? Policy 5.1.a: House at least 65% of the workforce locally This is not a policy, it is a goal. And it is tough to claim it is a realistic goal. The data are in the draft: The median home price is 14 times the median income – and this is after the worst housing price collapse ever experienced in this country. If the median home costs 14 times the median income, a bottom quartile home must cost up to 7 times median income. But under new mortgage rules, it will be tough to get a loan much more than 3 times income, and that is with a 20% downpayment. Please, before you commit to this goal, get the facts about land costs, construction costs, and mortgage standards, to see what workers in the County can truly afford. Policy 5.1.c: Prioritize housing for critical service providers Absolutely. But, be careful about the fine print: “Especially for volunteer service providers...” What does this mean? Volunteer providers of what services? Who makes the determination? Remember, you are making a big, expensive social and financial commitment. It is valuable, and people will want to take advantage of it. I would recommend you be careful about expanding eligibility for housing assistance. Your risk is too much demand for workforce housing, not too little. Policy 5.2.d: Encourage deed-restricted rental units This is the only policy that mentions rentals. An emphasis on renting is the only way to make market-based workforce housing practical. Beef this policy up. Principle 5.3—Address all causes of workforce housing shortages This principle is wholly unrealistic. The main reason for the shortage of workforce housing is the demand and cost trends driven by global economic conditions. Another reason going forward will be constraints on mortgage credit from more conservative lending standards. These are things you cannot possibly address. How about, “Adopt policies to resist forces reducing the supply of affordable workforce housing.”? And, mention those global forces so people understand the challenges. Policy 5.3.a: Mitigate the impacts of growth on housing This policy is far too weak if you really believe in the 65% goal. You don't “mitigate”, you “fully offset.” This is one of the few areas where local government can actually do something tangible about the supply/demand balance of workforce housing. Given all the other challenges to your workforce housing objective, if you allow development to worsen the balance you are not serious. Policy 5.3.b: Preserve existing workforce housing stock The is the elephant in the room. Commissioner Phibbs reported spotting it strolling through one of the JIMs, but all of you must have seen it. 90% of

Date	Name	Comment
		the workforce housing stock is privately owned and much of it is valued far beyond the means of the median earner. How do you “deed restrict” these homes without disadvantaging the current owners? I know you intend to pass this elephant on to a “community housing implementation plan” (policy 5.4a), but do you honestly expect to avoid having to take responsibility for it at some point? If not in this Plan, when? Policy 5.3.c: Create workforce housing to address remaining shortages The text of this policy should recognize the issue of leakage of deed restricted housing in the form of retirees staying in their homes after they stop work. You may well believe they deserve to stay, but please do the math on how this magnifies the long-run demand for workforce housing and flag it as an important policy issue. Principle 5.4—Use a balanced set of tools to meet our housing goal The policies under Principle 5.4 are reasonable ways to address the goal – but only if that goal is achievable at an acceptable cost. I would like to see some mention of a cost/benefit analysis of the 65% workforce housing goal itself. This is particularly the case with Policy 5.4.e on funding. How much of the County and Town budgets can be devoted to this goal? Balanced Economy This section of the Plan doesn't really say much. It is largely aspirational. I can, however, offer two criticisms: First, a word search of the section will find zero instances of “technology”, “broadband”, “internet”, “knowledge”, “science”, “education” or “research.” You will find “light industry” mentioned five times. Light industry is a perfectly good idea, but is that our best idea to develop competitive, modern jobs for our local economy? Let's reach for a few stars. Second, I don't see any differences between Principle 6.2 (Promote a diversified economy) and Principle 6.3 (Promote a stable and balanced economy.) You are just saying the same thing in different ways. Consolidate.
6/1/2011	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	Based on an initial review of Section 6 of the Comprehensive Plan, I feel it is important to note that the recurrent citation of ecotourism as the focus of the tourism sector of our economy is very limited. Ecotourism is one aspect of a much greater current state of and opportunity for our community – Sustainable Tourism. Sustainable Tourism is defined as tourism that leads to the management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems. Ecotourism addresses the environmental or ecological resources of our community but not the cultural, arts, historical and heritage resources of our community. While there are references to “cultural tourism” later in this section, it would be more accurate of our current and potential tourism economy and consistent with the world-wide trend in tourism to use the term “Sustainable Tourism.” Please let me know if you would like additional information on or if you have questions about Sustainable Tourism.
6/1/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Any chance you can bring some of your cohorts, I splurged on halfway decent coffee beans. I might even bypass the day old coffee cake and buy fresh. I'd like to show you the different affordables and what works and doesn't work here. Also, how the one way in and one way out for Cottonwood phase one could pose serious problems if High School Road is the main traffic corridor for West Jackson. These are a few of the issues that will become big problems if there is too much flexibility and LDRs trump neighborhood character policies in the comp plan. Many here think that in order to be fair-minded, the size of homes in town and county need to be reigned in to stem the tide of service workers needed to maintain them. Jonathan Schechter (Compass Symposium back on May 19th) believes that there will be even more emphasis on the uber rich because other states are going to become less inviting by raising taxes, making it more inviting here in the hole. Nothing wrong with that, but after the smart growth presentation at The Wort last week, the speaker reminded me, you have to have a carrot and stick approach towards the McMansion builders. I can't help but feel that they are getting carrot cake and we are getting the big stick. Well, I better get outside and finish planting my veggies, I make my own carrot cake:) Looking forward to our chat! Kathy

Date	Name	Comment
5/31/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi everyone, Thought I would point out one of a few concerns I have over some policies in the latest draft. I did submit this for comment to the JHN&G. I have been getting more defensive because it does comes down to Northern South Park in the end. I just don't want it to become a field day. It needs to be fair for people who are already struggling and don't have the time or energy anymore to deal with the future of Northern South Park. Kathy I have been reading through the latest draft of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan and would like the elected to clarify and strengthen a policy so it doesn't open the door to creative interpretations by future planners, developers and town and county elected. In section three, titled "Responsible Growth Management" under Policy 3.1.d: "Cluster nonresidential development in existing locations", it states; "existing county nonresidential uses outside of complete neighborhoods will be encouraged to redevelop in a manner that is more consistent with rural character. The possible exception to this would be the location of additional light industry opportunities that respect wildlife, natural and scenic resources and neighborhood character goals." I understand this is directed toward places like Hog Island where homes and light industry coexist and there is a need to support home businesses. But, I worry that this policy will also lead the way for more light industry along High School Road and around the high school. The comp plan's joint planning commission voted down expanding light industry in and around the schools because of all the congestion and environmental problems it would cause on High School Road and Flat Creek. By Including this statement in the latest draft, "The possible exception to this would be the location of additional light industry opportunities that respect wildlife, natural and scenic resources and neighborhood character goals" the comp plan will give opportunists the opening they need to expand light industry to Northern South Park and degrade the existing neighborhoods and schools in and around High School Road. Whose version of respecting neighborhood goals will be followed? When do neighborhoods have meaningful input on neighborhood goals or is it left up to each individual project of which I thought we were trying to avoid through a well defined comprehensive plan rewrite? We need to error on the side of "no expansion" of light industrial along High School Road and around Jackson Hole High School to ensure that we do preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods through park like open space, and traffic calmed complete streets. This is one of a few ambiguous policies, under the guise of flexibility, in the latest comprehensive plan draft that need to be clarified to prevent Northern South Park from becoming the cure all for Teton County's growth problems.

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Below is an updated letter that I submitted to JHN&G for an editorial a couple of weeks. I added a suggestion that you may or may not of heard before from other concerned residents. It could help our goal for a more sustainable economy and environment in Teton County. I believe the latest draft of the comprehensive plan backs away from the commitments of the joint planning commissioner's draft and still has ambiguities to be resolved. I liked the common sense overlay map that was discussed at the "Smart Growth" presentation in the Wort, last night. The example map was for Mizzoula, Montana and helped with practical info that included for example, how far a neighborhood is from a fire house, etc. I think PlanJH.org is going to post the meeting highlights. We need this practical overlay map before we delve into the final FLUP. It might of saved us four years of many comprehensive plan draft revisions. I was a little disapointed that the presentaion didn't touch on housing size and energy conservation in downsizing. It dealt mostly with moving the impacts of supersized homes to town. Have a great Memorial Day weekend! Kathy Dear Elected, I understand that everybody has to make sacrifices when it comes to preserving open space by stripping density from rural areas and shifting density to town and Northern South Park. But shifting “the burdens” of service worker housing needed to maintain large homes in or bordering sensitive areas in the valley, to Northern South Park, will only serve to increase traffic problems and negatively impact wildlife in all areas. We have not seriously considered the 4,000 square foot, supersized gorilla in the room that can still be built in and bordering sensitive areas that Transfer Development Rights don’t capture. “A 2005 article in the Journal of Industrial Ecology showed that a very well-insulated 3,000-square-foot house consumes more energy than a poorly insulated 1,500-square-footer. Building a 25 percent smaller house saves more trees than are saved by using advanced wood-efficient construction techniques. The average U.S. house in the 1970s had 1,500 square feet; by 2006, the typical house was heating and air conditioning almost 2,500 square feet, despite having fewer people living in it. The average home today has three times as much living space per person as in the 1950s.” Many McMansions on the West bank exceed these averages and require many laborers to maintain them. What we need is a combination of a permanent funding source to buy and extinguish development rights and TDRs that do not negatively impact existing neighborhoods in the receiving areas. TDRs also need to be closely monitored and transparent, so as not to allow phantom density transfers from unbuildable rural areas to receiving areas. We also need a long overdue realty check in the form of new responsibilities for want to be Mc Mansion owners. When planning for a more sustainable economy and environment in Teton County, prevention is far cheaper and less complicated than trying to play catch up by containing the negative impacts of McMansions in Northern South Park or other areas of town. The maximum size allowed for Mc Mansions needs to be drastically reduced. One example is to only allow a 2500 square foot house to be built on 35 acres. If the landowner wants to supersize, he or she needs to extinguish development rights on another 35 acres, to add, let’s say, another 1000 sq ft. to the house size. Along with TDRs, this combination will give you a three for one triple win strategy by increasing permanent open space, decreasing the amount of wasted materials and energy needed to build and maintain the McMansions and decreasing the amount of McMansion service workers that would need housing and services in town and any future “greenfield” development in Northern South Park. Transfers of service worker housing to Northern South Park without in place, numbers monitoring, checks and balances, will lead to sprawl southward. It also tempts developers and landowners to push for more light industrial around the schools, over priced convenience stores, low quality, lot line to lot line high density housing, for service workers sacrificing open space for families and schools. The proposed Tribal Trails connector will add to the traffic problems. The increased traffic impacts will pressure existing neighborhood families to increase car use because our roads will be unsafe for children to walk or bike to school. If change does come to Northern South Park, include open space that starts at the West side of the high school and ends at South Park Loop Road. A new, smaller, low carbon foot print neighborhood can be concentrated along the Southern border of the open space or around the high school. The open space can double as a wildlife corridor and learning park for the schools teaching conservation that could include xeriscape practices, solar and wind power generation, native habitat learning center, etc. Include a x-country track for skiers in the winter and runners in summer. Have local produce fairs in the park on summer weekends to help promote locally grown food and the (hopefully future) downtown Vertical Harvest Greenhouse Project. We would love to be able to walk or bike across High School Road to take advantage of these possibilities. Any new neighborhood should have its infrastructure like roads and sewers in place before home building starts. This will keep construction traffic off of High School Road. The infrastructure needed should be paid for by the proposed new development. Gravel pits in Northern South Park should be discouraged. The blowing dust and noise from a gravel pit at the entrance to Jackson, close to neighborhoods and schools is unacceptable. There must be a parallel road South of High School Road (connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road) that can drop off and pick up students behind Jackson High School to alleviate traffic on High School Road. The new road must also take the majority of traffic from the proposed Tribal Trails connector if it

Date	Name	Comment
		unfortunately becomes a reality. High School Road should be declared a campus corridor and the school children walking and biking to and from the schools should get top priority. It needs safe, weather protected START bus stops and narrow car lanes with trees, paths and other traffic calming methods to promote a shared campus corridor that slows traffic in favor of pedestrians and bicycle riders. There should be no light industrial added around the schools except for where it already exists on Gregory Lane. There should be no heavy commercial traffic allowed between High School Road at Gregory Lane and South Park Loop Road. Working class family neighborhoods bordering Northern South Park are committed to help cure our growth problems so we can preserve wildlife and open spaces in ALL of Teton County. But we will not suffer the burdens of an urbanized dumping ground shifted from anywhere in the valley, while others continue to build their labor intensive, energy inefficient McMansions. Strong medicine is needed for everyone, especially for those infected with the environmental and economic debilitating disease called Affluenza. (Epidemic of overconsumption)
5/23/2011	DesGouttes, Yves Interested Public	Let me mention before everything else that as our elected officials for County and Town you are easily accessible and it is the proof of a healthy democratic process. I must mention that I am an advisor to the board of a non-profit which deals with social causes. I want to make it clear that the opinions that I am exposing are my own and do not reflect the policies and directives of that organization. The process of dealing with the "Comp. Plan" has been a tedious one. However I have examined the latest draft dated 5/20/2011 and I am very encouraged with what I have read. The draft clearly identifies the most relevant issues by addressing the economic future of our valley In the section called "Common Value "; Principles 5.3 & 6.2 are the most pertinent and in particular sub section "Policy 5.4.e", which is dealing with a "reoccurring source of funding for affordable housing " although the source is not definite in a concrete manner. The vital correlation between affordable housing and a prosperous Jackson Hole is clearly deduced .The draft recognizes that JH cannot only rely on its beauty but must prepare the conditions for small businesses to thrive. Tourism and Constructions cannot be the sole motors of our economic activities. We must create a variety of jobs created by small, environmentally low impact businesses. The no-growth lobby may not realize it but their ideas would lead towards economic death and generational unsustainability (I mean with that expression the impossibility of generation from a same family to stay in our valley). The road map for a more stable economic life is as followed: Affordable housing → favorable climate for businesses → more stable economy. I am heartened that the draft tackles these thorny issues. The above implies changing our zoning laws. The new influx will be naturally limited to the land still available for construction, which is a finite number. JH has probably a maximum capacity of 30,000 inhabitants. This would kick start the building industry, not by building a few mansions but numerous middle class dwellings. Wildlife and quality of our environment have been and still are a major concern of ours. I believe that in the past decade we have been successful and have tried to minimize our impact on nature. We must continue to do so. As one elected official pointed at a recent meeting, the problem is that we do not have any scientific tools to monitor flora and fauna and therefore they would have to be created so that we base our decisions on true science and not on pseudo science. I like to conclude by mentioning the reality of the present. We are now three years into an economic crisis, hardship has unfortunately settled in our mist, but it is only recently that it is starting to make the news. I have been looking at the budgets from Town & County; money earmarked for social services have been cut like everything else. I looked at page 19 for the County (FY 2011) and page 107 for Town (recommended budget for FY 2012). The total allocated to social services has a combined total of \$ 1,470,391. - Total expenditures for the 2 entities are \$ 55,439,824. -. Hence Social services represent 2.65% of the spending and could have been left alone. The money raised by private donations is 70 % higher than the public one [calculated by researching IRS public information]. We may give ourselves a pat on the back as private initiatives pick up the difference from what is lacking from the public funds. In my mind it is hardly a source for rejoicing, as in the long run we cannot rely so much on the good will of private donors. The local governments probably feel that raising taxes for social services would be politically difficult? That would imply a change of attitude in all of us. I want to thank each one of you for the dedication you bring to your position. You have a very difficult task in these trying times. The latest draft is a genuine try at solving our economics vows. I will also send a copy of this letter to the editors of the two weekly papers as what I said to you could spur some creative thinking with people at large and also, I am certain, some criticisms.

Date	Name	Comment
5/20/2011	, Conservation Alliance	Deer today, gone tomorrow? Not if we stand our ground. Wildlife today. Wildlife tomorrow. Thanks to your calls and comments, your elected representatives have pledged that the new Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan will: •Honor the community's will that future growth should be limited to existing development entitlements. •Include a growth management program to evaluate the amount, location, type and impacts of development as it occurs. This program is also intended to specify what will be done if future expansions were to threaten the valley's wildlife, scenery and rural character. •Incorporate "Character District maps" in the plan, with buildout ranges for certain areas, so we'll know what future development will look like. Now, let's all walk the talk. The new plan is due out on May 20th. Soon After, the Alliance will post an expert analysis at jhalliance.org. There's no more critical time to be involved in the Comp Plan than the next few weeks. Please show up and speak up for wildlife on: June 7, 2011: 5 to 9 p.m. at Snow King Resort's Grandview Lodge. The draft Comp Plan will be presented and verbal public comments taken. June 29: Same time and place. The elected officials are expected to approve the plan's policies, but not formally adopt them until later. You can also comment online anytime at jacksontetonplan.com. Questions? Call us at (307) 733-9417, or stay posted at jhalliance.org. And please remember – it's up to each of us to stand our ground for Jackson Hole's wildlife and quality of life. Thanks for your help!
5/20/2011	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Thanks to the planning team for the hard work on this new draft, and for getting it out as promised May 20.
5/13/2011	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Hope all is well. Briefly, in the case that you are sending anything on to AECOM this afternoon or next week, we wanted to give you one comment on the Common Directions. We plan to send a few more brief questions/concerns/suggestions Tuesday afternoon of next week. But for now, one issue in particular - transfers of development potential - stood out because it has been such a consistent concern/question on the part of the Alliance and many members of the public. Specifically with regard to Common Direction #3: Where it says, "Whether by transfer or other right, development in these..." the question of what other right(s)? comes to mind. The issue of transferring development potential is clearly a key issue in this Plan, and this common direction should result in policies that are clear and detailed. As Trevor likely mentioned to Jeff, our newsletter, out at the end of the month, will have a highlighted section on transfers and open space preservation.

Date	Name	Comment
5/9/2011	Whalen, Lynne Interested Public	I have watched with interest the community dialogue over the Comp Plan. I had not intended to add any more comments to the vast amount you have already received, until now. I have knowledge and training in this issue having served on the Casper City Council for 8 years and the Board of The National League of Cities for 4 years. So therefore I will just make a few comments. I support growth. I believe all local public officials must support community growth. To due anything different limits the future of the community. Public officials must be mindful of many things but at the top of that list has to be jobs for their citizens. Limiting or capping growth of a community sends the wrong message to potential businesses looking to locate, relocate or expand. I understand the significant challenges faced by this community and many of them will be limiting factors in and of themselves. But if the official position of the community, written down and adopted through the Comp Plan is to limit or cap growth it in effect tells businesses that they are not wanted here. I realize the community does not wish to become another Aspen or a Vail, but it should not want to become another Boulder either. It makes perfect sense and is completely logical to encourage growth in areas that have basic infrastructure such as roads, water, sewer that are already in place. The vast majority of citizens can understand that fact. This prevents having to run roads and service lines through virgin land and to stretch out public services such as police, fire and garbage collection. It is cost effective in both the short and long term. Sometimes the use of fuzzy consultant words such as nodes or character districts obscure an easily understandable fact spoken in plain English. One of the most limiting factors for growth in Jackson and Teton County is traffic. While I watch the community spend and plan for many means of alternative transportation, I see no attempt to address the most vital transportation issue, car traffic and roads. Most citizens in this community still use their cars for the majority of their trips. Our weather and the convenience dictate this. But if growth is to be encouraged in areas such as South Park and the west bank, this issue must be addressed first. I do understand the need to work with WYDOT to plan and fund some of these roads and bridges. Yet there has been little public discussion on developing and identifying funding for redundant roads and bridges even though their sitting has been identified previously. To publicly tackle the car traffic problem should help increase public support for increased density in these identified areas. I do realize just how much time has been devoted to this issue and appreciate all your efforts and dedication. I know you do not get the thanks you deserve for all you do. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments.
5/8/2011	Young, Tim Interested Public	This rainy day is good for something - I went over the Theme 6 word doc you sent me, and provide suggestions with track changes. [see actual comment] I hope these are helpful and still timely in your revisions. I think these suggestions are all within the policy agreement on Theme 6 that the electeds have reached. I tried to keep as much as possible within the length and detail of the PC draft. In a couple sections, an added paragraph seemed helpful. I took a shot at another way to state the "Potential Transportation Network Projects" table after 6.3.e - these edits suggest a more general approach, to update the TIP and just list the most significant projects for each mode coming up. This creates a list of the key multi-modal projects and then you can reference where more detail will be provided (like in the TIP, or START Master Plan, Path plan etc.)

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2011	Cresswell, Anne JH Community Housing	Thank you for the invitation to provide language suggestions for Theme Four of the Comprehensive Plan. Please consider the following ideas to help memorialize the discussion and direction of the electeds. 1.The definition of “workforce housing” raised confusion and concern for most of the electeds. Further discussion among the electeds is necessary to clarify who in our community should be included in the definition. For example: Should retirees be included? Should employed persons be included that do not earn their living in Teton County, Wyoming (investment bankers)? This central definition should be tightened by the electeds prior to adopting the final Comprehensive Plan. 2.Why is this theme addressed? If we assume that “silence suggests support”, then it seems the electeds were supportive of Mark Obringer’s recommendation for a synopsis of the primary cause of the affordable housing problem. 3.New Policy 4.1.b: Create and adopt a 10-year housing action plan that identifies the specific actions the community will take to meet its housing goals. Meeting the community’s housing goals requires a variety of tools as well as coordination of the various housing groups. The 10-year housing action plan will be based on updated and current data, it will include an assessment of the tools and strategies that serve our community well, a revision and/or elimination of tools and strategies that have not performed as well as we hoped, and an analysis of potential tools that have not yet been implemented. The action plan will explore historic funding sources as well as potential new sources for funding. This comprehensive, strategic and technical plan will result in a coordinated, resource efficient plan that will ensure housing for 65% of the workforce in Teton County, Wyoming. 4.Amend Policy 4.1.e to read: Explore preservation of existing workforce housing stock. As noted by Melissa Turley, the costs and implications of this policy need to be further discussed by the elected officials. Further consideration of this policy option could be deferred to the housing action plan. 5.Principle 4.2 and Policies 4.2.a and 4.2.b: As Andy Schwartz cautioned, in the new economy, we can’t assume that new development will generate new employees that need new housing. Perhaps this principle and the associated policies should be tabled until after the housing nexus study from 2005 is updated. This updated study will determine if new development is in fact creating a demand for new employees. And if so, it will determine at what rate and at what thresholds. Inclusion of this Principle and the associated policies, if appropriate, could be incorporated into the housing action plan. 6.Principle 4.3 and Policies 4.3.b, 4.3.c and 4.2.c: Given the current expansive definition of workforce housing, the electeds discussed, but did not conclude if incentives and density bonuses should be awarded and regulatory barriers should be removed for workforce housing units that are not permanently restricted. With a range of opinions on this issue, this could be deferred to the housing action plan. 7.Indicators: All electeds agreed that there is a need to track the percentage of the workforce housed locally. In addition, there was understanding that this effort is independent of the nexus study. It should be tracked on a regular basis; it should be tracked more frequently than the nexus study, but it may not be necessary to track every year. This indicator should be updated once staff and electeds create a master plan for tracking the various indicators in the Comp Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2011	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Planning Staff and Bruce – as you meet next week on the composition of the character maps – plus the associated public process - I wanted to touch on one focused concern: Clearly whether through enhancing the existing PRD tool, new approaches via some form of TDRs or other to be determined mechanisms – there should be both a focus in mapping of density “receiving areas” – as well as “sending areas”. In South Park in particular the initial FLUPs had a very large and non-congruent mapping that was bounded by High School road and South Park Loop road. My concern is that for this area – and similarly for other receiving zones such as Town, Teton Village, Aspens and Wilson – you not paint the entire area with a broad brush which did occur in much of the language and values ranking (e.g. wildlife) in the old FLUPs – especially for my region. In addition, by the plan now committing to work within the overall entailments – more or less – any idea of holding back of any rural areas as potential sending zones in order to have future growth 50 years from now after we have doubled the built environment - is basically off the table. I bring this up as an unspoken assumption was that some of South Park was not to be prioritized for conservation so “as not to tie the hands of future generations” – this is now old thinking that has gone away via the public process to date. So - I expect a large portion of South Park’s rurally zoned areas to be sending areas – especially given the large land owners of Robert Gill and Kelly Lockhart that control both the logical receiving area near Cottonwood Park as well as considerable sending areas themselves – including non-contiguous parcels they control in the Snake River bottomlands near Shooting Iron. If we really want to see transfer of development rights happen - we need to accept this ownership reality and the existence of the PRD tool which certainly can be enhanced – but at least is already in the LDRs. So please consider how to address an area like the current middle/northern South Park FLUP map – either re-divide the maps to address this (brining much of these lands over to the Three Creeks/Indian Springs Ranch map). Alternately consider in an area like the old “middle” South Park FLUP map – that you then will need to indentify stable areas (Rafter J, Melody Ranch, South Park Ranches etc.) – plus areas that should most definitely be consider sending areas e.g. east of Flat Creek to HWY 89, central and southern South Park (Lockhart, Gill, Lucas and Seherr-Thoss) – then a focused character district description of NW South Park as a receiving zone. I just want to make sure the character district mapping for this area not only describes a “density receiving area” – but also represents that it has defined “stable areas” - and other significant “sending areas” (east of Flat creek and in the middle and southern portions) which are not only now zoned rural but the majority are also mapped within the SRO - plus this area is also specifically called out in the 1994 Comp Plan for scenic/agricultural/wildlife protection. The old FLUPs in multiple ways disavowed these embedded qualities (plus known habitat connectivity values) and I want to make sure the new character district maps reaffirm these values along with defining the character of the one portion that is to be a density receiving area. You will have this same issue to varying degrees in the remainder of the receiving zones of Town, Aspens, Wilson and Teton Village – unless you break those zones out separately from the old FLUPs that contained them. Good luck – I would love to give feedback on your chosen approach – and perhaps pull together a small interested group together again – before you simply present a plan to the public in June.
5/5/2011	Parks, Carla Interested Public	I am extremely concerned that you safeguard the environment-the reason people come and the reason people want to come back. We owe the people of this valley, the visitors, the future people, the future visitors to protect and preserve the environment, the aura of the town itself. You MUST place a moratorium on "box" stores and chain stores. The small businesses in this valley need the support of the local people and the visitors. Big chain stores dilute the integrity of the town, bring down wages, put other businesses out of business. This is true for all major corporations. One of the things that is especially important is to maintain the spirit of independence for those creating businesses here and now and in the future. Please do not allow yourself to be lured into betraying the people of this valley by BIG MONEY interests. You must also place LIMITS on the amount of development allowed if we are to preserve our environment. Please NEVER change the town square or the small businesses around the square. PLEASE do not allow huge hotels, motels, corporate store to change the small town atmosphere. We have a saying, "Please don't 'Vail-ify' our valley."

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Comp Plan Update - Substantially Responding to Recent Community Concerns [Dates for release of the final draft Plan should have been stated as May 20 instead of April 20 in my update. Sorry for the confusion. - Rich] AS ALWAYS – FEEL FREE TO FORWARD Comprehensive Plan Update I wanted to thank the scores of you that have commented the last several weeks – and the close to 50 citizens who attended the public comment session Wednesday afternoon/evening. The Plan has continued to respond to overwhelming resident feedback and concerns. Although it does not have firm growth caps – the new changes (and clarifications) are a significant and positive response to community concerns. Caveat - given the workshop format and various directions to staff for rewriting – we will not see exactly what was captured via changes until the final draft Plan is released to the public on April 20. After over 30 citizens verbally conveyed their concerns to the joint electeds the previous evening - the electeds yesterday morning did address all recent major issues to varying degrees. I would summarize that the Plan will now include language that does the following in some manner: Directions Issued for Comp Plan Rewrite •The Plan will mention a “desired community size” that is no more than twice what is on the ground today. Given the imbedded entitlements that basically match this number – they have acknowledged by “referencing” this statement in the managing growth theme and/or introduction – that this is the context the community expects the Plan to work within to achieve various community’s goals. •There will not be a hard cap either as a total or for any specific density receiving area (northwest South Park, Wilson, Aspen, Teton Village and Town). I would say they are establishing a “soft cap” approach instead based on sensitivity to each density receiving area’s unique limits and existing character. •“Character Districts” for all areas of the valley (replacing the future land use maps – FLUPs) will each have buildout ranges – along with descriptive and illustrative explanations of their future design. •Staff is to create a new “Appendix I”, which documents the outcomes of the Character District discussion and shows ranges of what may be possible in each district (and in total) and then compare that to the 1994 entitlements. •The addition of a progressive restrictive adaptive growth management process to measure (and respond) as we grow. As outlined in Wednesday’s News and Guide newspaper article, this will measure at set growth trigger points, whether we are matching our goals we want to achieve on: - oThe mix of development: especially commercial versus residential – and workforce housing units versus second home development. - oThe pattern of development: achieving permanent open space in important rural areas (this should include currently unprotected portions of South Park) and seeing development transferred (and/or purchased) via tools that are to be determined - either into various County “nodes” and/or Town itself. •There will be a statement that “measuring cumulative impacts of development on wildlife and natural resources is an important goal for the plan” – “but that the tools to achieve this are still being developed”. •Elected officials are to “affirm” the Plan Themes and Policies in June and this summer move into Character District discussions - then adopt the entire document as ONE package. •Elected officials are committed to completing the entire Plan in December 2011 – and staff is to set a schedule to achieve this. Thanks to the Electeds and Staff This has been a long and difficult process – collectively the electeds HAVE responded to a large degree to recent community concerns. Aside from a few unfortunate comments from a small handful of electeds yesterday - that they were responding only to a “vocal minority while a silent majority was not being heard from”.... – in general they respected the concerns and the will of their constituents. Go to the online audio recordings to follow the

Date

Name

Comment

nuisances of the entire conversation from yesterday morning. You can also listen in on the passionate and thoughtful public comment delivered to the electeds the previous evening.

Next Steps

Generally you will not see any alerts and/or updates from me for awhile - certainly not until the final draft Plan is released. Unless there are significant issues with the final April 20 draft – be prepared this summer/fall to weigh in on what you want the specific neighborhood you live or work in to look like via the to be determined process in the “Character District” public input process.

April 20 – Final draft of Plan’s Themes and Policies released – the public and the electeds will then be able to review if all direction/concerns have been addressed sufficiently.

June 7 – 5-9PM - Draft Plan Presentation and Review Workshop - includes public comment session. Location – TBD

June 29 – 5-9PM – Themes and Policy Plan “Adoption” Public Hearing - includes public comment session. Location – TBD

Mid-Summer into Fall – Individual neighborhood Character District map workshops.

December 2011 – Final Plan Adoption (including character district maps) and Implementation
 2012 and Ongoing – Modifications to Town and County Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to address Plan goals.
 Supplemental Information

- Web link to the Comprehensive plan - <http://www.jacksonstetontetonplan.com/>
- This includes audio recordings of all sessions, staff reports and meeting presentation materials.

Your South Park Neighbor - Rich Bloom, cell weekdays 690-5273

P.S. If you are getting this through forwarding and would like to receive direct emails – just let me know. Our email list is now over 410 neighbor (and County) households strong.

4/29/2011

Mortensen, Sue
Interested Public

After attending the public comment meeting on the 27th (thank you for providing this space and time!) I thought of one issue that was not specifically addressed.

It seems that under the present process a developer can get 70 - 80% through the approval process without ever addressing how the proposed subdivision will impact county infrastructure and how the developer plans to deal with those issues. The county and the developer together should know exactly how infrastructure issues are going to be solved very close to the beginning of the process.

In addition every prospective developer should design wildlife permeability into the general layout from the beginning and those corridors should be compatible with already existing corridors. For example Cottonwood Park has wildlife permeability that is completely blocked to the north by subsequent development.

4/28/2011

Stewart, Peter
Interested Public

I applaud the Elected Officials' conscientious review of the Comprehensive Plan.

All themes need to be addressed simultaneously to create a plan that enhances the valley for everyone. Please do not cripple the efficacy of the plan to appease interest groups that target one theme in order to protect their personal view corridor.

I appreciate the Elected's return of Nodes and ARU's to the plan. Comments they are ignoring the recommendations of the Joint Planning Commission is not true. As the commission progressed past theme 1 and 2 meetings and began addressing workforce housing, the economy, and traffic issues the commissioners realized early tie votes had created conflicts in the themes and did not represent their current beliefs.

Nodes are integral to a plan that addresses our valley's love of open space, preservation of workforce housing and a traffic plan that reduces fossil fuel consumption.

Date	Name	Comment
4/28/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	RE Town of Jackson, specifically, character of Willow Street: Resident for 30 years; seen it all, know area very well, neighbors too; wish to actively contribute to FINAL plan for this area. How can I do that?
4/28/2011	Resor, Miller Interested Public	I believe a growth plan is very important. I think the planning departments proposals have been well thought out, and represent the best approach to protecting open space and wildlife as well as supporting efficiency. As much as I would like to see zero growth, I don't think this is a realistic scenario. We are a tourism town and rely on being open and welcoming. Zero growth will make this town exclusive and difficult to access for many people that bring so much to it. I think it is important to allow for reasonable growth and embrace change. In one way or another Jackson will change. Old houses will be replaced with new houses. Old buildings with new buildings. I think it is important to make the most out of these changes and well thought out zoning seems like the best tool/approach to achieve this. I think that efficiency should be a major concern of the plan. Efficiency in transportation, heating, recycling and ease of access to essential amenities. I think that nodes are the best way to achieve efficiency. I believe in infill and upzoning, although I would agree that we should choose our areas for this wisely. I like the idea of mixed use development (residential above commercial). I want the plan to accommodate the next generation and the generation after that. Our children should have the opportunity to live and work in this valley. Jackson has changed a lot. It was great growing up here in the 80's, and it is great living here in the 2000's, but in no way is it exactly what it was in the 80's in the 2000's and this seems to me to be a fact of life. What we have lost in small town feel, we have gained in worldliness. I think making Jackson a smart growth leader should be what we are shooting for. Thank you for taking this into consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
4/28/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to thank all the people, public and private that worked so hard on the Teton County comprehensive plan to date. After a few years the public has been worn thin by the process as you can tell from the decreasing attendance numbers in our most important final phase of the plan approval. We owe it to the public to implement policies and themes that have been overwhelmingly favored by the public. We want to provide stewardship of wildlife habitat and other environmentally sensitive areas through science back monitoring and permanently preserved open space. Build out should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation. We all live with limits or boundaries. The Comp Plan is intended to put limits on the amount of growth. People surveyed said, to limit growth in the valley was most important. We would like to see an estimate for how much growth is allowed before the Plan is approved. That includes Non-residential square footage and dwelling units. Let's get the bad news up front instead of pawning it off on our children to deal with later when it's too late. Up zoning in perimeter areas is not smart growth. Only allow development in Northern South Park that leaves a small environment damaging footprint. Any development should be preceded by infrastructure including roads, pathways, open space, etc. to reflect and enhance a safe and inviting academic corridor. Up zoning in places like Northern South Park will cause damaging negative impacts to the established neighborhoods and school zones on and around High School Road. It is foolish to think that up zoning won't lead to never ending sprawl. We don't need convenience stores. Again, we do need family safe and bike friendly roads, paths, parks and open spaces to enhance our existing neighborhoods and school zones. Over 70% of the people surveyed said that they would be willing to pay higher taxes to conserve open space and natural areas. Do not rely on any one tool like transfer development rights. The community also needs to weigh in on TDRs and PDRs through community workshops. Performance based tools should be well defined. We can't rely on vague terms such as "it will provide community benefit". When I hear that term and it is not followed up with any actual benefit to the community other than higher tax revenue, then vaguely defined performance based tools serve no purpose except to fuel our addiction of relying on growth to solve our growth problems. TDRs if used must be well defined to prevent transfers that only benefit the money changers. People in proposed receiving areas should be given priority as to what and how much can be added to their neighborhoods to prevent negative impacts. Small property owners in neighborhoods are equally important and valuable to the community as the few large property owners whose property rights seem to get more attention and respect in this process. The Character District Maps are an essential bridge between the Comp Plan and the Land Development Regulations. The Comp Plan should not be approved until the Character District Maps are completed and included in the overall plan. The public needs input into all aspects of the character maps process and how they are incorporated. Character district maps are essential to a complete and enforceable comprehensive plan. The proposal for a growth management plan is a big step in the right direction. We need to monitor commercial growth, not just dwelling units. The trigger for reevaluation should be lower than the proposed 7% to give ourselves more time and tools to do deal with any growth problems that rear its sprawling head. I also have a problem with the 50/50 split. It needs to be lowered in the county to give us an earlier warning signal to take actions to rectify the failure. Predictability is important to the community because we cannot plan for the future if we do not know what we are going to allow to be built. This means we can't shy away from the numbers, indicators, science and actions needed. Don't be vague. Take out the loop holes and confusing doubletalk that people with narrow profit minded agendas can take advantage of. We need to be bold and thorough in order to pioneer a comprehensive plan that succeeds where the 1994 plan failed. If we fail again, there won't be a next time. Post comment meeting remarks...I heard from a couple of people at the public comment portion of JIM 8 that we should be prepared to get pushback from the neighborhoods when the character maps (flup - future land use plan) are dealt with and that the officials need to push through. They sounded sincere in their wants but what are the neighborhoods affected suppose to do, roll over? Don't we have a right to want the best for our neighborhoods? We can work together to create a great comp plan but we also can't ignore the small property owners in the affected neighborhoods, who most of the time bears the most of the cost of what others decide is best for us.
4/28/2011	Manhart, Amy Interested Public	Congratulations on being so thoughtful. I am supporting your thoughtful growth model. I think the more we can shift from having to use our cars the better overall for people and wildlife. I would like to see more START bus transportation and also maybe some commercial marketing mixed with housing. Some small stores or restaurants precluding the need to always run into town. I would also like to the town continue to use its renewable resources such as wind and the use of more solar energy.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	Good evening, I'm Scott Pierson; I'm a resident of Teton County. Bill Collins said that you should include maps. I agree with that, but I think first you need to finalize what you're doing and agree to the final draft. You don't have to adopt it as an organization, one or the other, until you get the maps, but the maps are going to be a minefield. Every neighborhood you go into is going to blow up because you're going to want to put additional density in those if you hold to what this Plan is talking about, whether it is the nodes in the Aspens, to the node in Teton Village, the node in East Jackson—they're all going to blow up on you. And you've got to have the political courage to stick with the Plan draft that you guys are looking forward to adopting. Open space, wildlife, people, diversity, economy, all equal our community. You guys have done a great job so far. Keep up the good work. You're heading in the right direction. Move forward and try to get it done before you all wear out. Thanks.
4/27/2011	Sharkey, Steve Interested Public	My name is Steve Sharkey. I'm a County resident living in South Park. I'm interested in predictability and a cap on population growth, and for that predictability I think it is important that the character district maps are the real FLUPs, right? It's hard for me to stay up with the process, but I think they should be finalized and they should become part of the Plan. Bill Collins made a great point. That's the link to the LDRs and that would provide some predictability, so I thought that was an excellent point that he made. And I think a cap is important but it'll take a long time to get there, so I do like the idea of an adaptive management plan. I think there could be a lot of merit to that. You want to kind of monitor the progress as you go to see how you're doing, instead of just waking up in 20 or 25 years and saying, ohmygod, you know, here's where we are. So, those are my points. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, speaking as an individual; I'll switch hats at one point. Thank you for your time and your diligence with your frank discussions. All of this would have been easier if we just had accepted that workable two-times number and had committed it ?? but a different pathway. And the whole process in these workshops, to me, who followed this closely, to me it's still as clear as mud on portions of it. So, you're already well aware of the overwhelming concern of the community on build-out and having limits to put on growth. I think that is your ?? to your plan and it's also what you have to have so you know what you're working towards so you can achieve other community goals—reinvestment in Town, workforce housing, all the other things we want to achieve concurrently. Even heard, you've individually stated strongly, publicly and also in the press, you basically committed to work backwards from the character districts to a build-out number that likely will match or is below where we are already headed. That is what I heard you say. Yet, talking to Staff, you basically unwound all discussions on growth limits as being two, so that means this undermines a key to predictability. So, to your credit, you have endorsed an adaptive growth management plan—thank you for that. It's not the same as addressing that all growth, no matter where it's located, or whether it's residential or nonresidential, has off site impacts on natural resources. So I am for smart growth especially as far as trying to extinguish entitlements found in sensitive rural areas, but there has to be acknowledgement that we all have our ??, even when we're living in a proper location. So the Plan I think needs to be a little more intellectually honest because this point of the Plan is missing. So, I think that is where you're headed and that you want to do that. You've committed to try to meet goals within a certain amount of budget. Some specifics I would suggest then, and you've even referred to those numbers in the growth management plan, because you're talking about 7 percent of 10,000 as a kind of a working number. So in this context I've asked for several items be addressed specifically. In theme two, you need to recognize that growth management encompasses not only the pattern of growth but also the total amount of growth. We've also talked about mix and ??, which has impacts and they will be addressed via the character districts as far as where they're going to go. But I think you need to tie into that whole idea that we can mitigate some of the impacts, that they don't go away just by locating them in certain areas. Be intellectually honest, because they do cross over impact—wildlife, natural resources, transportation systems, etc. Clearly, the character district maps will provide predictability. They need to have build-out ranges by area for that to be achieved. That since the character district maps are so integral to the Plan, the Plan cannot be adopted without those maps being completed. And then the build-out ranges, which I've heard you promise individually, would be calculated in total and compared to where we are already headed to give us a check. And that receiving areas, called nodes—now complete neighborhoods—I think we said in theme one pretty clear that that's linked as much as possible to shift current entitlements and extinguishing and getting permanent open space. If we don't know what the multipliers will be, all the mechanisms, but it really confused all of us, me included, when we had those growth-cap discussions about exactly what would go in these receiving areas, nodes complete neighborhoods. A couple of other things. I would suggest you use Bruce Meighen more integrally on a revised draft instead of simply reviewing the Staff work at the end of it. Staff has great direction and capable, but Bruce has also got a broad experience and fresh perspective. I think if he could work with the team in the next few weeks, that would be money well spent. I would also switch hats to ?? briefly as a Blue Ribbon Panel and not just...again, I'd ask you to accept the report, while not necessarily endorsing recommendations, so it's somehow accepted by this group. And then last, as far as South Park, to reiterate, it's obviously one of the several logical receiving areas. I would just want to say for my South Park neighbors, greater South Park has habitat connectivity, wildlife, agricultural and scenic values that are codified in the current Plan, and we want to achieve some of those values, along with moving things from those areas up towards the north, you know, in a very thoughtful way, dealing with the traffic issues on High School Road. But we want to see some regional gains. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	Good afternoon. Hope everybody's enjoying spending this beautiful spring day working on the Comp Plan. My name is Trevor Stevenson. I'm the Executive Director of Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, and it is an honor to be here to speak on behalf of the Conservation Alliance, an organization that was founded to help develop a good Comprehensive Plan for Jackson Hole and has now worked on these issues intensively for more than three decades. I want to begin by saying that we appreciate the years of effort that you've put into this work and your recent openness to the meeting with me and the other members of the Alliance to discuss many of the key issues in this Comp Plan directly. And we're heartened by the proposed growth management plan that you unveiled the other day. We believe that this may be the beginnings of a good framework. And we hope to collaborate in developing a resultant ?? and appropriate details for the growth management plan to help it really be effective, recognizing that we also need to do a lot of proactive work within the Comp Plan itself so that we're not simply reacting once the growth management plan gets activated by the different numbers ??. Personally, I believe that in many ways we in fact are fundamentally on the same page with regards to what we want to accomplish within the Comprehensive Plan. But I think that needs to be made much more clear. It is clear through the years of work on the Comp Plan that the community has clearly expressed a desire for some things to be addressed, and as a new Executive Director, I'm reading through a lot of the years' history, work on this, and seeing what themes have been emphasized. Certainly, the Alliance has done the best possible to convey these priorities to you in letters, publications, conversations. They revolved around issues like growth management, around public participation, and around timeline and process for adoption of the final Comprehensive Plan, including, as was just mentioned, the maps as an integral part of that Plan. I've been doing my best to calm down some rhetoric that I think has perhaps gotten a little bit out of control, and asking people to give you a chance to clearly demonstrate that you will be responsive to their requests and to provide...that you will be providing clear solutions to these concerns. My hope is to address a couple of these overarching themes now so that we can have a more productive discussion for the next few months. The process that you use on a Comp Plan will largely determine the quality of the result that you get and, unfortunately, it has not been at all clear what that process will be. The process of your meeting today did not clearly address how you'll proceed. And, Ben, I appreciate that you opened with some comments in terms of how you proceed for the next month or so, but beyond that it's very fuzzy, it's not clear how this proceeds, and that is extremely concerning to everyone involved, I believe. Instead, today we prioritized a number of cosmetic details when I think that time should have been spent clarifying, certainly, perhaps voting, on how this process will proceed. And I think all of you actually want to address this concern, but within the structure of the facilitative meetings for the last month, that has not been possible and I urge you to find the space, create a space, to clarify that process as far in the future as possible. If you're not able to allay some of the public concerns tonight, through our participation, and the timeframe for maps and final adoption of the Comp Plan, unfortunately, we can look forward to months of angry, fearful and frustrated comments that don't necessarily help address the important content of the Plan. I will not be able to continue asking people to wait, or to trust that you will address this, and certainly this is not what I want to happen, and I'm sure it's not what you want to happen. And I'd like you to take the opportunity to address these concerns tonight. Note that we made a deliberate decision not to activate the full 2000 household membership of the Alliance for tonight (I'll be done in a second), and we've not really conducted any outreach to those groups. We will be doing that after the draft is out with something more concrete to report. Overall, we'd like to mention that the elected officials and the Planning Staff we believe have become too isolated in this process and in deciding these vital policies. Public involvement has been too limited lately, and I appreciate that you expanded the comment session tonight from what was originally envisioned, but I think more is needed. More importantly, we believe you need a greater involvement of independent experts, and not enough effort is being done...is being made to do necessary research and analysis to inform the decisions that you're making and to compare your work to other cutting-edge Comp Plans in the region. We're trying to contribute to this from the Alliance by bringing in some independent review and analysis on some specific issues, but we also feel that you, as electives, need to do more to prioritize independent analysis, studies and comparisons on many of the other aspects of the Plan. Our decisions need to be clearly driven by the best possible data and not just by our own intention and opinions. In sum, please work to address some of the public's key concerns and open the process to allow for more productive involvement by the public, make it a priority to conduct the necessary studies, involve key experts, and clearly make your decisions on the best data possible. The Alliance is delighted to have this opportunity to work with a group of elected officials that...and Planning Staff who share our priorities for the preservation and enhancement of our ?? wildlife, our spectacular scenery, and our unique community character. We hope to strengthen our support of this process to ensure that we achieve the best possible Plan. And we appreciate you taking our concerns and recommendations into account. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Christel, Tammy Interested Public	Hi, my name is Tammy Crystal and I've lived in the Town of Jackson and lived here for a total of about 12 years. Thanks for letting us come today. Since the Town of Jackson's ?? plans were voted down via public referendum seven years ago, a true in-your-hands measure of community sentiment expressing its will that we not overdevelop our Town and not speculate with the master resort, destination allure of Teton Village. We've watched development happen anyway. When citizens said no to the RD, development rights were simply granted individually, one project at a time. And here we are with the ?? of empty commercial space, large quantities of unsold real estate units in a community that feels ever more transient to me. I talk to friends all the time who wonder if they should stay in the Valley or leave it. Town planners and the community have spent four years giving their lives over to creating a plan to shape the future of this special place. We have been asked to trust our comments are truly heard by our leaders. As a community, we cannot afford to know we've all been whistling Dixie without a logical process of implementation. Otherwise for all of these years our community has merely engaged in an exercise. Preserving environment and quality of place, managing growth, and creating a viable broad-based economy are Jackson's great challenges. We need a certain critical population ?? to achieve that balance, but most crucial is ensuring we promote and protect our wildlife, its habitat and other environmentally sensitive areas. We must continue moving towards making arts a part of our constitution, as it were. We can remind all visitors of our history by including beautiful and lasting public places in our Comprehensive Plan. That sort of planning aides in building tourism and it also supports finding out what level of economic success we can really expect to reach. We should as ?? strengthening sustainable tourism practices using cultural assets as tools. Growth should incorporate landscaping, parks and grace of space. Let's create space that's both sacred and fundamental. Without these provocative elements, we will forfeit the higher level of urban vibrancy. We should encourage current local businesses and new companies to establish desired products and services that are appreciated and put forward by locals and tourists alike. We should develop specific strategies designed to attract employers and fill the empty commercial space, rather than planning for more building. It still feels like developers are feeling encumbered by wildlife. Our core economic stability lies in protecting and preserving the power of this place. All new projects should be primarily concerned with that goal. Geography and wildlife are our golden eggs and they'll only become more precious. We should keep downtown vibrant, give it an identity that's separate from Teton Village—we can't match that profile—and use it as a place where families who can't afford \$400 a night lodgings might stay. We want to keep those families from ??. We want them to be able to come here and experience the wonders of Jackson Hole and want to educate them. If we don't do that, why will anyone want to protect it. We come home and there's a moose in the yard. We pick up the phone, call our friend in Atlanta and get them to guess what's outside our window. It's not just going to the parks to see these animals—it's having them right here with us and living with them. Nobody has the diversity of wildlife that we do, let alone have it as physical as it is and interwoven with our daily lives, and we don't want to lose that. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Varley, Jay Interested Public	My name's Jay Varley. I'm a resident of the Town of Jackson, essentially the downtown of Jackson, and I own some commercial property in the Town of Jackson also. I've been involved with Jackson Hole for almost 25 years now and participated when I could along the way in planning and things like that. I'm going to urge you to do something that I've urged before and that is to give ?? to the fact that community is a complex system. And this...when I'm talking about this, back when I was in engineering school, that was one of the things I studied. That was way back in the '60s. I'm kind of surprised that this is even more ?? today. But what really...a community is a complex system and these efforts, while I commend what you've done so far, need to consider this. And what it means is you can't take just all the parts and deal with them separately and then hope when they're put together you're going to end up with something close to an optimal solution. Typically, it only yields about 60 percent of the overall optimal solution, even though it's a very human thing to do and people want to try to do it all the time. And the reason for that is the interaction between all the parts. And it's the word synergy is used sometimes that has both positive and negative aspects to it, but it basically means that the whole is more than the sum of the parts on both sides, though. So, you need to look at these things. A lot of the so-called unforeseen consequences don't really have to be unforeseen if you take this approach, and start looking at what you've already done and start taking that approach. And many of them can be anticipated. Some of the different parts are not compatible with each other. And you need to recognize that and you need to see how they're going to influence each other. Some of externalities that are outside the community can be foreseen also. Demographic trends in the country, in the world, all sorts of externalities that look like they'd be external to this community really aren't. They have very strong impacts on it. Jonathan Schechter writes about these things quite a bit, and I think you can and should look at those. I'd like to applaud what Bill Collins said and I support everything he said, and Mark Sullivan as well, about the importance of the downtown and the importance of having...going up instead of out. And it has so many benefits that's it's hard to really even enumerate and I won't try to do that up here. But one of the things that's not talked about a lot is the social aspect of it, where people are meeting each other on the street, they're talking, they're just interacting with each other in a very day-to-day way. And that yields good political results, too, because they're better informed, they're just...they're more involved. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, I'm Kathy Tompkins. I live over in Cottonwood Park. First of all, I would like to thank Armond Aciri for a list of essentials to a great Comp Plan that I posted to a couple of websites. Very succinct and to the point, which I am not. So, I'd like to start by thanking all the people, public and private, that worked so hard on the Teton County Comprehensive Plan to date. After a few years, the public has been worn thin by the process as you can tell from the increasing attendance numbers in most of our important final phase of the Plan approval. We owe it to the public to implement policies and themes that have been overwhelmingly favored by the public. We want to provide stewardship of wildlife and habitat...wildlife habitat and other environmentally sensitive areas through site, monitoring, and permanently preserved open space. Build-out should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation. We all live with limits or boundaries. The Comp Plan is intended to put limits on the amount of growth. People surveyed said to limit growth in the Valley was most important. We would like to see an estimate for how much growth is allowed before the Plan is approved. That includes nonresidential square footage and dwelling units. Let's take the bad news up front instead of pawning it off on our children to deal with it later when it's too late. Up zoning in ?? areas is not smart growth. Up zoning in places like northern South Park will cause damaging negative impacts to the established neighborhoods and school zones on and around High School Road. It is foolish to think that up zoning won't lead to never-ending sprawl. We don't need convenience stores. What do we need is safe family and bike-friendly roads and paths, parks and open spaces to enhance our existing neighborhoods and school zones. Over 70 percent of the people surveyed said that they would be willing to pay higher taxes to conserve open space and natural areas. Do not rely on any one tool like transferrable development rights. The community also needs to weigh in on TDRs and PDRs through community workshops. Performance-based tools should be well defined. We can't rely on vague terms such as it will provide community benefit. When I hear that term, and it is not followed up with any actual benefit to the community, other than higher tax revenue, then vaguely defined performance tools serve no purpose except to fuel our addiction of relying on growth to solve our growth problems. TDRs, if used, must be well defined to prevent transfers that only benefit the money changers. People in proposed receiving areas should be given priority as to what and how much can be added to their neighborhoods to prevent negative impacts. Small property owners in neighborhoods are equally important in value to the community as the few large property owners whose property rights seem to get more attention and respect in this process. The character district maps are an essential bridge between the Comp Plan and the Land Development Regulations. The Comp Plan should not be approved until the character district maps are completed and included in the overall Plan. The public needs input into all the aspects of the process in how they are incorporated. Character district maps are essential to a complete and enforceable Comprehensive Plan. The proposal for a growth management plan is a big step in the right direction. We need larger commercial growth, not just dwelling units. The trigger for re-evaluation should be lower than the proposed 7 percent to give ourselves more time and tools to deal with any growth problems that rear its sprawling head. I also have a problem with the 50/50 split. It needs to be lowered in the County to give us an earlier warning signal to take actions that rectify any failure. Predictability is important to the community because we cannot plan for the future if we do not know what we are going to allow to be built. This means we can't shy away from the numbers, indicators, science and actuals needed. Don't be vague. Take out the loopholes and confusing double talk that people with narrow profit-minded agendas can take advantage of. We need to be bold and thorough in order to find a Comprehensive Plan that succeeds where the 1994 Plan failed. If we fail again, there won't be a next time.
4/27/2011	Swope, Linda Interested Public	It's still pretty simple. My view has not changed since the last time I wrote regarding this issue. Limit growth. Favor wildlife. Honor this incredibly special place. I let the moose eat the mugo pines in my yard in Melody Ranch. The moose and deer and eagles are good for my soul and my business! My customers come from all over the US to live briefly as we do in this amazing valley. It is up to you to protect it.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	As the open-door format for the Comp Plan committees began last month, it appeared as though both official elects and the community had come to strong agreements on the importance of wildlife, scenic values, and open space as our main priorities. These priorities would be the focus of future planning and development to maintain the delicate balance of “habitat criticalness” unique to Jackson Hole. It was recognized and documented that wildlife was our heritage, and a valuable asset to be protected for generations to come. However, as talks wore on, the open-door forum became open ended with regard to build out numbers and density projections. Smart growth initiatives seem to be lost in the current debate over future building potential and property rights. At this point, there is no agreement to submit exact cap numbers on growth, for fear of anger in the community. However, a doubling on growth of the current Comp Plan baseline is being suggested. This is irresponsible governance which contradicts our commitment to wildlife integrity. Sustainable wildlife habitats and open space are not compatible with a doubling of density in Jackson. The combination of the two, growth and wildlife, are not mutually exclusive, they are a delicate balance. Simply put, increasing growth decreases wildlife. If everyone doesn’t get that simple arithmetic, we are in trouble.
4/27/2011	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	I strenuously object to reviving nodes. What about decreasing development potential in the rural parts of the County? Without specific tools to decrease rural development, the node concept is a developer’s dream: greatly increased development in the nodes, and continued development across the rest of the County as well. How, exactly, will development be transferred from rural lands to nodes? Have you investigated other areas (e.g. Pitkin County, CO) who have programs to protect rural lands and direct development into specific areas? What do they do in terms of downzoning, deed restrictions associated with granting TDRs, creating a market for TDRs, integrating TDRs with conservation easements, etc.? Do you know what successes/ failures they’ve encountered? Their program is not some vague list of “incentives.” Do you have the political will to create such a program? You should not even consider nodes until you have real tools to decrease development elsewhere.
4/27/2011	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	I am disappointed that this important meeting is being held on April 27th, a time when the people most likely to participate are out of town for spring vacations. Those of us left behind, such as myself, are busy working to cover extra shifts and are also unable to attend. The residents of Teton County have overwhelmingly spoken out against nodes and have requested predictability in the Plan. I also strongly disagree with any participation involving Mark Barron and the Town Council - those that are elected to ONLY deal with Town of Jackson issues. It is my strongest wish that you will uphold the very well-documented will of the people and make the correct decisions.
4/27/2011	Gilday, Peggy Interested Public	To all of the hard-working participants of the Comprehensive Plan including Town Council, County Commissioners, Planning Staff and Commissions and the Facilitator, I would like to express my appreciation to the entire team working on this enormous and important task. After attending a recent meeting, I was impressed with the solid direction and efforts put forth to ensure that positive motion be executed for our special community. You have had to consider the many facets of serious issues faced by our community and although some are divisive, you continue to find a balance while making excellent progress. I support you in your continued efforts and while I personally agree with many of the decisions you have made and may have a different take on others, I encourage you to keep up the excellent work. It is great to see progress. With continued support,

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Simon, Ronna Interested Public	I wrote you about this before but want to re-emphasize the need for affordable housing in Jackson Hole. I work for the Bridger-Teton National Forest and have been a permanent full-time Forest Service employee for almost 25 years. I applied for affordable housing when I first moved to the valley almost 6 years ago and my name is just now coming up for a house with the Housing Trust. Unfortunately, I cannot afford the house I was offered--priced at \$275,000. The Trust then offered a house in the same development for less money, but I still cannot afford to pay that amount of money--well over \$200,000. I am single, and on one salary such costs are unreasonable for me. My income puts me in a category where I do not qualify for Housing Authority houses that I can afford. The affordable agencies do not allow housemates, and I do not want one: as a working adult, I feel that I should be able to live like an adult. Having been in government housing since my arrival, the Forest is telling me I must look for other housing options. I am trying to find a rental, but the barriers are (1) cost, (2) finding a rental that allows a dog, (3) finding a place with a yard where I can set up a dog run (I'm out in the field and work across the entire Forest. I need a place where my dog can stay outside all day). I have been looking in earnest for months, without success-- my limit is \$1000/month which should, reasonably, allow me to find lodging, but so far I haven't been able to find a place. I am an active member of the community, volunteering my time for a number of functions, and I feel that Jackson is my home. I do not want to commute to Victor or Alpine: plus, it would be unsafe for me to do so, given my irregular work schedule which makes the bus non-viable much of the time. After working long hours, driving the additional distance would not be safe. I should be able to live here. The comprehensive plan needs to work toward providing more affordable housing in the valley for the local workforce. This needs to include affordable rentals, as well as units for purchase, for single individuals like myself who do not have a spouse to provide a second income. Prices need to be set in a range that is commensurate with working incomes in the valley. There is too much emphasis on providing for second homes and real estate in the million-dollar range. No one I know who works in town can live in those units, and if the working locals are not supported, local businesses will not continue to operate. Please support the Jackson community in the comprehensive plan.
4/27/2011	Taylor, Nancy Conservation Alliance	My name is Nancy Taylor and I'm speaking on behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance; I'm Co-Chair of that. And I just want to mention that we have a board meeting at 5:30, and so if you see a mass exodus of Alliance-related people, that is not a protest, it's not a walkout. It's simply to attend to the Alliance business of living in this beautiful place. So, Mayor Barron, Council and Commissioners, thank you for this opportunity for the public to speak and for the hours of the endless meetings that you've had to endure to consider this Comprehensive Plan. I'd like to point you once again in the direction of the character district maps. The role they play should not be just an emotional picture of what might be, but the character district maps are a tool that will give the themes and policies predictability. And over and over again, you all have spoken about your commitment to predictability, and I think the community wants that, too. I guess none of us really like the unknown, so the predictability will be helpful to everybody. Without the maps being connected to the themes and policies, I think there's a disconnect, which I've spoken about before. Apparently, the themes and policies are now going to become pre-segments, so if they're going to be general guidelines at best for kind of the philosophy of what we want this place to look like. But I urge you not to adopt the themes and policies separate with...separate from the character district maps, because they refer to each other, they're interrelated and one is not complete without the other. So, I urge you to make the hard decisions—you said you would—by giving serious consideration to the build-out numbers within each character district. Without you making the hard decisions, there's no teeth in this Plan. There's no enforceability. And it will make your work much more cumbersome and difficult down the road, because you will be reinventing this Plan with each new development proposal. And I don't think you want to do that, and we don't want you to do that either. It's been a long process for both the public and you. We understand your need for it to be over and done with. And we are on the cusp of doing some...you and we, the community, are on the cusp of doing some really lasting work that will serve this community well. So, I urge you to make a decision tonight to combine the themes and policies with the character district maps. If you do, you will have concrete guidelines that will shape the character of this community for years to come. Please don't give up now—it's still snowing, but keep going.
4/27/2011	Hessler, Sandy and Chri Interested Public	Our family echoes Lou's thought. [reference Louise Wade's 4/26/11 comment] The magic and spirit of this valley is in the relative balance that's been maintained between wildlife and people. Having just returned from the mountains of Colorado, it's an easy and tragic thing to lose. Please place "maintaining safe migration corridors" very high on your priority list.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Wheal, Linda Interested Public	Hi, my name is Linda Wheal, I live in Wilson. I've been here since '95 either full time or part time. And over the past ten days I've been able to sit in on your discussions and deliberations of the two boards and I want to thank you for your time and your thoughtfulness. I feel very optimistic about the direction that our Comp Plan is going. And I'd like to thank the consultant for helping move this process along and facilitate a very civil group. And I want to mention specifically that, on the face of it, I felt that the adaptive management plan that was introduced to the group as a planning tool, as a monitoring tool that was introduced last week, I think it's a very wise and potentially very useful tool to make our Comp Plan a living document, rather than a static document that is a snapshot of now. So, personally, we would like to see the electives move forward in looking into this further and finalizing it and turning it into the kind of tool that was described last week. I think it could be very useful. And I think it will help instill viability and trust with the community that you are...you will be the stewards of this new Comp Plan. Last week there was also a lot of usage of the term neighborhood character, neighborhood integrity, trying to capture and preserve a certain neighborhood's feel, the importance of predictability. What that says to me is, as important as the Comp Plan is, it's a foundational document and the next two steps will be very important. That is moving to the development of the, what do we call them, neighborhood character districts and then revising the LDRs. And I would appreciate that when you get to these next two steps, which I think are going to be key to the success of this process, that you consider a widely used and very successful process for communities going up and down the Gulf Coast after Hurricane Katrina. And it was done again and again and again in communities that were partially devastated, where community members, who were very tied to their land, they had a strong sense of community character, and they were very worried about how their new community was going to be built—what it's going to look like, how do we capture this character that is unique to the south. And it was a process that was very participatory. The people who lived in those neighborhoods were telling the design professionals what made, specifically, what made their neighborhood special, what they want to try to preserve as their neighborhood grows and develops, and what they would like to replicate as their community grows and develops. And the process was also very visual, which I think was along the lines of what Pete was alluding to in his comment. That is, you can design a process where there are images of what neighborhoods in both Town and community will look like based on different scenarios, build-out scenarios. So I highly recommend that you take a look at this process. It's very used; it's been successful, and of course it's combined with the expertise of the planning professionals that we have in the Town and the County. But then the products that are created from that process, the LDRs become a translation, a written translation of what those visuals are. And I think that will help here with the predictability factor in this whole process. So, thank you for your work to date.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	Like many residents in Teton County I will not be able to attend tonight’s comprehensive plan meeting. I have participated and submitted my thoughts countless times over the last four years. It is difficult for me to muster the energy one more time to submit feedback knowing full well that it will either not be read or ignored. But I must because I love this valley and think that the elected official’s extreme reversals at the midnight hour of this process will ruin this special place. I did not send this email to the Mayor or the Town Council because I do not believe they have the legal authority to make decisions for Teton County Residents. They have no electoral accountability to 55% of the residents of Teton County and have had an undue influence on the planning process. I cannot express how disappointed by I am by the recent decisions and certain commissioners spin/double speak in the paper responding to the legitimate concerns of members of our community. The joint planning commission’s decisions to eliminate the Nodes and work within the existing entitlements were the first time in the process that the majority of county resident’s vision was honored. These decisions were well reasoned and sound planning for the future of Jackson Hole. Re-instating Nodes was in direct opposition to the overwhelming amount of public comment throughout the process. It is irresponsible to make this decision without having analyzed the fiscal impact of dense nodal development or if there is in fact any benefit for the whole valley. There was little support for the concept when the real estate market was booming and there is none now. This is an urban planning concept that simply does not apply to Jackson Hole. You can call them Nodes, Character Districts, or complete neighborhoods. It is the same flawed concept that will only worsen our traffic problems, ruin our quality of life, destroy the character of the special places most of us live, and further harm the already struggling middle class. This is simply not “smart” growth. Open space can be more effectively achieved privately through the land trust or with a permanent funding source. Sprawl can be limited and open space can be preserved without sacrificing our quality of life. Not working within existing entitlements is also in direct opposition to the will of the people of Teton County. It is challenging enough that we will already grow to twice what is on the ground today. Is that not enough? People have overwhelmingly and consistently asked for predictability. You must commit to working within existing entitlements to have a functioning plan. Perhaps you intend to limit growth and work within existing entitlements. The public trust was shattered when the planners released the 2009 draft which was a complete disconnect from their vision. Please commit to limiting growth within the plan. Numbers in the county and in the various areas need to be set prior to approval of the plan. Simply “monitoring” growth is unacceptable. People will need written assurances for limited growth for this plan to have a chance of being viewed as legitimate. The public is worn down by this lengthy process. I have talked to numerous people that are busy living their lives and unable to attend or speak at tonight’s meeting. I assure you that lack of numbers tonight does not represent the public’s approval of the current plan. It is clear that you have not listened to their thoughts for four years and that the interests you are serving are not the majority of your constituents. You are going to hear from those various special interests whose agenda the current plan serves. They will say they are proud of you for making the “tough decisions” all the while calculating the financial windfall the comprehensive plan will bring them. It is not too late to point this plan in the right direction. I truly hope that you do the right thing to reverse or at least refine your recent decisions. Please give the people what they have repeatedly asked for which is predictability, measurability, and accountability. If you do not I have faith in the intelligence and passion of the people of Jackson Hole. We will vote in County Commissioners that serve our interests and lessen the consequences of this ill-conceived plan.
4/27/2011	Marquis, Linda Interested Public	Keep the moratorium on growth. The most important thing is wildlife and to keep the corridors for migration available. Financially, wildlife, is what brings the money to our valley.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Collins, Bill Interested Public	For the record, my name is Bill Collins and I also want to thank all of you for the hard work that you're doing on this thankless job. Now, I'll be very brief and fairly specific. I would encourage you to include land-use maps into this decision. The current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in '94 and referring to a policy chapter, not the LDRs, I would venture to say that that document has not influenced a single decision in a meaningful way since it was enacted. And there are a couple of reasons for that, but I would say that the biggest single reason for that is that there are no maps. And so every time an application comes before the Planning Commission, or Town Council, what applies? Habitat preservation criteria, or the affordable housing density levels? And those arguments occur in Buffalo Valley and they occur in ??, and they occur because the policies, the goals, the implementation strategies have no relationship to the ground. So, I know that you are eager to adopt something, but I encourage you to take whatever time is necessary to include the maps. And when you're doing the maps, I believe the concept of concentrating development in the smallest possible footprint, and the term is nodes that's been used throughout this process. It is smart planning, it's intelligent planning, it's good for wildlife protection. It's good for the affordable housing strategy; it's a good transit strategy. It's all around good land-use planning. And it's unfortunate that we've kind of become uneasy with that term, and irrespective of whether you use that term or not, please incorporate that concept. Because it truly is taking the '94 policies one more step. And one of the objectives of updating the Comprehensive Plan is you go beyond where we were. And that's actually the step that takes us beyond where we were in '94. I've also read that this draft that's before you recommends 15 more plans and 79 indicators to be monitored. I've been in this profession for a long, long time, longer than I care to say anymore, and I can tell you, that's not the way it's done. Those plans have to get done, those ?? to be monitored. It's just not realistic. When you're into the day-to-day governing and day-to-day decision making, and you've got to deal with some sort of an issue, or you've got to deal with some sort of an application, are you going to deal with that application, or deal with that pressing issue? Or are you going to work on the ???. You know, 15 plans and 79 indicators are really quite good ideas, but they're not going to get done. And I would encourage you to pare that down so that you're including the plans that truly need to be done, and I would guess there's not more than two or three. And I would encourage you to pare down the indicators that truly need to be measured and monitored, and I would guess there's not more than a half a dozen. And when you go to monitor the indicators, much of the data that's revolved there is not precise enough to justify reviewing it on an annual basis. So, bring some common sense, some reality, to, along with the additional plans and the long list of indicators to be monitored, and adopt what's truly feasible and what's truly necessary. Something else I would...I will wrap it up. My last point is that, you know, Jackson Hole is a full-fledged community. It's a real diverse population and that is one of the characteristics of this community, and I ask that as you wrap this Plan up that you keep that in mind and keep in mind who we want to see living here, able to live here in 25 years. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Thomas, Shirley Interested Public	Hi, Shirley Thomas, I live in Melody Ranch and I've been a resident for 11 years. And thank you all again for everything. Just a very brief comment. When you're looking at all of the planning that you've been doing, please, please, please don't forget the old theme eight of a green community. I know we've been working towards that. Sustainability, reduce/reuse/recycle, LEED certified buildings, and we've gotten a lot of those going. But we need to keep that key element woven into every single one of the things, every single one of these needs to be in there. And that's it.
4/27/2011	Thomas, Stephanie Interested Public	Stephanie Thomas. Sorry we're making all the noise. Obviously, this isn't a very successful place for us right now, so we're going to get out of your hair. But this is our first time at one of these meetings. It's not that I don't believe in following the Comp Plan and making considerations. It's just that this doesn't make it super successful. I'm a Teton County resident and I've lived here for ten years. The reason I moved to this Valley was because of the wildlife and the scenery ??. (Shhhh, be quiet.) But the reason I've stayed is because of the people. And when our friends...oh, here—it always works. When our friends started moving to places like Victor and Star Valley, they ended up leaving because they didn't move to Jackson to live in Victor and Star Valley—they moved to Jackson, Wilson and Teton Village to live in Jackson, Wilson and Teton Village. So, I guess I'm just there to say that the more we can do to make our communities accessible to the people of my generation, so that 50 years from now we are sitting in a Comp Plan meeting and making decisions about our children and their children, it's a place that we're able to stay and we're able to be a part of. And that means to us being able to ride our bikes to the grocery store and being able to walk down the street to get some baked goods and come to Snow King for a wonderful Comp Plan meeting. So, I'm sorry for the noise and we'll get out of your hair now. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	I'm a shorter person...Hi, Gail Jensen, Teton County resident for going on 31 years. Thank you everyone, electives, Staff, County and Town, Bruce and his Staff, and all the community for participating. We need and want build-out numbers. Not any number, one that represents base entitlements of today. A Plan is a budget. The build-out is the budget. The adaptive growth management plan will be a great tool to keep us on budget. This tool needs refinement. Let's make this part of the Plan. The character district maps must be part of this Plan and not an afterthought. These need to be vetted through a public process. Please do not adapt the themes and policies without these maps. Please put the community stamp on this Plan, follow our hearts and not the dollars. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Thomas, Ned Interested Public	Hello, my name is Ned Thomas and I'm a Teton County resident. And I am going to address you on nodes and that is from my experience of six years on the Planning Commission and also going through much of the same process you're going through here today adopting the transportation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. I commend you all for your work. I believe in nodes as being...as they're being called as essential, cohesive and a well-planned Comprehensive Plan. Nodes facilitate good planning, open space, reduce traffic, reduce interaction and possible death to wildlife. Nodes create open space, wildlife migration, and reduce infrastructure. These nodes already, in most every case, have water, sewer, roads, bus service, thus reducing costs and expenses of all these services in the future. We cannot have open space, natural beauty, save wildlife, reduce sprawl, unless we concentrate ?? The nodes are the logical place for that development. We have a choice here. Small...sprawl, excuse me, or smart growth development of our community. Please make essential choice. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Sullivan, Mark Interested Public	Good afternoon, my name is Mark Sullivan; I'm a County resident. Mr. Mayor and members of the Planning Commission, thank you so much for your time and amazing effort ?? here. There's a couple of things I want to emphasize this afternoon. I'm something of a refugee. My wife and I moved here...we grew up in southeastern Michigan, which has become kind of a suburban sprawl nightmare. It's pavement from Toledo Ohio to Flint Michigan, some 180 miles, and we're here because of the extraordinary quality of this Valley and the viewsheds and wildlife and this place, its character. But we're also here because of the strength of the community, as a few speakers have mentioned. And a lot of that grows from the strength of our Town. The Town itself has an attractive and robust population with creative thinkers, artists and artisans and we've got an amazing community growing here and I'd like to see that continue. And so I have...my perspective is focused on these two common directions here, two and three, which is I'd like to see the open space preserved, because that's what brought us all here to begin with, or many of us. Certainly those of us who have moved here. And then I'd like to see Town grow and become even more robust and more dynamic and more interesting and have a stronger population, so that it'd have more street life and more vitality than it does even now. And so, I mean, I could still listen to three words that come to mind when I think about our long-range plan here for the County, and that's simply up not out. Let's preserve the open space, let's do our best to create incentives so that we can keep up the control of those properties. We'll shift some of that development east of Town into our population centers and drive growth where it belongs, where there's already pavement, where there's already development. So that's just up not out, just as simple as that. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Genzer, Jim Interested Public	Hi, I'm Jim Ganser. I've lived here for almost 40 years and most of that time I've spent in the Town of Jackson. Actually, the Town of Jackson grew to us rather than the other way around. I thank you as elected officials for giving us the time as members of the community to speak to you. I attended some meetings last year where we were talking about doubling everything that exists on the ground. Buildings, perhaps even greater population, and so on. I really...that blows my mind. We have less than 3 percent that is privately owned in Teton County anyhow, and to double buildings and population seems very ridiculous to me. In order to do that, I can see you bulldozing the whole community, or your whole neighborhoods, I should say, to build high-rise condos and apartments to house such people, and I think that is absolutely unacceptable. I'm also a numbers guy, as has been mentioned, and I would really like to see the square footage on buildings and the population build-out in the Plan. I'd like to see a real commitment to actual numbers to be put in the Plan as a not-to-exceed type of situation. We really need to accept the fact that we are not going to house all of the workers in Jackson Hole, that they are always going to come to Star Valley and Teton Valley, and we can't plan to house everybody in just a small community. If we are putting some fancy words into our...or new words perhaps into our vocabulary of smart growth and nodes, which to me is nothing more than the PUDs and that sort of thing that we've been working with in the past, and in the Town of Jackson—and I've spoken about this at Town meetings before—I think this has really been disastrous to our traffic, to our parking, and to our infrastructure. And developers have paid very little of the cost, if any, for the problems that they have created. The bottom line, very simply, is I want to see a real commitment from each of you as elected public officials to limit growth in the future in Teton County. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	Thank you, Chairman and members of the respective boards. In a way I hate to be here, because I've watched this for 50 years, and in going through my piles of planning stuff, I came across ?? and opened it up and wonder of wonders <<inaudible>>. [Laughter] I sent comments on May 17th, 2009, in response to something, in an email, and I didn't hear anything back, so I just want to quickly run over those comments if I might. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the planned proposal for ??. An incredible amount of study and work has been into planning efforts in this community for years. This set of papers present the opportunity to simplify the issue and resolve it. The interest in land use in the face of development goes back over 40 years when I was one of three local families who developed Skyline Ranch development in the '60s. This 600-acre development was accomplished on 250 acres with no bonus incentives. The remaining 400 acres constituted the first Wyoming Nature Conservancy easement in the state of Wyoming, permanently protecting both the open meadow along Wyoming Highway 22 and the entire arian strip of land ?? Snake River. Since that time, between the Land Trust involved...and excuse me, I'm going to ignore the audience, I want to focus on you folks...over 10,000 acres, perhaps more, have been preserved in a similar way in this County. And when you add that to the 97 percent that's in federal stewardship, we all have an incredible heritage in this Valley. We're very fortunate to be here. And one of the most important things I think that comes with that heritage is to look around and state what we are and where we are and what we need to protect, because it will all go away. If you look at the population or building projection, I did not thoroughly read the paper this morning, but there was a 7 percent growth in something or other. When 20 years of that, we're at 50,000 population. That's the size of Idaho Falls, or Casper, or Cheyenne. Can you imagine stuffing that into this five-pound bag? It's not going to work. You're going to have roads, you're not going to have a lane. I know you don't like roads. [Laughter] Since that time, I started mentoring and serving as a land planning consultant to other developments going on. In the early '80s, I served as local coordinator for the ?? land-use planning study for South Park, copies of which I believe are still existing, but I didn't find one. It's all about South Park; it's pretty straightforward. It said that a part of South Park is a natural appropriate expansionary for the Town of Jackson, the heart of the County. Why do we get beyond that? I am not a Teton Village ??, but I don't see any others who are capable of supporting what a node is supposed to support, so it's a self-sufficient place where you don't need to drive your car somewhere. And whatever you folks think a node is—I've seen some of the descriptions—I'd like to see, instead of 18 common directions, about 6 maps, whether it's character maps, I don't think...the names of these things keep changing, but it's really just only a map. Do some scenarios and get reaction to that, because I think under every comment, nearly every comment you may hear today, is a frustration that we see 10 years ?? delay, another ten years ?? delay, and another, and now we've had 50. And it's really unnecessary and I know you all understand that. I propose a simple scenario which might satisfy the citizens. Modify what's in the current Plan, which authorize PUDs, clusters or higher densities beyond the base density to restrict such additional density throughout the County, to restrict or prohibit. Accepting new development on lands adjacent to the Town of Jackson as that Town boundary runs along High School Road from U.S. 89 West and Spring Gulch Road. This would be a focused fix to the current Plan of additional <<inaudible>> affordable housing, and then it could be worked out as the next step. This would have the immediate effect of removing higher densities from a majority of the County, concentrating it as a logical expansion or growth within or a part of the Town of Jackson, exactly what I understand Town as heart to represent. This node would be within walking, biking and START system access with all necessary support services. The...Thank you. Affordable housing seems to be a frequent justification for the proposed additional nodes throughout the County. The fact is that affordable housing is being used as a cheap currency and so it's in more density. There's a lot of affordable housing opportunity in Star Valley, in Teton Valley, where you have START system service, despite the difficulty in <<inaudible>>. And I acknowledge that. But we are not going to fit that stuff in this County. There's neither enough public money nor private money to pay the cost of doing that. I admire the work of both the Housing Authority and the Housing Trust, but there are limits, and we're...I don't know if we've passed them yet or not. The rest is...I'll probably just get in more trouble if I go on, but I just...what I'm asking for is a summary to what I perceive the public has over 50 years expressed as their desire for housing value for the Town. If you say we can't have limits, then we should have everything. We should be like the rest of the state of Wyoming. We've got ?? OSHA, so people get killed almost randomly in the oil fields. We don't want federal OSHA in here. We need regulation. We have something that's worth protecting and preserving. I hope you folks think of this. <<inaudible>>.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Mowen, Penny Interested Public	Hi, my name is Penny Mowen and I've just lived here a lot. Not on any boards or ?? or any of that, but I thought it might be relevant to say why I live here. I came from Chicago 10 years ago, and when I began to think about the fact that I could finally get out of the city, where did I want to go to? And so I looked at...I had three criteria—outdoor life style, natural beauty, and enough culture to keep my brain ticking. So, I looked at college towns and places like that. I also looked at Aspen, Vale, and Park City, all of which I'd been to in the '60s when they were...well, Aspen was a charming little mining town, really charming. And Vale was a little Swiss village created out of ??, I grant you, but still not unlike little Swiss villages. And Park City was also kind of a real place, you know, a lot of mining shacks were still in, use and that is miners' homes, a family kind of shack, and so on. And so in 2000, when I went back to look at some of those places that I had known in the '60s, it was appalling. The hillside, you could see was carpeted with townhouses and high-rises and, well, maybe not high-rises, but places for people to live. The land had disappeared in these places. And, I mean, I didn't even look back, you know, just through town and out. And I decided on Jackson. My son was living here, which was a factor, I'll grant you, but this was a real place; this was a place that had not done that and had not carpeted over every dandelion, you know. After I'd been here about two years, someone asked me, well, why did you decide to stay, because I moved to a place I just wasn't sure I was going to stay, or really make that kind of transition. And I thought, what am I going to say? How am I going to...I sort of stepped outside myself and thought, well, why did I decide to stay? What's the answer? And I said, the natural beauty and my son, in that order.
4/27/2011	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Starting with the vision, I think we should seriously consider inserting a statement of intent to balance the statement of ideals, as well as an action plan into each theme. Come up with an action plan which allows specific entities within the community to participate. We're in a pay-to-play society. If they want the individual action items, they probably want to do some of the research themselves. As far as theme one goes, I think theme two is going to have much more to do with theme one than theme one goal. The only permanent protections, the only real value we can add to our wildlife is more permanent protections in the form of habitat and open space. Theme two, this entire Plan is predicated on a transfer mechanism, yet that's something we haven't talked about. There is no smart growth. There is no inherent dissidence to smart growth without a transfer mechanism. There is no Town as heart without a transfer mechanism. So, I propose, as I've done for the umpteenth time, a transfer mechanism task force. You guys have had four years to come up with some original thought on this and you've not yet given us any essentially solutions or any specificity, so give a shot to some of the skill set within the Valley to do this. There are 181 different transfer mechanisms operating in 33 different states right now, and each and every one of them are unique and specific to the community in which they're craft. It requires a tremendous amount of critical thinking and critical problem solving to implement one of these. As far as Town as heart in theme three goes, there is no Town as heart without a transfer mechanism. Town, as we currently look at Appendix I, only has 35 percent of the ?? dwelling units. Town is going to become a net sum exporter of housing requirements to the County in the very resource lands we attempt to protect. There is no Town as heart without a transfer mechanism. As far as theme four goes, the 10,000-plus platted, yet unbuilt, lots in Teton Valley Idaho, plus their property tax structure, is going to have more to say about our 60 percent, or 65 percent aspirational goal than anything we do here. And if it's not deed restricted, it eventually becomes part of the problem, not part of the solution. As far as theme five goes, our ecology is our economy. It's axiomatic. It's also our very competitive advantage in moving forward into our future. Theme six—I'm going to make some enemies here—but we tend to oversimplify when we tend to overassign traffic reductive values to local convenience, START, and pathways. If you added them all together and actually looked at the data, it's less than...it's a fraction of one and 11.4 trips we take on an average daily basis. So, the only reason I mention this is because we constantly use these as growth facilitators and growth precipitators when the traffic reductive value, the actual data, doesn't back it up. The other part of the START is that if we actually attained our transit goals, we would go broke because the pro-rata subsidy ?? I'm a big fan of START. I think we should have a more aggressive designated funding source for START. I consider it, personally, the third most actionable item we can engage in. Theme seven, all I've got to say is build-out, you guys are so afraid of build-out numbers and working within existing entitlements, but we all know it's going to happen when that point does come, 65 years from now when the current allotment of 7200 units with no PRD potential figured in is...you'll simply, or they, at the time, will simply up zone something out of the ?? like you're proposing with the node, the node concept now, so I don't think we should be afraid about planning within the numbers. Theme eight is just fine like it is. I agree with some of the comments to date. The FLUP, I, personally, don't think it's within the statutory requirements for you to certify the Comp Plan without the FLUP the way the current structure is. The FLUP is designed to be the bridge between the bark of the Comp Plan and the bite of the LDRs. I think they're so symbiotic related. You've really got to answer that question soon for the application. The last thing I'd like to say, as I hear the buzzer over here, after four years and \$400,000 of direct expenditure, I really believe we owe it to future generations to insert something in the administration chapter to act as, essentially, as a ?? before and as a warning to precisely how not to run a Comp Plan. Really, I'm not trying to be funny. I really think we owe it to future generations to pass on that legacy, that wisdom that we've gained on what worked and what didn't. If the '94 Plan crafters had that foresight, then we would have benefited from that. So let's not replicate mistakes of the past and let's send it forward. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Gillete, Claudia Interested Public	I am Claudia Gillette. I live in Jackson. I was born and raised here. And there's a limit to the people ??...the people crammed in here. We have to live in limits; there's only so much wildlife we can handle now. I'd just like to say that not only the more population, the bigger population, the more crime we have, the more dogs, the more crime, the more it grows, the more infrastructure, the more everything. And I should say that the gentleman who was speaking about how quiet it is downtown, he didn't live here in the '50s, I was babysitting for ??. But I do appreciate your work and I hope that we can come to a resolution on this that is agreeable to the whole community. And I thought that at one time we were on the verge of that last year. Thank you for your time, and let's take steps forward instead of a couple backward.
4/27/2011	Stevens, Anthony Interested Public	Hi, Anthony Stevens, Teton County, and I've lived here my whole life. I sort of want to echo a little bit of what you said. We live in an unbelievable place, as you all know. Mountain towns across the world are almost identical. The one thing that makes, you know, Jackson and Teton County unique is that we have an entire intact ecosystem. And, you know, having grown up here and recently having a son, I want to make sure that my child has roughly the same experience I had growing up. Obviously, the Town has changed since I was a kid, you know, ?? helicopter doesn't land over at K-Mart anymore. But we have an opportunity to keep it as unique and special as it has been for the last...at least in my lifetime. One thing I would like to see a little more emphasis on is wildlife crossings and road redevelopment. You know, a true commitment to wildlife is what has made this Valley extremely unique. And, you know, it'd be great to see that commitment moving forward. And thank you all for the hard work you've already put in. This is obviously a long process. So, thank you.
4/27/2011	Ankeny, Andy Interested Public	After re-reading April's email from yesterday and thought I'd send you a quick note as she suggested. This will not be another email (i'm sure you've had a couple) with a bunch of comments about the plan as I feel you, the planning staff, and the elected officials have done a very admirable job in putting the plan together. I submitted quite a few early comments online and many years ago worked on the downtown redevelopment guidelines with Tyler and other young Architects and design professionals. The approach of Town as Heart combined with a recognition that identifying other, diverse/distinct nodes is the responsible thing to do. Unfortunately I won't be able to attend the meetings during the next few weeks and so it continues to seem that the silent majority will always be overrun by the vocal minority, I guess the vocal minority don't have jobs or kids. Just wanted to say that although you probably don't hear it much, keep up the good work and be assured that there are many out there that appreciate the planning efforts to consider the many different views/opinions, not just the no-growth or NIMBY population.
4/27/2011	Sobey, Pegi Interested Public	Hi, I'm Pegi Sobey. I'm a Teton County resident and I'm also another Co-Chair of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide comments this afternoon. I would like to emphasize a few thoughts as we embark on yet another rewrite of our community's Comprehensive Plan. Even with the best of intentions, we've all seen communities around the nation and throughout the world where areas are named or memorialized or replicas of what once was there. And I think it's great that we've committed to protecting the wildlife, scenic and natural resources as our top priority. This can become a reality only if we also defined a realistic timeline and key benchmarks to track progress for reaching those goals. With that in mind, we must continue to work to substantiate our value statements with some workable policies and strategies. In concert with your excellent start to developing a meaningful, adaptive growth management plan, we can create indicators that are measurable and that actually work to protect what we value here. As next steps, we can collect and use the best available data when making...conducting our annual studies and making land-use decisions. We have a wealth of resources within our public agencies, our NGO community, like the Conservation Alliance, to consolidate existing and achieving late relevant data to inform our decisions. We can update our natural and scenic resources overlay. You've already tapped the extraordinary talent and expertise of the Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board to improve the vegetation mapping, which is crucial to updating the Natural Resources Overlay. If we're going to prioritize wildlife, scenic and natural resources, we need to fully establish how we are going to implement strategies to not only achieve but exceed those goals. We also must commit the resources necessary in this proposal. Thank you all, Staff and board members, for your tireless efforts to work with our entire community to create the best possible and measurable Comprehensive Plan. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	Curt Bollinger, I've lived here 37 years. I had originally planned to spend a lot of time to try to come up with a great presentation today with all kinds of salient points to make and then decided, no, actually I didn't need to bother. I'm on the sizable portion of the general public who's very disillusioned with this process. Perhaps an example would help you see it from our side. If you had been at the Wilson neighborhood meeting that was held two years ago and had seen and heard the outcry over the possibility of nodes there, you would have found the depth of passion incredible. Afterwards, we felt the planners had listened to us and that nodes were no longer in the picture. And then low and behold, under your direction, the nodes were done. It definitely makes you shake your head in despair of anything you say; it never has any kind of impact. Jackson is such a special place and that is why we get so worked up about it. The people who live here are by and large of much higher intellect and are much more publicly involved than the average community. We know what we want and I think you as electives take a risk when you disregard the voice of the public. What I really want to emphasize here today is that everything goes back to wildlife, open spaces and viewsheds. The Town itself is not that special. The reason people live and stay here, despite extreme weather, financial burdens, etc., and the reason people visit here by the millions is because of our wealth of wildlife and natural beauty. It drives our economy and our entire social fabric, everything. If you keep building up and out, you become like everyone else in every place else. So, of course, it takes more work to preserve and protect, but this unique place is worth it. Please do not let us down. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Good afternoon, Tim Young, Executive Director of Friends of Pathways. Thanks to both boards here, Chairman Ellis and Mayor Barron, and your boards for all your hard work on this; I really appreciate it. And I want to echo the Mayor's comments and thank the Staff for the good job they've done to incorporate the Planning Commission direction and review this. Quite a bit of that work has helped the product you're working with. And overall I'm going to focus a little bit on a principle in theme six, the transportation theme, and just to say, while we generally support the direction in the conversation you had last week at your meetings, I think our view and the future needs for this is very compatible with what I've heard you echo. A couple of key points to make, though. Why this theme is addressed in theme six, I think we need to...the Plan could benefit by emphasizing safety for, in this case, safety for people a little bit more. A policy to improve highway, street and pathway safety is important and some indicators of progress, but to decrease crashes 10 percent, for example, might be while we're still shifting modes. And it would be complementary to wildlife vehicle crash-reduction goals. I think it's just a missing element in there. We definitely agree that transportation choices must be considered regionally. One component of those is stress. I think you focus a lot of workers. And that's important, but our transportation system is a lot more than that. And one key area is to include visitors. It doesn't quite address the two to four million people coming through our community every year as visitors and it's a great impact on us, and addressing that is I think very helpful. The next point is on page 75, the Planning Commission draft references Appendix K and it's the current Comp Plan transportation chapter. As you look at that, it references...it's substantially highlighted in yellow, meaning it all needs to be updated. And those major additions are necessary and pretty darn important. But I'd like to see, as you're concluding this process, that you could get a more clear process map on the direction and how that will be accomplished, the key task you're willing to take in the next year, and then some statement of what the desired outcome is. Will it be a new transportation plan that covers all the modes? I think it will be helpful for all of us to know how that's going to play out. A couple of quick things on principles and policies. We support all the alternative modes in each corridor; however, it will vary in terms of its potential to shift trips. In the language, there remains a bit of a language focus on transit. It's sort of a leftover from the earlier drafts. I think that could still be improved so that you look at the full toolkit of potential solutions and transit is certainly one. Transportation plan management would...might be another one. The pathways, sidewalks, those combinations of what...it won't be a silver bullet—it'll be all of those, and referencing that would be good. And mode shifts, to conclude here very quickly, should be more specific and measurable. We don't have any baseline data in there, and we should put...if we don't have perfect data, let's put what we have and qualify it. But the best mode shift could be shown in like four pie charts—existing mode shift for all modes, existing budget for all modes, future projections for mode share, and how you're going to spend your money in the future. That would probably help everybody, I think, and would be helpful. A regional transportation authority is mentioned. That's a specific authority with taxability defined in Wyoming statutes. I think you might be better by being more generic, like a transportation program, a regional program, for example. Let the specifics be worked out because you may or may not want to have establishing a tax liability, I don't know, but this may not be the place to do that. And then coordinate into your transportation. I'd like to comment that it mentions WYDOT, that they're crucial, but it's more than WYDOT. I think including other federal agencies, which both impact us and have substantial access to funding and could help us. So, Grand Teton got \$11 million to date for the ??, for example. They have access to transit. And the strategies—one final point and I'll conclude this—they're all good and I support those. I'd like to see you if you could add a point regarding our...to expand or enhance our pathways and sidewalks through a sidewalk program. That could be mentioned in those strategies; it would align with the rest of them. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	Well, first of all, I want to thank you guys for all your time, effort and hard work. It's an arduous process, but it's important that we do it and important that we get it right. I'm sorry, I'm Carol Waters. Apparently, we are all in agreement that wildlife protection is paramount in this Valley. But how do we get that? As far as I can see, to succeed the Comp Plan must ensure that the primary concern in all land-use decisions is permanent protection of wildlife habitat and the preservation of all movement corridors, both seasonal and ???. Nothing else will achieve our agreed-upon goal of wildlife protection. To do this we need to incorporate the best science available into these decisions, and when we don't have adequate data to inform our decision, we should invest in the necessary long-term research to get it before making the decision. Clearly, wildlife preservation requires incorporating into our Plan a real, specific, public commitment to limit growth. I don't see what's wrong with growth caps. Unlimited growth would clearly be unreasonable and unacceptable. The amount of growth matters greatly and we can and should decide what we want it to be based on best science. Whether or not the existing entitlements are an appropriate amount of growth and development remains open to serious question. Those numbers alone already doubling what we have here. I'd say that it's highly unlikely that our wildlife and our natural resources could be protected to any significant degree. Of course, the rate, the scale, the location of growth are also huge factors. The Valley bottomland is primary winter habitat and many species of wildlife depend upon it to survive. I believe it is essential to monitor the cumulative impact of growth and development going forward and to alter that growth and development based upon the information provided by that monitoring. And an enabling mechanism for a cumulative impact analysis should be an integral part of the Comp Plan, not an addition decided upon at a later date. Without strict monitoring and appropriate responses to what is found by that monitoring, the hope of preserving our wildlife is very slim indeed. And, lastly, I would agree with the other comments on the character maps. I think that without knowing the role that they will play and the impact they will have and when they will be adopted, the public cannot evaluate the themes and policies because they're interconnected. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Levy, Robbin Interested Public	Hi, my name's Robin Levvy; I have a terrible cold; I'll try to talk as loud as I can. Thank you for all your hard work. I know how many hours you've put in, and I know how difficult it's been and I really appreciate it. I admire all of you for your willingness to do it, because you have to be out of your mind to be in that position. None of us want growth. I don't think a single one of us wants another house in this Valley. And if we could legislate that, I think every single one of us would support even doing it. I don't think any of us want additive growth, and by that I mean one house more than what's already entitled today. So, everybody talks about wanting growth caps. I support that, except that I know that if you adopt a growth cap, it will be thrown in your face time and time again when you're trying to implement the other goals that are important to this community like workforce housing. (Excuse me.) So, I like where you're headed. I like the growth management plan. I think it's a little more flexible. It will allow you to do the other things that are incredibly important to us. And I support you, and I hope you can maintain your courage, because you are in the unenviable position of trying to introduce reality to our desires, which is I think essentially no growth, because I think that's what would be best for our community as a built environment. If I could wave a magic wand and turn 65 percent of our homes into deed-restricted workforce housing, that'd be great. If everyone in this room would sign up and deed restrict their home, you guys could start, but I'm going to guess that's not going to happen. So, we have to plan for how we're going to achieve that some other way. So, when you talk about community character, the character maps are going to be really important to us and I do also encourage you to get to that before you finalize this, because I think it's going to illustrate the reality for a lot of people and what the constraints are that you already foresee but maybe some other folks don't. When I hear predictability and integrity, the thing that, I mean, that's great and we all want that, but the thing that I fear in that is that's going to become don't change my neighborhood. And I don't think that's going to be possible in some places and these maps are going to illustrate that. And so bear up because I think you're going to have a lot of arrows in your back when you start mapping. It's going to be ugly; it's going to be contentious. But I believe that you all have our best interests in mind. I've been before you before representing land owners and developers and I know you all don't want growth because I've seen it. [Laughter] So, I feel very comfortable that you don't, and maybe that's where my faith comes in and that's why I'm not so fearful of what you guys are going to do. So, I know you're going to do the right thing and I really do support you. Finally, workforce housing, you know, we all talk about it. It's very difficult. I don't want to see it all in Teton Valley Idaho and Alpine Wyoming because I don't want to see five-, six-, seven-lane roads and that is what we will have zipping in and out of this Valley. I don't want to see our volunteer Fire Department degrade any further. My husband's a volunteer fire fighter and I support that organization a lot. I don't want to see our volunteers go ???. I don't want to see anymore teachers have to commute to get to work and get stuck as the Pass is closed. I don't want to see all that. I want to support workforce housing and I know to do it, you're going to have some tough work ahead. You're going to need to zone for it, and please do it. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Halloran, Gigi Interested Public	Although I have not been in Jackson to attend your meetings I have been following your deliberations through email and the newspaper. Your careful consideration of all the issues has earned my respect and you are all to be congratulated for working hard through the whole process. Because I haven't had a chance to speak to any of the issues, I want to express a few opinions as the public comment period is coming to an end. First, I understand that the buildout potential is increasing over the prior comprehensive plan. In fact, one opinion I read said the buildout potential is doubling. Since, the number one priority expressed by the population of Jackson is to protect wildlife, this increase in future population seems inconsistent with the goal of wildlife protection. I'm confused as to the potential large increase in commercial development is being suggested in this new plan. A modest increase seems much more compatible with our number one goal of protecting wildlife. The Conservation Alliance and others have used a wildlife overlay to help guide future development planning. I hope that a wildlife overlay will continue to be used and is incorporated as part of the new plan. Jackson Hole along with many western towns enjoys beautiful scenery, great fishing, skiing and a robust tourist economy. The one thing Jackson has that other western towns don't have is our wildlife. We need to make sure that we don't sow seeds that will eventually drive away the beautiful animals that also call Jackson Hole home.
4/27/2011	Cresswell, Anne Interested Public	Hi, Anne Hayden Cresswell. I came tonight to speak about affordable housing, but now I don't have to; Robin just did that for me. She did a great job, thank you. And honestly the only remaining comment I wanted to make tonight about the chapter four, housing chapter, is to really sincerely thank the hard work and incredible work of the Planning Staff, the 41 meetings that the Planning Commission has put in to do the work on the housing chapter because it is a terrific chapter. So, thank you for all that work. It was also, I have to add, a treat for me. I'm coming upon my ninth year as Director of the Housing Trust, and I'm pretty certain it was the very first time in nine years where all of our elected officials have dedicated four hours to so many different topics related to affordable housing, which I think is such an important issue. Instead of speaking tonight as ED, I would like to speak as a resident of the Town of Jackson and offer a slightly different perspective than I think you've heard tonight. We've heard and read a lot about the need for build-out numbers, a growth cap, about needing character districts now, and about wanting regulations now. And I appreciate the passion that we all share for this wonderful place. We all live here because we love it, but I also have learned over the years how quickly passion can turn into panic and turn into panic really fast. But I think if we look at the last 20 years, our rate of growth between 1990 and 2000, and I will quote three unnamed, almost certain, individuals in this room that that rate of growth was between 1 and 1½ percent between 1990 and 2000. We know that between 2000 and 2010 it was 1.2 percent. If every person in this room could agree on one thing tonight, my guess is that we would all agree that the growth coming forward in the next five years is going to be a lot smaller than it was over the last 10 years. My perspective then tonight is that we are not in a place of crisis and rather that we have time to make really thoughtful decisions and continue the conversation that we're having tonight. I would like to add that I think on balance you have done a very good job with this vision and policy doc. I think we have identified every possible monitoring tool which will help us make sure that we're meeting the goals in our Plan, the one thing being maybe an 8-cent tax to help pay for all of those monitoring tools. I applaud the growth monitoring program that was presented on Friday. I think that's a terrific start and I think the character districts, and of course the workforce housing action plan, are critical. But again I think we have time on our side to be thoughtful and to continue some of the really important conversations that have gotten started where we've scratched the surface, but I think have some additional meat to unpack there. So, thank you so much all of you for your work.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Biolchini, Robert, Jr. Interested Public	I'm Robert Biolchini; I've been here for 20 years now. We're pretty lucky with where we live; we all know that. And given Teton County, we're down to about 1½ percent of the land that we're speaking about right now, given that 97 percent is already protected and now what is developed has been developed. I guess my concern is, as we look forward, we've got two things that are kind of clashing. That's the reason that the Comprehensive Plan is put together is to slow free markets. We don't want to see the free market up ??, so to speak, and grow in a direction that would not maintain the quality of life here. My biggest concern moving forward is understanding the cost, not the cost to our community but actual financial cost as we move forward. When we start restricting things, we've got the private sector versus the public sector and who is burdened with those bills. It would help, as we move forward with this Plan, to get a sense—I know that the exact numbers are going to be very, very difficult—but at least get a sense of sources and uses of cash, so that we can better understand who is going to benefit from and who is going to pay for some of our or your all's decisions moving forward. Anyhow, that's just my thought in terms of, well, as this community builds out, who's going to pay for it? We are, I would bet for the better part, we are at a pass right now, in that, you know, we've got our little piece of Jackson. We've got to consider those in the future and how they're going to afford to live here...kids—I don't have any kids yet but I've got plenty of people who are concerned with, you know, where are their kids going to live and how are they going to afford to live here, and so forth. Budgets can get out of control quickly. All we have to do is look to our federal government to see how quickly that can happen. And my biggest concern, as a small community, is how we're going to use those sources of cash to the best of our ability moving forward. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Hi, Franz Camenzind, resident of Jackson Hole. I appreciate you allowing me to speak here and the opportunity for this community to speak. I think it's great that you're setting aside this much time. And I really want to thank the Staff, because they really are the ones that put in the most time over the years on this particular project. I think there's been so much negative things here said this morning, or this afternoon, I'm not going to try to repeat those, but I will say that if we do want predictability, we do have to have some kind of growth cap, whether you call it that, or we have to know what the build-out number is. The '94 Plan gave us some idea what the build-out number was. It didn't send people over the mountain or whatever else. We knew what it was; it's roughly doubling. We may not like it but that's what we have now, and there's some sort of predictability with that. Now, we know that it's very, very, very difficult to down zone. But I'll tell you what, it's going to be very unpopular to up zone, and all we have to do is remember the DRD from a few years ago. Growth will have impacts. It's going to have impacts, I don't care how smart it is. And we can call them neighborhoods, we can call them nodes, I really don't care what we call them. It's what we do there that matters. If, for example, we have a cowboy town that has a hundred people, or a hundred units, and we double it, the best we can hope for is to capture 10 percent of that traffic. That means 90 percent is going to be new traffic and that's going to hold up just about anywhere in the Valley. I mean, a 10 percent capture is incredibly optimistic, so let's not forget that. We can, you know, support the START and we should be doing that and we should have community pathways. Those are all good, but at best if we can capture 10 percent, we have that extra 90 percent that's still going to have an impact on this, and that's going to be impacting roads, it's going to be impacting our deer and elk and moose, and so forth. Again, what we do in these nodes will change the character. And we're concerned about character and I think most people are and I think most of you are, too. We can't just double it and then try to figure out what did we do to the character of the node, whatever we want to call it. And I would say the same thing for the Town of Jackson. Clearly, it should be the Town of heart, or Town as heart. It is the heart of the community. Most of our services are here. But we can overbuild this Town, too. Maybe moving into South Park, a little bit is okay, but going up is congestion. I don't care how you look at it. You don't want to congest your heart. There is no Lipitor for community congestion. [Laughter] It's going to happen if we let it build like that. We are building not only in protecting character for ourselves, but we're also trying to protect the character in this Valley for our visitors. There's three million plus people a year that come here. They come here for the public lands and the wildlife and the scenery but they also come into Town for the character, so we have to keep that in mind, too. I think one of the things that—and I hope I don't embarrass you when I say this—but I agree with Bill Collins, despite everything that he said. [Laughter] And I think it's very clear. We had a pretty good Plan with the '94 Plan. There were certainly some things missing, and I do absolutely believe that we have to have these maps sooner than later. That's part of the predictability that we want. I think what we need, and I've been playing with this in my head for too long now, but however many themes we have, we should be able to write down what we want with these themes in a couple of pages and it should be simple and it should be very specific, so that when you do the LDRs, you know the boundaries that you have to work in. The Staff can say, okay, we want to protect this or that, we don't want this to go beyond such and such. Then they could come up with the LDRs. I mean, I think what we have right now is too vague. It's not predictable. There's no indication of how we're going to get any of these transfers into Town, or into the nodes. You're leaving that completely open. Yeah, the idea of monitoring is great, but if you don't have teeth to stop something, if you don't have brakes on it, monitoring is just going to give you a history of what we did wrong. So, I would really...what we have is the potential for growth here. Let's just find out the best way to rearrange those development potentials so it works for everyone. And I would hope that by rearranging that, we can end up with the good ship Jackson Hole and not the Titanic. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Hill, Megan Interested Public	Good afternoon, my name is Meagan Hill and I'm a resident of Wilson. Mayor, Commissioners and Council members, I'd like to thank you personally for the hard work and ?? courage for tackling some of these issues and to discuss them in the public realm. When I look back at my comments from March 8th, I see that many of my concerns have already been addressed, so thank you for listening and thank you for taking action. I want to specifically highlight some points of discussion and decisions that will be most important to me, and I want to start with smart growth principles. I support the rewrite of policy 2.1.A, to limit the base development rights. I agree with your approach to that the Plan results in population rights and smart growth principles. And I agree, whilst it may be unpopular, with removing language to ??. Thank you. But I agree and support the rewrite of policy 2.1.B, preserving existing County neighborhoods to maintain character while allowing density changes in existing neighborhoods. I don't know in fact if it's going to be really difficult to deliver within the character. District discussions is going to be challenging. I support the rewrite of policy 2.1.D to promote infill and redevelopment in Town, shifting the focus specifically to complete neighborhoods within the County. In addition, I appreciate the decision made recently to clearly differentiate between commercial and nonresidential. I think that terminology is key in perhaps dealing with some of the fear and frustration that's been discussed by other folks today. To include a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan and to include a growth management plan. I mean, so many positives. I have one significant concern. Quite frankly, I'm a little perplexed at the admission of they might ?? sustainability and energy from any substantial discussion. I listened to a lot of talk about green community, green ??, and the importance of wildlife and natural resources. I believe it's imperative that theme eight strive closely to achieve the goals of the community. I believe the changes in climate, weather patterns, and air pollution, water quality, and so forth, will impede our ability to live up to our wildlife and natural resources. So, I see some significant imbalance in front of us at this point in time. Moving on and to conclude, as you wrap up with the Plan, I encourage you to zone for workforce housing, to incentivize mixed-use development in a manner that allows us to locate our workforce in ?? of services and facilities, which not only help transportation and many other plans, but it will also help support businesses here. And finally my pet project is to recognize the importance of water as a natural resource and provide best practices ??. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Mobec, John Interested Public	I'm John Mobec from the Murie Center and also spent some time with the Chamber of Commerce several years back, so I've seen a couple of angles of this Valley. Sincere thanks to everyone who's been involved with this process. As far as I can tell with the work you've done so far, you've done tremendous work and most of it of course is thankless. As you know, we've got an incredible legacy of conservation in this Valley. The Murie family, who I probably represent...well, I can't speak to representing them, but I work for their organization that furthers their legacy, was responsible for building the Grand Teton National Park, expanding it. A hard fight, a tough fight. The good fight and the right thing to do. Let's not forget about those proud achievements that this Valley can hang our hat on. Grand Teton National Park being one of them. Yellowstone National Park being another. These are some of America's best ideas. At least, these are the things that make us different. This is the end of the world. This was the place where we decided that we were going to set aside landscapes where humans and wildlife could coexist peacefully, harmoniously and for the enjoyment of the people, as well as the preservation of the wildlife. We have an opportunity here to preserve an incredibly unique landscape and come up with America's best new idea, which is the true harmonious relationship between a community, its infrastructure's development and the wildlife that surrounds it. So let's not be afraid to be bold in preserving this vision for people and wildlife. President Roosevelt, former President Roosevelt, famously said, there's nothing more practical than the preservation of beauty than the preservation of anything that appeals to the higher emotions of mankind. That's what I hope that all of you are doing and thinking about as you think about this Plan. If it all becomes irreversible, the subsequent impairment of our landscape might also be irreversible. If we overreach, we can't travel back in time and rethink our development strategy. Limitation is an important concept in sustainability; it's an important concept in systems thinking, which we heard a little bit about before; it's an important concept in ecology. We manage these things in sustainable preservation of these systems, including humans and wildlife. We're trying to find a dynamic equilibrium where our community can create a template that other communities can look to as we've achieved something like a harmonious relationship between human communities and the wild landscapes. It's a delicate balance that's difficult to achieve, but I think we're up to it and our history suggests that we can do it. If that balance is disrupted, we could destroy what makes this an incredible, beautiful place. So, exercising your strength, appropriate caution, limiting growth to a real number is one way to ensure that we have a chance—just a chance—to build a sustainable community where people and wildlife, a place for beauty in all of its forms blooms brilliantly. Thank you, to each of you, to all of you, for fulfilling this significant promise.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'd like to thank you, first of all, for allowing me to talk and all your thoughtful conversation that has led up to this point. You guys have had some real I think in-depth discussions that were good. I'm going to steal a queue from Bruce. It's actually kind of hard to comment at this point, because there's really not a hard draft in front of us. So, I'm going to steal Bruce's queue and talk about what I think I heard you guys decide and give you some feedback on that. [Laughter] Because that was actually a real good way. I think you guys got to a lot of our things, so I'm not going to beat on that anymore. But transferrable development rights, I think you got some of it. I think you have the concept of the importance of the permanent transfer, because what we don't want is the worst of both worlds, which will be to allow increased density in wherever—I'm not going to touch where right now; I'll let you guys tackle that ??—but a key issue remains that how much, because it's not just important where, but it's how much, and that's one of the key discussions that needs to be had there. Some of the things that I think maybe you didn't get as much was the idea of no new resorts. I still hear people struggle with, well, what if we have another good proposal come in. I think people were pretty clear and would point out that the five resorts that we...these are the true resorts that are approved that have resort plans. Two of them are in trouble and two more may be in trouble. So, that's not a real good record. Maybe we need to rethink—I'm not going to throw rocks here—but we need to look at that model, so I think you need to think about that. The issue of an expansion in the lodging overlay, tourism is flat and this morning when I had this discussion, there was talk about not trying to fill...trying to fill the shoulder season, rather than trying to fill more hotels. So, expanding the lodging overlay seems to be a contradiction; I'm pointing that out then. Predictability, that's another landmine. The community I think is really clear. What they want to do is plan once, not plan for each project. That's really what the community wants. They don't want to have to come out for every project. They want to make clear what's going down. Don't want to reward speculation. The problem...one of the things that's happened is that we have people paying more for real estate in the expectation that they would get more development rights. And that's just increased the spiral which has then trickle-down problems instead of trickle-down benefits in terms of housing and everything else. ?? was a good example of that. I don't have the statistics; I wish I had time to figure that out. But how many of the PMUDs that were actually approved actually were turned around and built, and how many of them went right on the market right after that? It benefited the developer and not the community. There were no jobs created immediately after that. So, think about that. We do look forward to seeing the draft and the proposal will provide us with more details in the coming days. But we would ask that there be a workshop to discuss after you have a hard document where people can talk about it. Because I think you need to convince the public that it does address their concerns, and I think the way to do that would be an informal, maybe a workshop kind of a ?? thing, with a two-way conversation unlike what's going now. It's been very efficient up to this point so we would encourage that. A couple of last things. One, I think you guys need to give yourself more credit. This morning, you guys were dismissing your impact on the local community, and I would say you actually have a bigger impact than you want to believe. You did a pretty good job in the last couple of years. I'd also say, qualify that, it could have been better perhaps. But growth management is the way to soften the bust. There was talk about the boom-and-bust cycle, and it's a principle that's used in the stock market, electrical theory, everything. You know, to protect from overheating. And I think all you need to do is look over the hill in Teton Valley Idaho or Las Vegas Nevada and see the problems that happen from not allowing...for allowing things to grow with no limits. We look forward to working on a growth management plan and would ask you lastly to improve character district maps because we do consider those a vital link, too. Thank you.
4/27/2011	Thal, Lawrence E., AIA Interested Public	1.Next issue I would like to discuss is complete neighborhoods. Sounds good to me. though vague, If it allows us to make a few less trips in the car, I'm for it. If it is an attempt to retrofit our hyper sprawl and put community services closer to more people, I'm for it. We need neighborhood shopping, food & prof. services in carefully designed and crafted centers. 2.The character of these centers is as much determined by the physical form as it is by the activities that happen there. The best way to determine the desired physical characteristics of place is a good form based code. That should be the next step in this planning process. We have expressed a desire to be a leadership community. The way we deal with transportation and land use patterns will be one huge indicator of how well we have succeeded. I hope we look back at this time as the moment we made good choices. Thanks again

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Thal, Lawrence E., AIA Interested Public	Thank you to all re Transportation. We have to take seriously the goal of reducing vehicle travel. Our excessive reliance on driving and the large VMT threatens core goals of the plan such as community character, wildlife, economic vitality, climate sustainability and energy conservation. Ground transport accounts for 62% of energy use. Land use patterns are huge factor contributing to that #. The draft comp. plan calls for “per capita vehicle miles traveled” reduction. Great. I’m for it but shouldn’t we set higher goals? My thoughts are: 1.Set a substantial target such as 20% reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita and a net overall reduction in vehicle use by 2020. 30% x 30 This could be a boon to future economic vitality. 2.We are not going to get there with our current land use practices. Every planning & policy decision made from here on out has to be looked at through the filter of reducing vehicle trips. THANKS
4/27/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Oh, I’m Cindy Stone, I live south of Town. So, ten/fifteen years from now, believe it or not, this ??, this ?? is going to look really different and you guys are going to be gray, <<inaudible>> and Jackson Hole will look different. We need to limit change, or to limit growth. We can’t say slow down, or be careful. We have to say 35 miles an hour. And so we need an end-game number, something that we can work with. And we’re past the point of saying, hey, everybody jump in, we’re going to move to Wilson. Because there are only five seat belts in my car, so I can only take four riders and myself. And we need to realize that; we’re at that point now. Every...a smart businessman knows that more is not better. Most of the time it’s just more. And that’s a hard lesson to learn and most of us learn it the hard way. Now...sorry, I’m nervous...my great grandchildren don’t know me and ??, excuse me, that we stand for clean water and air and moose and trees, and so we have to remember that. I’m sorry...okay, I’m done.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2011	Carruth, Vance Interested Public	My name is Vance Carruth and I live in Teton County. And I arrived here in 1963 with the intent of staying here forever as a result of a tour visit with my parents in 1952. And I have always had an abiding love for the beautiful scenery we have here, as well as the diversity of wildlife that's here. And when I came here, this was a very small community, to say the very least. Much of what I've seen happen to this community over the years, I have found somewhat appalling, and other aspects I see very encouraging. So, it's kind of a mixed bag of how I feel about how this community has grown over the years. But in terms of the community itself and in terms of all of you folks whom I greatly admire everyone that's sitting at that table—your dedication, your sincerity, I know that you want to do the right thing for this community, for us and for all the future generations that are going to live here. At the same time, I also admire and respect the community at large who sits in these seats and comes up and makes all these excellent comments, and even though there's a diversity of opinion here, I do feel like that there has to be a way to bridge the gap between one side and the other at the two extremes of whatever we look at. Too often in our society today, the polarization is palpable, and it frightens me personally for my children and my grandchildren that we have so much anger and so much frustration with dealing with government. And you represent the government. And so I read some letters in the paper, I hear some comments that I find offensive because they attack personally the motivations, or whatever, of the people sitting here. And to me, we elected you people. It was majority vote. And you're here now and I know many of you personally and I admire all of you. I certainly don't have any expertise in pointing out what kind of a Plan you should make and I certainly don't envy you what you're attempting to accomplish here. But my overriding objective is to see this community and the beauty and the wildlife remain as the main focus of all the efforts we make, so that if we're going to build more roads or more homes or more subdivisions or whatever we're going to do, we need to think about how is that going to affect the wildlife we all came here to enjoy...and the scenery and the pollution locally produced and all the other accompanying aspects. So, I can certainly see, as I listen and as I read in the papers about going between flexibility and predictability, there has to be another way and it seems like you folks have come up with a Plan that might just accomplish both of those things that hopefully would satisfy all sides. But if you don't, or you can't, and it's impossible and you do have to draw a line in the sand and say, this is what we're going to do and this is how we're going to do it, that I would hope our community would pull together and continue to work with you folks to accomplish the goal in whatever way it is humanly possible. But of course my big dream is to see these wildlife crossings brought into the Valley when all these new highways are constructed, because to me the overriding objective here is to see sustainability for the wildlife and the connectivity of the wildlife, allowing them to move across the landscape freely and get where they need to go without having the impediments that are created by all of us. And in my opinion there are too many of us here now. So, if you're going to double the population and you're going to double the size, well, all I can say is I'm very grateful that I only have probably 20 more years on this planet, because I don't want to be here when it reaches the Salt Lake City stage. Anyway, I just want to thank all of you and all of you out there in the audience. And I love living in this community, which to me is kind of an anomaly out there according to the rest and I do not want to see us go down that line of adversarial positions where it's fight to the death. I just cannot tolerate that in this wonderful community. Thank you all very much.
4/26/2011	Stein, Bobby Interested Public	My name is Bobby Stein and I reside in the Owl Creek subdivision. My wife and I started visiting this beautiful area sixteen years ago. We decided to retire here from the East Coast and completed our dream home ten years ago. We chose to build here rather than Aspen, Vail, Steamboat Springs or Sun Valley for two major reasons; the easy accessibility to the abundant wildlife and the wide open spaces. I plead with you to use good common sense in making your decision about how much residential and commercial growth to allow in the future. Please don't cave in to the pressures of the developers as they will develop every square inch if allowed. Please do what the vast majority of the people that call this home want; slow and SMART growth.
4/26/2011	Gillette, CJ Interested Public	Comments for Wednesday's meeting "The Plan." Housing trust-Wildlife and people and too many dogs do not mix! In my opinion your organization is a huge problem for our town and county. The problem of overcrowding is not necessary. Unemployment, empty buildings, homes and apartments = more roads, infrastructure, ruined views and more crime, more wealthy people buying into the valley! [attached brochure regarding Jackson available in hard copy at the Teton County Planning Department; comments written on brochure are as follows] Housing Trust, City, County, C of C, Owners of empty buildings and failed businesses: This was Jackson's Hole long before 1999 and even this is not the real truth! 1999 Publications: "So many best small towns, some to live in"

Date	Name	Comment
4/26/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	I would like to address Theme 5 (Provide for a diverse and Balanced Economy) of The Comprehensive Plan. Sustainability is an important element of this Theme. However, I am concerned that the policies described to achieve this goal are either insufficient or in direct contradiction to it. An economy cannot be sustainable unless all economic activity pays its own way, both socially and environmentally. For example, exactions should be required to house workers for jobs created, or to help build roads, sewers and other infrastructure related to a project. If an enterprise harms the environment it should be taxed to pay for it. Sooner or later someone pays for all of these things and linking them to the economic activity that generates them is fair and efficient. Creating development caps at no more than current base entitlements are an integral part of this. Caps force us to face the reality that we cannot grow forever, that an important aspect of the cost of growth and development is a run-down of our finite amount of natural capital. Over-development or encouraging other unsustainable businesses leaves less for the generations that follow. The world has grown past the point where more is better. This is particularly relevant in Teton County where our Natural Capital is our biggest asset. If we ignore limits or hide costs because it's easier not to look, we will decrease our own wealth. Furthermore, we will exacerbate the problems associated with growth, selfishly passing them down the line to future generations. A more positive way to view this is that as the world grows, develops, and pollutes at an increasingly greater pace, genuine environmental capital will become more and more valuable. Protecting our environmental capital is an excellent investment.
4/26/2011	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	I have several specific concerns about the economics theme in the draft Comprehensive Plan: First, the goal of stabilizing booms and busts is laudable, but wholly unrealistic as written. As you all well know, County and Town finances suffer along with everyone else when the economy is bad. The only way for government to support the economy in bad times is if it raises extra revenue in the good times. If you want to keep theme 5.1.b in the Plan include in it the need to tax cyclical businesses when they are strong to raise revenue to spend in the bad times. Anything less is making a promise you cannot keep. Second, it is incorrect to characterize tourism and real estate development as equally cyclical, as implied in theme 5.1.b. They are not. Park visits and ski days have been much more resilient than construction activity and home values. Please recognize this difference in the Plan and encourage selling experiences through tourism as a much less volatile basis for the County economy than selling property. Also make accumulating a rainy day fund an explicit part of having development pay its own way. Third, apply sound economic principals to the goal of diversifying the economy (theme 5.3). Businesses that involve shipping physical products, or frequent travel, are not competitive in Teton County. Transportation is just too expensive and unreliable. Enterprises that can be competitive are information based. To attract and keep these the best incentives are to encourage appropriate infrastructure such as a powerful Internet backbone, fiber-optic cabling, and top-quality schools. You also need to point out the link between the natural environment and economic diversification. A unique natural environment is the competitive advantage that will attract and keep the entrepreneurs who build knowledge-based businesses. Please resist the temptation to fill the economics chapter of the Plan with nice but unrealistic aspirations. Take the opportunity to give the community some serious guidance for building a diverse and sustainable economy.
4/26/2011	Pyle, Owen Interested Public	I am concerned that the limits to growth in Theme 2 is being considered for removal. I want you to know that I am opposed to its elimination. Please listen to the community and do not be swayed by comments from developers who have their own self interest only in mind.

Date	Name	Comment
4/26/2011	Ferguson, Jean and Dick Interested Public	We are on vacation and unable to attend the meeting so we are taking time from our holiday to let you know our views. We hope you listen to the many citizens who are very concerned. There are strong opinions in town that the energy and input that citizens have devoted to many surveys, meetings, letters and emails over years are useless in the Jackson political process. We don't agree because we know many of you individually and think you may have personal differing opinions but you do listen to the public more than during election season. We also know you work hard and devote long hours. But your credibility is at stake here. People feel that the very future character of Jeackson is at stake here. Over several years we have established some common goals for the new comprehensive plan. We want it to be more predictable and have fewer variances. We want to keep the build out numbers specific and limited to those of the old plan. We are very concerned about cumulative development, not just looking at each individual project in order to manage growth and protect wildlife. Don't put off the hard choices of build out numbers. Thank you for listening.
4/26/2011	Folgeman, Jane Interested Public	I strongly oppose the concept of "Nodes" within your possible New Master Plan. The spirit and character of existing neighborhoods in the Town and County should be protected. They should not be destroyed by artificial up zones.
4/26/2011	Kolsky, Eddie Interested Public	The community has consistently and strongly expressed that the priorities of the new Comprehensive Plan should be the protection of wildlife and open space. Having predictability and build out numbers will help achieve those goals. Build out numbers should be equal to or less than the doubling of what currently exists. Please listen to what the community and the planning commission are saying. It is what is best for this valley. So much is at stake.
4/26/2011	Wade, Louise Interested Public	PLEASE PUT YOUR BEST FOOT FORWARD [see comment for picture] PROTECT THE WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES [see commetn for picture] WE ARE PRIVILEGED TO LIVE AMONGST THE WONDROUS WILDLIFE Louise Wade <loucwade@yahoo.com> Teton County Commissioners and Elected Officials : The power of this place is the open spaces and the wondrous wildlife we are privileged to live amongst . This is America's Serengeti ! Please DO NOT LET MONEY CLOUD YOUR JUDGEMENT and allow OVERBUILDING This would loose the integrity of why we live here. It took me 28 years to move here permanently . Remember Helen Mettter's words at age 9:"GOD BLESS WYOMING, & KEEP IT WILD !" Thank you for remembering why we all live here. Lou Crump Wade [see comment for picture] GOD BLESS WYOMING & KEEP IT WILD! HELEN METTLER AT AGE 9

Date	Name	Comment
4/26/2011	Ross, Lane Interested Public	AS A FIFTH GENERATION JACKSON HOLE RESIDENT AND A PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER, I'M BECOMING GREATLY CONCERNED THAT THE UPDATE FOR THE COMP PLAN IS LEANING TOWARD FURTHER RESTRICTIONS OR EVEN DISALLOWANCE OF DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS ON WHAT LITTLE PRIVATE PROPERTY REMAINS IN THE VALLEY. I HAVE BEEN TRYING FOR THE LAST 25 YEARS TO BE ABLE TO GENERATE SOME SORT OF VIABLE INCOME TO HELP WITH LIFE'S EXPENSES AND POSSIBLY GENERATE SOME RETIREMENT INCOME. UP TO THIS POINT, THE ONLY THING I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO REALIZE IS A MEAGER INCOME FROM A DEPLETED DRY FARM CROP AND THE JOY OF PAYING TAXES. MOST OF MY EFFORTS WOULD HAVE BEEN BENEFICIAL TO THE COUNTY IN THE FORM OF WASTE DISPOSAL, AFFORDABLE HOUSING, STORAGE FACILITIES, TRAVEL PARK, GRAVEL SOURCE, ETC. TO MY WAY OF THINKING THIS AMOUNTS TO A COUNTY GOVERNMENT TAKING OF MY PROPERTY. I'M SURE I HEARD SOMEWHERE THAT A TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IS AGAINST THE LAW. IT SEEMS THAT THE MAJOR FOCUS IS ON OPEN SPACE AND WILDLIFE ISSUES WITH LITTLE CONCERN FOR PROPERTY OWNING TAXPAYERS, WORK FORCE PERSONNEL, BUSINESS OWNERS, AND SERVICE EMPLOYEES TO MAKE THE AREA PRODUCTIVE. I FEEL IT IS TIME FOR OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS TO STOP SIDE STEPPING THE ISSUES AND DEAL WITH THE PEOPLE RELATED PROBLEMS FACING THE COMMUNITY. THERE IS ENTIRELY TOO MUCH FOCUS ON OPEN SPACE AND WILDLIFE ISSUES. IN A COUNTY THAT IS 97% OPEN SPACE THAT APPEARS TO BE A FAIRLY LOW PRIORITY. ONE CAN ONLY WONDER HOW MANY CITIZENS BOTH LOCAL AND VISITORS, HAVE SEEN OR WILL EVER SEE, EVEN A FRACTION OF THE OPEN SPACE AVAILABLE THROUGH OUT THE COUNTY AND ADJOINING AREAS. I ALSO BELIEVE WILDLIFE TO BE MUCH MORE RESILIENT AND ADAPTIVE THAN MOST PEOPLE SEEM TO GIVE THEM CREDIT FOR WHEN IT COMES TO DEALING WITH HUMANS. IT MIGHT BE INTERESTING TO DO A STUDY COMPARING THE LOSS OF WILDLIFE DUE TO TRAFFIC AND HUMAN INTERVENTION, DISREGARDING LEGAL HARVESTING, TO THE NUMBER OF ANIMALS LOST DUE TO THE SLAUGHTER IMPOSED BY THE RE-INTRODUCTION OF WOLVES TO THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT. IF SCATTERED OR EVEN CLUSTERED DEVELOPMENT IMPEDES MIGRATION AND ANIMAL MOVEMENT, MAYBE IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA TO LINE THE MAJOR TRAFFIC CORRIDORS WITH THAT KIND OF BARRIER AS A DETERRENT TO ANIMAL-VEHICLE INCIDENTS. EVEN THOUGH YOU ARE TRYING TO COVER ALL THE ISSUES, IT IS INEVITABLE THAT CERTAIN MATTERS WILL BE OVERLOOKED, POORLY DESIGNED, OR WILL SIMPLY NOT FIT A PARTICULAR SITUATION. THEREFORE, IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO INCLUDE A TOOL IN THE PLAN THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR MAKING CHANGES, MODIFICATIONS, OR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PLAN WITHOUT HAVING TO GO THROUGH THE TIME CONSUMING AND EXPENSIVE PROCESS OF A COMPLETE REVISION OR UPDATE. NO MATTER WHAT YOU COME UP WITH, OLD HISTORIC JACKSON HOLE IS JUST A PART OF SOMEONE'S MEMORY, IT NO LONGER EXISTS!!

Date	Name	Comment
4/26/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	We greatly appreciate the effort you made in the meeting last Friday to develop an adaptive management plan that may address some of the recommendations we have discussed with you. The Conservation Alliance looks forward to working with all of you to help refine the framework you discussed. Please let us know how we can be most useful in strengthening this tool so that it will help achieve the overall objectives the community has identified for the Comp Plan. During the meeting this week, we believe it is essential for you to clarify how you intend to move forward with the next stages of the planning process. This will help allay the public's concerns that they are not being given sufficient opportunity to review the upcoming draft, and should clarify when the Comp Plan will be formally adopted. There are two major areas that we believe it would be appropriate for you to address in the April 27th meeting: „h Upcoming opportunities for public participation „h The inclusion of Character Maps in the final Comp Plan Upcoming Opportunities for Public Participation We are grateful that you have moved to include more substantial public comment in JIM #8 and #9. In addition, we recommend that you clearly lay out a process for community discussion of the upcoming draft. This should include a mix of area-specific charettes, and several county-wide discussions that can address the broader impacts of the draft Comp Plan. In order for the public to participate effectively, you will need to provide enough time for community members to read the draft, and publicize the dates and locations of public meetings several weeks in advance, so people will have time to adequately prepare. In Wednesday's meeting, please clarify how you will address public participation in the future. The Inclusion of Character Maps in the Final Comprehensive Plan The Themes and Policies segment of the Comp Plan do not stand alone as an independent document, and must be adjusted to incorporate any modifications that seem necessary after the completion of the Character Maps, including the Natural Resource Overlay. Consequently, JIM #10 should be altered slightly, so that instead of being a vote to formally adopt the Comp Plan, it would be a vote to set aside the draft plan and commit to formally review and modify the plan as needed after the completion of the mapping. We strongly believe that adopting the plan without the maps as integral components would be irresponsible, and would go against overwhelming public opinion. Collaboration with the Conservation Alliance The Conservation Alliance has many detailed recommendations with regard to how this process might best move forward. We would like to work directly with the planning staff to develop a more detailed process that incorporates appropriate venues for public participation and any necessary studies and analyses. We believe it would be best if the agreed-upon process could be formally published as soon as possible, to alert the public to upcoming opportunities for involvement in this important work. The Conservation Alliance looks forward to supporting this process to our fullest capacity, to ensure that the community ultimately gets the best Comp Plan in the West.
4/25/2011	McClure, Bill Interested Public	Please put caps on residential and commercial development that Preserve what makes Jackson Hole different from we very other Rocky Mountain community.
4/25/2011	Steinberg, Ethan Interested Public	I've lived in my home on West Street in Wilson for over 10 years. i was part of the outcry against the Node proposal the first time around. I thought it was very clear then the community as a whole didn't want it. I understand it has come up again. I appreciate how much feedback Teton County looks for from it's community. However, most of us who work and have families don't have time to mobilize every time the County proposes something we have strong feelings about (unlike a concentrated special interest might). Our vigor and focus gets worn down by the County re-hashing issues that are unpopular. I'm taking the time send these comments because I want to be clear that while there is vocal (albeit tired)opposition to this strategy, there is a much bigger quiet part of your constituency that is strongly opposed to this that doesn't have the time to attend 3 hour meetings (again, I think it's great that the County allows that feedback opportunity). As elected representatives we mostly trust that you 'represent' us. If the County pursues this strategy, I and many of my fellow Node inhabitants will have to start taking more prescious time out of our days to mobilize for County representation that better reflects our community goals.

Date	Name	Comment
4/22/2011	Flitner, Sara Interested Public	I had hoped to come comment in person today, and thank you all directly for the time and effort you've given thus far to the comp plan process. As I told Mark earlier, I have driven 2000 miles around Wyoming since we got back from Spring Break, so I am a little behind. Also, I am unhappy to report that the weather is nicer EVERYWHERE than it is here! On the comp plan process itself, I applaud your efforts to give us what we ask for: a fair and transparent process, the opportunity to weigh in, and the respect of considering our opinions. I do believe you have done that. I emphatically disagree with some of the letters I read last week that the electeds have veered off the path or not considered input. The translation for me is that there are a few extreme views that are unlikely to be folded into policy, and those special interests are unhappy. Please maintain your leadership and cool, and continue to make thoughtful, deliberate decisions. I believe people see the name calling and hand wringing for what it is. I do believe that you are on the right track, and I see the deliberations ripen as more knowledge of the nuances comes into play. I support you in your efforts to MAKE A PLAN. There are many positive frames for good policy here - there is, for instance, recognition for the value of housing our workforce locally. There is recognition that we don't want sporadic development all over the county, so most agree it belongs in the town, and - less consensus here - near services and existing development when being proposed in the county. There is recognition that housing and open space must be planned together to achieve success for either. I believe that we have a chance to have a strong plan - maybe the best chance yet. It will be a lost opportunity if we focus only on criticizing the plan and the decision-makers, especially as you work through your own educational process. I support your efforts, this planning process, and your hard work.
4/22/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	RE: Complete neighborhoods;TOJ, Willow Street from Broadway to Snow King: All lots, 50' to 75' deep, facing Willow, require Commercial Zoning. Past, current and future absolute commercial use of Willow; Vehicle traffic exceeding 3000+; all BUT one & a half block[s] is now in commercial use; environmental & safety issues preclude residential use: Commerical frontage of Willow will preserve Character and desirable use of adjoining property. Without Commercial Zoning, traffic must be reduced and redirected.
4/21/2011	Minshall, Werner, E. Interested Public	I am a real estate developer from Washington DC. I have a home in Teton Village and have been active in the local commercial real estate market. The comp plan assumes that the work force / affordable housing zoning legislation will continue in effect as it is currently constructed. I would like to suggest that philosophy behind the existence of affordable housing be reviewed, and that its effectiveness in accomplishing that philosophical goal be assessed. This review should include a statistical review of the beneficiaries: where they work, what they do and what percentage of the population of their workforce do they represent. Affordable housing was built into the code and the plan in the 80's and may not be accomplishing what the community desires. This program should be assessed to determine its benefits results and its unintended results.

Date	Name	Comment
4/21/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is writing to provide our perspective on current Comp Plan discussions, and to offer concrete suggestions for how we think this process can best move forward. We greatly appreciate that many of you have highlighted community values, including the importance of wildlife as a top priority of residents. We also appreciate that you are making significant efforts to respond to recent concerns and comments from the community, and that you are willing to reconsider and clarify some of the issues that you have been considering. As you know, the Conservation Alliance has been committed to ensuring responsible planning for more than three decades, and this continues to be one of the top priorities of the organization. We believe that Jackson Hole's Comprehensive Plan needs to embody the best practices currently available, and should be seen as a model plan. As part of your recognized commitment to devise a visionary plan for our community, we want to be sure that you have the best available expert technical advice on best practices. To that end, the Conservation Alliance is contracting the services of a preeminent expert on comprehensive plans in similar communities of the Rocky Mountain West. Alan Richman has impressive qualifications, which are outlined in his attached C.V. More importantly, he is extremely committed to seeing Jackson Hole produce a cutting edge Comp Plan, due to his previous involvement in the drafting of the 1994 plan and his appreciation for this unique place. Richman will be utilizing the expertise of wildlife specialists as he works to produce a series of impartial memos addressing key issues that still need to be resolved. In the coming weeks, Richman will initiate his work by providing brief summaries on best practices for growth management and wildlife-related cumulative impacts analyses. We look forward to working with the planning staff and elected officials to ensure that we are implementing bestpractices models in these areas. We will continue to involve Richman as needed to provide expert review and guidance in the future stages of the planning process. The Conservation Alliance supports your efforts to locate development appropriately, and we have been pleased to see your emphasis on trying to preserve important wildlife habitat by reducing rural development in sensitive environments, and by concentrating future growth in ways that could constitute "Smart Growth" in Jackson Hole. Including strong policies for growth management is central to the success of our Comp Plan, and the community clearly sees this portion of the Comp Plan as a priority. The basic factors that need to be addressed in a best-practices growth management plan include defining limits on the location, rate, type, and overall amount of growth. More detail will be provided soon based on Alan Richman's work on this topic. We are encouraged to hear that you will be refining your work on this issue over the next sessions, and we urge you to be specific in defining how you will address this. Meanwhile, there are several steps the Conservation Alliance requests that you take over the next week, to enable the development of a best-practices growth management plan that upholds and implements community goals and priorities. This week, we ask that you: • Publicly commit to placing limits on growth, even if that exact limit will be determined later in the process. • Publicly commit to using best-practices approaches to Growth Management. Direct planning staff to produce a recommendation on what studies are needed to do this appropriately. • The Alliance will work with Alan Richman to provide support in identifying the best practices in this field. • Since not all necessary studies have been completed, make an interim commitment to at least work within existing entitlements until appropriate planning studies have been completed. This is a precautionary approach, since it is not yet even clear if existing entitlements may still result in too much overall development. • Clearly authorize retaining existing strong language on limits to growth. Your previous discussions suggest that this language could be removed. During the next month, it is essential that you publicly commit to completing the maps and verbiage that will be produced as part of the Character Districts or Future Land Use Plan prior to adoption of the Comp Plan, and that you adapt the policy portion of the Comp Plan to reflect the information that will be produced during the community's mapping process. We understand from your discussions that you expect "a buildout number to fall out" of this next phase of the planning process. This would clearly require that you revisit this topic in the policy portion of the Comp Plan after completing the maps, and that you commit to limiting growth – not simply monitoring it. We recognize that some additional technical analysis would benefit the development of a strong growth management plan. This will entail the completion of basic studies that are central to any planning effort on this issue. Taking a longer view of the Comprehensive Planning Process, the Conservation Alliance requests that you provide the public with a more detailed overview of how this process will proceed in terms of plan review, public input, map review and adoption, and explain how you believe this methodology will ultimately address community priorities and produce a top notch Comp Plan. The Conservation Alliance will work to provide a more detailed proposal on how this process could move forward, for your consideration. Thank you for the hard work you are doing for the future of this community. We look forward to working constructively with you to develop a best practices-based Comprehensive Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
4/21/2011	Markason, Steve Interested Public	I would like to add my comments for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Draft as a Teton County resident and a Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust home owner. I compliment you regarding the “Principles and Policies” for affordable housing in the draft plan. I ask that you continue to build strategies and solutions for affordable housing and adopt policies that help keep workers living in the Jackson Hole Valley. I ask that you consider the following: 1.Adopt a schedule and deadline for the 10 Year Workforce Housing Action Plan. Please involve the local housing organizations and key stakeholders in the conversation to work towards an effective and strategic action plan. 2.Continue to commit to wildlife with developments that integrate appropriately so as not to degrade habitat and key wildlife connecting corridors. Government agencies, non-profit housing organizations, and habitat biologists should work together to devise plans that are designed accordingly. Zoning alone will not solve our wildlife and housing problems. All stakeholders need to be at the table for a workable solution. 3.Commit to as strong a balance for worker housing and home ownership opportunities in the Town of Jackson as for wildlife considerations. It is critical that this plan addresses a vision and a strategic plan for community housing. A well planned Workforce Housing Action Plan will move us in the right direction and will help to balance wildlife concerns and housing needs. It is imperative that we strive to keep housing affording and subsequently keep residents in the valley who are champions of wildlife and appropriate development. We will build more depth in our community as a whole if the plan takes into consideration the people who care about the future of Jackson and its surroundings. Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
4/21/2011	Geraci, Carrie Cultural Council of JH	Thank you for your diligent work on the Comprehensive Plan and for taking the time to consider our request. The public art project started under the Center of Wonder with support from board members: Sophie Craighead, Gary and Veronica Silberberg, Erin Dann, Cindee George, Susan Thulin and Brot Coburn. The Public Art Initiative continues to have broad community support as a project of the Cultural Council of Jackson Hole and represents countless volunteer hours of the Public Art Taskforce and significant private investment. We are actively administering projects for the Town, County, pathways and the museum. Community organizations supporting our efforts include the airport, the Chamber of Commerce, the Center for the Arts and the Community Foundation of Jackson Hole. Our mission is to build a public art program that celebrates our unique cultural, historical and environmental heritage and increases public access to the arts. We collaborate with public entities and private organizations to: increase permanent and temporary public art and to provide education for residents and visitors that encourages investment in our creative economy. Funding from the Wyoming Arts Council and Cultural Trust Fund will support: hiring a conservator to identify, document and create a conservation plan for our existing public art collection, establishing voluntary guidelines for integrating public art into capital improvement projects, a policy for accepting donations of art and developing a website, modeled after Philadelphia's Museum without Walls project, that will host an interactive map of public art, increasing access and education. Your support for these grants will help us continue to leverage private investment in the program. A public art program will have a positive impact on the economy. Public art animates public space making it more attractive for residents, tourists and a creative workforce. Creative professionals help our local economies be more competitive in a global marketplace and add to the quality of life. Cultural tourists tend to stay longer and spend more, investing in arts and culture events and purchasing original art. These dollars will sustain and grow Jackson Hole's creative economy generating revenue for our local and state governments. Jackson Hole is home to nearly 200 non-profits, 75 of which have a strong relation to the arts. These organizations employ hundreds of people, while their events and programs serve tens of thousands and help bring visitors to the valley during shoulder seasons. Their boards, constituents and donors represent a large portion of the population. It is hard to find a voter in Teton County who does not have some connection to the arts. Public art is the practice of commissioning artists to create artwork that reinforces community identity and enhances the places where we live, work and play. Trends in public art include: commissioning temporary installations, building a collection of permanent public sculpture, integrating the work of artists into landscapes, streetscapes or architecture, using public art to promote cultural tourism, and integrating arts and cultural activities into community plans. While the environment drew us here, the arts are the fabric that binds our community. Your support will increase community access to the arts and develop an amenity that is both educational and meaningful, and inspires for generations to come. I hope you will support us in our efforts to secure this important funding. Thank you for your consideration.
4/21/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	Thank you for reconsidering capping growth. I think it is unfortunately something that must be done to preven the valley from becoming indistinguishable frm every other spawled mountain town. Thank you also for reconsidering nodes, which I think offer a good compromise between offering affordable housing for the town's workforce while still avoiding sprawling into the open space that gives the town it's character.

Date	Name	Comment
4/20/2011	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	Getting housing right is one of the biggest challenges you have with the Comprehensive Plan. Please keep the following in mind: 1.The root cause of the County's housing problem is price. Home prices are driven by national trends and are de-linked from local incomes. The financial crisis has reduced the gap some, but it remains and it will grow. 2.A consequence of the crisis will exacerbate this gap: Revised mortgage lending rules will require buyers to put up much higher down-payments and have higher incomes for a given loan size. It will be much tougher to qualify for a loan, including for deed restricted homes. 3.As a result, the cost of providing an affordable home will go up. Please make the Plan require explicit funding sources for commitments to provide affordable housing. This is fair for the taxpayer. It also is fair for those workers in the County who hope to benefit from affordable housing. Don't give people false hopes or expectations you cannot deliver. Your fellow elected representatives in Washington are grappling with exactly this problem: How to fund entitlements that were promised without adequate allowance for rising costs? Don't make their mistake. Affordable workforce housing is an essential part of our community. Please support it in an honest, sustainable way by identifying adequate funding and aligning commitments with our resources.
4/20/2011	Heine, Daniel Interested Public	This entire comp plan is a never ending bad joke, Jackson Hole lost its way long ago. Stop sending me this spam!
4/19/2011	Viehman, David Interested Public	We should commend our elected officials for the diligence and openness they are devoting to the comprehensive plan. These planning processes always are arduous and contentious, and they are prone to being influenced by only the few who spend many hours attending meetings. But the decisions the Council and Commissioners are making reflect a balanced approach that considers everyone. Their decisions are both protecting open spaces and wildlife and providing places for people to live. No one makes plans to fail but many communities fail to plan. While our elected officials are placing a priority on protecting open spaces and wildlife habitat, they also are making equally important decisions to steer growth to defined nodes. They realize a plan that avoids sprawl by directing growth to concentrated areas also protects open spaces and important habitat. This type of a plan also helps with other important goals like workforce housing and transit service. If you are unable to attend planning meetings, your voice can still be heard. Go to the county's web site and make a comment to support a comprehensive plan that is truly comprehensive. Support a plan that avoids sprawl and steers growth away from important open spaces.
4/19/2011	Manning, Richard, A. Jr. Interested Public	A days notice? Really?!?!
4/19/2011	Silcox, Jeremy Interested Public	I have been a Teton County resident for 20 years and have worked for 17 of those years as an employee of Teton Youth and Family Services. I have been awaiting selection for affordable housing for the past five years now and am hopeful that this community will continue to support and build affordable housing for the people that provide the most essential of support services for this community. I am glad that efforts have been and continue to be made in this area and hope that we will continue to recognize the value of affordable housing in this community. I am in support of the continuing effort to define and implement a Comprehensive 10-year Workforce Housing Action Plan.
4/19/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	If wildlife, character & growth/build-out are the major plan tenets: Nodes, wildlife winter habitat preservation & lodging [visitors] & resident population/accommodations caps therefore become the mandates.
4/19/2011	Levy, Robbin Interested Public	I support the recent decisions made by the elected officials in their review of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. I believe their work serves to protect the shared values of our community and the vision we have for our future. The perception that the electeds are ignoring the will of the public, expressed over the last several years of process, is regrettable and, I believe, incorrect. The electeds have the unenviable task of applying reality to our ideals. There is give-and-take and compromise in that reality. There must be flexibility to create tools and strategies to implement our goals. We must understand that the electeds cannot implement a vision for our future within an unrealistic framework, which would ultimately fail to protect those things that we value. Please support our elected officials in making the tough decisions.

Date	Name	Comment
4/19/2011	DesGouttes, Yves Interested Public	I think we share the same concerns . The militant i.e.: Jackson Alliance, Historic Jackson, Rich Bloom et al. are vociferous but contrary to what they claim they do not represent any majority. Their egoism is indecent. If their ideas were followed this County would become a sad , semi-empty place where the rich would come for 1 month a year. We must learn from this most serious economic crisis that the County has experienced since the mid-1980's. Tourism and construction are not enough. We must diversify our economy and that means make it easier for small firms with low impact activities on the ecology to settle here. That will entail to have a policy of affordable housing which is practically inexistent . The community should grow along the line of creating jobs so that we become real and not tinsel town. While I am writing to you, I am sure you are aware of the increasing suffering by many people who have lost jobs and houses. The problem is such that volunteer organizations are overwhelmed. The local authorities have to step in and help. I have bothered to look at the town's and county's budgets. For all the talks of helping social need ,it is kind of disingenuous because social services have been cut just as much as anything else. What should have happened is that they should not have been cut at all. When I think that the Sheriff department got an increase so did the County Clerk employees it is wrong! So Melissa there is plenty to be concerned about .Please think about the ordinary working folks : the salt of the valley, when you legislate.
4/19/2011	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	I am unable to attend the upcoming April 27 hearing on the Comprehensive ("Comp") Plan. I do, however, want to share my viewpoint with you. Throughout the four-year revision process, the community has spoken through its comments and surveys and made clear that residents want a plan that will not add any more development capacity or build-out beyond the baseline of what is allowed under the current Comp Plan. I urge you to commit to a revised Plan that works within and does not expand the valley's existing development potential. The community has been consistent in telling you that any revisions to the Plan should limit build-out potential; protect our existing neighborhoods; preserve wildlife, wildlife corridors, and open space; and preserve the character of the Town and the valley. There is a definitive amount of existing unused development potential in the Town and County. I urge you NOT to increase and instead set reasonable limits on development potential. Please honor and abide by the will of the citizens who elected you and develop revisions to the Plan that preserve, rather than threaten quality of life, wildlife, and the unique character of our Town and County.
4/19/2011	Soper, Keith Interested Public	I don't see how you can justify your actions to ignore the input and will of the people who participated in the meetings and planning process. A well defined plan will be easier and less costly to administer than one that is ambiguous and open to interpretation by whoever has the most money to spend on lawyers. Your actions should NOT be to privatize gain and socialize loss.

Date	Name	Comment
4/19/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Dear electeds – a few items as Theme 4 has a lot of needed work. First I would hope that you formally accept the Blue Ribbon Panel report on workforce housing. You can do that without having to commit to all of its recommendations. It has a much better structure to base Theme 4 on. The following comments are a simplification that is in the record - which I submitted to the joint planning commissions last May 27. Comprehensive Plan Comments – 5.7.2010 Draft Theme 4: Meet Our Community’s Housing Need Workforce Housing definition page 53: •All of our LDRs and the work of the last years by our community have defined this as housing for our workforce – whether seasonal or year-round. OThis new definition of “all housing occupied by people living in the community year-round regardless of deed restriction or employment.” - is very problematic! Workforce housing is tied to employment period – whether in deed restricted or free market housing units – whether owned or rented – whether seasonal or year-round. Please clarify that workforce housing – is for the workforce. - OThe way this is written – the plan will be directing subsidized efforts to the free market segments, second-home buyers that live here year-round, and also retirees that have moved here. In addition it says NO efforts should be made to accommodate the seasonal workforce. - OYou need to break out the types of workforce housing – season and year-round, rental and ownership, deed restricted ownership, deed restricted affordable, free market – ownership and rental etc. Without this there is no way to tell where governmental efforts are to be focused. - OSee my discussion later on how this focus on workforce housing then achieves secondarily the other goals of social diversity, sense of community and generational continuity that are indented in this Theme. Why This Theme is Addressed and other areas throughout the theme: •The key issue here is that supporting the goal of at least 65% of our workforce living locally will result in the other three bullets being achieved – socioeconomic and demographic diversity, generational continuity and a sense of community. - OIt needs to be clear that the reason we are focusing on the plan is to address workforce housing goals – and that will achieve these other three bulleted goals – not the other way around! - OThe way the Theme is currently written – we are left with whether we should incent or mitigate for retirees, generational continuity – or for our workforce? It is for workforce housing that this theme is addressing – but the other goals of diversity, generational continuity and sense of community will be achieved by this statement of ideal and focus on what we are intervening for through regulation, mitigation, exactions and incentives. - OIt is currently the greatest flaw in this theme – along with the confusion of who is the workforce (retirees and second home owners?) – and differentiating between affordable housing and workforce housing. - OThis is also found in Principle 4.1 – which should be rewritten to focus on workforce housing which then leads to achieving the other three bulleted reasons for this effort. •“Catch-up” – is clearly not something we have talked about since identifying the goal of housing at least 65% of our workforce locally. This is old language and dated thinking from the 2007 Housing Needs Study that predated our establishment of a realistic and achievable goal of no less than 65% of our workforce being housed locally. - OSince we are at 70%-75% plus, and have never dipped below 67% - the discussion has focused on “keeping up”. - OIt is a gigantic leap to now say we want to achieve 100% of our workforce living locally – the financial and regulatory implications of that are simply draconian and unachievable. I would strongly recommend removing all references to “catch-up”. - OAgain this is mentioned under “A Residential Workforce – page 55 – “The community’s goal is to increase the percentage of the workforce living locally, improving the existing situation.” ☐This again is Theme four’s second greatest weakness and will do great harm to our affordable housing efforts if it is included as written. It must be made clear that we will NOT be incenting for a goal above 65% of our workforce living locally - or our collective work over the last number of years will have all gone to waste. You need to clarify that the focus is not falling below 65% - for our workforce – living locally. ☐This is a very important point and I cannot emphasize it enough! •The statistics staff states on page 53 in the first paragraph, are not updated to the reality of the last two plus years where 1,800 workers have been

Date	Name	Comment
		lost in just over a year and housing prices have retreated 40-50% from 2007 highs along with rents, increased vacancies, total houses for sale and distressed sales. OTo be fair in this section you need to direct staff to bring this section current. The Teton County Housing Authority has more current statistics, and possible language, and it is something the Blue Ribbon Panel report addressed.
4/18/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I am sending this again because I see that it was either deleted or ignored in public comment. One Lady and Gentlemen, I would like to alert you to the fact that what is being printed in your advertisements in the newspaper is not what is being discussed and concluded in the "JIM" meetings regarding the comprehensive plan. I base this on the fact that I have sat through everyone of the Comprehensive Plan "JIM" meetings and listened to the audio twice, thinking perhaps my comprehension of the English language was lacking. I have the greatest respect for Charlotte Reynolds, the county's public relations manager, but I would caution you to have her print the facts of the meetings and not the watered down version of them. We, the valley residents have been duped by elected officials before. It would be foolish to think that because we are all tired of the process we can be bulldozed over.
4/18/2011	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	I, too, am exceedingly disappointed and disturbed by the recent decisions, taken by you, the County Commission, the Town Mayor and the Town Council, to exclude the idea of limiting growth to the existing entitlements, to remove the inclusion of build out numbers and to eliminate consideration of cumulative impacts as a strong, central policy. The public has made it's desires clear. It wants both limited growth and predictability. To remove these considerations from the Comp Plan is to eviscerate any possibility for predictability. Clearly, predictability is necessary to understand and plan for the infrastructure needs of the community, in addition to understanding where we are headed. It is foolhardy to disregard the cumulative impacts of growth and development. This is one valley. Any development decisions made in one part of our community have real, long lasting effects on the rest of the community. It will not be possible to protect our ecosystem, our wildlife or our community character without a fact based system in place to monitor continuing development and to alter that development based on the information provided by the monitoring. This concept must be included as an integral part of the Comp Plan, not as an addition decided upon at a later date. Additionally, we need to look at the whole picture, to consider not just the location of the development, but also the type, the amount and the rate. What we have in existing entitlements is sobering enough as it is.....a potential doubling of everything we already have on the ground! The idea of even considering going beyond that is dismaying! How can it be "unreasonable" to limit growth beyond what we already are bound to have? Not limiting growth is what seems unreasonable! Apparently, you, the electeds, are considering just that... Not limiting growth. Unlimited growth is a recipe for disaster. For one thing, the economic viability of this valley depends in large part on our wildlife and our vistas. People won't be coming here to look at our buildings! Without predictability, without limited growth, without incorporating the best science available regarding wildlife viability into our development decisions, the possibilities for protecting and preserving our presently abundant wildlife, our fabulous scenic vistas and our rural character are dismal. I urge you to re-consider these decisions and thus restore the confidence the people of this community have in this process and have in you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/18/2011	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	As part of the Conservation Alliance’s work to ensure responsible land stewardship in Jackson Hole, we are writing with regard to the upcoming JIM workshops on April 20, 22 and 27. Throughout the joint planning commission review, the Conservation Alliance submitted extensive comments on the topics of community character, workforce housing and the economy, all of which are already included in the summaries of public comment. With that in mind, below is a brief outline of key points we hope that you consider as you discuss these topics. Additionally, as you give direction to planning staff for the rewrite, the Conservation Alliance is committed to providing specific recommendations on policy language as this process progresses. Growth Management and Smart Growth as an Overarching Element On March 25, as a whole, you gave direction to staff to remove language regarding regulatory limits to growth in the new Comprehensive Plan. As suggested by the facilitator at that workshop, this action will have profound implications for the way that all of the chapters will be rewritten – including the topics you are scheduled to discuss during your next three workshops. While the Conservation Alliance appreciates and supports your efforts to steer development into appropriate locations, we have also always advocated for adequately considering the rate of growth, the type of growth, and the overall amount of anticipated growth as part of planning in Teton County. We will continue to advocate for a more complete approach to growth management to be incorporated into Theme Two, “Managing Growth Responsibly,” and other relevant policies throughout the new plan. Community Character Following are key points of discussion that relate to community character: • Please clarify if the new plan will now be rewritten in a way to reinstate a community character framework as a foundation for new land development regulations. Only recently has the broad topic of community character been reinstated into the planning process as a key point of discussion. (Unlike our current plan, it has not been a “theme” or defining framework for the entire draft planning process. Our current plan states, “Jackson and Teton County hereby formulate a land development regulatory system which protects the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Teton County by responding to the components of community character.”) • Related to the implementation of the new plan, please clarify how “community character” concepts of the Themes and Policies portion of the new plan will be linked to the “character district maps.” Will your discussions on April 20 provide the background to incorporate more narrative about how the character districts will function as part of a new plan? This is an important outstanding question and it is essential to have additional clarification before you finalize your discussions. • In respect to the legacy of conservation that has long defined Jackson Hole, the Conservation Alliance respectfully requests that you give direction to place a greater emphasis on permanently conserved lands as a defining element of community character in the new plan. Our existing plan places strong emphasis on the role of the natural environment in shaping community character, preserving rural character, and protecting a small town atmosphere. We hope that the new plan does the same, by not only addressing community character in terms of the built environment (which is more specifically addressed in the staff report), but also by further emphasizing the natural environment. The Conservation Alliance commits to providing specific recommendations for policy language on how this emphasis can be incorporated in a new draft. Workforce Housing Following are key points that relate to workforce housing: • The Conservation Alliance supports community efforts to secure housing for our local workforce, close to the workplace, as a core component of long-term strategic land use. From a land-use planning perspective, and given our community’s ability to learn lessons from past development proposals, we believe predictability will be a vital component of affordable housing programs in the future. We respectfully request that the existing chapter on housing be significantly reworked to better distinguish between affordable, deed-restricted housing and workforce housing, and their associated policies. Specifically, definitions and policies should be reworked to clarify when policies are meant to address workforce housing versus affordable housing. Without these clear definitions, this chapter will not provide the necessary predictability that the community has requested. To provide an example, Policy 4.3c states, “Provide additional incentives for the provision of workforce housing” and Policy 4.2c states, “Remove regulatory barriers that prevent the provision of workforce housing.” However, the workforce housing definition that is provided on page 53, “workforce housing means all housing occupied by people living in the community year-round regardless of deed restriction or employment,” essentially defines this type of housing as nearly any form of housing, including market rate housing. Smaller, free-market homes do not always function as accessible, affordable homes for the workforce; this has been demonstrated in a number of resort communities like Jackson Hole. To be strategic in the long term, more emphasis should be placed on adequate mitigation rates to supply deed-restricted units. Economy Following are key points that relate to economy:

Date	Name	Comment
		As we mentioned at the beginning of this correspondence, the actions you took on March 25 will have considerable implications for all chapters in the new plan, including policies on the economy. The Conservation Alliance fully supports some of the existing language in the current draft. For example, the language in policy 5.2a, which states “The community will seek opportunities within established growth potentials (see Theme 2) to increase the community’s economic capital without decreasing the community’s natural capital.” Also, on page 66, language states, “In order to achieve the community’s overarching goals of stewardship of our wildlife and natural resources, the economy cannot be dependent upon growth and expansion related tourism and real estate development.” We respectfully request that this chapter retain an overarching goal that our economy should not be dependent on population growth. Overall, the Conservation Alliance believes that stewardship of our valley’s irreplaceable wildlife and natural resources is an essential, central economic strategy for creating a long-term sustainable economy. Conclusion The book, “A Place called Jackson Hole: The Historic Resource Study of Grand Teton National Park” includes the following statement: “Conservation, represented by federal agencies such as the Forest Service and Park Service and the philanthropy of John D. Rockefeller Jr., is arguably Jackson Hole’s most important historic theme, because of its impact on the character of this valley.” We believe that Jackson Hole’s legacy of conservation should continue. We encourage you to take the actions necessary to uphold this legacy, and to make our community not only proud of its distinct heritage, but also capable of meeting its responsibilities to future generations. Thank you for considering our comments.
4/16/2011	Chadwick, Kelly Interested Public	My name is Kelly Chadwick and I've been fortunate enough to live in affordable housing since October of 2004. I don't think I would still be in the valley without it. I'm writing to compliment you on the "Principles and Policies" in the affordable housing draft Comp Plan, but encourage to you schedule an adoption deadline for the 10-Year Workforce Housing Action Plan called for in the draft Comp Plan.
4/16/2011	Hoyt, Clay Interested Public	Let your public control the Comprehensive Plan. Hear us. Wilson is overwhelmed with the current growth plans. We presently have 3 office buildings standing mostly empty with another in the plans to be built. These standing empty building prove that the present growth plan is irresponsible. Wilson and the West Bank have more than fulfilled our affordable housing quotas. The increase in the moose, elk and deer motor vehicle deaths is sickening. Please protect the wildlife who have been programmed to migrate our corridors for hundred of years. Please protect us residents, our property and rights. In comparison we have lived here a mere 30 to 60 years. The moose are being funneled down Fall Creek due to the widening of the road and building of retaining walls. After being hit by motor vehicles they die in our yards. Our forests, water flow and marshes are being consumed too. This node action is financially irresponsible, especially in the light of our debit laden economy. STOP. ENOUGH. Please be patient and think through the right growth plan for our needs.

Date	Name	Comment
4/15/2011	Cresswell, Anne JH Community Housing	We respectfully submit the following thoughts for your consideration as you embark upon your review of Chapter Four of the 2011 Comp Plan: Meet our Community's Housing Needs. We reviewed the chapter with the understanding that this is a long range future planning document that consists of a vision and preferred policies with new guidance and strategies to inform future land use decisions; it is not a regulatory document. 1. We believe Chapter Four would benefit from a brief problem description that is cast in the broadest possible terms. Currently, the scope of the problem definition (page 54) is limited to new development and redevelopment ("keeping up" and "catching up"). A more macro definition of the source of the problem would help open the door to additional possibilities for problem solving in the future. At the heart of the problem is a very limited supply of private land available for development. This, coupled with global demand, makes access to affordable housing a significant challenge for our workforce. 2. We believe the planning commissions and planning staffs created four strong housing goals for our community. Additionally, each goal appears to be measurable, though tools will need to be explored that will allow us to monitor our program's ability to keep current with each goal on an annual basis. 3. We would like our community and our electeds to consider using the term Community Housing in lieu of Workforce Housing. Community Housing would be inclusive of all housing occupied by primary residents of our community regardless of whether the unit is restricted or not. Community Housing would include free market housing, permanently restricted ownership housing, employment-based housing as well as rental housing. It would include subsidized and non-subsidized housing as well as housing occupied by full-time and seasonal employees earning their living in Teton County, Wyoming. Community Housing would include retirees, people with special needs, stay at home parents and caregivers who are not paid employees but nonetheless make a significant and meaningful contribution to our community. 4. The strongest recommendation in Chapter Four has unfortunately been relegated to the very end of the chapter and buried as one part of Strategy 4.1: Adopt 010 Year Workforce Housing Action Plan that identifies specific actions the community will take to meet its housing goals. We believe this effort is long overdue and we are happy to avail the resources of our organization, staff and board so that our community can have a coordinated, comprehensive and strategic 10 Year Action Plan for Workforce Housing that capitalizes on the strengths and capacities that all three housing organizations can bring to bear on the issue. To give sufficient weight to this concept, we would like the Action Plan to be introduced at the very beginning of the Comp Plan (Policy 4.1.b). In this light, Policy 4.1.b could be reorganized to read: Create and adapt a 10 year coordinated, comprehensive, and strategic workforce housing action plan. With this reorganization, Chapter Four could be simplified by capturing several of the other actions (currently listed as independent policies) as future tasks to be explored during the creation of a 10 year Action Plan, e.g.: Regulations, incentives and permanent funding opportunities will be explored in an effort to meet stated housing goals. We respectfully request the electeds consider and memorialize a process and a timeframe for creation and adoption of the 10 year plan. 5. Policy 4.1.e: Preserve existing workforce housing stock. We appreciate that this policy has the potential to be a community sensitive strategy. We support language that encourages cautious exploration of this strategy. However, we believe the benefits of the strategy must be thoughtfully considered and balanced against the potential cost and long term liability that could accrue to the tax payers. 6. Principle 4.2: Require that new development mitigate its workforce housing impacts. This Principle would be redundant and could be removed if regulations are a noted component part of a 10 year action plan as suggested above. 7. Principle 4.3: Provide incentives for the preservation and creation of workforce housing. The construction or acquisition of any workforce housing unit, whether rental or ownership, always requires an impressive combination of "subsidies" which include but are not limited to financial, time and commitment of staff, board and elected officials, and commitment and acceptance of neighbors and the larger community. With these subsidies contributed to the creation of each affordable home, incentives should be granted only for permanently restricted workforce housing so that our community wide investment can be protected. In addition, we believe this clarification is important given the more encompassing definition of workforce housing in lieu of more familiar and narrowly defined terms like affordable and attainable housing. 8. Principle 4.4: Utilize funding to provide workforce housing. This effort will be critical to our community's success in ensuring that we have a diverse residential population. However, this Principle would benefit by clarifying that the goal should be to not overburden anyone sector of the community whereas the current text focuses on developers only. A true community-wide solution will be necessary in the future if we hope to significantly address our community-wide problem. 9. While we are previously on record in support of Chapter Four's goal to house 65% of our workforce, we would like to reiterate how essential it is for our community to have a measurable baseline. This baseline gives our community the opportunity to regularly monitor the progress of our various housing programs and adjust our programs so that they can be more responsive to the ever changing needs of our community. It allows us to proactively ramp up or dial back certain programs depending on our ability to successfully hover around 65% and meet the goals of our community

Date	Name	Comment
		housing program. A critical goal of the Action Plan, however, must be to identify a reasonable and affordable tool that will allow our community to annually track this number as well as our program's ability to address the previous four program goals mentioned above. NOTE: We believe a change to the primary indicator is required given the pace (glacial) at which affordable housing efforts can be executed. In lieu of every five years, we feel strongly that we should be able to reliably and affordably measure the percentage of our workforce housed annually. Ideally, this effort could allow us to move away from the incredibly expensive and time intensive legal nexus study that we have relied upon in the past towards a more manageable and affordable annual assessment that can provide us with current data on which we can base critical resource decisions. 10. The first directive under Strategy 4.3: Update Land Development Regulations and the Zoning Maps could be simplified to read: Update regulations and implement incentive programs to reflect outcomes of the 10 Year Workforce Housing Action Plan. Thank you all for your thoughtful consideration of our comments as well as the tremendous commitment you have made to this critical planning process.
4/15/2011	Springer, Kim Interested Public	I'm writing in response to the new watered down changes to the Comprehensive Plan. The recent decision to take out specific build out numbers and goals is in direct opposition to four years of the planning process. I would like to see an emphasis on predictability. I realize numbers are controversial but how else will we know how much development is possible? I cannot support a plan that more than doubles the commercial and residential development that already exists. The Wilson area is full of important wildlife habitat including wetlands, moose habitat and a migration corridor, making it inappropriate for major development, as the new verbiage would allow. I do hope world-renowned hydrologist, Luna Leopold, is incorrect in predicting the town of Wilson will one day be underwater due to the Snake River's path. Our levees have held so far but everyone on the downhill side of the Snake or on the West side of the Snake needs to understand the inherent risks of living here. A minor accident on Highway 22 already plugs up traffic for miles and unfortunately there aren't alternate routes. Wildlife, open spaces, and small town character are the key issues I'd like to see designed for in this plan. The public has spoken many times in support of these key issues. As our elected officials we depend on you to represent us i.e. use all the work and input done thus far on the plan. Let's improve upon the existing plan that has worked quite well for many of us and not leave open-ended growth possibilities.

Date	Name	Comment
4/15/2011	Poole, Steven Interested Public	Gentlemen, I am writing you with great concern that your recent meetings and changes to the draft comp plan are a grave mistake that starts your portion of this review of in a totally wrong direction. The Planning Commission did good work and heard the message that the citizens of this county have repeated in meetings that have spanned years. Wildlife is a priority, Wildlife habitat is a priority. Constraining development must happen NOW. Certain guidelines should be self evident. We will never be able to house everyone who wants to be in Teton County. We will never be able to provide jobs to everyone who wishes to work in Teton County. If we wish to maintain the basic human values that we think make it a special place in Teton County, the time to act is NOW (if it has not already past). The task is not easy. The results will not please everyone. You as our elected officials must listen to what has happened in the multiple arduous meetings that have already sorted these issues into the best wishes of the thousands of public comments. As I have recently witnessed in my efforts to sort out one boondoggle at the county planning level (Poole vs. Daugherty) the rules listed in the guidelines are not followed. The broad language in the titles, headings, and descriptions through to the individual meanings of a word in the text must be defined in such a way as to leave no room for the lawyers to roam. I was very disappointed by the Commissioners response to, "Neighborhood character" and "Reasonable effort" for example. The title of a section can't say one thing and the body of text another unless the document defines the intent as so in the definitions. It is very clear that the citizens think your recent revisions fail to protect wildlife or will allow the option for nodes, even if you say it is in a descriptive section you do not just say "sorry we didn't really mean that" later on. NOW is your chance to have the strength and the courage to have the vision for our future that the citizens of the county have repeatedly asked for, please find those values. I attended the planning meeting that voted out the Node concept as presented in the draft document. The issue was not one only of public concern but also one of the legal framework that would permit the kinds of transfer of development rights that the concept was built on. Please review the minutes from the meeting and discuss the idea with legal counsel. Then come back to me and show me the places in your proposed nodes that are not already overbuilt and do not contain wildlife habitat and wetlands. I feel the in my node, Wilson, you will not find one more development that does not effect these most important values. Private property rights exist for the present residents as well as those wishing to develop. In my recent case, mentioned above, the rights of the existing community were disregarded for a developer who is not even a resident of our community. Finally, I feel strongly that the town officials should not be voting on county issues without representing the entire county voting population. The County Commissioners need to hear the town officials of many aspects of the plan, the town has a great stake in the planning results, but they should not represent my opinion if I cannot vote for them. Thank you for your attention to these concerns and your commitment to serve.

Date	Name	Comment
4/15/2011	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	I am very opposed to the recent decision to reinstate nodes and remove the growth cap. In one swoop, citizens of Teton County have been undermined and overturned after four years of hard work. Many people spent years, months and days at meetings for this process. We were told we were defining our future, making a difference and doing the "right thing". Now I ask our "elected officials" to do the right thing and reverse this decision. Most disturbing facts involving this decision: - March 25th. This meeting was held on the one day of the year when most residents are leaving town for spring break. The largest volume of residents are out of town and completely unaware of this situation. - The Mayor of Jackson and the Town Council. You have got to be kidding me! What are they doing in this process? I have a huge problem with the Mayor of the Town of Jackson and the Town Council being involved with County decisions. They are elected by only town residents and only for issues involving Jackson city limits and not the County! They are not on my ballot for voting so, therefore, I want them out of any decisions involving Teton County. - Serious concern. It is a serious concern when elect-eds are involved in decision making that is not in their jurisdiction. This goes against the basic foundation of our country's Constitution and the founding of our governments, including local government. Can this even be legal? I would like to research the legality of this very disturbing issue. - Lack of peace of mind. We have entrusted our elected officials to uphold the very well-documented will of the community and give us the peace of mind that the entire situation would not unravel on us by one meeting, when only a few adjustments were to be made. This did not happen. After a long winter and in view of the current exhausting economic situation, Teton County residents deserve to go on spring break and not have this reversal sprung on us. This hardly qualifies as a "few tweaks." I certainly hope this decision is reversed.
4/14/2011	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I am writing to express my frustration over the direction of the new comp plan. I attended meetings in the beginning until the nodes were taken out of the formula thinking that part was over. Now I see the nodes are back. The public does not want the nodes, that is clear. Can we get back to the clear direction from the public input. Wildlife first, open spaces, no nodes, cap on development. These are the values that make Jackson great.
4/14/2011	Hawks, Molly Interested Public	I have been a Teton County resident for 21 years and currently live in downtown Wilson. I am wrought with anxiety over the possibility of the reinstated nodes in Wilson and the Teton Village road. The charm and continuity of this little town is what dreams are made of. Having raised two boys in Wilson has been such an amazing experience because of the community character additionally with regards to less traffic, less pollution and the positive attributes to the amount of wild life we experience. With current entitlements, Wilson will already grow to twice the current size which already will be a huge strain on current infrastructure. The Wilson area has critical wetlands, Moose Habitat, and migration corridors that should never be considered for dense development. Nodes in Wilson will ruin the small-town character with increased traffic, more pressure to widen Highway 22, and immeasurable pressure on the Wilson school. When my children were in Wilson school 3 and 6 years ago, the student to teacher ratios were already well above the national average. Wilson already has more deed restricted affordable housing than any similar area in the county and the West Bank has already received the greatest portion of development since the 1994 plan. With similar issues, nodes reinstated at the Aspens location will be equally as devastating. With increased highway traffic and noise pollution, the quality of life for residents as well as wild life will suffer greatly. Please do not reinstate the nodes in Wilson or the village road.

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2011	Van Gelder, Bill Interested Public	I have always considered myself a moderate and felt like the comprehensive plan was heading in the right direction. I have looked upon groups such as Save Historic Jackson Hole and Friends of South Park as in the fringe, pushing a very specific agenda. After watching the public discussion for the past two weeks, since what I view was a complete turn around from the direction the comprehensive plan was heading, I find myself agreeing with those groups more and more. The final straw was a 1/2 page ad in the paper yesterday telling me I was wrong, probably paid with my tax dollars. As are the people telling me I am wrong. The plan needs to cap growth, the plan needs to protect what makes Jackson special, wild life and scenic resources, the plan needs to have an implementable plan to move forward and protect Jackson for generations to come. In my opinion the changes you have made to the plan do not, and need to be reversed.
4/13/2011	Jannotta, Ned Interested Public	I am writing to express my concern that you have veered toward a more development oriented comprehensive plan, despite the overwhelming public support for a "limited" development plan that places wildlife and the preserving open spaces as the primary concern. The Valley simply cannot accommodate the number of residents that your plan envisions without fundamentally altering to the negative our community. I urge you to heed the voice of the broader community, not the limited number of those in development/construction, and create a more conservative plan as it relates to the future of our Valley.
4/13/2011	Wakeman, Polly Interested Public	I am alarmed at the recent decisions made by the Teton County Commissioners, Jackson Town Council, and Mayor regarding the Comprehensive Plan, which are in opposition to the 4 years of planning and the will of the Jackson Hole community. Previous public comment has clearly expressed the desire to limit growth to a predictable maximum buildout set forth in the Plan's Appendix 1. To disregard this will irrevocably damage the small town character, wildlife, and quality of life of the proposed "Nodes". The town of Wilson stands to be especially impacted by this, as well as by the stresses to existing infrastructure, traffic, and pollution caused by such lack of foresight. To reinstate the development Nodes allowing for more than double today's buildout, with no limits to growth is shortsighted and negligent. I implore you to honor the previous years of circumspect planning and return the "Monitoring of Cumulative Human Impacts" on wildlife and human resources language to the Comprehensive Plan, as it is irresponsible to eliminate such an important policy of checks and balances. I also am shocked that "Flexibility" in the comprehensive Plan would replace "Predictability". It is imperative that a concrete and modest growth cap that is less than the doubling of buildout be established. If the goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to represent the wishes of the majority of the residents of Teton County, then you need to listen to us, as well as the special interests whose motives are driven by financial gain, rather than a respect for preserving the unique character of this place we love. Should a few larger landowners' property rights to develop their land supersede the rights of the majority of the county's citizens who wish to limit growth? While a few stand to gain, most of us stand to lose. Please use your position to make this place one you will be proud to have helped preserve.

Date	Name	Comment
4/13/2011	Spence, Kent Interested Public	I am strictly against high density development in Wilson and area. I was sure we already visited this issue and the majority of public opinion was against this. I understand that the commissioners and town officials are seriously discussing this matter again in the light of "land owner rights". Yes, I believe in such rights but I also believe in the rights of the community and those who have long lived in the Wilson area. The Wilson area has critical wetlands, Moose Habitat, and migration corridor that should never be considered for dense development. Dense development in Wilson will ruin the small community character and Jackson Hole will get nothing in return. There will be increased traffic, more pressure to make Highway 22 into more lanes, more noise and degradation of environmentally sensitive lands. Putting thousands of people on dense islands of development in the outlying community only generates more trips to town to work, the grocery store, soccer practice, school etc. Please vote against the move to allow "Nodes" or high density development in Wilson and keep any growth in already dense areas where grocery stores and other services already exist. Thanks for considering my vote on this matter.
4/13/2011	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	I am very dismayed with what is going on with the Comprehensive Plan revision. I am a resident of Wilson and have been involved with this plan from the beginning of this long process. It is hard for me to understand how after 4 years that you, our public officials, have not heard the PUBLIC. Your recent decisions have been in direct opposition to what the public has said is important to us in this plan. The public made it very clear that we want predictability in this plan, which you have decided not to provide. The public made it clear that we are not in favor of nodes and you have reinstated them. Why is it that the planning commissioners heard the public but you have chosen to ignore them and ignore us? I am also very concerned with the fact that the Town Council members are voting on decisions for the County when they have absolutely NO ELECTORAL ACCOUNTABILITY to us! Why are the Mayor and Town Council deciding what happens in Wilson and other areas of the County when we are not allowed to vote for these representatives? They do not represent our views and I am afraid not our best interest. The citizens of Wilson are against higher density than what is currently allowed which is twice what is in Wilson . It makes absolutely no sense to me to put dense development in Wilson so that our citizens are required to make more trips in their cars to town where the majority of jobs and services are. The West Bank and Wilson have received the highest amount of additional density since the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. Wilson is not an appropriate location for increased density now. Wilson has many critical wetlands, critical moose habitat and important migration corridors. It is not appropriate to put high density in Wilson which will increase the stress on our wildlife and wetlands. The public has made clear that wildlife, wetlands and migration corridors are important to our community. I am shocked that the elected officials in our community do not put a greater value on our wildlife and natural resources. The fact that you deleted the "Monitoring of Cumulative Human Impacts" on wildlife and natural resources from the plan is counter to the well documented public will. I understand that this was not a unanimous vote and I ask that you reconsider this ill-advised action and reinstate this in the plan. The people of Wilson want our quality of life preserved. Your voting public would like you to listen!

Date	Name	Comment
4/12/2011	Denny, Chris Interested Public	I'm writing to you as a long-time Jackson resident, local business owner, and concerned citizen, regarding the open hole/vacant lot on the corner of W. Gill and N. Glenwood. Our offices are located immediately adjacent to this property and I have to ask - what in the world is going on over there? A quick survey of the property today shows the entire side of the safety fence has fallen into the 'hole' (on the east side where they've eliminated the sidewalk) and the parking situation on Gill is equally a disaster, due to the barriers taking up part of the east bound lane, essentially turning a two lane road into one lane without any notice or signage. I sit here most everyday day, seeing discouraged pedestrians and drivers not understanding the flow of traffic. It's really a bad scene over here and there really should be no parking allowed on the south side of W. Gill. What's the deal with this property? Hopefully the town is making some money leveraging serious fines against this developer - its just the biggest eyesore for our historic downtown. Regardless, I just wanted to bring to your attention that the fence and barricades need immediate attention. As for the rest of it, hopefully the developer will be filling the hole in this summer and planting grass to cover up the mess they've left behind. I'd appreciate a status of some sort, since this is not only effecting our ability to do business in this neighborhood, it's also a unsightly stain on our beautiful downtown business sector. Thanks for your consideration.
4/12/2011	Falcey, Missy Interested Public	It is difficult for me to express my profound disappointment in your recent decision with regard to the Comp Plan. Your vital stewardship of this valley has been abrogated. Your response to your resident constituency, not commercial constituency, has been ignored. Jackson Hole is unparalleled and we have the opportunity to ensure that it remains unique. Your decision has embraced commonality. Please reconsider your decision and reinstate mandated limits on growth in order to protect our character and our precious wildlife. I endorse limiting growth to the development allowances already established.
4/12/2011	Fennessey, Kelli Interested Public	Please consider adding affordable houses. We have many small units available already. Most people have families etc. When planning the 10-Year Workforce Housing Action Plan please consider building homes with garages and yards. Not apartments and condo.
4/12/2011	Klene, Richard Interested Public	Clearly our electeds have ignored the wishes of the majority of county residents and gone with a hugely pro-development plan that panders to the wishes of folks who want the county to grow, for the purpose of enriching themselves and their business partners. The slogan now is "Grow, Baby, Grow." The lack of constraints on growth, and of serious consideration of its impacts will certainly lead to increased traffic, more animal vehicle collisions, and reductions in the quality of air, water and life in the Valley. Many of the characteristics that brought residents here are already gone, along with a lot of old-time and not-so-old time homeowners. Certainly they will be replaced by wealthy folks looking for a second or third residence, but the values and long-term commitment to the character of the place will be even more drastically and permanently altered. Our "one of a kind" town will be increasingly like another crowded theme park for those who like to visit places that aren't too unlike the rest of the country.

Date	Name	Comment
4/12/2011	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	When the comp plan draft was first released we were astonished that our tax dollars were being wasted on planners who did not understand or appreciate the unique nature of the valley we call home. At that time, with the growth proposed and the high density in sensitive areas, I said we should fire these sad, short-sighted, Colorado imports. With the town meetings they claimed "we listened to your comments", but all the evidence is to the contrary. Those planners have earned dismissal. Send them back to their rocky mountain home. More disappointing is the vote of the elected officials. The cynics said early on that the process was designed to wear down the voters until everyone lost interest. The cynics were right. Our elected officials have shown little regard for the wishes of the community and the need for only the most limited and necessary growth. Clearly it is time for a new county commission. The next election will indeed be interesting. Respectfully (but just barely),
4/12/2011	Womack, Ray Interested Public	Please do all you can to support affordable housing in this valley. My wife Meg and I live in Melody Ranch, and the affordable housing upgrades the place a lot, bringing in young families and children that make it a real neighborhood.
4/11/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	I have attended almost all of the public meetings on the Comp Plan and many of the meetings of the Stakeholders Advisory Group. (STAG) After a desire to protect our wildlife the most common desire I heard was for predictability. It seems many of our citizens believe we would benefit from a Comp Plan that meets this desire, but many of our electeds maintain that we need flexibility not predictability. Why is that? Are the two mutually exclusive? At the simplest level, people want to know what kind of building can be built next to them. How big will it be or how many units will it have? How high will it be? Can it be located to block my views or my sunlight? Business owners have the same questions and also wonder if the building will affect their parking, and access for their customers. Taken to the next level, if we know what can be built on individual lots, we can understand what our community will look like in the future when those lots are built out. This helps us plan for our future. Why do some of our elected officials want to hide what our future will look like? One of the biggest faults of our current Land Development Regulations are the discretionary tools like the PMUD and the PUD-AH that allow our elected official to "horse trade" extra development rights for what they perceive to be public benefit. These alphabet soup projects are almost always controversial and benefit no one except a few lawyers. They have resulted in hotly debated public meetings, tied up planning staff and elected officials, and resulted in several lawsuits. That kind of flexibility doesn't benefit the community. Buyers pay a higher price expecting to get extra development rights. They then have to pay a high cost to have their team present a complicated plan to the electeds. This increases the cost of development which increases the cost of real estate in both the Town and the County, and prices locals out of the market. Let's go back to building smaller buildings that can built by our local trades people, not large projects that require large out of state corporations. We do not like to shout, but so far it seems only Ben Ellis and Paul Vogelheim have heard our request for predictability.

Date	Name	Comment
4/11/2011	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	Listening to the JIM discussions on the comp plan, I'm impressed with the seriousness with which our elected officials are discussing issues and tackling important policy questions. And rightly so. They have taken on the public trust and the duty to work in the public interest. However, I was disappointed by the unrealistic discussion in the March 25 meeting on caps or limits to growth. You could have been listening to a meeting in Anytown, USA where the big planning worry is making sure the buildings look nice. But Jackson is not Anytown. Teton County is one of the few accessible, high mountain habitats and recreation areas on the planet. Its uniqueness will grow in the decades ahead as global warming takes its toll. At the same time, the global population, now 7 billion, will be 9 billion within a generation, and global GDP, now \$60 trillion, will double every 15 years or so. Sure we are now suffering through the aftermath of a financial crisis, but the future is clear: There will be powerful demands to visit, exploit, and buy a piece of Teton County. Any planning caps or limits we choose will be tested like Japan's sea walls in last month's tsunami. If the Plan seeks to control growth through a sequence of short-run checkpoints it will be overwhelmed by the pressure of global demand. The logic of starting the Plan with a robust cap or build-out limit is that this acknowledges that the significant existing development rights in Teton County are a uniquely valuable resource. Limits help to build a culture of husbanding that resource, and making sure that it is used wisely. Limits require tough decisions that recognize trade-offs. Some may call a build-out limit a "scare tactic" approach to planning but it is not. It is simply an honest recognition that this Comprehensive Plan has to take account of the long-term global forces we face. Anything less would be a refusal to accept reality. Commissioners Ellis and Vogelheim have supported development caps as well as mechanisms to monitor and enforce them. I hope they persevere in those efforts and that their fellow elected officials join them.
4/11/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	I'm confused! After over three years of well attended meetings, and hundreds and hundreds of public comments, in the fall of 2008 JHN&G printed the following ad: "The Comprehensive Plan Will Be Responding to Public Comment. What you (the public) said: Wildlife and open space protection is the most important value in the community. Buildout should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation. Growth Rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts of development to natural resources and community infrastructure. Workforce Housing should be provided by commercial development and include a mix of rental and ownership options. Commercial Development potential should be limited with sensitivity to building design, community character, and not exacerbate the workforce housing shortage. South Park should only develop at town density in the northern portion in order to address the workforce housing needs of the community. Plan Format should be more clear, concise, and user friendly." Compare this to the ad (Also paid for by the joint Town/County Comprehensive Plan) in the March 30, 2011 JHN&G. "Meeting Summary for March 24 & 25". The ad reflects discussions from the elected official that essentially reverse the direction of the Comprehensive Plan. This isn't an argument about no development or no growth. Consider the following growth is already entitled and/or approved for future development: Commercial: Town - Already built commercial: 4,576,840 sq. ft.; allowable NEW commercial: 3,436,798 sq. ft. County - Already built commercial: 3,476,829 sq. ft.; County allowable NEW commercial: 3,179,295 sq. ft. And, current Empty Commercial Space is now estimated 40% rate of occupancy. Residential: Town/County current built dwelling units, 9,644; Town/County allowable new dwelling units: 10,000 And now we hear that this is not enough and you want to not limit yourselves to this already doubling of everything as a reasonable constraint to plan within. Simply put, during the last three plus years, public comment has consistently asked for: Predictability, not flexibility; Community Character definition which is clear (not urbanization of Jackson Hole); Cost of growth: infrastructure, roads, sewer, water, traffic, schools, and social services. I am confused. I'm frustrated! I'm beginning to believe that public comment, however well-reasoned, well-researched and well-written has no impact. I'm beginning to believe that it doesn't matter what the issue is, public comment does little to change what the electeds want to do. The Comprehensive Plan will be so complex and unintelligible to the average reader that it will provide cover for any action the electeds want to take. And, this will be the most expensive Comprehensive Plan in the country!

Date	Name	Comment
4/10/2011	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I will keep this short, as I have been on record many times with this same concern. Why are you trying to develop this valley with such detrimental numbers, developments and nodes? It has been very clear from the public input that they don't want to see that. When the rewrite of this plan was undertaken, it was supposed to be a few points of clarification. I was told that Wilson needed a new plan because every time someone wanted to build something it took a variance. So what? That at least gave us a baseline to ask for a variance. The other concern was that it took too much of staff's time. I can't think of anything that could be more time consuming, for staff, officials and the public, than these last three years of intense meetings and desperate outcries to STOP this rampant obsession for build out. I believed that the public had been heard when nodes went away from the plan. Why the reversal? We can still protect wildlife and open space without these massive nodes which will be abused and ruin the character of our valley. Once again, I will say that not everyone has an entitlement to live in Jackson Hole. We can't produce housing for everyone. There have to be caps or we will become like so many other resort areas --- nothing special. After working in the real estate profession here for over 30 years, and having tried hard to participate in a meaningful way to have people understand the intrinsic value of lack of development, I truly believe that less is more. Everyone's values will be better protected by not overrunning us with more and more growth. In fact, what you're proposing will actually harm property values across the board! I'm very disappointed in the direction you are heading after your last meeting. PLEASE rethink that position and listen to what has been put in front of you for the past few years by your electorate.
4/10/2011	Poole, Carol Interested Public	To preserve our highest community values of wildlife, open spaces and small town character – I will not support any plan which more than doubles residential and commercial development. I demand that the plan is predictable and that starts with setting a reasonable – and achievable – end-state of growth that is equal to, or less than, the current doubling they have now thrown out as a reasonable constraint. I demand the nodes only be established if we work to constrain growth to no more than double what we have – and any development potential moved to nodes is achieved by transferring or purchasing of existing rights - thus permanently extinguishing them to achieve permanent open space in important rural areas – that includes the bulk of South Park. I demand that the monitoring of ongoing human impacts on wildlife and natural resources is a critical policy for managing growth and should be reinstated in the plan.
4/9/2011	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	I agree with Brooke Bullinger and others who question why Comisioners reversed direction on the buildout number and nodes. If there was a good reason why public sentiment was ignored, then I haven't seen it. Maybe in the next meeting the Comisioners could reinstate the previous concepts or at least more clearly explain the drastic change. Thank you for listening this time.
4/9/2011	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	I feel that I have been slapped in the face. Four years of attending countless meetings, writing letters, talking with officials, presenting not just opinions but also facts and in one fell swoop, you have wiped out the hard work that the people who live and work here have done. I will not stoop to restate my opinions, obviously they have been ignored. Simply put, growth does not equal quality of life for anyone in Teton County. (or elsewhere in the USA, obviously) We have something special in Teton County....but it looks that we are headed to be "everywhere" land. I am so disappointed in your actions. Leland Christensen attended so many of those meeting with the planning commissioners.....where were you? Nodes, who supported nodes? Certainly not the people living in those areas, only developers. Guest houses? Do you really think we should double the density of a lot from single family to dual...and also, how many "rich" people now use their guest houses for caretakers.....very, very few. Most locals do not want to turn into indentured slaves, which is what most caretaking positions are. You can't state a top number for growth? It would upset the population too much? What are we? Children who do not know what is good for ourselves and our families? We can't handle the truth? Or are we not smart enough to know how we want to live? Four of my employees live in Idaho and have worked for me over 4 years each. Two own houses there, two rent. None would prefer to live on this side of the pass. They love working here but would not choose to live here. They feel that their quality of life is better where they are. (three of them make the drive at 5 am in order to work for me) Good transportation would eliminate a great deal of employee issues without promoting a more than double index for growth in Teton County Wyoming.

Date	Name	Comment
4/8/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Dear electeds – I do believe each of you has the preservation of both our natural resources, and our community and its economy, at the center of your beliefs. I also know that trying to both simplify - but at the same time highlight - direct changes in course that did occur on March 25 via an email alert – had its risks. Believe me it was not what I wanted to do – but I felt that a significant course change had indeed occurred. I was not alone in that view. I admit it also felt a little like “nailing Jell-O to the wall”. That does not mean I doubt your core values – but you need to understand as a collective body it did at least defer - and also seriously call into question – whether you will work within the existing extensive entitlements or not. You have all seen my alert – as I made that transparent to you. I do not feel we really are that far apart – but both “Smart Growth” and the continued dependence on growth is still a core philosophical divide. Instead of what you may see as another “email blast” from me to anyone – please read and consider my following thoughts: Is "Smart Growth" the Ultimate Oxymoron? “Smart growth” is an urban planning and transportation theory that concentrates growth in compact walkable urban centers to avoid sprawl. Smart growth is at the core of the debate in the Comp Plan as its principles portend to achieve the development of vibrant, healthy communities. Premise: Sustainable, unending population growth in a valley (or planet) with finite resources and land area is an oxymoron; no possibility of such "Smart Growth" exists. Argument: Merely concentrating humans and their built environment cannot compensate for the fact that ever-increasing residents and visitors ultimately require ever-increasing resources, infrastructure and energy inputs. The view that high-density human settlement protects our wildlife, public lands, agricultural/ranch lands or open space, in the long run, is illusory: all are increasingly stressed by the demands of burgeoning residents and visitors in "high-density" areas. Long-term solutions require policies that stabilize population and create permanent open space. Logically, Smart Growth alone will not create or maintain sustainable communities. When in-fill projects and high-density development reaches capacity, sprawl will resume unless population stabilizes and open space has been permanently preserved. Smart Growth masquerades as the ethically more responsible choice, while ignoring the reality that more people use and over-use natural resources and public lands, whether they are physically located inside or outside the higher density area. Ultimately, it only slows the pace of sprawl and obscures real, workable solutions offered by population stabilization combined with permanent open space preservation. Comp Plan Realities: We have 30 to 40 years – or more - of growth already entitled according to Appendix I. That provides ample time to adjust ongoing, permitted growth to create a sustainable, stable population within existing parameters to achieve community goals. It makes no sense to allow additive growth when we are not even close to buildout. Now is the time to recognize real limits and put appropriate tools in place so we don't reach capacity with community needs unmet. We need to acknowledge that the Comp Plan is a de facto cap on the number of buildings and the mix of development. This indirectly controls population. Until you address the community mandate to work within the extensive existing entitlements, you will find little support for the process and our community will lose faith in its own government. The prospect that we collectively can achieve workforce housing and fiscal balance within a viable and stable economy – while maintaining our wildlife, open space, natural resources and small town rural character – will continue to recede. As an individual trained in free market capitalism who also has two degrees in ecology and environmental studies – I know communities develop more sustainably when they create jobs, income and savings by doing more with what they have. This is especially true with workforce housing and governmental income. True Smart communities recognize constraints and determine a desired population. Their economy develops, the environment stays healthy and the valley remains a place people want to live and others want to visit. This is better – not always and certainly not forever – bigger. Possible Solutions: Growth Management – what many of us want •In the Themes and Principals section - commit to work within the extensive existing overall base residential and commercial zoning and entitlements collectively within – and between (shifting) - the Town and County to achieve community goals. Status: postponed till after the character district discussions. •State that we desire a viable community of no more than 40,000 residents – and an economy that is not dependant on population growth. Status: collectively you did not accept this approach. •Add a statement that both the pattern of growth - AND our resident and effective (includes visitors in our hotels and campgrounds) population has on-site AND off-site impacts on wildlife, natural resources and community character. Status: this has been partially addressed - but not directly. Only by addressing both our population (via buildout) AND our pattern of growth - can the community be assured of achieving its greatest community values of wildlife, open space and community character. Status: this has been deferred until after the character district discussions. •“Adaptive management” approaches should be considered – to measure achievement of our goals on reinvestment and revitalization, workforce housing ratios, wildlife and natural resource impacts, transportation systems, and fiscal balance of income versus expenses. Status: collectively you did

Date	Name	Comment
		not accept this approach. Pattern of Growth – what many of us want •That the preservation of permanent open space is much preferred over temporary zoning – thus permanent open space should be the primary goal of any shifting of development rights. Status: this was addressed. •That development potential in important rural areas is thoughtfully either extinguished through the purchase of those rights – or transferred to appropriate receiving areas. Status: this was addressed. •Receiving areas should be evaluated not only on existing infrastructure – but also on the natural and scenic values on those receiving areas and potential impact to existing neighborhood character. Status: I assume this will be discussed in the upcoming meeting on Character. Impacts of Growth – what many of us want •Reinstate at the policy level that measuring cumulative impacts of human activities on wildlife and natural resources should both be collected, and also be one of the foundations that informs policy decisions on future growth. Status: the policy was removed while the indicators remained. This should be revisited. Cost of Growth – what many of us want •Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct incremental impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. Status: I assume this will be discussed at one of the upcoming meetings probably under Economy.
4/8/2011	Trachtenberg, Barbara Interested Public	I am extremely disappointed in my elected officials and worried about the future of my home—to me the beautiful spot in the US. The Comprehensive Plan should and must protect our neighborhoods, valley and precious wildlife from unpredictable growth. Please listen to your community.
4/8/2011	Trachtenberg, Barbara Interested Public	Mark [Barron], Please be a voice for the community that elected you, and put limits on the Comprehensive Plan. This could be a mistake that will never be rectified.
4/7/2011	Unfried, Amy Interested Public	I was horrified to learn that after all the meetings, all the countless hours of effort put into the process by planners, electeds, and concerned citizens, all the progress that had been made on developing a plan that everybody could live with has been undone in a stroke. There has to be a limit on growth, and it should NOT be more than double the current amount of development and population in the valley. There have to be protections for wildlife, which was the number one value that the community identified in public meetings early in the process. Wilson must not be allowed to grow to five times its current size. There has to be respect for the property rights of small landowners who hope to live in a community much like the one they bought into, not just the rights of the big landowners wanting to maximize when they sell out. There has to be predictability, which means there have to be measurable standards. The community has been speaking throughout this process, and it seemed that it had been heard. Now it appears that although it may have been heard, it is being ignored. Please reinstate all those things that you've just taken out.
4/7/2011	Unfried, Steve Interested Public	We were shocked and dismayed to learn that our elected officials have reversed years of progress toward a reasonable comprehensive plan that would have preserved our unique wildlife and channelled future growth in the least harmful way. There is already too much potential buildout authorized; the existing limits should not have been disregarded after all the discussion thus far. Concentrating future growth where it will create the least traffic and disturbance of wildlife is essential to maintaining our community character and attractiveness to visitors, who continue to be a mainstay of our local economy, therefore reinstating excessive growth at various "nodes" around the county is counterproductive. We continue to be very concerned that the new plan will not provide enough predictability to guide its implementation over the years ahead. It needs serious benchmarks, limits and monitoring to be effective. We are uniquely blessed with the most intact temperate ecosystem in North America, which has been the wellspring of our community and economy for some time. Now is not the time for any further encroachment on it.

Date	Name	Comment
4/7/2011	Salter, Andy Interested Public	Over the past years and over the course of numerous public meetings, valley citizens and organizations have repeatedly and consistently urged you to commit to revisions to the Comprehensive Plan that will preserve the character of our community, protect the natural resources and wildlife of our valley, retain and not exceed the limits of the valley's existing development potential, and provide some certainty with regard to the scale and locations of future developments within the County. The Comprehensive Plan is perhaps the key document that articulates the community's vision for future development in the Town and County. While I could not attend your March 25 meeting, I was distressed to read that you have tentatively decided to remove constraints on future growth and development in our community. I strongly urge you to reconsider those tentative decisions. Growth within the Town and County must be managed responsibly and to do that, the revised Comprehensive Plan needs to provide clear direction for the future and provide citizens with the assurance that there are reasonable limits on future development in our community. I urge you to commit to a revised Comprehensive Plan which works within and does not expand the valley's existing development potential. I understood that one of the main reasons for revising the current Comprehensive Plan was to make it more predictable. The community has been remarkably consistent in its public comments during the revision process that any revisions to the Comprehensive Plan should limit build-out potential; protect our existing neighborhoods; preserve wildlife, wildlife corridors, and open space; and preserve the character of the Town and the valley. There is a definitive amount of existing unused development potential in the Town and County. I urge you not to increase, and instead to set reasonable limits on that development potential. The three prior draft revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, written by the initial consultant in 2008, the Planning Staff in 2009, and the joint work of the Town and County Planning Commissions more recently, all properly incorporated public input and mandated limits on future growth to preserve the existing character of our community. The referendum on the Downtown Redevelopment District in 2003, the Lake Research Partners survey of Teton County voters in 2007, and the University of Wyoming survey of Teton County voters in 2008 all establish that the vast majority of citizens of the Town and County find it critically important that community character be preserved. The wildlife and abundant natural resources in our Town and County makes ours a unique community. Impacts on those resources should be minimized by the revisions to the Comprehensive Plan. Predictability regarding land use decisions should be increased. The Comprehensive Plan is critically important to shape and guide development patterns that leave a legacy for generations to come. Your March 25 vote ignored community input and disregarded the input of your own consultants and professional planning staff. The "flexibility" some of you seek will remove the predictability and reasonable constraints on development that we should expect to see in the plan. The character of our community is defined by appropriately scaled developments, considerable open space, and abundant wildlife. These natural resources of our community must be preserved and protected. Please honor and abide by the will of the citizens who elected you and develop revisions to the Comprehensive Plan that preserve, rather than threaten, the economy, quality of life, and character of our Town and County.
4/4/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I would like to alert you to the fact that what is being printed in your advertisements in the newspaper is not what is being discussed and concluded in the "JIM" meetings regarding the comprehensive plan. I base this on the fact that I have sat through everyone of the Comprehensive Plan "JIM" meetings and listened to the audio twice, thinking perhaps my comprehension of the English language was lacking. I have the greatest respect for Charlotte Reynolds, the county's public relations manager, but I would caution you to have her print the facts of the meetings and not the watered down version of them. We, the valley residents have been duped by elected officials before. It would be foolish to think that because we are all tired of the process we can be bulldozed over.
4/4/2011	Parker, Jon Interested Public	Unbelievable! After more than three years, holding more than 40 meetings, paying professional consultants , and lots of public input, you have gone against all of the previous drafts to come up with a new plan that allows virtually unlimited future growth. This is such a sham that you could have saved us all a lot of work and grief if you had just done what you were going to do anyway. Did you listen to anyone beside the developers?

Date	Name	Comment
4/2/2011	Thomas, Shirley & Dan Interested Public	Thank you to all for continuing to work on our Comprehensive Plan. However, we believe you are now heading in the wrong direction on a number of issues. We MUST continue the monitoring of ongoing human impacts on wildlife and natural resources. This is a critical policy for managing growth and should be reinstated in the plan. We MUST continue to preserve our highest community values of wildlife, open spaces and small town character. We will not support any plan which more than doubles residential and commercial development. The plan MUST be predictable & MUST set a reasonable and achievable end state of growth that is equal to, or less than, the current doubling. If we re-establish the nodes, we need work to constrain growth to no more than double what we have. The development potential moved to nodes should be achieved by transferring or purchasing of existing rights. We MUST permanently designate open space in important rural areas, that includes the bulk of South Park. We will continue to follow the plan progression & hope you will take our comments into consideration.
4/1/2011	Whissel, Fred Interested Public	As you know, Rich can occasionally go off the deep end, when conversing about the comprehensive plan – but only because he is so dedicated to getting it right. In this case, having read his attached comments, I have to share his concerns. If what Rich describes is true, then you certainly may be making an unforgiveable mistake, and the subsequent huge increase in allowed development will forever destroy the very thing that makes Teton County great. For what? A few tax dollars? Please be certain to fully consider both the short-term and the long-term consequences of your impending decision, and choose the course that will achieve the greatest good for the greatest number, both now and in the future. I have only one vote, but I have a great propensity to write letters and to draw editorial cartoons when I feel the need justifies the means. This does.
4/1/2011	Stokes, S. Interested Public	To preserve community values of wildlife, open spaces, & small town character – We will not support any plan which significantly increases residential and/or commercial development.
4/1/2011	Long, Katsey Interested Public	I would like to make note that the recent vote on the comp plan by the Co Commissioners be revisited since it goes against what the people, consultants and others have said is too much. Please stay within the bounds of what has been agreed upon by the majority, not the few.
4/1/2011	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Your recent changes to the Comprehensive Master Plan in JH are very disappointing. In view of the overwhelming community outcry for eliminating nodes and a growth cap in the numerous public meetings that started this process several years ago, your decision seems to make a mockery of the good citizens who made the effort to attend the meetings. Many, many people studied the situation, made informed comments and were led to believe that they had made a significant contribution. Even the Planning Commission recognized the contributions of the many people who live here and generally honored their comments. Since we can double under the existing development plan, there is plenty of room for economic growth at hand. Abandoning the cap on growth will not have anything to do with the Depression that grips our area at this time. Why should citizens take an interest in their community going forward? And I object to the Town Councilmen having so much influence in the County's Plan. County residents never voted for or against them.

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	AS ALWAYS – FEEL FREE TO FORWARD – Neighborhood networks - please consider forwarding all or portions of this alert to your neighborhoods. Comprehensive Plan Alert - I will cut to the chase – last week the public trust was severely violated. The final phase of the comprehensive plan is now before the only party that has the legal authority to change and finalize the plan – the Teton County Commissioners, Town of Jackson Mayor and Town Council. Although much good work has been maintained and reaffirmed – I am reactivating the South Park Neighbors alerts because last week the joint electeds went against the overwhelming community will and made devastating amendments to the plan that threaten our economy, quality of life, community character, likely worsen our workforce housing shortages and further degrade our natural resources and wildlife values. In a nutshell the largest negative changes in the plan last Friday were: • A GREATER than DOUBLING of everything on the ground today - The joint electeds in basically a 8-2 “vote” (Ben Ellis and Paul Vogelheim petitioned to uphold the community desires and Hank Phibbs found a way to modestly address the community will) – said that limiting future development to no more than double everything you already see in the valley – homes, commercial, institution facilities, traffic - was not a reasonable limit to plan within. Instead they implied they were willing to more than double everything – with basically no limits on how much upzoning could be possible. This unlimited approach to try to grow oneself out of growth induced problems is unacceptable and goes against all three drafts of the plan including: the initial consultant draft in 2008, the professional planning staff draft of April 2009 – and after a year of work (41 meetings) by the joint volunteer Town/County planning commissions – their certified draft of September 2010. This reversal in effect not only goes against the community will – but also their own consultants, professional planning staff and the joint planning commissions! •The approved planning commission version’s (9/10) “statement of ideal” on managing growth stated: “Limit growth to established development allowances while encouraging preservation of open spaces and existing neighborhoods.” – has now effectively been modified to the published meeting summary this week of (emphasis added): •“This plan must protect wildlife resources and our unique landscape, while ensuring private property rights, continuing to support reasonable land uses and minimizing the effects of population growth on community character. •A potential buildout number will be calculated following discussions and decisions about the appropriate character throughout the community in order to analyze future development patterns.” •So what does this mean – that the potential amount of growth does not matter; that only shifting some of its location is a concern. That your input – staff’s input – the joint planning commissions input – over the last four years did not matter. That even after all the decisions are made and the increased buildout is recalculated – there is no commitment to do anything other than continue to direct additional future development potential - with no end in sight. •They reinstated the NODES in Wilson, Aspens, NW South Park, Teton Village, Hoback and Jackson – with much better – yet still incomplete language - that this would only occur by the transferring of existing entitlements from important rural lands. Given the reversal of trying to work within the tremendous existing development potential – some 10,000 additional homes (think 20 Rafter J subdivisions) and nearly seven million square feet of new commercial (visualize 132 new Smiths) scattered through the nodes and valley – the nodes appear again to contain substantial additive growth. To be clear I support the redirecting of existing entitlements to compact centers – as long as it achieves the protection of permanent open space and is done within our overall substantial existing development potential. On Friday this intent was made very unclear given the lack of commitment to honor community concerns on working within overall existing entitlements. •They deleted the “MONITORING OF CUMULATIVE HUMAN IMPACTS” on wildlife and natural resources - they stripped this approved policy in its entirety – so that no policy decisions will have any linkage to the wildlife and natural resource impacts that have already occurred via previous decisions. They said it is not important to monitor human impacts on wildlife and natural resources at the “policy level” – and have relegated it to a few “indicators” that they may monitor. This was a close split “vote” so can be reinstated if the community weighs in. •Deemphasized the prioritizing of PREDICTABILITY – The language of the plan continues to get watered down – and the most fundamental predictable metric – knowing just how much future development will be allowed – has been removed in its entirety until all the decisions are completed. Even then the intent appears to continue to grow after that is reached - with no end contemplated. Several of the electeds said they want “flexibility” above predictability - directly contradicting the will of the community.

NOTE: Remember the current slowdown in construction and the significant vacancies and foreclosures are not tied directly to the comp plan. Millions of square feet of new commercial and thousands of homes could start construction tomorrow under current entitlements. Although the plan will effectively direct the next several decades of growth – the burst housing bubble, surplus of existing commercial and rentals and the still stuck credit markets – on a global scale – have caused new development to slow to a crawl – not the arduous plan process.

ACTION ITEMS:

The next three weeks will make or break the plan! A number of electeds have stated they are willing to revisit and/or clarify these recent decisions – but they need the weary community to weigh back in. Do that as you see fit – but make your positions and concerns known.

- Privately you can do that individually with any, or all, of the ten electeds representatives in the Town and County. I have listed their names and public email address below. Have a private conversation, give them a call, or send them a private email.

- I would ask in addition for you to again submit a formal comment on these concerns to our decision makers - and make it part of the public record.
- It can be as short as: To preserve our highest community values of wildlife, open spaces and small town character – I will not support any plan which more than doubles residential and commercial development.
- Demand that the plan is predictable and that starts with setting a reasonable – and achievable – end-state of growth that is equal to, or less than, the current doubling they have now thrown out as a reasonable constraint.
- Demand the nodes only be established if we work to constrain growth to no more than double what we have – and any development potential moved to nodes is achieved by transferring or purchasing of existing rights - thus permanently extinguishing them to achieve permanent open space in important rural areas – that includes the bulk of South Park.
- Demand that the monitoring of ongoing human impacts on wildlife and natural resources is a critical policy for managing growth and should be reinstated in the plan.

- Email comments to: feedback@jacksontetonplan.com
- Copy the County Commissioners at - commissioners@tetonwyo.org
- and the Mayor and Jackson Town Council at - electedofficials@ci.jackson.wy.us

Keep it short – make it long – but please get it done.

Write a 'Letter to the Editor': Jackson Hole News & Guide

The Jackson Hole News and Guide is an extremely important venue for communication – please consider writing a letter. Generally cut off for the Wednesday paper is 5pm Monday afternoon. They will need your name, how you might want to be identified (e.g. Town of Jackson), and contact information if they want to verify you actually are who you say you are – can be email or phone.

Thomas Dewell and Angus M. Thuermer Jr., editors - editor@jhnewsandguide.com
800 word maximum for a "Guest Shot", but if well written the editors will fudge on that. Otherwise 400 words for letters.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

- Web link to the Comprehensive plan - <http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/>
- Also available on the website are all of the presentation materials and audio recordings from the last five meetings – plus the upcoming schedule.

DECISION MAKERS PERSONAL CONTACT INFORMATION:

- Teton Board of County Commissioners
- Ben Ellis, Chair - benellis@22wy.net
 - Hank Phibbs - plawoffice@cs.com

Date

Name

Comment

- Andy Schwartz - aschwartz@bresnan.net
- Paul Vogelheim - pd@vogelheim.com
- Paul Perry - pperry@tetonwyo.org
- Email comments to all Commissioners at: commissioners@tetonwyo.org
- Voice mails can be left at 733-8094

Mayor, Town of Jackson

- Mark Barron - mbarron@ci.jackson.wy.us

Jackson Town Council

- Bob Lenz - blenz@ci.jackson.wy.us
- Greg Miles - gmiles@ci.jackson.wy.us
- Mark Obringer - mobringer@ci.jackson.wy.us
- Melissa Turley - mturley@ci.jackson.wy.us
- Email comments to all Town elected officials at: electedofficials@ci.jackson.wy.us

Your South Park Neighbor - Rich Bloom, cell weekdays 690-5273

P.S. I promise to only send alerts no more often than once per week. If you are getting this through forwarding and would like to receive direct emails – just let me know. Our email list is now over 410 neighbor (and County) households strong.

“[The Comp Plan] will set in motion development patterns that will leave a legacy for the rest of our lives and the rest of our kids’ lives. And I think it’s important to do the planning within the entitlements and implications that are on the ground today....

Without designing within the potential as listed in Appendix I, or with a percentage less than that so that we have the ability to move forward, I think that we would be making a grave mistake....

I think we would be ignoring what is a strong comment by the community that predictability is tied to this concept. And I think we would not be planning as well as we could by using Appendix I, which is again essentially the entitled development rights today, for our discussion.”

Comments made during last Friday’s March 25, 2011 Comp Plan hearing by Teton County Commission Chairman Ben Ellis as the majority of the electeds were unwilling to constrain future development to a reasonable level.

Note: “Appendix I” in the September 2010 certified draft quantifies the breakdown of doubling both future commercial and residential development potential in the valley.

3/30/2011 Wallace, Jim
Interested Public

Agree: Nodes or clustering, receive global and historical support. Used for centuries, this concept of connected villages with preservation of open space has been proven to be the most desirable land use design.

Wildlife: Winter habitat is critical. Critical losses to development: Teton Science School c, Karns Hillside, County Heli-pad at junction, Snake River corridor developments; require identification and preservation. Purchase & relocation of present occupancy is the best option.

Dogs: Wildlife killings by dogs are increasing: Harassment of wildlife by dogs at critical levels. An unsupervised dog running free on 35 acres can easily render such land as inhospitable. Sound planning, in the interest of wildlife, encourages further restrictions and limitations upon pets; dogs, cats, horses, etc: our County's carrying capacity maybe a limit of no more than 10,000 dogs.

Government: Combine Town & County.

Date	Name	Comment
3/30/2011	Thurston, Ray Interested Public	How many times does the county have to do this? Seems like a big waste of time. In my area we have protected elk habitat. Now the neighbors and ranchers are complaining that the elk are damaging hay and landscaping. Can't win. Ray
3/29/2011	Kochan, JP Interested Public	Thanks for the update.. I am glad and relieved that conservancy is a priority!!!
3/25/2011	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	First the expression of three per 35 is actually a misleading phrase. Any free standing 35 acre parcel in Teton County will be reduced to two units once the Base Site Area is calculated. There are a significant number of properties where because of the river, streams and hill sides reduce the BSA = 23.65 acres to one unit. The PRD at one per 35 was a compromise for the down zoning of the RA-3....RA-20 zoning of the 1978 plan. The configuration of the two units on less than 1/3 usually 1/5 of the property clusters the compound leaving permeability for the wild life. The LDR environmental standards still must be met as well, such as the 30 foot setback from wetlands. In addition there is then a site for a caretaker and therefore workforce housing. I would gladly discuss this further with anyone so as to provide you a better understanding of how non-subdivision PRDs are used and the negative and positive impacts.
3/25/2011	Spetrino, Diane Interested Public	I HAVE HAD THE PLEASURE OF LIVING IN JACKSON FOR A WHILE. I AM NOT LIVING THERE AT THE MONUMENT. BUT I FEEL I NEED TO RETURN EVERY YEAR JUST TO BE IN WHAT I CALL GOD'S COUNTRY. THE SPACE THE BEAUTY THAT SURROUNDS YOU, THE WILDLIFE, AND THE WONDERFUL PEOPLE THAT LIVE THERE, I ONLY WISH I COULD LIVE THERE ALL THE TIME. WHAT YOU ALL HAVE THERE IS SO VERY SPECIAL IN EVERY WAY, EVEN ON THE COLDEST DAY, THERE IS BEAUTY. I ONLY HOPE THAT IT REMAINS A SMALL TOWN IN EVERY WAY THAT IT COUNTS. SAVE AND RESERVE ALL THAT NATURE HAS GIVEN FOR AS LONG AS FOREVER.

Date	Name	Comment
3/25/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Greg – thank you for your phone call just now asking for more information on the PRD, its benefits and its limitations – basically how do we achieve permanent open space – and how does it fit with Smart Growth principals? As I discussed the presentation from County planning staff today only focused on how the tool has been used in direct applications through their office. Although considerable benefit has been achieved on smaller parcels – the entire story was not shared with the electeds this morning. I hope it is alright that I have copied in both Laurie - and also John Sheppard – who has been attending all the joint sessions. Attached are the Land Trust’s formal public comments on the April 2009 draft that reinforces our conversation we had just now – on the benefits of the PRD for achieving open space even when the use is not necessarily visible to the planning office. That is not to say the tool does not need some refinement and enhancements. Second the Trust’s comments cover the relative value of permanent open space versus temporary zoning that you and I discussed – and is a foundation of Smart Growth principals. The letter also echoes in addition why I, and the public at large, were so concerned when the draft plan was released in April 2009 – basically how were they going to redirect the existing potential – shift it or simply down zone the entire rural areas? The Trust has expressed these concerns quite well in the attached May 14, 2009 letter. The second attachment is from rancher Brad Mead who weighed in on the issue though a News and Guide Guest Shot - when the County, without completely understanding the implications - was considering removing the tool in its entirety – as they could not see the non-visible (outside of planning office applications) achievements as it was used. That is because - as we discussed - it is a private conversation between the land owner, the land trust, the land appraiser and the IRS. The Trust states it quite clearly – that after the PRD was adopted in 1994 – unseen to the County – some 10,000 acres came under permanent conservation easements – versus 5,000 acres in all the proceeding years. Granted some 2,400 of that 10,000 were directly seen in the planning staff PRD applications. Those other 7,600 acres were never seen by the planning staff as direct PRD applications – yet the PRD played a critical tax role in the Trust’s ability to achieve thus easements. With the Town as involved with the Land Trust as partners on Karnes, Flat Creek and now Snow King – I would suggest you sit down with Laurie in the next few weeks. Again thank you so much for the call – I just wanted to make sure you also consider talking to the true experts on how permanent conversation easements are actually achieved with willing land owners. Feel free to share this email and the attached public documents with other members of the Town Council and/or Mayor – as we discussed the PRD is a tool largely unfamiliar with the Town electeds. The next joint meeting will be the County’s turn, as we discussed, to understand the complexity of some of the Town tools – the main thing is that we all continue to learn through this process before making the final policy decisions.

Date	Name	Comment
3/24/2011	Ross, Ty Interested Public	The current PC Certified Plan indicates that the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) will be appended to the plan upon completion of the Themes and Policies. I find this approach completely disheartening, as the FLUP is the primary component of interest to most concerned citizens. I believe the final Comp Plan should be reviewed and approved just as the name implies, in a “Comprehensive” format, rather than the piecemeal approach currently being undertaken. The ramifications of the verbiage within the Themes and Policies cannot be fully evaluated without concurrently reviewing the FLUP. Regarding Themes and Policies, the reviewing body must contemplate the current economic climate and outlook when considering outdated information collected at the outset under brighter conditions. Attracting growth and improving the economy likely garner much more weight now than when this colossal process was first begun FOUR years ago. At this point in time, growth in any respect should be welcomed, but definitely cannot be discouraged or stifled as was outlined in past plans. Just because some properties within the County are not located within or adjacent to designated development nodes does not mean they should be completely discarded when considering future development. The decision makers of the Comp plan should be reminded that only 3% of the entire land mass comprising Teton County is privately held, developable land. It is unnerving that the officials responsible for approval of the plan, which has taken four years to date and will likely require an additional year or two to finally complete (I have heard as many as three additional years), will dictate property uses throughout the entire valley for the next 15 – 20 years. Under the present economic conditions and atmosphere of uncertainty, fluidity in any particular eventual land use from that dictated in the plan should be achievable by some means. If this cannot be provided for, specific nodal development designations should be revisited and include major portions of the Hog Island area. The County is constantly opining the affordable housing problem but refuses to allow or zone for development that could and would alleviate the issue. The concerns of maintaining wide open spaces, acceptable view corridors for tourists, and unlimited migration paths for wildlife of all species far outweigh the pesky dilemma of maintaining a viable, LOCAL work force. The decision makers of the comp plan, and perhaps the public in general, need to be made aware (or reminded?) of the reality that currently exists. Only a smattering of local law enforcement, emergency responders, healthcare providers, teachers, etc are able to reside in the valley. The majority of the active workforce commutes from one of the many satellite communities that actually provide (and actively encourage) affordable housing. Access to this valley from those satellite communities is dependent on two narrow canyon byways and a mountain pass that is regularly closed for maintenance. A minor event such as heavy snowfall (not to mention a much more devastating one such as a major earthquake) could conceivably isolate the entire valley, leaving the area bereft of critical services, potentially during the greatest time of need. The comp plan should be more focused on affordable housing and providing the tools throughout the valley (not in just three or four nodes) to accomplish and actively promote development thereof. I am uncertain how closely the eventual, appended FLUP will resemble the original version depicted in the April 2009 Draft, but would like to offer the following comments regarding District 7 (Hog Island/Game Creek) as portrayed in the April 2009 version: 1. I and other members of my family own significant portions of property in this District. The FLUP that is ultimately adopted will essentially determine the value and worth of our property, and dictate what (if anything) will be allowed to occur on the property. I do not believe that the April 09 Draft proposed use schedule accurately reflects existing conditions or reasonable future land use expectations, especially along portions of the Highway 89 corridor. Many areas slated for Single Family Dispersed classification (which is 100% Residential) is either sandwiched by or directly adjacent to Light Industry property. The configuration of lots and existing uses (which in many cases are not residential at all) indicate that much more property in the area should be classified under Light Industry, or some other use allowing home businesses by right and businesses of all types through a CUP process. Mandating these properties to be 100% residential while they are surrounded by industrial uses of all varieties is indisputably asinine. 2. The Teton County Gravel Study (which also has drug on the last several years) identified the Ross Plateau as a viable gravel extraction location. However, the designation in the April 09 FLUP indicates strictly agricultural use. This is completely contradictory considering the Evans pit and yard are proposed as Light Industry. The decision makers must consider the gravel study during their deliberations, even if the study remains technically incomplete. The status of this study is ambiguous, but my understanding is that final release of the study is being upheld due to ongoing litigation with another landowner mentioned in the study 3. It should be noted that Ross Plateau is one of the rarest properties in the valley, offering expansive development potential while unseen from any public byway. This property could prove to be an invaluable resource to the entire community as; 1) an alternative gravel source 2) an affordable housing location 3) any other positive development contribution ALLOWED OR PRESCRIBED IN THE COMP PLAN, FLUP, AND FINAL LDRs. 4. As implied in 1 above, a new zoning designation needs to be created to accommodate existing configuration and uses in the Hog Island area. A very large percentage of existing residential properties contain either grandfathered, nonconforming uses or businesses allowed through the CUP process. This area epitomizes the actual working class of Teton County. This being the case, the ultimate zoning for most of Hog Island should allow for both residential growth and growth of businesses of all types, including heavy equipment contractors. Under current rules and regulations, the only zone allowing these types of businesses is BP, and even under that zone, a CUP is still required. What is so scary about heavy equipment contractors,

Date	Name	Comment
3/23/2011	Chatham, Bud Interested Public	especially if their existence is regulated through a CUP? Thanks for considering these comments during your deliberations. Many County residents share these or similar opinions. Unfortunately, most of those that do are busy making a living and are not afforded the valuable time necessary to consistently voice their opinions, as so many other valley residents and organizations are. maybe not, but i get the feeling that campgrounds might get a few more definitions labeled to them in the new comp plan as a result of these application. when/if this discussion happens, can we make sure that we are apart of that discussion? just do not want this to be talked about and decision made without our input. will we be notified if there are discussions about this?

Date	Name	Comment
3/23/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Dear electeds – You have heard staff, myself and many others state that we are already heading to roughly doubling everything we see on the ground in our valley today – and the community expects you to work within – or less than – that potential to achieve community goals. I state in today’s N&G in a “letter to the editor” specifically there are 6,600,000 square feet of additional potential commercial and some 10,000 potential more housing units in the Town and County. For explanation I want to clarify how I got there – as you know I do not quote numbers randomly. Following are some footnotes to my letter to the editor. Footnotes: The latent development potential I quantify in my letter comes from the joint planning commission’s certified draft – Appendix I: Buildout Numbers and Assumptions. See first attachment – complete assumptions are found in the rest of this appendix – second attachment. For commercial existing and potential - I used the fairly straightforward numbers in the table of 8,050,669 square feet existing and an additional 6,616,093 square feet of potential. I did not go into the Town versus County commercial potential split but it is an additional 3,436,798 square feet in Town and an additional 3,179,285 square feet in the County. Especially in Town – some of this latent commercial square footage has the potential for conversion to residential - which I mention in my letter. For residential this was a little bit harder to not over estimate the potential. Existing is straightforward at 9,644 housing units with 3,898 units in Town and 5,746 in the County. This does not take into account short-term rentals – just housing for the workforce and second homes. Note this also does not include housing on federal lands - as they are outside the legal application of our plan. Naturally it also does not include campgrounds, hotel rooms and the like – all which add to our “effective population” on any given day. For additional residential potential - Town is also fairly straight forward at an additional 2,534 units. This is modest estimate as it under estimates the potential in the significant AR zone because attached rentals to a home are consider all one unit. The County is a little more difficult to not over estimate the potential and is based on the following assumptions: •The appendix quotes the potential of an additional 18,820 housing units in the County alone (I used about 7,500 in my letter to the editor – plus the Town potential of 2,534 - for a total of 10,000). In total Town and County would give us some 21,354 more potential housing units – which is clearly too high (again I used 10,000). •This includes 3,567 units under “potential base Dus” - a combination of numerous platted and not yet built lots – such as the 30 vacant lots in northern Melody Ranch and the 73 homes to be developed via the final phase of the PUD south of South Park Loop road; potential in addition outside of PUDs and subdivisions such as the housing in planned resorts – think of SRA and Targhee; Suburban zone (note 140 of this housing unit potential sits south directly across High School Road from Cottonwood Park on 35 acres zoned Suburban) and NC-SF zoned lands; and finally this also includes base property rights in rurally zoned lands (think 1 unit per 35 acres). OBasically the 3,567 housing “potential base Dus” breaks out as: 1,220 base rural potential (1 per 35), 1,190 in the NC-SF, 174 Suburban, 282 NC-PUD, 549 Resorts, 152 other. There are also much higher numbers called “possible” (see Appendix page I-11) – which I simply ignored. This would have brought the “potential base Dus” of 3,567 to 8,264 – or an additional 4,697 units. I used the much lower 3,567 “potential base Dus”. •Then there are some 1,100 potential units of “commercial ARUs” and “employee units” possible in the County. •The numbers that I then adjusted downward a lot so as not to overestimate - were the potential County accessory residential units (ARUs) – if they were all actualized (10,946 ARUs). I also reduced significantly some of the open space clustering tool “bonus” potential (the PRD – 2&3/35, 6/35 and 9/35 multipliers) in the County. If it was all utilized then another 3,651 units in “Planned Residential Development” (PRD) bonus potential. Note: this 3,651 has actually already been reduced by staff by 23% based on “historic utilization” of the bonus PRD tool. OIn the attached appendix it strips all 10,496 potential County ARU’s (given the joint PC vote - which personally I did not support) and also leaves out

all 3,651 bonus PRD units since the multipliers were “to be determined”. That left just 7,207 potential additional housing units in Town and County – which is much too low as the PRD will remain in some fashion and the ARU’s (which are probably over estimated) will likely be put back into the plan.

Ol chose to add back to the 7,207 total Town/County unit potential a modest 1/2 of the County bonus PRD potential (already reduced 23% by staff) for around 1,825 – since the tool will remain in some form – or likely be added to with some sort of additional transfer of development tool. Then I only added about 1,000 back in of the potential County ARUs (or less than 10% of the 10,946 total potential) to represent both a reduced utilization rate and the likely residential impact via rental to the workforce of these units – versus simply used as a seasonal guest house instead.

That brought me to a realistic – and probably conservative - estimate of 10,000 additional housing units in Town and County – with 75% in the County and 25% in Town. Still a daunting number and much higher than most people are aware of.

Nearly half of these 10,000 potential County housing units location can be shifted and redirected and/or simply reduced - in a variety of ways - as I touch on in my letter. In particular some 3,000 - 5,000 units (depending on how you calculate it) of potential rural zoned units - and much of the nearly 1,200 units of excess capacity on the NC-SF zoned lands – the bulk of which sit in the Snake River riparian corridor.

Letter to the Editor – News and Guide

How to manage growth - NOT whether to grow or not grow – is the critical issue being addressed in the ongoing comprehensive plan process. Town and County elected officials will focus on “managing growth” this week. Base property rights and current entitlements will already roughly double housing units and commercial square footage. In numbers, that translates to 10,000 additional housing units to the 9,650 we’ve already built - or the equivalent of twenty more Rafter J subdivisions. At buildout, 6.6 million square feet of commercial development will be added to the existing 8,050,000 square feet of commercial space in the valley. With Smiths at 50,000 square feet, visualize 132 more Smiths scattered through Teton Village, Snow King, Targhee and Jackson proper. The implication of this much future growth is mind boggling.

Our community has wisely weighed in strongly against nodes as presented in the draft plan. With no mechanism of transferring development rights, “new” centers in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, Hoback and Teton Village represented additive growth beyond existing buildout numbers that already pose daunting challenges to our transportation systems, wildlife, public lands, community character and quality of life.

I urge our electeds to redirect and shift existing growth entitlements to compact centers to preserve sensitive rural lands, scenic vistas, wildlife movement corridors, some remnant of our ranching heritage and curtail sprawl. There are a wide variety of tools to shift future entitled growth without increasing ultimate buildout. These include enhancing our existing rural open space clustering tool, outright purchase of important open space by partnering public money with private philanthropy, conversion of commercial square footage to residential, refinement of Town tools to invigorate significant unutilized in-fill potential, a measured reduction of development potential in important rural areas, and various legal mechanisms for landowner-to-landowner transfer of development rights. I believe our community wants “no additional growth” solutions to address community goals. Roll up your sleeves and see what you can do with what we already have.

Date	Name	Comment
3/23/2011	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the 2,000 members of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, we would like to submit brief comments regarding your ongoing review of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, particularly in light of the staff report that was released last week. Background The Conservation Alliance is dedicated to responsible land stewardship in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, working to ensure that human activities are in harmony with the area's irreplaceable wildlife, scenic and other natural resources. Our organization has worked on local planning issues since its inception in 1979. Our work is rooted in the recognition that this valley, particularly its wildlife, scenic and other natural resources, is incredibly rare and is worth protecting for future generations. With over three decades of history in local planning, we understand that these unique attributes that largely define Jackson and Teton County's character do not exist today by accident; there is an extensive history of active and dedicated community and elected official involvement that has shaped our valley for many decades. In an effort to continue this community legacy, the Conservation Alliance supports a fact-based, conservation-focused and precautionary planning approach as the most effective way to uphold community values. In other words, the plan must include a clear prioritization of community values, incorporate essential data and the best available science, identify a need for precaution in cases where data is lacking, provide unambiguous policies and realistic implementation measures, include maps consistent with prioritized values, and, as a result, increase overall predictability. Most importantly, it must work to protect what makes this community so unique – our rural landscape, open spaces, scenery and abundant wildlife (values which currently fall under "Theme One") – by clearly placing them as the primary factors for consideration in all land use decisions. Discussion Topics and Key Issues The future implications of planning decisions made today are sure to be significant. With that in mind, the Conservation Alliance would like to emphasize the following few points for inclusion in your discussions in JIM #4 and #5, on March 24 and 25, in addition to pointing to our previously submitted comments, some of which are included in the appendices of this week's staff report. 1. Wildlife and natural resource protection: Attached to this letter is a November 12, 2009 memo that we submitted to the planning commission highlighting how we believe the policies on wildlife protection could be improved. Many of these policies are still up for debate today. For those that have been incorporated in the plan, we hope that you continue to support them. Overall, wildlife and natural resource protection is the community's top priority and this needs to be reflected in the draft plan in a consistent and enforceable way. Our abundant wildlife, scenic vistas and rural character should be the top priority in all land use decisions, backed with strong and consistent policies. Themes and values truly need to be prioritized, not just balanced. • Wildlife Stewardship Plan A key issue, which we hope that you can address, is the need for a more specific Wildlife Stewardship Action Plan. This tool is critical given that the values under Theme One are the community's highest priority. (This could be similar to the proposal for a community housing plan in the sense that these types of plans would include measurable steps, with timelines, responsible parties and specific goals. This is particularly essential if the Comp Plan itself is not going to dive into much detail.) 2. Avoiding oversimplification of planning principles, including Smart Growth: Four years into this process, after countless hours of meetings, volumes of public comment and significant work on the parts of the elected officials, the planning commissioners and the planning staffs, we hope that our community doesn't oversimplify the issues that we are facing. If we oversimplify concepts, we will not achieve an overall and primary objective of this process – an increase in specificity and predictability as a way to avoid piecemeal, contentious decisions in the future. Many of the issues up for debate in JIM #4 and #5 are complex and nuanced, and all are important. The concept of smart growth, for example, by its nature necessitates consideration of our existing context and conditions - not a blanket application of the term to describe simplified development patterns. Case Example – The "node" concept We will provide one example that is sure to be raised again - the concept of nodes. From a planning perspective, it can be an easy question to simplify – do you support confined development footprints, or not? While we certainly cannot speak for everyone, it is likely that most people in our community

would support this basic planning concept (including the Conservation Alliance which has expressed concerns about the application of the “node” concept in the April 2009 draft).

However, what the Conservation Alliance has recognized, as well as other members of the public, is that the important issues, the ones that must now be discussed in order to achieve the objectives of the plan rewrite process, are in the details. Following are some of those details that should be considered:

- Are there mechanisms that would enable permanent tradeoffs for shifting development into these areas? In other words, does “growing up” in fact prevent our community from “growing out?” Or, does the expansion of these centers represent additive growth?
- How much more expansion is appropriate for distinct areas? (including those that are already called out as mixed use villages in our current plan)
- How much development potential do these areas already have (including approved, but not yet built)? What timeframe are you planning for?
- What is the existing balance of commercial and residential development in those areas?
- Are these areas geographically scattered throughout the valley? What are the consequences of this?
- What type of transportation infrastructure exists to support expansion in different areas? What is the existing capacity (for example, on Highway 390 or High School Road) to accommodate additional traffic?
- We have existing areas, such as Wilson, where concentrated development has already occurred. Just because concentrated development has occurred there in the past, does it mean it should go on endlessly? What are the pros and cons of placing growth boundaries around these areas? As the Conservation Alliance has stated in the past, we believe that growth, regardless if it occurs “next to existing development,” should first and foremost truly respect community priorities, such as avoidance of further encroachment into wildlife habitat. In short, continuing to intensely develop in the wrong area (such as in the middle of wildlife habitat just because it is “next to existing development”), does not make it right.
- What are the fiscal implications of expansion of certain areas (in terms of schools, law enforcement, transportation infrastructure, etc.)?
- Overall, the Conservation Alliance recognizes how interconnected different areas of the valley are. What could happen in one “node” or “village center” affects the valley as a whole. This is a critical point to keep in mind. As fragmented discussions on “character districts” occur, this need to come back full circle and understand the comprehensive picture will be essential.

In summary, and in response to the clearly outlined objectives of the process, members of the public have expectations, after over four years, to move beyond approval of simplistic concepts that can then be interpreted and acted upon in myriad ways in the future.

3. Tools: First, according to the staff report for JIM #4 and #5, it appears as though fundamental, hard decisions could be made in the “character district” maps, formerly the FLUPs. As we have stated before, the maps and accompanying narrative are an integral, predictable part of the plan and should not be treated as an addendum. Also, the Themes and Policies should go into more detail as to which areas are appropriate for development and which should be prioritized for conservation. This would help in providing a comprehensive picture of the valley to serve as the larger context for framing the production of “character districts.”

Second, as many community members have requested, we would like to once again ask that a workshop (or series of workshops) on the PRD and TDR tools be held. These two issues alone stand to have big impacts for overarching principles of the new plan. They are too complex to be adequately covered as one of several topics in a single meeting.

4. Predictability: Increased predictability is and has been one of the primary goals of this Comp Plan rewrite process. To create a truly predictable plan, the topic of buildout (in terms of dwelling units

Date	Name	Comment
		and square footage) should be addressed. It's important to remember that identifying buildout was a key desired outcome by members of the public. For example, on October 15, 2008, the Planning Team placed an ad to confirm recognition of top community concerns voiced during public comment. Under the title, "The Comprehensive Plan Will Be Responding to Public Comment: What you said", the second bullet point stated "Buildout should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation." Again, thank you for your dedication to the creation of a Comprehensive Plan that truly reflects our community's priorities. Jackson and Teton County are faced with unique challenges and should be approached as such. As history has shown, if we don't make the hard, detailed decisions now, we'll end up making them incrementally as each development proposal comes up in the future. We look forward to working with you over the next several months. If you have additional questions, please feel free to get in touch with us.
3/23/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Sprawling development that dilutes customer bases while destroying open space,wildlife habitat and scenic vistas is dumb growth. And that is the most likely outcome of a plan that promotes nodal development. A community of 20,000 people does not generate the volume of commerce necessary to support a variety of shops and services in each of several "nodes". As a result, people would end up driving among multiple nodes to do their shopping. Moreover, promoting satellite commercial centers would pull investment dollars away from Town. It is important to keep the primary tax base in town so we can afford to build the public infrastructure associated with commercial centers. Quality of life and our environment are assets that attract high-value businesses. Sprawl will make us just another ski resort town. Please implement a Comprehensive Plan that creates value, that is ensures permanent protection of open spaces and fosters a vibrant town center. Say no to nodes and sprawl.
3/23/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I encourage each of you to remember that wildlife, habitat and open space are the priorities of this valley. Each theme of the comprehensive plan should reflect that. e.g. Because wildlife is the valleys highest priority, affordable housing will be encouraged in this manner. Because Wildlife and open space are Teton county's highest priorities transportation will be dealt with in this manner. Thank you for your continued hard work

Date	Name	Comment
3/16/2011	, Habitat for Humanity	On behalf of Habitat for Humanity of the Greater Teton Area, we thank you for your leadership on workforce housing and for calling for the formation of The Blue Ribbon Panel on Workforce Housing. We would like to acknowledge the tremendous amount of work that the volunteer panel invested in learning about the history of housing in Teton County and discussing strategies to house 65% of our workforce locally. In general we support the findings in the report and would like to touch on four points: 1. We agree there is a need for a more decent, affordable rentals and this would be achieved by zoning for multi-family rentals. We also want to emphasize the importance of providing our workforce with homeownership housing options, as we know that high homeownership rates in a community result in a more stable workforce, better school attainment in children, and more active citizens. 2. We are strongly in favor of having a goal on which we as a community can measure our success with regard to housing our workforce. We support the goal of having at least 65% of our workforce live locally, as we know that will help maintain the strong sense of community we currently enjoy. We recognize that maintenance of the 65% goal will require a steady and sustainable approach despite the fluctuations in the market, and we appreciate your continued support of the Teton County Housing Authority to monitor this number and provide leadership on this matter. 3. We support the encouragement of free market solutions. We understand workforce housing to mean all types of housing that serve our workforce, not just deed-restricted, subsidized housing. As the free market has not traditionally been effective in providing Category 1 – 3 ownership opportunities, we agree with the assertion that the housing agencies should focus on creating those categories of housing while allowing the free market to provide solutions for higher category housing. 4. As Habitat is made up of community members with an appreciation for all that Jackson has to offer, we strongly appreciate the importance of balancing housing with other community values of wildlife, open space and our western heritage. We understand there are trade offs and we appreciate the fact that housing needs to be appropriate and predictable. As work is currently underway on the Comprehensive Plan, we hope this report and the comments it generated will be a resource to inform the discussions around housing. Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for the work you do on behalf of our community.
3/16/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO ASK THAT THE ROSS PLATEAU BE ZONED FOR THE GRAVEL PIT THAT WE INTEND TO PURSUE.
3/14/2011	Potzernitz, Lisa Interested Public	I am in support of zoning changes for the South Hwy 89/191 area. Because there are a large number of home operated business' along Hwy 89 (that include masonry, construction, electrical, landscape, etc), it only makes sense to change the zoning to allow for this type of use. It will also enable landowners that might have vacant land the possibility of marketing their properties to a larger pool of potential buyers. It is my understanding that there is a huge need for areas to stockpile during construction projects with little to no locations available in Teton County. I fail to see the sense in trucking this material out of county or state when there are viable options available yet unattainable due to a zoning issue. This only increases the cost for the owners and builders and takes money out of Teton County. Due to the lack of options available to landowners currently, changing the use could open avenues previously declined thru the planning process. These changes could include a sit down with county planners to ensure that intended uses are both beneficial to the landowner as well as Teton County. Thank You.

Date	Name	Comment
3/14/2011	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	Dear Jackson Town Council Members and Teton County Commissioners, A reference was made in last Monday's Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan presentation by the planning staff concerning the status of Tourism as a contributor to our local economy. The statement made was based on information that was limited (i.e., source of personal income in Teton County) and not inclusive of all of the data available from the Wyoming Department of Revenue and Wyoming Office of Tourism. For your review and reference, I have attached information from these sources which will provide a more comprehensive, accurate status of Tourism's role in our local economy. To highlight the attached data, you will find that: Tourism accounts for \$572 million in spending in Teton County Notes: (1) This is the average between years 2006-2009 (the most representative years of Tourism in Teton County) (2) Visitor spending has been increasing at an annual average rate of 4.3% since 1997. Tourism accounts directly for 6,315 jobs annually in Teton County Notes: (1) This is the average between years 2006-2009 (the most representative years of Tourism in Teton County) (2) Approximately 24% of our workforce is directly dependent upon and benefits from Tourism. More jobs are indirectly or secondarily dependent upon and benefit from Tourism. (3) Jobs from Tourism have been increasing at an annual average rate of 1% since 1997. Tourism generates \$189 million direct payroll income annually in Teton County Notes: (1) This is the average between years 2006-2009 (the most representative years of Tourism in Teton County) (2) Spending of income earned by employees generates "secondary" sales tax revenue and revenue in all Teton County industries including professional and other services, local government, wholesale and retail trade, and finance, insurance, and real estate. (3) Direct payroll income has been increasing at an annual average rate of 5.3% since 1997. (4) Approximately 18% of income of Teton County residents is directly generated from Tourism (investment income is the #1 source of income) Tourism DIRECTLY generates 44% of the annual sales tax revenue and SECONDARILY at least 70% of the annual sales tax revenue for Teton County Note: (1) This is the average between years 2008-2010. I hope this information is helpful in your understanding of the basis of our economy, what metrics are used to measure this, and for your discussions concerning the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan and other contexts. Please let me know if you have any requests, comments or questions for which I can be of further service. {referenced attachment on tourism dollars available hard copy in the Teton County Planning Department}
3/13/2011	Weenig, Andy and Andr Interested Public	To whom it may concern involved in the TOJ &/or TC comp plan, Thanx for receiving my public comment in favor of the TCHA and JH affordable housing in general. We think the TC affordable housing program has been vital to our family's full integration to this community. After renting & working in JH for six enjoyable yrs, we were able to buy an Ellingwood condo in Cottonwood. Almost immediately we felt connected to this community in a deeper way than the previous yrs, notwithstanding a very involved relationship w/ folks at church. And in response to what we felt, we helped out w/ local activities more & more; also we got involved w/ community groups: scouts, community garden, FOP, public health, Rendezvous PTA and more. Four yrs later, we're raising our young family, and we absolutely love this place and feel extremely committed to the entire area and its residents. We honestly think we have, in some small ways, made this a better place to live for others. This wouldn't be possible without home ownership made possible thru the program of affordable housing. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/10/2011	Kochan, JP Interested Public	I have been writing the Forest service and Ranger Dale Dieter regarding the US Forest Service' plans for the Teton to Snake Fuel Management Program. The program details plans for commercial logging and prescription burning of a large swath of Bridger-Teton forest in the Wilson area. I am deeply upset by a plan that is designed to burn a forest in order to save it. The forest is the most positive feature of our area and I feel they are wrong in pursuing this. The Forest Service has held public meetings to discuss this, but I don't think any one individual has the clout to avert this destruction. I would apprerciate it greatly if the county would consider playing a role in preserving the forest. While there are currently discussions about the Comprehensive Plan, this may be an ideal opportunity for the county to formally take a stand on this. Please see the attached correspondance to Mr Dieter....Dear Mr. Deiter: I am writing in response to the article published in the Jackson Hole News & Guide entitled "Forest Service Moves on Thinning Project". My wife and I currently own property bordering the Bridger-Teton National Forest in the Butler Creek, Highland Park community in Wilson. We are currently in the process of building our home which we intend to occupy full time within the next two years. The site is a magnificent densely wooded property with a panoramic view of the Bridger-Teton National Forest. Finally moving there will be the culmination of our dream to retire to the forest. We purchased the property because of the trees and the proximity to the National Forest, something we value very highly. We chose this site to build, knowing what the risks might be in the event of a forest fire. I would imagine there are many others who chose to live near the forest who are of the same sentiment. We have followed all of the code requirements of the Fire Department for building in the Urban-Wildlife Interface in order to reduce the risk of catastrophic loss in the event of a fire. I was horrified to read of the Forest Service's plans to "thin" the forest in our area. We already mourn the loss of so many trees to the pine beetle, but dread even more, the intentional destruction of thousands of trees in an attempt to save them and to protect housing.. I understand the concerns regarding fire safety for the homes along the corridor for planned thinning and feel certain that others, like us, chose to build there knowing the inherent risk of fire living in or near the forest. I personally do not want to live in an area that has been laid bare by logging and prescription burns. What I have seen of other such projects has been heartbreaking. Given the loss of so many trees to the beetles, I personally don't feel we can afford to loose any more trees. Furthermore, I am greatly concerned about the number of "controlled" prescribed burns that have gotten out of control and destroyed tens of thousands of acres of forest. We are loosing forest at a rate faster that would occur naturally. I have a deep faith in nature and a belief that she can take care of things by herself without our help. We are more than willing to accept the potential risk of fire to keep the trees. If a fire happens, we will deal with it. Trees, as I am sure you agree, are the principle beauty and asset of the Tetons. I implore you to please reconsider this project and abandon any plans to clear the forest. I understand there are many others who are part of this planning process and ask that you please express our concerns while there is still time. As a reasonable compromise, would you consider public discussions before committing to this project? Would you consider modifying the plan to clear only the dead wood to reduce the more combustible fuels but leave the live trees standing? Can we invest in more effective aerial firefighting equipment to reduce the need to prophylactically clear the forest? Are there any other options at all, short of clearing the forest? I very much look forward to hearing your response.
3/10/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	THE AREA BETWEEN COWBOY AND KDC LANE, 9 MILES SOUTH OF JACKSON, NEEDS AN UPDATED ZONE TO ALLOW CONTRACTOR YARDS AND SIMILAR BUSINESSES TO OPERATE. AT THIS TIME THERE ARE 35+ BUSINESSES OPERATING WITHIN A 1 MILE RADIUS OF THIS PROPERTY, MOST ILLEGAALLY ACCORDING TO CURRENT ZONING, THIS PROPERTY COULD BE USED TO IT'S HIGHEST AND BEST USE IF ZONED FOR INDUSTRIAL USE. THIS ZONE WOULD BE FOR CONSTRUCTION RELATED BUSINESSES, NOT BOX/OFFICES AS SEEN IN VALLEY VIEW.

Date	Name	Comment
3/10/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE A COMMENT ABOUT THE FUTURE ZONING FOR OUR PROPERTY SOUTH OF JACKSON. THE PROPERTY LIES BETWEEN COWBOY WAY AND KDC LANE. WE HAVE HAD NUMEROUS OFFERS TO SELL THIS PROPERTY TO CONSTRUCTION RELATED BUSINESSES. WE HAVE TRIED TO GET THIS ZONE CLARIFIED SO THAT THESE BUSINESSES COULD LEGALLY OPERATE THERE. SO FAR NO LUCK, ALTHOUGH THERE ARE 35+ BUSINESSES IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA SURROUNDING THESE PARCELS. MOST ALL OF THESE BUSINESSES ARE OPERATING OUTSIDE THE LEGAL ZONING IN PLACE NOW. THERE SEEMS TO BE A GREAT NEED IN THIS AREA FOR MORE INDUSTRIAL USES. IF THESE ISSUES ARE NOT ADDRESSED, IT WOULD SEEM THAT THESE BUSINESSES WOULD NECESSARILY BE PUT OUT OF BUSINESS IN THE JACKSON HOLE VALLEY AND WOULD BE FORCED TO RELOCATE OUTSIDE OF THE VALLEY, THEREBY INCREASING ROAD AND FUEL USAGE. THIS DOESN'T SEEM TO BE THE BEST ANSWER. I APPRECIATE YOU LOOKING AT THIS PROBLEM.
3/9/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	WE OWN 13+ LOTS ON HWY 89 BETWEEN WY DOT AND KDC LANE. WE HAVE HAD THIS PROPERTY FOR SALE FOR SEVERAL YEARS AND THE ONLY OFFERS HAVE BEEN FROM BUSINESSES SUCH AS TRASH COMPANIES, CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES, LANDSCAPING, ETC. IN THIS AREA ALONE THERE ARE 35+ DIFFERENT BUSINESSES, MOST OPERATING OUTSIDE THE CURRENT LAND USE PLAN. MANY OF THEM ARE CONSTRUCTION BUSINESSES. WE WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE A BUSINESS PARK OF SOME KIND FOR THESE BUSINESSES TO LOCATE LEGALLY. SO FAR WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH THIS GOAL WITH THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND WOULD LIKE SOME CLARIFICATION ON THE FUTURE LAND USE IN THIS AREA. IF WE CANNOT CREATE A LEGAL ZONE, THEN ALL OF THE ILLEGAL USES LOCATED THERE NOW WOULD BE TERMINATED AND THESE BUSINESSES WOULD HAVE TO FIND A PLACE OUTSIDE THE VALLEY TO RE-OPEN. WE FEEL THAT PROPERTY RIGHTS SHOULD ENTER INTO THE EQUATION SOMEWHERE WHEN TALKING ABOUT FUTURE LAND USES. WE FEEL THAT TETON COUNTY HAS DONE A TAKING ON OUR PROPERTY AS WE CANNOT SELL EVEN THOUGH NO ONE HAS OBJECTED TO OUR PLAN EXCEPT THE PLANNING DIRECTOR. WE HAVE HAD MANY CHANCES TO SELL THIS PROPERTY, WHICH HAS ALWAYS BEEN USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OUR OWN CONSTRUCTION BUSINESS SINCE 1966, BUT CANNOT BECAUSE THE BUYER WILL NOT BE ALLOWED TO BUILD A CONTRACTOR YARD OR SHOP. THIS PROCESS HAS DRAGGED ON FOR SO LONG THAT MANY OF US ARE BEGINNING TO WONDER IF IT WILL EVER END AND WHEN IT DOES IF WE CAN LIVE WITH THE END PRODUCT. WE DON'T SEEM TO HAVE MUCH ABILITY FOR INPUT AND DIRECTING AN OUTCOME EVEN THOUGH OUR FAMILY IS ONE OF THE FOUNDING FAMILIES IN JACKSON. GUESS WE GET TO PAY NOW FOR NOT SLAMMING THE DOOR SHUT IN THE 1940'S. HERE'S HOPING THAT THIS PROCESS ENDS SOON.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Schulte, Brendan Interested Public	Brendan Schulte, Chair of the U.S. Green Building Council, Wyoming Chapter. Thanks for the opportunity to speak today. I submitted, or our board submitted this policy statement to the Planning Department last year and we stand by it. Encourage you to read it; happy to resubmit it to Staff if I need to. Some things have already been said. Obviously, we want to encourage infill development and direct proposed development into existing nodes of development, and also look at...try and take a look at form-based code options instead of saying you put in code options, so that way we have the bulk and scale development as kind of a guide where more development should go. So that's something we want to think about. I was very encouraged to hear the conversations and look at the summary yesterday as far as what has been discussed. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend; did have to work. So, that was very encouraging to hear all the smart-growth terms being thrown around, and I was very satisfied to hear that. To quickly go through the points that we laid out in this policy statement from our board last year. It's mainly focused on greening the current infrastructure of our buildings. That's our focus. And more, our focus is trying to transform the built environment so it's more sustainable. And I want to just read one paragraph that we wrote here. The idea of sustainability should encompass more than approved use of development and energy of natural resources. Successful sustainability is also measured by wise and responsible growth and economic development on a scale which will allow the community and its inhabitants to flourish while maintaining their specific identity. Without this attention to positive and integrated community development, the message and purpose of sustainability could become confused, diluted, or equated with other luxury items to be enjoyed and practiced only by a few. That kind of reinforces what someone else said about who they want to live here later. I definitely want this community to stay the same 25 years from now as far as who is living here, who is working here. And then more specifically, some of the recommendations we make—and I'll close on that—we recommend reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption associated with development and patterns in transportation. And people have already discussed how we can do that, so I won't reiterate. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption associated with buildings—that's the big one. Thirty percent of those things...30 percent of greenhouse gases is attributed to buildings and we've really got to stay focused on that. The County and the Town have made great strides so far. I encourage you to take the next step. Encourage water conservation, again reinforcing what someone else said. And then finally increasing recycling composting—no one has really talked about that. It's kind of one of those underlying issues, is what do we do with all of it, but if we can try and spread that out and reuse a lot of it, that's going to help as well. The last thing, on a personal note, I want to commend the County and Town again for moving forward on energy conservation and implementing measures to encourage energy conservation, but I would also encourage you to provide more incentives and less penalties to encourage people that make those things happen to do it because they want to do, not because they have to do it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Kochan, JP Interested Public	I originally submitted this commentary to Mr Norton regarding plans for Wilson: I read with great dismay, the county's proposed comprehensive plan for the future of Wilson. I refer to the front page article in the May 6th edition of the Jackson Hole News and Guide in which numbers between 120 and 690 were cited as the number of proposed new housing units including worker/low income/affordable housing. Based on the many commentaries published in the following two issues of the paper, there are many others with a similar sentiment. I have no desire whatsoever to trash Wilson by tripling its population density. Contrary to the vision of the commission, my personal vision is to see Wilson, and for that matter, the rest of Teton County left entirely as it is. I fail to understand this driving need to destroy the natural beauty that makes the county so unique by overdeveloping it and paving it over. The commission's proposals serve to benefit the developers and large land owners who might seek to develop their properties. The proposal does not clearly benefit the average resident, the land or the wildlife. As a tax paying property owner in Wilson, I look to the Commission to protect the township from overdevelopment, not promote it. In the Wilson plan described in the article referred to above, 7 themes were listed as priorities. The first two points cited were to "promote stewardship of wildlife and natural resources" and "manage growth responsibly". I might suggest building up to 690 new homes would be in direct conflict with both these goals. Planning for 690 new homes in a town of just over 200 residents is not being responsible and certainly not in the best interest of the residents of Wilson. It seems reasonable at some point to ask the residents of Wilson if this is what they want for their town. Item number 4 refers to "meeting the communities housing needs". Here again, I might suggest that the community affected by these decisions be the ones to determine it's own needs. This should not be a county issue. If the public opinion supports provision of affordable housing for Jackson, then Jackson should provide that housing. It is inappropriate to presume that Wilson should provide the low income housing for Jackson. We have been inundated with the excessive reference to affordable housing in almost every statement issued by the commission. The planning commission and it's perceived need to provide low income housing is in my opinion, excessive and out of control and does not reflect the vision of the current permanent resident majority of the community. I do however support the development of services for the community. I agree that projects such as improved transportation services and utilities should be a high priority in planning for the future of Wilson and Teton County. These represent efforts that would directly benefit all residents. In summary, a global rethinking of the future of Teton County should be considered.... How willing are you to sacrifice those assets that make Teton County unique for the sake of growth.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I want to hit on what I consider, after four years in this process, the two apex topics, as I see it, the two topics that will allow us to derive the greatest of scenic benefit and downstream benefit. I really don't believe we can achieve our aspirational goals as a community if we don't look at these long and hard. You can discuss these during your opportunity segment later on. I would suggest that you possibly insert them Strategy 1.1, or possibly Strategy 2.1, if you see fit. What I want to request is that a PRD/TDR task force be formed. There are four questions that we're going to have to answer at some stage that nobody in this room is sitting here with the answers to. A parallel, a concurrent review by a group of citizens, primarily composed of ranchers, large landowners, Land Trust, Nature Conservancy, Teton Scenic Trust Preserve Board, people with legal and land-use acumen, like Commission Mr. Phibbs, whoever you see fit. We've gotten a lot of our best work in this process out of citizens, quite frankly. If you look at STAG, if you look at the Joint Planning Commissioners, if you look at the Build-Out Task Force, Commercial and Employee Generation Task Force and, hopefully, at some stage the Environmental Commission. Citizens do great work and they do it for free and that free up Staff from looking into these questions. The four questions that I would suggest be looked at is, what should the multiplier be and why? Should we consider a strategic, qualitative acquisition component to all land that is strictly acreage based multiplier that we use today? That would be a pertinent question. How can we best leverage effort and funding resources? And finally what I consider, quite frankly—I don't want to sound pedantic—but the number-one question...I challenge everybody in the room to come up with a singular question that will have a greater systemic benefit across the eight themes than are we going to consider a transfer mechanism? It's going to require a lot of work. It's great in concept. It's very hard to implement, but there are successful examples nationwide. At some stage we're going to have to look at this. And if you get a running head start, we can benefit from some of that information already being gathered, so we don't end up with pretty much arbitrary multipliers like three, six, nine—throwing darts at numbers. We can have some systemic benefit and fiscal impact analysis after that. The second issue, and the final issue, is...no one mentioned this yesterday—I consider it an apex issue also—is the incredible overwhelming amount of latent commercial potential we have. It's going to drive the bus and it's the...quite frankly, it's the tail that wags the dog. We've got 6.6 million square feet of commercial potential. And in Town, for example, it doesn't even have the ability to house the low end of that employee generation number in Town, so that ties right back into the TDR transfer mechanism. So, thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Rich Bloom – South Park Neighbors – you already have my comments and I will do my best to follow up tonight’s brief comments with more complete thoughts later. Last night when I could not sleep – again - due to yesterday’s session. I thought of the serenity prayer: “Grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference.” I seem OK in the courage department and am working every day on the wisdom portion – serenity over the last four years though has been very hard to find. I think that is true for you also – as we all care deeply about this community and this special place. I want to address those things perhaps I can inform you on - change though is done on a personal level and I would not be so grandiose to think I can change your minds or world views. ☐ Address the pattern of growth – Smart Growth goals – I know you will do this. ☐ Define the end-state of our community’s growth – the total amount of growth – this perhaps you are unwilling to do - or simply do not believe needs to be addressed. ☐ Address the types of growth – especially the balance of residential and commercial – and large second home housing units (homes, condos) and housing more likely to be accessed by the workforce (rental and ownership). ☐ Address the cost of growth - Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. Again you have some of my comments on this. I want to emphasize a few items that the joint Planning Commission in the certified Theme 2 – Growth Management got right. The primary topic to not unwind - is addressing in some manner the end-state of growth and what you can do to rearrange the growth that is already in the pipeline. But I want to approach that from a world view that perhaps you may accept or at least be open to. The community clearly does not want new growth areas – regardless of where they are - and sprawl. I don’t think any of you want both new growth areas and sprawl. You also probably don’t want new growth areas at the expense of reinvestment, revitalization and in-fill in places like east Jackson of north Broadway. Smart growth is best when it focuses on substitutive growth – that is when it tries to work with what we already have – and we have a lot already entitled. We can’t do that completely, and I know there are also some underlying zoning we need to fix – especially in town. The community has learned and acknowledges though that we have base property rights and current entitlements that will already lead to roughly a doubling of both residential units and commercial square footage. Even with Smart Growth principals applied – that which we can - the off-site implications of an eventual doubling is daunting to our transportation systems and public lands – our community character and quality of life. Much of the community wants you to apply “least growth” solutions to address community goals – meaning seeing what you can do with what we already have - before you add a whole bunch more – especially for the next 10-15 years when we sit on significant empty commercial, vacant rentals and un-utilized significant commercial and resort entitlements. It is a slippery and dangerous slope to merely try and grow oneself out of growth induced problems whether they are jobs, workforce housing or tax revenue. Be careful – and be modest on growth that is not substituted growth but true new growth. You also need to talk about the cost of growth. Michael Kinsley of the Rocky Mountain

Date

Name

Comment

Institutive spoke elegantly through a parable on the cost of growth issues. Consider the story of the recently unemployed builder: Undaunted by downsizing, he buys a truck and a load of vegetables to sell beside the highway. After a terrific day, he's sold out. Back home, he gushes to his wife about his success. "How much did you earn?" she asks. "Eighteen hundred bucks," he crows. "And how much did you pay for the veggies?" Punching his calculator, he hesitantly announces, "Two thousand." "Hmm," she says, "there seems to be a problem." Dreamily, he says, "Yeah, I need a bigger truck."

Communities develop more sustainably when they seek ways to create jobs, income and savings by doing more with what they already have. In these smart communities, the economy develops, the environment stays healthy, and the town remains a place where its residents want to live... and nobody needs a "bigger truck."

In summary then – FIRST: please address the cost of growth – start with something tangible like a 15-year capital improvement plan. That should keep you busy.

SECOND: Please talk about redirecting and reshaping existing growth as much as possible – again the community is absolutely clear in their comments - we do not want both new growth centers and sprawl! You don't either I suspect. There are ways to do that while respecting private property rights.

And THIRD: talk about how to achieve permanent open space – don't take the easy route and simply downzone large rural areas – permanent open space is much more preferable than temporary zoning.

Thank you.

3/8/2011 Pierson, Scott
Interested Public

Good evening, Mayor and Council, Commissioners. I'm Scott Pierson. I'm a consultant, a land surveyor, business owner and I live on Teton Pass. It looks like you're off to a good start with your planning process. I heard you talk last night about pragmatic goals and these big vivacious goals are supposed to be within reach, pragmatic. I think the goal of property rights that was mentioned last night is important, because it keeps us within a certain pragmatic goal structure. In trying to create something that takes that away, it creates jobs for the lawyers in the community, maybe, but not necessarily everybody else. I like the smart-planning goals, the smart-growth goals that you're talking about. It'll help us to direct the inevitable growth that will come to Teton County and the Town of Jackson to where the community wants it. In 1978, we planned the County in three- and six-acre lots and we got three- and six-acre lots. In 1994, we planned for 35-acre lots and we got 35-acre lots. Thirty-five acre lots aren't too bad, but if we didn't have the Melody Ranch, the Indian Trails, and the expansion of Wilson that were kind of drawn out of the pre-94 Plan, who knows what would have happened with regards to the other approvals that might have just built up. But we're still working through that, approvals pre-94 up to now. If we go with nodes in the Town as heart that you talked about, I think that will be a long way to get there. The FLUP separation I think was a good idea at the beginning and I think you can continue that while you talk about those other issues, because as soon as you start threatening, as far as people are concerned in neighborhoods, all you're going to get is opposition, just like the Planning Commission got. They'll throw the nodes back out and you'll get, cram it all into Town, Town will say, don't give us all the burden, and we'll be back to where we are today with the failures of what I think happened with the Planning Commissions. I believe you guys were all elected to represent all the people, so let's try and keep it that way. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Jorgenson, Larry Interested Public	Larry Jorgenson; I live in Jackson; I'm an attorney. And I attended yesterday in the joint meeting discussion. One thing that continues to hang up in my mind is the issue of transportation which has plagued us ever since growth really took off. And we never seem to move any closer to a solution. I'm particularly disturbed, as a resident of Town, at this time, of the idea that we can begin to solve it with more and more bus traffic and so on in Town. And taking, quite frankly, Mayor, the Visitors Center in that area and making kind of a bus hub there. Because the more we begin to move those bigger vehicles in and out of our streets and the main highways coming into Town, the livability factor of in-town residency begins, in my opinion, to diminish more and more. The traffic that we relied on, at least when I was on the County Commission, always seemed to be in ?? The traffic studies, the parking, and so on. Nothing ever seemed to be truly hitting the nail on the head. And so that problem has continued to exacerbate and become more and more, do we solve that by mass transit of a certain type of buses, because that's what we relied on. And I have to question that. We have to find an alternative. And we aren't going to do it with bicycles and pathways and room on the sidewalks for strollers. That's part of it, but that's certainly not the solution. In my opinion, we have got to do something to come up with a different form of mass transportation than the large buses, even the smaller ones, by multiplying those in number and continuing to crowd our streets with those vehicles. The other thing with regard to transportation that I'd urge you to look at is the cost of our START system as it relates to the numbers of people that we're bringing into the Valley for our workforce. And the relative cost of where that money's going. I could recall our discussions at that time on the Commission as it... primarily on some questions I was raising about where is that money going? If all of those people are coming in on buses to this community to work and taking most of their paychecks and going home and spending it in Idaho, whose pockets are we really enriching here in this County and what are we doing to our quality of life? We have to become a bit more parochial, in my opinion, in addressing the livability factor as influenced by our workforce. Building homes and affordable housing for our workforce here at a rate of 65 percent of the workforce, laudable in concept, may very well be inadequate when compared with the ownership, the market ownership workforce that we have and be so far out of balance that the only thing that we have coming in to supplement our workforce at that time is indeed these other communities who are taking their paychecks home and not spending them here.
3/8/2011	Strout, Roger Interested Public	Hi, my name's Roger Strout and I just want to begin by saying yesterday I heard some great discussions and I'm super impressed with really all of you who gave your comments and your ideas and your thoughts on this Plan. I recognize this process is really difficult and timely, and so I'm very impressed with the Planning Office as well. I just wanted to comment on a few notes that I heard the other day. One has to do with the Town of Jackson, a comment on here that I had a number of green dots on it. And the statement was that Jackson would be the only place for residential growth, and to me that doesn't make any sense. I realize and I want to see growth, future growth happen in Jackson and I think it's the logical place for the majority of that to happen. I also heard another comment—I'm not sure whether I misunderstood it, or—that the only growth in Jackson should be residential. And I don't know if that's I'm just misstating something I misheard or not, but I'll throw that out there anyway. The other comment I want to make is on Andy Schwartz's comment, which I thought was really good, in that we do need a reality check, a financial reality check on some of the things that we're going to be trying to implement, before actually following through with those. And then we talked a little bit about sort of a mechanism for achieving the goals that we're going to set and that's all fine and good in my mind, but I'm hopeful that those mechanisms can result in positive incentives for achieving these goals, instead of negative incentives, or penalties and so forth. I prefer to see that on more of the positive side. And then, finally, I have to say that I'm very in favor of the concept of nodes. I know that that at one point was a very big issue for many people, but I see that as, sort of going along with Bill's comment, of deciding where we want the growth to happen, and I think that improves our potential for achieving efficient mass-transit systems and so forth. So, the node word doesn't bother me at all. Thank you very much.
3/8/2011	Walker, Christine Teton County Housing	The Comp Plan meeting yesterday was very productive, and your efforts to get to that point were visible. I had one brief comment, and Bruce indicated that I should email you before 10:00. My understanding is that this phase is working on the Principles...I do not recall Principle 4.5 – Predictably locate a variety of housing types listed yesterday. Maybe I just did not see, but if not, this seems to be the most important Principle and the piece that came to the surface through the Blue Ribbon Panel efforts. It was stated a little differently...Identify areas and zone for workforce housing...and Identify locations and zone for multi-family rental units. Basically, the 62% chunk that you called out. I look forward to hearing the discussion this evening.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Rich Bloom, speaking for South Park neighbors. You already have my comments and I'll do my best to follow up tonight's brief comments with more complete thoughts. Last night, when I could not sleep again, reviewing yesterday's session—and I've never been to Alcoholics Anonymous—but I thought of a serenity prayer: Grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference. I seem okay in the courage department. I'm working every day on the wisdom portion. Serenity over the last four years, though, has been very hard to find. And I think that's true for you also. And ultimately that's because we all care deeply about this community and this special place. I want to address those things perhaps I can inform you on. Change, though, is done on a personal level, and I would not be so grandiose to think I can change your minds or your world views. Address the pattern of growth, smart-growth goals. I know you will do this. Define the end state of the community's growth, the total amount of growth. This perhaps you are unwilling to do or simply do not believe it needs to be addressed. I understand that. Do address the types of growth, especially the balance of residential and commercial, about large second-home housing units, homes and condos, versus housing more likely to be accessed by the local workforce, landowner ownership. Address the cost of growth. Growth regardless of its location and how that would be paid for. The primary topic, though, I open the room is addressing the end state of growth and what you can do to rearrange some of the growth that's already in the pipeline. But I don't want to approach that from a world view that perhaps you may accept or at least be open to. And that is the community clearly does not want new growth area, regardless of where they are, and sprawl. That's what we're concerned about. I don't think any of you want both new growth areas and sprawl if you can avoid it. You also probably don't want new growth areas at the expense of reinvestment, revitalization and infill in places like East Jackson and North Broadway. I think you should give some consideration of that competition. Smart growth is best when it's focused on substantive growth, especially when you're starting fresh, when you can move it around or start fresh with a piece of land. That is when it ties with entitlements we already have. The concern the community has, and we've learned in this, is we're already going to roughly doubling of housing units and commercial. And even with smart-growth principles of pride that can be to those, also implications of an eventual doubling is daunting to our transportation systems, our public lands of community character and quality of life. It scares the bejesus out of us. It is a slippery, dangerous slope to merely try to grow oneself out of growth of these problems, whether they are jobs, workforce housing, tax revenue. Be careful and be modest, especially on any new growth that is not substantive. You also need to talk about the cost of growth. Michael Kinsley of the Rocky Mountain Institute spoke eloquently through a parable on the cost of growth issues. Consider the story of a recent unemployed builder, daunted by down size, he buys a truck and a load of vegetables to sell beside the highway. After a terrific day, he sold out. Back home, he gushes to his wife about his success. How much did you earn? Eighteen hundred bucks, he crows. How much did you pay for the veggies? Two thousand. Hmmm, there seems to be a problem. Grimily, he says, yeah, I need a bigger truck. [Laughter] So, in summary, first please address the cost of growth, starting with something tangible like a 15-year capital improvement plan. That should keep you pretty busy for the next five months. Second, please talk about redirecting and reshaping existing growth. We do not want both new growth centers and sprawl. Third, talk about how to achieve permanent open space. Don't take the easy route and simply down zone large rural areas. Permanent open space is much more preferable than temporary zoning. Thank you.
3/8/2011	Hill, Megan Interested Public	Good afternoon, my name is Meagan Hill; I'll keep it short. There's three main things I want to hit on. I've been listening to the comments and I think the first one I'll start with is a statement of the obvious and that relates to growth. I want to make sure that we recognize the fact that, like it or not, global population is increasing and so, as we move forward in the Plan, regardless of whether we like growth in our backyard, we need to plan for it and we need to address it. With that in mind, I'll move to my second point, which is the concept of nodes. We do treat that as a four-letter word, we do some of the time for it. We need to acknowledge the fact that we have, you know, existing areas of density—Wilson, the Aspens, the Village, Town and so forth—and so it makes sense to focus our density on those areas to allow ourselves to best manage infrastructure costs for the Town and the County, and best provide transportation, whether it be walk, bike, or bus. My final point is our natural resources, and I would specifically like to encourage you to increase your emphasis in the Plan on water conservation. I think so far we've made great progress on energy conservation, energy efficiency with the ten-by-ten plan, the stormwater project, Wilson sewer and so forth. What I think we're missing at the moment is the opportunity to recognize the correlation between water conservation and energy efficiency in what may be the next ten-by-twenty plan. But the most important thing is the future burden on infrastructure costs that we don't even know about yet and we haven't forecast. If we continue to spend our water resources the way we are, it's going to bite us in the back pocket before we know it, so I would encourage you to increase that. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Cresswell, Anne Interested Public	Anne Cresswell speaking on behalf of the Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust tonight. My comments today will be related to the principles of Chapter 4, Bruce, Commissioner, as well as about the goal of 65 percent that's baked into the Chapter 4. Most importantly, we agree a goal of housing 65 percent of our workforce will help advance and strengthen our community's housing program and ensure that we are, in fact, meeting our community's housing needs. I personally believe the only reason to embark on or participate in the Comp Plan process is that, at the end of the day, our goal is to improve upon the programs we collectively provide and better serve the residents of our community. What's so attractive about a 65 percent goal is that it provides a baseline for us to monitor our success. With a measurable baseline, we have an opportunity to grow our program so that it is more responsive to the ever-changing needs of our community than perhaps we have been able to be in the past. This in turn allows us to ensure we are allocating the appropriate resources, time and money, to the issue at any given time. I really see the goal of 65 percent as a pivot point—and I couldn't think of any other word to use to describe it—but this pivot point would allow us to ramp up or dial back our program, depending on our ability to successfully hover around that 65 percent number. The key here, and the area where I think we need additional discussion—a blue dot or two, or maybe I just need more information—is that this only works if it is easy and affordable to measure where our workforce lives on a regular basis. And I'll throw my own measurables out on the table. I think we want to be able to measure this on an annual basis and I think we should ultimately be able to measure for about \$110,000 a year. Part and parcel of this measurement conversation is the premise of Chapter 4 that our community housing program should also aim to accomplish four primary goals, goals which also can be measured. But the question is, how easily can we measure this info and how good is the information that we ultimately get? Andy touched on this yesterday. Are we creating unmeasurable goals and expectations? And if we think we are, can we recalibrate them now? Specifically, the information we would need to know, as I understand it, is from every household, to understand if we're meeting the community's housing program, we would need to know the age, income, location of employment, length of time in the Valley of everyone in the household, as well as if the residents are second homeowners, seasonal employees, or if Jackson is in fact their primary residence. Again, is it possible for us to get this information from every household? At what cost? And the indicator matrix at the end of the chapter suggests we would have this information annually. If so, are we using estimates? Are the estimates good enough to base important decisions upon? As Principle 4.1 states, housing programs, like the Housing Trust, will need to ensure we meet these goals. This is something our organization can easily do. We can do it affordably and we're happy to provide this on an annual basis to the electeds. But I don't think the royal we can meet our community-wide housing goals if we don't have this information for every household. The other principle I just want to flag for you and touch on is that I would ask you to clarify 4.3 and that incentives...it would be our recommendation that incentives continue to be considered in exchange for permanently restricted workforce housing and not just a word for the creation of unrestricted free-market housing. Thank you.
3/8/2011	Hankey, April Friends of Pathways	Okay, April Hankey, Assistant Executive Director at Friends of Pathways. I couldn't sleep last night either, Rich. I think it's more to do with my dog sleeping on top of me and less to do with yesterday. Thank you all so much for all your thoughtful work. This is a long tedious process and you're great and thank you and thank you for representing all of us. A couple of things. When you guys talk about transit tonight and traffic as manifestation of growth and your transportation plan, we really hope...and nodes aren't a bad word, I don't think...but we really hope that you all can support development patterns that in turn support multi-modal transportation, and that includes biking, walking, ride sharing and mass transit. It also includes looking at complete streets like our Town Council did very recently. And thank you all on Town Council; you guys really set a precedent and showed leadership on that, that's providing sidewalks for people to walk on, people in wheelchairs, people with babies, people who are running late to work and are trying to catch the bus that stops, you know, on the sidewalk. That includes really enhancing our mass transit system. You know, 65 percent of the people in Teton County drive themselves by themselves, by themselves, themselves by themselves, whatever, to work every day. That's a big number. And the only way we're going to get that number down is if we really support our multi-modal transportation system. So I really encourage you all to take a stand with that and again appreciate all of your hard work. And, as always, we hope to be a resource if you ever...if you have questions. So, thank you and good luck.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Collins, Bill Interested Public	Good evening, Bill Collins. I live in the Town of Jackson. Don't be afraid to make plans on where you want to see growth located. And I think the '94 Plan I think had a major shortcoming in that it did not deal proactively with locating growth. And that did not mean growth did not occur; it just means it occurs in haphazard locations, haphazard forms, with not a lot of thought given to the character of it. And I think I sort of sensed the Planning Commission kind of drifted in that direction through their reviews. It's very good to identify the resources that should be protected, and that's crucial. And the '94 Plan was very good at doing that. But that's a half a Plan. The other half of the Plan is when growth occurs, where should it occur? What should be its character? At what level? So be proactive in doing that. I think that will entail reinserting the land-use maps, and I also think that entails reinserting the concept of nodes. The '94 Plan kind of moved us away from the checkerboard zoning of three-acre lots to clustering within the boundaries of somebody's property. I think it's very important that this Plan take us to clustering on another level, and that is clustering on a community-wide level. And that's what's behind the idea of the land-use maps, I believe, and I think that's what's behind the idea of the nodes. But that is really planning proactively for growth, because it will eventually begin to occur again someday and we need to have a Plan that deals with that. And in thinking about that, I also would encourage you to have...be mindful of who we really want to be living here in 25 years. And Jackson Hole and Teton County, the legacy that it's a full-blown, comprehensive working community. It's not just a playground for people who can afford it. It's truly a working community with a resident labor force. And as we think about the next 25 and 50 years, let's try to maintain that. I think that's an important characteristic of this community. And that also sets us apart from a lot of other resort towns. Thank you.
3/8/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri with Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'll start off with what I see as the top issue or opportunity. At least, the biggest challenge is how to manage growth. I think we all pretty much agree on what we want to do. The real issue where we believe we diverge is when we talk about how to achieve those goals. So, with that in mind, a couple of things to think of as recommendations. To manage effectively, it's important first to set goals. That was done in the '94 Plan and we're doing that again now, and that's good, that's important. The second step is to measure against those goals. Unfortunately, since the 1994 Plan, we've done nothing until recently to go back and do that. So that's a shortcoming that we need to overcome as we go forward from this point. And the third thing is to adapt, because no matter what, we're going to make mistakes and the market's going to change. We all talked about that. So we need to be able to adapt and not dig in our heels and stay on the course that we do. Having said that, I want to talk about when we grow fast, one of the problems with that is that we stop taking those measurements. That's what happened during the boom period. That's bad. Your Staff can't keep you updated on whether you're even doing things, so I would suggest that is one metric to decide whether growth is too much to be managed properly. If you can stop making measurements, that's bad. The key is to get the proper goals. What do we really want? Building permits do not necessarily equal local jobs, and big cranes building big steel buildings don't necessarily equal local jobs. So, it's really important to focus. If we're talking about jobs, we can create jobs, but do we want to create jobs for local trades people? So that's an important thing as you focus on what do we want to actually measure. Big jobs that go to out-of-state companies would submit don't do as big a benefit to this community. And so that is something to think about when you think about the size of the buildings that you want to do. Do you want to build buildings that are going to put local people to work or out-of-state people? You need to provide a clear vision for the developers. A recent example that was very divisive was Teton Meadows where, as was talked a little bit about yesterday in terms of transportation, we had a development that didn't have adequate infrastructure to allow for mass transit that we say we want. But we let that developer spend all that time, and the community go down that road arguing it, when it...they had a fatal flaw. Clearly communicate, if that's going to be important, transportation, put that in there and make the developer see that so that they don't waste time going down there. Make that a priority for any new development in the County that it have adequate connections for transportation, that the highest and best use is going to be dead end. The developer will make more money and people will say that that's where they want to live, but that's where you need to have the backbone to say that what's best for the community, though, is to have through trans exit. One last thing, there's a lot of talk about what we can and cannot do. I think it's important to say that we can, that management of growth is not a bad thing. All we've got to do is look at this community and Teton County Idaho and compare ourselves to Teton County Idaho. We're in way better shape. And that was I think the result of letting them do whatever they wanted to do. So, I close by saying I think focus on what you can do and what you can control. The market will correct things, but it is painful. Your job is to make it less painful. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	Thank you. My name is Tim O'Donoghue; I'm Executive Director at the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce. And I just want to give a prefacing statement. But I think the Comp Plan process is an opportunity and responsibility for our community to establish the bounds of the economy, community, the environmental priorities, and I think that we realize that the key to sustainability is to integrate and balance the triple bottom line—economic, social and environmental priorities. So, two other things I'd like to say that the Comp Plan I think addresses, but I want to be sure our community knows that the Chamber of Commerce is of like mind, and one is that we agree that we should be balancing our economic development with stewardship of wildlife, scenery, and natural resources. The other one is to integrate resident and visitor transit and concentrate development. So, I think what Bob Lenz said yesterday about really focusing on the transit as part of our Comp Plan with deciding how we want to develop in the future, where we concentrate development, is pretty key. Support a more sustainable Teton Village. Teton Village has a certain amount of commercial space allocated to it that may or may not be enough for them to be a sustainable village center. And so I think the process here should address that concern and issue, not only in Teton Village but the business community. Create sustained workforce rental housing. I think there needs to be strong emphasis in the Comp Plan for affordable rental housing, as well as just open free-market rental housing. I think we're really short when it comes to housing for workforce in the rental area. Strengthen economic diversity in Teton County by supporting the network of small locally owned, operated and supported businesses consistent with community stewardship, social, culture & arts and heritage goals. So, it's supporting small businesses as strongly as we possibly can and looking at supporting businesses that have a consistency with what our community's goals are for history & heritage and culture & arts, as well as sustainability. Strengthening the community orientation of the tourism economy. There's a concern in the business community, as well I believe elsewhere, that our development patterns are showing businesses coming in that are requiring higher and higher income levels to afford to stay here and visit here. I think the core that's always been—and it's weakening over time—in our economy is the families, especially in the summertime. So, if we're going to be looking at development, should we be...the question mark for you all is should the Comp Plan be addressing the affordability for visitors here? Are we looking at development that may or may not help families continue to come here? So, if will strengthen the community orientation or family orientation of the tourism economy. And then, lastly, orient economic development towards community self-reliance and sustainability. The Comp Plan should support the formation and growth of businesses that support our goals of self-reliance and sustainability. Such businesses be consistent with our community's orientation towards balancing economic, social and environmental interests and concerns in creating jobs, perhaps like green jobs for our community. And our community's tourism economy be strengthened by the attraction of discriminating travelers just like Jackson Hole as their destination of choice because of our community's economic development and orientation, progress towards sustainability, and protection and promotion of makes us unique and distinct—our history, our heritage, our cultural arts, and our environment.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Taylor, Nancy Conservation Alliance	Commissioners, Council, Mayor Barron, my name is Nancy Taylor, co-Chair of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance and I'm speaking for the Alliance this evening. Given your three-minute cap, we can't talk about every policy and principle that needs additional work, but for the last four years, you have our written and verbal comments about these policies, in addition to what we submitted yesterday. We'll continue to summarize the major issues and inconsistencies and continue to provide specific recommendations on each draft. The pivotal decision that has been made to separate the FLUP, the future land-use planning maps from the themes and policies, I'm afraid, in the end, will make a whole lot more work for you, as elected officials, and I don't think you're looking for more work given how rapidly you want this process to go, your timeline. We have set objectives of predictability, measurability and accountability and those objectives cannot be met without the inclusion of the future land-use planning maps. So, it's a disconnect and they need to come together. You, our elected officials, are the guardians of this pristine place. You're the keepers of the crown jewels in this unique ecosystem and all that it encompasses. I was involved in the first comp planning efforts in Teton County 30 years ago and I've watched the Valley change in a piecemeal fashion. The crown jewels need to be guarded, not sold off in little pieces. As guardians of this unique land, it's incumbent on you to make this Comp Plan strong and enforce it with your clear vision. That's what we're asking for. Chief Seattle states: treat the earth well—it was not given to you by your parents, it was loaned to you by your children. We do not inherit the earth from our ancestors; we borrow it from our children. We as a community are not taking this message to heart. We're not treating this earth well when we approved five golf courses in this tiny community, when we approve more commercial development while commercial space is sitting vacant, and we don't have the resources to monitor the impact of that which we approve. This Plan needs teeth and you, as our elected officials, need to ensure that it's strong and then you need to enforce it with every decision you make. Why not make history as a group of elected officials that took the long view, that recognized with every ill-conceived development, we are borrowing from our children. This Valley is a finite place and you have a responsibility to protect it with a strong Plan, clear and enforceable LDRs, and with vision that carries this community into a vibrant and sustainable future. The economy of Jackson will tank as soon as the wildlife that depend on open migration corridors are gone. The animals can't attend your meetings and speak about wetlands that have been filled in, that used to be their winter habitat. They have no representation on your Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board. This is an invitation to you from the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance to step forward with courage and a strong united voice to protect this fragile and unique place for perpetuity. If you do not act now, no one will and it will be too late. Thank you for listening and for giving the public an opportunity to speak.
3/8/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Hi, Kristine O'Brien. I was one of those people listening online yesterday and I'd like to thank everyone for the hard work they're putting into the Plan. I just want to say that Teton County is a small part of a global economy and we cannot change that and we cannot affect what goes on in the rest of the world; however, we can, to a significant extent, determine the shape of our community, if we have a strong and sound Comprehensive Plan, one that acknowledges the cost of growth and allocates resources within our means and according to community priorities and goals. We need a clear map of what we want our community to look like with clear and predictable land-use regulations along with incentives for permanent conservation easements. Teton County's comparative advantage is its natural capital—its wildlife, open spaces and scenic vistas. Moreover, I agree with Commissioner Ellis that our landscape has an intrinsic value and our stewardship responsibility for it transcends our personal and economic interests. Cost of growth must not only consider fiscal costs—for roads, crime prevention and other public amenities—but also the degradation of its natural capital for use by current and future generations. For example, irreversible destruction of wildlife habitat and scenic vistas. A Plan that promotes economic activity, such as eco-tourism that is renting this capital, rather than selling it all out in an attempt to create another real estate boom will be sustainable and affordable. It will also distribute wealth across a wider range of individuals, in addition to making the Jackson experience accessible to more people both now and in the future. And I appreciate that some of you expressed concerns about the cost of growth yesterday. The Plan can only be a Plan if it is feasible and sustainable. I'm counting on you to provide leadership and ensuring the Plan is going to be moving forward, that we are not kicking the can down the road for future generations to pay in the form of unsustainable debt, as we are seeing in communities across America, or in running down the natural capital that sustains our economy for good times and bad, such as burst housing bubbles, and the stewardship of which is the number-one priority of this community. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Levy, Robbin Interested Public	Hi, Robin Levy; I'm an attorney in Town. I was encouraged by the conversation yesterday. I think you guys are doing a great job and I thank you for your service. I thought it was very appropriate that the Commissioner started with a conversation about a fundamental truth that we're dealing with, which is private property rights. We can't waive a magic wand and make it go away resulting no growth, so we need to deal with that. And I think that that pushes us to smart growth and smart planning, which is obviously what you're all about today. But I think smart planning...I heard a lot of conversation about smart planning among the group and it was very encouraging. I think, Greg, you might have brought up nodes and getting the nodes back in the conversation, clustered development. I think density transfers and moving development into the nodes is going to be challenging. I think the thing that I push today is to encourage you to keep that toolbox as big as you can in this Plan and don't inadvertently tie your arms together, because I think moving density that already exists that we can't take a magic wand and wipe out into the nodes and into clusters is smart development that's going to result in all the things we care about, like mass transportation, less cars on the road, open space, protection of our natural resources, and all those things that are important to everyone. So, I'm just giving you support for the hard work you need to do and asking that you, please, carry on and make those tough decisions for us. Thank you.
3/8/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hi, Gail Jensen. I've written a lot of...I've attended a lot of Planning Commission meetings and I've written a lot about what my feeling are, but I'm trying to keep it up to the higher level this evening. And where I think a lot of importance is in predictability. And I guess I go contrary to just the last comments, in that I think we do need to map. I think everybody in this community, that's what they have asked for, that's what they've wanted. They wanted predictability. They want to see the maps. I'm not so sure that they'll oppose. You need to locate the density where you want to put it and let's put it out there. Let's not surprise people. Let's not pull the rug out from under their feet after you've already approved a Comp Plan and you've thrown the maps out there. Let's talk about it; let's get it out there right now. Let's figure, let's talk to the predictability and what smart growth means. And we can plan for it. Also, the cost of growth is really important to me. I see, since I moved here in 1980, I have seen a very...a lot of lack of planning when it comes to infrastructure—well, we can't certainly ask this developer to do it because we didn't ask the last developer to do it. We really need to plan for infrastructure. I feel we're at a critical point right now. We can double in size here with what's entitled and we really don't have a plan for our infrastructure, improvements for our highways. We really need to get that under control. We need to plan, truly plan. And I think that that's critical. Who's going to pay for it? With everything that's in the current draft, I'm not going to be able to afford to live here, if we entitle everything, the whole wish list, in every one of those themes. If you look at the end point of those strategies and how we get there, and it's all about, well, we'll incentivize; well, the public will fund it. You know, it just doesn't add up. So I think we need to take a hard look at that. And I'm all for any energy conservation, any smart building, any kind of ways that we can protect the environment and to save on energy. Thank you.
3/7/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	It is imperative that we have a sound comprehensive plan, one that acknowledges costs of growth and allocates resources within our means and according to community priorities and goals. We need a clear map of what we want our community to look like with clear and predictable land use regulations, along with incentives for permanent conservation easements. Teton County's comparative advantage is its natural capital; its wildlife, open spaces and scenic vistas. Costs of growth must not only consider fiscal costs, but also the degradation of this capital for use by current and future generations. A Plan that promotes economic activity such as ecotourism, that is, renting this capital rather than selling it all out in an attempt to create another real estate boom, will be sustainable and affordable. It will also distribute wealth across a wider range of individuals in addition to making the 'Jackson Experience' accessible to more people both now and in the future. I am concerned that the Comprehensive Plan, as it stands, takes no account of the cost of growth, neither fiscal (taxes for roads, schools, crime prevention and other public amenities) nor environmental (irreversible destruction of wildlife habitat and scenic vistas, pollution, etc). How can the plan be a plan if it does not consider what is feasible and sustainable? The Plan must be one we can afford and not a mechanism for short-term gain, kicking the can down the road for future generations to pay in the form of unsustainable debt (as we are seeing in communities across America) or in running down the natural capital that sustains our economy through good times and bad (such as burst housing bubbles) and the stewardship of which is the number one priority of this community.

Date	Name	Comment
3/7/2011	Simon, Ronna Interested Public	Since I've been asked, here are some thoughts about housing needs. I am single, without children, and not likely to be marrying (again), but I have a dog. There are many individuals like me in the workforce in Jackson, and the current affordable housing options are biased against people like me. The options I've been offered have been extremely expensive (over \$250,000), which I cannot afford on a single income, they have only one bedroom (which, having been in the workforce since 1987, is pretty pitiful-- I don't think it's unreasonable to be able to have a second bedroom to use as an office/spare bedroom for guests), and they generally lack access to even a small yard for my dog. Side-by-side duplexes are preferable to apartment-style situations for those of us who work. I often cannot return home during the day to let my dog out, and need a small yard where I can set up a dog run. Oh, and the dog-verboten Golf and Tennis housing (TCHA) is positively out of my consideration. Please consider the needs of single people, and don't assume that we all want roommates. If 2-bedroom, side-by-side accommodations-- both for ownership and for rent-- at a reasonable cost were available, many people would be happier staying in Jackson. A reasonable cost for purchase would be about \$150,000, and reasonable rent would be about \$450-\$500 per month. P.S.-- I neglected to say it, but I work for the Bridger-Teton National Forest, am currently renting government housing, and am on the verge of being told that I can no longer stay in government housing. I am active in volunteer activities in town and after almost six years here was finally offered a home through the Housing Trust-- but I cannot afford it, even though I have been a federal employee since 1987. It is over \$260,000. The availability of housing will determine whether I stay in Jackson or not, much to my regret. I consider Jackson my home, but I cannot drain my bank accounts to live here.

Date	Name	Comment
3/7/2011	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Given the Conservation Alliance’s work to ensure responsible land stewardship in Jackson Hole, we are writing with regard to the staff report that was released the afternoon of March 3rd for the March 7th JIM meeting. Given the short turnaround made available for public input, combined with your regularly scheduled meetings, we recognize you may not have time to review a lengthy correspondence prior to the comp plan hearing scheduled for Monday afternoon, March 7th. With that in mind, we respectfully request that you consider the following brief comments. The staff report that was released on March 3rd provides an example of why it is beneficial to allow some opportunity for limited verbal input at the beginning of each hearing on the comp plan (at a minimum). While we appreciate the commitment to provide a summary of written comments at the beginning of each hearing, in cases where there is such an abbreviated timeframe between the release of information and a scheduled meeting, the approach does not seem sufficient. Since the release of the staff report, citizens were essentially given one business day to evaluate what is being proposed, formulate thoughts and recommendations, and submit them in written form. This type of timeline is not conducive to enabling adequate citizen input for issues that are time-sensitive. Of key significance, these are not issues that the public has had the opportunity to comment on in the past. Specifically, the staff report that was released on March 3rd introduced a number of new ideas and fundamental issues that the public should be given ample time to evaluate and subsequently provide input on. Some examples, which are not minor, include: • Quantitative Analysis of Public Comment The quantification of public comment in the staff report raised some questions. From a practical standpoint (i.e. the time required to enter the data), we can appreciate why data analysis would be limited to April 2009 and beyond. However, it is essential to understand that the database leaves out a critical element of public comment – more than 1.5 years of the early public comment, which was during the main public outreach component of the overall process. In addition to the surveys outlined in appendix D, individuals were energetic and engaged in a number of different meetings and open houses commenting on broad values, all of which is highly relevant to your broad level discussions. In short, we are surprised to see the approach to represent the data in quantitative statistics when the dataset is incomplete. It also has the potential to send the message that recent comments are somehow more relevant. If the database is “to serve as a valuable tool for informed decision-making” as appendix A states, it is important to recognize it as only a partial dataset rather than an entirely complete picture of all public comment to date. Overall, the graphs in the staff report are confusing. How were the percentages figured? For instance, the sum of the percentages is 110 percent. • Newly Established Definition of Community Character as “Value #2” of the community It was very surprising to see a newly established top community value that utilizes the term “community character,” a term that already has a strong significance in local planning. Specifically, our current land development regulations are based on a community character framework. (Our existing Comp Plan states “Jackson and Teton County hereby formulate a land development regulatory system which protects the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Teton County by responding to the components of community character.”) The April 2009 draft took a significant step away from using community character as a framework for planning. Also, based on the “opportunities” outlined in the recent staff report under the value of “community character,” there appears to be a different focus than what is currently recognized in our existing plan as components of community character. In short, to be a fundamental, key value of the community, there needs to be consensus on what the term means and whether the “community character approach,” as an implementation strategy, will still be used as it is in our existing plan. We believe the approach can be a good planning tool, particularly in the case that objectives for implementing a desired community character are clear. It’s important to note that some public comments regarding “community character” likely referred to principles in other sections of the draft, particularly themes one and

two, which focused on growth management and natural resources. (These themes' principles are not mentioned in the staff report under "community character.") Following is an excerpt from the community character chapter of our existing plan, which describes community character more from a land planning approach, which we believe should also be maintained:

"A fundamental objective of this Comprehensive Plan is to preserve rural character and enhance it where possible; to allow development, but to make sure that new development is consistent with rural character. Primarily, rural character is defined by large amounts of open space in relationship to the floor area and volume of structures. Therefore, preserving a rural character requires that very large amounts of open space be set aside as development occurs. Open space also results in the preservation of natural resources, wildlife habitat, and scenic vistas, if the regulations are so structured to protect these attributes."

Overall, we appreciate that many of the issues identified in the staff report are relevant for "community character," but we believe that the list should be more comprehensive, particularly given the historical context of the term in local planning and the potential for it to be a top priority in the new plan. It would be good if some explanation could be provided regarding the criteria, or rationale, for grouping the various comment topics under "community character" in the staff report. This will help ensure everyone is on the same page before identifying the community's top values.

- Proposed agenda item to discuss potential new format of the plan

The agenda for March 8 includes a "format and outline brainstorm" to discuss structure choices for the plan - three values, one vision, or eight themes. We would like additional clarification on this item. It is surprising to discuss structural changes to the plan that are this fundamental given where our community is in the process - approximately four years into the rewrite. The community, including volunteer planning commissioners, spent considerable time with the plan framed around "eight themes." If you choose to reformat the entire plan, it is unrealistic, and inappropriate, to say our community is in the "FINAL" phase of review and to give the public such a limited timeframe at the end of your discussions to review a new draft. More valuable to the process, in terms of discussing "the format of the plan," would be to dedicate considerable time evaluating the decision to separate the "Themes and Policies" from the "character districts." The Alliance respectfully disagrees with the tentative decision to adopt the "Themes and Policies" - without the Future Land Use Plan/Character Districts - as the new plan. This is specifically in response to the way the new plan was written, which is very different than our existing plan that provides considerably more direction within its narrative on specific geographic areas throughout the town and county.

To date, no explanation has been provided as to why our community would benefit from not reviewing the plan components in their entirety prior to adoption. As we have stated before, the Conservation Alliance supports the joint planning commissions' unanimous recommendation to adopt the plan as a complete unit and to not simply incorporate the maps as piecemeal addendums.

Conclusion

The Conservation Alliance will submit comments shortly regarding specific recommendations on discussion topics. (Attached is a memo that we submitted at the end of the planning commission review that summarizes what we believe are key inconsistencies and contradictions with the draft plan. Most of these concerns still hold.) At this point, we respectfully request that some of the items in the staff report be further clarified before you finalize decisions on common values in the March 7 meeting. Thank you for considering our comments.

Date	Name	Comment
3/6/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi everyone, Don't know if any of you have seen these websites. It is a clearing house of ideas and policies that embraces localism with emphasis on individual and community responsibility to the environment which in turn rewards that community with a more enduring stable economy and healthier, richer (spiritually and monetarily) households and individuals. I think the only people that would be against what I stated above are CEOs of natural gas, coal and oil companies that need us to be dependent on their products. Hope everybody is enjoying the snow! :) Kathy http://www.newrules.org/ http://www.ilsr.org/ Institute For Local Self Reliance P.S. I liked Jonathan Schechter's column "Like land use, economy needs vision" http://www.jhnewsandguide.com/article.php?ctg=9&csfd=1 About the New Rules Project A program of the Institute for Local Self-Reliance, the New Rules Project started back in 1998 and continues to bring fresh new policy solutions to communities and states to ensure that they are "designing rules as if community matters". • It Takes a City – How better rules and regulations promote local self-reliance- this excellent article by David Morris published in In Character magazine (February 2007) provides a fantastic overview of the reasons behind our New Rules Project. • Communities: Building Authority, Responsibility, and Capacity A good overview article on the concept of local self reliance by David Morris, published in State of the Union, 1994. The New Rules Projects features a number of policy areas and several key programs and initiatives, including: The Hometown Advantage, Telecommunications as Commons Initiative, Biofuels and Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles, and Climate Neutral Bonding. Meet our staff. Why New Rules? Because the old ones don't work any longer. They undermine local economies, subvert democracy, weaken our sense of community, and ignore the costs of our decisions on the next generation. The Institute for Local Self-Reliance (ILSR) proposes a set of new rules that builds community by supporting humanly scaled politics and economics. The rules call for: • Decisions made by those who will feel the impact of those decisions. 2 • Communities accepting responsibility for the welfare of their members and for the next generation. • Households and communities possessing or owning sufficient productive capacity to generate real wealth. These are the principles of "new localism." They call upon us to begin viewing our communities and our regions not only as places of residence, recreation and retail but as places that nurture active and informed citizens with the skills and productive capacity to generate real wealth and the authority to govern their own lives. All human societies are governed by rules. We make the rules and the rules make us. Thus, the heart of this web site is a growing storehouse of community and local economy-building rules - laws, regulations, and ordinances - because these are the concrete expression of our values. They channel entrepreneurial energy and investment capital and scientific genius. The New Rules Project identifies rules that honor a sense of place and prize rootedness, continuity and stability as well as innovation and enterprise. Click on any of the sectors listed and you will be taken to a web page that contains a list of categories of policy tools appropriate for that sector. Questions and Answers Isn't it unrealistic to expect communities to be self-sufficient? Yes, it is. Localism does not mean self-sufficiency. Nations are not self-sufficient, and neither are communities. But nations that are self-conscious and self-determining are stronger because of it. The same holds true for communities. But aren't there economies of scale?

Date**Name****Comment**

Yes, but empirical evidence has shown us that in many important areas--education, health, manufacturing, farming, the generation of power, for instance--it is not globalism and bigness, but localism and smallness that are more costeffective, more profitable, more environmentally benign, more democratic, more enduring. The only thing that smallness lacks is power, the power to make the rules.

Doesn't localism pose a threat to those who are not in the majority? Doesn't it allow those with means, or power, to secede from responsibility for the whole, leaving the powerless behind?

If localism were absolute, yes, it would do that. But it is not. Localism is an approach that allows us to sort out which roles are appropriate for which levels of government. Guarantees of basic rights must come from the federal level. Higher levels of government appropriately should set floors--e.g., a minimum wage or a minimum level of environmental compliance or minimum guarantees of political rights-- but not ceilings. They should not pre-empt lower levels of government from exceeding those minimums (as international trade agreements do, for instance.)

Why would localism guarantee efficient, environmentally benign development?

It doesn't. There are no guarantees in a true democracy, because power rests with the citizens. But it does create the possibility. And without localism, we are guaranteed the opposite: rootless corporations with no allegiance to place, other than to the place with the lowest wages and least environmental restrictions; long lines of transportation, which are inherently polluting; and out-of-scale development that wrecks neighborhoods and destroys habitat. By its very nature, localism would shorten transportation lines, encourage rooted businesses, demand an active citizenry. Localism is a development concept that would enable humanly-scaled, environmentally healthy, politically active, economically robust communities.

Isn't localism simply nostalgia for a simpler time?

No. Just as globalism is mistaken for progress, localism is often confused with a desire to reverse technology, or turn back the clock. There is nothing inherently progressive about globalization, and there is nothing inherently backwardslooking about localism. Localism has to do with (1) where decisions are made, and (2) the principles guiding those decisions. Those are issues that will and should remain central to society throughout time.

Is localism anti-technology?

The new localism relies on some of the most sophisticated technologies (e.g. integrated pest management, flexible manufacturing, solar cells.) At the end of the 19th century, as we switched from wood to steel, from water wheels to fossil fueled central power plants, and from craft shops to mass production, technology seemed to demand larger scale production systems and economies. At the end of the 20th century, as we switch from minerals to vegetables, from fossil fuels to solar energy, and from mass production to batch production, technological progress encourages decentralized, localized economies

3/6/2011 O'Brien, Paul F.
Interested Public

The over-riding goal of this Comprehensive Plan should be to prepare for an inevitable return of intense development pressure. It may not look like it now, but demand will return, probably powerfully. Poor economic conditions in the United States belie a strong global expansion, and the worldwide population with the income for travel, or the wealth to afford high-end resort property, is growing much faster than the overall economy. The experience of the past boom should have convinced you of the challenges that lie ahead: Protecting the environment and wildlife, managing access to affordable housing, and maintaining a balanced community will be extremely difficult. You must prepare for that now, with a Plan that presents a clear, unambiguous vision and lays down meaningful ground-rules to maintain community goals. Anything less would be to ignore a critical opportunity.

Date	Name	Comment
3/4/2011	Uhl, Richard Interested Public	Thank you for the time and effort that has been expended on working through the Comprehensive Plan. It is a daunting (and probably feels thankless) task, but very necessary to provide a viable economic future to our community and county. Here are a couple of thoughts/ideas that I would like to share with you, as you consider moving forward with an updated plan: 1) Homeownership has and will be an important factor in the survival of a sustainable workforce, citizens that are socially and economically involved in the local community, and preservation of a long-term, multi-generational community base. 2) We need to be careful that we don't shut-down development where and when it is appropriate, by prolonging the approval process and charging fees and requirements for affordable housing mitigation that discourages developers from pursuing. In the long-term, we lose potential tax income, jobs, new housing opportunities, families, stable critical service providers, etc. by being too short-sighted. 3) Zoning needs to be allowed for multi-family rentals. Not everyone will own a home during their tenure in Jackson. I don't see that it is realistic to provide homeownership to everyone either. Many of these individuals, families, workers, adventure seekers, etc. are here for the short-term (2 to 5 years) and do not need homeownership, but could be housed in apartments. As well, homeownership is not a right, it's a privilege and may become more difficult to obtain in the future. 4) If possible, we should have a goal of housing at least 65% of our workforce. This does not mean they all own a home though. It will be a combination of deed restricted housing, market housing, and rentals. 5) We have three affordable housing entities in Teton County, the Teton County Housing Authority, Habitat for Humanity, and Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust. These entities with their expert staffs, boards, and abilities to provide housing should be utilized to their full extent by the Comprehensive Plan to promote and provide solutions for housing in the local area.
3/4/2011	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	Hi Charlotte, Thank you for sending me this, but at this point after spending the past 3 years trying to partake I feel the planning staff Mr. Dougherty in particular are deaf to the community, and the top priorities that you mention in line one of your note are totally disregarded. In dealing with the MESS we have in front of us presently in Wilson all our comments of the past Comp Plan Meetings have fallen on very Deaf ears. When Andy Swartz asked Jamie Mackay if postponing a decision on his mess in Wilson would cause him financial issues, I realized have been bought off. We have ended up with "A Node" we have ended up with a project that we don't need or want. I presented the commissioners with over 300 signatures of people that don't want what we are about to end up with in the heart of Wilson. I believe it quickly became Andy's fire starter. 6 months ago Susan Johnson told me "We love this project in Wilson" even worse, the planning staff has now become the developer, working diligently with the applicant to assure it's passage. How is it that the Senior Planner has the power to determine the use of wetlands is necessary. Frustrated, saddened, and sickened. I doubt you can find a citizen of Wilson, let alone Teton County that doesn't echo my feelings.
3/3/2011	Anderson, Kristie Interested Public	As a five year valley resident and future teacher in TCSD I'd like to have my opinion heard on the matter of Workforce Housing. I believe having decent, accessible and affordable housing in Jackson is (not only the right thing to do morally and ethically but) what will keep our community thriving with diversity, education, art, music and kind family oriented people who want to stay here and get invested in building a future here. Please include an array of WH in the Comprehensive Plan that will help people like myself, a hard working single mom, find a place to live that will support my efforts to be a secure, stable, involved and positive community member!

Date	Name	Comment
3/3/2011	Humphries, Shepard Interested Public	While I have many preferences for the future of my community, I find it distasteful and presumptive to suggest that my preferences should have any bearing on what my neighbors do with or on their private property. I am writing to ask that local governments and their agents decline to continue with social planning and instead allow creative, diverse and free people to build their lives as they each choose. Despite the grandiose manner with which I often enjoy presenting myself, I lack the actual arrogance to think that I or any of my friends or associates could possible out-plan the natural processes of the free marketplace. The individual choices made by thousands will yield a far better tomorrow than the noisy intellectual dictates of dozens or hundreds that “get involved” as petty tyrants attempting to rule their fellow’s lives. Oops, I just got involved by sharing this letter of encouragement. ☺ I love ya’ll, and ask you again, please don’t plan our futures; plan instead (if you must plan) to meet our infrastructure and emergency safety needs as we continue to blossom in our own inspired ways!

Date	Name	Comment
3/3/2011	Davis, Leslie and Eric Interested Public	Since we were given the opportunity to give feedback, I'd like to just let you know what my husband and I are thinking. I'm really thankful for everyone who works so hard to make housing affordable in our area! We think you guys do a great job! We have lived in Jackson over the past 11-12 years (away for 5 of those years for grad school), and do not currently own a home yet. It seems like it is difficult for a young family to live in Jackson with enough space to raise that family. We have 3 in our family and 1 on the way. With a growing family and my husband working out of our home, 3 bedrooms seems to be an adequate sized home (or 2 bedrooms and an office, something like that), but seems to be pretty unaffordable. I'm sure none of this is new information to you! And we understand, it's not our right to own a home, especially in such an incredible area. However, we'll share our situation so you have some more information to help you lead our community in this area. One of the things that has made owning a home difficult is the limited amount of Category 1, 3 or more bedroom houses. Since the restrictions changed, and it became impossible to purchase a home outside of the financial category one falls in, our family is limited to purchasing a Category 1 home. We understand completely the reasons this changed and know that is fair. However, since there are only a few Category 1, 3 bedrooms in the valley (particularly on the westbank), owning an affordable home isn't much of an option for us. As I said before, our family size is growing and my husband works out of our home. The Category 1, 2 bedrooms aren't big enough to decide to spend that type of money on in our situation. In addition, we would qualify financially (in Teton County) for a Habitat for Humanity home. However, given the stipulations required to own one of those homes, it would be almost impossible for us to own one of those as well. One of the stipulations makes families who have the "potential" to earn more money than they are currently making, lower priority to be chosen for one of these homes than a family that does not have that potential (i.e., a single mom with 5 children, etc). My husband works full time in a job that focuses on serving and helping the people in our community. I stay at home with our daughter and work part time from the home, as well as help with my husband's job. Full time for my husband looks like 70-75 hours a week, because we choose to give more of our time than a typical 40 hour work week to serving people in our community. He could make more money if he only worked 40 hours doing this and then got a second job for the other 30-40, but we feel it benefits our community more for us to give a lot of our time away for "free." With that stipulation in place and our decision to pour into helping people in the community with more of our time, we would be lower priority for a Habitat for Humanity home, although we barely make ends meet every month. A market home is not really an option for us either. The prices are lower than they've been in a long time, but not low enough for us to be able to afford a mortgage, unless we purchased a 2 bedroom, 750 square foot home for \$200,000. Again, not conducive to a growing family or to working out of the home. We've even found it to be difficult to rent a place that's big enough for our family. With very high mortgages, owners have had to charge a lot more for their rentals. It's easy enough to fit 3-4 ski bums in a 3 bedroom home and charge \$1850 or \$2000 a month, but for a working family in Jackson to pay that amount to rent a 3 bedroom place is out of the question. At least for us (and I think many families in similar situations) it seems one of the needs of the hour is affordable housing options for families with more than 1 child. In no way, do I want this to be taken as a complaint. Again, we are so thankful for the hard work people do in our community to make housing affordable! As well, we understand the choices we make impact in some ways our ability to be able to own a home. However, as you are continuing to think about ways to serve the workforce in our community, we thought it would be helpful to share our specific situation.

Date	Name	Comment
3/3/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Members of Town Council and Teton County Commissioners, -As you begin your review, we hope you will keep asking if the document is clear, concise, and easy to understand. The Plan must meet this criteria to be effective. -Town and County compete for limited resources. (tourists and tax dollars) We need to acknowledge that fact and discuss how we can make that competition constructive, not destructive. (improving services is constructive, building bigger and bigger high end lodging is destructive) Our Comp Plan may be joint, but the needs of the Town and County are not always the same. We can try to fool ourselves but the reality remains. -To be effective the Comp Plan must examine all the impacts. A Comprehensive Plan must be just that, comprehensive. It must include a visual representation of the vision for different locations. (Character Districts or FLUPs) It must also include a capital plan to address the needs to accommodate growth that is anticipated during the Plan's life. We recognize the capital plan will need to be updated more frequently than the Comp Plan, but that does not mean it should be adopted later. Adopting the Comp Plan piece meal will undermine its effectiveness because it is not comprehensive. -We know you have heard the community say that protecting wildlife is our highest priority. Do not fall for the mistaken idea that some areas have no value for wildlife. As an example, permeability of development is an important concept to maintain our wildlife populations. Development patterns should allow safe travel corridors and road crossings. This concept is just as applicable to Town Development or other areas of dense development as it is in Rural Areas.

Date	Name	Comment
3/3/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	The Comprehensive Plan???? Can you believe they are still working on this??????? It's been over four years and over \$400,000 (No s—t). Who persuaded me to get on this bus????? The most recent stab is a facilitator, \$78,000 to conduct the meetings. He seems like a nice enough guy. He laid out the rules, "No name calling, stay on subject, when the bell rings everyone to their corners, don't look the public in the eye." Two bouncers from the Cowboy could have done the job for \$700 a piece but who am I to know the workings of politics? They want this to go fast. It really doesn't matter what the plan says at this point, let's just git —er-done. Here is my take; """"SHOW ME THE MAP"""" There will be no FLUP (future land use plan) until after the comprehensive plan is finished. "HELLO" I thought the future land use plan basically was the comprehensive plan. One is a map; the other is a wish list. You can't have one without the other. There are no more "NODES". Remember, nodes are new growth centers or neighborhoods. They are now "CHARACTER DISTRICTS". Moran – Cowboys Kelly –nomads with a view (transcendental meditation) Golf and Tennis – corporate funding 2 Town – broken heart Teton Village – corporate heart Wilson – new money South Park – every man Hoback and Hog Island – outlaws (we'll finish with them after South Park) Alta – farmers (they won't be a problem) The electeds don't want to hear what I have to say or what you have to say because, face it, they have heard it before. I'm a mom I know the reality of "How many times do I have to say it?" "What did you not understand about what I said the first time?" Did we say WILDLIFE and OPEN SPACE first? Is that being incorporated into the plan? Where?

Date	Name	Comment
3/2/2011	Patterson, Patti Interested Public	Good afternoon! I would like to share my concern for workforce housing in Teton County. I grew up in Jackson, have experienced the challenge of getting into our own home and work with folks every day who are trying to obtain homeownership in our community. We are starting to see first time homebuyers jumping into the real estate market and many into the deed restricted product. A few have been able to move up from deed restricted into market homes. However, it remains a huge struggle. It is especially challenging for a family. I have attached a worksheet that shows estimated payments on a home priced at \$500,000. The annual income required to service the loan payment would be \$92,300 assuming that the purchasers do not have any other monthly debt (a highly unlikely scenario). The median income for Teton County is \$92,500. This is the link to that documentation. http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/il/il2010/2010summary.odn There are a number social benefits for homeownership. A couple of those include enhancement to children's learning, improved neighborhoods, and higher volunteer activity. I've included a couple links for that research. http://researchnews.osu.edu/archive/chldhome.htm http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/homeownership/liho01-12.pdf (conclusion page 22 sums it up nicely) Not everyone is desirous or merits homeownership but should have access reasonable rental product. Thus the need for the comp plan to consider proper zoning for multi-family housing. Thank you for your consideration and the time you devote to our community. {worksheet outlining typical closing costs attached--available hard copy in the Teton County Planning office}
3/1/2011	Goymerac, Tony Interested Public	A ridiculous aspect of the current situation/regulations is the limitation of certain employment-based housing to US citizens only. The county has employed me, a legal resident alien, for the past 11 years, yet it does not see fit to allow me to purchase employment-based housing at, for example, 810 West. It's employment-based, I'm employed by one of the entities controlling the housing, yet I am not allowed to take advantage of that housing. It would be good if the current round of planning addressed this discrepancy.
3/1/2011	Fennessey, Kelli Interested Public	It would be nice to have employment based housing that is really a house. I currently have a market condo. Hopefully, the market will change someday and I can sell it and move to an area that has affordable homes with yards and garages... Example 1: In Ohio, I owned a brand new 3,600 sq ft home for the cost of my condo. Example 2: In upstate New York I owned a 2,000 sq ft home for ½ the price of my tiny condo. Example 3: On the beaches in South Carolina, I had a custom built brand new home for ½ the price of my condo. Most people move to Jackson Hole for the beauty and the outdoor activities. They don't realize how hard it is to find a good job and affordable housing (I didn't). Unfortunately, the housing situation is getting old. I want a house with a yard and a garage like I used to have.

Date	Name	Comment
3/1/2011	Polo, Arty Interested Public	My name is Arty Polo and I am lucky enough to live in an affordable home in the 810 West units. I moved here in 1999 and over the years have worked at JHMR, C-V residential treatment facility, and for a number of food service providers in town including Trio presently. For the past nine years I have worked for and now manage the Van Vleck House Group Home in town which houses youth ages 10-17 who are experiencing problems living at home. I am on call seven days a week for crisis and emergencies. I can honestly say that I would not be in the valley if there had not been an affordable housing program. I do not want to live in Idaho or Alpine. I do not want to commute 1.5 hours a day. I love this community and want to be a part of it. I feel that the housing program allows for creative, motivated, and competent people to feel that they are a part of this special Jackson community. I also manage a staff of 18 young people, all of which are college educated, enthusiastic, public servants. They are working to provide a safe and structured environment to at-risk youth from this community for less than what some of our residents can make working at one of towns fast food restaurants. All of us, including myself, have a second job. We do it because we want to be here. Most will do there time and move on to further their education or move closer to home. Others will want to stay but will feel that making a life here may be too difficult because of the cost of living. I know for a fact that just knowing that there are options out there to be able to own a place in Jackson keeps people here. I have had friends on the list for years and they are still hopeful. They still apply over and over again. They will hopefully all be in an affordable one day. The affordable housing program is needed in our community. Our community servants, emergency workers, counselors, teachers, and our hospitality workers all are needed to keep our town functioning. We need to do out best to keep good people here and to not loose them to other communities. Jackson is great because great people flock here to explore, be adventurous, and live healthy lives. I believe that the affordable housing program is a crucial piece in keeping our community great and making it better. Thank You!
3/1/2011	Crawford, Shannon Interested Public	I am just writing to share my experience as a teacher who has been in this valley for 8 years now and has been a part of the free market system and is now living in an affordable home. I worked hard and saved in order to put a down payment on an apartment 5 years ago. Without the help of my parents my mortgage would have been a stretch and would have kept me from saving for retirement and putting into other important aspects of life. I met my husband a few years ago (a valley resident for the past 14 years and someone who had never owned a home as it had been out of reach for him). We were expecting a child last year and went in pursuit of a new home that would fit a family of 3. My condo was a mere 700 sq ft. place and we were in need of more space. We looked a free market home and decided it was out of our reach. There was no way for us to live a balanced life, save for college and retirement and own a modest home in this valley without the affordable route. We are living in our 3 bedroom 2 bathroom home with our daughter now and couldn't be happier to have this option for our family. Without affordable housing, I don't know that we would have stayed. We are two hardworking individuals that are very imbedded in our community. Now we can go home at the end of the day to "our home" and feel at ease about managing our expenses and living comfortably in this beautiful place.

Date	Name	Comment
2/28/2011	LaJeunesse, Debbie Interested Public	To Everyone working on Workforce housing issues in the new comp plan, I'd first like to commend everyone for all the hard work you been doing. Next, I'd like to say how important wildlife issues are to most in our community and that I agree with many of those sentiments. However, I also think that a lot of the folks that already have their little piece of heaven have lost sight of keeping our valley, economy and human residents happy as well, and they are not thinking clearly about where we need to house people, now and in the future. As I look at the Teton County GIS, and those areas already protected by conservation easements (thereby precluding most further development), it leaves very little land available for housing our residents. The most logical place for housing is all the areas between High School Road, west to South Park Loop Road and south to South Park Loop Road. As you know, there are already several dense subdivisions in this section of the valley (South Park Ranches, Melody Ranch and Rafter J). If these areas are allowed to be developed, in the same density and keeping open spaces for animals to migrate, it is the ideal space for housing. It irritates me that NIMBY folks have been able to shut down proposed subdivisions in these areas, when it is a perfect logical place for people to be. I hope that you will zone, plan and regulate this section of the valley to allow greater density. It makes sense for animals, traffic, and in so many other ways. Thanks, Debbie LaJeunesse, 2225 E. Porcupine Road, Jackson, WY 83001 307-739-1461 P.S. I'd prefer if this letter were not printed in the newspaper.

Date	Name	Comment
2/22/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Dear Electeds - I've been asked my opinion on the Comprehensive Plan's "big items" that need full discussion with the joint electeds by a few of you - and have been responding individually. I thought I should do that now to the full group. Following is my stab at the big issues - as I think we already agree - more or less - on most of our shared values and their priorities including wildlife, natural resources and open space - a diversified and stable economy - goals for sustainability and energy conservation - predictability - etc. Following are the five most difficult, complex and important topics (from my perspective) for the County and Town to discuss in detail. Growth - Growth is item number one that needs a full discussion - it is - and always has been - the elephant in the room. It is not just about where growth goes - but how much occurs in total. It also is about the types of growth and in periods when we do boom - the rate of growth. •The existing (1994) comprehensive plan states our community's vision is to 'promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth.' (p 5) •This topic then is about both improving the pattern of growth (Town versus County, Town as Heart, "smart growth", reduced carbon footprint etc.) but also about the end-state of growth (call it what you like - build out, rate of growth, growth caps, getting to an economy not dependant on growth). •Acknowledge and quantify that growth will already occur. Current entitlements are quite large - close to a doubling of both residential units and commercial space. •Impacts of growth are significant off-site through public land use, transportation and other impacts. Improving patterns of growth - only modestly reduces cumulative and off-site impacts. That is why the community is so concerned. The plan should recognize this and you should discuss it. That can only be done by visiting the end-state of growth discussion. •The rub is the community does not want both sprawl and new city centers. The community wants a potential build-out that matches, or is less than, currently where we are reasonably headed. The first plan drafts dramatically over estimated the rural PRD and other tools - then transferred a bunch of "phantom density" to multiple "nodes". •County planning chair Paul Dunker summarized it well in his final comments: "What Staff wound up with, however, was a hypothetical buildout number that included every rural landowner using the PRD to its maximum potential, as well as every landowner with the right to construct an ARU doing so, and then transferring all of this hypothetical development potential into the various nodes designated in the April 2009 draft." •This discussion should also include the balancing of job inducing commercial versus residential units. Also large second home (mostly in the County) job inducing impacts versus a balance of housing most likely to be utilized by the local workforce. Open Space - This is about the clear benefit of permanent open space versus temporary zoning. •It is also tied to the "pattern of growth" discussion. Basically is there a way to move base or current entitlements? So this is about the County's PRD tool; changing the multipliers and enhancing the non-contiguous PRD. •It is also a discussion on whether some version of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) - beyond the PRD - could work and should be considered - both within the County - but also from the County to the Town? •It also includes direct acquisition approaches and whether we should identify a permanent public funding source to complement the private philanthropy to achieve open space? Both municipalities have great achievements to reflect upon - the Town with the recent Karnes Meadow and Flat Creek acquisitions - the County with the Hardeman Meadows. All three partnerships with the JH Land Trust. •It is also about the limits of simply down zoning to 1/35 acres in the rural County - that it is both not permanent and also would end up with an undesirable pattern of development. So simple "by fiat" decisions of major down zoning and then subsequent major up zoning - is limited. It also brings in the concept of a modest upzone versus downzone balance that may be still needed though (while still preserving base property rights) - so is tied to the sensitivity that you don't end up with any one landowner either with a "Wipe Out" or a "Windfall". •It is also tied to overall end-state growth goals - which the community clearly wishes discussed. Basically again that the community doesn't want both sprawl and new city centers - something we termed as "additive growth" in our discussions. •I think this topic is actually the most complex and important discussion of the five. Your joint Planning Commissions spent a lot of quality time on this issue. Economics - this is tied to the decades old tension between Town and County for the following: visitors and visitor's dollars they spend - basically simplified to the tension between a vibrant downtown and a viable Teton Village.

- It is also tied to how tax dollars are then accessed by each municipality – and how costs are allocated between Town and County? So when a benefit is clearer let's say to the County (pathways for example) and the Town is asked to pay half the cost – it creates tension.
- The other most important aspect to this is ongoing perceived competition between Town and County for significant dollars to be available in the free market for reinvestment and revitalization. I believe this has been the driver for Town in some of their development tools like the PMUD. It is a very legitimate concern – simplified again to: Teton Village gets all the investment capital and Town does not. It all then percolates down to jobs of course.

Cost of Growth – basically first acknowledging that growth generally does not pay its own way.

- That the increased tax dollars do not pay for the increased obligation of the new growth. So how do we pay for the next trash transfer station site, the expansion of START, the sewer and water system expansion when that becomes an issue, identify the next school sites, public parks?
- Do you want all development – commercial and residential - to pay for the full incremental impact it engenders – whether sewer, roads, water, parks or workforce housing?
- It should be an integral part of your discussions – boiled down to how much should each new development pay (legally never more than their direct impact – you need to be able to actually document that though – thus the need for updated legal nexus work such as for workforce housing impacts). Basically how much should be paid for by the public at large – perhaps an approach such as parking districts? Simplified how much do you “privatize the profits” of a change in zoning or new development - and then “socialize the impact costs”?
- To not address this – and also to not know what the fiscal implications of your policies will be – is not a prudent approach.

Workforce Housing –

- I will not go into the details as you know them well. This has to be discussed also – it is still relevant. The Blue Ribbon Panel report should be the framework to launch this discussion.

Everything else then is tied to these five topics – especially transportation and transportation systems (roads, pathways, START etc). They are tied to both rate of growth, end state of growth (build out) and pattern of growth. So if there was a sixth item it would be transportation – e.g. roads – Town, County and WYDOT.

In Closing - Whatever you do – please actual plan – that means make the hard decisions, make them specific and move towards a LDR approach that is predicable for all parties. The will mean drawing lines on the map and producing the numbers of units and square footage desired. It is called planning – and it should be comprehensive.

Date	Name	Comment
2/22/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	I have finally taken the time to read most of the articles that Kathy has forwarded. It is déjàvu. I built my Bar Y Estates home in 1980. It is passive solar, I utilized a double 2x4 east and west wall system, positioned the house so that the 2 longest sides were the south (all glass) and north totally buried into the hillside, roof and under slab concrete "solar collection floor "were heavily insulated. In 1980 the Federal energy credits for solar were still in place so I was able to take credits for what was attributed to additional costs for the solar envelope. Without state income tax, Wyoming was not one of the states that gave these credits. The addition, in the early 90's, of light sensing electronic window quilt shades on all of the south glass really make the house work! In the winter when the sun is out, the shades are up and down at night and during cloudy snowy weather - all automatically. I built this home on a strict budget, choosing to spend money on the structure and envelope than finishes. Finishes can be upgraded over time but the big energy efficiency savings come from how the structure is built and insulated. Our energy use is about 50% of comparable sqft homes. Dave and I have since remodeled the home and upgraded to take the energy efficiency to a yet higher level utilizing new products that were not available in 1980. We are not the only ones that have pursued solar and energy efficiency. I admire all that have made the commitment. We should encourage everyone to build smaller and more energy efficient. The new Comp Plan draft (Theme 8 - Energy Conservation) does not go far enough to raise the bar on requiring building more energy efficient structures, both commercial and residential. Stricter building codes specific for Teton County should be adopted which require more insulation and better building techniques that accomplish energy savings. Thermal imagery of every newly constructed home and Commercial building should be required and a standard set that must be met. I wish this was available when I built in 1980. If Teton County can not do a detailed enough inspection to stop the construction abuses that ran rampant the last 30 years, then a 3rd party inspection service should be used. Many of the construction requirements for leed certification and leed qualified inspectors should be used. Costs need to be born by the owner. I have always felt the maximum sqft of residential building is too high and should be reduced. Energy efficient building is not a new concept, it should be required in all construction. Build smaller - Build more energy efficient!
2/15/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I forgot to add this article. A Net-Zero-Energy Home for \$180,000 http://www.finehomebuilding.com/item/11546/a-net-zero-energy-home-for-180000 Hi, Here's some good winter's night reading... The below article link talks about New Landscape Urbanism Vs. New Urbanism; Either way we have to ask each theory the question "Where does our milk come from?" Has some good links for further reading and debate. http://www.greenbuildingadvisor.com/blogs/dept/green-building-news/ringside-seats-urban-planningrivalry?utm_source=twitterfeed This article is for the energy nerd in hopefully all of us:) http://www.greenbuildingadvisor.com/blogs/dept/green-building-blog/double-stud-wall-construction-path-efficiencybudget A little history on the how the American house came to be what it is today for better or... who are we kidding... for worse mostly. The American House: Where Did We Go Wrong? http://www.finehomebuilding.com/PDF/Free/021216070.pdf Have a great day! Kathy

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to bring the public back into this most important public document. I support Kristy Bruner's op ed piece in the JHN&G on Feb 9th "Land-Use plan A Flop Without A FLUP". We need to be proud of our unique valley and take seriously, the responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and being live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Please remember going forward that a desired vision for the new comprehensive plan is one that doesn't impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connector's negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park
2/15/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'll try to be brief. I pretty much agree with I think a lot of the comments already made. I'll try to add a few new points, too. One thing I think I want to elaborate a little bit on the issue of the public participation, though. Good communication really is two way. It involves a timely exchange of information and for that reason we would encourage you to consider having even a brief period. I think people were generally respectful for that during the Joint Planning and Zoning Commission. It's a way to stay engaged in the process, to give brief comments that were focused on the topics of discussion for that time period, not to go back and bring up other issues. It's really important for us as we try and talk to people and try and encourage people to be involved in the process. If, you know, when I tell people and they say, well, can I go to the meeting and can I make public comment, and you say, well, no, you won't be allowed to make comment at that meeting, I heard people say, well, then, what's the point of me going, I'll just go and read what ?? has to write in the newspaper then the next day. So it's something to consider. I think people would be respectful; if you think it's being abused, it's certainly something to go back and revise. So, that would be a real way to encourage ownership. The important point I think that Gregory touched on is this concept of how you're going to phase this in. I think that is important to at least have a plan for how you're going to do that. Because I think, as we try and learn from what happened in the past, to Bruce's point, and what worked well and what didn't work well, one of the key things from our organization's standpoint that didn't work well in the '94 Comprehensive Plan was we kind of got burned out, we worked on the whole Plan and we left out the transportation document because...for a bunch of reasons, I don't know, I wasn't directly involved, but you guys didn't actually adopt it, the elected officials, until 2000, almost four years after the Comprehensive Plan itself was adopted. And that was...that undercut some of that effectiveness of the transportation plan. So I think that it is key to envision this truly as a Comprehensive Plan and keep all this stuff in, and if you're not going to address it right now, at least talk about how you're going to address it, because you lost a lot of engagement in that transportation because people said, wow, the Comp Plan is done, you know, let's all go home and let's party and we're done. And really there was a lot of work to be done there. So, hopefully, we won't make that mistake. Let's keep all of the key principles together and move them at the same time, or together. So, thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2011	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Thanks. Gregory Griffith, West Bank. As far as the 20 topics go, I think there should be more consideration that if it's going to be five board discussion meetings with four hours each, that's one hour per topic, sixty minutes each, on some of the pressing issues of our time. I would suggest that you relegate 14 or 15 of those issues into overflow or contingency topics so that we could mark up and discuss the big-ticket items that we really need to discuss. We know what issues are controversial. We know what issues are going to cause the problems. We know what issues have the greatest potential for negative downstream impacts and undesirable development patterns. After about four years and four hundred grand rec expenditures, I really think we should be engaging in discourse at the, again, the solutions-oriented specificity level, not the generalities and abstraction levels. That's just one suggestion. Absolutely strictly to the process, I feel that there's a way that we can combine JIM #2 and JIM #3 to give you one more core discussion meeting. I feel like that could be compressed. That's just a suggestion. Public comment for 9 and 10, JIM's #9 and #10, is basically superficial inclusion. If you gave up the comments, significant public comment at JIM #8, it would affect what you direct Staff to go and write, instead of having the horse out of the barn in 9 and 10. Split votes, you've addressed those. I really would like to comment, though—this is zero disrespect to the Mayor and Town Council—but we do have issues we have to confront about jurisdictional and regulatory authority on some of these issues, primarily in the FLUP, but the majority of residents in this County, a full 52 percent, can't vote for the Mayor and Town Council, so at least some consideration of that topic would be nice. We continually ask for measurability, enforceability and predictability. I don't see why we want to attain those aspirational goals as a community if we don't get into specific wording. That would be something that would be nice to address also. I also have a question of what we're going to do on June 30th if a development application comes through in Town or County, will we be operating on the '94 Plan? Or will we be using this incompletely vetted, non-specifically worded document that was designed to function as horse and buggy with the FLUP. So what are we going to do on June 30th? That would be a nice question to answer. The last thing I have on process is I think we should consider and provide a contingency for JIM #11, so that we don't have a situation where the travel schedule or the allocation or the budget for the facilitator artificially attenuates the process. What we want...well, at least what I don't want to see is having the process define the end product more than what we need to talk about. Thanks very much.
2/15/2011	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Rich Bloom, speaking on behalf of South Park neighbors. I have four process comments. First, you know, the purpose when we started this process three and a half years ago was to update the existing Plan so we'd have more predictability, accountability, and measurability. And the FLUP maps, which are now the character district components, are critical design for that increased predictability. So, I want to ?? on all four of my comments. I would just find a way at the end of the Plan review on the themes and policies for the joint boards to perhaps certify the Plan, or otherwise agree to the rewrite, so it's accepted, it's closed out, but not adopt it, which then would formally be replacing the existing Plan that has more detail, and then be in limbo as you go into the character district discussions. I think there's a process way to do that. Otherwise, I think you'll be very vulnerable legally to make findings on anything that comes up when deciding on a new Plan without details, and I think that protects your two boards. Second, I would ask you to perhaps...I know you're considering this, but to task the Joint Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board to begin now on updating the Natural Resources Overlay maps to currently. The Jackson Hole Alliance, you know, commissioned the Conservation Research Center of the Teton Science School to consolidate all the public agency work to update those maps. That was submitted to the JIM in April of '08 to both the County and Town and nothing has been done with it. But I don't know how you can start this summer with substantive character district discussions if you don't have those maps updated. I think that's critical information, especially in the County but also in the Town. So, it would be a task to assign them, and I think a lot of the work has been done and I think it's a good board and I think you've already been discussing it, you just haven't pulled the trigger. Third, likewise, the best public policy is based on the best information, this time on workforce housing. So as you work through the Plan, I would concurrently ask you to release funding to update the 15-year-old legal nexus work dealing with all your housing mitigation exactions. A recommendation Christine brought to you a year and a half ago and as recommendations ??. Before you get into the LDRs, a discussion of summary, you need to refresh a lot of that data, the legal nexus data on that. So I think that should be happening concurrently outside of this process but parallel in this process. I wish we had it now because I think it would have been good data to have in this discussion. Fourth, linked to this process, and I think Town Council is headed this direction, to not let the moratorium lapse on the planned mixed-use development in April. And I know it's on your discussion February 22nd. But as we get into character districts, and you've heard my comments on this, I think it would be a shame to let that lapse, especially when it's already funded <<inaudible>>. And that will parallel what the County did with the planned unit development for affordable housing and the planned resort where you polled those, because I think we're moving from discretionary density tools to character district discussions. So those are my four items. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen...actually, well, Jackson, north of Town. What Gregory Griffith just said was a lot of the same concerns I have, and I'll just touch on a few more specifics that he didn't go into. Don't need to repeat what he had to say exactly. I think a lot of the detail is totally missing from this draft, which a good job was done on themes one and two, but then you stayed at the 100,000-foot level. And, to be honest, most of this Plan that has not got detail in it, was not talked about. They were moving so slowly that they decided let's just stay at that 100,000-foot level and then, you know, the details were never vetted. That's why you see so many inconsistencies, and so I think there's a lot more work than what we're hearing from you all like, oh, we're almost there. I just feel there's a whole lot more work. And then if it does need detail, whenever an application comes in front of either the Planning Commission of either the Town or the County and then on to the electives, the Comprehensive Plan is looked at. Yes, it's not Land Development Regulations, but it's looked at and the Land Development Regulations mimic what's in our Comprehensive Plan. So this is important. It's not to be taken lightly. And I think that sometimes people do take it lightly. And if the detail isn't there, there's too much flexibility and it really doesn't reflect what the community really wants. One more thing. I think that there should be room for more public comment. And I haven't heard...I've heard that there's these workshops but it doesn't sound like the public gets any participation at those workshops. We just sit and listen to the electives discuss. But as this Plan develops and changes with detail and there's no public comment between March 10th until June, that's an awfully long time to go without any public comment, especially when there's so much lack of detail to this whole Plan. You know, I just don't think that that's acceptable. The past public comment you have is not going to be comments that are specific to what you're going to be doing now. So, anyway, those are my concerns. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2011	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment today. As you know, the Conservation Alliance represents some 2000 members and we've been closely involved with this process from the beginning approximately four years ago. And, in fact, the Alliance was established in 1979 at the onset of the very first Comp Plan for our Valley. So in three decades of history and local planning, we really understand how important it is to have a good Comp Plan for the Valley. Because this process is very different than what would be generally expected at this stage, we would ask that you do add some time, which can be limited, for verbal public input at each hearing and workshop. Second, we do believe it would be a good idea to incorporate some type of forum for public input between the March 25th and April 20th hearings. There's a gap there that we feel like would be a good opportunity to incorporate more input but not lengthen the process overall. And touching on that, today I'd just like to go over a few of the broad goals that we're working on in the Comp Plan, and we mention those today because we want you to allow adequate time to address those in your process. First, we want the new Plan to represent an improvement of our existing Plan. This point is very basic but it's critical. The entire reason our community has supported the effort was the belief that we would make a Plan that's better than the one we have, one that is more predictable, accountable and measurable. You know, we've made some good strides in the right direction but we've also backpedaled in some areas, so we do need to do more to get back on track. And the future land-use plan is part of this. And just touching on what was mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, if in your discussion today you could provide an explanation to the public why it's beneficial to adopt part of it, you know, at the end of June and why not wait until the whole thing is reviewed and then adopt it formally in its entirety. Could you just speak a little bit to that? Second, we think that the new Plan must represent the documented will of the community in a consistent way throughout all its policies and maps. And we're sure that you will be working through some of those inconsistencies. And there are a number of places where we feel like the draft Plan didn't go far enough—affordable housing, transportation, natural resources are some examples. Third, the new Plan should work to protect the qualities of Jackson Hole that matter most to its residents and visitors. The new Plan really does need to make the values that fall under theme one the primary factors for consideration in all land-use decisions. And by that we mean you need to consider not only direct impacts to resources but indirect and cumulative impacts as well. So that's what we mean by that. Again, the policies and themes are a good start but more needs to be done overall, including updating some of the science information that we do have, which was already touched upon, so I won't go into that. You know, if you decide how to approach your review, it's important to remember this process has taken a long time, not simply because people here passionately care about where they live. They made their priority clear sometime ago and were ready to jump in and make, you know, the hard decisions, and we hope that you move forward in that direction. I'll try to wrap this up. Fourth, the new Plan shouldn't oversimplify planning principles and instead respect the unique context of Jackson Hole. If there's anything that acts like it's really important that we learned through this process is that there are a lot of negative consequences of oversimplifying the issues. You know...I'm running out of time. Anyway, so with that, related to your process, what we're concerned about how generalized your review could become, particularly given how accelerated the timeframe is. And, anyway, we really don't want you to oversimplify some of the issues. To conclude, this is a really important time to be visionary and to avoid oversimplification. In your effort, we hope that you really focus on what makes Jackson Hole rare, you clearly identify it, and then you do all you can to gain consensus on what you need to do to protect it. It's relatively easy to say that the values in theme one are going to be the community's priority. It's yet another thing to do the very hard work to gain consensus on what has to be done to uphold those values. You know, moving forward, the Alliance will continue to do all that we can do to help provide solutions, specific solutions to help uphold those values. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I know you said it was unnecessary to prepare a formal response but as a small homeowner with concerns that official stakeholders might not have, I thought it was important to jot some things down. I think the questions on allowed growth keep popping up so I responded to them also. Could you send my comments on to Bruce and incorporate them into your records. I appreciated being invited to the introduction meeting with Bruce Meighen, but I forgot to submit my comments to him. I have a tough time organizing my thoughts on a normal day so I chose to organize them on paper:) 1.What are the three objectives you would like to accomplish from the Comprehensive Plan update? A.“No Net Negative Environmental Impacts; Ideally, this means everyone working together to ensure that wildlife, plants, water, air, soil and the processes that connect them will be better off or at least no worse tomorrow than they are today.” (http://www.banff.ca/locals-residents/environment/No_Net_Negative_Environmental_Impact.htm) B. A healthy, energy sustainable, diverse economic mountain community and national park gateway that is not dependent on growth, non renewable energy, and boom and bust industries. C.An enforceable checks and balances system to support objectives A and B. 2.Given that new development will occur in the Town and County based on existing zoning, what are some key opportunities we can achieve with new growth? There are no opportunities we can achieve with new growth unless we resolve the contradictions in the new comp plan draft and create a verifiable predictability that does not deposit phantom densities in selected family neighborhoods that may not benefit from the open space these transfers claim to create. If these issues are left open to interpretation, the only people that will see opportunity and rewards are developers, while established family neighborhoods bear the negative impacts of unchecked dense growth. 3. What must happen for this development to occur in the right way? Verifiable predictability that includes a well researched (not inflated) build out number and permanent open space once created. 4.What is the desired character or vision you would like the Plan to achieve? A.Pride and responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. B.A desired vision is one that doesn't impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connector's negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. 5.Provide several realistic tools and recommendations that would help preserve the character or vision you desire? A.A fully funded, enforceable, ongoing checks and balances system that would make themes one and two a success. B.Public and Private support for programs that encourage sustainable energy programs like JHESP, Slow Food, and Vertical Greenhouse... sharing and gathering helpful info from other mountain communities to further our goals. C.Switch from being dependent on boom and bust economies which include industries like non renewable energy and second homeowner construction (that increases the need for more servicing), to more innovative and sustainable industries like retrofitting existing housing with Net Zero Energy Community (“A net zero-energy community (ZEC) is one that has greatly reduced energy needs through efficiency gains such that the balance of energy for vehicles, thermal, and electrical energy within the community is met by renewable energy.”(National Renewable Energy Laboratory)) and Passive House (http://www.passivehouse.us/passiveHouse/PassiveHouseInfo.html) inspired techniques, green career training for our local youth in order to give them an option to stay and contribute to the community in a positive way, regional grown and transported food and goods (Wyoming, Idaho and Utah) and made in Jackson Hole products marketed throughout our intermountain region. 6.A successful Plan is one that : A.Realizes and supports new and healthier ways to sustain and preserve our fragile ecosystem. B.Does not sacrifice the needs of established family neighborhoods that want to foster a safe, healthy place to live and share with wildlife. C.That is simple to understand, and not contradictory.

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	1. What are the three objectives you would like to accomplish from the Comprehensive Plan update? • The Public Art Initiative would like to see the references to public art remain unchanged in Theme 3 of the comprehensive plan. • Recognize that arts and culture organizations have an economic impact on our community and should be cultivated as a revenue and cultural tourism generator in long-term economic development plans. • Declare the Town as Heart as a Cultural District 2. Given that new development will occur in the Town and County based on existing zoning, what are some key opportunities we can achieve with new growth? Public Art can be used as a design tool to make our public spaces, gateways, pedestrian areas and government projects exceptional by integrating artwork that speaks about the values of our community and educates visitors and residents. 3. What must happen for this development to occur in the right way? Strategy 3.4 must remain in the plan and elected officials should review the draft Public Art Plan that has been completed by the Taskforce. One elected from the Town and one from the County should be designated to work with the Public Art Initiative Director to revise the Draft Public Art Plan, including investigating potential funding sources, creating a Public Art Policy or Resolution. 4. What is the desired character or vision you would like the Plan to achieve? We live in a community with extremely limited developable area. Our elected leaders have the opportunity to use new development to engage in Creative Placemaking. New developments should be treated as opportunities to create exceptional public space. We attract inillions of visitors each year, we should be developing our community spaces to attract a certain type of visitor and include creative professionals in the design of public spaces to educate visitors about the values we hold as a community. Public spaces and buildings from bus shelters, parks, gateways, plazas, pathways and more should all have creative features integrated into the projects that serve as benities to the public, but also delight, inspire and add to a sense of place. (Creative Placemaking) 5. Provide several realistic tools and recommendations that help would preserve the character or vision you desire? • Develop and implement a comprehensive public art plan for the community (Strategy 3.4). • Create incentives for private developers to include publ ic art in their projects (Text amendment to the LOR's public art as option 4. Article 4, division 4100, page 8). • Create a regulatory structure effecting municipal development that supports public art (Policy, Joint Resolution or other). 6. A successful Plan is one that: has not removed the language in support of Public Art from the Plan, establishes guidelines for the inclusion of public art in public and private CIP's and results in the creation of separate (or joint) Town and County policies or resolutions on Public Art. Suggested change... Policy 3.2.b: Maintain downtown Jackson as the commerce and culture center of the region Please Note: these comments are submitted by Carrie Geraci and have not been reviewed by the Public Art Taskforce.

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2011	Day, Candra Interested Public	1. What are the three objectives you would like to accomplish from the Comprehensive Plan update? a. Plan establishes a strong foundation for an economic development plan for JH, including a tourism development plan that focuses on sustainability standards and strengthening tourism that supports local businesses and community assets and values. b. Plan establishes a positive, constructive vision for JH's future – not just what we want to avoid, but also what we want to accomplish. c. Plan has clear opportunities for citizen engagement in implementation as well as annual monitoring of progress -- and doesn't just sit on a shelf, with all attention focused on the land use regulations. (I don't believe land use regulations alone can achieve the goals of the comprehensive plan. Goals require proactive community participation.) 2. Given that new development will occur in the Town and County based on existing zoning, what are some key opportunities we can achieve with new growth? In the commercial sector, interesting and unusual visitor services, with an emphasis on supporting locally owned businesses and strengthening community assets. For example, I'm thinking of Santa Fe's Canyon Road and Museum Hill, which do not replicate the central Plaza, but add a different dimension to serve cultural tourists and take advantage of Santa Fe's heritage. (Did you know that little, tiny Santa Fe's art market is second only to NYC?) Now, in Santa Fe, the creative economy has grown larger than Canyon Road can accommodate and they're building a whole new arts district that include farmer's markets, etc. In our case, we might see visitor services that take better advantage of our strong culture of conservation as well as more traditional cultural activities. Conservation internship opportunities, including live/work space. Open studios with shops in front, for artists & craftsmen. Also, other live/work spaces that support creative economies. Incubator buildings for new entrepreneurs. There are many possibilities. I'm also interested in more choices for visitor lodging, for example apartments such as offered in Tuscany. And agritourism ranches. There has also been a suggestion to study the feasibility of a Creative Corridor on S. Cache, extending from Snow King to Art Center, with bus service from the two Visitor Centers on N. Cache. In the public sector, educational facilities for locals and visitors. In the housing sector, non-institutional eldercare facilities that are part of the fabric of the community. I also hope we can find room for co-housing options. 3. What must happen for this development to occur in the right way? A shared vision for a positive future. I don't think we have this. Our community dialogue is usually focused on what to avoid. But we do have a strong sense of shared values. We must also have strong Town & County encouragement for citizen initiatives. 1 And MUCH more encouragement for preserving our heritage, particular ranching. Big problem right now... regulations make keeping horses, training horses very difficult on any new site, for just one example. I also think the Plan should acknowledge need for integration of our immigrant community. 4. What is the desired character or vision you would like the Plan to achieve? I think consensus is clear that we want to preserve our small town character, protect our natural environment and wildlife to the highest possible standards of stewardship, preserve our heritage as a Western town and control the rate of growth in order to achieve balance. We might not agree on how to achieve this vision, but I think the vision itself is very widely held. (Plan currently seems to allow too much growth to serve this vision. Easy fix seems to be to just hold development levels to those provided for in the current Plan.) My hope is that the Plan can address this core vision, but also move beyond it. This vision is about what we want to preserve and protect. I'd like to also include what we want to become. I personally would like Jackson Hole to become an international center for mountain cultures around the world and a gathering place for mountain people and the exchange of knowledge and ideas. I would also like Jackson Hole to become one of the world's center for learning about the fine art of conservation. I would also like Jackson Hole to become a regional leader in adopting sustainability "best practices" of all kinds (including energy, clean air, tourism, etc.) I would also like Jackson to become a center for the arts, design and creative entrepreneurs. I would like us to become a model for integration of new immigrants. This is just my personal list. Everyone in town would have a list like this. I would like the Plan to adopt proactive goals of this kind, with specific strategies for what we'd like to accomplish in the next five years and a system for monitoring progress on an annual basis. Maybe, in the near term, we could begin by just gathering ideas of this kind and evaluating their relative potential for community benefit and inspiration. 5. Provide several realistic tools and recommendations that help would preserve the character or vision you desire? Town & County governments need some new structures, common in other towns, such as Small Business Development Loan Fund, Small Business Ombudsman, Diversity Commission, Art Commission, Mayor's Roundtable for New Ideas, Office for International Relations (including services for international visitors, cultural exchanges, sister cities, etc.). Public Art Program. Heritage Commission. Children and Youth Commission. World Heritage

Date

Name

Comment

Site Secretariat. Commission in Favor of Horses. A whole variety of ways for citizens to engage in achieving the goals of the Plan above & beyond land use regulations.

6. A successful Plan is one that :

Takes us beyond the core vision of what we want to protect and preserve into a positive and creative vision for the future , one which has multiple opportunities for engaging the energy and talents of our citizens to achieve these goals. Plan as springboard.

SPECIFIC GOAL: I am hoping to see significant changes to Theme #5: Provide for a Diverse and 2

3

Balanced Economy. I have detailed suggestions, but perhaps this is not the appropriate time to submit these. Please let me know when I should submit specific suggestions.

Generally, this theme is now framed in a negative way in order to restrain negative impacts from tourism. More important, it is lacking in positive direction. We want a Plan that is proactive and offers specific goals for making our tourism-based economy more creative, more sustainable, more serving of local values, more supportive of community assets, more encouraging for local small business development.

It should also include other goals for a diversified economy, above and beyond tourism, with specific strategies about how to achieve these goals.

I am attaching a copy of Santa Fe's 2004 Economic Development Plan as an example of the kind of specific goals that we need for this section, as well as a tone of positive energy and ambition. We can honor our core vision of protection and preservation and have a direction for the future at the same time.

Thank you!

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2011	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Jackson[eton County Comprehensive Plan RewriteWhy the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is at the table Mission: The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is dedicated to responsible land stewardship in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, to ensure that human activities are in harmony with the area's inreplaceable wildlife, scenic and other natural resources. (Our organization, with some 2000 members, has worked on local planning issues since its inception in 1979.) Philosophy for working on the community's Comprehensive Plan: All of us who are privileged to experience Jackson Hole have an obligation to take care of it. We, as a community, need to embrace how incredibly rare and precious this place is, and how much work will be required to make sure it stays that way. It's the right thing to do - for our community, for those drawn to Jackson Hole, for the wildlife that roam through and beyond it, and for all the generations to come. Success - What it Looks Like If our community adopts a comprehensive plan that clearly embodies a conservation-based, factbased and precautionary planning approach, the planning process will be a success. With this in mind, there is still a long way to go before this process could be considered a success. At the broadest level, a successful plan needs to do the following three things: • Improve our existing plan, by including a clear prioritization of community values, by incorporating essential data and the best available science, and by providing unambiguous policies and realistic implementation measures (all with the larger goal for increased predictability in mind), • Represent the documented will of the community in a consistent, integrated way throughout all policies and maps, and • Work to protect the qualities of Jackson Hole that matter most to its residents and visitors - our rural landscape, open spaces, scenery and diverse wildlife - by placing them (the values that currently fall under Theme One) as the primary factors for consideration in all future land use decisions. Re: Future Land Use Plan (excluded from the proposed scope offacilitation work) The Conservation Alliance does not agree that the Themes and Policies alone (without the Future Land Use Plan) would suffice as an acceptable replacement of our existing plan. If the Future Land Use Plan is not going to be a specific part of the new plan as was originally intended, major changes must be made to the Themes and Policies to make the overall plan clear enough to provide adequate guidance for the land development regulations and future land use decisions. We look forward to working with you over the next six months. If you have additional questions, please feel free to get in touch with us. [attached brochure on comp plan update available hard copy at the Teton County Planning Department]

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Public Comment & Participation • Understand folks have already weighed in - we want that comment listened to - not just heard. Do not expect a weary public to offer up much more. The plan should reflect the will of the residents. • Staff versions have not done that to date. • The joint PCs approved Theme 1 & 2 mostly has. I am worried that the improvements in Theme 1 & 2 - and to some degree elsewhere - will be unwound. That is very concerning to the public that has engaged to this point. • Trust is lacking. Community Priorities • Wildlife, natural resources and open space should be the top priority in all parts of the County. Growth • Growth is the elephant in the room. It is not just about where it goes - but how much occurs in total. • The existing (1994) plan states our community's vision is to 'promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth.' (p 5) • Growth will occur. Current entitlements are huge - close to doubling of both residential units and job creating commercial space. The plan should work with rearranging that potential to achieve community goals - not pile on "additive growth". • The plan should clearly achieve community goals within, or less then, our reasonable assumed development potential - minus discretionary tools (PUO, PMUO, PR, and PUO-AH). We have termed this as a "least growth" approach to achieving community goals. Pattern of Growth • Impacts of growth are significant off-site through public land use, transportation and other impacts. Improving patterns of growth - only modestly reduces cumulative and off-site impacts. That is why the community is so concerned. The plan should recognize this. • The rub is the community does not want both sprawl and new city centers. The community wants a potential build-out that matches, or is less than, currently where we are reasonably headed. The first plan drafts dramatically over estimated the rural PRO and other tools - then transferred a bunch of "phantom density" to multiple "nodes". • County planning chair Paul Dunker summarized it well in his final comments: "What Staff wound up with, however, was a hypothetical buildout number that included every rural landowner using the PRD to its maximum potential, as well as every landowner with the right to construct an ARU doing so, and then transferring all of this hypothetical development potential into the various nodes designated in the April 2009 draft. " Cost of Growth • All development - commercial and residential - should pay for the full incremental impact it engenders - whether sewer, roads, water, parks or workforce housing. Predictability • Plan and zone for what we want - to avoid getting what we don't want. • No more discretionary floating density tools. Encourage performance based, prescriptive approaches to zoning rather than less predictable tools. • Either Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) maps must be included - or the plan itself will need significant more clarifying language. Achievement of Permanent Open Space • Permanent achievement of open space should be a priority over temporary zoning. • The rural open space clustering tool (PRO) is performance tool based but needs work. Right now - especially the non-contiguous PRO - is the only transfer of development tool we have. South Park - especially within South Park Loop Road (as greater South Park values have been mostly affirmed) • Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using

Date	Name	Comment
		language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan. • Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district. • South Park not become a dumping ground for additive growth that no one wants - or needs. • Thoughtful transfer of development of rights could be accommodated - if permanent open space is also achieved
1/31/2011	Geraci, Carrie Cultural Council of JH	As requested I have attached a report containing abstracts of public art programs, their funding mechanisms and links to their websites [see actual public comment for referenced report]. This document has been reviewed and edited by Barbara Goldstein, Public Art Director for the City of San José Office of Cultural Affairs to highlight communities with similar demographics to ours and programs that follow best practices. The Public Art Initiative, under the direction of the Cultural Council of Jackson Hole, is working to raise the level of discourse and open discussion to potential approaches in the creation of a public art program that will address the needs of our community and compliment the Comprehensive Plan. A Public Art Program has the potential to successfully address three major themes included in the Comprehensive Plan. In Theme 5 a Public Art Program could increase cultural tourism through investment in our communities' successful arts and culture organizations and businesses. Public Art supports Theme 7 by making our public spaces, gateways and parks more livable, including artwork that is integrated as functional architectural features. There is also no doubt that Public Art will serve Theme 3 perfectly; identifying Jackson as a Cultural Destination. Barbara Goldstein is a great resource for best practices in Public Art around the country and she will be conducting a free community workshop on March 10th at the Center for the Arts. I hope you will take a moment to review the information contained in this report and I look forward to continuing our discussion.
1/28/2011	Schechter, Jonathan Sustaining JH	Also, FYI, for reasons unrelated to the Comp Plan, I have reconvened a variant of the Sustaining JH environment group. We met for the first time earlier this week, and they felt the original group's Statement of Ideal should be tweaked in two ways: -- they don't like the term "viable populations," and want something they feel is stronger; and -- they want the Statement to read include "preservation of natural processes" as in "Teton County will have viable populations of all native species, and preserve all natural scenic vistas and natural processes." I mention this because it not only raises the issue of what the Statement of Ideal in chapter 1 might look like (assuming you want to keep using that tool), but also the larger issue of Statements of Ideal in the other chapters. I don't know what you are thinking regarding re-writing those, but my deep concern is that, if you continue to use the term "Statement of Ideal," you need to re-write the many draft Statements which are, um, less than ideal. If that's not possible, I very much hope you drop the use of the "Statement of Ideal" term to describe what you have in there, for in most of the chapters, it's a case of mis-labeling/mis-use of the term.

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2011	Reynolds, Charlotte Interested Public	From: EPA-State-Local-Climate-Energy@icfi.com [mailto:EPA-State-Local-Climate-Energy@icfi.com] Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2011 8:26 AM To: Charlotte Reynolds Subject: New Report Examines How Smart Growth Can Enhance Prosperity New Report Examines How Smart Growth Can Enhance Prosperity A new report by the Center for Clean Air Policy finds that smart growth practices can enhance community prosperity and generate economic benefits for local businesses, households, and governments. The study, Growing Wealthier: Smart Growth, Climate Change and Prosperity, shows how reduced driving and efficient land use planning are strongly interconnected with economic growth and better quality of life. Growing Wealthier reports that cities investing in public transportation and downtown development are experiencing cost savings, growing tax revenues, increased property values and higher retail sales. For example, downtown retail sales in Dallas, Texas, grew by 33 percent annually after the city's light rail system began operation. In Portland, Oregon, a \$100 million investment in streetcars helped attract \$3.5 billion in private investments. And in Denver, Colorado, home values within a half-mile of stations on a light rail line rose by 18 percent from 2006-2008, while home values in the rest of the city declined by 8 percent during the same period. The report also documents how efficient land use planning can improve household resilience to rising oil prices by enhancing travel choices. Allowing more people to live closer to job centers can boost employment rates and income levels for low-wage workers while reducing exposure to congestion for all. Smart growth policies are also shown to cut government infrastructure costs, enhance public health, and conserve natural resources. The executive summary and full report are available at http://www.ccap.org and at http://www.growingwealthier.info. *** State and local officials interested in additional information about developing and implementing cost-effective climate and energy strategies that help further environmental goals and achieve public health and economic benefits may visit: http://www.epa.gov/statelocalclimate To subscribe to or unsubscribe from this listserv, go to: http://www.epa.gov/statelocalclimate/listservs/index.html

Date	Name	Comment
12/17/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	December 17, 2010 To: Board of Teton County Commissioners, Mayor Barron and Jackson Town Council CC: Jeff Daugherty and Tyler Sinclair Re: Dec. 20 & 21 Discussions regarding Subcommittee Recommendation for the draft Comprehensive Plan Submitted via email Dear Commissioners, Mayor and Council, Given the Conservation Alliance’s work to ensure responsible land stewardship in Jackson Hole, we are writing in regard to your December 20 & 21 discussions on your review process for the draft Comprehensive Plan. As our community nears the beginning of the fifth year of this “update” process, the Alliance looks forward to continuing our active participation as you move into your discussions and review of the latest draft plan. While we understand that you do not intend to make a final decision on hiring a facilitator until January 3, we respectfully request that you keep the following comments in mind during your continuing discussions. Initial Objectives of the Process As we stated at the December JIM meeting, we believe that considerable attention should be given to creating consensus on whether the original objectives of this “update” process are still your objectives. If so, how will you work with the facilitator to ensure these objectives are addressed within a six-month timeline? (See the original RFP from January 2007, as well as earlier published materials from Clarion and Associates.) Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) Is there still a 65-page section (the FLUP) of the draft on the table that you envision being adopted as part of the plan within the six-month timeframe? If so, how will the public be involved in reviewing it? This section of the plan was initially designed to be an essential part of the final product - and not an addendum. In order to make meaningful comments on the draft, the public must understand whether you envision that only the “Themes and Policies” (without an associated FLUP) would be an acceptable replacement of our existing plan. This is a key point moving forward – and one that the public, as well as a potential facilitator, would need to understand, particularly when considering anticipated timelines for public participation, plan review and adoption. Subcommittee Meetings As a public participant in all aspects of the “update” process, the Conservation Alliance would like to make specific, constructive comments regarding the nature of your upcoming review – including establishing opportunities for effective public engagement. However, given the brevity of discussions on the Comprehensive Plan at JIM meetings, and given that meetings of the subcommittee have not been open to the public, it is difficult to provide comments in a manner that is specific enough to be helpful. In the future, because key discussions occur and recommendations are formulated via subcommittee, it would be helpful to clarify which meetings of certain subcommittees should be open to the public for observation. That way, it would be clearer for the public to understand how significant decisions and recommendations are made. (For one example, the public was able to observe the in-person interviews for the planning consultant finalists at the onset of this “update” process. Recent interviews were not open to the public.) Thank you very much for your consideration, open communication, and all your efforts with this important planning process for our community. Happy Holidays! Kristy Bruner, Community Planning Director & Becky Tillson, Community Planning Associate

Date	Name	Comment
9/13/2010	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	On behalf of South Park Neighbors. I think most of you know, I've supported and previously proposed using a facilitator in this process, starting two years ago, and I've now watched this process and been intimately involved in it for a long time. I think what your planning staff is recommending about the value of a facilitator is very well founded in their reasoning. It's not just for them, it's also for you as the co-chairs of this process so you can be a resource and participate and not have to act as facilitators. You know my most recent experience was this last year or two, this Blue Ribbon panel, that was a facilitated process, and that did work very well. Not singling out that individual but we had a pretty diverse group and it was nice not to have to have Christine Walker in that position or anybody else. I think it would save considerable time in the process, to the joint electeds and to the public, who are all getting weary by keeping the process focused and moving along. I think indirectly it would actually save money in the end if you look at your staff time costs and your electeds time cost. If we can quicken this process that is a savings in money even though you have some front-end dollar expenses. I think it could help defuse the process somewhat, although there will be a lot of passion in the discussions, I'm not naïve on that. But the public will react positively to the use of a neutral facilitator in the process. I don't think you'll feel a lot of resistance. I think it should be somebody local to save costs, yet not affiliated with the process, meaning not, you know, Clarion or somebody like that. Somebody trained in facilitation. It's not a mediator that you're looking for, so they need not be fluent on the process to date, because staff is still going to be developing all the meeting agendas. They are not out of the process. You're just trying to facilitate the process forward. In the end, if money is an impediment, which it always is, you know where the budgets are, even though I think it will save money in the long run, then right now, South Park Neighbors, I'm willing to pledge \$500 today towards dampening that cost. And I'd also pledge to assist Town and County in identifying other nongovernmental support like I did a few years ago through some of the local nonprofits. Thank you.
9/13/2010	Lockhart, Kelly Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity. I actually came to speak to you about the committee report but I couldn't hear an opportunity for public comment on that, so I'll roll that into this. I think kind of both applies. Seems like we've been talking about housing, you say for 38 years, I think we've been talking about the comprehensive plan, for seems like 38 years. I think it's great that we're here talking about it. I think it's great that it's on every agenda. I think it's great to talk about the process, who we're gonna hire next, which study we're going to do. I personally would like to move on and start to do something. And I guess everyone feels maybe we have moved on and we are doing things. But when I look at the report, I think we ought to take an agenda item or a recommendation and we ought to stop talking about it and figure out what we're going to do about it. If it's identify a location, great, identify a location. If we're gonna modify the mitigation rules, then modify the mitigation rules. And I think these meetings where we all sit around and talk are great, whether it's the housing plan or the comp plan, I mean we've been sitting around and talking about it for three years. So, I personally don't care whether you hire another facilitator or hire somebody else to do another study, but it seems like another year goes by, another election goes by, a decade goes by, and not much happens. So, I guess my thought is you ought to start having meetings where something happens on both the housing and the comp plan.
9/13/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Putting on my Save Historic Jackson Hole hat, I certainly would encourage discussion on the process, cause we do think that spending the time up front on setting up the process for this is important both for success and efficiency in the evaluation of the plan and developing the plan. I would like to suggest as you do that, do have some discussions about what the role of the facilitator would be. I think that would be really important to understand that. More than just saying we're going to have a facilitator, I think we need to have some real discussions about what is that role going to be. And we would share Greg's concern on the cost. Thank you.
9/13/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Read on his behalf by Armond Acri: First let me start off with some comments from Greg Griffith, who sends his regrets that he is unable to be here but he did have some comments that he wanted to get in. Greg was concerned, one of his major concerns, was taking on what he saw as an open-ended financial commitment. Because if we do have a facilitator, it would have to be an hourly rate, and he was concerned about whether that was the most efficient way, and probably the only way to bid a job like that, and he was concerned about that unknown amount of money to be spent. Also, I think he had questions related to paying outsiders to learn about our plan, to learn about our regulations, to learn about our community. He felt pretty strongly that the people in the community knew best. One suggestion that he offered was that if you did want to explore the concept of a moderator/facilitator was to ask perhaps members of the planning commission who've gone through the process and maybe saw the pitfalls, if one of them would be willing to serve in that role. So there's that comment from him.

Phase: Joint PC Review

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2010	Nash, Paul Interested Public	Speaking of Gregory [Griffith's] comments last week, I'd like to see some type of documentation created in fact that for the first bunch of meetings, a couple of Themes, I felt like we were reinventing the wheel over and over again. And I'd like to see if we could maybe streamline it for the next poor souls that have to go through something like this, whether it's in saying what worked, what didn't, or coming up with at least a starting point for them to start their meetings and start to organize their thoughts and streamline it a little better.
7/1/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	My list of contradictions was more to the text than to the general theme. I think we battled the whole time to balance Theme One with the rest of the Themes. And, as Paul said earlier, we've learned a lot through the process and perhaps we were a little bit better in the later chapters. I personally think we erred in the TDR chapters, or in the concept of it. I was against the idea of taking property rights from certain owners, just obliterating them and then providing a windfall to others. That was a huge issue for me when we were reviewing this. However, I do think that conceptually the idea of down zoning—that was the wrong word to use—of keeping our open space open and putting our density where our density should be was the correct idea. I'm not saying nodes, but I do think that the Town was the place for it to be and in the Village; I put that in my comments and my contradictions. I think as the electeds are going through the chapters and trying to figure out how to work that out, I think if we had had a better idea of how to make TDRs work that seemed fair and that could be a success, I think perhaps we would have...or I would have felt differently about some of the chapters. I have one more thing. Can we make a recommendation that the electeds review the transportation chapter prior to chapter two, or following chapter two, rather than at the end of the document? Or a suggestion? I think that had we all seen the transportation document, it would have been helpful in the review of...does anyone else?

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	Anyone else care to make a comment? Okay, I will, and I apologize that this is a little bit long. I wrote it all down and I thought it was going to get included, not in the Staff Report but in some sort of Appendix. It didn't, so I'm just going to go ahead and read my written comments. These are my final comments to the County Commission and the Town Council as they begin their process. When this process of reviewing and updating our Comprehensive Plan began, I had high hopes that our Joint Planning Commission would embrace some of the progressive land-use policies we have discussed over the last year, such as transferrable development rights and a growth-rate cap. We have not. If we were not able to reach consensus on TDRs, I'd hoped we would at least be able to considerably strengthen the noncontiguous PRD tool included in our current land-use regulations in order to give our Valley's large rural property owners more options for realizing significant financial gain from their extremely valuable properties other than by sale to developers of high-end suburban subdivisions. We have not. We have, however, taken what might be the first baby step toward this goal by allowing an increase in base density allowances in the Town's targeted growth areas if it's transferred from a rural PRD in conjunction with permanent conservation. In my opinion, this is the high point of our year's worth of effort. The low points are the elimination of nodes and Accessory Residential Units in the County. I have already written at length about nodes. They need to be acknowledged as an appropriate extension of our current existing land-use pattern and allowed to receive additional density within targeted growth areas, which would be determined in the Future Land-Use Plan, just like Town is. If the policies contained within the draft Plan we are certifying to the elected officials are implemented as currently written, the Town will be able to grow over time and the rural County will be able to grow over time, but the nodes will remain unchanged. This makes no sense. As far as County ARUs are concerned, my understanding of the reason they are eliminated by only two of the five sitting County Planning Commissioners was to subtract one hypothetical buildout number from an even larger but equally hypothetical buildout number. This action, however, would have some very significant impact on real homeowners, who currently have the right to construct these ARUs and have planned the development of their properties accordingly. One such example is a client family of mine who have master planned their property to include a main house and a guesthouse and have chosen to build the guesthouse first. They visit periodically and occupy the guesthouse while they approach retirement and plan the main house. What happens when their ability to construct a main house in the primary view corridor with the already-planned driveway access and pond is taken away? This policy represents nothing but a series of lawsuits waiting to happen to which written public comment has already alluded—just one reason to overturn this recommendation. Other equally valid reasons are the negative impacts it will have on current owners of overpriced Jackson Hole properties who are counting on rental income from those ARUs, as well as the loss of reasonably priced workforce housing opportunities. In retrospect, I think I understand why both these policies were recommended and I share some of the blame. At the very beginning of the process, we had discussions with Staff regarding whether or not an end-state buildout number should be included in the Plan, and I was one advocate for calculating and including this number. What Staff wound up with, however, was a hypothetical buildout number that included every rural landowner using the PRD to its maximum potential, as well as every landowner with the right to construct an ARU doing so, and then transferring all of this hypothetical development potential into the various nodes designated in the April 2009 draft. The uproar over this number and the way it would affect the neighborhoods included in all these nodes came to drive the rest of the debate and made every Staff member and Planning Commissioner gun shy about changing very much that was included in our 1994 Plan. Some of my fellow County Commissioners advocated for stopping the debate at that point and remanding the draft Plan back to Staff for an immediate rewrite rather than to continue with the review process and try to fix the April draft. At the time, I advocated for continuing with the review process and again have come to realize that this was a mistake. If we had stopped the process at the very beginning and had Staff rework the Comp Plan based on historical development patterns instead of hypothetical maximum buildout numbers, we might well have been able to implement some of the progressive policy directives I mentioned earlier. I was perhaps too optimistic about what we could achieve and underestimated the power of the politics involved in Jackson Hole land-use planning, and for that I apologize. Having said all of this, I do have to acknowledge that while not perfect, the 1994 Comprehensive Plan is still a very good document and the 2010 draft improves on it, even if just incrementally. The primary shortcoming of this draft, as well as the 1994 Plan, is the fact that we as a community continue to rely on the stewardship of our large rural landowners to maintain the community character we so cherish without giving them every conceivable option related to permanent conservation of these valuable properties. As a community, we are extremely fortunate that these historic ranching families have chosen to preserve their properties in a way which directly benefits all of us. And I lament the fact that our Comprehensive Plan doesn't give them every possible support mechanism to ensure that these properties can remain as close to their current state of (un)development as possible. I ask our elected officials to remedy this shortcoming, though we on the Joint Planning Commission were unable to do it.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Incorporate FLUP statement: •That, the elected officials request, as soon as they deem appropriate, that the Town of Jackson Planning Commission and Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission (the "joint planning commissions") certify the Future Land Us
7/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Make annual analysis description clearer that the review will be inclusive of the public
7/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Allow any member of the public to propose an amendment to the FLUP
7/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Change the language in the resolution to "certify" unless referring only to Town and clarify that only the Themes and Policies part of the Plan is being certified, but that the FLUP should also be a part of the Plan
7/1/2010	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	I'll just state that I tried hard to try and clarify the issues as I see them and the contradictions in written comments, and would basically make that my statement, and refer anyone to my written comments regarding the contradictions that are in our Staff Report tonight and that will be forwarded to, I believe, wherever this stuff gets forwarded to, I guess.
7/1/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. Thanks, everyone, for all your efforts. I know, yes, it's coming to an end for this part, but I really truly believe that you really need to reengage when and after the electives go over the themes, or I guess the vision and themes, after they're finished with that, and go reconcile the FLUP maps and the directives that go along with that FLUP map. It's really important. I think the process is also really important in that the community really needs a two-step process—the Planning Commission process and then the electives process like you do on every application for development or an LDR change. I think it's really critical that the public has two chances to comment, two chances to look at it. You know, I know everybody's exhausted and tired and doesn't really want to start up again at that point, but, you know, I think that's what's called for in the state statutes and I think that's what is really necessary to really move forward with a complete review. Thank you and thanks for all your work.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. As far as Commissioner Mr. Wall's calling out of a citizen being able to make amendments to the FLUPs, I fully agree with that. Any member of the public should be able to bring forth an amendment to the FLUPs or LDRs. No one wants to hear, and I certainly don't take any pleasure in telling you, I told you so, but last August and in numerous instances along the way, I called out continuously the fact that if you did not review the FLUPs, that you possibly, or even probably, relinquish our right and our responsibility to help shape, craft and guide them to bring them in line with the Comp Plan. And here we sit. I don't even know what to call Staff waiting until the last meeting to say that they had consultations with the County Attorney and the Town Attorney and that they stated exactly what was brought up by the public last August. We need to be a little more foresighted in our review going forward, if possible. The other issue apropos and looming is elections. I stated last August and numerous times along the way, whatever you do, don't string this out to the point where we get significantly into or past the primaries or, heaven help, past the general election, which, according to the comments by Mr. Daugherty, Planning Director Daugherty, could possibly be the case. We don't like to see October as the electives beginning to review. We have the right to vote into or out of office elected leaders based on what they do and how they vote, not how they say they're going to vote. So, if we're going to have a delay until October, let's go ahead and start working on the FLUPs now. That would be my point on that. The public again has the right to have a redundancy—Gail, I think, spoke very eloquently towards this—a redundancy of review. That multiple-layered, I think she called it, multi-tiered approach where you had that extra opportunity to help shape and craft and guide our very future. So that's very important. I've found that life in general, and this process specifically—I've attended every minute of every meeting—that the relative acceptance or rejection of a specific idea is inversely proportion to Wyoming ???. If you have a really idea, you can guarantee it won't see the light of day. So I'm going to give you one right now that I guarantee you won't see the light of day, that I doubt anyone can make a compelling or cogent case against. And that is recommend the strongest possible recommendation to the electives they ?? the process. Each and every one of you sitting there know that it's the most efficient way forward. We don't have any cross-jurisdictional enforceability on most issues. You know, I hate to call out someone, but this is positive. Commissioner Mr. Wall and Commissioner Mr. McCarthy are looking more like precious geniuses by the week, and I made that statement in August. So, at least consider it. I know you won't, but at least I stated it. As far as the five-year review goes, a great concept. I really think we need a one-year review after...whenever this process comes to an end. Five years is too long to wait to pick up where we may or may not have missed. I would like to thank somebody also. I'd like, you know, our nation sleeps easier tonight because the military is out there and being ever vigilant and on patrol. This community sleeps better at night knowing the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is ever vigilant and on patrol. I would especially like to call out Kristy Bruner. I know everybody that's been involved in this process and nobody has worked harder, nobody has been more overworked, no one paid and more under appreciated than Mrs. Bruner, so I just wanted to acknowledge her hard work in this process. As far as you go, your task was Herculean, but ours is Sisyphean because we get to do it again. We all had a really good laugh at Commissioner Mr. Pruett's expense at the last meeting when he was asked, do you really want to kid up and do this all over again if elected. Well, that's funny, but what isn't funny is the public has to kid up and do it all over again whether we want to or not. So, we're the only demographic that's involved at every stage in this process. So, the last message is really simple that I'm going to leave you with and I really wish you'd think about it. And it's this—our community at large should not have to work this doggone hard to get our community plan implemented. I mean, you talk about Herculean, every meeting you attend, we attend and more. Everything you read, we read that and more. Everything you write, we write that and more. And, you know, some of the really good ideas I've heard from the public throughout this process, it just bounced off...you might as well throw mud on the wall. You need to realize that the only demographic in this community that matters is the citizens because it's the only demographic to which we all belong. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I want to start off by recognizing the tremendous effort of...by my count, it has been 41 meetings, which is probably about 750 man and woman hours. That's just in the meetings alone, untold hours. Outside of that, I think preparing for the meetings and it shows what you guys did. It took a tremendous amount of sacrifice to get where you are. There has been compromise. I know not everybody's happy with everything. But I think overall you've done a good job. It's certainly been chock full of analysis. Two points I would make in addition to what pretty much what everyone with the comments made already. One, there is a thing about the justification which promotes morals. Certainly, we're okay with promoting health and safety and general welfare but I'm not sure whether you really want those words in there promoting morals—it doesn't seem to be appropriate. But the big issue for us is exactly what others have said about we support amending and certifying the document that you have, but we don't support adopting it at this time. Pretty much has been said, we see it as very problematic to try and administer a Plan without the specificity for individual projects. We have some statements about where we'd like to see development, but we don't have enough detail. We have to think about just a theoretical, hypothetical someone coming in with a property, specific property. We don't believe you have enough definition yet to determine whether it fits within the guidelines of places where you'd like to have either increased density or decreased density. So you're just going to create headaches for yourself. We certainly need the FLUPs for the detail to truly administer it and then we can go forward. Amending it we think would be problematic. And probably one FLUP in the '94 Plan was the transportation element was adopted separately and it ended up being six years later when...I think it was 2000 and that was a handicap we believe. So, get it all together, send it off, let the electives work on it, let them figure out what to do with what you've done, and then get together and work on the FLUPs and then we'll have an entire document that we can go forward with. Thank you and again I want to recognize your tremendous efforts. Also, I need to apologize as I'm going to have to leave shortly and I don't want you guys to think that it's I don't care. I need to go to the Tribal Trails connector meeting. So I actually would like to stay and hear your discussion, so I apologize.
7/1/2010	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Good evening, Rich Bloom, and tonight I am speaking on behalf of some of the South Park neighbor groups that I ?? in the last few weeks. You're going to hear a theme repeated...thank you for all your work by the way and thank you especially to Tony Wall and Barbara Allen for resonating some of my concerns that I have on theme four. I do appreciate that. Likewise, you know, I held back from engaging South Park neighbors until the FLUP maps came back, because that's really where the rubber meets the road. Now I'm wondering whether that was the wrong move. Because I don't think it was your intent. I was at the meeting when you decided to separate the FLUPs and the policies and themes, and then decided to wait and see if the electives would simply change the themes and policies before you put your time and effort, volunteers as you are, in the FLUPs. I do not believe that any of the Planning Commissioners that voted for that intended to have the themes and policies by themselves replace the current Comprehensive Plan. I certainly didn't think that was the deal we made. I know well the current Comp Plan. I've read it through multiple times and I know pretty well this Plan before you and where it is right now cannot replace our current Comprehensive Plan. Until we add the FLUPs or use a substitute for those to have the detail, lesser, we won't have the predictability. And again for those of you that are new to the Planning Commission when some of those decisions were made, it was very clear it was done so you wouldn't have to repeat work by having the electives state a change of course. So, with that, and I guess for integrity of the process, I would hope that you would amend this Resolution to honor bullet number two the Staff put out there, requesting the Joint Planning Commissions be asked that the Future Land-Use Plan or their substitute following approval of the themes and policies by the electives, and that the elected officials wait to adopt the themes and policies as a formal portion of the Plan having it replaced. Or we will be in a quagmire. What will happen is they will be adopted in with no specificity. All of sudden applications will come forward and we'll be in a worse situation than letting the current Comp Plan sit until we get this fully done. Thank you. I know you guys are tired and would like to get this done, but I think this is the proper way to do it, and it's what the community and what I expected. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2010	Sobey, Pegi Conservation Alliance	Good evening, Pegi Sobey, Co-Chair for the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. We have submitted written comments on behalf of our Alliance members regarding the administration chapter and hope you will take the time needed to get this section right. And also to promote the Resolution to adopt and certify the 2010 Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as the Comprehensive Master Plan for our community. I would just like to emphasize a few questions about the certification vote that we believe must be answered prior to your much-deserved break from these Comp Plan discussions. The draft Resolution before you clearly indicates that the themes and policies alone are intended to be our new Comprehensive Plan. This would mean that what was once nearly half of the proposed Plan, the Future Land-Use Plan, will not be considered a part of the Plan itself. The draft Resolution even goes as far as to state that the Future Land-Use Plan could be added later as an appendix. This change from the April 2009 draft Plan warrants discussion and clarification as to the legal implications and the unintended consequences of this significant shift. The themes and policies section alone will not suffice as an acceptable replacement for our existing Plan, because the current draft lacks the maximum level of clear guidance and direction that a Comprehensive Plan must provide. The Future Land-Use Plan was explicitly designed to be a critical piece in order to bring increased predictability to the overall Plan. If the Future Land-Use Plan is not going to be a specific part of the new Plan, major changes must be made to the themes and policies sections to include adequate guidance for the Land Development Regulations and future land-use decisions. We strongly recommend that you adopt the second bullet point identified in the Staff Report and request that your joint bodies be asked to complete the Future Land-Use Plan following approval of the themes and policies by our elected officials. And further, our elected officials must wait to adopt the 2010 Plan in its entirety until completion of the Joint Planning Commission's certification of the Future Land-Use Plan. For example, if bullet four in the Staff Report is adopted and only the elected officials review the Future Land-Use Plan, does it mean that the Future Land-Use Plan cannot officially be considered part of the Plan? This and other questions need to be resolved prior to handing this off to our elected representatives. To be clear, throughout this review process the Conservation Alliance has raised a number of concerns about the Future Land-Use Plan and we continue to believe that this section needs significant modification. In conclusion, the Conservation Alliance insists that any new Comp Plan must have some component, whether it is the Future Land-Use Plan or simply more narrative in the themes and policies, that will bring increased predictability to the community and provide for enforceable policies. In any case, if it is to be included, the Future Land-Use Plan must be an essential part of—not an appendix or addendum to—our community's Comp Plan. We therefore ask that the Planning Commissions recommend that the elected officials wait to adopt the 2010 Plan in its entirety until after the Joint Planning Commissions complete the review of the Future Land-Use Plan, and also that you make the necessary revisions to the Resolution to reflect this. Thank you for your hard work throughout this review process and for the time that you as volunteers have spent working to uphold our community's priorities. And thank you for the opportunity to comment this evening.
6/25/2010	Read, Ben Interested Public	At this point, as the comp plan advances to elected officials of town and county, I have two overriding hopes or concerns. One of these is that in rural areas that are of importance to the community in terms of open space, ranching and wildlife values, we move as far away from traditional Euclidian zoning practices as possible, by reverting to base line development potentials and mobilizing, on the other hand, incentives (like the non-contiguous PRD) to shift development into areas that can better absorb growth. Under the heading of discussion points: •Are we offering property owners in rural locations as much flexibility as possible in our efforts to minimize the impacts of new development on open space and wildlife? •Do accessory residential units have a constructive role to play in terms of meeting the community's diverse objectives? •Separate from the decision to designate town as a focal point for nodal development, should relatively small and discreet amounts of additional development potential be allowed in areas like Wilson and the Aspens area that have local convenience services (when such development is density neutral)? Other questions depend largely on how our concluding conversations develop.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Pruett, Michael Interested Public	My comments are specific to the Town of Jackson. I do not feel the growth caps achieve the goals we set for our community. I feel that the Town is the place the community agreed to meet many of our goals including housing, redevelopment, Town is Heart, vitality, character...etc. The community and we have agreed that we need to be "smart" about growth in town, that this is the right place for it because of : •Smart growth concepts •Existing infrastructure in the town •Walk and bike to work •Vitality in the town •Supports local businesses •Supports the tourism business which in turn benefits the community •Consistent in maintaining and preserving community character •And more
6/25/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	1)I believe there needs to be reconciliation between the caps placed in Town and our goals in 1, 8, 6 & 4. 2)Still think that 3.2.b "sales tax collection within the Town must be maintained and expanded" is in conflict with Policy 2.6.c "Do not make land use decision for revenue purposes." I do not think we should be discussing the expansion of taxes in a land use plan.
6/25/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	Policy 3.2.c: Protect the image and function of Town Square: Last sentence: "Pedestrian only areas around the town square should be considered including the feasibility of closing certain streets to vehicular traffic." Contradicts Rec# 222: "Identify pedestrian only areas around the town square including enhancement of pedestrian amenities and closing streets to vehicular traffic" Our recommendation was to identify pedestrian only areas, including closing streets to vehicular traffic not just consider their feasibility.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	The fundamental contradiction in the current draft is between Theme’s 1 and 2. Theme 1 states that for ideological, ecological and economic reasons wildlife will be protected and afforded as much opportunity to thrive as possible, cumulative impacts will be monitored and mitigated, and “large contiguous open spaces” will be conserved. There is little that is unclear about this Theme. It sets a high standard that poses challenges for the other seven themes in the plan. Never the less, it is clear this is desired by the community and should remain a preeminent theme going forward. Insightful public comment has noted that the best way to successfully carry out the principles of Theme 1 while allowing for their common enjoyment by residents and visitors alike is to “rent” our community’s natural resources (here we can consider open space to be a proxy for natural resources), not occupy it. Logically this entails either not allowing any new development (unrealistic) or arranging new development near existing areas of density already impacted by humans, close to public transportation and services, and outside of scenic vistas. Theme 2 primarily contradicts Theme 1 by precluding such land use planning other than by moving as much new development as possible from the county to the town. While conceptually ideal, reality may prove that Theme 2 as written motivates a dispersed type of ranchette development that contradicts core principles of Theme 1 as well as contradicting parts of Themes 4,5,6 and 7. The reasons lie in how large property owners may interpret their development alternatives as stated in the current draft. “Why is this Theme Addressed?” in Theme 2 states that “increased density and intensity of development” threatens the character of existing neighborhoods in both the town and county and is undesirable. However 35-acre ranchettes are “inconsistent” with Theme 1 and also undesirable. But to avoid 35 acre ranchettes some form of density “bonus” must be allowed. Principle 2.1.a states that such density increases will not be permitted without “defined community benefit” (first and foremost in the way of open space/wildlife habitat if we are to abide by Theme 1, only secondarily for workforce housing). Fair enough. 2.1.c goes on to allow for PRD’s in areas outside of wildlife habitat and “adjacent to existing development”. However inserted between 2.1.a and 2.1.c is 2.1.b that states that no such development will occur in nodes, despite the fact that nodes are largely outside of vital wildlife habitat and are adjacent to existing development. Furthermore much of the open space that is outside of nodes but still “next to existing development” has seen development proposals in the past, proposals that ignited no small amount of debate. Policies 2.1.d, 2.1.e and 2.1.g provide guidance in how to handle dense development where proposed as an alternative to 35 acre ranchettes: move it into town. However the mechanisms proposed, to my knowledge, have not been evaluated as to their efficacy or viability. I don’t think we know whether the logistical hurdles can be surmounted or whether there would even be any economic incentive to transfer development. Such transfers are at best uncertain. Thus development under Theme 2 will occur only in town and/or in areas that have already seen contentious development proposals, or it will progress as 35 acre ranchettes. To force development into areas where contentious debate has already occurred is undesirable. And developing 35 acre ranchettes is undesirable as well as being counter to Theme 1. However without a clear mechanism and obvious economic incentive for transferring county development rights into town, such options seem hard to avoid. The fundamental flaw is that mechanisms for density increases are allowed but only in impractical ways, illogical places, or in a manner that defeats the goals of Theme 1. How about removing the possibility for density increases altogether? That would resolve the issue of where density increases should go, but it would certainly result in 1 in 35 as being the primary development tool, which again contradicts the communities desire to not develop in 35 acre ranchettes as well as contradicting much of Theme 1. Furthermore it contradicts Theme’s 4 and 8 by leading to the potential construction of over 3500 dwellings of the most energy and employee intensive type. Per dwelling unit and per person energy consumption would rise. The need for subsidized employee housing would continue unabated. Furthermore, if the subsidized housing required by ranchette style development were required to be placed on site, it would potentially lead to clusters of five, ten, possibly more units dispersed around the valley, again contradicting much of Theme 1 and some of Theme 2. Such development would also have a “bar bell” effect on the community by creating a class of service industry and maintenance workers living in subsidized housing along side a class of much wealthier large home owners. The middle class may be left with few housing options other than those that exist today, an amount that will comprise an ever smaller percentage of the overall housing mix, all of which is in contradiction to Theme 4. To reiterate, the most important contradiction is that Theme 2 contradicts the core of Theme 1 by likely dispersing development throughout the remaining large open tracts of space and wildlife habitat. Above all, the contradictions in Theme 2 may ultimately render this plan ineffective in meeting the preeminent goals of Theme 1 by actually encouraging ranchettes and dispersing development. Side effects would include a heavier reliance on subsidized housing, potentially dispersed clusters of workforce housing, and/or the increased likelihood of dense development in areas where battles over development have already been fought. Throughout history and throughout the world, when open space was considered valuable, buildings were clustered and building size was minimized. I believe this plan can do better towards both strategies without addative growth.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	I see two overarching contradictions between the policies outlined throughout the Revised Comprehensive Plan and the directives the Joint Planning Commission have issued. The first is the elimination of ARU's in the unincorporated county. Apparently, much of the public agrees with me on this. I feel that the abundance of public comment opposed to this directive will insure that it gets brought up for discussion and resolution by revote. The second major contradiction is the elimination of the concept of Nodal development. As outlined in my previous written comment, a nodal development pattern is exactly what we have on the ground in Teton County today, and it is aligned with many of the other significant goals of this plan such as increased mass transit opportunities, compact development footprints and the preservation of open space. Failing to acknowledge this is hypocrisy. Failing to correct it would be unconscionable. I have organized my reconciliation list to address the second inconsistency (Node elimination) rather than by Theme. Nodal Development Elimination Contradictions: •Policy 1.2.d: Improve air quality "Strategies to improve air quality will include reducing vehicle miles traveled." A nodal development pattern would help reduce vehicle miles traveled. •Policy 1.3.b: Maintain expansive hillside and foreground vistas: "Development in such areas will retain these vistas by being located at the periphery of the expanse and naturally screened." The opposite of a nodal development pattern is a sprawling development pattern which would cover the valley floor in a uniformly spaced sea of houses. •Rec # 172: "Maintenance of the existing residential and/or nonresidential pattern allowed today is the desired land use pattern in the areas formerly known as nodes." The existing land use pattern in Teton County is nodal. A land use pattern which focuses development to a single area (town) is not "maintenance of the existing residential and/or nonresidential pattern allowed today." Recommendations #147 and #172 conflict. •Theme 2, 3rd paragraph text (p26): "35-acre ranchettes are valuable and easy to create but are inconsistent with the community's goal to preserve large open spaces for their ecological and scenic value. To achieve the community's ideal of preserving undeveloped lands as perpetual open space, land owners need to be able to achieve value from a development that also preserves large amounts of open space and clusters development out of ecologically sensitive and scenic areas, near existing development." These sentences explain why nodal development should be preserved rather than eliminated. •Policy 6.2.a: Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity; That's a nodal development pattern. •Theme 8, 3rd paragraph text (p92): referencing the avoidance of sprawling development patterns directly contradicts the elimination of Nodal development pattern. Same is true for Principle 8.2, Policy 8.2b, 8.2c, 8.3b, Remove language stating that the only Node will be Town, and language that Wilson, The Aspens, Teton Village and northern South Park will be eliminated from the Plan as nodes appropriate for increased development (172 and 147.) Allow PRD development transfers into specific Targeted Growth Areas within these Nodes, as designated by the FLUP, in association with permanent conservation. Once these Targeted Growth Areas have been filled to capacity with transfers related to permanent conservation, all PRD density bonuses will have to occur on site or in other rural areas of the county. Policy 2.3.b: Fit the contextual scale and design of existing development in town: "development in Town must be consistent with existing contextual scale and design." This contradicts "Theme 3 – Uphold Jackson as "Heart of the Region" – defines the characteristics of areas in Town appropriate for preservation and areas targeted for growth." Targeted growth areas will not match the existing contextual scale and design. Omit the sentence.
6/25/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	Conflicts/Contradictions – We need to identify more areas in Town (and the Village) to accommodate the transfer of density from the county. I am not in favor of taking property rights from the county landowners and giving a windfall to owners in Wilson, Racquet Club, etc; however, I would be in favor of creating a multiplier for the PRD and specifying that a certain portion of that multiplier can only be realized in areas designated in Town or in Teton Village as receiving zones. The logistics of this would be left to the individual landowners to figure out. a. We have unintentionally, but with good intentions, created a contradiction between Theme I, the Transportation Chapter and the Energy Chapter by not forcing remaining development into the denser areas. I am not in favor of density bonuses for specific end product; however, I would be in favor of upzoning some areas with the parameter that the upzone can ONLY be used if it a development right is extinguished somewhere else. b.2.1.d. The last sentence of this paragraph "and encouraged to be designed provide workforce housing" is not an accurate representation of our discussion. Our discussion was to incentivize the conversion of commercial to residential. This would trigger an affordable housing requirement. We DO NOT need additional language hampering this effort by suggesting that it will "be encouraged to be workforce housing." c. Ref Recommendation 174 and 175, I think we need to discuss the conflict of the chapters I referenced in point a with the possibility of identifying some receiving areas in Teton Village rather than the outlying county again ONLY if said density is transferred from another location.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	As for Themes 3 and 4, the potential available housing supply in town will fall well short of the demand generated by this plan even if very little or no development is transferred from the county. Also the density asked for of town may be unpopular and resisted by a large enough segment of the community to render this goal unattainable. And the conversion of existing non-residential to residential mentioned in 3.4.a is untested (i.e. the relative levels of commercial rents to owners equivalent rents that would drive such a conversion have not been examined), and the amount of housing conversion will create remains uncertain. Given the above, Theme 3 may well contradict Themes 1 and 2 by placing an impossible burden on town and forcing dispersed pockets of workforce housing back into the county. If workforce housing is forced out of the county due to contradictions in Principle 2.1, an increasing number of employees will seek homes outside of the community, contradicting Principle 2.5.
6/25/2010	Wall, Tony Interested Public	1)Places where the desire for “predictability” is affirmed: a.pg. 25 “Development that is not predictably managed to enhance community character will degrade it” b.pg. 26 “The community now desires predictability” c.2.3 (pg. 32) “Conservation and development will occur in a predictable pattern and with a predictable character” d.2.3.e (pg. 34) “Limit discretion in land use decisions” and “discretionary regulations and incentives do not provide predictability” Places where the concept of “predictability” is contradicted (ANY reference to UNQUANTIFIED “bonuses”, “incentives”, or “conditional” developments a.2.1.c (pg. 28) “Allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space” without any quantification this statement directly contradicts “predictability” b.2.3.e (pg. 34) “the intent and limits of the incentivized or conditional development will be clearly stated” which is saying that incentivized and conditional (both unpredictable) development is OK if it is “clearly stated” undermines our desire for predictability c.4.3 contradicts the desire for predictability when it says that we will “provide incentives for the preservation and creation of workforce housing”. This is repeated in 4.3.a. Both of these errors could be corrected by adding the language “without increasing the potential levels of density or intensity” 2)2.1.e (pg. 29) Allow development of County residential potential in Town” is contradicted by vote #144 which FAILED to approve TDRs 3)2.2.c and 2.2.d appear to contradict each other. One advocates for “clustering” non-residential development, then the next one encourages “dispersing” of that same development 4)Place where a residential development “cap” is noted a.2.1.a (pg. 27) “Limit base development rights to those allowed today” Place where the development “cap” is compromised a.2.1.c (pg. 28) “Allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space” If the phrase “without increasing the potential levels of density or intensity permitted under the 1994 Plan” is added to this statement then it would not conflict with the concepts of “no additive growth” and “predictability:

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Pruett, Michael Interested Public	Reconciliation #1 My comments are specific to density and caps on residential density in town Principle 2.1 and Policy 2.1.a. I think having a cap on residential development in town is inconsistent with any redevelopment in town and constitutes a “no growth” policy. A hard fast cap on residential development is not the solution we need – it is in direct conflict with providing housing for our workforce, local jobs, and supporting local businesses. It is in direct conflict with Theme 3 Town is Heart. For example under the current plan we would not be able to find any high density areas to meet the community’s goals of rental housing and workforce housing within the caps. This is inconsistent with the Theme 3, 4, and 5 and will stagnate our town. I propose that Principle 2.1 and Policy 2.1.a be revised to allow residential growth above the caps in specific areas (targeted growth areas) and for defined community benefit as follows: •Workforce housing •Market rate housing •Apartments •Etc. Reconciliation #2 My comments are specific to caps on nonresidential density in town Principle 2.2 and Policy 2.2.a. I think having a cap on nonresidential development in town is inconsistent with redevelopment in town and constitutes a “no growth” policy. A hard fast cap on nonresidential development is not the solution we need – it is in direct conflict with providing redevelopment (theme 3), providing local jobs (Theme 5), new lodging (theme 3) and supporting local businesses (theme 5). For example without the ability to discuss the appropriate nonresidential allowances in the Lodging Overlay we may not be able to implement the future vision for downtown in Principle 3.2 and Policies 3.2.b & d. This is inconsistent with the theme 3 and will stagnate our town. I propose that Principle 2.2 and Policy 2.2.a be revised to allow nonresidential growth above the caps in specific areas (defined in FLUP) and for defined community benefit as follows: •Redevelopment to implement vision for downtown “lights on” •Lodging •Local jobs and businesses •Etc.
6/25/2010	Read, Ben Interested Public	My other concern or hope is that we embrace as directly as possible the idea that sustainability practices should be applied to land use planning and that we acknowledge (and manage) as a community the direct and excessive bearing that prosperity has on energy usage.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Walter, Jamie Interested Public	Areas of Existing Dense Mixed Use Development (Nodes) Principle 2.1.b Preserve existing county neighborhoods (development in existing nodes, except Town to remain at existing levels). This Policy is contradicted by the following policies and principles: •Policy 1.1a ...encouraging clustered development to be located outside the NRO •Policy 1.1.d ...conserve large, contiguous, and connected open space •Policy 2.1.c ...Teton County will encourage that development resulting from bonuses be clustered outside of crucial wildlife habitat and scenic corridors, adjacent to existing development •Policy 2.2.c&d ...cluster county nonresidential development and encourage local convenience commercial in appropriate areas (If you add more commercial development to theses existing nodes but do not allow for additional residential units, who will work at and or patronize these businesses? People from Rural areas, from Town, or neighboring communities will commute to support these businesses, increasing traffic, adding to pollution, and intensifying wildlife conflicts.) •Policy 4.1.a ...achieve all four housing goals (Town can only fit so much density, once this level has been reached, and if additional density can not be added to the existing nodes, the only place for homes to be built are in the large undeveloped open lands within the County. Lots/homes developed in this location will most likely be large in scale and very likely owned as second homes. But by allowing density to be incorporated within existing areas of dense development more small lots/homes will be constructed that are more likely to be occupied, full time, by members of our workforce, therefore reducing traffic and pollution and adding to our sense of community by having homes occupied year round.) •Principle 6.1 ...increase the share of trips made by alternative transportation modes (Because of convenience, people living in areas of existing dense mixed use development are more likely to walk/bike to work, run errands, visit friends, etc... than those living in a more rural setting.) •Policy 8.2.b ...encourage mixed use, compact and connected land use patterns •Policy 8.2.c ...guide future development into already developed areas •Policy 8.3.b ...promote alternative modes of transportation (See •Principle 6.1.) Accessory Residential Units (ARUs): Strategy 2.1 ...prohibit accessory residential units associated with residential development in the County (Does this eliminate Guest homes entirely, or just renting them, ie, ARUs? If this eliminates Guest Homes, I feel that his is contradictory to other sections of the plan that encourage the maintenance of community character. If guest homes are eliminated, people will build larger homes with attached guest wings, which will increase the bulk and scale of the dwellings. It is my opinion that clustered smaller homes (main houses and guest houses) are more line with our existing community character than single large scale homes.) Retain Base Zoning Allowances (Caps): Policy 2.1.a ...limit base development rights to those allowed today. This Policy is contradicted by the following policies: •Policy 2.1c ...allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space •Policy 4.3.b ...allow for density increases for restricted, workforce housing in targeted areas of Town How can density bonuses be granted in the above two instances if development rights are to be limited at those allowed today? Instead of having an absolute “cap” I think it would be more beneficial to have the build out set at what is allowed today but allow the number to be flexible by +/- 5%-10%. This is important for two reasons. First, over the past 12 years I have seen more development units be given up for tax write offs than have been added using density bonuses. I have spoken to staff and this observation has been confirmed. Therefore by having a cap we actually have a number that will constantly be declining. By allowing bonuses we are more likely to stay closer to a constant build-out number. Secondly, allowing for appropriate and permissible density bonuses can be a very useful tool for the planning staff and the elected officials when dealing with either a difficult or desirable project.
6/25/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	Policy 8.2.b – This is in conflict with language in Theme III about stable neighborhoods as well as with zoning in certain areas. While I am in favor of the concept, it needs to be modified to make this policy appropriate. Policy 8.2.c is inconsistent with Theme II and with the decision to cap growth. This needs to be reconciled
6/25/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	“Energy costs are also greatly impacted by the energy demand generated by development patterns. Sprawling development patterns increase infrastructure, service delivery and transportation costs for residents. Further, by reducing energy consumption the community reduces its reliance on foreign non-renewable energy sources. Thereby increasing our energy security position and creating benefit to our national security.” (This is precisely the justification for a Nodal Development pattern rather than a sprawling development pattern.)

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	Theme 8 can do more to emphasize that building size, whether residential or commercial, is one of the most critical factors in energy consumption and should be limited or “energy taxed” on a sliding scale (bigger place, bigger tax). Furthermore it should be noted that reducing building size can play a beneficial role in meeting the goals of all other themes, especially Themes 1 and 2.
6/25/2010	Wall, Tony Interested Public	The appendix {Appendix I} should contain both ACTUAL and EFFECTIVE population numbers for 2000, 2010, and at build-out
6/25/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	1)Theme [4] Workforce Housing definition: Seriously, you can’t call it “workforce housing regardless of employment.” Omit the words “or employment” and add a sentence including retirees as part of the historical workforce. 2)I agree with the Conservation Alliance’s 5/28 comments regarding this Theme as they relate to Affordable Housing (which is one component of Workforce Housing.) More specific explanation of our Affordable Housing program needs to be included. Why it exists, what it’s goals are, how they’re being achieved, what needs to be reevaluated & update in this plan. Specifically, new ideas are included?
6/25/2010	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	I find no glaring contradictions in Theme 6. However there is a critical lack of emphasis on human safety. The current development pattern has resulted in a large west bank population while our hospital is on the east bank. If a major incident (an explosion perhaps, or a fire at the urban/wildlands interface) were to occur simultaneously with an accident on the Snake River Bridge or at a similar constriction elsewhere in the county, we may lack adequate alternatives for rerouting emergency vehicles in a way that will effectively handle people needing emergency hospital care. Perhaps local fire and EMS have already planned for such contingencies and have viable plans in place. If not, the issue should be considered and taken into account when making decisions about transportation planning.
6/25/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	Policy 6.1: The term “year around mode shift” should be “year round.” Strategy 6.7: Establish a Regional Transportation Authority: I support the concept, as well as joining the Linx Co-op, but they’re two separate entities. The Linx Co-op is a regional transportation network, a Regional Transportation Authority is a policy making body charged with identifying and funding projects and initiatives.
6/25/2010	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	Theme 5 is broadly contradicted by Theme 2 due to the potential stifling effects of Theme 2’s contradictions and associated uncertainty. As stated in Theme 1 the health of the county’s natural resources is critical in preserving the visitor service segment of the economy. If development in the county is comprised largely of ranchettes, it may impact the visitor experience. Furthermore if price incentives do happen to drive the conversion of non-residential in town to residential, it may suppress entrepreneurialism (other than in the long term rental market) and impact economic vitality. It may also become more difficult to accomplish the goals of self reliance and diversity as stated in Theme 5.3.
6/25/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	I cannot recall whether in our second review of this we agreed to the rewrites that are throughout. I thought this was one of the only chapters where we did actually vote on exact wording. I am concerned with the insertion of the word “sustainability” which is then tied to the concept in other communities. We voted to redefine the phrase, and I thought, remove much of it because we were concerned by the implications or the standard definition in other areas.
6/25/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	I still think that this is a superfluous chapter, but will bow to being outvoted in every vote on this one. ☹
6/25/2010	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	I support the inclusion of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce recommendations.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2010	Wall, Tony Interested Public	1)pg. 54 The third housing issue “Catching Up to improve on existing situation” is in direct conflict with the goal of 65% and the acknowledgement that we are currently in excess of that number. There is no justification given for “catching up” - “Maintaining our current levels” should be the title of this bullet point. In the indicators section the goal should be changed accordingly from “Increase” to “maintain”. The language on pg. 55 “the community’s goal is to increase the percentage of the workforce living locally” is also in conflict with the fact that we are currently in excess of our goal 2)4.2 (pg. 58) “developers will be required to mitigate a portion of their impacts” is in direct contradiction to the achievement of our goal of housing 65% of our workforce 3)the goal in Theme 4 Indicator #1 to “increase” the % of the workforce housed locally from today’s number should change to “maintain” if we are currently above the established threshold 4)the goal in Theme 4 Indicator #7 should be changed to “maintain” for the same reason 5)The definition of Workforce Housing (Theme 4) is even more vague than in the original draft – there was considerable PC discussion and Public Comment about creating a NARROWER definition – not a BROADER one. By not defining WFH more narrowly we would be undermining the opportunity to achieve the 4 goals set forth on pg. 54
6/25/2010	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	1)I do not think it generally reflects our discussion 2)I think definitions on page 55 need to be removed 3)Ref rec 263 – I do not see where this was incorporated into the chapter. The bullet point where this is footnoted does not pertain to the intent of this vote 4)Generational Continuity: Phrase “Community members that grew up here have a greater appreciation for the shared values of the community and its history.” I do not believe this was in the last version and would like it taken out of this one. I’m fine with “play an important role” or something of that ilk. 5)Problem 1: Statistical info at beginning of chapter discussing median income etc is no longer accurate 6)I do not think Rec 272 is accurately reflected in the text 7)Policy 4.1.e is very vague and I’m not sure it addresses the discussion 8)Ref Policy 4.2.c – This is a repeat of policy 2.1.d and does not accurately reflect our votes in rec. 34, 35 and 36. We did not incentivize the conversion of non-residential to residential with any stipulation as to the “encouragement of workforce housing.” 9)Principal 4.3 – this rewrite does not reference any recommendations nor does it accurately reflect what we reviewed in the previous version. It does not reference the rental housing issue that redevelopment impacts nor does specify what the word “incentive” means. 10)The concept of the “middle class” was a frequent conversation in this chapter, but not addressed in this chapter. Text needs to be added that recognizes that deed restricted housing raises the end price of the final product and prices out any “middle class” housing that may have existed without a deed restriction. Language should be added regarding potential size constraints to help create “urban” housing that is more efficient and that is more affordable based on the unit size, not based on a deed restriction Indicators – I do not recall or read a recommendation where we agreed upon 65%?
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Indicators: reference the transportation indicators and add an indicator regarding energy use in leaving and reaching this destination
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add building material reuse to 8.4.c
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	8.4.a: only the new part of addition or remodel must be brought up to improved standards
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 8.4 language: add discussion of "incentives" for private construction

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 8.4 last sentence: change "should also" to "will also be required to"
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Adopt anti-idling language as a policy or strategy
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add 8.3.c: support regional transportation system
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add 8.1.f: designate in Future Land Use Plan a renewable energy research campus
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	8.1.d: replace "home-based" with "on-site" throughout policy
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add 8.1.e: to reduce use of non-renewable energy as soon as possible
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 8.5: add encourage curbside recycling countywide
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add 8.5.d: best practices to limit stormwater/snowmelt runoff
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this Theme Addressed": add a discussion that natural resources can be better protected by conserving them rather than consuming them
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Throughout Theme: recognize that technology will advance and allow for incorporation of best available technology
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 8.4: add: develop a permanent subsidy for START provided needed infrastructure for expanding START
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 8.1.b: be careful of what impact this may have on older, less efficient homes that people cannot afford to make more efficient or are unable to make more efficient such as older condominiums.
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Throughout the Theme: add language that wildlife values will not be compromised by policies
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	add Strategy 8.5: identify permanent locations for recycling stations

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Alex Norton Subject: Please add these comments to public comment for the Administration Chapter - Thanks! From: Gail Jensen Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 2:38 PM June 17, 2010 Gail Jensen Comments Administration Chapter • This is one of the most important chapters of the Comp Plan. It deals with trust and commitment from our County Employees, Elected officials and Community to support this Comp Plan. • I support all of the JH Alliance's comments. I also hope that each of you has read and considered Roger Elletson's comments made May 18th of 2009. I have similar concern's and spent the better part of the last 3 years entrenched in the processes he describes. • Page 140 The Community. 2. "Where government and other organizations are falling short in the implementation of this Plan, the community will hold them accountable and take additional action where needed. How can the community hold the elected officials, Planning Director, County Deputy Attorney, County Agencies, and Planning staff accountable? Let's talk about the realities of our current government when a community member has a complaint with enforcement or an interpretation that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and/or Land Development Regulations. If it concerns one of many possible Planning Director decisions or interpretation's, then the community member or community group must file a written appeal which includes an \$800 fee, go through what is now a lengthy legal process, which will ultimately involve hiring an attorney and all this without our elected County Commissioners ever weighing in. Now the County Commissioners can not talk to the community member as there is a legal process that must be followed. The Deputy County Attorney always represents the Planning Staff which is at odds with the Community over the complaint. That same Deputy County Attorney also represents the Elected's. Now an out of town hearing officer is appointed which generally is an attorney from an adjoining county which knows and is very familiar with our County Legal Staff. They expect to hold a "court like hearing" and really do not like the public speaking. Anyway, I hope you get the point and see where this is going. There is no reasonable system in place to hold accountable, the people that are employed by our county, paid by the citizen's and that are tasked with representing our Comp Plan and LDR's as written and approved short of litigation. • Following and enforcing our Comp Plan and LDR's is not optional. • In this chapter there needs to be written commitments with a specific resultant action taken when this Plan is not followed. • Teton County Governments policy of no enforcement is this: Let's bury as many conditions of approval and restrictions in HOA Covenants so that the County is not responsible. The Commissioners feel good about the approval as they have throw in conditions etc. The result pits neighbor against neighbor. Please put enforcement language in this Chapter! • The Community at large has lost confidence in our County Government and more specifically in the Comp Plan process. We need to feel that we have a role and voice and know that ultimately what we say does matter. An every 5 year review meeting with the community is not enough. The Planning Department needs to reach out to the Community and communicate with us. • How many people are in this room tonight? Why isn't this room filled? This Chapter must be written so that we have accountability, enforcement, predictability, and which embraces and encourages Community involvement. 2 Thank you for considering my comments, Gail Jensen

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	Coon, Dave Interested Public	My comments are directed towards theme 8.Policy 8.1.a: Shift Community energy consumption behaviorThe community will probably need some very hard line rules and regulations to get the point across i.e. more modest dwelling size limits, no heated driveways, etc.Policy 8.1.b: Encourage Energy conservation through energy pricingEnergy pricing structures need to be steep and really hit the pocket book to be effective. Pricing could be tiered to penalize large energy users/wasters.Policy 8.4.a: Construct Energy Efficient Buildings I would encourage the Town and County to not only adopt the most current energy and building codes, but also go beyond and require additional higher standards for our local climate/location in warranted situations. Along with requiring top notch energy and buildings codes, the contractor licensing program and building inspection process may need more monitoring. The basic building inspection process should be expanded upon even though it will increase the cost of permitting.Policy 8.4.d: Energy Efficient Building systems and appliances Wording needs to be added to include "building envelopes".Policy 8.5.a: Encourage water conservation Be sure to address smaller/older/private water systems that might not have the pumping capacities to handle even minimal revegetation/landscape requirements and fire sprinkler demands required by the regulatory agencies. Trophy homes use more water! Not allowing pond construction helps keep aquifers intact.Strategy 8.2: Develop a comprehensive Sustainable Building Program-Add a requirement of a maximum residential square footage of 5000 feet.-Develope some performance standards for all housing that confirm codes are being met (not just in LEED construction.Strategy 8.3 Education In the last bullet of this section change the word "encourage" to "Require" the use of energy efficient building systems and appliances.Thanks for all your time!Dave Coon
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 8.4 and Policy 8.5.a: change to actively pursue incentives to reduce water consumption rather than a sliding scale for pricing
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	8.4.e: incentivize smaller buildings in town and county
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this Theme Addressed": amend to indentify the policies of this Theme as an obligation not an opportunity
6/17/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. A couple of quick comments. One thing, I would urge you to use caution in the one statement about relaxing the Regulations to encourage sustainable energy. That is good, but we have to be careful, especially when we think about it in terms of relaxing things for wildlife. But two quick examples to think about. One is certainly we'd encourage people to use outdoor drying in good weather like this, but we do need to be cognizant that's one of the things that the Game & Fish does get called out for is for moose especially getting caught in clothes lines and stuff. So, that's not to say that we should not encourage people to dry their clothes outside, but again we need to be cognizant that we're in a little different world than other people. If people use clotheslines, they should probably make them break away so that there's not a problem, you know, as an example. The other example that I would use is one that was in Town now. Members of the Town Commission at least are familiar with, which was the refuge project on North Cache where they were proposing to put wind turbines on the top of their building to boost their energy. And while that was a noble cause, I'm grateful or thankful that they at least withdrew that part of the project, because the concern there is that we spent a lot of money burying the power lines there to protect the trumpeter swans that use that corridor there along Flat Creek. And on a foggy day, that would potentially be a disaster. We only need to kill one or two swans a year to have a pretty catastrophic effect. So, we do need to be cognizant of that. And that's another example of where, as Nancy Taylor mentioned earlier, the wind is not as efficient here. Certainly, if we have a good application and a good place to do it, we should encourage people to use it, but we shouldn't just relax the standards and lose sight that we are trying to protect our wildlife. One other thing. We did have written comments but I would like to reiterate one point there because I have not heard anybody else say it is that one of the ways that we can use less is by avoidance. And that is something that we should always examine I think is whether we really do need...do we need a building or do we need a building to be as big. That should be the first policy in anything when you look at the...the mantra is always reduce, reuse, recycle. So, in this case, it would be reduce, do we need a building in the first place, is there a building existing that would work, or can we make the building smaller, to make the footprint small. That would be a good thing. One last thing then on the administration chapter, as Tony Wall pointed out in his comments, this is a community plan and we feel pretty strongly the community should be allowed to make proposed changes, not just to the administration chapter, but to the other parts. We don't see any reason why the community shouldn't be allowed to at least propose those and then go through the regular process. So, thank you and keep up the good work. It is appreciated, and you don't always hear that.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Tonight I'd just like to emphasize one topic as it relates to the administration chapter, which is the future land-use plan. For our other points on this chapter, we would just refer you to our written comments. In reviewing the admin chapter, we believe it's very clear how critical of a role the future land-use plan is expected to play in the Comprehensive Plan as a whole. As we voiced last week, we believe it's very important, prior to completion of your review, to provide additional comments and guidance on the ultimate role of the future land-use plan. You know, based on the previous vote, a statement that the FLUP maps are off the table for now, we believe you need to move beyond that. It's really necessary to get the public and the elected officials a clearer idea of what to expect moving forward. Essentially, the Alliance wants to see the themes and policies section and the future land-use plan combined as originally intended and outlined in April 2009 draft to create a new Comp Plan. We believe that the themes and policies portion that you've reviewed to date cannot stand on its own as this replacement of the '94 Plan. So we just ask, you know, please include this in your discussion on the admin chapter this evening. This could entail just at a minimum just discussing a very basic question: Do you envision that the 1994 Plan will only be replaced upon adoption of both the themes and policies and the future land-use plan at a future date whenever you review that? Or are you to even envision that this part of the Plan that you're moving forward could actually suffice as a substitute or a replacement of the '94 Plan? Again, we would really appreciate this and it's really to ensure that everyone involved has a clear understanding and is on the same page as we move forward. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'd like to get real quickly on administration. It follows very closely to what Gail was saying. We have a major problem. It almost reaches crisis proportion in this County at times and also it involves the coefficient between enforcement, enforceability and the writing of our documents. We have written documents so poorly in the past, Master Plans, LDRs, you name it, that they're virtually unenforceable. It's a major problem. We're going to have to send forth a very strong recommendation. Most of the acrimony ...I don't think I'm engaging in hyperbole if I say most of the acrimony contentionness in this County is based on the nebulous language, selective interpretation, etc. We've got to do something about it. As far as the inconsistencies go, members of Staff have been quoted in the paper this past week or the week previous, whenever, they keep talking about the inconsistencies, etc. I'm not going to hammer on Staff or anything, but the idea—actually, I brought it forward way back in the day—that we should balance the statements of ideal with statements of intent. It would give us a way out of some of these contextual conundrums and these opportunities for selective enforcements, etc. Most of the major documents through our world history had a preamble, bill of rights, etc., that condenses the intent of the community at the time. With all due respect, the same Planning Commission, the same Staff, the same electives and the same members of the public won't be involved in a lot of these decisions down the road. It won't be any context of the way the document is written now. And again I explained last week for those of you who weren't here that I don't put any blame whatsoever on you for that. It takes a Village so to speak. Also another suggestion would be somewhere just subsequent to the administration chapter I imagine, there should be some acknowledgement that we would have benefited greatly if the crafters of the 1994 Plan would have had the foresight to say, look, we're tired, we're worn out, 15 years from now those individuals—us now—would have benefited from a list of what worked, what didn't, this would have helped, this wouldn't. We almost owe it to future generations to provide almost a primer forewarning to future generations on precisely how not to run a Comp Plan process. And I don't say that with sarcasm or a feeble attempt at humor. We owe it to ourselves and to future generations, because a vision is possible to prevent some of this contentionness, some of this acrimony, etc. So, that's something to consider while it's fresh on our mind. Fifteen/twenty years from now, the same—again, as I've just stated—the same people won't be involved in the next process. So, we as a species don't often think of the next generation, and it's an opportunity to do so. Theme eight, I actually commend Staff for as little input that you got in the public, in open forum, and from the Planning Commissioners, this is really good, it's really good, has really good writing. I have a...maybe it's semantics, but sustainability, even the word, I really don't think anything we do...our lifespans aren't sustainable, our life style is not sustainable, our resource extraction rates aren't sustainable, our population rate of growth isn't sustainable. So, even though it may be semantics, I would suggest we go back to the document where it says sustainability, change it to more sustainable, so it's aspirational instead of...we're never going to attain sustainability. We can always strive for more sustainable. Again, maybe it's semantics to some. Theme eight, the follow-through is going to be the most important. If we wanted to follow through with whatever we suggest and whatever we aspire to, we're going to have to follow through with it. You know, I could give a million examples, but if we look very closely here right now, brown, in the hills above us, brown is the new green. It's going to have enormous implications for fires, species loss, basic weeds, landslides, erosion, etc., etc. This is a good place to incorporate some of the skills and acumen of the Environmental Board, the Environmental Commission—they're calling it a Board now. The last thing I'd like to say, it's on the heels of what I said last week and I meant every word about how much respect I have for an unpaid body of volunteers to go through this much angst where no matter what you do, it's wrong, you know. Whatever decision you make, somebody's in your grille about it. But I really think there's a small chance—and luckily it's only a small chance—that some may try to devalue your effort by throwing this back to you. I think maybe it's a 15 or 20 percent chance the electives in an election year may say go back and work on it. I would urge you to say, look, we've got individuals who are getting paid to make these decisions and the public has a right to vote into or out of office individuals based on what they do and how they vote, not what they say. So, don't let anyone devalue your efforts; I'd greatly appreciate it. Thank you.
6/17/2010	Thomas, Shirley Interested Public	Hello. My name is Shirley Thomas and I live in Teton County, Melody Ranch. And I just had an idea as I read over the sustainability energy conservation theme. One of the things that came to mind is that maybe we can incentivize people in decreasing the amount of their trash by basing the rate on weight. And I don't know if this is even feasible. You know, I have a bag of trash this big every night, a little tiny bag, because I compost and I do all kinds of things to reduce my weight. So, if everyone knew what I know and could do that, maybe an incentive, as far as what our waste removal would be, our garbage prices, even if it's based on possibly containers, size of containers, or whatever, or a weight on a truck when they lift the bins. I don't know whether that's even feasible, but it's just something to think about to reduce our waste in general. That's it. Thank you.
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	8.5.b: last sentence, amend to read: ...the County, and "designate appropriate locations for a potential landfill site within Teton County."

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	Taylor, Nancy Conservation Alliance	Good evening. My name is Nancy Taylor and I have two different hats I'm wearing tonight, so hopefully you'll bear with me through two different testimonies. The first one is that I'm on the board of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, so I'll be making the comments for the Alliance tonight, and then I'll tell you what hat I'm wearing for the second one. So, thank you, on behalf of the Alliance, for letting us comment on this energy conservation chapter. And please refer to the Alliance's written comments for further explanation of these few bullet points that I'm going to make tonight. It's really important to have this chapter on sustainability and energy conservation. But part of the original intent of the Plan was to leave sustainability throughout each theme, and that seems to have maybe fallen into the background somewhat. So we ask you to bring it up to the forefront to be sure that the whole content that's outlined in theme eight is also woven through each of the chapters, so it becomes an overarching, oh, guidance, I would say, for the Plan. The Alliance has always focused on kind of the big picture of this Valley and researching sustainable energy practices. And we've consistently worked for reasonable amounts of locations of development to meet the community needs. But always the kind of overarching theme of the Alliance has been resource protection, which in the end is a very sustainable form of land-use planning. A couple of points to make. Conservation of energy is fiscally responsible, but as the economy kind of limps to a recovery, if that's what we can call it—I'm not even sure it is limping at this point—sustainability often gets pushed to the back burner and is not given such a high priority, probably because sustainability is so hard to define, that kind of by default it takes the background. So I urge you to keep it in the forefront, even if the economy is limping through Jackson Hole. So education is key, education of the public, and related industries will be a critical component of the success of the goals of this theme. It needs more emphasis. So we'd like to emphasize education as a key part of this theme. There's a couple of different definitions. The original one in the vision statement was from the ?? Commission and that was changed by...I'm not sure if even the ?? group that changed that is still here, but it was right at the beginning. So, and now there's kind of a different definition. So if you could reconcile the definitions of sustainability, that would be really helpful I think for the public, and the Alliance urges you to do that. The theme gave mention of the commitment to keep up with technological advances, both as technology rapidly changes in the green-building industry, what is a best practice for green building today changes by next year, probably governed by the industry and the new materials that are coming out. And also the technological changes that take place in terms of renewable energy. So we just urge you to somehow incorporate in this theme to stay current with the technological advances in energy conservation as building practices. Originally, the original intent of the Energy Efficiency Advisory Board was to have subcommittees. Some of those committees I believe are still functioning. Many of them are defunct. But all of them had a tremendous amount of input to get us to where we are now. And so if it would be of help, I'd suggest reconvening the committees, or at least working with the energy sustainability project so that the work of the EEAB isn't...you don't have to reinvent the wheel and that work is incorporated. When discussing disposal of waste, please take into consideration more innovative reduction strategies, noise reduction strategies. I know that now the Recycling Center is a joint power board of the County and yet they're somewhat inhibited by the market and what the market will bear in terms of recycling practices. So maybe theme eight can address that or help them move it further down the road. This theme should outline energy resources that we have here and explore whether it's really viable to...well, it would be important to prioritize the resources that are available. It isn't mentioned anywhere in theme eight that ?? solar is a really good resource. So, if you're considering retrofitting, orienting even acute windows in a retrofit can make a difference in terms of a very low-cost way of generating heat in a home. So ?? solar isn't really mentioned as a strategy, and in my personal comments mentioned that land was a valuable resource immediately at this time. So, to just kind of reiterate the first point. The Alliance feels it's really important to weave sustainability throughout all of the chapters, all of the themes. And I hope it can become an integral part of the whole overarching part of the Plan. So those are the comments from the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	Taylor, Nancy Interested Public	And the other hat that I'm wearing is that I'm an author and I wrote a book called Go Green – How to Build an Earth Friendly Community. It was published in 2008 but much of what's in it is still relevant. So just in my role as an author and member of the community, I wanted to say, however we think about sustainability, we must consider what we are sustaining. This is a fragile...this ecosystem here, is a fragile part of our Plan. We have a short growing season, we have a migration route for a fragile population of animals, and a community filled with both human and financial resources. What we choose to sustain will be determined by this Comprehensive Plan, the Regulations that accompany it, and the elected officials and Planning Staff that implement it. The way we live now in Jackson and Teton County is unsustainable. I think all of you know that. I would suggest that we use our creative resources in this room and engage those who are not here to find a way to truly live in harmony with the wildlife and natural resources that are here. Instead of focusing on becoming an example to the rest of the world, which is a noble vision, why don't we first help each other live in a way that truly has minimum impact on the planet and each other. We can do this through education, through example, through demonstration projects that teach our residents how to save energy and money at the same time. And through offering residents financial incentives to change their behavior. If our community values and embraces the idea of creating green jobs by retrofitting our homes and businesses, the benefit will go far beyond creating energy-efficient structures. We will be building a community of diverse individuals who not only feel the power of place, as the Chamber of Commerce motto states, but we will create an empowered community that understands how to live in harmony with this place. Thank you.
6/17/2010	Shuptrine, Sandy Energy Efficiency Advis	My name is Sandy Shuptrine and I am a member of the Energy Efficiency Advisory Board, which did submit some comments related to the energy conservation chapter to you. We are not seen in any of those comments are yet reflected in the drafts that are available. But I probably heard last week that comments that were submitted by the deadline were incorporated. So, partly I have a question I guess about what's going to become of those comments that were submitted? I don't know. Okay. And having said that, we would appreciate your consideration of comments that were made. My particular interest is, as it relates to principle 8.3, transportation, I would like to say that I think that this is very minimalistic in terms of your own study that certainly transportation is one of the major contributors to ?? in the Valley, 80 percent basically. And I would ask you to please fill this out utilizing some of the comments that we have submitted to you and with recognition of alternative fuels and vehicles as well as other strategies that help to minimize transportation. And the other thing that I would like to just point out to you is that I know that you were looking for inconsistencies and you probably found this one already. But this chapter is inconsistent I think with some of the other areas, in particular as it relates to development patterns. And it's important from a transportation aspect to try to keep development as consolidated as possible, which is mentioned in here, but I'm not sure that it's consistent throughout the Plan. So that's just one of the things I'd like to point out. Thank you very much.
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this Theme Addressed": restate the definition of sustainability from the Vision chapter in a call out box
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Indicator 3: change to "LEED or comparable"
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 8.1 language: change "alternative" to "renewable"
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this Theme Addressed": Reverse the language of the first sentence to positively call out the centrality of climate sustainability and energy conservation
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Call out education in "Why is this Theme Addressed"
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Change title of theme to "Climate Sustainability and Energy Conservation"

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Include all recommendations of the Jackson Hole Energy Sustainability Project in locations to be determined by staff
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this theme addressed": add language that recognizes that any and all added development and increased visitation can add to our impacts if mitigation is not increased as well
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this theme addressed": add language that recognizes that any and all added development and increased visitation will add to our impacts
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this Theme Addressed": add: because climate change impacts: wildlife and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, opportunities for recreation, and quality of life and local economy
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add a commitment to include alternative energy generation in all public projects in a location staff believes is appropriate
6/17/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	8.5.b: add language that waste disposal pricing will reflect the true cost of waste disposal
6/11/2010	Hoffman, Nancy Interested Public	I'm Nancy Hoffman. I'm a resident of Teton County since 1978. I'm speaking for myself. I look at this community, and having lived here as long as I have, I've seen many changes and I wonder now whether the Plan of '94 was really...it had wonderful goals and I'm wondering how much they were met. In doing a revision of a Plan or even rewriting it, I feel that we needed to analyze what didn't work in this old Plan and try to make it different. Make it better. And the most important thing I feel we should concentrate on is enhancing our quality of life. We have such a unique community. We go around the country and we look at the different environments and we look at how we have...we have such a special place. And our whole goal should be to keep that as special as it possibly can. We don't want to turn around and become a town like anyplace else. We've talked about that before also. We get away with Wal-Mart. That's one example of how we can make a difference. We can take the ball and run with it.. The policies of this particular Plan do not meet even the criteria that we had in '94. And, as has been spoken to recently loud and clear by so many of you in the community, that I think that we cannot deny that this is still our goal, the preservation of not only our lifestyle but our national environment. To preserve it on. The Plan, presently, two examples of where it doesn't meet the goals is the up zoning and new commercial where we have plenty that hasn't been developed at this point. And then the incentives that are built in for growth. This is almost an anything-goes plan, and I would hope that you would all reconsider it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Woods, Becky Interested Public	My name is Becky Woods. I hope you bear with me if I ramble a little bit because I didn't have time to really prepare any remarks. I was so surprised at Wednesday's Daily saying nodes were going to be revisited, and come Thursday night, and I went, ohmygod, okay, I'll be here. I hope you stick with your original vote. That original vote came after several years and much consideration. The Planning Staff, the PowerPoint slide shows, and newspaper articles, had neighborhood meetings and laid it all out to our community. Based on the accurate information they gave, the community carefully considered it and said this is not what we want. Why did they reach that conclusion? Well, there was a variety of reasons, but I think the main one was additive growth. To have a node, you have to concentrate growth in one area. That land is owned by X number of landowners and under the existing plan are only allowed so many units. To concentrate that growth, they get more units, or more growth. To not have additive growth, you have to transfer development rights from somewhere else. Yet, the Plan had no accurate or reliable means of transferring growth from other areas. So, what you opened yourself up to is sweetheart deals, where developers come in and talk to people who have land on a hillside that will probably never really be developed, a farmer in Town or ?? and say, look, we'll buy your development rights if you let us put more units on our property. It propels growth. The community understood that and said, this is not what we want. We are already under existing base development rights that would double our population. Growth impacts every other aspect of the Comprehensive Plan. It impacts our open space. It impacts our scenic vistas, our wildlife and, yes, our transportation plan. Rather than going backwards, because you're struggling with making the transportation plan work, I suggest you look at the current proposal of no nodes and figure out how to make a transportation plan work for what that is. Concentrate on the current areas where we have the greatest population, make the system efficient, and as the Valley progresses, then readdress that component. To do otherwise seems to be putting the cart before the horse. Please realize also that as Peg stated, if you're trying to reconcile various areas of the Plan, and try to do that by revisiting nodes, you're opening a Pandora's box. What will nodes affect have on one of the top identifying primary needs, which is wildlife. How will it affect potential conservation easements? You may think you're reconciling in one area only to reopen problems in others. Finally, I appreciate all your work. I appreciate all your time. It's been amazing. But I think you will shoot yourselves in the foot and ?? if you change courses midstream and don't honor what the public has explicitly expressed as their desires after many, many meetings and much, much comment. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Yes, Kathy Hopkins, Cottonwood Park. First of all, my husband came home with the newspaper, threw it down on the floor and ran in the other room—a new life for nodes. He really liked that title and totally agreed with what the Conservation Alliance is saying, and I don't want to revisit anything that has been already voted on. It just hurts the process. It humiliates everybody that's been spending so many months coming here and really, really putting in some good work. And the other thing I would like to say is Ben Reid's comments on chapter eight. I loved the one paragraph. There is a direct and conspicuous correlation between prosperity on the one hand and both carbon emissions and climate change on the other hand. And there are, of course, no differences at all between carbon emissions produced by a coal plant in China and those generated by the construction of large luxurious homes here that are far from services. It follows that we are challenged precisely because, as our community, we are so wealthy to recognize and manage our disproportionately very high contributions on ?? carbon emissions and of course global warming. And that leads me to the comments on the review about ARUs, Auxiliary Residential Units, and the opinion page last week about ?? consequences. You know, I read things like that, and I know they mean well, but I hate to be reminded of the hand that feeds us, you know. It's getting very old and it's very shortsighted. There are two editorials I really do like written by Kristen Rivers and Butch Kirschner about using local labor for local jobs. It's so important to hire locally so we don't get in, you know, when we do have a recession, we do have jobs for people here. And I'm embarrassed to say that, you know, with that Rocky Mountain Bank going up and how big it is and yet they have laborers from Utah building it, as Kristen states in her opinion, in her letter. I'm embarrassed that that's my bank. I was happy to go to that little building there and get my mortgage. They were very helpful. I don't see how they can be more helpful in a little building...or even more helpful in a big building. I was totally happy with that little square footage thing they had, almost a little bit bigger than my house. And I wasn't going to submit another comment, except I wanted to...I did write an editorial that I did not submit, like Sue did with her response, so I'd like to submit it today, answering all the comments about the ARUs from a lot of real estate agents and architects and everything. And I know everybody needs jobs, architects need jobs, and real estate agents need places to sell to keep their companies going. But, again, it's shortsighted solutions that have long-term problems attached to them. So, I'll just read this letter that I wrote. It took me a long time to write this, so I didn't rewrite it for the meeting. It says, I'm writing in response to the guest shop last week, as guesthouses have unintended consequences. They often make some valid points about the proposed elimination of Auxiliary Residential Units and making it right so it is fair to year-round Valley residents who want to provide for their families and live on their land when they get old and somebody can take care of them. You know, I think that should be a discussion, but I don't think it should be a reason to go back to that vote. Unfortunately, the proposed elimination was probably needed to focus on a real and meaningful dialog to create and enforce real solutions for potential growth problems of ARUs. We need this conversation. We also need to create a sustainable economy to prevent boom/bust cycles that hurt our local service employers and employees. It is true that jobs are created by second homeowners. But what was not mentioned is what happens to the service people like carpenters, electricians, housekeepers and gardeners when the second homeowner industry goes into a bust cycle. And these same people see their jobs disappear that pay for mortgage, for rent and put food on the table for their families. I support the need like bumper stickers that the author resents. It is not an admonishment of second homeowners but more of a push for changing the way we all think about living in our natural environment. We need to choose human needs before human wants. And I know I say this a lot but I'm just going to keep repeating it—human needs before human wants. Let's take care of human needs first with a healthy environment at the top of the list. I believe the environment is the hand that feeds us all, including second homeowners. Then we have to see if our wants are sustainable and leave them behind if they're not. The United States leads all other nations when it comes to excesses in the building size of residential homes and what goes into them. The housing industry is the biggest user of oil. Unfortunately, we took a wrong turn and went down the road of everything bigger is better, and that journey led to our addiction to oil and ultimately to the tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico. Look at all the fishermen, oyster men, store owners, resort owners, restaurant owners, their employees and families who rely on the Gulf for their livelihood. Now they're relying on BP. That could be here, you know, I mean, in different circumstances. People in need, the museums and the arts are already recipients of second homeowners' charity and we benefit greatly from them. More importantly, however, we need to help Jackson Hole small business owners, their employees and their families in a permanent way. I agree with the author about needing a solid enforceable limited growth management plan, but that also includes a sustainable economy that is not constantly subjected to the high price of housing in a boom cycle and the harsh reality of a bust cycle. Therefore, we cannot rely on the second homeowner in these recurring recessions. They may have to cutback on services here to maintain their lifestyle and their primary home. The socioeconomic environmental damage, the downside of trickle-down economics, ?? is not good for Jackson Hole. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Sobey, Pegi Conservation Alliance	Good evening, I'm Pegi Sobey. I'm Chair of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Again, thank you all for the work you have put into this process. Tonight I'd ask that you refer to our written comments that we submitted on May 28th where we provided detailed comments and concerns on clarifying the future land-use plan and the review process, the administration and energy conservation chapters, as well as on potential key inconsistencies in the latest draft. However, after reviewing the latest Staff Report, which included comments by the Planning Commissioners, we have additional comments and concerns regarding how you will go about the rest of your review on the themes and policies section. We fully support your goal to forward a draft document with as few inconsistencies as possible; however, we are also confident that you will stick to the rules you agreed upon at your last hearing. When you agreed upon this procedure, the public comment adhered to that procedure. We trust that you as Commissioners will continue to do the same. This is very important in terms of maintaining overall public confidence in this process. The public understands that the intent of the no-revote rule was to ensure that you would not rehash topics that have already been discussed which could lead to a circular endless discussion at the Planning Commission level. Once you go down the road of rehashing topic after topic, you could then end up with yet another fundamentally different fourth draft, which the public will be called on again to review, all before anything even goes to elected officials. This will discourage public involvement, particularly as we enter the fourth year of this process. We trust that the entire process to date, which includes years of participation on the part of the public, including those of previous Planning Commissioners, you will be respected...I'm sorry, yeah, you will be respected at the Planning Commission level. Looking ahead, elected officials must work to vet and to review, clarify key issues of the Plan, particularly those that have been difficult to reconcile across jurisdictions during your review. To make a point on the process, any member of the public, including the Conservation Alliance, could provide numerous examples of inconsistencies that could lead to revotes. But we believe revisiting all the concerns on the part of all citizens involved was not the intent of this next phase of the ???. Here are a couple of examples. It's inconsistent to place wildlife as the Valley's top priority in any kind of meaningful way and still be planning to, at a minimum, approximately double what's on the ground today without recognition of the likely irreversible impacts on that wildlife. It's inconsistent to sign off on a growth management chapter as the second highest priority without any mention of the importance of the rate of growth. It's inconsistent to claim that this new draft has established a strong monetary program that will offer increased accountability and predictability when the baseline figures for indicators haven't even been identified yet. How will we know how we're doing in the future if we never even had a starting point? This is across the board in all chapters. It's inconsistent to have the housing goals in the Plan without more meaningful consideration of significantly reducing commercial development potential. Isn't it better to take proactive steps to reduce the demand for more residential housing, rather than always resorting to building more and more houses? It's inconsistent to say that we will have a more predictable Plan than the one we have now, our 1994 Plan, given that the draft today, particularly without the accompanying final land-use plan section, has far less detail and context to use in drafting the Land Development Regulations. Again, we expect, because you have already had hearings, discussions and taken votes on many of these topics, that elected officials should now address these topics. This leads me to the last point. Regarding the reference to a final vote in the Staff Report, we think it is absolutely critical to provide additional clarification. Are you assuming that just the themes and policies section of the Plan, the part you have reviewed so far, could stand alone as a replacement of our existing Comp Plan? And that you would take an official vote now? Where do the final land-use plan figures in? It's clear when you read the draft that many of the major decisions are still ahead in the final land-use plan review. The Conservation Alliance strongly believes that part of the Plan you are currently reviewing cannot be a substitute for the existing Plan. Without the final land-use plan, this section should not stand alone. So, again, please provide directions to Staff on your expectations of how the final land-use plan will be reviewed with respect to final voting and adoption of the overall Plan. This is a very important ??. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Blann, Jerry Interested Public	Thank you, and good afternoon. I think it's appropriate...I haven't been here for quite some time. I think it was March the last visit I remember, but I just wanted to share and acknowledge these boards for the amount of time and effort that's gone into this effort. It's been a brutal one and it's certainly taken its toll. And I just want to say that from the public's perspective, it's appreciated. I know it's not been easy and I just wanted to acknowledge that. The second thing is I want to applaud at least the willingness from what you read in the paper to address some of the tough issues that are still out there, and one of those is certainly nodes. In particular, I don't think, at least I don't believe anybody is arguing that Teton Village is in fact a node. When we last visited back in March, we discussed the cap on commercial and Teton Village. And I thought at one point we had an agreement that that would be addressed, and obviously it didn't make it into the rewrite, and I'd just like to make a comment to support maybe taking a look at that again. If you recall, the discussion back then was such that, to give a little bit of history relative to the expansion of the SRA and the long period of time it took for the Village and the SRA to get together on that Plan. In fact, 60 or 70,000 square feet of commercial was taken out of that. In fact, that's what is knitting or is going to knit the two port holes together. In fact, what we have now is an addition on the commercial core that's not viable. And so what we end up with is a golf course along with affordable housing and nothing really hanging together. The other elements that are critical to that are some of the Village infrastructure, which I believe makes us...gives us the inability to really deal with some of the supportive and particularly competitive issues that we have in our business today. One of them is the transit center and without that commercial core, we don't have a transit center. It's not viable; it doesn't work. And so just by simply instructing the County...the County Commissioners took that out of the Plan, it doesn't work. It's not going away and I would hope that you would see that perhaps if you're going to address the tough issues, to take a look at that one again. I appreciate your efforts, again, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.
6/10/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Final Review Process: Review 8 and Admin Compile composite list of individual commissioner indentified inconsistencies and points for elected official discussion Prepare individual opinions to explain final vote (optional) Certify
6/10/2010	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	?: Hi. My name is Sherri ?? and I don't have anything prepared. I was really disappointed when I read the paper this morning. I thought, here we go again and kind of flashed SRA in my mind—we're going to vote again until we get it the way somebody wants it. I think the people have given a really clear indication for three years at all these meetings and neighborhood meetings I've been to, all the times I've come here at night through the winter and spoken or listened to other people. And it was really clear what people wanted and what the priorities were. And by revisiting this, it's almost insulting that we didn't get it and we need to have it talked about again and again. Or you guys didn't get it. I'm not sure. I actually heard someone, one of the members, mention during the winter sometime that, I didn't know I voted for that four or five weeks ago, I didn't know that. I'm like where were you, you know. I'm not sure where you're coming from. I'm not sure about the preparation you gave people an opportunity to come here and talk. This was really short notice. There's a lot of people out there that would like to speak again and tell you exactly what we thought you said, you know. I think nodes has been addressed. I think residential housing and guesthouses have been addressed. I'm not sure why we need to go again. We need to stick with our principle concept, you know, what's really important, and the rest, we can work out. We don't need to start from the bottom and go up. We need to stop with what's really important and then people adjust, you know. Maybe there's not a right and a wrong road. Maybe there's two right roads, but we have to decide which one we're going to take. And I thought we kind of started on that way. So I want you to kind of think about it and let's not talk about this again. Let's get it moving on. Thank you

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. We submitted written comments and won't belabor those. Hopefully, you've all read them and have had a chance to think about them. I guess the decision has been made to reopen debate on nodes and ARUs under the guise of resolving conflicts, so I'll play that game and argue the points on why they are not in conflict of some of the other policies. As far as axing nodes, the argument goes there's a conflict because we...convenience locally will cut down on the number of trips. There's a whole bunch of examples of that, but I boil it down to simple audio-visual aide here. And convenience, for those who can't read this in the back, it says, convenience equals increased dollars. And that's a fact of life. We've seen it in the Village where we put convenience commercial in, and you can put it in but you can't make people go there. And we see it when people go to Idaho Falls. Why do people go to Idaho Falls? Why do they choose not to buy from their neighbors? They choose because it's an economic decision. So, under this guise that we're going to put nodes in in convenience local and it's going to cut down on the trips, I think the reality is you don't have any guarantee that that's going to happen. So, I think that's not in conflict with the transportation plan, not having nodes and not having that convenience local. As far as reducing trips, it's not about putting the convenience local, the convenience shopping in, it's about a change in attitude. My parents live 30 miles from the nearest store. They have a different lifestyle. They don't run to the store, and they shop once a week and that's the way they do it. And so that's the way we're going to truly reduce the number of trips is to convince people to change their lifestyle. It's not going to be for convenience local in a node. Also, it's an insult to the small businesses that we have here when we have this idea that convenience local is going to stop people from going, because what that's...going someplace else. Because what that says is one place is the same as another. And I think most small business owners would be insulted to hear you say that my place that offers a beer is the same as the other place that offers a beer, my burger is as good as the other guy's burger, or my pizza is as good as the other guy's pizza. That flies in the face of what they're trying to convince us anyway. So, that's a problem with this idea that nodes are in conflict with our transportation plan and also with fostering small businesses. Also, we know we don't have the jobs in nodes, so those people that are living in the nodes are going to have to still travel. We know that they don't have the critical density in the nodes for START, unless you really seriously change the character like a tremendous increase in the density, much more than what you propose. We saw it with Rafter J, which is more...as density, we still can't transfer service as mass transportation, because START says there's just not enough people there. So, this idea that these other nodes are going to have mass transit and are going to reduce our transportation, it's a wonderful idea, but the practical side is it's not going to happen. And if any of you had the privilege of sitting in the JIM meeting the other day, you would have heard a lecture on the airport study where they looked at whether it made sense to run START out to the airport to get people there, or some type of mass transit. The conclusion that came there was, despite the density in Town, it's still not economically feasible to deliver people to the airport. So, you know, I think that there's not a conflict between the transportation plan and this idea of the nodes. I think the nodes are not going to address our idea for transportation. As far as the ARUs, I certainly would acknowledge they do provide jobs. They provide jobs for workers who have to drive because they have no option for mass transit. They all have to drive to work—the exact opposite of what the transportation plan asked for. Even if it does provide workforce housing, once again, it puts people in the wrong place. It puts them in a place where they're going to have to drive to work, rather than live in someplace where they might have the option to use mass transit, or maybe even be able to walk to work. The biggest thing, and this was partly for those of you who weren't here for the...and my apologies to those who were for this debate...over what should happen to these, or whether our area should continue this, you have no control once they're built. Are they going to go short-term rental, even though it's illegal? Are they going to go long-term rental, which in some cases is legal? Will they be sold off at some point in the future? Because that's actually the debate that's going on in Town right now is that, well, maybe we should be able to sell them off. And you have no control of that once you allow them to be built. So that is the question I guess, the real key issue on this, is how good is your vision for the future? What is going to happen to these units 20 years from now? Will there be a desire to sell them off? If it does, that represents, if you sell those units off, it represents a significant increase in dwelling units in an area that we all agree is inappropriate for that amount of density. I guess the last thing that I would ask you is, as you make this decision, I think I would remind you that you are asked to represent the community and not your individual employers, and hopefully you'll use that filter as you make your decisions. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen, representing myself. I really appreciate all the work, all the hours, and I painfully sat through a lot of that, as you did, through the last year. And, you know, we're not all going to get what we want. We all need to make compromises. And everything was debated, votes were taken, comments were made based on those votes, or potential votes, and I don't feel it's appropriate to reopen the discussions again. I think there is a lot of reconciliation in a few places, but I also question that, because who's going to reconcile the votes...or the inconsistencies really? If you look at all the...the small inconsistencies I think you might be able to deal with, but some of the larger ones, I think they need to go to the electives. Let them choose what to really reconcile with the big questions. You know, we could start all over again. I just don't think that that's what anybody really wants to do. We need to move this forward. I'm extremely embarrassed to call myself a realtor with all the comments that have come out in the paper in the last week. I'm embarrassed because very few of those people attended any of these meetings. They don't understand how that came to be. And I'm very embarrassed for my industry that that's what's come out in the last couple of weeks. I understand why that vote was taken, what the basis for it was, and I think we all need to understand that and send it forward and let the electives decide on what to do to limit ARUs, or put them back in. I don't think we should reopen that, revisit that. I think it's terribly inappropriate. A lot of my comments and a lot of the people that have spent a lot of time listening and commenting, I mean, my comments would totally change if you want to reopen that and a lot of the Plan, just not issue, but it affects other issues in the County, too. I just don't find that appropriate. I'm not going to go into my other comments; everybody's read those. But thanks for your hard work, all the thousands of hours put in, and I hope we can move this forward and move it forward in a timely fashion. Thank you.
6/10/2010	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Dave Coon, Teton County at large. First off, thanks, you guys, you all have done a great job. New faces after my hiatus, I just had other things to do, and it's good to be back, and I'm glad it's moving along. I hope we don't revisit too many things. I'm sure there will be a couple of things that are revisited it sounds like it. We'll see where that goes. If there is revisiting done, I just wanted to make a few comments on ARUs. ARUs are additive growth, period. I'm on the Water Board for 22 years. I'm on the Wilson School Board. I'm aware that these things have affects, and it's not just those things, but it's roads, hospitals, schools, ??, grocery stores, ?? ski area. I mean, it is growth. And if you do revisit ARUs, just make sure you have a handle on how much growth they really are. I know that right now, because of some of these boards I'm on, we have trouble ourselves monitoring their use, their impacts. And if they are going to be put back in, we need to know those things to add to the quote build-out, ???. But you just need to pay attention to these things. And I'm not saying do them, don't do them. Just include them in the bigger picture because they really are an impact. Quickly, one other thing. I think it's theme eight, you know, energy and conservation. It's a great way to go. I'd like to see things, you know, improve in that area a lot. And I initiated some thoughts with the County and the Town building departments to even just go basic and look at some of our building codes we use and improve on the basic codes. Besides going greener, you can up some codes up to a higher standard for our local climate stuff. And they're looking at those, and that's a good thing. So, I think we can even start more basic on some of those areas and move up from there and improve those things. So, that's...I didn't come prepared but ??. Thanks.
6/10/2010	Paolucci-Rice, Francesc Interested Public	: Francesca Paolucci-Rice. I'm here to address the issue of ARUs. I sent a letter to all of you and I think that it expresses my opinion that I'm strongly opposed to removing that development option for any number of reasons, and I won't rehash those. And I think there are a large number of folks in the community who really did not understand that that was being considered until very recently in this process. And I think whether you reconsider it at your level, or it becomes an issue of intense discussion at the board level, it is going to be an issue where it will be discussed—whether that type of development option remains to allow for rental, or returns to what its original condition was in the 1994 Plan as being guesthouses. That is something that I do think warrants a great deal of discussion, because it significantly impacts not just second homeowners but also a lot of middle-class homeowners who basically have relied on that ability to house their children, to house caregivers, as an option for private quarters for long-term guests, etc. And while right now we are not facing a significant issue with employee housing, as we did several years ago when the trans-modification for guesthouses to ARUs was made, I think sometime in the future we will find that a problem again, and it is a significant source for employee housing, which is important to the working community. I know many folks rely on that for use for nannies, for caregivers, for ailing members of the family, etc. So, I do think that that particular issue warrants a reconsideration. Again, whether it be at this level or at the board level. Thank you.
6/10/2010	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	My name is Sara Stevens and I have nothing prepared, because I heard about this this morning when a friend and neighbor called and told me about it. We get slammed with this on June 10th when 80 percent of the Town is at a middle-school graduation, the other 20 percent of Town maybe hasn't had time to read the paper yet, or they're working one of their two or three jobs? I mean, you've got to be kidding. That was my reaction. This is insane. I feel like it's unethical. There was no notice in the weekly newspaper that came out yesterday. At least there was no notice that I was aware of. It comes out in the paper on the same day as the meeting on June 10th? You've got to be kidding me. Anyhow, I really appreciate the previous speakers and the fact that they can speak so eloquently. And I'm ashamed I don't have anything prepared, but my coworker is covering for me right now while I came over here, and I'm amazed that this even happened. That's what I have to say. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Walkman, Nancy Interested Public	Hi, I'm Nancy Walkman. My comments are related tonight to the process and the public expectation of the Planning Commissions. Trust, accountability, transparency and consistency have always been my ideals for what the Planning Commissions are responsible to do. They are the research people for the County and the Town and they are to come up with their best suggestions. And you have done that. The challenge has been, because of the difference in values from Town and County and they've been obvious for years, is to bring those together and make a plan that relates to each other. The Town and County are very much interrelated as are the public lands around us. And if we don't have that, we really don't have a solid Plan. We are ???. You have also been challenged in the process and much work was done to get to that point you are today. Your work has been very valuable and we cannot discount that. But there are points of disagreement. And instead of moving on to another discussion for another rewrite, you have defined the differences that you have, and my suggestion and others probably, too, is to take that list and what you have done to date and present that to the Town and County for their reconciliation. Thank you.
6/10/2010	Wallace, Herb Interested Public	Herb Wallace, Wilson, representing myself. I read in the paper today that you are going to reconsider reconciling nodes with the rest of the Plan, or at least you're going to potentially do so. There's no reason to do this. The Planning Commissions' vote to eliminate the nodes was in line with the wishes of the people of Teton County. Public comment was overwhelmingly against the nodes and a huge unnecessary density that they bring with them. Building thousands of homes in the outlying County will only make our terrible traffic problems worse. Any additional housing than what is currently allowed will generate far more pressure on our highways when people commute to their workplace in Town, to go to the grocery store, to go to school, to go to church, to go to soccer practice. It goes on and on and on. Nodes will stress and kill more of our precious wildlife. Nodes would bring noise and light pollution. Nodes would also lead to the loss of quality of life and character in the communities where we live. Additional housing should be placed in Town where the majority of our population works and there is already four-lane highways and the infrastructure to support additional growth. I also read that one of the Planning Commissioners thinks that nodes would prevent our Valley from becoming 35-acre ranchettes. Simple economics prevents this type of development. According to the Teton County ??, only 40 pieces of property for 35 acres sold in Teton County in the past ten years and that was through the boom. That is an average of only four properties in a year, and this number includes tracts that are substantially larger than 35 acres. Large landowners will continue to put their lands under conservation easement and do not have to sacrifice the communities that were designated as nodes to do it. Nodes belong in anywhere suburbia and not in Jackson Hole, at least under the years of work on this process, hundreds of Planning Commission votes, and the vision of the people of this County. Leave the nodes out of the Plan where they belong. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I guess the purpose of this public comment is to help determine that you, as Planning Commissioners, capture the will of the community—its direction, its vision, etc. Having attended every minute of every one of these meetings, I actually believe that you did a superbly good job. Despite the differences, quite frankly, 18 of you stepped up to the plate when the community needed some service and a lot of us didn't. So, that's greater than thanks, that's respect. As far as the question, did Staff capture your vision and your direction, I think after some initial resistance, they did a very good job capturing what you relayed on a weekly basis. Quite frankly, they had to make order out of chaos in some of the meetings. Those of us who were here can chuckle about some of the meetings and how they went. That would have happened regardless of who was sitting on the board. Slightly not as favorable to Staff was the fact that you were hampered, or hamstrung in effect, with the April '09 draft. It bore so little resemblance to the well-documented will of the community that you had to spend 14 months and several hundred votes to try to bring it back up to snuff. And you did a superbly good job on that also. As far as the macro question, revision versus rewrite, I suppose it's still valid. You don't know what the electives are going to do. I was in the revision camp from the very beginning for the simple reason that we have a 16-year period of observation with the '94 Plan. We knew where the unintended consequences lay. We knew where the inconsistencies and gaps were. And it would have been slightly more efficient—and maybe greatly more efficient—to try to plug those holes instead of doing a complete and utter rewrite. But here we sit. So, I would just caution in the future that we remain very vigilant that we don't allow the inconsistencies between what the initial vision was to interfere with where we're at now. As far as the ARU question, I said at the time there wasn't a snowball's chance in the Sahara that the electives would leave the ARUs thrown completely out. I understand the context of that vote. However, other communities have addressed this by having subcategories of ARUs—family-occupied dwelling units, employee-occupied dwelling units, caretaker dwelling units, etc. And if you put size, square footage restrictions, and deed restrictions on these units, and this would give us some greater input into how we shape our future. Quite frankly, by just having the taboo or wipeout vote for ARUs, we've neglected...we've actually abdicated our right or our responsibility to discuss these contentious issues in detail. The same with the PRD. Probably, in my opinion, the biggest mistake we made with the PRD...going back to the ARUs for a minute, if we took the outstanding potential of the ARU and multiplied it times the historical utilization rate, we come up with a relatively low number, in the high hundreds. If we take the historic utilization rate of the PRD and multiply it times its outstanding potential, we're going with a very large number, somewhere around 4000 units. So, we probably should have taken...that was a five-zero-three-three vote where we suggested we hold a series of PRD forums. That one will come back to bite us in the butt. As far as the PRD goes, we need a greater discussion. I think Commissioner Mr. Reid suggested this qualitative aspect to the multiplier, at least a coefficient between the quantitative and the qualitative. If someone has a hundred acres, so to speak, hypothetically, in the Snake River migration corridor, and somebody has a hundred acres in a hayfield or a cow pasture, it's ridiculous to have the same multiplier. We need to have a qualitative aspect to our PRD moving forward or we're going to fall short on a lot of our theme-one goals especially. As far as the FLUPs go, the FLUP I should say, I said this before and I'll say it again, we really need to caution that we don't allow the FLUP to supercede the Comp Plan. The linear progression from utilizing the FLUP as a bridge between the Comp Plan and the LDRs, that in a linear train of thought means superior to the Comp Plan. It would create a dynamic with different electives, different appointees, etc., maybe even new Staff in the future, where the path of least resistance is to look at one district map with one map on one side and some writing on the other and have that supercede the intent of the community that we've put years and lots of time, effort, energy and money into, so we need to caution against that. Variances also weren't addressed. I think we should send a strong recommendation to the electives that variances not be used to supercede the FLUP or the Comp Plan in the future because, you know, if we don't remove the ability for the electives to use variances, we want to discourage judiciously and have them use in full view of the original intent of the community with the Comp Plan and the FLUP. Probably the second biggest failing we had in this process in my opinion, and I know Commissioner McCarthy was strong on this as well as some others, a viable transfer mechanism. We have a theme, theme three, Town as heart, where we don't have Town as heart. We have 74 percent of the employment in 1200 acres of Town, yet only 48 percent of the population, so we don't have Town as heart now. Moving into the future the disparity is going to increase, because the way the Plan is written right now, the potential dwelling units in the County dwarf that of Town and that's not even considering the PRD potential of approximately 4000 units. So, without a viable transfer mechanism and a real tough hard discussion, a lot of what we've done previously is going to fall flat. Everyone has spoken to, you know, stick to the rules, stick to what was presented to us as far as not going back on votes, reconsideration votes, etc. I'll ask the same question I asked previously—is your task to implement the well-documented will of the community, or is it to implement what you as an individual think you should implement? And if you believe the latter, as some of you obviously do, if you weren't misquoted, then where does that leave the public if that's the way things are going to go? I'll leave it there. Thanks...One more thing, again, I'm not going to give you thanks because that wouldn't cover what you've done—respect would cover it in my mind a lot better. You stepped up to the plate. We all had the same opportunity to do so, but we didn't and you did. It's a thankless task and regardless of any disagreements, kudos.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Washut, Harry Interested Public	Harry ??, Grand Teton Park ?? in Granite, Wyoming, 36 miles from Town. It's somewhat of a commercial node because there isn't nothing else out there. I don't think, in this whole planning process, the BC <<inaudible>> category. And if you look at a chart of all properties—there's 20 some properties in that thing—we're still about where we were back then, because the plan was never set up. There was always talk of some kind of way to work us into auto urban or auto commercial or something that fit in our areas, but we all have been stuck with BC and it's like they don't want it to...and back then they said they didn't want us to grow up and down the highway. Well, we couldn't anyway, but there's no other place to zone because we're stuck where we're at. There's no expansion ability. And so between Camp Creek, and a lot of property has changed hands or went out of business, so to speak, and by not being in a lodging overlay, you know, we lost a lot of opportunity to grow with the economy locally. And it's just ridiculous that and all these platitudes that everybody wanted to tell a neighbor how to live, private property rights has never seemed to be any part of this process. All I'm thinking is we should have a workshop, nodes or whatever you want to call it, and delve into the inequities of the BC landowners. You know, I know when Larry was Old West Cabins, he spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to get a plan through. Well, most of the property owners in this category don't have that kind of money to run what has been...I was chastised because I called it a gauntlet, but it quite frankly is. We don't have any clear-cut thing that we can do, there's so much ambiguity to it, that, you know, we can't hardly expand or do, you know, modernize our businesses with times, especially <<inaudible>> edge of Town. But it's almost like we're the forgotten ones and you're going to brush over us again. So, I think there should be a workshop concerning that where it's clear cut what we can do with our parcels that are very few, but they were more than mom and pop businesses in the Valley. Thank you.
5/28/2010	Mahood, Virginia Interested Public	I am opposed to eliminating guest houses under the current draft of the comprehensive plan. Specifically under policy 2.1.a, lines 6 and 7, where it states, "accessory residential units associated with residential uses will not be allowed." Guest houses are a vital element of our community. They provide affordable housing for employees and a means for a homeowner to subsidize their mortgage through rentals. The construction of guest homes also provides much needed work for the construction industry. What guest houses provide greatly outweigh their impact on the environment. If a homeowner needs a guest home and they are banned under the current plan, they will be forced to buy adjacent land to develop that site for their needs. Please do not exclude "accessory residential units" from the comp plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2010	Cameron, Phillip Interested Public	(Resources collected from communities are available for review from the planning departments) Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Proposed Theme Six Comments Submitted via email to Alex Norton and Tyler Sinclair Dear Commissioners and Staff, On behalf of the Yellowstone-Teton Clean Energy Coalition, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide comment the May 7 2010 version of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive plan. Below are general suggestions followed by specific comments on proposed Theme Six – Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy. Theme Six - “Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy” Transportation choices drastically affect a variety of critical elements of a community including public health, the environment, and local economies. Considering the large portion of energy and emissions attributed to transportation activities in this community, local policy and planning related to transportation play a crucial role in a community’s sustainability. Sustainable transportation policies that address municipal fleets, commuter options, and alternative transportation systems cannot focus on simply displacing traffic congestion, but must also consider measurable strategies to seek a reduction in the role that petroleum based fuels play in local transportation. This will play a critical role on the long-term sustainability and security of the transportation models adopted in this community. Statement of Ideal: • Consider, ‘alternative fuels’ in lieu of, “clean and renewable fuels.” This matches better with language in the next section of the document. • Add language to include the use of ‘advanced vehicle technologies’ in the description of the basis for the proposed transportation system. P.O. Box 11756, Jackson, WY 83002 phil@ytcleanenergy.org 307.413.1971 www.ytcleanenergy.org Why is this theme addressed? • Consider changing, “Reduce economic impacts of a changing world, where the cost of oil will continue to rise.” to ‘ Increase long-term economic security by decreasing the role of (foreign) petroleum on local transportation systems.” Principles and Policies Policy 6.2a • Define, ‘active modes of transportation.’ Policy 6.2.d • Is ‘Level of Service D’ a high enough level of service to receive WYDOT Funds? This seems to be at odds with the later mentioned Policy 6.3.d describing increased cooperation with WYDOT. Policy 6.3.b • Consider including language about communicating with, or engaging, existing, transportation focused organizations in developing transportation network decisions. Organizations such as ours have direct connections for funding sources that could support projects in this area. Policy 6.3.d • The use of alternative fuels, advanced vehicle technologies, and other strategies to reduce petroleum consumption play a role in diminishing the collective effects of transportation on natural resources through improved local air quality. Harmful exhaust emissions including sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, benzene and the secondary production of ground level ozone all result from vehicle emissions. Albeit less tangible,

May 28, 2010

Date**Name****Comment**

these harmful substances all pose serious threats to local air quality and natural resources.

Strategies

Strategy 6.1

- Include 'supporting alternative fuels and advanced vehicle technologies' to the funded programs.

Strategy 6.2

- Consider including, 'and to better facilitate the use of alternative fuels' into the reasons for supporting a new START facility.
- Consider pursuing transit from Jackson to GRTE, beyond the airport, to accommodate visitors and employees travelling to the Park

Strategy 6.6

- Define 'periodically' for purposes of reviewing the entire transportation system.

Strategy 6.9

- Consider adding language to better define what the 'Travel Study' will constitute.

P.O. Box 11756, Jackson, WY 83002

phil@ytcleanenergy.org 307.413.1971

www.ytcleanenergy.org

- What will function as the baseline for this study? The first step should be establishing this prior to the 5-year interval as described and how it related to the Indicators identified.

This highlights the necessity for further study to establish baseline for the indicators.

- 1996 Travel Study should not be considered baseline.

Strategy 6.10

- How exactly will Appendix K and the information it contains be 'utilized'?
- When will TAC update/or complete a more detailed transportation plan?

Thank you for your ongoing, tireless efforts in the process of rewriting this important document. I have included several resources collected from communities throughout the country that could have bearing on the rewriting of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan's Theme Six.

Please consider our organization as a resource in any efforts to promote more efficient transportation systems and technologies in this community.

Best,

Phillip Cameron

Executive Director

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2010	Sobey, Pegi Interested Public	Weâ€™ve come a long way since work began on our Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan to â€œupdate and prioritize the values in the 1994 Plan.â€ In the early stages of this process, the Comp Plan Survey results clearly confirmed that stewardship of wildlife and scenic and natural resources remains our communityâ€™s TOP priority.A simple comparison between drafts illustrates that our communityâ€™s efforts over these last several years have begun to reap rewards and benefits to the future of our community in the form of a vastly improved draft Comp Plan. I am certainly appreciative of the Town and County Planning Commissionsâ€™ willingness to listen and carefully consider a majority of the recommendations made during what inevitably became a very complex planning exercise over the last year that has culminated in the current draftâ€™s release. Commissioners, therefore, have a plethora of information in the public record upon which to evaluate whether this draft is truly representative of the communityâ€™s vision and, in fact, the promised improvement to our existing plan.An initial review of this draft indicates, ironically, that the Comp Plan has now come full circle and more closely resembles an update to the 1994 Plan that we anticipated from the start. I am heartened to see that this draft aims to identify wildlife protection as the communityâ€™s overall top priority, protect scenic vistas and preserve rural character in the county, while also identifying wildlife and natural resources as the foundation of our economy. While this draft plan looks better at first glance, a closer evaluation proves that it lacks essential policies needed to ensure unequivocal protection for Jackson Holeâ€™s irreplaceable wildlife, scenery and community character.Theme One:This draft is missing detailed language, data, action plans and specific timelines that could provide assurances that subsequent land development regulations will actually provide stronger protection for wildlife. This draft does not, for example, promote a true cap on development nor does it show whether the amount of development as proposed will or will not have negative, irreversible impacts on local wildlife and the community.Theme Two:This draft plan proposes contradictory future patterns for both centralizing and dispersing commercial development. Theme Three:This draftâ€™s definition of our Townâ€™s â€œcharacter and charmâ€ is less definitive than our current plan.Theme Four:This chapter needs work. By substituting â€œworkforceâ€ in place of â€œaffordableâ€ housing, its principles and policies become unnecessarily confusing and vague. The idea that smaller, free-market homes function as accessible, affordable homes for the workforce has not been demonstrated to hold true in this or any other resort community and is unrealistic at best.Theme Five:None of the indicators include baseline data, and many sections contradict the goal of economic independence from growth and expansion.Theme Six:The level of analyses that typically accompany a comprehensive plan is missing. County-preferred and WYDOT Level of Service standards must be reconciled.Theme Seven:Policies must be refined for consistency between realistic goals that can be implemented versus a wish list. This is impossible to determine unless infrastructure and public facilities needed for buildout and future development patterns are projected.Appendix I:The new table must be reconciled as to the cap plus light industrial plus local convenience commercial, as well as numbers associated with overall development potential.Of grave concern, is your deferral to date of review of the 65-page section -- the Future Land Use Plan. The Future Land Use Plan includes appropriate types of development and conservation efforts, wide ranges of expected development potential for newly proposed land-use types and a table of priorities that will take precedence in each district. Therefore, many of the most difficult questions remain unanswered. I think you will agree that the final state of the Future Land Use Plan will be the true test of the themes and policies that are being proposed. This fact unnecessarily complicates evaluation of the overall plan without a clearer understanding of this critical section.The desire for predictability to future land use decisions appears to remain as elusive as ever. Adequate analyses of fiscal impacts, transportation, natural resource inventories, etc. that typically accompany comprehensive planning processes have been conspicuously absent in this revision process to date.Each theme independently includes a number of unique strategies, but the draft plan does not correlate or prioritize them. A comprehensive priority list of strategies needs to be incorporated into the plan.Jackson Hole and Teton County deserve a comprehensive plan that will preserve and protect our wildlife, scenic vistas, natural resources, community character and quality of life in a sustainable and predictable manner.Letâ€™s continue to work together to create a Comprehensive Plan of which we can all be proud.Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft plan.
5/28/2010	Smith, Patricia Interested Public	To Whom It May Concern:I believe that the comprehensive plan should not exclude people from being able to build guest homes.Best, Patricia Smith

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2010	Reichert, Jennifer Interested Public	Dear Teton County Commissioners, We are saddened and appalled to learn that guest houses would now not be allowed on properties. Fifteen years ago my husband and I purchased a 4.5 acre parcel south of town. Ten years ago, we began building and moved into our home. In the past two years we just finished our basement. Now, we are trying to save to add a guest house. We live in a neighborhood where maybe 1/3 of our neighbors have guest homes and bought here because of the ability to have a guest home for future needs. We have parents who may have future health issues or needs that would require close or live in type care. Some of our neighbors have guest houses, we would like the same opportunity for our property. We greatly appreciate your efforts to look at maximizing wildlife conservation and minimizing impact. However creating a blanket moratorium on guest houses does not seem fair or just to the private property rights of individuals and landowners in Teton County. There does not appear to be any regard to the size of the lot or the homeowner's immediate neighborhood. Thank you, Jennifer Jennifer Reichert PO Box 7149 Jackson, WY 83002
5/28/2010	, Chamber of Commerce	We congratulate the Town and County planning staffs and planning commissions on an improved Comprehensive Plan. The following are our comments on Theme 5, "Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy": GENERAL: (1) Change Policy 5.1.b to 5.1.c, change Policy 5.1.c to 5.1.d, and add the following policy as Policy 5.1.b: Title = "Strengthen community orientation of tourism economy." Explanation = "Jackson Hole and Teton County should appeal to a broad range economic demographic. A continued and new focus on middle class families should be integrated into our plan. Family visitation has been central to the success of our community's tourism economy. Left unattended, current economics are driving new commercial development towards high-end business that is unaffordable for many families. In order to continue to attract families, commercial development policy will support affordability for visiting families. The policy and tourism goal of providing a high level of services and amenities is not limited to high-end development and high priced services." (2) Add the following as Policy 5.2.d: Title = "Orient economic development towards community self-reliance." Explanation = "As the community strives towards energy efficiency and other means of economic self-reliance, the community should promote the recruitment, formation, and growth of businesses that support our goals of self-reliance. Such 'green' businesses would be consistent with our community's orientation towards balancing economic, social, and environmental interests and concerns and create 'green collar' jobs for our community. Our community's tourism economy would be strengthened by the attraction of discriminating travelers who select Jackson Hole as their destination of choice because of our community's economic development orientation and progress towards energy efficiency and self-reliance." (3) Revise the last sentence in Principle 5.3 to read, "Economic diversity in Teton County will focus on creating a network of small locally owned, operated, and supported businesses consistent with the community's stewardship, social, cultural and arts, and heritage goals."

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	May 28, 2010 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Cc: Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Staffs Re: Theme Eight: "Energy Conservation" Submitted via email Dear planning commissioners and planning staff, On behalf of the Conservation Alliance, thank you for your attention to this memo regarding the May 7 draft of Theme Eight of the draft Comprehensive Plan. We understand that this theme, because it is new, will be reviewed differently than the other themes, and so have included the following broad, overarching comments. What it did well: 1. It generally introduces many important topics into our planning process – from awareness of global climate change to concrete steps we can take on a local level and our responsibility to the larger ecosystem; 2. It focuses on ecosystem adaptation in the face of a changing climate; 3. It mentions possible changes to the ways we treat building materials and encourages "reuse, repurposing and renovation of existing buildings and building materials"; 4. It encourages non-chemical methods for cleaning our drinking water; 5. It has started a list of indicators to measure our success. Needs improvement/still to do: 1. The definitions of sustainability in the Vision chapter and Theme Eight should be reconciled; 2. The field of energy efficiency and sustainable living (from building standards to waste reduction and disposal) is constantly evolving and advancing. A mention of a commitment to keeping up with technological advances would strengthen the theme in the long run; 3. The timeline for implementation of some of the larger strategies can end up being quite protracted. In the interim, it would be appropriate to pursue some "low-hanging fruit" strategies, such as supporting existing groups and energy conservation efforts, adopting an idle-free ordinance and continuing the legacy of the 10X10 initiative; 4. When discussing disposal of waste, it is also important to discuss waste reduction strategies; 5. Looking forward, the plan could benefit from a policy committing to exploring economically feasible ways to expand the diversity of items that can be recycled locally; 6. As with most of the other indicators throughout the plan, there is no baseline data included in the plan yet. We cannot measure reductions or increases without knowing the starting points. We need to set concrete and measurable goals; 7. Lastly, clarification of the role of this theme in relation to the others would be helpful. One of the original intents of this planning process was to weave the concept of sustainability throughout the plan. But, seemingly in an effort to give "sustainability" a broader and more prevalent role in the plan, planning commissioners voted to give it its own chapter. Even so, sustainability and energy conservation should play a role in this plan that is slightly different than that of the other themes. It should continue to be woven throughout the rest of the themes, even if it is merely through additional references to other topics. Regardless of the exact form of this theme, it would be beneficial to discuss its role. We would like to reiterate that we appreciate the inclusion of this theme into the overall plan. It encompasses some very valuable and forward-thinking concepts and is an excellent addition to the plan. Sincerely, Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson

Date

Name

Comment

Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	May 28, 2010 Town of Jackson & Teton County Planning Commissions cc: Alex Norton Re: May 2010 Draft – “Themes and Policies” section of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the May 2010 draft of the “Themes and Policies” section of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We really appreciate your hours and hours of time over the last year to improve the plan; in numerous ways, the new draft represents a significant improvement over the April 2009 draft. However, to be clear, we believe there are a number of outstanding issues with this draft section of the plan, many of which relate to previous votes you took or ideas that have already been presented to you but were never discussed or voted upon. With this in mind, we will not reiterate all of these points at this time. Our comments are specifically framed within the recommended structure for public comment for this round of planning commission review, and will therefore be brief. We anticipate that many of our concerns will be addressed during the upcoming review by elected officials. Also, over the last several years, members of the public, including the Conservation Alliance, have submitted extensive, detailed input to help shape our community’s next comprehensive plan, including suggestions for ways to improve the various drafts. You already have a lot of information in the public record that should help you determine to what extent the draft section you are forwarding on to elected officials is truly representative of the community’s vision and the original intent of this planning process – to improve our existing plan. Below are comments related to the Future Land Use Plan, the overall review process, Theme Eight, the Administration Chapter, inconsistencies and key areas of contradiction organized by theme, and new ideas. Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) & Review Process While we understand your decision to defer review of the Future Land Use Plan at this point, it is critical that you clarify your intentions for the upcoming FLUP review process. Specifically, please clarify whether you think elected officials should “formally act upon” or adopt the “Themes and Policies” section of the plan prior to your review of the FLUP. Based on how the plan was structured, it appears that the FLUP is intended to be the predictable piece of the overall plan to guide future decisions and that it should be considered as a formal section of the plan, not something separate from it. Until the draft plan is considered and reviewed for consistency in its entirety, no single portion of it should replace our existing plan. Because the document in its entirety has not been reviewed, many of the really hard questions remain unanswered. Specifically, the FLUP – a 65-page portion of the plan – includes considerable narrative on what types of development and conservation efforts are appropriate across the valley’s 25 districts. It provides wide ranges of expected development potential for newly proposed land-use types, and perhaps most significantly, includes a table that identifies the priorities (theme-wise) that will take precedence in each of the districts. It appears, based on the way the plan was structured, that the review of the FLUP will be the part of the planning process that will test everyone’s understanding of the themes and policies that are being brought forward. For example, are the policies in the May 2010 draft clear enough, predictable enough, etc., to direct clear, effective land development regulations? Also, while we appreciate that you, as planning commissioners, are not going to undertake a line-by-line review of the plan, we believe it is critical to acknowledge how important this step will be prior to adoption of the plan. Based on our organization’s decades of history in participating in reviews for individual applications in both the town and county, one thing is clear: the details and specific wording

within our community's comprehensive plan matter a lot, because decision makers rely heavily on the Comp Plan for direction. At a minimum, a line-by-line analysis, including legal review, should occur well before plan adoption to ensure the proposed wording is clear enough to meet the community's desired intent. Prior to concluding this phase of your review, please provide recommendations regarding this step of the process – who should do a line-by-line review and when – to assure the public this critical step will be undertaken at some point.

Theme 8

Please refer to both the written comments that we submitted on April 12, 2010 and the May 28, 2010 memo, included as an attachment.

Administration

Please refer to the written comments that we submitted on April 1, 2010.

Theme-By-Theme Analysis

While significant strides have been made, below are several key topics that would benefit from additional clarification to eliminate potential contradictions or inconsistencies. In general, and as we have expressed throughout this process, many of the policies in the draft are too broad and as a result leave the door open for diverse interpretations. In a number of cases, because the text is so abbreviated for certain policies, the context or rationale, which can help to more clearly provide guidance for land development regulations, is absent. We expect the elected officials to address this central issue of the draft plan – the shift to a far less detailed comprehensive plan than the existing plan.

In short, we have identified many of the topics below with the primary goal of this process in mind – to increase predictability for landowners, decision makers, and other members of the public in future land use decisions. As a result, the basic contradiction is, in some cases, the policies' failure to be consistent with the overarching goal of the new plan – to improve upon and lessen the uncertainties and unpredictability of our current plan.

Theme One: Practice Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources and Scenic Vistas

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- This theme lacks the detail typically necessary (such as recent data and the scenic policy-related illustrations that exist in our current plan) to guide strong land development regulations for wildlife and scenic resource protection.
- Even though wildlife is stated as the highest priority of the community, and the new plan is supposed to ensure greater predictability and accountability, no expected timelines are identified to carry out the actions or strategies that would increase our chances of actually protecting wildlife.

Theme Two: Manage Growth Responsibly

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- This theme includes vague, contradictory language regarding caps on development potential. (In some instances, it is unclear whether the implied goal for density neutrality supercedes policies related to density increases.)
- Several questions remain regarding references to potential transfers of development.
- Policies regarding the proposed future pattern of development for commercial development have the potential to be contradictory in some cases (the draft calls for both centralizing and dispersing commercial development).

Theme Three: Uphold Jackson as "Heart of the Region"

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- To ensure growth is not for growth's sake, the intent of "growth neighborhoods" in town, specifically as it relates to unrestricted "workforce housing" should be clarified – See summary of theme four for discussion regarding "workforce housing."
- If the "character and charm" of the Town are not more adequately defined, success in protecting

them will be difficult to achieve. (The draft's approach to character is less defined than our existing plan.)

Theme Four: Meet Our Community's Housing Needs

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- This chapter needs a lot of work. If significant changes are not made to this chapter, it alone could undermine all the improvements made to the new draft over the last year. Switching the focus to "workforce housing" without adequate inclusion of "affordable housing" criteria and specificity has made this chapter's principles and policies unnecessarily confusing and vague. In general, there is awkward wording throughout the entire chapter.
- Policy language is inadequate for setting and meeting a 65% quantitative goal.
- Currently proposed policies, which have some good and reasonable intentions, need more detailed description to ensure no loopholes are being created. (Examples include requiring "mitigation on a sliding scale" and promoting that "small, local entrepreneurial businesses should be exempt from requirements.")
- The chapter appears to be largely based on the myth that smaller, free-market homes function as accessible, affordable homes for the workforce. (This idea rarely holds true in resort communities, and has not been demonstrated to hold in this community in the long term.)

Theme Five: Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- The indicators, as in all chapters, need a lot of work. (None of them include baseline data, and some of the goals are questionable given the goals of the chapter.)
- Some sections of the draft plan contradict this theme's goal of an economy not dependent on growth and expansion.

Theme Six: Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- The role of Appendix K (existing transportation chapter) needs to be clarified to avoid confusion in the future.
- This theme currently lacks the level of analysis that accompanies a comprehensive plan. Prior to consideration and adoption of the FLUP section of the plan, considerably more analysis should be required.
- This theme needs to reconcile County-preferred and Wyoming Department of Transportation Level of Service (LOS) standards.

Theme Seven: Provide Quality Community Facilities, Services and Infrastructure

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- This theme needs to clarify concurrency review requirements, given that the following language was removed, "project the infrastructure and public facilities needed for the buildout and future development pattern."
- Policies need to be refined to ensure that the chapter goals are realistic and able to be implemented (rather than just a wish list), particularly given the role of the FLUP section.

Appendix I: Buildout and Numbers

Inconsistencies and Potential Contradictions

- Anytime a new document is to be released during this process that refers to the findings of the Buildout and Employee Generation task forces, the members of the task forces should have the opportunity to review the document before it's released. And, as we have stated before, we believe it is critical when presenting numbers to always attach information regarding the assumptions that were used to arrive at those numbers. Appendix I should include a list of assumptions. This would help to alleviate confusion for the public regarding the development potential associated with the new draft, and make things clearer for planners and community

members who will refer to these numbers in the future.

- The descriptions with the table, particularly the reference to a cap “+ light industrial and + local convenience commercial” should be consistent with the policy language regarding caps. (In both the town and county, when is additional local convenience commercial and light industrial permitted beyond the “caps”?)
- Also, ultimately, actual existing baseline allowances should be used to determine potential development, not figures that include many assumptions (including those for redevelopment).

New Ideas

It is unclear how you will specifically define and address “new ideas” in your review. Over the last year, the public (both in written form and in verbal testimony) introduced a number of new ideas and suggestions on which votes were never taken by planning commissioners. At this point, we assume any ideas that were previously brought forward in public comment will not be considered “new ideas” (regardless of whether a vote was taken related to these ideas), and will therefore not be considered during this phase of your review.

To provide one broad, comprehensive “new idea” for this plan, we recommend that you identify a comprehensive priority list of strategies to be incorporated into the text of the new plan (or you should make a recommendation that the elected officials develop this list as part of their review). Currently, the independent chapters include a number of strategies unique to each theme, but the draft plan, as a whole, doesn’t prioritize them in relation to one another. (For example, the 1994 Plan included a list at the end of the first chapter that identified the top issues that needed immediate attention upon adoption of the plan. A similar, but more specific approach with timelines, would be good to take with this new plan.)

Closing Thoughts

Based on our review of the new “Themes and Policies” section, we believe there have been some great steps in the right direction, but there are still a lot of remaining questions and issues that need to be clarified prior to adoption of a new comprehensive plan. The key factors of this uncertainty include:

- 1) There are many outstanding issues associated with the FLUP section. (It is structured to be a section of the plan, not something separate from our comprehensive plan.)
 - 2) Some of the policies’ language is broad and vague, leaving potentially very diverse interpretations in the future when drafting land development regulations. (There are a number of issues that still need to be reconciled at some point, some of which can only be done at a more detailed level than the level at which the issues have been reviewed to date.)
 - 3) Many of the tasks are still ahead of us that should play a role in the FLUP section discussion, such as an updated Natural Resources Overlay and Scenic Resources Overlay. And,
 - 4) There are several key topics within the plan that should be more representative of the information gained in years of public input. However, again, to respect the structure of your review not to reconsider topics, we will emphasize these topics again as the draft gets forwarded to elected officials.
- Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Again, we really appreciate your dedication of time and energy throughout this planning process and all the efforts you have made on behalf of our community.

Sincerely,

Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson

Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Dear Teton County and Town of Jackson Planning Commissioners, Planning Staff, First of all, I want to thank of of you for your thoughts, considerations and the unbelievable time committment for the benefit of our community. I very much appreciate each of you and I hope those that have not been involved really show their appreciation as well. Generally the new draft is greatly more representative of what the community wanted verses the first draft. With the County and Town being so divergent in goals and policies, I do not know how you could have done a better job trying to reconcile between the 2 commissions. Until the BCC reviews this new draft, and the FLUP maps are prepared, It seems pointless to take this draft much further. I hope that you will take the time now to correct some obvious inconsistencies. VISION The new graphic and 2009 Vision on Page 10 represents that Theme 1 is above all and is the # 1 consideration in planning. I do not see this as the first and most important thing to be considered in each one of the following themes as I read through the full draft plan. This priority needs to be repeated at the begining of all themes. I am also concerned with the overuse of the word sustainability. Yes there is a definition, however, this word has so many different meanings to so many people. The definition provided in the draft indicates a balance where the Page 10 graphic is clear on the priority of Theme 1. Theme 1 Establishing the Environmental Commission is the key to this Theme and tasking them to develop baselines. Without baselines, and knowing where we are now, we have nothing to measure. Unless there are real numbers attached to this theme it lacks meaning and certainly planning staff, commissioners, and the BCC can not make planning decisions based on numbers or facts as there are none. The LDR's will not have these numbers or baselines. When will these be filled in? Is this Theme not the #1 priority and we have no recent data? Theme 2 There is inconsistent language in 2.1.a. The first sentence limits to existing base development rights allowed today, yet the next sentence indicates there can be additive growth. This is confusing and sends conflicting messages and offers no predictability yet offers vague flexibility. Public benefit? Who decides? The elected officials at the time? This is recurring throughout Theme 2. Policy 2.2.b possible increase in non-residential is inconsistent with other policies in theme 2. Does Policy 2.4.c. mean platted but undeveloped lots can no longer apply for variances? Is this a taking? Policy 2.4.f. Shouldn't wildfire mitigation be required for all properties including existing for the protection of all in the community? If your neighbor does not mitigate their existing home they put you at risk. Policy 2.2.d. Policy which indidicates just Teton Village could have local convenience expanded is inconsistent with Straegy 2.1 which allows local convenience at all Resorts. Policy 2.6.a Does "Natural Resouce conservation" also mean wildlife and wildlife habitat? Theme 4 I agree with Rich Blooms comments. I feel there is inconsistency in the density bonuses/incentives in this Theme and keeping with the existing base development rights as described in Theme 2. I still do not see the 65% number really documented anywhere unless you use the vague workforce housing description which is meaningless as it includes about every breathing human in Teton County. Theme 8 I feel there should be wording that confirms enforcement of building codes with real inspections in our Town and County. I had hoped to not be so rushed to get these comments out by your deadline. I did not see the draft of the Administration Chapter? Did I miss this? Is this not up for review too? Thank you again for considering my comments. Gail K. Jensen
5/28/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I just wanted to say thanks so much to all of the planning commissioners for all the hard work and long hours put it in to get the plan going in the right direction. I echo what SHJH and Rich Bloom submitted for comments. The contradictions about staying within our growth limits and bonus densities need to be addressed. Put more bite in the growth watchdog end of it. Implement an environmental commission, define better, workforce housing with emphasis on not going below 65% instead of increasing growth by increasing workforce percentage that can live and work in the valley (the dog chasing it's tail syndrome). Remember that some people do choose to live somewhere else and come to work here. The flup is going to be the key to a successful comp plan. Get the planning commissioners review and recommendations to the county commissioners before the election to get their stance and then we can get going on the flup. Thanks again, Kathy Tompkins
5/27/2010	Faupel, Matt Interested Public	If guest houses are considered AR units then this is a terrible idea. Guest houses do not have the issues that you are trying to mitigate with AR units being rented, etc. They are essentially guest bedrooms that are private. They can also provide housing for caregivers, nannys and caretakers who you are now saying either need to live off site or in the home of the owner. This is simply an unneeded restriction and a large right taken away from a landowner. If enforecment is the issue, fix the issue, do not avoid the issue, fix it and do not penalize those who are not the issue.

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2010	Scarlett, Dick Interested Public	May 27, 2010 The following are comments which we tried unsuccessfully several times to send via the Commission web sight. We are adamanty opposed to the proposal within the conprehensive plan which would prohibit accessory residential units associated with residential uses. We stongly endorse Susan Shepherd's thoughtful and articulate letter which details the consequences (intended and unintended) of such a myopic effort. We are not Johnny Come Latelys to Teton County having resided here and been in business here for nearly 30 years. We have seen the good, the bad and the ridiculous, including this effort, of county planning. This proposal demonstrates a lapse in common sense. The reality is that there are and will be a very small percentage of residences with guest houses. The message, however, is huge. It is negative, unwelcoming and woefully short sighted. We respectfully request the commissioners to consider the concerns of so many of us and eliminate this proposal from the conprehensive plan. Thank you. Maggie & Dick Scarlett, PO Box 12139, Jackson, Wy 83002, 3150 West Wilderness Lane, Wilson, WY, 83014

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2010	Paolucci-Rice, Francesc Interested Public	May 27, 2010 Teton County Planning Commission: Paul Dunker, Mark Newcomb, Forrest McCarthy, Tony Wall, Peter Stewart via e-mail to: planningcom@tetonwyo.org Town Planning Commission: Barbara Allen, Paul Nash, Dana Buchwald, Michael Pruett, Ben Read, Jamie Walter via e-mail to: Jeff Noffsinger, Contact Planner: jnoffsinger@ci.jackson.wy.us Board of County Commissioners: Hank Phibbs, Ben Ellis, Andy Schwartz, Leland Christensen, Paul Vogelheim via e-mail to Sandy Birdyshaw, Office Manager: sbirdyshaw@tetonwyo.org Jackson Mayor and Town Council Mark Barron, Mark Obringer, Bob Lenz, Melissa Turley, Greg Miles via e-mail to: Asst. Administrator, Roxanne DeVries Robinson: rrobinson@ci.jackson.wy.us County Planning Director, Jeff Daugherty : jdaugherty@tetonwyo.org Town Planning Director, Tyler Sinclair : tsinclair@ci.jackson.wy.us Regarding: Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan Revision Elimination of Guest Houses / ARUs Dear Commission and Board Members, We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposal to eliminate guest houses/accessory residential units (which, for simplicity I will refer to below as ARUs) from allowed development in Teton County. We believe ARUs, now each limited to a maximum floor area of 1000 square feet, are important for many permanent residents and second homeowners. We own property in an area generally referred to as South Park Ranches, a development of 2.5 acre tracts, in which there are currently a significant number of ARUs. (We do not have ARU on our property.) The majority of ARUs in South Park Ranches, as I believe is the case in most areas our community where permanent residents predominate, are utilized as: private living spaces for out-of-town family and friends who come for extended visits; quarters for aging parents; transition or permanent housing for children who could not otherwise afford to live in the valley; housing for caregivers in households with seriously ill family members; and/or living quarters for nannies for single parent households, or for families where both parents have demanding work schedules. For second homeowners, a core segment of our tourist based economy, ARUs serve as an important source of caretaker employee housing, as well as a valued amenity allowing large families and groups of friends to comfortably visit the valley at the same time. The current land development regulations (LDRs), adopted in 1994, did not originally allow the rental of guest houses. However, it is our understanding that one of the factors (along with a concern for creating more options for employee housing) resulting in the Page 2 of 2 May 27, 2010 Letter Re: Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan Revision Elimination of Guest Houses / ARUs LDR amendment that transformed guest houses into ARUs (permitted for rental) was the difficulty of enforcing the non-rental status of guest houses. Removing ARUs or guest houses with non-rental status from allowed uses under the Land Development Regulations would not preclude the development of attached and detached recreation rooms or sleeping areas, which would easily and likely often be converted effectively into guest quarters again resulting in many enforcement and regulation compliance issues. We understand the concern over the growth potential of Teton County, but the goal of providing for smart growth should not be achieved in a manner that creates unnecessary hardships on important segments of the community. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Francesca Paolucci- Rice Richard A. Rice

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2010	Jackson Ranch Associat Interested Public	May 27, 2010 Via US Mail and Email to Jeff Daugherty Re: Comment on DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. Dear Jeff: I respresent Jackson Ranch Associates, LLC in their capacity as the developer of the 3 Creek Ranch and they have retained my services specifically to comment on Policy 2.1.a of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. As you are aware, the Ranch and Estate Lots at 3 Creek Ranch were approved by Teton County for development with a residential structure and an accessory residential unit. For the most part, the Ranch and Estate Lots at 3 Creek, while sold to end purchasers have not been developed. It is my client's expectation that Policy 2.1.a, if adopted, will NOT affect the Ranch and Estate Lots at 3 Creek Ranch since it is a previously approved development and that all future residential development on the Ranch and Estate Lots will allow a primary residence and accessory residential unit, subject of course to the terms of the development permit and other regulations. If it is the County's intention to eliminate accessory residential units for previously aproved developments, we believe this would constitute an unconstitutional taking of land without fair compensation and would therefore strongly object to the same. If it is the County's intention to apply Policy 2.1.a to future developments only, my clients objection remains as they believe accessory residential units are a necessary component of sound community plan. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call. Very truly yours, Christopher Hawks, PC, Hawks & Associates, LC cc: Jackosn Ranch Associates
5/27/2010	Adamson, Sara Interested Public	As a professional in the field of historic preservation, I'd like to add my personal support to this draft of the Comprehensive Plan, specifically section 3.6 for its recognition of the importance of historic preservation in promoting heritage tourism and economic development. Our historic buildings may be humble, but they meet nationally-recognized criteria for historic significance. And while they may not be as old as historic structures in other communities, they are the oldest buildings we have, and if we don't allow them to survive to 100 years, they will never be 300 years old.I also support Theme 8 and its recognition of the sustainability of reusing existing buildings, a practice that further supports the local economy by putting more construction dollars in the pockets of local construction laborers than new construction, while reducing waste. Thank you for leading the county in recognizing that recycling buildings is as important as recycling cans and bottles, if not more so.
5/27/2010	Vito, Kristin Interested Public	Dear County Commissioners:I am opposed to the ban on future guest homes in the county. Most guests houses are used for just guests or caretakers. Eliminating future accessory units will eliminate caretakers from being able to live close to their work and will eliminate guests from staying with friends and family. I do not believe that this is the intention of the ban.Thank you for your time,Kristin Vito

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2010	O'Connor, Jesse Interested Public	On behalf of the Teton County Historic Preservation Board (â€œthe Boardâ€) I am writing in strong support of the Planning Commissionâ€™s Teton County/Jackson May 7, 2010 Draft Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the board supports the careful consideration paid to the communityâ€™s cultural resources in the planâ€™s emphasis on the role that preserving heritage plays in maintaining community character, promoting economic development, and by promoting sustainable practices through the reuse of existing structures (found in Themes 3 and 8). The value of our historic resources is sometimes less obvious than in older communities, but Jackson Hole does have historic buildings that meet nationally-recognized criteria for historic significance. The town and county were designated a Preserve America Community by the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, a Federal agency, in 2009, identifying Jackson Hole as a cultural asset important to the nation. The county is home to over 350 structures listed on or eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, and the area contains many more potentially eligible sites and structures that have yet to be evaluated. The Board supports the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan, which clearly articulates the importance of these nationally-recognized resources through policies 3.6a, b, and c and provides for their consideration during the planning process. We applaud the planâ€™s support for the mission of the Teton County Historic Preservation Board to identify and protect these resources. The plan, as drafted, is also consistent with the existing town Preservation Ordinance (15.38.020). This plan also acknowledges the core value of preserving the community character of Jackson Hole. Community members poled in the Lake Research Partnerâ€™s 2007 survey ranked preservation of community character as the second most important goal of the comprehensive plan (shown by the support of 90% of respondents). The character of any community is inextricably linked with an understanding of its roots, and with the built environment that represents those roots. When asked what defines community character, this Board has found many residents mention historic resources such as the town square, Mormon Row, the Wort Hotel, Jackson Drug, and the valleyâ€™s historic ranches. We support the planâ€™s goal of guiding development in a way that is respectful of that heritage. In terms of economic development, that heritage is critical to attracting heritage tourism, a valuable asset to the valleyâ€™s economy. Studies have shown tourists who travel to historic sites stay longer and spend more money each day of their trip than other types of tourists. Those are economic benefits this community reaps simply by preserving what we already have, and they are benefits we endanger if we do not protect our heritage. Historic preservation promotes economic development in another critical way. As opposed to new construction, in a project reusing an existing building, whether it is historic or just old, more of the construction dollars go to labor than to materials, keeping those dollars circulating in the community. Lastly, we applaud the plan for its recognition of the sustainability of the reuse of existing buildings (Theme 8). Green building professionals estimate it takes from thirty-five to fifty years for a new buildingâ€”even an energy efficient, LEED-certified buildingâ€”to recoup the embodied energy lost when an existing building of its size is demolished. The embodied energy in an existing building is equivalent to five to fifteen gallons of gasoline per square foot. New construction also creates significant wasteâ€”waste that constitutes 25% of the nationâ€™s municipal waste stream. The Jackson Hole community is passionate about reuse and recycling. The Board supports the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan for clearly articulating the connection between building reuse and sustainability. We appreciate your consideration of our comments and hope that we can continue to provide feedback for this important planning document.
5/27/2010	Parent, Karen Interested Public	I strongly believe that eliminating the option to build separate, free-standing guest houses is a mistake. The opportunity to have a separate "outbuilding" helps to reduce and minimize the bulk and scale of larger homes. Furthermore, guest houses help provide housing for caretakers/employees on these properties. Why would should the county remove this tool in the new comp plan? This tool has not created a problem - so why take the option away? It makes no sense.
5/27/2010	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	Sirs,I just heard that one of the new provisions of the new comp plan draft is the elimination of guest houses. New I havenâ€™t thought this through completely since I just found out about this today and comments are due tomorrow. However, on the face of it this seems completely backwards and counter productive. Think about it. Who uses guest houses?1- Guests (temporary visitors)2- Relatives (children trying to make it in Jackson, or parents now living in the guest house)3- Renters4- CaretakersNow we obviously want to continue to allow people to have guests. And we all know how hard it is for children to continue to live in the valley once they are out of the house, this is one way to facilitate this transition and keep families together in Jackson. So what about renters and caretakers? Guest houses are small, by regulation. So renters (and caretakers) are consequently also small: young couples, singles, maybe a new small family. People who have a hard time making it in Jackson. The very people we are building affordable housing for and worrying about providing rentals for (Witness the Townâ€™s moratorium on condominium conversions last year). This is not the type of population increase we are concerned about. This is the type of population increase we are trying to encourage--working people. One of the main concerns and goals of the plan is that Jackson go forward as a viable, balanced, and sustainable community. These are the people and this is the housing we need. Not new subdivisions where people with money can drive up the overall cost of living in Jackson. Concentrate on limiting that kind of growth, and leave this kind of affordable housing alone. Thank you, Kim & Bob McGregor Jackson Hole

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2010	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Comprehensive Plan Comments – 5.7.2010 Draft Theme 4: Meet Our Community’s Housing Need I have read the May 7, 2010 draft and have decided to submit comments only on Theme 4 as it has the most disconnects from the other chapters, your joint votes and also where we have been heading in workforce housing solutions as a community the last number of years as well as the current Town and County LDR’s. I will focus only on those areas that I think do not represent your votes via other chapters - or fully represent the intent of the votes on this theme that you took. Recognize that the questions asked by staff to the joint planning commissions greatly influenced the votes and what they meant. I hope you will review the intent of some of your votes recognizing this limitation – without feeling it is in anyway “revisiting” any of the votes. This is an important point as you will see from my comments that follow. Although my input is informed from my long history of creating workforce rental housing in the private sector (TSS), 30 plus years living in this county, well known community organizing – not only on planning issues but also advocating for workforce housing, and my current nine month involvement as a member of the Town/County Housing Blue Ribbon Panel – I am commenting solely as an individual. Workforce Housing definition page 53: • Your votes, all of our LDRs and the work of the last years by our community have defined this as housing for our workforce. - o This new definition of “all housing occupied by people living in the community year-round regardless of deed restriction or employment.” - is very, very problematic! Workforce housing is tied to employment period – whether in deed restricted or free market housing units – whether owned or rented – whether seasonal or year-round. Please clarify that workforce housing – is for the workforce. - o See my discussion later on how this focus on workforce housing then achieves secondarily the other goals of social diversity, sense of community and generational continuity that you have identified. - o Also an emphasis for incentives can be more weighted for year-round and/or emergency service workers - without changing the definition of workforce housing in this manner by dropping all employment requirements as part of the definition and solely focusing the definition on year-round employees when seasonal employees remain a critical need for our economy – and community. Why This Theme is Addressed and other areas throughout the theme: • The key issue here is that supporting the goal of at least 65% of our workforce living locally will result in the other three bullets being achieved – socioeconomic and demographic diversity, generational continuity and a sense of community. - o It needs to be clear that the reason we are focusing on the plan is to address workforce housing goals – and that will achieve these other three bulleted goals – not the other way around! - o The way staff interpreted your votes (and how they constructed the votes themselves) – we are left with whether we should incent or mitigate for retirees, generational continuity – or for our workforce? It is for workforce housing that this theme is addressing – but to be consistent with your votes – the other goals of diversity, generational continuity and sense of community will be achieved by this statement of ideal and focus on what we are intervening on (workforce housing – your votes also on priority for year-round employees and emergency service workers) through regulation, mitigation, exactions and incentives. - o It is currently the greatest flaw in this theme – and what I am suggesting is not inconsistent with your votes. - o This is also found in Principle 4.1 – which should be rewritten to focus on workforce housing which then leads to achieving the other three bulleted reasons for this effort. May 27, 2010 Rich Bloom • “Catch-up” – is clearly not something we have talked about since identifying the goal of housing at least 65% of our workforce locally. This is old language and dated thinking from the 2005 Housing Needs Study that predated our establishment of a realistic and achievable goal of no less than 65% of our workforce being housed locally. - o Since we are at 70% plus, and have never dipped below 67% - the discussion has focused on “keeping up”. - o I want to point out that you never took a vote on these two terms. - o It is a gigantic leap to now say we want to achieve 100% of our workforce living locally – the financial and regulatory implications of that are simply draconian and unachievable. I would strongly recommend removing all references to “catch-up”. - o Again this is mentioned under “A Residential Workforce - page55 – “The community’s goal is to increase the percentage of the workforce living locally, improving the existing situation.” ▣ This again is Theme four’s second greatest weakness and will do great harm to our affordable housing efforts if it is included as written. It must be made clear that we will not be incenting for a goal above 65% of our workforce living locally - or our collective work over the last number of years will

Date	Name	Comment
		have all gone to waste. You need to clarify that the focus is not falling below 65% - for our workforce – living locally. ☒ This is a very important point and I cannot emphasize it enough! My suggestion I also believe falls within the votes you did take – it is simply of matter of using more precious language in the plan. • The statistics staff states on page 53 in the first paragraph, are not updated to the reality of the last two plus years where 1,800 workers have been lost in just over a year and housing prices have retreated 30-40% from 2007 highs along with rents, increased vacancies, total houses for sale and distressed sales. - o To be fair in this section you need to direct staff to bring this section current. The Teton County Housing Authority has more current statistics, and possible language, as it is something the Blue Ribbon Panel has been working on. Within Current Development Potential Concepts • There are numerous examples where the density portion of any incentives conflicts with the votes from other themes – especially in Theme 1 and 2. It is addressed in one or two occasions in this Theme 4 but generally it should be clear that any targeted growth areas in town, density tools etc. – exist only within the overall Town County potential – simply this language needs to line up with Theme 2 where any up zone is tied to a County down zone, or conversion of Town commercial to residential. As Theme 4 reads currently, this concept is not consistently or clearly stated. • Again from my in-depth understanding of workforce housing issues – the need for the next ten years is quite modest – in the neighborhood of a few hundred units – especially given the economic and affordability (both rental and ownership) impacts of the last two plus years. Your votes from the other themes should tie to this reality and the constraints you have put through votes and language in Theme 1 and 2 about working within the current overall development potential. Since this is meant as constructive criticism – and the points I have addressed are very concerning to me and the community – I wanted to close with some balancing comments. Overall the new draft, especially Theme 1 and 2 as well as 3 – are a tremendous improvement from the draft of last April 2009. I want to thank the planning commissions and staff for all of your work. Although there are some sections in the other themes I wanted to address – I limited myself to these fairly large disconnects and unclear intent found in Theme 4. In closing - thank you for all the hours you have spent on this process – it is appreciated. I will not be able to attend the next public meeting so hope all of you give my comments due consideration and attention. Rich Bloom – submitted solely as an individual
5/27/2010	Ankeny, Jake Interested Public	I stand in strong opposition to the elimination of the ARU from the Comprehensive Plan and future LDR's. People have reduced their main residence sizes to allow for future, potential ARU's. I can only imagine their disbelief, frustration and potential litigation that would come from such an action. You should also strongly consider who has benefited from ARU's, namely caretakers, mothers-in-law, family members, etc. This is too severe of an action to take in these down economic times as well.
5/26/2010	Bohl, Steven Interested Public	Good Morning, We completed the construction of our guest home last May. We also had a building permit approved for our main home, however, due to economic changes we have postponed the main house construction for a year or two. Our property address is 5235 Fish Creek Rd, Wilson. As you can imagine, if we lose the ability to build a main house, with the exclusion of an accessory structure provision, this would dramatically impact our property. We complied with the maximum of 1,000 sq ft for a guest house in anticipation of building the main house. We have owned homes in the Jackson area for over 10 years and are planning on retiring in the area in two- three years with the completion of the main house. We bought this lot specifically for the building of the guest home and main home as proven by our approved building permits. Please consider this unique situation and not significantly impact our property value. Thank you, Steven Bohl 612-221-8741
5/26/2010	Smith, Bitsy Interested Public	I just submitted a lengthy comment and I am not sure it went through. I received an error message. I will send this to see if I get same message.

Date	Name	Comment
5/26/2010	Ward, Thomas Interested Public	The transfer of density from county to town seems ill considered as well as a thinly veiled piece of political gerrymandering. It will remove housing stock that is often utilized by caretakers (tax paying working types) as well as eliminating the prospect of some construction opportunities for general contractors (also tax paying working types). The proposed amendment does not outline how these density credits will be transferred. An ARU in the county is 1000sf for a private residential development and 850sf for a commercial development. Neither of these floor areas would qualify as an affordable/employee housing unit as outlined by the housing authority, so if these are to be combined, how? This should be outlined in the proposed amendment. I did not see whether or not this would apply to new developments or be applied retroactively to all lots eligible for an ARU. These specifics should be worked out prior to being proposed for approval. I am certain that our elected county officials would require the points above, but I felt compelled to comment myself.
5/26/2010	Smith, Garnett Interested Public	I hear the new plan has a provision stating that "accessory residential units associated with residential uses" will be prohibited. If this means there will be no guest houses allowed I am opposed to that. I am the owner of 2 lots in 3 Creek Ranch and if guest houses are not allowed then I think the value of these lots will decline. I purchased these lots with the idea that guest houses were allowed. If you grandfather existing owners that is one thing, but if you plan on applying this moratorium to existing owners I feel it will result in the taking of a right that was in the purchase price and would result in a diminution of value. Garnett Smith 307-732-0038
5/26/2010	Lamppa, Todd Interested Public	Regarding any changes to the allowance of having a guest house or mother in law apartment, I believe it would be unfair to property owners if the county prohibited the right to have a place for guests or family members to reside. Let each development decide during the development process whether or not it is appropriate to have guest homes or apartments within the project, but don't take away the right for the whole county.
5/26/2010	Smith, Bitsy Interested Public	Although I am in favor of limiting growth in the county, I would like to make a comment regarding the estate lots at 3 Creek Ranch. These lots are 2 1/2 to 3 acres in size and were sold with the understanding that a guest house could be built on the lot if the owner desired to do so. I think this could devalue the property, and hope that your proposal would only effect lots that are smaller in size. Bitsy Smith 3 Creek Ranch Board of Directors
5/26/2010	Cox, Barry Interested Public	Planning Commission, I strongly object to the comprehensive plans intent to not allow accessory residential units, guest houses. Sincerely, Barry P. Cox
5/26/2010	Linton, Carol Interested Public	Commissioners and Planners, I have been a Jackson homeowner since 1987. I have lived in three different areas of the valley, bought and sold 5 times. My husband is a fourth generation Wyomingite; he owns a Wyoming business that has just celebrated its 50th year. I am telling you this because I am trying to impress that we are not "newcomers" to the valley. Eliminating guest houses in the Valley is not in your realm to impose. If the CCR's of a subdivision allow it, and the property is of a size to allow it, then you are taking away an individual's property rights. Why not put a restriction that it must be within a certain distance from the main home (clustering which you are fond of)? Clustering guest homes to main homes is the right solution. Eliminating guest homes from lots that allow them is just plain wrong.
5/26/2010	Gaitan, Penny Interested Public	To Whom It May Concern: With regards to the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan, I am very concerned and opposed to the Policy 2.1a, especially the proposition that future constructions of accessory residential units not being allowed. I have a 3 acre piece of property with home and plan to build a guest house for one of my children to be able to move back to the area and live in Jackson Hole. I haven't had the ability to do it yet, but that was the purpose of the purchase years ago. This ability to put a guest home on property has been allowed use for years and I would like to see that continued. I do not understand why it was even considered to change this regulation, but I definitely oppose this change.

Date	Name	Comment
5/26/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Theme 2 Manage Growth- One potential conflict is Policy 2.3.e which limits discretion in land use decisions, but then says "regulations and incentives will be performance based." At least it does say the "intent and limits of the incentives will be clearly stated." Unless incentives are clearly defined, they are discretionary. The statement that "small town, rural character is to be preserved, human needs must be provided within existing development potential" seems pretty clear, but in the Housing Theme it mentions giving limited density bonuses. This conflict should be resolved. Policy 2.1.d talks about transferring density from the rural county and converting non-Residential potential into residential potential in town. No mechanism is proposed or an audit system to be sure this is not abused. Indicator 1 basically says we will follow the LDRs. Is that what the JP&Z C, meant? It seems redundant, like promising to stop at red lights. Theme 4 Meet our Community's Housing Needs- Generally this Theme seems confusing and in need of some clarification. The definition of workforce housing as "all housing occupied by people living in the community year round regardless of deed restrictions or employment" is very confusing and vague. We would ask the JP&Z C to confirm that this is what they recommended. Policy 4.3.b to "allow density increases for restricted workforce housing in target areas of town" is in conflict with Theme 2 managing growth. Even if "Base density allowances will have to be set low enough to allow for density bonuses that do not increase residential development potential", it is difficult to understand how this will maintain the goal of no net increase in total Town and County development potential. We ask the JP&Z C to confirm that the goal for indicator 1 is to increase the percentage of workforce housed locally. Our understanding was the goal was to stay above 65% but not necessarily to keep increasing the percentage. It is unrealistic to expect it to increase forever. Theme 5 Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy-Although the Theme talks about "Developing a better economy without building a bigger economy" indicators for skier days, National Park visitation, monthly lodging occupancy rates, airport enplanement, and local domestic product are all targeted to increase. This seems to be in conflict with principle 5.2 which says "Economic development will occur within the growth management policies of the community" with the primary goal of improving the local economy not necessarily physically expanding it. Theme 6 Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy-Policy 6.3.c: to "Review land use proposals and decisions against their transportation network impacts" Is not necessary if total development potential in Town and County is limited. Instead the plan should review what transportation network is needed to service the development potential that is allowed. The goal to increase Level of Service for all modes in indicator 7 seems to conflict with other statements to discourage vehicle use. Theme 8 Energy Conservation-This is a new Theme which has not been reviewed so our comments are more general. Principle 8.4 misses an important way to reduce energy which is to build smaller public buildings and not build unnecessary public buildings. Consider requiring larger buildings to have higher energy efficiency. Policy 8.5.c suggests pursuing methane capture in the landfill. Is this possible since we do not operate the landfill in Sublette County? Is the goal of indicator 2 to reduce the number of carbon neutral buildings in 2030? How will indicator 4, per capita miles driven be measured? Indicator 7 seems to be a goal, and should be restated. The draft does not discuss efforts to reduce idling, which is a topic the Town has been working on.
5/25/2010	Mahood, Ken Interested Public	I am opposed to removing the provision for accessory residential units associated with residential uses in the county. This is the wrong approach and should not be adopted.
5/25/2010	Evans, Tom Interested Public	see comments above:
5/25/2010	Budge, Chad Interested Public	If the elimination of guest houses is being considered, I am extremely opposed to that.
5/25/2010	Bennett, Brett Interested Public	I oppose the elimination of guest houses as noted in Policy 2.1.a. Guest homes are an integral component to the employee housing base. The elimination of future guest homes would reduce the capacity for the valley to absorb future housing needs, would require more "affordable housing blocks" to be built and would increase commuter traffic from Star Valley and Teton Valley. Sincerely, Brett Bennett

Date	Name	Comment
5/25/2010	Jay, Chris Interested Public	I strongly disagree with Section 2.1.a of the Comprehensive Plan. It border line attempts to diminish our freedoms as land owners more so than the current FAR regulations. The current regulations atleast allow individuals to decide how they want to develop their own land (to a degree) but still controls the FAR. I think if someone wants to build a 3000sf Main house and then a 4000sf Guest House, they should be allowed to do so. The proposed method is just one step closer to the government completely dictating (and limiting) what we can build on our own land. The next step will inevitably be to cut down the allowable square footage of the one allowed building unit thus mandating that we all live in cabins. If the intention is to limit the amount of "building" per square acre, then just decrease the allowable square footage per unit, not the allowable number of units. Personally I think the current system is more than restrictive enough to accomplish the goal.
5/25/2010	DesLauriers, Rob Interested Public	eliminating a property owner's right to build a guest house (Policy 2.1.a.) is equivalent to a taking of rights. It is inappropriate and unfair. please remove. Thank you.
5/25/2010	Bryan, Bomber Interested Public	TC Planners and Commissioners,I am strongly against the proposed language in the Draft Comp Plan that defines the inability to construct future ARU's. This is not the answer to managing growth in Teton County. What exists is history, and fo-forward management has to do with future allowable deeds (residential development) and proper mitigation policies.Thank you for your time and consideration.
5/25/2010	Stevenson, Phil Interested Public	I strongly object to the language contained in Policy 2.1.A which states,in part, "...acesory residential units associated with residential uses will not be allowed". This would appear to be a direct prohibition on guest houses, which I believe would be a huge mistake. More than almost anywhere else in the country, when you live in Jackson, people want to come and visit, often for weeks at a time. For those who can afford them, a guest house is a gracious way to house visitors, and I don't see how they in any way are harmful to the citizens of Teton County, especially when they are limited to 1,000 square feet.
5/25/2010	Evans, Tom Interested Public	I am not in favor of taking away the accessory residential unit associated with residential uses in Teton County. I find it interesting that this is being considered. I have a guest house and I use for guest and friends and it is a wonderful addition to our household. It allows me the opportunity to also use if for staff and or employees without taking up any housing needs in the balance of the county. I don't see what the purpose is to not allow guest houses other than wanting to take jobs away from architects, contractors and landscape companies or for that matter eliminate future housing of employees in the valley. By disallowing you are continuing to increase the demand for housing and in return will increase the amount of rent someone will have to pay. You need to be more proactive in this economic climate and not take away a potential job that does no harm in keeping the accessory units in place as it currently is in the master plan.Tom Evans
5/25/2010	Kleiman, Darren Interested Public	I wish to voice my OPPOSITION to section 2.1.a of the most recent draft of the Comprehensive Plan, specifically as it pertains to ARUs. The proposed legislation stating "...accessory residential units associated with residential uses will not be allowed." will have unintended consequences beyond anyone's imagination. While control of density in theory is a good idea, this is NOT the right way to achieve the goal.Commissioners, vote NO on the Comp Plan or you'll be out of a job next election.
5/25/2010	Clancy, Nancy Interested Public	Eliminating guest houses is absurd and there is no reason for it.
5/25/2010	Dalby, Mark S. Interested Public	I firmly disagree with removing the option to build ARU's (Accessory Residential Units) on our land and in our community. For many, this provides another means of income to help support our families. Additionally, it provides low income housing for families in need of living space, which is extremely limited for our workforce. With the further expansion of the airport, which drives our growth bringing financial stability to our local economy, this seams a mistake. There should be incentives for ARU's to help our community. Landowner's should have the power to chose.
5/24/2010	Emrick, Madeleine Interested Public	I really object to the elimination of guest houses in this new proposed plan. Our world is changing very rapidly and as a lot of us age we may need assisted living. I think that guest houses will be a great way to be able to stay in our homes and have some one providing us care. I also think many guest houses become beautiful spaces for living for many who can not afford to buy properties. I know many caretakers who live very happily in these guest houses. If you want to limit growth limit future development but do not change what was once allowed. Thanks, Madeleine

Date	Name	Comment
5/24/2010	Lewis, Edie Interested Public	â€ Dear Teton County representatives,I write to voice my serious concern and opposition to Policy 2.1.a, specifically the proposition that accessory residential units will not be allowed. The caretaker or guest apartments are a sought after feature for many of our residents as well as new buyer's looking to put down roots at some level in the community and have been a long accepted element in county residential properties. In no uncertain terms I oppose this provision.Thank you for your attention in this matter.â€Best regards,Edie LewisAssociate BrokerSotheby's International Realty, Jackson Hole
5/24/2010	Hunter, Tom Interested Public	The elimination of guests homes in your draft proposal is arbitrary and will irrevocably damage the marketplace for high end homes. Restrictions such as this at this time will kill what's left of the golden goose. Please reconsider this portion of your draft plan.Sincerely,Tom Hunter1575 Crooked Creek Rd.Alta, WY 83414
5/24/2010	Delay, Jack Interested Public	Dear trusted representatives,I write to voice my serious concern and opposotion to Policy 2.1.a, specifically the proposition that accessory residential units will not be allowed. The caretaker or guest apartments are a sought after feature for many of our residents as well as new buyer's looking to put down roots at some level in the community and have been a long accepted element in county residential properties. It was a key feature for me when I bought my home.I am not certain what reasoning led to this provision in the plan but I would be happy to debate it or provide further comment as I'm confident I would find it flawed.In no uncertain terms I oppose this provision.Thank you for your attention in this matter.
5/24/2010	Ross, Charlie Interested Public	I think that guest houses should be allowed in the new comp plan.
5/24/2010	Hanlon, John Interested Public	Re: Theme two on mananging growth responsibly:I feel it is unwise to take away the guest house in the county. They should be added to the town and long term rental allowed too. When housing is tight and prices are high is one way the locals can pay their mortgage. It allows more quality to lives of people who live here. Some are turned away because they can't pay a mortgage in this high priced community. Another advantage to guest houses is that they allow people to come and visit without having to actually move here so the impact on the community is lessened.A third benefit they provide is that if locals can rent guest houses then we will have less need for bigger apeartment and condo complexes. If there are several hundred seasonal summer workers in the area and many of them are renting in various apartment complexes those place start looking like fraternity row. (just go by Ponderosa village on frday evening in the summer time - you'll see). But if seasonal workers are renting a guest house behind a private home there will not be a "keg party" there because the owner would never allow it. This translates to less disturbance calls to the sherriff/police too.A fourth benefit is that it leaves other housing available, thus lessening the demand to build more publicly subsidized housing by Teton county. Please keep guest houses in the plan.
5/24/2010	Gillespie, Christy Interested Public	In regards to: " Policy 2.1.a, lines 6 and 7, where it reads, â€œaccessory residential units associated with residential uses will not be allowed.â€ As a realtor in this valley and property owner I'm extremely disappointed that the planning commission for even considering this. Guest houses create jobs in the valley and provide housing. In a time when the economy is already in a downturn and builders are out of work - is this really the right time for you take an anti-growth policy on guest houses? Not to mention, all the other services industries that will be affected by this - architects, landscapers, cleaners, etc.
5/21/2010	Shepard, Susan Margar Interested Public	I am opposed to the elimination of the option to build guest houses that exists under current law.I would like to build one to house my adult children who are struggling with the economy right now. It could later be rented out to a couple who need reasonably priced housing.Also, it will impact second homeowners who bring a great deal of revenue (hence Jobs, charity and business support) to our valley.I am sending a more comprehensive letter outlining my concerns.
5/21/2010	Moore, Robert, E. Jr. Interested Public	Dear Planning Commission,I expect that you use this forum to gauge popularity of particular issues as it is convenient, though be it misleading. One should be aware that not everyone has the time or ability to follow your latest endeavor. I fall into this forementioned group having to rely on our local news media which is obviously biased. I just thought to clear my conscious I needed to add my two cents by speaking out against eliminating ARU's. Any more infringements than have already been inflicted by yourselves and your staff upon property owners in this valley is just plain wrong.Thank you for your service and your time.

Date	Name	Comment
5/20/2010	Ankeny, Shawn Interested Public	Please do not deny homeowners the right to build a stand alone Guest House. Several people I know have recently bought their lots knowing that they would be able to build a guest house on the property eventually. I believe that if Guest Houses are no longer allowed, main houses will become that much larger, and that much more noticeable in the landscape. To be able to build a small Guest House and a moderately sized house breaks up the mass and creates smaller scale structures, which have a more quaint feel, like those of the olden days of Jackson Hole. I do not believe that eliminating Guest Houses will help wildlife in any way. Instead, it seems like eliminating them would take away coveted rights of the landowner to build on the land they own. I would rather not see Jackson turn into a place of 8000 sf houses. The fabric and beauty would benefit from grouped smaller scale structures. Thank you for your consideration! Shawn Ankeny
5/20/2010	Shepard, Susan Margar Interested Public	May 20, 2010 Addressed to: The Teton County, Wyoming Planning commission; TheTown of Jackson, Wyoming Mayor and Town Council; The Joint Town and County Planning Commission. RE: Draft Joint Town and County Comprehensive Plan "Unitended Consequences". Dear Representatives: With personal fidelity to the overall goal of protectng wildlife and our incredible natural beauty through a reframing of our comprehensive plan, I also understand that every major decision made in such planning will have "unintended consequences." Wise planning should welcome serious discussion of the consequences of regulatory decisions. I refer in this letter to the proposed elimination of "residential ARUs, " i.e., "Accessory Residential Units," or "Guest Houses." I understnd that 53% of those attending a recent public meeting strongly supported such elimination. I wonder if they and others supporting such a change have considered the unintended consequences? While even home owning residents of more modest means will be affected by this change, it does appear that this proposal seems directed toward second homeowners to discourage them from coming here. I urge you, our commissioners and councilors, and the citiazns of Jackson Hole to consider the following: There are more than 150 "official" charities in our valley, an unbelievable number for an area of our size, that support underserved and needy people, the homeless, sick and hungry. Many are funded in large part by current and fomer second hoeowners who have "fallen in love" with Jackson Hole. Jobs in our valley are increasingly scarce in this recession-battered time. It would be hard to overstate the positive effects on second homeowners on our local economy, even if the construction workers who build their residences are not included. Take for example just one family that spends a few weeks here winter and summer and employs two garden workers twice weekly in summer, snow removal workers in winter, a caretaker (who lives in their ARU with his family), a handyman, weekly cleaners, fishing guides, etc. This couple also donates heavily to several JH charities. Consider then, the many jobs created by them and other second homeowners. Along with the Tetons and National Parks, second homeowners are prime engines of job creation. Virtually every job here is due to the trickle down effect of money spent by tourists and second homeowners. Could we have a national award-winning weekly newspaper laden with advertisements without the purchasing power of second homeowners, or world-class skiing and outdoor recreation, shops, businesses, a good hospital, restaurants? A short drive over the hill or to Idaho Falls or Star Valley will illustrate how difficult things are without a strong local engine of job creation. The Center for the Arts and National Wildlife Museum are remarkable achievements for a small valley. They were paid for and supported in part by generous donations from current and former second homeowners. The Grand Teton Music Festival receives strong support from second homeowners. These days nearly every mountain resort has one, but ours is world class and widely considered among the finest in the nation. Despite the perception of some locals that second homeowners are all jet-setting dilettantes, and while some certainly are, most JH second homeowners are more like those who worship in my church. "In love" with our valley, they donate substantially to the church and local charities. They love and value being here and many bring their children and grandchildren from quality family time. Finally, and importantly, in addition to guest houses for second homeowners, those built by residents of more modest means can under current law be rented out or occupied by family members struggling with recession fallout. It is incomprehensible to consider taking away the option to build onto our own properties during a major recession. We can have limited growth, create affordable housing, protect our wildlife and the incredible character of our valley, and discourage futher large development without making it impossible for my middle class family and other like ut to live here. Thoughtful planning can demonstrate the these concepts are not mutually exclusive and can be achieved without wreaking havoc on a fragile economy or biting the hands that feed us. Those who espouse extreme measures to "take back our valley" and who also claim to speak for "the people", will succeed only in destroying the abiltiy of most of us to have gainful employment in Jackson Hole. And yes, I have seen the crop of bumper stickers admonishing us to "Need Less". The unintended consequences of even well meaning decision may adversely affect life in Jackson Hole far into the future. We could end up with much less to need less of.

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2010	Taylor, Nancy Interested Public	Comments on Theme 8. Thank you very much for adding Theme 8 to the draft Comprehensive Plan. It is crucial that it be included as part of our planning process. I would suggest that the word "Renewable" be used instead of "alternative" when you are speaking about energy, particularly where it is used as a theme heading. The word "alternative" implies that it is a practice that is on the fringe. The use of renewable energy needs to become mainstream for all of our citizens, even those who frown on "alternative" options for their lifestyle. The use of wind as a renewable resource for energy generation is really not a viable source for Teton County. We don't want to discourage the use of home wind turbines as they become more viable in the future, but at this time we do not have enough wind to make wind energy cost effective. It might be worth mentioning solar thermal or the heating of hot water from solar panels, as it is a very cost-effective way to heat water with a very short pay-back period. There was a Green Building Action Team which was a branch of the EEAB that drew up Green Building Guidelines for residential housing. We spent several years drawing up these guidelines and it would be good if they were incorporated into the LDRs connected to Theme 8. Please talk to Jesse Stover in the Building Department. There also needs to be some financial incentive to encourage green building for residential and commercial development. The Energy Mitigation Regulations need to be mentioned with more emphasis, as the size of 2nd and 3rd vacation homes does a great deal to increase the carbon footprint of Teton County. There was also a community 10X10 effort headed by Sarah Mitchell. We drew up several suggestions for education and retrofitting which could be mentioned in Theme 8. Thank you for your consideration. I would be happy to answer any further questions on this theme.

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2010	, Chamber of Commerce	Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Theme 5, “Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy” Issues and Proposed Positions for Approval by the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors in its March 31, 2010 meeting. ISSUE 1: Definition of a “strong and diverse” economy JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: A strong and diverse economy (1) creates opportunities for business start up, sustainability, and growth that meets the essential needs and desired amenities of our community and visitors while having little to no negative impact on our local economy, community, or environment, (2) fills unused capacity in winter and shoulder seasons, (3) provides year-round jobs that attract a diversity of experience, skills, and capabilities that strengthen our workforce and community, (4) is flexible and resilient to changing economic conditions, and (5) establishes and sustains a stable tax base. ISSUE 2: Are we a community first, resort second; a resort community; or a gateway community? JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: The Town of Jackson and Teton County are a gateway to our federal lands, recreation opportunities, incomparable wildlife and scenery that is characterized by the economic, social, and environmental benefits of both a community and a resort. Our gateway community works to sustain and enhance our distinctive economy, recreational opportunities, arts and culture, environment, heritage, aesthetics, and well-being of our residents and workforce through wisely managed tourism and destination stewardship. The strength of our community enhances the competitiveness of our resorts and the economic benefits of the resorts supports the creation and maintenance of the community’s amenities and essential services. ISSUE 3: Economic Development Council (EDC) JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: Create an Economic Development Council comprised of key business leaders for the purpose of developing and guiding the implementation of an economic development and sustainability strategy. ISSUE 4: Maintaining Current Levels of Approved Planned Resorts (Theme 5, Policy 5.1.a) JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: Modify Policy 5.1.a to read as follows (change highlighted in bold italics): “Previously approved resort developments are estimated to have an approximately 20-year build out. As a result the county and town will not approve new Planned Resorts or expansions to Planned Resorts that are not designated on the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP). Exceptions to this would include community amenities necessary to support these areas as sustainable community centers and community mix-use neighborhoods including workforce housing and local convenience commercial, if determined to be consistent with this Plan.” Restrictions to expansion or types of expansion decrease the flexibility to adapt to changing economic and competitive conditions (e.g., ability to expand lift operations rather than base square footage). ISSUE 5: Subsidizing Small Businesses (Theme 5, Policy 5.1.d) JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: There should be no subsidies for businesses. Incentives rather than regulations should be provided for the creation and success of businesses according to an economic development and sustainability strategy developed by an Economic Development Council. Proposed Recommendations and Positions for Theme 5 3/26/2010 JHCC Board of Directors Meeting, March 31, 2010 ISSUE 6: Taxation and Economic Development (e.g., Lodging Tax, etc.) JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: Any taxes, rules, regulations, and incentives developed should enhance and sustain our tourism economy. ISSUE 7: Integrate Arts and Cultural Offering as a Cornerstone of our Local Economy. (Theme 5, Policy 5.2.d) JHCC PROPOSED POSITION: A vibrant arts and culture industry provides direct and indirect stimulus for local business – attracting tourists, providing a professional workforce and increasing revenues. The town and county should support and encourage business partnerships with the Arts, helping to keep jobs local, strengthening the economy and enriching our quality of life.

Date	Name	Comment
4/12/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	April 12, 2010 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Cc: Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Staffs Re: Proposed Theme Eight: "Energy Conservation" Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear planning commissioners and planning staff, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Theme Eight of the draft Comprehensive Plan, "Energy Conservation." Conceptually, we fully support the writing, adoption and implementation of this proposed theme. As suggested by some of the planning commissioners in the April 8 hearing, we also support that the new theme have a broader intent to address climate change and adaptation issues. Included below are our comments regarding this theme, the first of which pertain to the existing Principle 1.3 and related policies, strategies and indicators, followed by several comments regarding what we believe should be added to this theme. Amendments to existing plan principles/policies: (please refer to our comments on Theme One for more contextualized explanations) 1. Energy conservation on a broad level is an essential goal. However, in terms of the statement in Principle 1.3 about "lower energy bills," it is important to remember that it is safe to assume that energy costs will significantly increase once total energy demand in Teton County approaches a certain level. While reducing energy demand per capita is a necessary and essential policy, it is clear that the amount of development proposed within this plan will dramatically increase total energy demand, and therefore energy costs, despite how much is reduced per capita. 2. Policy 1.3c: Incentives should also be provided for reuse and/or recycling of materials in existing structures prior to razing. Questions/Additions to a proposed Theme Eight: 1. The role of climate change with regard to our wildlife populations, water quality and conservation, and economy are not yet adequately addressed in Principle 1.3. There needs to be more language specific to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem within the dynamic context of a changing climate. In addition, the policies in this theme should speak to what it means to be a gateway community committed to the stewardship of two premier national parks and one of the last relatively intact ecosystems in North America, specifically in terms of the example that we set for visitors. 2. Conservation of energy is fiscally responsible; it is arguably the biggest cost savings measure that this community can take. Language to prioritize energy conservation beyond land use pattern and standards for new construction should be included. We need to set aggressive energy conservation goals and then carry them forward; this could include goals for the interim while larger changes are being implemented. 3. Air and water quality are essential to the health of the ecosystem, economy and community. Any and all growth and development will negatively impact these resources, so it will be important to continue to commit to mitigating those impacts. 4. Education of the public will be a critical component of the success of the goals of this theme. For example, developers and contractors could receive materials and information during the building permit review process regarding best building practices (green building). The more conversation about efficiency and conservation that takes place, the more likely people are to amend their behaviors. 5. In the energy audit conducted by the JHESP, it was determined that transportation is the number one CO2 (carbon dioxide) producer in Teton County. In most communities across the country, buildings are the number one CO2 producer, followed by transportation. But, here in Teton County, including

Date**Name****Comment**

the airport, transportation is the largest contributor. This must be addressed in Theme Eight beyond what policy 1.3b and c mention, and be at least mentioned in Theme Six.

6. This theme should mention the concept of the responsibility of individuals and communities to act locally to reduce our impacts on the changing global climate.

7. In the creation of the indicators for this theme, it will be important to include both numerical and narrative descriptions of baseline conditions, or measurable starting points.

Thank you again for your continued work on this Plan and for your attention to these comments. We also encourage you to seriously consider the recommendations made to this body by other external groups and commissions whose exclusive, or at least primary, charge is energy efficiency and related policy considerations. In the writing of these comments, we also referred to several other community plans from across the country; we are by no means the first community to consider the incorporation of a broad definition of “energy conservation” into our community’s planning and vision document. We urge you to consider examples from other communities as well. Lastly, we applaud your efforts at including the important concepts of energy efficiency, climate responsible strategies and energy conservation into this Comp Plan. In addition to upholding the original intent to weave the concept of sustainability throughout the themes and policies, having a chapter directly related to sustainable community development will strengthen the overall Plan.

Sincerely,

Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson

Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate

4/8/2010 Koelfgen, Wendy
Jackson Hole Energy Su

Wendy Koelfgen. I’m the Energy Affairs Coordinator for Teton County and the Town of Jackson and I’m here tonight representing Jackson Hole Energy Sustainability Project. I wanted to thank you for identifying the public mandate to start looking at drafting a theme eight on energy sustainability. I couldn’t agree with you more. And pursuant to that, we were asked to prepare what we thought should be included in that chapter. And I believe that you all have in front of you the contribution of the Jackson Hole Energy Sustainability Project. In the gray box is our mission and goal statement. I want to make one clarification and make it very, very clear that any other mission and goal statements that come from other groups may contribute to this chapter, but these are the ones that are specific to the Jackson Hole Energy Sustainability Project. We are pursuing energy savings as a means of saving money for this entire community. There were some other documents floating around earlier this week that appeared to come from the Jackson Hole Energy Sustainability Project and they included some other goals surrounding climate and wildlife protection, and those are definitely admirable goals but they’re not part of the Jackson Hole Energy Sustainability Project. We are careful about our messaging and I want to make sure that that is clear to everybody. So, again, thanks so much for the opportunity to participate in this. We look forward to participating in the drafting of the chapter going forward. And if you have any questions of us, please feel free to direct them to me and I can take them back to the steering committee.

Date	Name	Comment
4/8/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	: Gregory Griffith, West Bank. A couple of things I'd like to talk about; hope I'll get through it. Paid parking has been brought up as a strategy. I just wanted to relay the information that we took extensive paid-parking surveys, research, petitions, etc., in about '99 and '08. In '99 it was also a mirror of '08. I'll give you '08. In the 2259 responses total, 2212 responses, no, negative—97.9 percent. Even more telling was the negative comments on the comment side of that I don't have time to relay; 2.1 percent, yes. It mirrors to '99 results also. The local participation and the demographic distribution was 65½ percent locally, 29½ percent tourist, 3.1 percent second homeowners. The effects of paid parking are generally oversold. The revenues generated are miniscule after maintenance, installation and enforcement. It's not a viable option. And if we propose something like that, we need to talk to the experts and that's the merchants downtown, Town Square, ??, etc., so it's a major disagreement, one of the few I have with some of the board members over there. I'll leave that there. Last week's meeting lacked a lot of energy and a lot of focus, in my opinion, and I really think we need to pump up the volume and push through to the end of this process. There was a lot of discussion on some topics that don't have a snowball's chance in Sahara of ever getting implemented. And if we're wasting time talking about that, we're not talking about something else. The process transition is going to be very important here, and this is not a shot at Staff, but I categorically reject Commissioner Walter's and other's assertion that you can't get this done without Staff leading you around by the ring in your nose on some of these questions, especially in the transition and the procedural end-game here. It's worked very well in the past. I don't know that that's going to be the case. You've evolved into a group thing. I'm just responding to whatever the questions say and we've lost a little critical thinking skills here. As far as the FLUPs go, I'm not going to say anything retroactive because it won't do any good, but we should have discussed them. We pragmatically probably won't because it will take several months. However, the only comment I'll make is I have a real strong inkling that they'll be used in the future to supercede the Comp Plan. In other words, since they are supposed to be the bridge between the Comp Plan and the LDRs, they will be viewed as superior to the Comp Plan and the development application because they're further along the linear progression. Someone will come in and say, well, wildlife is number four here because we didn't rectify the inconsistencies between the community's vision, the Comp Plan and transfer that to the FLUP, because we're advocating our overriding responsibility to comment on it now possibly. So, someone could come in, wildlife is number four in this district, rampant growth and urbanization is rated number one, so therefore that plan is in Death Valley. We really need to watch out for that and that's not an absurd...that's not beyond the realm of possibility the way things have worked around here in the past. I've been here for every minute of every one of these meetings and my observation is that we need to be talking less about the Comp Plan at this stage and more about an action plan. We've got so many unfounded mandates. We've got so many authorial concepts, everything. We need to concentrate. We need to condense this down to an action plan moving forward, so we have something to look at, so we have something concrete to get our teeth into, and so it condenses it for the public's assimilation. A really bad analogy is when you were a kid at Christmas, you made a 100-item gift list, you just increased your odds of getting any of those gifts that you aspired to. We're doing the exact same thing here by not having the focus, the targeted aspiration, the prioritization, etc., on what we should do. Theme by theme, we should list it out. The last two things I'll say is we have an aspirational goal around here correctly to become the first green resort, the first green community, the first green airport, or whatever, and we need to work real hard on closing the gap between what we say is what we do. If we continue to promote...maybe it's like a snowmobile hill climb. It doesn't mesh. Theme eight, I'll refer mostly to, hopefully, Commissioner Mr. McCarthy's comments, or the Alliance's comments, and—I didn't catch the nice lady's name here—but we absolutely should be including climate considerations and wildlife considerations in anything we do relative to theme eight. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
4/8/2010	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Good evening, Tim Young, Executive Director of Friends of Pathways. And I wanted to add an idea that's already actually in chapter eight and I think it would be a very good idea to dust off and incorporate into the new theme, and that's...it's called transportation administrative strategies in the existing chapter eight. It's only five pages long and I can e-mail it to the Staff. I'll just them a...and it's already in today's Comp Plan, so it isn't anything new here, but it...I'll just go through a couple of quick pieces for you just to frame it and you can consider it as you have time to evaluate what you want to have in this theme. And then there will be, as I understand it, an administrative chapter and it might be appropriate to leave it within that. But potentially it could be an Appendix to the document. I guess you'll have to determine its best fit. But the intent of it is the implementation of—in this case, it was chapter eight—will require technical advice and committed oversight. So those are two pieces—oversight is policy related, and technical advice is obviously transportation specialists that really know the nuts and bolts of how to make systems work. And this suggests that a policy committee would provide oversight to the implementation of the Plan and make that important link to the elected officials that ultimately...or appointed officials, if it's an agency like WYDOT, to those officials who will make those decisions. The policy committee could make direction to the administrators of their agencies to allocate the necessary resources for implementing chapter components. So that's actually a mechanism to get done what you say you ultimately will have goals about—multi-modal accommodation, improving transit, doing a TM program. Ultimately, whatever comes in here will be goals and objectives and aspirations. But without a mechanism to accomplish them, it's a challenge. And I understand that after the planning consultants were in Town two weeks ago, there was a bit of a discussion among Planning Staff kind of looking at chapter eight and saying, whose job is it to implement this chapter? It's not my job, is it your job? No, it's not my job. And it's a good question—whose job is it? And this I believe could be...it's existing, but it's not really being followed at this point in time. But it's very well crafted. It's I think fair between different entities that have autonomy or jurisdictional relation, like the Town has its own major and Council, the County Commission has the Board of County Commissioners, WYDOT has a mechanism in District 3 with the District Engineer and their oversight. And this is a mechanism for those to work collaboratively to assign resources as need be and to implement what you'll ultimately move forward to the elected officials for the Comprehensive Plan. So I thought, as I read through it, it incorporates the information on how the transportation improvement program, for example, will be developed. A really important component of what is it that's your capital improvements plan, or what are you going to actually do. And it has a monitoring program. How will that take place or who will do what. So, all really...traffic counters, transit ownership, the kind of data that would be good to gather over time. I thought it was...it remains a perfectly valid document with some very minor updates that could be considered. In fact, I'd even go one step farther in recommending you folks, as planning bodies, that are I think that our elected leaders look to you for advice. And I think it's perfectly appropriate if you look at this and you say, that really does make some sense. There's no reason to wait until we adopt this entire Plan when it's already in chapter eight today. You could make a recommendation that we think this has merit in the future and one way to test it is to get going with it right now, to advise them, to kick start this. It's in their policies. It's in our community's policies already as approved. They could simply have a meeting and decide let's get going with this. And you'd have a test over the next six months and see is this exactly what we want, could we fine-tune this. And if it isn't, certainly you could make another decision at that point. But I think it has a lot of merit and I wanted to put that forward as additional to my previous comments. Thank you.
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 6.2.a - add language referencing the traffic benefits of conservation easement acquisition
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Review the Administration Chapter as part of the final review only

Date	Name	Comment
4/8/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. You have a lot on your agenda, so I'll make some brief comments. With regard to theme six, we raised a number of issues in written comment that we hope are addressed in addition to Staff's questions on the Staff Report. I just want to mention two of these. First, we would really like to see the incorporation of a policy regarding the importance of continued permanent conservation easements as a specific transportation strategy, as it is clearly outlined in our existing 1994 Plan. We believe the new chapter shouldn't remove the fundamental strategies that the 1994 Plan outlines to reduce traffic growth. Therefore, we request that you take a vote to incorporate the language that we cited in our written comments regarding conservation and conditions. Second, we believe it's important to vote on incorporating language from the '94 Plan about community character as it relates to transportation. Community character has been a central part of our community's transportation policies, and we believe the removal of focus on this element of our community vision could have negative consequences for transportation decisions in the future. With that, it's really critical to remember that early on in the process you voted to add community character to the overall vision statement, and it was supposed to have implications throughout the other chapters of the Plan. At this point, it's unclear how Staff is expecting to integrate community character criteria into other chapters. So, I just want to make sure it's an important part of transportation. More specifically, in terms of transportation character, preservation can have very direct and meaningful implications for design choices as our community moves forward with projects. By defining the character we are trying to protect as it specifically relates to transportation, it will help us when we are at the table with partner agencies asking for context-sensitive solutions that work within our local character objectives. So it's a really big concern to us that that concept of character is moved so significantly in the new draft. So again, we ask you to take a vote on whether to incorporate and build upon the '94 language <<inaudible>> transportation. Last week we provided a lot of comments on the review process, so I won't reiterate them all again tonight. But I did want to mention a few things after looking at the Staff's questions for this week. We believe serious consideration should be given to the nature of the final product from the proposed June hearings, particularly given that you will not be expected to review the rewritten version that may result from these hearings, as suggested in bullet point two on that question in your report. It's questionable to do yet another rewrite based on your June discussions. For the community to review an April 30 draft, and then another draft, which I assume will be available in July before it gets sent to elected officials, seems questionable. Again, from a procedural standpoint, it seems that you would need to review and vote on the actual version that will be sent to elected officials. So, if you're not going to review the second version, which is mentioned in bullet point two, then it seems that that shouldn't be the product that's the final version moving forward to the electives. Again, this is a procedural question that would be great if somebody could clarify. With all this in mind, we would lean towards sending the April 30th version based on your preliminary review, upon which you can also submit your suggestions for new ideas and recommendations for reconsideration, reconciliation in a list form to elected officials to consult as they will actually be amending the final Plan. With theme eight, the Alliance, along with other organizations, will be submitting written comments to Staff on what types of policy should be included in this chapter. As we stated, we think the incorporation of this chapter is extremely important and look forward to seeing it as part of the April 30th draft. With regard to administration, there are several critical items that you should discuss before completing your discussion on that chapter, and we would request that you review our written comments, particularly as they relate to the topics, those last three topics that are outlined by Staff at the end of page 8 on your Staff Report. I'll close there. Thanks.
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Review of the Future Land Use Plan will occur following elected official adoption of the Themes and Policies
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 6.3 - add language where appropriate..."Systematically plan for future mobility that meets the needs of residents and visitors within the context of community character"
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add an east-west connector through South Park to the list of Potential Transportation Network Projects
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The public and Planning Commissioners will categorize their comments into following: -New ideas – organized by Theme -Items for Reconciliation (inconsistencies and contradictions) across Themes There will be no reconsiderations

Date	Name	Comment
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff will rewrite the Vision and Introduction Chapters for release and review along with the rest of the rewritten document
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Two additional strategies should be added to Theme 6: -Institute a community-wide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan -Update Chapter 8, the Pathways Master Plan, and the Transit Development Plan based on land use decisions
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	A staff report of comments will be produced, but no additional rules will be placed on the structure of the discussion
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan's mode share goal should be formulated by the TAC to be realistic, but exceed the mode share goals of the 2000 Transportation Plan
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The final draft with jointly recommended changes included in the text and split and failed votes in the footnotes and color coded that is passed to the elected officials will be produced by staff after the redline version is reviewed and approved with any changes by Planning Commissions, the final draft will not be reviewed again by the Planning Commissions
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The ground rules for oral public comment will be: -Unlimited public comment at the beginning of the first meeting only -Limited public comment (45 minute per meeting) at the beginning of each meeting pertinent to the agenda
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Clarify the role of the existing Chapter 8 - Transportation Plan and include stronger language about implementation and accountability, and specifically include the Transportation Administration Strategy
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The initial public comment period will last for three weeks following release of the rewritten draft
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Planning Commissioners will submit their comments within 1 week of the close of public comment
4/8/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Direct staff – with the help of the TAC and other local transportation experts – to amend the indicators section to be consistent with the policy changes recommended by the commissions and add the following indicators: -Quality of Service -Livability (as defined by federal highway bill) -Level of Service (multi-modal)

Date	Name	Comment
4/7/2010	Schilling, Brian JH Community Pathway	(email thread is available for review from Planning Departments) Subject: Ch. 6 Review and APBP thread Attachments: APBP Discussion - Congestion, LOS, Livability.pdf; APBP Discussion - Congestion, LOS, Livability.doc From: Brian Schilling Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 10:01 AM Barb and Paul, I wanted to forward the attached transcript to you (Word and .pdf versions)...it's an email thread that has been going on for the last few days on the APBP listserve (Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals) that may provide some interesting ideas for the Planning Commission's discussion on congestion, LOS, and our transportation network and community goals. The discussion started as a request for examples of bike/ped projects that have led to measurable decreases in congestion, but, like many threads on the APBP listserve, quickly diverted to a more philosophical discussion about community character and design, congestion pros and cons, why LOS may not be the best indicator of transportation network success, and the importance of asking the right questions and framing your discussion. I have included the full discussion but have highlighted certain sections that are particularly relevant to our local conversation. Bear in mind that the folks on the APBP listserve are generally more progressive minded than the average car-oriented transportation engineers, but they do have a great deal of transportation expertise and usually have broader scopes of training and experiences than many 'traditional' transportation engineers are willing to allow themselves. That is not to say that we're way behind the curve locally--many of the concepts discussed in the thread have also been discussed by your boards, the TAC, and the Comp Plan consultants. If possible, would you mind forwarding this to your respective planning commissions? Thanks, Brian Brian Schilling Pathways Coordinator Jackson Hole Community Pathways

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Good evening, Rich Bloom, speaking tonight on behalf of South Park neighbors. Theme six, you already have my written comments and I don't really have anything to add, but what I did want to do is just backtrack. You know, in August of 2007 defining the issues and concepts, the Plan's role and this was from the Comp Plan. We're three years into this process. Update and evaluate democratic changes. Evaluate consequences of overall growth—fiscal, environmental, social, infrastructure, transportation and public services. Key issues to be addressed. Model what the County might look like at build-out and consider the implications for infrastructure needs, quality of life and the environment. Transportation needs. Determine whether traffic and construction needs for the future in order to obtain our vision for the Valley. Determine under what conditions the traffic could affect the growth of the community. Fiscal and economic. Evaluate whether the Town can afford the public commitments in the Comprehensive Plan and that revenue is greater or at least equal to the cost of services. And I guess how did we do? You know, I wish I could say this was an April Fool's joke, but we basically failed on all those, except for some modest modeling of a few connections in North Bridge and Spring Gulch. Why is that important? Because then I think we would have seen the economic and the traffic impacts of our decisions instead of that now coming at the end. So, I guess with theme six, the only thing to add to my comments are two. One is, I think Paul Duncker stated it best—we might as well stay at the 50,000-foot level because we don't have any data. We don't have any information to make those decisions about widening and connections and local connectors and bypasses. And second would be Friends of Pathways. Tim Young is here tonight. You have his written comments. You have his verbal comments. It's been our whole argument about why this became a rewrite versus an update. We left behind all the good stuff in the existing transportation chapter. So, I hope you find a way to add that in. As far as the process, and that's why I'm really here tonight, why I stepped back into this meeting. You know, in the last three years, this is a three-year plus process. In that time the economy has gone from growth to collapse to partial rebirth. We've elected a new President. We've debated health care. We actually passed it. You know, we've entered a new decade. As far as, you know, the public is drained and they've checked out. An elective has died in office in that time—God rest Bill. Another elective has become pregnant and given birth at this time. We're in a new election cycle of half of our electives up for election. The Planning Commissioners finally review their new year tonight versus a year ago. Some have changed jobs. Others have gotten pregnant and had children, started new careers. No wonder the public is left behind and then left out. So general suggestions in the remaining process. Do not radically change course, e.g., the nodes and compact centers. The public will only be confirmed of things that are said to me on a weekly or monthly basis at this point, which is this is just like a large development process—it drags on and on and on until the public gives up, doesn't attend, and at the very last moment a change in course. The public isn't there to yell. And it's done. Please don't do that. I know that's not your intent. And it's not your intent to drag this out for a year since this review and three years since the start. Keep the new ideas out when you go back to visit the themes. Focus on whether Staff has gotten your joint votes correct in the new text. Then reconcile the inconsistencies between any themes. Those are two tasks that I think is big enough before you. That's important. Specific suggestions as far as following the Staff Report. Again, public stay tuned on themes one and two and the introduction. And I think we heard them loud and clear. I think the other themes follow from that. So, please don't go back and start changing the prioritization of wildlife and open space, capping development at no more than currently title, removing all nodes except for Town, because those tie into all those other things that were in some of my comments. Release of the remaining themes. With that release of the redline theme copies, the public is going to need four weeks to review that if you're willing to make changes in course. And concurrent with that will be the vision and introduction chapters. Please release all those together so they will see three, four, five, six, seven and eight, plus the introduction and vision. And I understand that could be rewritten to the point it won't be the final final, but let's see those all as a whole if we want to have any hope of trying to get the public to see how we've done. Oral public comment because there's some questions here to remain of no more than 45 minutes at the start of each meeting. Please don't change that routine if you want to invite the public to speak. Vision and introduction again, release it. FLUP maps, these need to be addressed before you pass this on to the electives. The FLUP is about the only thing we ultimately care about at the first-step level as we tie it into the bigger picture, because that's our backyards. As far as how you review those, I would go with the preliminary review by the Town and the County separately and then come back together with the joint finalization. That way you honor the joint process, but you have a little more efficiency of those three choices. Thank you for your time. Let's get this done. Let's get to the FLUP maps and get it to the electives so we can see what they do with it before we get the new member. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment	
4/1/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	[full comment available for review from Planning Departments Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Administration Chapter Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to the Administration chapter. Overall, we really appreciate the efforts to add this chapter and incorporate a more clear commitment to enforcement of the community's comprehensive plan in the future. Based on a thorough review of our existing plan, it is clear that a major obstacle was not necessarily the existing policies or recommendations, but rather a lack of enforcement. Ultimately, a comprehensive plan is only as effective for a community as the willingness and ability to enforce it. Unfortunately, the current draft will not provide increased accountability (particularly without clear timelines for specific strategies). Attached are line-by-line comments and suggestions for discussion related to administration of the plan. Listed below are the key points that we hope are addressed and clarified during your review of the chapter: • Clear purpose and need for the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), particularly as it relates to the proposed criteria for amendments to the FLUP - (The FLUP is too detailed in many ways, and lacks analysis to support what it proposes); • Clear process for prioritizing strategies by elected officials on an annual basis, particularly as it relates to the need to make sure the highest community priorities are upheld on a comprehensive, long-term basis; • Clear process for upholding the overall priority of a predictable community vision within the context of potential incremental amendments to the comprehensive plan and the FLUP (versus amendments to the land development regulations which this chapter does not address); • Potential additional criteria for policy changes and adjustments to the new plan, including the FLUP. As a concluding chapter of the plan, this chapter raises a central issue that has been discussed throughout this planning process. How much detail should a comprehensive plan address versus the subsequent land development regulations? And more specific to this chapter, how often should broader policies and vision statements outlined in the comprehensive plan be amended versus sections of the plan or land development regulations that actually involve implementation? While we support that the land development regulations are the more appropriate place for many of the details (such as specific development standards), it has been unclear how the FLUP portion of the draft comp plan (some of which is highly detailed) is to be linked with the draft's very broad-based themes and policies. This clarity is important in terms of deciding when and under what conditions (such as a completed analysis of transportation impacts) the community should adopt the FLUP, which currently includes parcel-level-looking maps for twenty-five districts in the town and county. If you choose to delay the FLUP discussion until a later date, it will be necessary to revisit, at some point, all of the statements regarding the FLUP, including those in the administration chapter. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Sincerely, Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate	April 1, 2010

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Comments - Theme 6 - Transportation Excerpts from “Comprehensive Plan – Defining Issues & Concepts – draft of 8/27/2007” (this is on the Comprehensive Plan web site): - o The plan will “evaluate consequences of overall growth in the County (fiscal, environmental, social, infrastructure, transportation, public services, visual, etc.)” - o The plan will “model what the County might look like at “build-out”, and consider the implications for infrastructure needs, quality of life, and the environment.” - o The plan will “determine what our traffic infrastructure needs are for the future, in order to attain our vision for the valley.” - o The plan will “evaluate whether the Town and County can afford the public commitments in the Comprehensive Plan, and that revenue is greater or at least equal to the cost of services.” So it is about time to be straight with the public and finally do this: - o To clarify my public comments of tonight: my argument was not that we need more data – but that the plan as presented did not inform the public of its consequences. The plan has mostly failed to accomplish any of the primary goals laid out in the initial defining issues and concepts above. - o Specifically commitments to multi-modal transit aside, we currently need – and over the next fifteen years will demand - dramatic expansion of - and additions to - our transportation systems. The expansion will be even greater unless we address commercial growth, second home development and preserve additional open space. - o Please be crystal clear with the public in Theme 6 and say both with our current land use plan, and especially with the incomplete and ill-conceived new draft use plan, the following will be needed: - o A north bridge that will involve the use of eminent domain and the removal (via the courts) of what were to be permanent conservation easements. This will also further fragment and disturb wildlife movement and critical winter range. - o The widening of HWY 390 (Teton Village road) to four lanes (plus center turn lane in places). - o The widening of HWY 22 to four lanes and in places five – including through the town of Wilson. - o The paving and widening of Spring Gulch road. - o The construction of the Tribal Trails Connector with the resulting redirected traffic (other than local traffic) onto the already failing High School Road. - o Despite these additions and improvements - a lower grade of service along several pinch points including the town center and the “Y”. - o I would go on to estimate the fiscal impact of this transportation infrastructure. How will it be paid for – especially the portions that are a County (versus WYDOT) obligation? I am not asking for more data. The issue is if we had been given the outline of these needed transportation improvements as promised - along with their environmental, quality of life and fiscal costs – we would certainly have had a very different dialog the last year on constraining build-out and its effective population. It is not too late. Be straight up with the public on where we are headed – and let them and the electeds make an informed decision on whether this is the direction we want to head. Apart from base property rights, durable entitlements in existing resort zones, already approved town commercial and platted lots – we still have a lot to discuss. Meanwhile we will need to do serious improvements and some additions even with a concerted effort of reducing our end state of development. Don’t get me wrong – I also strongly support all the multi-modal efforts in addition. So when we asked for metrics early and often during the plan process – transportation improvement needs, build-out, effective population, other infrastructure needs and all of their fiscal costs – that was not a demand for more data before moving forward – but rather the frustration that we continue, after several

Date	Name	Comment
		decades, to make land use decisions without understanding their implications. This is simply backwards. Respectfully, but with frustration - Rich Bloom
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Language precluding consideration of paving Spring Gulch road should be removed from the Plan
4/1/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. A lot to cover here fairly quick. I think it's my page five, it's the hearing format, the last sentence, Staff recommended new members should be able to propose a motion to vote how they choose. I wholeheartedly agree with that. However, the question that we never asked or answered... actually, I asked it early on; it never was answered. What is your role? Is your role as a citizen oversight committee who seeks to implement the well-documented growth of the community on some of these 60, 70, and 80 percent top issues, like nodes? Or is your role as an individual to implement whatever you as an individual think you should implement ala nodes? And if you answer in the affirmative to the latter, then where does that leave the public on an issue like nodes? We've got several instances in the Staff Report here, it leaves it open directly for reconsideration. So it's something to think about as we move forward with that, the timing of how that's presented, etc. Throughout this process, we've focused on a notion. We focused on micro supply-type solutions instead of macro demand solutions. This is a prime example in traffic. If we listen to the traffic consultants, etc., we realize that no matter what strategies we employ, if we added home mail delivery with local convenience commercial with START Bus expansion with pathways expansion, all of which I'm in favor for. In areas that have tried this and have implemented it for 30 years or more, we've had around a 10 to 15 percent reduction in the traffic growth. So we continue to talk about the small scale. If our goal is to reduce the growth of traffic in the future, then we would be much better off talking about commercial down zones and reducing PRD potential to two or three, etc., because that is a macro application for the desired goal of reduction of traffic in the future. I found it kind of odd that both traffic consultants last week didn't mention that anything from the National Geographic Landmark Study on Sprawl to local data show that anywhere from 10.1 to 10.6 trips per household are generated daily. Locally, it's about 11.1 to 11.4 trips per household per day. And we're talking about a 10 percent reduction of those, some of which are already in place. I'm the biggest promoter of mass transit as there is, but there's a tremendous subsidy involved—seventy cents per ride locally, \$2.30 state and federal subsidy. We can't infinitely expand a system that requires subsidy without a monstrous and dedicated funding source. With the funding sources...we have a funding source identified in every chapter, every theme so far. We're going to have to triage and prioritize those funding sources and have direct applicability like the 40 percent remainder of the lodging tax direct to START Bus, etc. We're going to have to start focusing in on it. We don't really have any of the answers to any of the questions that we've asked ourselves. I think the answer in the future, I think I'll be proven correct in 10 or 20 years that the real answer is going to be modifying our threshold of acceptability. We're going to have to put up with longer cueing lines, and we're going to have to put up with the great levels of servicing. Alternatives are just too onerous to consider. The last thing I'd like to touch on is the process itself. Some of the dates mentioned by Staff are getting into June, well into June. I think it's the public's right to vote into or out of office our elected leaders based on what they do and how they vote, and not what they say. If we extend this process long enough, that's going to be violated. I really enjoyed Commissioner's Wall's...I'm singling anyone out but it's positive...Mr. Wall's comments about truncating this portion of the process. But if for no other reason than that reason, to allow the public to vote into/out of office the 60 percent of the electives who are up for reelection, based on what they do and how they vote on our very future, not on how they say they're going to vote. Thanks.
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	With the exception of any additive nodal development previously removed, the commissions agree with Principle 6.2 (reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel through concentration of development in a nodal land use pattern, prioritization of alternate mode solutions, requiring development to promote alternate modes, and discouraging SOV use) as a general community transportation principle.
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Incorporate entirety of Friends of Pathways' 3/18/2010 comments except for proposed mode share goals on page 4
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The commissions agree with Principle 6.1 (increase the share of trips made by alternate modes, especially transit by establishing a funding source for transit, shifting community behaviors, researching a Regional Transportation Authority, and interconnecting all modes of travel) as a general community transportation principle - with the exception that the policy should be to establish a Regional Transportation Authority not just research the idea.

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	the commissions agree with Principle 6.3 (maintain a safe, efficient, interconnected, multi-modal transportation system through implementation of “Complete Streets”, coordinated transportation planning efforts, concurrent land use and transportation review, reduced wildlife and scenic impact, and maximized redundancy) as a general community transportation principle.
4/1/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hi, Gail Jensen, Teton County. First of all, the process that you’re going to be discussing. I very much agree with what Tony Wall had to say about what he feels the process should be and that would be don’t get into the overall detail, fine detail of this chapter or theme six. We really don’t have the information we need to write a good Plan. And I, like Rich, have...I’ve lived here for over 30 years. And I have seen absolutely very little planning when it comes to roads around here for 30 years. And with what’s in here right now, there’s very little planning in this either. And that was one of the main topics of discussion when we had the transportation experts here last week. So, you know, you guys have these lofty goals but you’re not doing anything. I would really like to see with theme six, ultimately, once you get everything else settled in build-out number, or where the density is really going to go, when you really settle on that, we need specifics. We need a prioritized list. We’re going to do this; we’re going to do that; we’re going to start working with WYDOT. I mean, we have lost so many funds in this County over the last three years on our road construction. It is pathetic. It is really pathetic. I sat by living on Highway 22 for 28 years, and just every time I looked in my rearview mirror thinking I was going to get hit every time I turned into my subdivision. I mean, people shouldn’t have to put up with that. I pay a lot of money in taxes, and I’m sorry, my tax money should be going to improve our road situation. And for some reason, the planning part just falls apart every time. We need a strong effort to really plan for our transportation this time around, not just FLUP but really plan this time. At the end of the chapters, I agree with Tony, we need to be looking globally. How do they all fit together? You go from theme to theme and not one of them fits with each other at this point. They’re lofty goals, but it’s a whole disconnected...I don’t know what it is, really, to be quite honest. There’s good stuff in every one of the themes. I’m not saying there isn’t, but they don’t fit together in any way. I think you need to be looking at the overall picture and how they fit together and maybe that discussion. And then fine tune it from there. I think that’s really, really important. And then yet again on theme six, I really think this theme is so important. It’s one of the main things, the most important things, and I just don’t see that there’s any hope in getting much detail the way it’s structured right now. So, please, if you give that a lot of thought and a lot of effort...and one more thing, I did really appreciate a lot of the, or at least your comments, about what you saw as a real Plan. And take those ideas and really come up with a Plan this time. I’d really appreciate it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Brunner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight. I'll try to be brief given that you've already received our extensive written comments on the transportation theme. I know you have a lot to discuss on your agenda tonight, so including clarifying the process moving forward. With respect to the review process, we appreciate Staff's outline of procedural items you need to vote on. We would like to request one more key clarification. It's really important to make the process as clear and understandable as possible. I'll be describing that. Plus just going through steps outlined and a few quick points. We would request that you allow for a written comment period of a minimum for three weeks to give the public time to understand the changes, as it is fairly safe to assume that we're going to see essentially a new document. We also believe it's important for you, as Commissioners, to have at least two weeks to submit your discussion points after public comment ends. That's at a minimum. In terms of public comment and hearing format, we would ask that the points brought up in verbal and written comments are always available, you know, as discussion items and as voting items in your process. We feel this is absolutely essential. Regarding the line-by-line review, while we recognize the Staff doesn't recommend the theme that your boards do a line-by-line review, we feel like it's really important to identify who is going to do this review and when will they be doing it. You know, this document has huge implications for our community and someone has to be doing a very detailed review of it. To answer the question, is that going to be placed on elected officials? Who is it going to be placed on? Regarding Staff's point about the vision and introduction, this question itself really raises some points and deserves some attention. The original design of this process was that the community vision, you know, at a very broad level should guide the individual themes and policies of the rest of the Plan. That's how it was set up. Remember, in the very initial themes, you spent a lot of time on the vision and introduction chapter because you knew it was going to have huge implications for the rest of the Plan. And we should stick with this original design of a community vision driving the policies, the fundamental basis of the Comp Plan, and we hope you stick with that process. With regard to the FLUP, we believe that there are other options than those listed, one being that at a minimum you discuss the role of the future land-use plan or FLUP and how it is structured to function with the themes and policies of this Plan. You know, if you decide that you don't want to review the individual district maps, the characterizations, all the details of that, you know, a recommendation on whether you agree with incorporating highly detailed parcel-level looking maps without analysis as a part of the Comp Plan, it's an important broad planning discussion that you should answer before it goes to the electives. As we have stated, it's important to not oversimplify the role of the future land-use plan. It's simply a step between the themes and the Land Development Regulations. It's intended to be an element of the Comp Plan that actually makes it predictable. So, with that in mind, we hope that you would vote to at least discuss the intended and purpose of that section of the Plan before sending your draft on to the electives. Before concluding with our comments on the review, we request that you vote on another item, which is the central question, this process looking forward. Is your intent for Staff to do another rewrite, so if you go through your new ideas, reconsiderations, reconciliation, which is scheduled to be discussed in hearings in June, are you expecting to see another rewrite? And if so, do you expect to do another review of that before it goes to the electives, or are you just planning on sending a list of your ideas, reconsiderations, that you hope, you know, the electives consider when they're looking at the draft that's released and expected on April 30th? Again, if the draft is to change considerably based on the June hearings, it's important for the public to have an adequate understanding of what those changes will look like before the electives begin their review. I guess in short, what product do you expect to come out of the hearings in June and do you expect to review them again before sending it on to the electives? With regard to theme six, we raised a number of key issues and concerns in written comment that we hope are addressed. We also encourage you to incorporate much of the public's suggestions, including many of the thorough comments that were provided by Friends of Pathways. We also urge these boards to consider what the consultants brought to the table last week. You know, as it's been indicated, the draft theme six is a starting point, but it's by no means as complete or as useful as chapter eight of the 1994 Plan that we have today. You know, all in all, there was some excellent debate and consensus when the consultants were in Town and we hope that you build on that tonight with your recommendations and votes. Lastly, just to give you an update. As you know, the Alliance and the Chamber of Commerce are working on the effective population study. Some of the data that we thought was compiled isn't compiled, and compiling that and making summaries is taking a little bit longer than we expected. So if your meeting is actually due in next week, we don't want to commit to April 8th as being when we would present. We wanted to let you know in the next few weeks we would, at a minimum, get the report to you in written form if you ??, and I'm asking if you have any questions about that. That's all for now. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Good evening, Tim Young, Executive Director of Friends of Pathways. Thanks a lot for letting me comment. I have submitted a letter, which I won't go into again, but I did comment on it last week, and I appreciate your consideration of those comments. I just wanted to fill in a couple of thoughts as I continue to listen to your dialog here with the Commissions, particularly to address the question of how to address chapter eight in the Plan in theme six as it's currently drafted here. And a suggestion I'd like to put forth to the Commissions to consider is given the existing level of detail in chapter eight, which is I think recognized as being more mature than some of the other chapters in the existing Comprehensive Plan, to take advantage of the level of detail as much as practical and include it in theme six. And by that I mean...I'm thinking of two categories. There are those items that I think a majority of you would agree with and, if that's the case, I think it would be appropriate to include those now in the document because so much work is already in place. It's a relatively non-controversial component when you start talking about transportation demand management that that could be in theme six a little more completely. And I might touch on a couple of others as well. There could be a second category that we might categorize as larger issues that are not resolved at this point in time and that probably do require some more analysis and study before reasonable bodies could make a decision. Without thinking of what the answer should be, just let me suggest that the North Bridge from the Village to the airport might rise to that level of an issue that's...I don't think you have the ability to make a decision on that as you move forward. Perhaps Tribal Trails Road, do you have enough information like to...I don't know. But if you were to look at those problematic thornier issues that probably require more data and study and put those in one box and take the substantial number of issues, which are actually not that controversial, which would be very beneficial and have had a lot of discussion and are quite mature in the existing document, and integrate those into your Commissions' revised theme six. I think that might bridge the gap between not being overly specific in this Comp Plan, which seems to be the tone of your other chapters, but recognizing good work where it exists and preventing having to redo much of the study that's really ready to be incorporated with modest editorial efforts to include it in this theme. For example, some of the things that come to my mind that are probably not that controversial that would have broad support, the complete streets terminology and the idea that updating Town and County street standards, road standards, is appropriate. I think that's almost universally supported. We could include it now. Adding traffic count information where we have it, at least for the last decade, would be appropriate. There's good data that WYDOT keeps every year on traffic counts of your main corridors. And that would really give us a good idea of traffic going up or down. There's data for the last couple of years as this process has gone on. It'd be interesting to see, for example, has the south highway actually gone down in the last couple of years as the economy has changed. I'd just like to know that and I don't. But I do know the data exists. It'd be easy to include it in this chapter as you have it now and it would help all of us as you move forward. The transportation improvement program is really something fundamental that should be incorporated and you could reference that I think, and my comments did refer to that, the letter that's on file. The transportation demand management, another I think well-supported theme. Regional transportation I think is a theme that is well supported. Just improve the terminology from being too specific with the Regional Transportation Authority, which is defined in Wyoming statutes, and allow yourself a little more room in that with regional transportation systems or terms that will allow you a couple of choices and not box you in too much. I also suggested administrative strategies are really well developed in chapter eight. It's something that was vitally needed and it may be appropriate to include that as an Appendix. It may be more detailed than you decide the theme six, but it's so well constructed as it stands now. It's so vital to progress for transportation planning model for our community that it would be appropriate to put that in an Appendix type or if there's another mechanism to do that. But to take the good work that's in chapter eight and bring that forward as it stands with revisions that obviously make sense as time ?? And I think one thing that's...that you might look at and make a recommendation on, this summer 2010 would be a great time to do an update of travel study. It was last done in 2001. It was done in 1996 before that. It's a really important tool. It's generally agreed in transportation planning. Professionals say it's one of those tools that you use when you need to gather data. This would be I would suggest a very important year to gather that. It's just something that goes in someone's budget as a recommendation you might make. And before this whole thing is approved, you would actually have some really useful new information you could gather from that. So, thank you very much for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. To quickly address first off process, a couple of suggestions. We would suggest that you not limit comments to only one meeting. That's one of the items for discussion. And we certainly would discourage only allowing discussion of items that are in the Staff Report. That we feel is only going to further insulate and alienate the public from the process. We really feel it is important to...if there is good oral comments that happen in the meeting, that at least you guys be allowed to discuss that. We would also question the need to limit to 45 minutes. If I am the last person tonight, we're only going to go about 32, 33 minutes, and I think out of all the meetings, very rarely have we gone over the 45 minutes. So, I would ask you at least one question whether that is really necessary to limit it to 45 minutes. In most cases, I think people have been respectful. There's been a lot of good dialog. And I'm not sure we need to have an arbitrary time limit. I think overall for the whole process we've averaged much less than 45 minutes. And I'm not going to blame, I just want it on the record here. On transportation then, we'd like to hope there's one thing that we learned from last week that if it is to be effective, there really is a need for a comprehensive transportation analysis, the improvements that are needed to accommodate future growth. That has to be the basis of what we do. And those improvements that are needed have to be both possible, both from a technical and financial standpoint. We can't ignore those things as we go forward. There's no discussion in the Staff Report, but hopefully you guys will discuss updating functional classifications to reflect our current condition. We have changed and there is really a need to update that. We agree with Tim's earlier comments about take the ?? now, the harder ones as a good warm up. Lastly, I'd like to leave you with one thought and that is the need for the decisions to be based on data. I think we all agree with that, but we tend to do a lot of things based on our own perceptions. An example I would give you of that is that what we all talk about we don't want four-lane roads. Plenty of data from last year from WYDOT was that south of Town when the road widened to four lanes, wildlife mortality actually went down, rather than up. Now, does that mean that I would favor four-lane roads? Absolutely not. What I would say is that we need to study that more and understand why. There's a couple of possibilities there. One is good and one is bad. One possibility is by widening the road, we allow more visibility and gave people more opportunity to avoid collisions. You know, that would be a good thing. The bad thing is maybe we did actually isolate the animals from one side to the other. But I think the point to be made there is the real need to base these decisions on real data and not just data that reinforces our own opinions, but it needs to be data that we understand the underlying causes and effects here, and that's really important as we go forward. Again, not that I'm out espousing four-lane roads, but I think it really is important that we understand the impacts of the things that we do and make sure that what we're proposing to do really does accomplish the goals that we want to. And go back...that's interesting and if the road is there, but we need to go back and look at that data now and see what is the real effect, rather than just folding up our hands and say, well, we should have never done this or, well, this solved all our problems. We really need to understand these basic things. Thank you.
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Language precluding consideration of a north crossing should be removed from the Plan
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	A north crossing should be identified in the list of projects to consider
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	In addition to the five project identified in the April draft, the projects identified in the Pathways Master Plan and Transit Development Plan (START) should be incorporated by reference
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan should be clarify that each of the five projects identified as necessary in the April draft should be studied for full system improvement and pursued
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The commissions believe more emphasis should be placed on working with WYDOT to complete mutually beneficial projects
4/1/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Theme 6 should state the community's transportation vision and values, so that they can be implemented through regulations and more detailed transportation planning and analysis in other documents (April draft structure)

Date	Name	Comment
3/25/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	08Theme610-03-25Alliance.pdf March 25, 2010 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Theme Six Comments Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to Theme Six - "Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy." Attached are line-by-line comments and suggestions for discussion related to Theme Six. Listed below are key points that we hope are clarified in discussion and/or incorporated into a new draft of this chapter. First, it is important to specifically identify how Chapter Eight of our existing plan is going to be used and integrated with the draft's Theme Six. During a previous workshop, it was suggested that both Chapter Eight and Theme Six will be included as part of the new Comp Plan. Clarification on how this will work is essential. As we have consistently voiced throughout this process, in many cases the new draft is a step backwards from the existing plan. Perhaps nowhere is this more obvious than in the chapter on transportation. Please read and revisit Chapter Eight of our existing plan before you start your recommendations/voting on the new Theme Six chapter. In comparison to the new chapter on transportation, the existing chapter, which was adopted in 2000, would provide better guidance in terms of predictability, measurability and accountability than the new draft. As voiced in the March 23 workshops, much of the problem is not how the 2000 plan was written, but rather that it hasn't been followed or enforced. The hard work that has gone into previous planning efforts should be built upon and enhanced, not weakened or eliminated. Second, we fully agree with the points raised by transportation consultant Robert Bernstein that this process should include a comprehensive transportation analysis that is beyond what has been provided to date. The improvements necessary to support the expected growth outlined by a proposed Future Land Use Plan must be identified. Otherwise, decisions could be made without an adequate understanding of their implications. We also would like to see more discussion on the importance of setting infrastructure goals based on an understanding of fiscal impacts, which was a key discussion point at the morning workshop on March 23. One of the more compelling points made was that creating a fiscally constrained plan is what helps a community set realistic priorities. Without this component of knowing whether improvements and projects are financially feasible, the plan could result in simply a wish list with little guidance for prioritized implementation. You must ask – what does our community need to support anticipated growth, in terms of transportation infrastructure, and can we afford it, both financially and in terms of achieving other community priorities, like wildlife protection? Third, and related to our concerns with not using our existing plan as a strong foundation for the new plan, there are critical elements missing from the new chapter. As an example, one of the three main land use strategies in our existing plan is "eliminating transportation demand by reducing the overall amount of residential development in the county." However, there is no mention in the new chapter about how the overall amount of development is a factor in traffic growth rates. While the concept of shifting development into the town and mixed-use villages concept is included in the existing plan, there was clear recognition that in order for these land use strategies to bring benefits, the shift had to be combined with the continuation of conservation easements. Interestingly, the clear language about the need for continuation of permanent conservation easements, as a transportation strategy, (in terms of "incremental trip reduction") has been removed in the new draft. The following is the strategy statement in our existing plan: "Facilitate conservation acquisitions including seeking funding in locations where removal of vehicular traffic from roadway corridors has the greatest benefit on the transportation system." No such statement exists in the new chapter on transportation. It needs to be reinstated. Fourth, as suggested in public comment, the new chapter needs to reinstate a much broader focus and clearer policies to implement a multi-modal system. Language should be incorporated that speaks to the ideal goal outlined in the March 23 workshop, that the policies must directly create the conditions and opportunities that allow

Date

Name

Comment

people to choose not to drive. Within these policies, realistic identification of existing conditions and challenges, which are unique to Jackson Hole and not Anytown USA, is also really important. Understanding and recognizing traveling behaviors associated with lifestyles in Teton County is important in achieving overall goals. Friends of Pathways has provided excellent comments to help improve the language regarding implementation of a multi-modal system.

Fifth, our existing plan includes considerable language that links all community goals to community character preservation. For example, the first goal of our existing transportation chapter is to “systematically plan for future mobility that meets the needs of residents and tourists within the context of community character.” Many of the previous planning decisions regarding transportation infrastructure have been related to rural character preservation. However, the new draft does not speak to this concept, which is a concern.

Finally, when discussing the role of land-use patterns (i.e. compact centers and dispersed patterns) as it relates to transportation, it is essential to not oversimplify the issue. The Conservation Alliance supports the need for confined development footprints, but we have not supported the way the new draft implemented the nodal concept, specifically the manner in which “nodes” were defined. All nodes, centers, or confined development footprints are not created equal, which the new draft failed to address. The larger context, which includes location, scale and type of development within these areas, must be considered and analyzed in order to evaluate the benefits and costs. Also, in many of these identified areas, there is already considerable development potential still on the table. Ultimately, the capacity to uphold community priorities will weaken through time if our community’s vision of planning is to simply promote more growth (physical expansion) in places where growth has occurred in the past – in spite of whether those areas are important in terms of wildlife, scenic vistas and small mountain town character preservation.

We urge you to evaluate this chapter with the larger goal of the planning process in mind. We shouldn’t get so far beyond the basic point of this process – to improve and refine our existing plan – that we forget what we can build upon. We urge you to direct staff to not only carry out the additional modeling and analysis upon which your decisions can be better informed, but also to reincorporate the positive work that is in our existing chapter on transportation.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson

Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate

Date	Name	Comment
3/24/2010	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	08Theme610-03-24Bloom.pdf Rich Bloom – March 23, 2010 Comprehensive Plan Theme 6 Comments Support for the Friends of Pathways modification on the statement of ideal - especially the last sentence. • “Town of Jackson and Teton County residents and visitors will be able to safely, efficiently, and economically move into, within, and out of the county by a variety of transportation choices that comprise an interconnected, multi-modal system based on conservation of energy, enhancement of public health, and fuels that are clean and renewable. The transportation system will allow for viable populations of all native species, the preservation of natural scenic vistas, and the safe, unimpeded movement of wildlife.” Incompleteness in WYDOT Based Model: • Citizens and electeds need the best available information to make sound policy decisions. • As the consultant Carlos Hernandez stated in today’s presentation – the modeling done as part of the comp plan “is not the best available tool to determine roadway design.” • In particular as consultant Rob Bernstein stated today “you need to determine the improvements to support your proposed growth. This was not done. You need a full traffic analysis based on the full comprehensive plan proposal; you need to indentify the list of improvements to meet the plan’s growth objective - including new roadway links, intersection and interchange improvements and additional capacity – e.g. widening of existing roadways.” • Rob concluded with “This would have provided the information on your growth choices in how they will affect roadway costs, impacts and their desirability.” • Simply we did not get the feedback on what the draft plan meant as far as build-out, effective population and the required transportation improvements to know what our decisions would actually engender. If we had - I think we would have had a much more meaningful discussion on possible growth reduction strategies as we worked through this plan review. Circular Thinking: • Identifying your total growth goal. I believe you will hear that again tonight from the consultants as a start point for what you then must model and plan for. The joint planning commissions have already decided on a slightly different approach. • Absent that then - do the modeling as proposed by the transportation consultants once the draft is accepted but before it becomes law. Otherwise we still will not know the implications of our decisions. Then be willing to revisit our decisions once the public understands the implications of the revised plan. • You will hear there is no silver bullet for transportation solutions – both total growth and pattern of growth are inseparable issues. As Michael Kinsley – growth expert from the Rocky Mountain Institute said when he visited: “Smart growth that is additive growth – can not be called smart!” Revisiting nodal development without discussing how you will achieve the shift in development patters (e.g. TDRs) will not move the plan forward – only backwards. • You need to deal with the build-out and/or cap of growth if you want to reduce the ultimate impacts growth makes on transportation systems. Mitigating impacts only through pattern of development and multi-model approaches is incomplete. We have discussed this at length. • Compact centers (nodes) will likely be revisited as you move into this theme. O Listen to the consultants carefully and do not over estimate the achievable mitigation of compact centers. O Patterns of behavior will still be important. Folks housed in Wilson working in Town or those housed near Cottonwood Park working at the village will only modestly reduce transportation demands. Likewise folks living near Cottonwood Park recreating at the

Village, skiing the pass or visiting Grand Teton Park will also not reduce transportation demands. The only sure way to reduce impacts – is to address and reduce the total build-out.

Rich Bloom – March 23, 2010

- As I said months ago on why citizens were so reluctant about the nodal concept – why does it seem there are no acceptable receiving areas (Wilson, Aspen, South Park, Teton Village)?

O The nodes were additive growth as proposed in the draft plan.

O The nodes were much too aggressive in footprint and in total housing numbers.

O The nodal approach did not appear to accomplish certain community priorities such as achieving the permanent protection of open space.

O The locations were selected in the FLUP maps without first updating the natural and scenic overlay maps (NRO and SRO).

- The community may be willing to support the concept of nodes if it is considered WITHIN the following constraints:

- o Absolutely can not be ‘gamed’ to achieve additive growth.

O That nodes be used to address substitutive growth only – not adding, but rather shifting growth patterns.

- Do not revisit nodal development in Theme 6 unless you go back and also resolve the issues on growth caps, on how to incentivize permanent open space if the County PRD tool was removed, a workable Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, the converting of some commercial to residential zoning, or down zoning significant areas if you intend to upzone any compact centers (nodes).

- As I have said before - the Planned Residential Development (PRD) tool does NOT depend on the node concept to work. So nodes as proposed in the plan are not connected to the PRD tool.

- In closing relative to greater South Park:

- o We will already be achieving transportation and other goals without indentifying a new ‘expansion area’ to Town. It already exists.

O Next week the PRD tool will come out of moratorium. On Robert Gill’s property as one example – there are 35 acres zoned as Suburban across from Cottonwood Park.

At 4 DUA (four dwelling units per acre) this equates to 140 housing units, 25% of which must be Category 1-3 affordable.

O In addition Mr. Gill has approximately 1,000 additional acres zoned rural. With the current unmodified PRD tool – 85% of this acreage can be permanently preserved as open space while locating some 257 additional housing units (maximizing the 9/35 clustering incentive) in the most logical location on his two parcels – in northern South Park. Again 25% of these units would be required by law to be category 1-3 affordable workforce housing.

O The neighbors are also open to financially assisting Mr. Gill via a land trust to achieve any personal desires he may have to protect the ranch if this is simply too much development.

O So why would the community want the proposed 1,500 unit node (more than the entirety of greater South Park to date including Cottonwood Park, Rafter J, Melody Ranch, 3 Creek Ranch, South Park Ranches, Shooting Iron, Indian Springs Ranch, Flat Creek Fishing Club etc.) identified in South Park where zoning could then be selectively changed?

O A significant ‘node’ already de-facto exists via the LDR’s and zoning maps that also achieves other community values such as protecting open space and wildlife habitat.

Date	Name	Comment
		O South Park WILL push back if needed housing to support growth and jobs on the west bank or north of town are dumped unnecessarily into South Park! O South Park has it own significant documented wildlife, scenic and agricultural values that we intend to achieve protection of as development occurs. That has always been our regional pattern of development. O Please let South Park work with its large land owners, and within the existing zoning and LDR's, to achieve regional open space AND workforce housing – while at the same time achieve smarter patterns of development that better meet the transportation objectives you will be discussing in this theme. We already have the tools in place without the cancerous 1,500 unit South Park NODE returning. Thank you for all the hours you continue to spend on this process – it is appreciated! - Rich Bloom
3/23/2010	Buckstaff, Sandy Interested Public	Sandy ?? from Nelson Engineering. I worked with the Transportation Technical Committee on the Plan that you have that dates back ten years. In fact, I think I was the chairman of that committee by the same process that Sean is now the chairman of this committee. I heard in the question of the gentleman over here something that I think probably ought to be dispelled and that is that our peak traffic is three months, it's in the summer, and gee we can blame it on the others who come to our community. In fact, our peak is longer than three months. It extends more like five or six months. And one of the things that we found ten years ago and we find today is to a certain extent the old colloquialism is true—we have met the enemy and the enemy is us. A lot of that traffic comes from us. It's not easy to just blame it on the folks that come to our community.
3/23/2010	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Dave Kuhn, Teton County. It's kind of a big-picture question, so I think everybody needs to get out their crystal balls or weegie boards. We've got a core of the professionals—Carlos and Robert, the Transportation Advisory Committee, and I think all of you that are on the planning staffs. I guess with our propensity to procrastinate as a community on making these tough decisions, are we looking far enough out on our modelings and traffic estimations? I see 2020/2025. Maybe should we be looking more at 2040/2055, just because, you know, it takes us so long to make these decisions, and with funding sources probably becoming tougher, not easier, in the future, do we need to take a bigger-picture look and not just on paved roads but multi-modal types. I think Tim was talking about ten, realistically talking, \$15-a-gallon gas or is there going to be gas? You know, what really are our transportation future needs beyond this 15-year projection or whatever we're looking at here. Kind of a second question to the professionals of these modeling systems you're using...I wasn't clear, are you using kind of a peak simulation or a daily-use, or is it a combination? I see a July date up there, which is kind of peakish, but I didn't see the April stuff. We are a seasonal kind of, you know, community that has those three months of huge influx in the summer. Just some basic questions, so.
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Development should pay its share of the costs of necessary future facilities and services so that they are not passed along to existing residents
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	7.2.a: Amend language to read: "The town and county will implement and update..." rather than "...consider updating..."
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	A goal of the community should be to provide redundancy in services/facilities in case something should happen to our ability to cross geographic barriers
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Plan to provide community facilities through an annual, rolling 5 year Community Capital Improvement Plan that responds to the needs and desires of the community at the time
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Why is this theme addressed: add parks and other agencies to the list of services in the community

Date	Name	Comment
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Direct staff to amend the strategies and indicators sections to be consistent with the policy changes recommended by the commissions (Themes 2, 3, 4 & 5 approach)
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add waste management/recycling, stewardship of wildlife and natural resources, and energy conservation to the list of community services that would have LOS plans in Policy 7.1.a
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Remove any perceived prioritization of importance of services from Policy 7.1.a
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Critical facilities (to be defined at a later date) should be designed to provide the desired level of service to the peak effective population, but other community facilities should not
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Level of Service methodology for community service provision should be implemented: through a timely public process the community and service providers should define acceptable levels of service, identify barriers to the provision of that service, and create plans for service provision
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Direct staff to include fiscal responsibility language in the Theme 7 Statement of Ideal
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Housing for critical service providers (to be defined later) should be prioritized in our housing program
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	7.3.b discussion should be expanded beyond the westbank and Alta by adding more examples or taking examples out
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Housing for non-critical community service providers should not be addressed in Theme 7
3/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Critical service provider housing should be allowed on-site as an exception to caps on residential development

Date	Name	Comment	
3/18/2010	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	(Teton County Travel Study can be reviewed in the Planning Departments) Town of Jackson and Teton County P.O. Box 1727 Jackson, WY 83001 ~ Submitted via email Subject: Comprehensive Plan Comment on Theme 6 Dear Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissioners, On behalf of Friends of Pathways, I would like to submit the following comments on the Theme 6 – Develop; a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy in the Draft Jackson/Teton Comprehensive Plan (Plan). Friends of Pathways is a private non-profit with 1,200 members serving Teton County, the Town of Jackson and the greater Teton region. Friends of Pathways advocates the funding, construction, maintenance, and use of pathways, trails, and complete streets through advocacy, educational outreach, and public/private partnerships. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. One over all comment is regarding statements made by Town and County Planning staff that the current Comprehensive Plan Chapter 8 Transportation is to be continued whole-cloth as “an appendix to the new Theme 6.” There are two problems with this. One, Theme 6 does not articulate this; one could argue, in fact, it does not say that. Second, the Theme 6 as proposed contains substantial reductions in goals and outcomes than the current Chapter 8, and would force the question, what are the real community transportation goals? These concerns are developed further in this comment letter, but the planning process must clarify just what our starting point is in the important discussion of transportation in the new Comprehensive Plan. Friends of Pathways (FOP) comments start with the Community Vision on page 7, and then shift to the Transportation Theme 6 starting on page 59 (of the spring 2009 draft Plan). Quotes from the draft Plan are highlighted in italics with page numbers for reference. Page 13. Community Vision, Strategy Theme 6, Transportation “The most sustainable way to provide for the community mobility is through alternate modes of transportation such as transit, walking, carpooling, and bicycling. Part of enabling this change is by placing people in closer proximity to services and by providing travel choices—through a nodal development pattern and increased funding for transit and other travel modes. A larger part is changing way we think about transportation options.” FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 2 of 2 FOP generally supports this general vision for Theme 6 Multi-modal transportation. We recommend this section should be improved with adding that TDM, or Mobility Management, is another one of the list of key solutions, along with walking, bicycling, transit, and Ride Share (perhaps better term than carpooling). The term nodal might be replaced more successfully with words like village or town, terms people have more association with than nodal. Also, the final sentence should simply state “...increased funding for the Active Transportation modes (we suggest use of “Active Transportation” term compared to “alternative transportation modes”), not just “...for transit and other travel modes”, which could be interpreted to mean wider roads. Page 59. Current Theme 6 - Statement of Ideal “Reduce resident and visitor reliance on single occupancy vehicles while still allowing safe, efficient, and economic travel” This statement could be one of several plan goals, but it is nowhere near inclusive or measurable enough for a Statement of Ideal for the entire transportation system. Friends of	March 18, 2010

Pathways would like to suggest the following alternative statement. This is based on a significant effort by the Sustaining Jackson Hole project that worked on the transportation issue for 3 years. It incorporates the input and support of over a dozen transportation, planning, and energy professionals and experts familiar with our community and its challenges.

Statement of Ideal – Friends of Pathways - Suggested Alternative:

“Town of Jackson and Teton County residents and visitors will be able to safely, efficiently, and economically move into, within, and out of the county by a variety of transportation choices that comprise an interconnected, multi-modal system based on conservation of energy, enhancement of public health, and fuels that are clean and renewable. The transportation system will allow for viable populations of all native species, the preservation of natural scenic vistas, and the safe, unimpeded movement of wildlife.”

Comment Theme 6 - Why is this theme addressed: Include more key Issues

The opening section would be improved with a better statement of the problems, thus better providing the answer to the question, “Why is this theme addressed?”

The draft Theme 6 primarily mentions the problem of roadway widening. There are significant additional reasons why this theme is addressed that should be developed in the Plan, these are:

- Environmental impacts of transportation (climate change, air/water/noise pollution)
- Energy issues, including goals to reduce use of fossil fuel and promoting alternative fuels
- Public health impacts of auto-centric transportation (obesity, diabetes, cardio vascular disease)

- Economic impacts to JH of a changing world, where the cost of oil will continue to rise.

Comment – Mode Shift goals should be increased, not decreased

On page 59-60, the draft Plan states a substantially reduced goal for shifting trips – Why?

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 3 of 3

Draft Plan Page 59-60

“This will require that an additional 10% of all trips along these major corridors be shifted out of single occupancy vehicles into another travel mode. Transit offers the most viable alternative to vehicular travel, however, roadway designs that use the “complete streets” principle will help ensure that roads safely accommodate all modes of travel.”

This is a significant reduction from the current Comprehensive Plan. Today’s Plan includes goals adopted by the Town of Jackson and Teton County in 2000 that are to increase “ride share 1%, walking 4%, bicycling 4%, and transit 5%”, which add up to a combined 14% mode shift goal by 2020 under current policy. [Page 8-22 of Chapter 8 – Transportation, Third Printing, October 2002] The draft Plan therefore represents nearly a one third reduction of the current community goal for mode shift.

Friends of Pathways does not support any reduction in the modal shift goals for the new Plan. It would be a step backwards from current policy, incompatible with the vision chapter of this draft Plan, and runs counter to the public opinion received in the Comprehensive Plan process. All Plan surveys clearly showed the public overwhelmingly supports multi-modal transportation, including pathways, bicycle, walking, and transit. Residents also support public investments to construct needed facilities and operate these active transportation systems safely and efficiently. In fact, public support for Pathways was typically higher than any other mode of travel in surveys as well as the recent SPET election.

This Plan should deliver on the public’s desire for a real multi-modal system that is among the best in the country. Such a system would go the farthest in minimizing environmental impacts of motor vehicle travel, and would overall be the best for wildlife and all natural resources. This means:

1. Completing the pathways system.
2. Greatly improving the pedestrian walkways in Jackson and all the mixed use villages
3. Making every street a complete street that serves all the users.
4. Expanding the START system, making it viable for more of the community and adding new routes to Wilson, the Airport, National Parks, and connecting to the region.
5. Working collaboratively on transportation projects with WYDOT, Bridger-Teton National Forest, and Grand Teton National Park.
6. Use the best of alternative fuel technology to minimize the carbon footprint of Jackson Hole's transportation system.
7. Developing a high level of expertise in successful participation in federal funding for transportation projects - through the STIP and a wide range of federal grant opportunities in SAFETEA-LU the federal transportation bill, and other federal programs.

It also means leadership-level participation in the new Linx regional transportation system now underway and being formed with support from the ARRA Stimulus funds, Idaho Transportation Department, and Yellowstone Business Partnership. START should be interconnected with the entire regional transportation system now being developed.

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 4 of 4

Imagine full access to our region including the parks with one simple ticket connecting us to our neighboring communities and beyond. This regional transit system is underway, and the Plan should specifically include recognition and policy support. FOP believes it is important to broaden the Plan's view of our region to include mention of future transit connections the next step beyond Teton Valley and Alpine to connect Jackson to the main greater Yellowstone gateway cities like Idaho Falls, Bozeman and others, and to Yellowstone, the hub of regional tourism. This is needed to support the future of travel in our region, including sustainable access for tourism, as gas prices will continue to climb over the next few decades and life of this Plan. Forward thinking goals should be a hallmark of this Plan, and taking steps backwards in mode shift would be the wrong way to go. Instead, the Plan should be revised to set higher goals and take much more advantage of the synergy of a comprehensive transportation strategy and action plan. This is possible - Many progressive local governments in America are achieving mode shift changes that exceed these levels, and most European nations are well above this - the Netherlands has bike mode share of 30% nationwide. Jackson Hole's Plan must as well. Goals such as the following should be considered:

Mode Share of all transportation trips* - Proposed by Friends of Pathways:

- 10% Bicycle
- 10% Walking
- 10% Transit
- 10% TDM Reduction of motor vehicle trips
- 10% Ride Share reduction of motor vehicle trips
- 50% Total Alternative Mode share of all Jackson Hole trips by 2030.

*(Note "one trip" is travel of one block or more, for any purpose)

Comment: The Plan must rely on a combination of all active transportation solutions. One important example of how the draft Plan language could be significantly improved is this statement on page 60, which is repeated in the draft Plan in multiple locations:

Page 60.

"Transit offers the most viable alternative to vehicular travel..."

This statement should be revised to more accurately reflect the reality that a combination of strategies will be required for Jackson's transportation future. Each active transportation mode – Walk, Bike, Transit - has advantages, and works well in some, but typically not all,

circumstances.

Therefore the statement should be expanded to properly support the key additional alternative modes and key programs. Modern transportation research is clear – successful communities are using a combined, multi-modal approach, which is what the draft Plan claims to embrace. Thus, the language changes proposed are consistent with the intent of the Plan.

For the new Plan to succeed it must proposed more specific, comprehensive, and integrated solutions. A proposed improved statement would be:

FOP Suggested change:

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 5 of 5

Transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes (including the pathways system) offer alternatives to private motor vehicle travel for many trips. These “Active Transportation” modes have the lowest environmental impacts and help lower Jackson’s carbon footprint, and will be encouraged.

In addition to embracing all the “Active Transportation” modes of Walk/Bike/Transit, the Plan needs to include a more robust Mobility Management strategy (or Transportation Demand Management). This must also play a key role in shifting private motor vehicle trips to lower impact modes and methods.

Each mode has its benefits and challenges, and the Plan needs to embrace all the active modes to fully develop a multi-modal system. Bicycle and walking are great for short to medium trip lengths, and since research shows 40% of all trips are 2 miles or less, there is substantial potential to increase these trips. Transit works well on fixed routes, including in-Town, Teton Village routes, and commuter routes from Teton Valley and Alpine. Today’s START system can be expanded in service frequency and with enhanced buses, which will increase use. The Plan should endorse potential transit extensions to the Airport and Grand Teton National Park, additional routes like Wilson and South Park, and better service to mixed use villages. Bike and walk modes can also be combined well with Transit, leveraging more use.

Page 61.

“Principles and Policies 6.1 - Increase the share of trips made by alternative modes, especially transit”

Same comment, this must be revised to be more inclusive. There is no magic bullet in transit, which in fact it is very expensive and the Plan even acknowledges on p. 60 it does not serve all the dispersed sections of our community. The other active modes frequently are more cost effective, serve most of Jackson Hole, are better for public health goals, and are the clear environmental winners. The best modes from an environmental sustainability standpoint are clearly the active modes of bicycling and walking – nothing else comes close. Transit is important and is more efficient than single passenger vehicles; FOP supports transit, but it is only one of the viable options that should be prioritized.

Page 61.

“Policies 6.1.a: Establish a permanent funding source for transit”

Friends of Pathways strongly recommends this Permanent Funding Source policy be expanded to include pathway, pedestrian and bicycle systems needs in any new funding source. For example, pedestrian facilities are one of the most important and challenging areas that need investment. The Town of Jackson and all Teton County villages have seriously deficient walkway systems, substantially fail in ADA compliance, have long capital needs lists, and limited funding sources. Pathways maintenance is equally very important to preserve the investments, encourage use, and provide high quality service. But funds for pathway maintenance are challenging to find, and would also benefit from a permanent funding source.

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 6 of 6

Page 62.

“Policies 6.1.c: Research Regional Transportation Authority Viability”

This Policy section should be expanded to reflect the significant Regional Transportation Planning that is currently underway in our Teton/Yellowstone Region. The Plan should reference the Regional Transportation Concept Plan recently completed by the Idaho Transportation Department and the Yellowstone Business Partnership, which has recommended a Transportation Co-Op be formed. The Linx Co-Op is now a reality and is in Pilot phase. It has received over \$535,000 in ARRA Transit Stimulus funding from ITD, and has a full time staff working on a regional transit pilot program.

The Linx Regional Transportation Plan recognized START as the most successful Transit System in the region. This regional transit planning offers Jackson a tremendous opportunity to connect regionally. The opportunity to expand on the somewhat limited Regional Transportation language in the draft Plan is significant. The Plan should be revised to establish a local vision for how Jackson will fit into a future regional transportation network of not only transit, but also pathways and complete streets.

Leveraging the means and resources of our Greater Yellowstone region, including Idaho and Montana communities and the two National Parks is a significant opportunity. The Plan touches on the topic, but should be more specific, clear, measureable, and inclusive.

Please revise the Plan to include policy support and commitment to participate in the regional transportation planning underway. This is important not only for our local transportation, but also to support the future of travel and tourism in the Greater Yellowstone. Simply relying on motor vehicles for regional access will not be adequate to achieve our goals in the future. For more information please see: <http://yellowstonebusiness.org/transportation/>

Page 62.

“Policies 6.1.d: Interconnect all modes...”

This 6.1.d is mostly a Transit statement; it should be expanded for all the modes.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.2 Reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicle travel”

The Principle 6.2 needs to be specific, “single occupancy [add] MOTOR vehicle travel”. One reason, a bicycle is defined as a vehicle by Wyoming statute. So the Plan should call out motor vehicle where that is intended.

Also, perhaps in this section, there should be a basic policy statement on the primary “active transportation” modes. Add a bicycle section, pedestrian section, pathway section, and transit. In addition, this may be the place to add significant policy statement on adding a “Mobility Management (or TDM)” section with measureable goals.

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 7 of 7

One of the world’s leading TDM experts Todd Litman has lectured in Jackson Hole on two recent occasions. Litman states that aggressive TDM programs can shift up to 20% of trips from high impact to lower impact via a mix of ride-share, employer, and neighborhood programs. See: <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/> Jackson could easily seek 10% TDM type motor vehicle reductions using off the shelf, proven programs.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.2.c Require Development to promote alternative modes...”

Should be expanded to require easements of developments to provide for sidewalk, pathways and transit needs. While a rational nexus must be met, that starts with good and specific policy support in comprehensive planning documents like this. Please add mention of this topic in the appropriate locations. This will help with future LDR revisions as well.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.2.d: Discourage single occupancy vehicles”

See comments above, this may be the place to add a “Mobility Management” or TDM policy.

Page 63.

“Principle 6.3—Maintain a safe, efficient, interconnected, multi-modal transportation system”

“Principle 6.3.b Coordinate network decisions...”

This should be substantially enhanced to spell out, in simple measureable ways, how all of Jackson’s Transportation Improvement Programs are developed, coordinated, and updated. Federal law requires states develop a STIP, and the current Comp Plan requires that an annual local TIP for Jackson Hole be developed. This is crucial policy to continue.

The reality is, the Town and County have substantially failed to follow through with this critical aspect of transportation planning. There is no on-going TIP as required by the current Comp Plan, which states:

2002 Comp Plan Page 8-47: “The Town and County will develop a Transportation Improvement Program that represents a master summary of the transportation components of the improvement programs developed by each agency and department.

Principle 6.3.c Review land use proposals...

This should also mention the concept of requiring reasonable easements for pathways, sidewalks, and/or transit needs.

Page 64: Potential Transportation Network Projects:

This section of the draft Plan only contains highway projects, and thus is a highly limited list.

A list of highway projects is appropriate in the Plan and should be included. However, it is equally critical a much broader list of improvements be included as well, and that the highway projects are being considered as meeting Complete Streets and Context Sensitive principles. The FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 8 of 8

list should include all known major Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian projects. As a starting point, this would need to include:

- West Broadway 5-Way Main Street Project: roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, a complete street project.
- WY-22 and West Broadway Pathway
- New START Transit Center
- Sidewalks in Town and mixed use villages
- Teton Village expansion follows Complete Streets concepts
- Hoback-Jackson South Project (Complete Street - highway, pathway, wildlife mitigation, river recreation access, and transit needs)

Draft Plan Page 65 - Strategies:

In general, the Theme 6 Strategies section is less specific and potentially less helpful than the current Transportation Chapter 8. It lacks measurable details and guidance on what is recommended, what agency is responsible for what actions, and does not adequately discuss how this plan is to be integrated with the WYDOT and Federal agencies STIP (State/National level).

Strategy 6.1: Establish a dedicated funding source for alternate modes of travel

Dedicate a seventh cent sales tax, additional mil property tax, or other funding source to the provision of infrastructure for alternate transportation modes with transit as the priority.

Comment: Strike Transit as priority. Transit should be one priority, but sidewalks and pathways are equally important and must also be in the eligible list for funding.

Strategy 6.3: Create a behavioral shift program to increase travel by alternate modes

Educate the community on alternative mode travel options and benefits.

Pursue home mail delivery.

Encourage or require students in all grades to take alternate modes of transportation to school rather than driving or being driven.

Pursue transit service between Jackson and the airport.

Establish a trip reduction coordinator to work with employers to reduce trips and facilitate carpooling.

Comment: As noted above in the policy section, this strategy needs to be better called out in the policies. This strategy is a good start, but would benefit by selecting a name – is it to be a TDM or Mobility Management Program? Those seem more descriptive than “behavioral shift”.

Also, transit service to the Airport is a new transit route, not behavioral shift, this should be shifted to a revised Strategy 6.2 for a more comprehensive transit strategy section, which could also include Regional Transportation Co-OP and Regional Transportation Authority strategies.

Strategy 6.4: Update road design standards

Include “Complete Streets” and “Context Sensitive Solutions” policies in road design regulations.

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 9 of 9

Include wildlife crossing and other wildlife mitigation standards in road design regulations.

Comment: The new Plan should go farther and formally adopt a strong Policy Statement on Complete Streets. This strategy can then be expanded then to show how the policy will be implemented. It should be more specific that it will apply to Town, County, and WYDOT. FOP would like to note it is very likely the U.S. Congress will include a new federally required Complete Streets policy in the big Transportation Reauthorization bill currently underway and expected to be completed next year. USDOT Secretary Ray LaHood has just announced strong new federal policies for planning for all modes.

Strategy 6.5: Update land use review standards

Concurrently review development projects for transportation impacts that can be mitigated.

Track incremental impacts and periodically evaluate their cumulative effect.

Institute a countywide transportation demand management program.

Adopt design standards to promote alternate modes of travel.

Reevaluate parking standards and other regulations that may promote the single occupancy vehicle.

Comment: Here, this should discuss how land use review could help TDM goals. The program itself should be covered above under behavioral shift, or TDM section. Additional mention of the need to secure easements for sidewalks, pathways, and transit should be noted.

Strategy 6.6: Cooperatively create, maintain, fund, implement, and monitor a joint town/county Transportation Capital Improvement Plan

Prioritize projects within the plan across all modes to implement this theme.

Establish permanent traffic counters for all modes of travel on specific corridors in order to monitor the effectiveness of crucial segments of the transportation system.

Comment: Cooperative planning for the TIP is an important topic, but as stated this is substantially incomplete and hard to track progress. It should spell out who is responsible to do it, and should be expanded to include WYDOT and the federal agencies, BTNF, GRTE, YELL, NER. It is worth reviewing the current Chapter 8, which has a much more specific process.

The unfortunate reality is the Town and County have not followed the adopted policy in Chapter 8 in recent years. However, this is not a reason to take key details out of the plan; rather,

Date**Name****Comment**

this should be an opportunity to redouble efforts on critical components like the development of the multi-modal local TIP. This is crucial for the success of any multi-modal system.

Strategy 6.7: Research a Regional Transportation Authority

Discuss with neighboring jurisdictions and state and federal officials the costs and benefits of a Regional Transportation Authority.

Discuss with neighboring jurisdictions improvements that can be made to the regional transportation system.

FOP Comprehensive Plan Comment – March 18, 2010; Page 10 of 10

See Earlier Comment: Teton County and Town should engage in the Linx Regional

Transportation project underway, and should explore the potential benefits of expanding on the Pilot Transportation Co-Op now underway with ARRA Stimulus transit funding. RTAs are one possible option, and should be explored. However, there is substantial opportunity to fund much the START system's needs through participation in the Regional System. This should be embraced fully in the Plan.

Page 66: Indicators:

The draft Plan Indicators are incomplete, far too general, and missing important items. The indicators should specifically set goals and track transit, bicycle and pedestrian mode share along with single and multi passenger motor vehicles. See FOP's proposed Mode-Shift goals earlier in this comment letter. The current Plan has good, measureable and specific goals - those should be expanded on, not reduced.

The Plan should also require an update of the Teton/Jackson Travel Study. This key study should be updated every 5 years as is called for in the current plan. Travel Studies are considered essential tools by noted transportation experts such as Dr. John Pucher, and are frequently used in leading communities. The County and Town have missed the last two cycles of Travel Plan updates. Friends of Pathways strongly recommends that an updated Travel Plan be incorporated into the Town/County plans for FY-11, and that a summer plan be conducted this summer, 2010. (see: <http://www.tetonwyo.org/plan/docs/SpecialReports/TetonCountyTravelStudy2001.pdf>)

On behalf of the Friends of Pathways Board of Trustees and our members we thank you again for your consideration of these comments. Please contact me if you have questions or wish more information on any of the points and issues raised.

Sincerely,

Tim Young, Executive Director

3/18/2010 ,

Joint Planning Commiss

Theme 8 should be drafted by staff with help from relevant community organizations after a hopes and dreams exercise, using Principle 1.3 and previous PC recommendations as a base, prior to any workshop or presentation to the commissions

Date	Name	Comment
3/18/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. We are also going to listen to what I just heard expressed some similar concerns. You've already seen our written comments on theme seven. We really hope that some of the fundamental concerns we outlined are put on the table for discussion. However, our verbal comments tonight are just going to be targeted to the need to discuss and clarify the next steps of your review process, which you touched on last week. You know, the Conservation Alliance has not spoken to the process for some time, but last week was a turning point. The public are the portion that has remained engaged and been patient in working within the process that was laid out, including the shift to not actually review the 2009 draft of the Plan but instead to just review broad questions by Staff. While we have questioned whether this is really what joint hearings, rather than workshops, should entail, we understood the rationale for wanting to focus on the big picture at this point and not the details of the Plan, particularly given the shape that the draft was in when it was released in April. While the process today of course can't be changed, we think there are a number of items related to the final review process that you can proactively act on to make the final review more effective and of greater benefit to the public. Overall, we speak to this process because of our direct concern with the end product. You know, we really feel that if this process suffers, the final product, which is the community Plan, will suffer as well. With that in mind, we will request that you set adequate time, if not tonight, on April 1st to outline the remaining tasks for your joint Commission. While we fully appreciate the difficulty of setting exact dates and timelines, we see no reason why your task or process description cannot be clearly identified. This is really important for making the process more understandable for the public. Basic questions should be on the table at this time, particularly given some of the recent suggestions and discussions that the review is almost over. We're just going to provide a few examples. You know, people wonder this—will the joint Planning Commission review a list of inconsistencies before Staff finishes the chapter rewrites, or will the rewritten drafts, you know, chapters three, four, five, six and seven, be released for public review prior to you going through inconsistencies? How long will the public have to review the full draft before your final hearings? Will you vote on...revote on items, or will your list of inconsistencies along with your rewritten drafts based on your original votes be forwarded to elected officials? These are just some basic questions that we really feel like are important to let the public know where you're heading. A couple of specific concerns that we really feel is critical is you need to talk about the future land-use plan. It's critical. Last week you discussed chapter eight but you didn't discuss whether you'll be discussing the role of the FLUP prior to being reviewed by elected officials. For months the Alliance has expressed concern about the need to clarify this. Perhaps particularly for those of you who are new, I'm not sure if you realize the potential consequences, the implications, and the intended role of the FLUP in the Comp Plan overall. As the FLUP maps are designed now, they are the key predictable element to guide future decisions, specifically directing which priorities and themes are going to take precedence and specific decisions in specific districts. At a minimum, prior to an initial review by electives, we think you, as a joint board, should discuss in a meaningful way whether you agree with the intended function and role of the future land-use plan. From the beginning, the Alliance has expressed concern about the disconnect between highly specific parcel level maps and the broader visionary function of the Comprehensive Plan. At the broad level, it's really important to understand how this Plan is going to work and how integral the FLUP map is to the structure and design of the Comp Plan, so it's got to be put on the table...very soon. Second, moving ahead, for the benefit of the public, we see room for improvement in your latter phase of the review. To be really frank, based on recent hearings, it has been really disappointing to see how little public or community preferences in common are being referred to in your discussions. Perhaps this is an unfortunate side effect from your review being so far removed from the years of energized public input. But too infrequently do we hear a mention of public vision or incorporation of many citizens' and organizations' ideas in the Plan. I'm just going to give an example. You know, somehow the initial review of the economy chapter was completed without sufficiently knowing or considering ideas from the Chamber of Commerce. I know that the Housing Habitat—I'm just going to throw out an example—Habitat for Humanity comments weren't even mentioned. And I just bring this up because the public isn't seeing the review, so it's really hard for us to know whether the rewrites are going to include any of this, given that you didn't take votes on the points raised. One more thing, perhaps some of you didn't participate in the years when substantial public comment was compiled from workshops, open houses, phone and web-mail surveys. We really believe that it's critical that you do not lose sight of the overall effort for this to be the community's Plan. I'm just going to provide an example from last week's meeting. We were disappointed to hear some of the comments about revisiting resort development language. The public has made it very clear that caps should be placed on resort developments and additional resort development is not a community priority. Polls showed a 77 to 82 percent agreement with caps, and only 11 to 13 percent of the public thought that additional resort development was appropriate. So we feel like it would be encouraging to see, you know, this mentioned when you're discussing these types of things. It's also interesting that the recent vote to repeal the resort zone in the County wasn't even mentioned. I mean, to be honest, backpedaling on an issue that has such clear importance to the public, it's concerning to hear and disappointing. I also want to point out the discussions continue to point to what seems like a common misunderstanding. There seems to be a perception that by capping resort development, no additional potential is possible, when in fact millions of square feet of commercial and residential development in resort zones are still going to be built beyond what we see on the ground. You know, it's critical to understand the extent of how much potential exists that's been approved but it simply hasn't been built yet. We feel like it's critical to have this information on the table when you're

Date	Name	Comment
		taking votes. So, with that, thanks for your patience. But we really request that you keep the best interest of the public and the community in mind during your individual debates. The preference is the community and how this Plan, from a planning perspective, is actually implementing these preferences, not just your own. We don't mean for this to sound exceptionally harsh, and your hours of work are really appreciated, but we really believe that to make the upcoming final review process more effective and more productive, you should devote adequate time to prepare and clearly outline your objectives for your final steps for the process. You know, don't forget that these weekly meetings that you put a lot of time into are intended to be hearings for a draft document that will have huge implications for the future of this Valley. And also the public needs to be given an adequate opportunity to review and to respond to what your process results will be. The clearer that can be made to the public, the sooner the better. Thank you.
3/18/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Relative to theme eight, since you brought it up last week, I made a specific request to you back in the fall that you direct Staff to immediately begin writing theme eight so that we wouldn't be in this position. Quite frankly, the importance of energy efficiency, energy sustainability issues warranted its own theme; we determined that. We also have a right, from a public perspective, we have a right to review this Plan holistically. The whole is bigger than the sum of its parts. So, I would respectfully request that you direct Staff tonight to immediately begin writing theme eight, especially considering the time that we've spent on this process. There's really no excuse for not having that done. You know, you can go back and listen to the tapes that you have my assertion, that I made that request of you in late fall. Relative to the theme seven, I don't have any philosophical disagreement with anything that any of you said in hopes and dreams last week. However, I have some pragmatic problems with some of the stuff that you had said. Quite frankly, throughout the process, and last week was no exception, we have...quite frankly, our idealism has been writing checks that our reality can't cash on a lot of these issues. The community asked specifically for theme seven. That's acknowledged within the text of theme seven. The reason that we asked for it was not to discuss burying power lines and moving landfills from Sublette County. We just...our position in asking for theme seven was to do an exhaustive if necessary fiscal impact analysis so that we could look at the cost of growth in the development, not look at the micro-supply solution, but look at the macro generation of demand for infrastructure and services. Quite frankly, a secondary reason was to codify concurrency, ironclad concurrency requirements that would prevent development from getting ahead of infrastructure. So I think maybe we looked at some easy-to-discuss type topics in theme seven and we lost the big picture. I have a request that when you pass the baton on to the joint electives in this process, that you also pass on an instruction book, quite frankly, in the form of an open forum, a workshop, a retreat, if you deem necessary, so that we don't repeat the mistakes that we've made in this process. We don't replicate inefficiencies that have been inherent in this process. You owe that much to the public. We made so many mistakes and have taken so long that you need to get together with them so that we don't again...if you don't know history, you're doomed to repeat it. Like Lincoln said, better than anyone else could say, if you have four hours to chop down a tree, you spend the first three hours sharpening your ax. So, let's do that in the form of foresight and preparation. The last thing I want to cover is responsibilities that I see you as having to discuss in this process from now to the end of this process. Number one is the fact that we did a complete and utter rewrite instead of a revision. How are we going to address, since you have saw fit not to continue the line-by-line, etc., how are we going to address these inefficiencies, sorry, these inconsistencies, etc.? Who's going to do it and when? As far as re-review goes, you also probably need to explain to the public how that process is going to play out, because I've heard varying accounts of how we're going to do that. And there's numerous examples I can bring up. I'll only bring up one specific and that of course is Mr. Walter's chomping at the bit to put the paddles to that flatline Frankenstein that we know as nodes. So that's something that we need to...don't spring that on the public at the last minute, please. Also, if we continue this process and continue to let it play out like it has been, we're going to write this thing right back around to where we started, right back to the status quo. We saw some of that with the resort discussion last week. The last thing, and most importantly in my mind, is you need to have some type of discussion and explain to the public how you're going to work the FLUP discussion. There was supposed to be the bridge between essentially the bark of the Comp Plan to the bite of the LDRs. It was supposed to codify consistency and predictability the public requested. And right now we don't even know if you're going to look at them or not. So, it's something that's very important. Thanks.
3/18/2010	McNutt, Jim National Museum of Wi	Arts & Economic Prosperity III: The Economic Impact of Nonprofit Arts and Culture Organizations and Their Audiences in Teton County , WY [full study available for review from Planning Departments]
3/17/2010	Valley Advocates for Re Interested Public	A Comparison of the Costs and Benefits of Residential Growth in Teton County, Id (Full study available for review from Planning Departments)

Date	Name	Comment	
3/16/2010	Hoke, Bland, III Interested Public	(Boise's Comprehensive Plan can be reviewed at the Planning Departments) Public Art Ambassador Center of Wonder 307-690-0097 Theme 7- Quality Community Facilities, Services and Infrastructure Comment in support of public art Dear Planning Commissioners, Thank you once again for your time and energy in this process. Your support of public art in Theme 3 was paramount. Theme 7 garnered many comments as well due to our advocacy efforts. Below are some considerations. Thanks again for your time! Background: Bland Hoke is currently coordinating a Public Art Taskforce to develop a Public Art Plan. This document will outline the framework of a Public Art Program, prospectively administered by the Cultural Council of Jackson Hole, for the Town of Jackson and Teton County. The Public Art Task Force meets the second and last Wednesday of the month at the Photo Lab at the Center for the Arts at 5 pm. Please contact Bland Hoke for additional information, or visit http://www.centerofwonder.org to review draft documents of the Public Art Plan. Introduction: The vast majority of public art programs (300+) derive funding for projects by allocating 1%-2% of eligible Capital Improvement Projects for public art. The Public Art Plan currently in development is based on this widely supported and accepted model funding for public art. Given the broad scope of Theme 7, public art may not be appropriate to highlight in a specific Policy or Principle. However, it must be addressed in the resulting Level of Service plans and the Capital Improvement Plan. Revisions to Theme 7 are listed below in RED For reference, an image from Boise's Comprehensive Plan is included, which details how public art fits into the City's infrastructure. Revised – Policy 7.1.a: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) plans for the provision of public services Level of Service (LOS) is the quality and quantity of services supplied to the community by a provider of public services. To ensure that services are delivered to the public in a safe, efficient and timely manner, the Town of Jackson and Teton County will coordinate with governmental and nongovernmental service providers to accomplish the following: A. Identify each provider's acceptable Level of Service B. Create a Level of Service plan for each service provider C. Develop standards for measuring service delivery success The first priority will be to identify acceptable Levels of Service, create LOS plans, and develop standards for measuring service delivery success for the following services: • Fire/EMS and law enforcement, • Library, • Parks and recreation, • Public health, • Utilities/Infrastructure, • Public transportation, and • Weed and pest management. The second priority will be to identify acceptable Levels of Service, create LOS plans, and develop standards for measuring service delivery success for the following services provided by non-profit, public and quasi-public entities:	Bland Hoke

Date	Name	Comment
		• Arts/culture, • Community events, • Human services, • Medical care, • Schools, and • Child care. Rationale: If the intent of this policy is to actualize Level of Service Plans, Arts and culture necessitates it's own category, separate from Community events. This will ensure the Arts/Culture organizations can effectively develop a LOS plan, which will incorporate a public art program. Community events necessitate a separate category to ensure the topic is adequately addressed in the development of LOS plans. Jackson is home to a plethora of events such as the Hill Climb, Fall Arts Festival, Easter Egg Hunt, Old Bills Fun Run, and Old West Days. This breadth and depth of events necessitates a separate category so a LOS plan can be developed accordingly.
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff to amend the strategies and indicators sections of Theme 5 to be consistent with the policy changes recommended by the commissions
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The community's reliance on the tourism sector of the economy should be maintained
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Tourism should be encouraged as a basis of the economy
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan should emphasize the importance of local ownership of businesses, local production and supply of goods, and local support of local businesses.

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2010	Blann, Jerry Interested Public	Madam Chair, members of the joint Planning Commissions, Jerry Bland, Jackson Hole Mountain Resort and a member of the STAG Committee. We've been reviewing a lot of the documentation from time to time and, having sat through a portion of your meeting last week, I had a couple of comments for here tonight. First of all, there was a number of comments about resorts, and I see you struggling with resort, which is a community, or resort/community, community/resort. I'd just like to point out a couple of things. You know, resort and tourism really describe our economy. I mean, it really is the economic generator, I believe, that really has put us in the position we are. I know some might not like to see the caps increased; however, if by nature of capping that, and we have through various regulations, really in the resort district in particular, there creates I think a potential to stagnate vision. And what happens when things stagnate is that you can't develop, and capital investment will not come to this economy. The other thing that you touched on in pretty dramatic fashion last week was diversification. And I think we all support that. There is no doubt that a diversified economy here in Teton County is something we all desire. I would just point out that tourism and outdoor recreation is a ?? And it, by its nature, is what brings a lot of this diversified economy, such as we do have, and what brings people here in the first place. In the case of Teton Village, which, of course, I am formidably familiar with than any other component here. We continue to do economic analyses, fiscal impact analyses, to show that we more than carry our share. Now, what comes along with resort problems is other economic development and secondary development, those kinds of things. But I think, as certainly the County Planning Commission observed, services provided in Teton Village are minimal. And we actually, as a part of the 1998 Master Plan, formed a resort district out there in the Teton Village Association, which supports the bus system, START Bus, and I'm sure with the budgetary issues that are going on in the County, we'll be hearing more about that <<inaudible>>. Every employer provides every employee a bus pass in Teton Village. We definitely support the transportation ??, and we are involved in and responsible and accountable for mitigation. In addition, I just might also add that any incremental activities that take place in the County, just to give you an example, we had a special event at Teton Village. We called the sheriff. We pay for the sheriff. If we want to get a dog catcher in Teton Village, we pay for the dog catcher. And so, you know, a lot of the services and the kinds of things that we're talking about here, they really maybe don't necessarily apply directly. Now, again, the secondary impacts, the kinds of things we talked about ?? I, and I know you've dealt with this earlier, we are in a pretty significant recession now. We planned to discuss it before we started here. Last year our skier visits were down 9.2 percent. We're down about 5 to 6 percent this year. That is on the throws of about a hundred-million-dollar investment in Teton Village. So, if you restrict growth in a community, what you inevitably do is limit the ability of, whether it's airplanes or jets, or, you know, certainly we want to utilize the <<inaudible>>. I think we're doing a better job community wise dealing with that. But the only thing you have to deal with then is price. And if you come...you can point to other resorts that have done this exclusively. And I think that's not what our community is really all about. When SRA in the past several years ago, we worked prior to that and actually from the first day I arrived in Teton County in 1995, we tried to work with the SRA to try to come up with a plan that jointly really represented the visions that we all had for our community out there. We weren't able to do that through the 1995 and 1998 Master Plan process. But subsequent to that, we sat down and worked with them over a three-year period to come up with a joint plan that really, we think, benefited everyone, and it included a transportation plan and it included a whole series of improvements to the Village that we feel restricted the whole donut in Teton Village. And SRA presented an opportunity to do that. Some of those components have been seen and executed at the Village, one which is certainly the ranch lot, transportation to and from, a lot of the improvements which are now being supported, I might add, by the Teton Village resort district, which is an incremental sales tax we have in Teton Village now, 2 percent, so anybody who goes to Teton Village pays an incremental 2 percent out there. What has been suggested through this process is that there should be no additional commercial other than what has been approved. Well, after three years of really extensive work by all of the Village and SRA, we came up with a plan to improve the process, but 60,000 square feet of commercial was stripped out of that plan. We thought that was the minimal amount, but that was really the glue that put it together. So what we ended up with is the golf course and, frankly, some nice open space that went along with that. We ended up with a parking lot. But what we don't have are the other components that are really critical for development in Teton Village. And I would just like to point out that these kinds of things are extremely important for the sustainability of our Village. And you can put a cap on it. I've seen many resorts that I've been fortunate enough to work in, if you put a cap on these kinds of things, what you'll end up doing is really restraining where we could have flexibility in the near future, because we don't know what the market is going to handle. We hope this market will come back and skiers will start to <<inaudible>>. But I think it's going to take a long time. Our budgetary process is starting right now and we're going to, given what we've seen in the economy, you know, budget about where we were this year, which is going to be about flat and hopefully we can do that. So far, this recovery that we're seeing has benefited this obvious recovery. The fortunate thing about it is we'll be able to hire locally and domestically. We haven't had to go outside to foreign countries as we have in the past and hopeful that over a period of time the economy will be sustained as well. So, anyway, I just want to make a few comments. What you're saying here is all fine and good. There's a lot of discussion today around some of these components. I just want to point out that from a fiscal, from an economic generator standpoint, I didn't hear a lot about that last week. Resorts are planned. If we deter, or we try to attract people, and they come and they see an economy that's driven by an environment that isn't sustainable, that doesn't work. They will not come back. They've got a lot of choices. And let me just point out to you that in a

Date	Name	Comment

green resort community, and I don't know how many of you know that Jackson Hole Mountain Resort is one of only two resorts in the United States that is ?? certified. And I will tell you that that's a subject...we just went through our fifth audit and that's a formal audit process. Aspen is the only other resort that has that. And every department in our organization is accountable specifically for environmental standards and improvement. I think we're a long ways down that road, and we can work together I think to achieve a lot of these goals. We frankly are and besides it certainly helps when you have an environmental policy envisioned like that to attract the right kind of employees and the right kind of ?? this very unique place that we live in. Thank you.

3/11/2010	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance

Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. As you continue in your review of theme five, we wanted to say that we really appreciated your commitment at last week's meeting to protecting the basis of our economy, our natural resources. We also applaud your vote to incorporate suggestions from the Rocky Mountain Institute into this theme. RMI is a well respected and valuable resource for a community such as ours and their work is backed up by comprehensive research. So thanks for taking the time to consider their suggestions and viewpoints, particularly when it comes to creative ways to build our economy without building our physical footprint, such as building upgrades, energy efficiency and local business ownership and patronage among many other creative solutions. We hope your discussions will continue to be informed by RMI's work. In our written comments on this theme, we outlined seven specific topics that are missing from this current draft, that we feel are missing from this current draft. And we hope that once you've finished the Staff's questions, you will not move on without at least discussing why this theme removed so much of the emphasis on community character and existing conditions that were central to the 1994 chapters that relate to the economy. Specifically, the current Plan attempts to describe the types of signage, appropriate building type and scale, and, excuse me, appropriate building size and scale, and the types of development that we want or do not want to see in relation to character preservation. It is not covered in the Comp Plan ?? LDRs, and we assume that signage and building type and scale will be regulated. Before moving on, it will also be important for this board to clarify the big shift from the '94 Plan that this draft makes with regard to community character as an economic goal. Last summer when you discussed the vision chapter, you took an 11 to 1 vote to incorporate the concept of community character back into the entire Plan. It's important that this board ask whether or not the economy of the region should be clearly linked to community character as it is in the draft Plan. As always, please refer to our written comments for more details.

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	March 11, 2010 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Theme 7 Comments Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to Theme Seven - "Provide Quality Community Facilities, Services and Infrastructure." Attached are line-by-line comments and suggestions for discussion related to Theme Seven. Listed below are key points that we hope are clarified in discussion and/or incorporated into a new draft of this chapter. First, we believe it is important to integrate additional language regarding fiscal responsibility in this chapter. In comparison to the 2008 draft of this chapter, the 2009 draft does not include a principle or policies that specifically highlight the importance of fiscal responsibility. For example, the first principle of the 2008 draft was "provide adequate public facilities and services for current and future residents in a fiscally responsible manner." The 2008 draft also included statements such as "new development should not increase taxpayers' costs to provide new schools" and "new development should not occur in locations or a manner that increases taxpayers' cost to serve it or creates unsafe conditions." In general, the lack of focus on fiscal responsibility is particularly concerning given that the concept of fiscal responsibility in future land use decisions was also not highlighted in the "managing growth responsibly" chapter of the new draft. Second, the 2009 draft should include an estimated timeline for the development of a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), particularly given the policies' intent to require concurrent review of facilities' capacity as it relates to new development. Related to this concern about a need for a timeline is the extent to which considerable detail has been removed from the "themes and policies" on community facilities, as compared to our existing 1994 Plan. The existing 1994 Plan included extensive detail to provide for clear guidance on the drafting of land development regulations, whereas the new chapter leaves considerable room for interpretation. The extent to which this new approach can lead to increased predictability and accountability, particularly in the near future, is questionable. Additional information on existing conditions and challenges should be incorporated. Third, while we appreciate and support the inclusion of a specific chapter on community facilities, built infrastructure, and associated services, we also believe it is critical to at least reference how these issues complement other public priorities, such as open space conservation and wildlife habitat protection. We mention this for a primary reason; through its descriptions of public needs and preferences, this chapter will likely form the basis of public funding policies in the future. As part of these discussions, it is important to keep in mind a comprehensive picture of how the community prioritizes different amenities and services. Ultimately, we need to make sure public preferences and priorities like wildlife protection are factored into budgeting and decisionmaking in a meaningful way in the future. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Sincerely, Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	A strategy should be added to the Theme to explore the creation of an Economic Development organization to establish an economic development plan for the community

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	: Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I agree with about 20 percent of what Mr. Bland said. If there was a 100 percent mitigation rate, maybe that would be 50 percent. I would like to propose tonight, if you take a vote tonight, up or down, on sending a strong message via a recommendation to the electives to form an Economic Commission along the lines of the Environmental Commission where we have scientists informing science that informs policy. We have economists and business interest and business acumen informing policy decisions involving economics. It would eliminate a lot of the discussion that we had last week, etc., at the elected level, because they won't have to go through these procedures because they'd already be whittled down by an Economic Commission. It would be very easy to get people to participate in this. We had quite a few members of the Chamber and the STAG Committee type representation, which could be approached. No budget; no staff. Make it a task force, if necessary. I think it would be very efficient. What we don't want to see, as a member of the public watching a proceeding that occurred last week at the elected level, because quite frankly if you've watched the JIM meetings of late, it ain't going to be a pretty sight. So, that's one recommendation I would make. Another recommendation I would make, if we took a snapshot of the last four meetings we've had, we could have eliminated three of those meetings with just a little bit of foresight. Quite frankly, it's a very low efficiency rate in the last four series of meetings. It's effectively a month we could have eliminated the process. One way to do that is not have a situation occur that occurred last week where Staff is writing questions on a theme that you have not yet discussed. I understand the dynamic and Director Daugherty's explanation was perfectly acceptable last week. But just looking forward and not complaining about the past, but looking forward, let's not get in that situation again to the point where if you do finish theme five tonight, consider staying late and having the hopes and dreams discussion of six or seven, whatever the next sequence is, because there has been some discussion of taking those out of sequence because of the traffic consultant. Instead of staying late and doing hopes and dreams so Staff can have some insight that your direction to Staff on the questions that they ask you, did their interpretation of your directions capture what you were trying to do. Just always trying to get at better efficiency. Look at the room, you know, I've mentioned this in the past about the public participation. Quite frankly, relative to theme five, let's not succumb to what I call the chamber of paradox. Chambers of Commerce nationwide are overly aggressive in pro-business, pro-growth, pro-development issues, with the paradox being that they essentially create more competition for their members and constituents. It's, as I mentioned in the past, a slow, smart, sustainable economy and ?? probably our idealized future. And I'll stop with that. Thanks very much.
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Unemployment should be added as an indicator
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The community's reliance on the Real Estate Development and Construction sector of the economy should be maintained.
3/11/2010	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Christine O'Brien, Teton County. I also <<inaudible>>. I just wanted to talk a little bit about the economics chapter and how it can be more specific about the community's vision of what drives the economy. And how the community wants to tradeoff its goal given the constraints it faces. I think we agree that the basis of economic strength for our community is its natural capital. Maintaining a strong and diverse economy means protecting that capital so it can continue to produce economic benefits. The community is fortunate that its natural capital, unlike an oilfield, for example, is a living entity and is renewable. If it is properly managed, it can support the community's goals generation after generation and through hard times. We should encourage renting access to local experience, stays at camping, or stays at hotels, or well-planned resorts, rather than selling ownership through big second-home development. This not only keeps control of our natural capital in the community's hands but produces steadier, less volatile income. For example, park visitation may have been flat but did not crash like the building industry and housing prices. And then all economic activity should be required to pay for its full cost and particularly those environmental and social costs that are now externalities, degrade the environment, traffic, increased infrastructure needs, workforce housing, wildlife impact, etc. This will ensure natural capital is preserved and level the playing field for green and sustainable industries. The Plan should commit to making all projects pay their full cost. This entails finding ways to measure these impacts and enforce compliance. And then finally there's a lot of money at stake here and choices about development will have important financial consequences. The Plan should be clear that it's economic vision means we can't accept every development that comes along. In addition, transparency is essential. The Plan should recognize economic incentives to lobby the planning process and encourage appropriate sunshine laws wherever appropriate. Thank you.
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The economy should be diversified by incentivizing local entrepreneurial opportunities

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The community should encourage eco-tourism that sustains our natural capital
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Outdoor recreational opportunities should continue to be a focus of the economy
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The community should encourage tourism that enables recognition as a “green resort community”
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The economy should be diversified by encouraging “green collar” jobs and industry (such as alternative energy research and development)
3/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	With regard to promotion of self-reliance, the community will explore land use policies that promote local business (for example, but not limited to: live/work units, small lot development, etc.)
3/7/2010	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	From: Kristine OBRIEN Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2010 11:28 AM Dear Planners, Thank you again for all the hard work and time you are devoting to the Comprehensive Plan on behalf of the Community. Below are some thoughts on the economic section. The economic chapter of the plan should lay out the community's vision of what drives its economy and how it wants to trade off different goals. Economics is about understanding the consequences of choices, and how to make the best choices given goals and constraints. The Plan should go beyond statements of aspiration and lay out real obligations and objectives. 1. Source of economic strength. Jackson Hole's economy is based on its natural capital, the scenic beauty that attracts people from across the world. Preserving that capital, and using its dividends to meet the needs of the community should be the goal of the Plan. 2. Diversity and balance. Economic diversity and balance can be achieved by using the natural capital of Jackson Hole in different ways: seasonal recreation, vacation homes, attracting entrepreneurs to build businesses. But the Plan must be realistic and make clear what sorts of businesses are viable. Moreover it should be stated whether words like “foster” and “encourage” mean “subsidize”. If so the decision to subsidize any economic activity must be justified by strict cost/benefit analysis. 3. Renting versus owning. Natural capital is the ultimate renewable resource. Ownership of it gives control and responsibility. As much as possible, the community should keep control of the natural capital. “Renting” access rather than “selling” it keeps that control (i.e., selling resort stays, experiences and hotel visits rather than building irreversible residential development). Renting access promotes economic stability, because rental income is less volatile than real estate prices. 4. Making projects pay their way. The community must ensure that development projects do not degrade the environmental capital and quality of life that underpin the area's economy. This should be paramount. The Plan should commit to making projects pay for all costs – workforce housing, infrastructure, traffic, pollution, wildlife impact – and provide for a mechanism to measure those costs. 5. Transparency. Limits to development deliver financial gains and losses. Provision of benefits such as subsidized housing will attract demand. These economic facts of life must be recognized and the Plan has to insist that implementation be open and fully transparent. Kristine and Paul O'Brien

Date	Name	Comment
3/5/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Subject: Comments from 4 March 2010 Joint P&Z Comm Meeting From: Armond Acri Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 9:44 PM Some thoughts on your discussion on Theme 5 this week: -Stability in the economy probably means controlling growth in some fashion to minimize the boom/bust cycle. That is what the Fed does. You have voted not to use growth caps, but you might want to consider some sort of indirect controls. Rapid growth is often followed by painful contractions like we are currently seeing. -Stability probably means raising taxes in good times to get through the bad times. It is tough to raise property taxes and sales taxes when property costs are high, but it is even tougher to raise taxes when people are losing their jobs and their homes. -It is difficult to legally exclude certain types of businesses like big box retail, but you can indirectly control the types of businesses you attract by controlling the size of buildings you allow. Large corporations are not interested in small buildings. Small local companies are. -Businesses that cater to locals will not earn as much money as a high end service business, but will probably have more business in the shoulder seasons. We cannot control the weather in spring and fall. It is very unpredictable and often unpleasant. That makes it difficult to attract tourists (including second home owners) during the shoulder seasons. True locals will be here during most of the shoulder seasons and will buy things they need. They do not need "local discount" high end services during the off season. Armond Acri Save Historic Jackson Hole
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The economy should be strong, stable, diverse, and balanced
3/4/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I'm just going to make a few brief comments since you already have our written comments that we submitted on February 4th. In this week's Staff Report, we were really happy to see Staff's questions that we think will help refine what a sustainable economy should mean in Jackson. We do believe that Rocky Mountain's extensive work on this topic can provide a good foundation for discussing these issues. I just wanted to reiterate if you think that a key goal for this chapter must be to distinguish between the words growth in terms of physical expansion and economic development. You know, when discussing and debating these terms, growth and development, and making recommendations on policy regarding a desired economy, it's important to all be on the same page about what these broad terms represent, and particularly before you get into detailed discussions. As you do discuss future bases of the economy, another item that we feel is important to always keep in mind is the extent of commercial and residential development that has already been approved and that is in the pipeline. You know, we certainly are not facing a no-growth scenario with the decision that we should focus future efforts on economic development of our existing economy and businesses, as opposed to being further dependent on additional growth in land area or increase in development potential. With this chapter we really urge you to ask the tough questions about what's in the best interest of a long-term sustainable economy here in Jackson. We hope that you'll commit to policies that will protect our most important natural assets, our quality of life, family quality, the visitor experience, rather than promoting a continuation of policies that focus on the short term and that don't provide the stability during economic highs and lows. Thanks for your work.

Date	Name	Comment
3/4/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I just wanted to clarify the spring break request was for one week, not two, and it was to acknowledge the extra time commitment we had the week previous. It was also to acknowledge the fact that Staff informed us last week they weren't going to perform a task that was assigned to them because of time constraints. Also to acknowledge that you aren't the only people in the process, quite frankly. The public is usually left out of these discussions. I find it ironic that we can't discuss a strategic break that could be used to increase efficiency, yet we left an hour and a half of quality discussion time at the table at the last meeting. The hopes and dreams, a very good addition, very informative, worked really well in theme three and theme four. I do have one additional thing that we weren't allowed to comment on previously and that's Commissioner Walter's assertion that he's going to dredge up the node concept yet again. And I fully respect and acknowledge that right. I just really think if we're going to acknowledge that right, there's a commensurate responsibility to do it earlier rather than later. If we can press all these tough revisits of contentious topics to the end of the process when six of our ten electives are engaged in the primary process in the summer and people are three sheets to the wind, etc., I don't know how that contributes. And I fully respect the right of that. I just wanted to know that we weren't allowed...that that was brought up at the last minute previously. As far as theme five itself goes, there's very little we can do. Most of theme five is subject to the vagaries of market conditions beyond our control. I really think we can finish theme five tonight. There needs to be a stronger acknowledgement, as I said before, that ecology is economy in this Valley, that the best possible idea of what we should be striving for is an economy in relative spaces that utilizes our resources that we've been given and we're in charge of maintaining stewardship of at a responsible rate. And that's what I have to say. Thank you.
3/4/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'd like to thank both Chairs and the members for letting me speak tonight. I wanted to talk a little bit...I won't repeat my comments, written comments, but I did want to make a couple of other points. I think one important thing to keep in mind is just as we cannot guarantee that everyone is going to get a house, I think it has to be the same way that we have to acknowledge that we cannot guarantee that everyone will succeed in business, or everyone will have a job. Our obligation is to set up opportunities for reasonable chance for success for people for starting jobs or for having opportunities for employment. One of the things I think that is a powerful lesson from the current economic problems is that the too-big-to-fail concept is a dangerous thing, and I think we need to keep that in mind as we go forward looking at what kind of business that we do want here. It's probably good to ?? a little bit. But I think the fundamental question that we should always ask and should be the screen that we use is what is in the best interest for the community, not is what is in the best interest for ?? And then also I would lastly like to acknowledge Mark Newcomb's comments, which I thought were very eloquent and actually a lot of verbiage could be taken out and put in for this chapter I thought, so very well written, Mark. Thank you.
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Year-round viability, by addressing economic shoulder seasons, should be part of the definition of the community ideal economy
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Diversity should be defined (partly) by: available jobs providing a spectrum of incomes
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Diversity should be defined (partly) as: maintenance of a middle class
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Diversity should be a desired characteristic of the economy
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Stability should be a desired characteristic of the economy(Superseded by Recommendation 328)
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintenance of a predictable tax base should be part of the definition of the community's ideal economy

Date	Name	Comment
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Statement of ideal framework: Remain a community by balancing commercial, resort, and housing growth, with stewardship of natural resource
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strength should be a desired characteristic of our economy and be defined by stability to level out economic highs and lows
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintenance of western character should be part of the definition of the community's ideal economy
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintenance of community character should be part of the definition of the community's ideal economy
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintenance of a high quality of visitor experience should be part of the definition of the community's ideal economy
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintenance of a high quality of life should be part of the definition of the community's ideal economy
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Commissions generally agree with using the Rocky Mountain Institute concept of “economic sustainability” to evolve the 1994 Plan as a way of more clearly defining the community’s ideal economy Economic sustainability in Teton County will be focused on the development of our existing economy and businesses within our current physical and regulatory boundaries, not dependant on growth in land area or increase in development potential. More specifically, economic sustainability in Teton County will: •Redefine prosperity weighing quality of life, community character and the environment alongside economic considerations •Advocate the long-term stewardship of community resources including the natural environment, ensuring that present actions are considered in the context of not eroding the opportunity for future prosperity •Pursue self-reliance through diversity within the local economy •Stress balance, resilience and a conviction that many small efforts work better than a single one size fits all approach
3/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strength should be a desired characteristic of our economy(Superseded by Recommendation 328)
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Request that the JHCA and JHCC produce an updated effective population number
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Revise 1/22/10 rewrite 2.1c, and other areas in Theme 2 to state clearly that increased residential development potential is allowed within Targeted Growth Areas in Town
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.d incentivization of local convenience commercial in Teton Village must respect the cap on Resort nonresidential development
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Allowance for local convenience commercial in mixed-use neighborhoods in Town must still respect the overall cap on Town nonresidential potential

Date	Name	Comment
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 2.1.c from 1/22/10 rewrite: remove the last sentence related to TDR's
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.c regarding nonresidential uses located in residential neighborhoods is not only applicable to the County but also the Town
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Enabling locations for new light industrial land in 1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.b is adequate; identification of specific locations is an issue to be addressed when the FLUP is discussed
2/18/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I'll be brief since you already have our written comments where we outlined what we see as the major improvements in the draft and in some topics where in some places were inconsistencies will be clarified. It's good because it was our understanding that you are just revisiting votes, I mean, rather than revisiting votes, you're simply confirming Staff's interpretation of your previous votes. With that in mind, that's why we framed our comments the way we did. One thing, after looking at the Staff Report, I just have a few comments. As a member of the Build-Out Task Force and the Employee Generation Task Force, I agree with the third point raised by Tony Wall that the Task Force numbers should not be referenced the way they currently are in the Plan. They're merely assumptions tied to these final numbers and it's critical that these assumptions are understood when you see the numbers in any way. The same goes for employee generation numbers. Referring to these numbers without sufficient noting of the assumptions to arrive at them is a concern. Therefore, we do think the findings with the assumptions should be in the Appendix. Also, based on some of the other comments from the Commissioners, it seems that some of the assumptions for the data, particularly regarding a PRD multiplier, were unclear. You know, without going into too much detail, line-by-line review, we feel that the draft should be very clear about the use of discretionary tools and how this affects other statements in this draft regarding the desire for predictability, and then additive growth is not appropriate right now. There's a couple of instances the way the draft is written it's sending mixed messages and we feel like that should be clarified before you move forward. Thanks.
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.a allowance for the addition of nonresidential potential in any Resort if a commensurate amount of residential potential is eliminated should only apply to Teton Village
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Recommendation 174 limiting land area expansions of Resorts applying to County Resorts (Teton Village, Golf & Tennis, Snake River Sporting Club, and Grand Targhee) should also apply to Snow King – the only Planned Resort in Town
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Expansion of light industrial activity in Town must still respect the overall cap on Town nonresidential potential
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The 1/22/10 rewrite of Theme 2 generally reflects the previous votes and discussion of the Joint Planning Commissions
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.a allowance for the addition of nonresidential potential of in Teton Village if a commensurate amount of residential potential is eliminated should only allow an increase in local convenience commercial for a decrease in lodging

Date	Name	Comment
2/18/2010	Fodor, Stefan Interested Public	Hello, Stephan ??, Town resident. Some of your recommendations, if I read it right, number 1 50 talked about keeping new development should be what its base rights are in the County now. What I contrast that with the push by both the Town and County planning boards to eliminate ARUs. I'm somewhat at a loss and I'm hoping you might be able to discuss that tonight. There's lots of talk about keeping the '94 development plan potential, yet this seems to take a step backwards from it. So I encourage you to look at what ARUs are today in the County. Some of them are guesthouses for second homeowners. Some of them are workforce housing, as people who live in there part time are caretakers and part-time workers in the Town or the County. Others are full-time caretakers on those properties. And still others, they're full-time workers in the County. That's, I think, a way to meet some of the stated goals you talked about in the last theme about meeting workforce housing in the County. Instead of going on with exactions and conveying those exaction fees to other entities in Town that are already in the County that are making housing, it seems to me you've got a system of encouraging housing in the County that's already linked to existing development, and I encourage you to take a look at keeping that. Those are my comments on that. Thank you for your continued time and effort.
2/18/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. This is not related to theme two, but if you haven't already done so, I suggest that we identify, re-identify the spring break period. It's highly likely there'd be a loss of quorum during that time anyway, so why not go ahead and do that tonight. You've got a calendar here. That's all we need, five minutes prior to Matters from Staff or something. Every process has a cost/benefit ratio and the cost/benefit, risk/reward, input/output ratio in the process is extremely low. I suggest with all this insight and intelligence we have, and I mean that sincerely, that we put our heads together and figure out a way to facilitate this process. We have spent an inordinate amount of time reaffirming the status quo—weeks and weeks and weeks on an individual theme—and I feel, and this is an actual suggestion which I know you won't take but I'm going to make it anyway, that we seek to limit one theme per meeting, one meeting per theme, and then handle all the minutia and the micro-suggestions, etc., on the re-review. I really think we can cut this time in half. I mean, we have to get real. We've been at this seven months. And when we finish theme two, three, and four re-review, we'll be halfway through it. So, this is the problem. You know, to the 50 percent of you who remain from the beginning of this process, in theme one and theme two, we, on a weekly basis, had a room full of eager, enthusiastic, energized citizenry, you know, looking forward to participating in the planning of the future. And we disenfranchised and de-energized them by this extremely long process. So, nobody else is going to say it, so I just did. So we really need to put our heads together and figure out a way to do this. Now, specific to theme two, the biggest thing missing in theme two, besides PRD potential, is a fiscal impact analysis and cumulative impact cost to the community. We haven't even made any strong recommendations, you know, along those lines. Two specific sentences. One is 2.2.D, local convenience commercial. I really feel like through some of my research that the benefits of local convenience commercial are often greatly oversold and that some of the language remaining in 2.2.D and elsewhere can facilitate new growth via utilizing the supposed benefit of local convenience commercial. I won't get into that specifically. Commissioner McCarthy and several others have covered that previously. The last thing I'll say is 2.3.E, the middle sentence there is discretionary tools shall be limited. Anytime we have language that's ambiguous like limited, it really should be prohibited in that stage. When you have limited, you have an infinite amount of non-predictability. So, let's put the harshest language in, prohibited, and then ask the developer to come back for variances, which they always do anyway. Thank you.
2/18/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. Accountability, predictability, and measurability are all important ingredients in a successful Comprehensive Plan. In particular, build-out numbers and a cost-of-growth statement incorporated for theme two will define what can and cannot be done when it comes to rewriting LDRs. You can stop unwanted growth and development that can't pay for itself. Along with results and conflicting statements and better defining theme- two policies that were mentioned in the public comment, a lot of the public comment on theme two, we can also avoid long, drawn-out and costly confrontations with landowners and the public <<inaudible>>.
2/18/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'm not going to repeat...I gave you guys some brief statements. I would like to point out that I've been reading the other comments that there were a number of comments that did point out there are some things that are inconsistencies. And that's not a criticism because actually I think we're a world ahead of where we were before, but I think as you go at it step by step, it is possible to not remember past steps. So, hopefully, you will address those. That's all I have to say. Get on with it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/17/2010	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Theme 4, “Meet Our Community’s Housing Needs” Issues and Positions of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors The following positions of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors were approved in its February 17, 2010 meeting. ISSUE 1: Regulations versus incentives for developers JHCC POSITION: Do not increase current regulations for mitigation rates and exaction fees in the current economy. Maintain current sharing of affordable housing mitigation by both residential and commercial development. Develop stronger and more diverse incentives for developers to provide workforce housing. ISSUE 2: Rental housing for workforce JHCC POSITION: Shift focus from ownership units to the creation and preservation of rental units, including but not limited affordable and attainable rental units, free market units, etc. These rental units should be for seasonal workers as well as year round workers. Regulations should be modified to promote and govern the amount and density of rental housing stock. Establish an affordable rental housing program with principles and criteria similar to that established for the affordable ownership program. ISSUE 3: Sources of funding for affordable housing JHCC POSITION: The pursuit of funding for affordable housing should continue tap Federal and State grant funding to the greatest extent possible in addition to the other current sources of funding, i.e., private donations and current exaction fees. Private and public cooperative partnerships should be explored and facilitated. No increase in taxes should be pursued during the current economy. Consideration of further SPET funding should be delayed until a strong economy is restored. ISSUE 4: Location of workforce housing JHCC POSITION: With an emphasis on redevelopment instead of new development, workforce housing should be concentrated in the Town of Jackson and Teton Village. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors recommends that the Town of Jackson and Teton County conduct a study to explore the feasibility of moving the fairgrounds and jail from Town neighborhoods to the County to create additional space for workforce housing. Employee housing should be established near downtown Jackson and near any centralized mass transit locations rather than outlying areas to support the “Town as Heart” goal. Quality affordable housing should be mixed with free market homes rather than creating dedicated affordable housing subdivisions or developments. ISSUE 5: Limiting or promoting new developments to provide more affordable housing units or funding for affordable housing. JHCC POSITION: Emphasis should be placed on redevelopment of existing developed land versus the expansion of new development on undeveloped lands. Teton Village should be provided with enough square footage for workforce housing as well as commercial development to be a sustainable village center and lessen traffic impacts. Incentives should be created for landowners to work with developers on existing properties rather than build new developments. ISSUE 6: Economic basis for housing at least 65% of the workforce in Teton County, Wyoming JHCC POSITION: The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce strongly agrees with the goal of at least 65% of the workforce housed locally. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce understands that approximately 65% of the current workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming. Further decreases of workforce housed locally equate to further losses in revenue for local businesses as well as losses in sales tax revenue for Teton County and the Town of Jackson. The economic rationale for supporting this goal and maximizing the percentage of workforce housed locally is based on studies indicating that for every \$100 spent at a locally owned business, approximately \$63 remain in the community. In addition, money spent locally has a “multiplier effect” where the more people that spend money locally, the greater the percentage is of the money that stays locally because of the greater financial success achieved by local businesses. For example, increasing local spending from 50 to 80 percent more than doubles the local effect – from \$200 to \$500 (ref: Entrepreneur.com, Sustainable Seattle and Civic Economics). Money spent outside of the community by workforce housed elsewhere remains outside of the community. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS: - The data from the 2007 housing needs assessment and related studies needs to be updated in order to establish an accurate basis for making policies. - Housing agencies and organizations should explore the purchase of existing “stressed” or affordable housing stock

Date	Name	Comment
2/16/2010	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Dear Planning Commissioners and Staff,Thanks for all the hard work on the rewrite of Theme 2. Here are a few more general comments.â€¢The costs of growth are still not adequately addressed. Public comment has consistently said development should pay its fair share of the costs of infrastructure, workforce housing, and social systems.â€¢The PRD tool still adds little predictability for future growth.â€¢Managing growth responsibly without a build out number may be an oversight. The valley (town and county) does have a carrying capacity for humans before degrading the abundant wildlife. Please consider my comments.Sincerely,Dave Coon
2/16/2010	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Dear Jeff, Thanks once again for working so diligently on the rewrite of Theme 2 Following are my comments for Theme 2 . Apparently the Jackson Teton Plan website for Theme 2 is still down and I could not find the comment section within the redline version or the new version you sent me. The original Statement of Ideal clearly identified and ranked the priorities of the community. Use that statement and modify as follows: "Preservation of the community values of wildlife protection, community character and quality of life will be the determining factors to manage" growth by limiting development rights to base rights allowed today. 2.1a Predictability is the goal for development. Predictability is achieved by limiting development rights to base rights allowed today. Town should not be the target for higher density beyond base rights allowed today. 2.2a Clearly state "No new resorts allowed." 2.3e Eliminate discretionary planning tools. (Elimination of planning tools achieves predictability) 2.6b and 2.6c: Prohibit building on steep slopes and avalanche paths. (probably too late for that!) Theme 2 does not address the cost of growth to the community. Growth should pay its own way, not the community. This should be an overriding dictum for managing growth. Thanks for including these comments on Theme 2. Patty Ewing

Date	Name	Comment
2/16/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Comments On Theme Two Rewrite I would like to comment on the theme 2 rewrite of the comp plan. Armond Acri said it best in SHJH's in all his comments on the theme redline version. I support his comments on tightening up the policies and defining better things like what kind of light industrial and convenience commercial will be allowed in neighborhoods. I worry about interpretations being wide and varied that could negatively affect neighborhoods in and around Cottonwood Park and interfere with the school zone on High School Road. We can't be all things to all people and still be a viable family neighborhood. With outside pressures coming from the Tribal Trails proposal and the development wishes from across High School Road you should be thinking a few steps ahead to prevent over doing it in West Jackson. Please continue to keep listening to what the public has been saying all along. We want accountability and predictability to make this plan work for the community. I would also like to include the below letter I wrote about including a cost of growth statement in the plan. Keep up the good work. Accountability and Predictability As the joint planning commissions review Theme 2 "Growth Management" of the Teton county, Town of Jackson Comprehensive plan over the next few weeks, the most important ingredient that seems to be missing from the plan to date is the cost of growth to our community. Adding this to the formula will help the plan succeed in making sure future growth won't be subsidized by the taxpayer. This in turn will help prevent unwanted growth and development that can not pay for itself. In my family budget we make sure that if we can't pay for it, well, we can't have it right now. It has helped us avoid getting in over our heads when something new looks too good to resist. We make do with taking good care of what we do have and putting our money where it counts, into our family's future. I think the nation is in the mess it's in right now because a lot of people's questionable needs wound up being wants they couldn't afford. If we treat the community of Jackson Hole as our family and the environment we live in, our home, then I think you'll easily agree that a cost of growth statement is needed in the rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan to create accountability and help predict what will be costly to the community or a great benefit to the community and future generations. Thank You, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park Neighbors
2/15/2010	Jankowsky, Dorothy Interested Public	Hello, I would just like to say that I support the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's comments (which are posted on the Alliance's website at http://www.jhalliance.org/Library/Comments/2010/CompPlan10/Theme2RewriteComments.2-10.pdf) regarding the rewritten Theme Two of the draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Thank you, sincerely, Dorothy Jankowsky

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Policy 2.1b Preserve Existing County Neighborhoods Regarding the second sentence, it is important to recognize that impacts of additional development potential in the county are not restricted to impacts on neighborhood character alone. These impacts also extend to wildlife, energy, and transportation-related issues, which should also be described. Policy 2.1c Allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space Regarding the intention to encourage a shift of development relating to density bonuses “adjacent to existing development” versus not promoting a transferable development rights program should be further clarified. Policy 2.1d Allow additional residential units in exchange for allowed commercial floor area in Town This policy, as it relates to capping residential development at base allowances, needs to be clarified. This policy should be clear about the conditions under which additional residential units are allowed as well as about the intentions of the allowances. Policy 2.1e Allow development of County residential potential in Town The statement “allow residential units to be built in Town that could otherwise have been built in the County” should be further clarified. This relates to both the definition of a “commensurate decrease” as well as recent discussions regarding future conservation easements and how their associated “removed” development potential could be interpreted in this policy. In many cases, donors desire an extinguishment of rights, not a formal or informal transfer of these rights. Policy 2.1f Promote infill and development in Town over development in the County The language of the end of the last sentence “in all situations where possible” makes the intent unnecessarily open-ended. Principle 2.2 Local convenience commercial and light industry are the most appropriate types of future nonresidential development The language in this principle is unclear particularly given its strong assumptions (such as additional local convenience commercial is needed to preserve the small town community character). Interpretations of statements such as these could vary widely, which removes some of the predictability the community wants from the new plan. As for future nonresidential development, it is important to note that future types of development are already heavily targeted to resort-related projects. Policy 2.2a Maintain nonresidential development potential allowed today; Policy 2.2b Promote light industry In these two policies it should be clarified whether the additional potential is additive commercial Policy 2.3e Limit discretion in land use decisions The language “discretionary tools will be limited” is weak and unclear. Given that the overall goal of this new process is to increase predictability, it is critical that this new plan clearly identify the role of regulations and incentives (and not include vague language). Highly unpredictable, discretionary tools should not be used in the future. Strategy 2.1 should be reconciled with this policy. Strategies and Indicators It would be ideal to work with designated technical committees or task forces on each of the chapter’s “Indicators” sections to ensure that these are the most beneficial and feasible factors to measure. We appreciate the effort to establish a baseline column, or measurable starting point. We still believe that some of the goals should be reworked in addition to incorporating more baseline data. For example, “consistent with historical trends” is not the best indicator for growth rates by jurisdiction. At a broad level, below are key areas in which the rewrite improved the earlier draft: Principle 2.1 The Town of Jackson is the only appropriate location for future residential density increases In the second sentence, the use of the word “overall rural character” would be more appropriate than “neighborhoods” and “density increases in some areas of Town” would be more appropriate than “density increases in Town.”...[also] Policy 2.1b Preserve Existing County Neighborhoods Regarding the second sentence, it is important to recognize that impacts of additional development potential in the county are not restricted to impacts on neighborhood character alone. These impacts also extend to wildlife, energy, and transportation-related issues, which should also be described...[also] Principle 2.3 Conservation and development will occur in a predictable pattern with a predictable character The addition of “with a predictable character” is a fundamental improvement over the April 2009 draft. An expansion of this should include what the public has consistently expressed regarding not only the importance of predictable development locations, but also the importance of a predictable amount. Policy 2.1a Limit base development rights to those allowed today The specific language of this policy needs to be clarified. “Base residential development potential, “ as outlined by the Buildout Task Force will need to be clarified in terms of the assumptions associated with the planned residential development tool. Also, statements such as “density increases” in relation to statements such as “additive growth will not be permitted” need to be clarified.

Date	Name	Comment
2/13/2010	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Comprehensive Plan Final Theme 2 Draft Comments Theme 2: Manage Growth Responsibly Statement of Ideal: Limit growth to established development allowances while encouraging preservation of existing neighborhoods and open spaces. Reflective of joint votes and overall community feedback: • Theme 2 overall is well aligned with the joint planning commission's votes and community input. Staff should be commended for the tremendous improvement in this draft. This version more accurately reflects community input and also captures the joint votes of the commissions properly. Areas for improvement: • Theme 2 still is silent on the issue of the cost of growth. - o Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. - o If this is not discussed in this theme – then certainly the joint commissions need to address this in Theme Five – “Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy”. • More precise language – each and every word will count and be debated for years to come in this plan. A few changes to consider that will clarify the specific intent of the language in this theme - yet are still aligned with your previous joint votes. • Policy 2.1.a: “Limit base development rights to those allowed today” should be changed to read “Limit development rights to base rights allowed today.” This language better captures your votes on this topic. • Policy 2.2.a: It should clearly state, “No new Resorts will be allowed.” Remember this is a ten year document and I believe you clearly reached this conclusion – that for the next ten years at least - given the very significant entitled but not yet built square footage in existing resort zones – there should not be any more resorts. • Policy 2.2.b: I am concerned that promoting light industrial in some residential neighborhoods will change the character of these neighborhoods. This needs more clarity and detail. I believe your intent was to legalize some small-scale existing uses but not open the door for out-of-scale new uses. • Policy 2.2.d: “Encourage local convenience commercial” should change to “allow limited convenience commercial.” The market will decide what succeeds and what fails. Although this is a good idea for transportation goals – not everyone's plan to sell a four dollar gallon of milk will work. Let the market decide – “encourage” is an imprecise word as it infers free market interference. • Policy 2.3.e: “Discretionary planning tools will be limited” should change to “strictly limited.” The community and also land owners have been quite clear on this. I think your votes were also clearer then the current language is written. Housekeeping Item: • Theme 2 and other chapter format: - o Drop the “What the community said about this theme” pages – this section is not scientific but rather staff's interpretation of what we said - this is better served through the appendix with all applicable questions and responses from the various surveys and forums. - o I believe you may have already resolved this issue at your last meeting. In closing - thank you for all the hours you continue to spend on this process – it is appreciated! Rich Bloom

Date	Name	Comment
2/12/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Dear Planning Commissioners and Staff,I find the rewrite of Theme 2 Manage Growth Responsibly is a marked improvement over the draft. The Staff should be commended!What I find is missing from this entire theme is the costs of growth and who pays for the impacts? Consistent public comments have been made about this from the initial meetings on the Comp Plan and most recently through the chapter by chapter review of the Plan. There should be a general statement at the beginning of the Theme that is clear that development will pay its full share of direct impacts on infrastructure, workforce housing, and social systems via exaction fees, connection fees to existing utilities, impact fees, and required rates of mitigation. With the local and national economy down, it is even more important that struggling residents not pay for new development that most often is done by out of town, county or state Corporations. The premise that this type of growth is good for our local economy is misleading. Most of the building materials are shipped in from out of state, as is much of the labor. The profits from development are not reinvested into Jackson Hole. Let's not stimulate growth without charging the developers with the costs. I am still not happy that the PRD tool is left unchanged. I understand that the amount of density bonus allowed with the PRD will be determined with review of the Land Development Regulations, however, I feel, that some mention of limitations should be stated here. There is little predictability in any of the Rural zoned properties. This tool left unchecked represents the greatest potential in residential growth within the County. There are no guarantees that Conservation easements will be the result of the upzoning. The lack of a PRD workshop that the entire community wanted was unfortunate. The entire concept of how most of the conservation easements have been done was not truly presented. For instance: "The Poodle Ranch" (Hwy 22) shows as a Jackson Hole Land Trust Conservation Easement restricted property on the County GIS, yet, it does not show how many units/homes that can still be developed. Yes, the conservation easement agreement protects against the densities of an Indian Trails type of development. I would hope that when the FLUP maps are prepared that the number of homes to be built on all conservation easements are identified. I think these numbers will surprise many. The box on page 29 "What the community has said about this theme" should be eliminated. Any actual polling results and not someone's opinion of conclusions should be in an Appendix exhibit. Page 31- Top of the page. The reference to Transferable Development Rights wording could be stated more clearly. Page 32 Policy 2.1.f I think a mention of existing private property rights in the County needs to be inserted here. Page 32 Policy 2.2.a The last sentence to me seems backwards. Isn't the goal to trying keep nonresidential development from creating residential needs? There is a conflict here. Page 33 Policy 2.2.b A mention of a conditional use process for light industry home uses verses an open ended statement should be made. Page 35 Policy 2.3.c. "Areas identified as appropriate for increased development" Was it not determined that Town would be the only area indicated. Why not say this rather than saying there will be areas on the FLUP maps that may be inconsistent with Comp Plan Policies? Page 35 Policy 2.3.e Why say in the future? This would indicate a flexible undetermined timeframe. Just say: Discretionary tools will be eliminated. Page 40 The Indictors Box #3. amend to indicate: "Acres permanently conserved per PRD" The baseline should be tated as a ratio of acres/approved units. Page 40 The Indictors Box #4. This should indicate # of units above the 1/35 base Page 40 The Indictors Box #9. I do not think that this indicates anything about growth management. It indicates how efficient our planning dept. and approval system is functioning. Why not monitor building permit numbers if you are looking for an indicator of growth? Isn't this convered in the numbers in #1?Again, I feel the rewrite of this theme is very close to what was intended. Thank you for considereing my comments.Sincerely,Gail Jensen
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Direct staff to amend the strategies and indicators sections to be consistent with the policy changes recommended by the commissions – with inclusion of the basis goals as indicators (Themes 2 &3 approach)

Date	Name	Comment
2/11/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole Comments on Theme 2 Rewrite (Redline Version) General Comments: We are very happy that the document recognizes that flexibility and discretion have caused many problems in the past and should be eliminated. We agree that they caused more hard feelings than community benefit. Predictability does not just benefit the citizens. The landowner also benefits as they do not have to spend a great deal of time and money to develop their property. They will clearly understand what is allowed. We still believe that the box "What the Community Said" belongs in the Appendix with all the data, not snippets. We feel the rewrite is an improvement, but there are some conflicts in the policies that need to be resolved. They are called out specifically below. What is Missing: A statement on the cost of growth and the need for development to pay for any costs associated with it is needed. The Community should not subsidize the cost of growth. Predictability means there must be an upper limit not just on base zoning but also on performance based tools such as density bonuses for clustering. That limit needs to be defined somewhere. If it is defined in the LDRs, the Plan should give clear direction on how to determine that limit. Specific Comments: Policy 2.1.a "Limit base development rights to those allowed today" should be changed to read "Limit development rights to base rights allowed today." This is consistent with 2.2.a and more closely reflects public sentiment. The statement that additive growth is not permitted and density increases will be performance based are in conflict. Density increases are additive growth. This should be resolved. Policy 2.1.c The policy states that transferable development rights that increase density in existing neighborhoods for conservation easements is not consistent with Community goals, but Policy 2.1.e allows residential development in Town that could have been built in the County. This is a conflict. How can the County development be built in Town without increasing the density in Town? The goal is to be predictable and limit development rights to the base amount allowed today. The Community has been consistent on this point. 2.1.f Same comments as Policy 2.1.c Policy 2.2.a It should clearly state, "No new Resorts will be allowed." Policy 2.2.b We are concerned that promoting light industrial in some residential neighborhoods may change the character of the neighborhoods. This needs more detail. There is a big difference between allowing a tradesman to store limited materials and tools at his house and allowing a fabrication shop in a residential area. Policy 2.2.d "Encourage local convenience commercial" should change to "allow limited convenience commercial." Encouragement of a bad business plan is a bad idea. The market will decide what succeeds and what fails. Encouragement will not matter. Policy 2.3.e "Discretionary planning tools will be limited" should change to "eliminated" or "strictly limited." Policy 2.6.b Prohibit building in avalanche zones. This is consistent with 2.6.c which prohibits building in steep slopes. Policy 2.6.d "Poor soils" should be defined. Strategy 2.2 Who will map hazard areas? This should be defined. Indicator 1 This should compare development and redevelopment that occurs to what is already built and what can still be built. Indicator 9 A decrease in the length of land use decisions can be accomplished by approving every application with no debate. That would be counter to the desires of the Community. A better metric is to monitor the time for decisions. If it starts to increase it is evidence we are growing too fast and our Planning Departments and Electeds are not able to keep up with the rate of growth. This should trigger a discussion on our rate of growth without requiring a growth rate cap. Armond Acri Executive Director Save Historic Jackson Hole

Date	Name	Comment
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Remove all “What the Community Said About this Theme” boxes; instead reference appendices regarding public comment
2/11/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	: Gregory Griffith, West Bank. You know, a few things that were stated last week, if you get a chance to comment on the percentage afterwards. The 25 percent of zero argument is null and void in my mind because mitigation rate, there is a tether or a nexus or a linkage between the creation of demand and creation of supply. So, to use Commissioner Pruett’s—again, not to pick on anyone, just responding to the sentiment, not the individual—using the three-legged-stool analogy of mitigation, incentives and permanent funding source, if you remove mitigation, which would significantly reduce it to a two-legged stool, just as a house divided cannot stand, a two-legged stool cannot stand in this example. But we really don’t have a two-legged stool. We’ve got a one-legged stool because we don’t have a permanent funding source and we probably won’t get one in the foreseeable future. So, that leaves us with a one-legged stool, which is essentially a crutch and that crutch is incentives. We know that incentives is growth and development to be for density bonuses. So, there we go, last week. We’ve got to avoid being prisoners of the moment here with the economic situation, because we’ve got to plan for the boom and the bust, and hopefully this Plan will outlast the current economic cycle, as some people pointed out last week. We haven’t discussed what we need to discuss, and that’s commercial down zone. We have such an incredible imbalance in commercial latent potential and excessive employee generation that it’s not as we have, you know, indicated here on several of the other themes, it’s not balanced out by residential potential. So, the electives are going to have to address commercial down zones at some stage. If we’re not willing to go there, we need to at least consider a purchase of development rights from commercial entities. If we constantly talk about converting commercial to residential, really what we’re talking about is cash in the form of direct gain to the developer, or in the form of avoiding costs. So, at some point, it would be a win/win to remove that excessive employee generation willingly from the developer and convert that to residential. There’s actually some economic indicators that state that some may be more valuable ?? . A concept we have to discuss, and I feel we need to discuss, is reverse regionalism. There’s an incredible imbalance between Teton County Wyoming and Teton County Idaho in that they have about 8200 platted yet vacant units potentially. And they also have a favorable property tax structure—3 percent per annum, capped. This coupled with our imbalance in commercial will create—not might—will create in the future a...almost a plethora of housing in a dearth of jobs on that side, and in our commercial potential will create a plethora of jobs and a relative dearth for housing here. I maintain that the negative impacts of Teton County Idaho in the near to middle future will be greater than our impacts on them that reverse ?? . There was a mistake in the paper last week, at least contextual, in that the Housing Needs Assessment stated as one of their number-one actionable items that we increase the mitigation rate from 15 to 25 percent. It actually said on both commercial and residential we should increase mitigation rates to 40 percent. And we pay good money to these so-called experts and consultants not to consider that. Lastly, I’d like to say...and nobody’s going to cover this...there was no love lost between the methods that the Housing Authority has employed in the past from my perspective, especially in ?? Creek. So, to keep it simple, I just want to state that we need to be sophisticated and savvy enough in the future to avoid this misperception and this mythology, quite frankly, that anyone who is a proponent of affordable housing for any reason is an angelic altruist, pure motive, beyond reproach, and of them questions cannot be asked. And conversely anyone who has sense on any level of density placed anywhere with any amount of environmental degradation or degradation of adjoining and adjacent community character or any amount of externalized cost of community is somehow sub-human. We’ve got to get past that. Thanks.
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Ensure that multifamily (4 or more units in a building) housing is allowed by Plan
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Promotion of quality workforce housing should be added as a policy of the Plan
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan should include shared appreciation mortgages as a strategy for retention of existing workforce housing stock?
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Place the Housing Authority under joint jurisdiction of the Town of Jackson and Teton County

Date	Name	Comment
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Limit the scope of the TCHA from any land banking
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The concept of affordable housing easements for the construction of additional deed restricted housing on an existing developed property should be included in the plan as a retention of existing workforce stock strategy
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Encourage deed restricted rental units
2/11/2010	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Planning commissioners, After reviewing the redlined version of "Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2)" I would like to say that it is indeed easier to read and provides a better understanding of the work you have been pouring yourselves into. On page 29 there is still the ghastly box that reads "What the Community has said about this theme". In planning meetings past, it was agreed upon that this box is indeed a façade that only suffices the egos of the paid planning staff. It is upsetting that the planning staff is still able to control the body of this important document with misrepresentations. On page 35, Policy 2.3e; Limit discretion in land use decisions; it states that discretionary planning tools will be limited. Regulations and incentives will be performance based. Limited to what? What are you basing performance on? Draw the line here team. Don't talk out of the side of your mouth. Cindy Hill Stone
2/11/2010	Frederick, Morgan Interested Public	Hi Paul- I got your email address from my dad, Bud, and hope that you don't mind me sending a town business letter to your personal account. Reading the paper today, I got the impression that frankly, the debate over mitigation rates has not been very well informed. In particular, the comment that mitigation rates increase rents is highly questionable, and although possible, it is dependent on a number of other factors. Maybe the reporter just declined to include the reasoning of some commissioners, but I wanted to write any way. Last year, I devoted a chapter of my thesis paper at the Univ. of Montana to mitigation rate policies (known also as inclusionary zoning) in JH and thought that I would send it to you to see if it might be able to serve any purpose in this more focused discussion with the planning and zoning commission. It is largely theoretical in nature and written by guy who is probably a lot better carpenter and bartender than economist, but it is at least grounded in solid research and was reviewed and revised in conjunction with two professors - both PhD economists. As such, I wanted to send it directly to someone to whom I have a mutual contact rather than to the commission as a whole, since as I've said, it's value is of course, limited. Nonetheless, it is the only economic analysis of any kind that has been done on this issue in Jackson, and contains some figures I compiled about units built under this program, building permits, rent prices, etc.. I have included the chapter and attached at the end a little summary from the conclusion chapter. Thanks. Morgan Frederick

Date	Name	Comment
2/11/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Dear Planning Commissioners, First of all I wanted to say thank you to each one of you for all of your time and effort put into our new Comp Plan. After reading what has been written and recommended by your Joint boards, I felt I needed to make the following comments:â€I do not believe in the percentage of 65% as the goal and the background of why this number. I did not see any real studies associated with the â€White Paperâ€ that justify this number. The definition of â€workforceâ€ is loose and not really clear or meaningful. This is too broad and encourages the TCHA to delve into too many areas outside of the most needed housing.â€I do not support any dedicated funding source of any kind while the TCHA is in complete control of how and if funds are allocated. Their behavior history shows an unwillingness to comply with our LDRâ€™s and decisions made by our Board of County Commissioners. The way the Authority is structured via the State Statute does not make me, as a taxpayer; feel comfortable with how funds are spent and how decisions are made to benefit the Jackson Hole community.â€Raise the mitigation rates on new development to whatever is needed to keep our workforce housed so that there is no net loss with new development. This will not stop developers from building in Jackson Hole. Set the required mitigation and they will still develop.â€I agree with all of Tony Walls comments with the exception of the 65% number.â€Michael Pruettâ€™s motion for a vote #2 comment. I support his restructuring of the TCHA. I would add a provision that says: The Housing Department is required to comply with and support all Teton County/Town of Jackson Land Development Regulations.â€I do not agree with any of the Staffâ€™s Summary 1-4. I especially am disturbed by the attempt to choose whom my neighbors might be based on who their parents are, their income, their age. The full time verses seasonal residences comment is inappropriate for this Theme.â€Workers generated to construct, maintain or staff new developments are primarily out of state workers, hired by out of state developers who purchase their materials from out of state and take their profits out of state. This does not support our local community. I do not want to support housing for this type of worker. Our Housing Authority should support local developers that hire local workers and invest in our community.â€I support attached, multi-family and rental housing types. Land is too expensive and the lower categories 1-3 are the ones most in need.â€Quality workforce housing is of utmost importance. This housing has to last more than a few years. Each new housing unit should meet the basic level of inspection as dictated by our Building Codes for our Area.â€Remove all â€What the community saidâ€ boxes. All polling or studies should be placed in the Appendix so the reader may reach their own conclusion. Thank you for considering my comments,
2/11/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'd like to thank, or wish Alex a happy birthday, I didn't recognize that. I just wanted to recognize one of the issues you guys did cover last week with the Four Seasons and elaborate a little bit on that. I feel bad we keep ?? them as a bad example, but I think it's really important to recognize the issue there, and I think you guys you're striking at the root cause there. The reason that everyone is so upset is the impact ?? was calculated on our sliding scale, or a scale that tries to calculate impacts. When we get these high-end businesses like that, what happens is we under mitigate for them and over mitigate for lower, smaller mom-and-pop businesses. So, I think the sliding...we think the sliding scale is a good approach to try and attack that in battles that happen right now, that it makes more sense to...it's a little more work, but it makes more sense and probably is fairer in the long run to try and address the individual impacts rather than do a broad-brush thing, especially as we go into this trend to go towards more high-end housing. What's going to happen is we are concerned that we will under vacate because we're taking the midpoint and if everybody's going to be above that, then we are going to under mitigate for that. Also, one cautionary statement, just remember that your vision should be independent of the current economic conditions. I mean, we certainly need to acknowledge this. I think no one can deny that we're in trying times right now, but I think we do need to remember that our vision, like the 30,000-foot-level view, should not be set by current economic conditions. We should determine what is our vision of what we want to do, and then if we set good policy, then it will adapt to those changing economic conditions. Otherwise, at some point, we're going to have to go back and change things. So, and then I just want to echo Gail's comment on the what-was-said boxes. Thank you.
2/11/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Affirm Policy 4.1.d from the April 2009 Draft

Date	Name	Comment
2/9/2010	Faraday, Michael Interested Public	Commissioners: I was disappointed and very concerned when reading (JH Daily, Monday, 02/08/10) that some of you believe it is in our best interests to lower or put a moratorium on housing exactions. As reported, Commissioner Pruett stated, "If the goal is to promote local businesses, increasing those mitigation rates will increase rents and drive out local business," he said. "I'm in favor of decreasing [rates]. I do believe ultimately that helps your local businesses." He may be correct but I strongly challenge the worth of the entire premise. First, Mr. Pruett's indication that "...if the goal is to promote local businesses..." is disasterously single-minded. The goal of any government is to secure equal opportunity for all its citizens. I suggest that focusing so narrowly on promoting business 1) is an abrogation of the totality of his responsibilities, and 2) has led to placing the community at large in great financial jeopardy. Second, Mr. Pruett fails to recognize that promoting business without a guarantee that adequate employee housing will be built concurrent with the project is what got us into this situation. Alternatives to exactions may appear useful in print but are always very slow to implement and seem particularly susceptible to variances. Commissioner Di Costa's concern that any exaction rate may be too high for developers, for perhaps as much as the next 10 years, again focuses only on business and completely misses the point: perhaps we don't need more commercial development now. What we need is housing. The fact that we are almost totally dependent on development to provide new employee housing is the problem; we have no mechanism to meet exisiting housing needs other than through development exactions. That means we need new development, which only increases the need for housing (and services). A most vicious cycle. It seems obvious that if we increase commercial development without the attendant housing we are only exacerbating the problem, which doesn't seem very smart to me. The first step in any solution is to find out what caused the problem. If, as I suspect, the problem of adequate employee housing was caused by inadequate exactions (and enforcement), then let's fix that problem; and certainly, don't make it worse. Respectfully, Michael Faraday

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I'll be asking you primarily to refer to our written comments, but I just wanted to mention a couple of things based on the last Staff's questions that you'll be discussing this evening, particularly with regard to mitigation. We think it's critical to step back and recognize the lessons we can learn from other communities and what's been most effective there. You know, while human nature can make it difficult, we really feel like, you know, as you go through these questions, that it's essential to look at them with the long term in mind, not just the economic conditions that we're facing today. You know, it's really critical to not lose sight that this is supposed to be a long-term strategic document. We recognize that it would be difficult to say, yes, we should increase mitigation today, but we also believe that as a general policy, new development should abide by the maximum level of affordable housing mitigation possible. That is the mitigation requirements should be at the levels supported by the required studies, and that could be the policy statement that can be in the Plan. I want to say this just isn't the idea, you know, the Conservation Alliance mitigation has been proven a very effective tool in other communities. The 2007 Needs Assessment very clearly states that mitigation is the most effective affordable housing tool in Teton County, and approving the mitigation programs is the single most productive action to address the housing needs of the future. And also, in addition to that, the public has made it very clear that they support this. It's a very large majority...I don't have the statistic in front of me, but I believe it's 78 percent agree that all new development should be required to increase or build a higher amount of deed-restricted housing. You know, at the most basic level, we encourage you, as Commissioners, to support the public as the public has supported that action. You know, with that in mind, we were disappointed with last week's votes that failed in the Town regarding the mitigation rates should be set at levels that will assure success in achieving goals. You know, a second issue, I haven't seen any votes yet that specifically call for narrower definitions of workforce housing, which was recommended by the County Planning Commission in June of '09. We're concerned that this is a central issue of this chapter and would like to see some votes direct additional clarification for the chapter. And along those lines also after looking at the Staff's questions, I'm just curious if Commissioners are going to plan on voting on the 65 percent goal at the broad policy level. It's in the statement of ideal, but we noticed that that question isn't explicitly in this week's list of questions. Other than that, I'll close there, but I do agree with the concerns mentioned by Armond before me regarding the conservation easements. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2010	Bruner, Kristy Interested Public	Feb. 4, 2010 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Theme 5 Comments Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to Theme Five - "Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy." Attached are line-by-line comments and suggestions for discussion related to Theme Five. Listed below are key points that we hope are clarified in discussion and/or incorporated into a new draft of this chapter. First, we believe that this chapter must incorporate more language on the importance of wildlife and scenic resource protection to the community's long-term economic well being. More explicit language should be included that speaks to our unique economy and character as a gateway community. Because our location in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, and the wildlife it sustains, draws millions of people to visit the valley, our economy is intricately tied to the protection of these irreplaceable resources. Second, we believe that it is absolutely critical that this chapter distinguish between the terms growth and development. To ensure that everyone is on the same page in discussing growth and/or development and how it contributes to a long-term economy, further clarification on these terms is essential. Please see the attached report "Grappling with Growth" by Michael Kinsley of the Rocky Mountain Institute for explanation and specific details. Third, it would be helpful to clarify the intent of removing a number of topics (that are in the 1994 Plan) that relate to community character and the local economy, such as signage or the appropriate size of structures. At the conclusion of our line-by-line comments, we highlighted a number of topics that are addressed in our current 1994 Plan, but that are no longer addressed in the new draft. Without guidance that certain topics should be addressed in the land development regulations, it's unclear whether they will be. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Sincerely, Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate
2/4/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'll be real quick. I want to comment on a...or a comment that was made last week but wasn't actually voted on, which was the concept to transfer the density from conservation easements into Town. And you didn't vote on that, but I want to at least comment on that. I think that's something that you want to give careful consideration to. If we think about how our Grand Teton Park evolved, the concept there was to permanently retire all that density. And I think if you want to imagine what this community would look like if we had transferred all that data, or all that density, down into the rest of the County and in Town, I would propose, or submit to you that it would be quite a different place to live in. So, I think you want to think real hard before you do that. I'm not against...we're not against the concept I think of transferrable development rights where the owner agrees to transfer them, but where the goal of the owner is perhaps to maintain the community as they see it and the desire is to extinguish those rights, I think you should respect that. The one point...I apologize to those of you who have already heard that, but I know there are some new members, we'd like to make the point again, which has been made, which is that density bonuses are not free. There is a cost to the community. It's not an economic cost; it's a cost in terms of traffic, change of character, and a change in the demand for services. So, thank you.
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	New small developments in Town should be exempt from mitigation requirements

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2010	Kaminski, Jim Interested Public	My name is Jim Kaminski. I've lived and worked here for about 35 years. And I just have a...I'm not an expert on the Housing Authority, but I want to comment about what I...sort of to me is a disconnect between an effort to try and make housing available to people who can't afford the median home price of around \$2 million and up, and increasing amounts and ?? on public lands in the interest and in the expression of a meaning for more housing or a meaning to moderate-income people. And I'm speaking primarily about Park Service and Forest Service employees ??. Now, there's an issue that will probably take some time to unravel up on Nelson Drive and much of that interest has a lot to do with increasing the amount of available housing for people who work up in ??. Now, I don't argue that those people are poor. What I do assert is that there are very few people who, on an income of around fifty to seventy thousand dollars a year, can finance a home in the Valley on the order of 1.5 to 2 million dollars. Now, I've got a number of colleagues who work not just work for the Park Service, because it's not just Nelson Drive <<inaudible>> to try and use public land for more housing. But that very issue is present in the Park as well. So, on one hand, people argue consistently about the value of public land. It's a value of wildlife, recreation and a number of other issues and ??. On the hand, we seem all too willing to gobble it up, and it strikes me as something that's difficult to reconcile. And so with that comment, I talked to the mayor's office and to the city ?? about a better connection between the housing authorities and the need for moderately priced, or available public housing, or housing, if you will, that's moderately priced and could be accessed by people who lived in the community and worked for government. Now, there are a number of examples where people simply make too much money to make the affordable housing available to them, and I'm not talking about extraordinary amounts of money. I'm talking about seventy to ninety thousand dollars a year. Now, so, there was a broader issue that the context of that I want to underscore is that there are serious tradeoffs, or so it seems to me, for continuing to nickel and dime <<inaudible>> of making housing available to people who are seeking moderately priced homes in the Valley, and a continuing effort, or a lack of communication, so it seems to me, between the housing authorities and an effort to try and meet the needs of people who work here, not just to make a living, but to try and serve the public resources and public needs. Thank you.
2/4/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Looking at inherent inefficiencies in processes, sometimes having presentations prior...after public comments <<inaudible>>, the question was asked of the Housing Authority Director last week about the proportion of distribution of Class 1, 2 and 3 houses. It was responded to correctly according to statute and LDR; however, the real world...and that's thirty-three and a third each...however, the real-world answer to that is during the ?? Creek hearing, the Housing Authority rolled over for that developer in favor of 50 percent Class 3, away from the demand, by the way. So, the reason I bring this up, it's not a gottcha moment for the Housing Authority, it's to illustrate that no matter how hard we worked on the Comprehensive Plan and transitioning that part into the light of the LDRs, we don't have the will to prevent selective enforcement and selective interpretation of some of our existing statutes that the whole exercise will be partial to or not. There was a lot of language in theme four about deed restricted or not, including in the workforce housing definition. To my way of thinking, if it's not deed restricted in perpetuity, or appreciation capped in perpetuity, that at some stage that unit becomes part of the problem, not part of the solution. The community will have to regenerate and re-subsidize that unit, a net loss, which brings me to the next topic. No net loss, there was a lot of discussion in theme three especially about redevelopment, etc., ??. There wasn't much discussion on how that affects no net loss, especially in Town, because as we do redevelop, obviously we will lose some of the lower-priced ownership and rental units. Funding source, no disrespect to Mr. Pruett, but my interpretation of the funding source was diametrically opposed to his. My idea is no better than his. I just figured I'd bring that up. Purchase of existing stock and to augment, not replace, mitigation was what I've been referring to since the first of this meeting actually. Also not to disrespect, by being cryptic, Commissioner Mr. Pruett and Commissioner Mr. Stewart, to my way of thinking, any suggestion that those who disproportionately create the demand for affordable and employee housing not be simultaneously and proportionately responsible to create the supply flies in the face of everything that the community has told us about development paying its own way and about instituting some hard-core codified concurrency requirements to prevent development from getting ahead of infrastructure. So, again, my idea is no better than yours. That's just my interpretation. Also, we've had a lot of effort in this and a lot of successes, but I'll give you one extreme example. The Four Seasons generated 450 employees. If at the time they were only required to mitigate 15 percent, or 25 percent with the current Regulations, that still leaves us housing the remaining 75 percent, or added into our commuter rate. If the suggestion comes up in the future that we somehow pay for this employee generation, you're essentially asking us as a community to subsidize the vacations and the recreation and the amenity migration of some more affluent people in the world. So, that's...if you're going to run for office sometime, try to run on that platform. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2010	Cresswell, Anne JH Community Housing	Anne Cresswell, speaking on behalf of the Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust. I don't have much to say. I want to thank you for all the hard work and thought that you've given to this issue over the last four or five meetings. We have already submitted comments so I don't want to add to that, but there's been a lot of conversation over the past couple of meetings about what I would coin a seductive notion that we can buy up restricted housing, use taxpayer money to buy up restricted housing and then permanently deed restrict that. And I think there is some merit to that, but as you continue to consider this, I would urge you to very carefully consider the long-term financial liabilities that could accrue to the County and to the Town in the event of failure. All the due diligence in the world sometimes cannot uncover issues that are hidden in between walls. There are non-spectrums that can find very expensive problems and failures ?? that when you're selling these homes to people that are earning less than 120 percent of median income, they can become upside down very quickly, and then the Town and the County can find themselves in a position of a bailout. And the Housing Trust has some experience with this, so that's why I share this with you. We've acquired four to six different homes over the course of the last 20 years, bought down free-market opportunities as they've become available. And I would characterize half as having being very successful and half as having been pretty significant nightmares that we could not have anticipated. And we felt that it was our obligation to help out those homeowners and we did that, but we spent a lot of money trying to fix those problems. So, I think there's a lot of merit to it and it certainly could have potential, but I don't think it's a silver bullet and we have to tread lightly when we go there. Thank you again for all the time you've put into this issue.
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	With regard to socioeconomic diversity, set a goal of maintaining the current statistical distribution of incomes and ages in the community
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation on nonresidential development should generally stay the same as it is under the current requirements to house those peak seasonal workers that cannot afford housing
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation on residential development should generally be determined by a sliding scale based on the impact from the development
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation on nonresidential development should generally decrease from the current requirements to house those peak seasonal workers that cannot afford housing
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation on nonresidential development should generally increase above the current requirements to house those peak seasonal workers that cannot afford housing
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	With regard to maintaining a sense of community first, set a goal of increasing the current ratio of housing for full-time residents (community) to housing for seasonal residents (resort) [will supersede 275 if approved]
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	With regard to maintaining a sense of community first, set a goal of maintaining the current ratio of housing for full-time residents (community) to housing for seasonal residents (resort)(Superseded by Recommendation 276)
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff should rewrite the fourth basis to discuss maintenance of a sense of community by encouraging housing for full-time residents (community) over housing for seasonal residents (resort)
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	With regard to socioeconomic diversity, set a goal of achieving an evener statistical distribution of incomes [will partially supersede 273 if approved]
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Set a goal of increasing the percentage of the workforce living locally beyond current (65-70%) levels [will supersede 271 if approved]

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Set a goal of maintaining the current percentage of the workforce living locally (65-70%)(Superseded by Recommendation 272)
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Development of new small businesses and small homes should be exempt from mitigation requirements
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The 2009 draft prioritizes preservation of existing housing stock over the use of density bonus incentives in addressing the potential impacts from the resale/redevelopment of existing housing stock (Policy 4.3a). Is this prioritization still accurate?
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	There is no prioritization between use of mitigation regulations, permanent funding, or incentives in addressing the impacts from new development
2/4/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation on nonresidential development should generally be determined by a sliding scale based on the impact from the development
2/3/2010	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	Dear Planners, It was surreal to read in our local papers this week that both our Planning Commissions were proposing expensive measures to support affordable housing at the same time that property tax revenues are expected to plunge and the Town Council and County Commissioners plan to present voters with a sales tax increase. One wonders if all these officials really live in the same county. Surely they are not looking at the same economy. Affordable housing may be a laudable goal and maintaining the share of locally housed workers might benefit the community. But it does not come cheaply. Direct subsidies cost real dollars, and indirect subsidies (aka density bonuses) cost more when costs of congestion and additional infrastructure needs are counted. These costs are not at all hard to enumerate. (X workers times Y dollars per home.) . And this is without counting the costs to the environment pushed off onto a community whose most valuable asset is its natural capital. While there might be more demand for ownership of more expensive homes, there is no doubt greater need for those in categories 1- 3, especially for rentals, a sustainable option which should be considered. Developers (profit and nonprofit) might find it financially rewarding to provide more expensive homes and lobby for these. It is important to keep the policy goal in mind, being careful not to subsidize development in the name of affordable housing, but actually solve the problem and give priority to those most in need. At a time when Town and County are struggling to meet their current obligations (as are many of their citizens) the planning process cannot ignore the costs of the promises it is making. Yes, the Plan is a long-term document, but it would be foolhardy to presume our current economic difficulties will end soon. Besides, hoping for another housing boom to solve our affordable housing challenges does not sound like a winning solution. An effective comprehensive plan must align our goals and aspirations with our resources and competing needs. Over-promising and under-delivering is not a recipe for successful public policy. Kristine and Paul O'Brien
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan should continue to regulate the net loss of market workforce housing through redevelopment

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	No mitigation should be required on new residential development
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation rates should be set at levels that will assure success in achieving the goals of all bases of the housing program
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Programs to provide housing in neighboring communities should be a housing strategy
1/28/2010	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment tonight and for all the time and energy that you've put into this review process. In your Staff Report for next week, ?? comments on theme four, but we'd like to briefly raise a few key points tonight as well. Many of these are related to the County Planning Commission's recommendations from last summer and echo some of the concerns raised by the housing agencies. First, this theme needs to more narrowly define and distinguish between workforce housing and affordable housing. We appreciate the intent of this theme to expand housing discussions to workforce housing as we set our community goals, but we believe that the current chapter's language doesn't provide enough policy guidance in the importance of clearly defining affordability measures. There needs to be stronger language that housing to be targeted to categories in proportion to local incomes and the community needs. The increase in higher category homes should come in addition to the development of lower category homes, not as a replacement for them. As we have raised in other chapters, we're concerned about the amount of information on a diversity of topics, such as substandard housing, that were removed from this draft Plan but exist in our current Plan. Also, try to add new topics, such as the need for higher category homes, some who are ?? and should not be removed, but rather updated in this new draft. Second, this theme should securely indicate that workforce and affordable housing units are included in the overall development potential. Exceeding this number is not appropriate for our community. The goals of this theme, particularly quantitative goals, such as the 65 percent number, and eventually the mitigation rates, need to be based on ?? sizing houses and should be reasonable as a goal. Also, language in this theme should be strong enough to require that new development will not ??, and in the case of redevelopment, a no-net-loss policy should be explored. Third, as we've stated before, preservation of existing housing, the existing stock of workforce housing should be clearly prioritized over new construction. More and more detailed policies regarding production and preservation of rental housing, including opportunities for conversion of commercial square footage to rentals should be included. Essentially, there are two major pieces to the affordable housing puzzle—the supply and demand for the housing. Many of your earlier votes indicated a commitment to address the issue of <<inaudible>>. We hope that this will continue in future votes. We also hope that this group will continue to acknowledge that the lens through which we are building this Plan is and should continue to be the protection of wildlife, open spaces and natural resources and community character. Lastly, on a ?? question about theme two, we're hoping to clarify when the hearing on theme two will be able to take place. It's important to give the public adequate notice—a couple of weeks really—for both the hearing date and any deadline for written comment, especially since it wasn't in this week's Staff Report. I don't know if people even knew that it was released. Thank you for your time.
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Creation of a permanent funding source should be a housing strategy
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Density bonuses should continue to be a housing strategy - while respecting the overall development caps previously recommended
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Preservation of existing workforce housing stock should continue to be a housing strategy - with caution not to actually deplete middle class housing opportunities
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Mitigation requirements on new development should continue to be included as a housing strategy

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Subsidized housing programs should focus on full-time workers
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintaining a "sense of community" should be a basis of the community housing program; and the concept of "community first, resort second" defined as desired housing types - acknowledging that resort jobs are important to the community - should also be a basis of the community housing program(Superseded by Recommendation 285)
1/28/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Workforce housing, socioeconomic diversity, generational continuity, and limiting exportation of impacts are all bases of the housing program with no priority
1/28/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'll hit on a few topics here, primarily related to the mission statement itself. We quite often use a lot of slogans in this County—Town as heart, workforce housing, community first, resort second, but we don't always follow through with them. Community first, resort second, there's been a tendency in the past to approve developments—??, Shooting Star, Jackson Hole Golf & Tennis, I could keep going—that we always see the golf courses and the golf-course-view lots, i.e., the resort first, and we're still waiting on the affordable and employee housing, i.e., ??. So, we need to do something to reverse this dynamic in the future as we go through this process. I have a direct challenge, and I have for quite some time, to the 65 percent rate itself and its statistical validity. It's not based on peer review research or reproducible results. As I've stated in the past, it's extracted from a singular comment in the Housing Needs Assessment that pretty much states that observation in the peer mountain resort areas seem to suggest that volunteers and rates go down and employee absenteeism rate go up some undefined percentage if you get much below that 60 percent number. We absolutely need an affordable housing program. I would just like to see more data-based approaches in the future. Also, there's a problem in my mind with using the 65 percent, that number, which is almost wholly statistically correlated to the commuter rate as the sole arbiter of the success or failure of our entire affordable housing program. If you think about it, we're basing everything on non-reproducible results that are statistically tied only to the commuter rate. There's at least four major reasons for the commuter rate that have nothing to do with ?? or any of the other factors that often touted. Reason number one is the over approval of large golf, lodging, and resort entities within this community the last decade and a half that had an excessive employee generation, under mitigated. And that in itself necessitates a commuter rate. Technological advances, allowing remote work stationing, the discretionary income, market forces beyond our control, and lifestyle and quantity of life choices by our fellow citizens that choose not to be ball and chained to a deed restriction and maybe want a little space, in the great western tradition or great western mythology, whichever you choose of self-sufficiency, etc. Funding source is mentioned. Absolutely we should have a funding source for affordable housing, a dedicated revolving revenue stream. I think it should be tied to open space, as I've said in the past, but I personally as a citizen would rather have a direct known quantifiable subsidy than a series of unknown subsidies with the affordable housing program. I didn't have time to review this chart, but just glancing at it, 45 percent of our stock, if I'm reading this correctly, is above the median income, above 100 percent of the median income. We have a tendency to pad our numbers by overproducing Class IV units in the very recent past, and we have seven units available unless we see 200 or 250 people show up, so we should correlate supply with demand a little more closely. Finally, on the 65 percent, two things: What will we do when the Planning Directors come in for the first time at an annual review meeting and say, last year we were at 64.9? We really need to discuss that. What are the ramifications of dipping below that number? The last thing was other communities have abandoned the numeric objective of workforce retention in favor of a targeted retention of essential services personnel. They've actually defined those persons and defined what is the threshold of retention they want in the community. So, that's an example of communities that have tried a numeric objective in favor or adopted another one. The last thing I'll say is that the...according to Mrs. Walker last week, I think the lottery system increase of one per application for emergency services workers is insufficient. We really need to address that, because you don't want to place a greater value on one person or another, but you can over or under value specific skill sets for individuals, and emergency services are the most important there. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
1/27/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	January 27, 2010 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Theme 4 Comments Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to Theme Four - "Meet Our Community's Housing Needs." As we stated at the January 14 hearing, throughout its decades of work in the valley, the Conservation Alliance has addressed affordable housing policies within a larger context of responsible land use planning. We see affordable housing issues as a critical component of long-term strategic land-use. While we believe some of the recent approaches to secure affordable housing have been flawed, such as the unpredictable PUD-affordable housing, we support the broad intent to secure housing for our local workforce, close to the workplace. With this in mind, attached are detailed comments associated with specific policies and language currently outlined in Theme Four. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Sincerely, Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate

Date	Name	Comment
1/21/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, given your discussions at the Jan. 14 hearing, I would like to clarify our concerns regarding the “What the Community Has Said About this Theme” sections in each chapter. While we appreciate the intent to provide narrative summaries within the various chapters, we have consistently raised concerns regarding the degree to which the summaries are comprehensive and objective representations of public comment. We have requested that either the sections include a comprehensive list of findings (with actual results), or that the sections are eliminated and the plan simply include the polling findings as an appendix where a comprehensive data set can speak for itself. In short, caution should be taken in citing just several polling examples in these sections given the diversity of other community input that is highly relevant to a given chapter, but that is not reflected in the abbreviated lists. To provide specific examples, below are some excerpts of the points we raised in earlier public comment as they relate to different themes. Theme Four - “Meet Our Community’s Housing Needs” The draft states the following: “2008 polling indicated that: a majority of the community agrees that the town and county should continue to use incentives, rather than requirements, to encourage more deed restricted workforce housing in new development.” However, based on analysis of three public surveys, two of the surveys actually demonstrated the opposite result – with more people disagreeing than agreeing with the statement. Only the University of Wyoming survey shows 50.3% in agreement with the statement, with a full 40.1% opposed, which does not represent a notable majority. Theme Three – “Uphold Jackson as ‘Heart of the Region’” The draft states the following: “Most of the community supports limiting building heights to three stories along major corridors outside of Town Square.” However, other polling indicates that this is not necessarily representative of the breadth of results across surveys questions. For example, the University of Wyoming “Key Findings” report states: “There was nearly equal agreement among residents that, “Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change,” (40%), and, “Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings,” (37%). Also, in discussions on theme three, the Conservation Alliance provided the following examples of polling results from The University of Wyoming, Teton County Community Survey (2008) that could be added to allow for a broader picture of community input: • “A far higher percentage (78%) of residents considers it a higher priority to build more deed restricted affordable housing than to allow additional commercial or resort development.” • “Both overall development in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited.” (61%) Theme Two – “Manage Growth Responsibly” The Conservation Alliance raised questions as to why this section “what the community has said about this theme” included no polling coverage on questions regarding the preferred overall amount of development. The public has expressed strong support for limiting or reducing development potential. (See attached memo for examples.) If this section remains, it should address community input on this important aspect of growth management. Also, the narratives should not include incorrect statements, such as “the community strongly supported the value that growth in the community must be managed responsibly, and that a “no growth” strategy was not the preferred alternative.” See attached memo for clarification. Theme One – “Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources” In discussions on theme one, the Conservation Alliance primarily expressed concerns about the subjectivity of the narrative portion and the degree to which polling topics were not sufficiently addressed in the new draft overall (such as the lack of a strategy to establish a funding source for conservation easements). In conclusion, thank you for your consideration in evaluating the “What the Community Has Said About this

Date	Name	Comment
		Theme” section of the chapters. These sections should either be rewritten to more accurately reflect all the survey results, or eliminated and all the polling results included in the appendix. If the plan’s policies are written clearly enough, then they will capture and represent the community input, without having to have an additional section describing this input. Thank you again for all your work.
1/14/2010	Fodor, Stefan Interested Public	Good evening, Stefan Fillmore. I live here in Town. I want to say first off that as a general concept, I support the concept of affordable housing; however, I think that the policy over the years has become somewhat skewed. And I think also...unfortunately, I haven’t had a chance to read the Housing Authority’s 65 percent report, but I think especially in this economy, and I think probably Alex made some comments in his Staff Report, that now is the time with prices so depressed to look around for some flexible alternatives. I also note that whether or not the 65 percent goal is adopted by these boards, we’re currently at 68 percent, so maybe we don’t need to do that much tweaking of our current policy and we need to focus on some market-based alternatives. Habitat for Humanity, there’s a group involved in the Point, which is affordable rentals. And that’s without any government subsidies or any taxation or any exaction fees on development here in Town. And I’d encourage the boards to look at those sorts of things as opposed to continuing to add exactions on existing or potential or future developments. There’s only so much that those entities can take, or those developments can take, before you make them unfeasible. Also, I think that in my brief experience in looking at a few and knowing a few people in affordable housing, I think there’s a fair amount of abuse out there. And I’d like to see or like to know—perhaps I need to get with the people in those entities—what’s being done to curb those abuses at the root, because that to me is unacceptable. If we’re going through a process to provide housing to needy people, to people who we deem should have some assistance, and at the same time that process is being abused, so I’d like to see some of that. Flexibility is the key. And especially with prices as depressed as they are, I’d like to see us look at some alternatives and perhaps if there’s money available, buy it up now. Lastly, I appreciate your time and all the effort you’ve put in over the course of this long process. Affordable rentals I think is a real thing we need to focus on as opposed to affordable housing permanently. If we’re saying we need some more workforce housing, we need to find housing for people because they’re providing a valuable service to the community, or because they provide valuable volunteer time, I think that should be more linked to a rental as opposed to a long-term housing. There’s some comments as to what happens when people retire, the stock gets taken up. Should we be providing affordable housing to retirees when really the goal...I think one of the goals is to provide for people that add some particular value to the community. I think that affordable rentals might be a better way to meet some of those as opposed to long-term. And I’m sorry, I did say last, but I have one more—shared appreciation mortgages. I believe, and I may be wrong, I believe Mr. Daugherty benefited from that when he was hired by the County, and I think that alternatives like that are really the way to go. The County has put in, I think, or my understanding of a shared appreciation mortgage, the County puts in a percentage of the purchase price and on the sale, gets a percentage of the sales price back. So, as long as the market goes up, the County is actually going to make some money investing in real estate, while at the same time allowing someone who may not have been able to come to Teton County to provide a service for us is allowing them to do so without, let’s say, capital outlay. So, that’s the way it...we’re not giving away those dollars; we’re actually investing them with the people that we feel need to be here. So, I thank you for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
1/14/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gale Jensen, Teton County. I have a few comments. I've read, in anticipation of making comments, the white paper that Teton County Housing Authority is going to present. I have one comment with regards to that and that is I think a definition of worker, like number of hours worked. There's no mention of that and so everybody's a worker in Teton County. And I think that there should be some sort of definition somewhere about what constitutes a worker, at least for consideration for the affordable housing and deed-restricted housing, whatever, some sort of definition needs to be established, number of hours. Also, my other comments relate to the Staff Report, and pretty much I mimic exactly what Tony Wall has stated in his comments, and since he's not here, I'll just...I'm not going to read them completely but I'll just highlight what he has said. They're very simple and very to the point. Add language to establish special zoning districts for high-density, deed-restricted rental housing. And I would add a comment to that and also add them to the FLUP maps when those are produced. His second comment was strong language requiring that mitigation rates for both residential and commercial development be set at levels that will ensure the success of theme-four statement of idea of housing 65 percent of the workforce. And I would change what he has said to the percentage that is determined in the LDRs, or the Comprehensive Plan, because I don't think you've established a number at this point, the 65 percent. The next thing would be to his third comment, page 49, principle 4.4, incentivize the creation of workforce housing should be removed entirely. I agree with that. We've already determined that we don't want additive density and that that PUD-AH does not meet our desire for predictability. And then also his number four on density and floor-area bonuses and other incentives are what the public doesn't want to see put in place. Onsite mitigation commercial and residential for employee generation is the only solution going forward that will eliminate subjectivity in the planning process and provide predictability. I had one more comment and that has to do with number eight, and I think this is in what the Staff I think is asking for questions that they would like you all to discuss. Yes, Staff followup and discussion points, in their number eight, I would add as other, pursue government, state and federal grants to build rent-restricted housing. Thank you very much.
1/14/2010	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you. Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. A quick comment. I heard repeatedly over the last four weeks the conversation I think that came out of the numbers, the discussion on nonresidential to residential conversion and the need to incentivize that. And I'd like to caution you about that. I'd really consider you being careful as you go forward with that. I'd liken that to try to start a fire with gasoline, and certainly, you know, if you've ever tried to start a fire when it's cold and wet, you do need some accelerant, but too much and you lose your eyebrows and, in my case, you might lose your beard. So, that is I think something that needs to be considered in this is that incentives should be applied very carefully in that; otherwise, we're going to end up with a phrase I used a lot during the STAG group, which is mischief. So, I think that's something that you need to consider. To consider actually maybe not whether just let the marketplace handle that, whether you just allow the conversion to happen, because I think if you look at what's going on right now anyway, there's not that much drive for people to build commercial right now, nonresidential. So, if someone wants to build something, that would be perhaps something that would just come out of the market without having to incentivize. So, don't give them something that they were already going to do in the first place, or consider not giving too much and slowly feed it in rather than throw a big slug on the fire. Lastly, one other comment on all the incentives, I think that incentives do have a value, certainly in the case of affordable housing, especially when you consider key occupations. I think if we did a secret poll of you guys, and even if we included the rest of the public, as to what we thought were key occupations that we need to support and make sure those people stay here, we'd probably come up with the same five. So, I think that's something to consider that that is a place for incentives are to incentivize people to take those occupations. And then one last thought I'd like to leave you with, and I haven't read the report on the 65 percent, that one of the things I think the goal of, really the goal of affordable housing should be to help people help themselves, not to give them a gift. That's a big distinction because, coming back to the old proverb, anything easily obtained is not highly valued. So, I think that should be the goal is to help people but not to necessarily give them something. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
1/14/2010	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. On behalf of the Alliance, thanks for all your work on this. While there are a number of line-by-line adjustments we believe are critical in making this theme tonight, our comments are just going to focus on the broad level that you're reviewing. And also I wanted to go ahead and warn and thank you in advance for some of your patience tonight since our comments are a little bit lengthier than usual. Throughout these decades of work in the Valley, the Alliance has addressed workforce housing within a larger context of responsible land-use planning. We see affordable housing as a critical component of strategic land use. While we believe some of the community's recent approaches have been flawed, such as the unpredictable PUD for affordable housing, we support the broad intent to secure housing for our local workforce being close to a workplace. With this in mind, I'll raise some issues along with four recommended actions to address our broad concerns on theme four. A couple of these I'm going to mention now and then I'm going to do a handout so I won't have to read them all now. First, we believe that affordable housing policies in the new Plan must be consistent with the community's primary goals to protect wildlife and to limit overall development potential. Policies must also clearly indicate that workforce and affordable housing units are included in an overall build-out number. So, to address this, we recommend voting to add a policy similar to one that was in the summer 2008 draft of the Comp Plan. The exact language stated workforce housing developments will be consistent with other aspects of this Plan, including overall build-out and protection of natural resource areas. The policy also included the language the appropriate levels of density established for workforce housing should not increase the overall build-out potential for Teton County. This type of language should be reinstated that speaks to a specific value and a goal, rather than just the consistency with the FLUP language that's currently there. This is a similar concern that you already voted on regarding theme three. Second, policies in the new Plan must limit the demand for additional workforce housing just as your previous commitment to not expand commercial development beyond baseline entitlements did. Also, policies must include more specific definitions for affordable housing to help guide LDRs. Policies must clearly direct that affordable housing types in terms of category and pricing be required to enforce a community need. We think that policies must direct that new development, residential and commercial, abide by the maximum level of affordable housing mitigation possible. Mitigation requirements should be increased to levels supported by the required studies. So, to address these, we recommend voting to add stronger language in some of the policies. For example, workforce housing as it currently stands is far too vague. Some of the housing organizations already made really good recommendations regarding the importance of affordability, so I won't reiterate that. I'll just make two...bring up two other examples from again the 2008 draft of the Comp Plan. It stated that commercial development should fully mitigate its demand for employee housing. In this recent draft, that language has been weakened to housing to be granted for a portion of these new employees. Another example is the '08 draft had a policy that stated prevent net loss of housing units during redevelopment. The most recent draft simply says minimize loss through redevelopment. We believe stronger language will go further in shaping LDRs that actually product more housing that will benefit the community. Third, policies in the new Plan must be fiscally responsible in the long term. To address this, we recommend voting to add additional language that acknowledges that new development, unless strategically planned, proposes long-term financial cost to the community and, too, that clearly identifies that preservation of existing housing as the highest priority approach. More specifically, we caution the use of statements such as those currently in policy 4.4.A. It states density and floor-area bonuses provide workforce housing units at less financial cost to the community. While we understand the intent of this language, particularly if we're talking short term, in certain aspects this statement wouldn't hold. Time and time again, studies have shown that new development rarely pays its way in the long term and the financial costs to the community may actually increase through time. In terms of the economic times that we're currently in, we do appreciate the hesitance to discuss higher mitigation rates and increasing requirements for developers. We fully appreciate that. However, we believe that the goals of this Plan must extend beyond current times and shouldn't be based on...about concerns about developers today. As we said earlier, you don't need to call out a specific number in the Comp Plan in terms of mitigation rate, but we believe that language should be included that affordable housing mitigation requirements will be at the maximum level supported by necessary studies. In terms of a lot of the discussion on cost of development, we believe it's critical to understand in a policy that decreases costs for new development, for example, not requiring new development to pay its way in terms of housing, doesn't actually result in a removal of costs. Costs, such as a lack of workforce housing, they don't just disappear. They are simply displaced most often to existing taxpayers. If our community doesn't commit to requiring mitigation of these costs up front, the burden on a single development in the short term may be removed, but it's been placed on the larger community in perpetuity and that we don't support this vision for planning in Jackson. Further comments about needing more growth to get housing, this argument is unclear. What about the thousands of residential units and millions of commercial square feet that are already in the pipeline and permitted under base zoning? In terms of redevelopment, as many communities have based unless strategically planned redevelopment actually results in a net loss of housing and successive workforce. I'm almost finished—last but not least, we request that you move or remove what the community said about this theme's sections. We did raise this concern in various theme but no direction or votes have yet been taken in regard to this. And I'm just going to provide one example from this particularly theme four. There's a sentence that states, 2008 indicated that a majority of the community agrees that the Town and County should continue to use incentives rather than requirements to encourage more deed-restricted housing. However, based on our analysis of the surveys, two of the surveys

Date	Name	Comment
		actually demonstrated the opposite result of more people disagreeing than agreeing with the statement. So with that, in closing, we hope this theme will increasingly focus on comprehensive housing solutions that target both the demand for and supply of affordable housing. You know, looking forward, our community, if we continue to encourage rapid growth of low-income jobs, we can't continue to be surprised by workforce housing shortages. You know, part of the responsibility in planning lies in the extent to which we prevent the problem such as workforce housing shortages from developing, not just how we respond to it once it has already developed. I'll close there. And thanks again for your patience.
1/14/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The basis of the housing program should be: -Maintaining a local workforce (April draft structure) -Maintaining socioeconomic diversity -Encouraging generational continuity of local families -Not exporting our housing impacts to neighboring communiti
1/14/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	A housing program is still necessary
1/14/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	The basis of the housing program should include: -Continuing to be a community first and a resort second(Superseded by Recommendation 285)
1/12/2010	Chong, Geneva Interested Public	Hi All, I have been having an interesting conversation with an architect friend about accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as affordable and ADA accessible housing options. I am not pushing his business (kit and modular ADA accessible ADUs < 800 sf), but instead the idea that ADUs are not all bad and should be considered in town and county zoning where we want to encourage increased density of this specific type. Town's suburban residential comes to mind - where people already build "care-taker" and "mother-in-law" apartments, and the lots are big. These ADUs could also be used as home offices. Something to think about. The attachment provides links to zoning laws in specific towns and cities. Please share with the other planning commission members and electeds as you see fit. Thank you, and happy new year! Geneva
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Upgrade alleys and bury overhead power lines
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add Indicator: Aesthetic quality, ecological value, and recreational opportunities along Flat Creek and Cache Creek - with a goal of improvement

Date	Name	Comment
1/7/2010	Fulton, Greg Interested Public	To the Honorable Mayor and Town Council, City of Jackson, Wy, Thank you for the opportunity to voice my views regarding the future of the Jackson Hole Town Square. As the owner of Astoria Fine Art Gallery located at 35 E. Deloney Ave. (on the Town Square) I am against any proposal to close Deloney Avenue or any Town Square streets to create a pedestrian only area. I am shocked and concerned that such an idea would even be considered without first contacting and interviewing the business owners that would be the most effected my such a measure. I believe this is a bad idea for the Town Square. I believe my business would be adversely effected by this proposal. It is important for my customers to have ample parking in the street; and especially during the winter months my business relies on people being able to park in front of the gallery and having easy access to my entrance. As you may know we are in the process of expansion. We are adding employees and attempting to grow even in a tough economic climate. Any experiment (and it would be an experiment) that could hurt traffic patterns at my establishment would be contrary to your mission statement: It is the mission of the Town of Jackson Municipal Organization to provide municipal services that enhance the quality of life for our residents and guests and to help support the local economy. Changing traffic patterns, perhaps adversely, would be a terrible blow to businesses who may be struggling. I believe the proposal would hurt, not support, the local economy and would be a decision that could lead to more closings and empty buildings. It is too risky. So far Jackson has survived the recession well. Other large art markets have seen 10-15% of their galleries close. Jackson has not. Please do not take any action that may change that scenario. Please do not close Deloney Avenue to the vehicles that our customers use to visit the town square and the adjacent businesses. To use the old adage: If its not broken do not fix it. Please trust that if I thought my business or my neighbors' businesses would stand to benefit in the slightest way I would support any measure. I see no benefit and stand firmly against any future consideration towards changing a very good and historically high-performing economic center downtown. Sincerely, Greg Fulton A very concerned local business owner and resident
1/7/2010	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Welcome to the new guys. Be careful what you wish for; you got it. I'd like to reiterate a request for stronger language in a specific statement in regards to wildlife in Town, everything from, you know, Florence Meadow, Flat Creek Crossing, etc., etc. It's not quite strong enough now. Also, this is related, Mrs. Chairperson, to theme three, PRD. PRD is the only mechanism whose tentacles permeate the rest of the eight themes. Relative to Town, we keep...we're almost doing a disservice to ourselves by maintaining this Town as heart semantics, because, as I stated at the last meeting—this is for the benefit of the new guys—we have 1780 units entitled in Town. We have about 6200 units entitled in County. We have 47 percent of the population in this County lives in the Town of Jackson. We have 53 percent that lives out. It has not been for a couple of decades now Town as heart, and nothing we've done to date is going to change that. We really need a focused, coordinated discussion, and we tried to do this early on with the PRD forward request, which passed five/zero at the County level and it stalled at the Town level. Maybe that's something we could bring back up, because more knowledge and more discussion and more discourse couldn't be a bad thing. And if we don't figure out a way to shift that dynamic to the entitled development in Town from the County, a mechanism other than the TDR that was proposed originally, we will never achieve the objectives of Town as heart as far as I see it. Thanks a lot.
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 3.1: Change "Amend PUD and PMD to be consistent with the Future Land Use Plan " to "Remove PUD and PMD as development options"
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Remove reference to the FLUP in Theme 3 and recraft language to instead reference the intent of the policies
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add a strategy to enhance the influence of the Design Review Committee

Date	Name	Comment
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Create a paragraph relating to wildlife planning policies in Town – use the intent of the Conservation Alliance guidance to “address town’s ‘interface’ areas with adjacent public lands, ecologically sensitive and valuable riparian areas (Flat and Cache C
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Include language that a specific plan be developed to utilize the bridges and waterways as a part of the plan to improve and emphasize our gateways
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 3.2.c: Remove the sentence "The sales tax revenue generated in this area is essential to the funding of most public and community services and functions and will need to be maintained or expanded in the future." and insert into Theme 6
1/7/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	A Flat Creek Corridor Overlay should be developed that addresses the ecological, recreational, and aesthetic values of the corridor while not diminishing the existing uses and/or property rights along the corridor
1/7/2010	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Welcome back ???. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Thank you also for taking this extra day to be sure that the review of theme three is complete. It’s important for this body to discuss all the things that are important to the public. Regarding theme three, we’ve submitted written comments with specific recommended actions followed by rationale and explanations. We also raised several significant questions that we hope will be addressed. There are a few key points for your consideration tonight. Commissioner Allen suggested in this week’s Staff Report the inclusion of a section regarding ecological and wildlife issues specific to Town as outlined in our comments. This important addition should be centered on the protection of areas that abut and interact with public lands, riparian areas and watershed health in quality in and near Town still to function as crucial winter ranges and corridors that ensure wildlife habitat connectivity. This addition would be particularly important to sensitive species, particularly the moose and mule deer, who are currently at the low target population levels and that rely on the Town as habitat. Second, the transportation issue specific to Town should be addressed in more detail in this theme. For example, West Broadway has the highest mortality rate for mule deer in all of Teton County and should be taken into consideration. Even if much of the discussion is postponed until the transportation theme, a reference to or mention of the interactions of transportation and wildlife in Town ???. Lastly, the indicator section could be improved by including, for example, percentage of net gain, preservation and loss of affordable housing units within the Town boundaries, transportation efficiency, watershed protection and wildlife habitat preservation in both the Town and the County, all of which are factors that measure the success of the Town as heart position and policies. The indicator section should also include baseline conditions as measurable certain points. As we have with the other themes, we will be submitting comments on theme four in weeks to come. Thanks again for all your hard work.
1/5/2010	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce respectfully submits the following recommendations for Theme 3, "Town as Heart" of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan:1. Place an emphasis on redevelopment versus expansion (new development) in Teton County with the exception of Teton Village. Provide Teton Village with enough commercial square footage to be a sustainable community center.2. Develop architectural design and energy efficiency standards for redevelopment corridors3. Zoning in Town of Jackson promotes mixed commercial/residential redevelopment on North Cache, the five-way, the “Y”, Jackson-King sections, Pearl-Hansen sections, S. Glenwood between W. Deloney and W. Gill, Scott Lane and other arteries off of Broadway, and Gregory Lane.4. All development and redevelopment applications should address community transportation needs and concerns.5. Any development of the “Y” should consider the completion of the “Brown Cutoff.”6. All development and redevelopment should place consideration on affordable rental housing7. Develop density transfer regulations (TDRs) that will help land owners maintain their land values, provide incentives for redevelopment within the current town boundaries, and greatly reduces impacts to currently undeveloped lands in Teton County.Sincerely,Tim O'DonoghueExecutive DirectorJackson Hole Chamber of Commerce

Date	Name	Comment
1/4/2010	Chong, Geneva Interested Public	Dear Mayor Barron and Town Council Members: Thank you for considering the formation of the Environment Commission today. I hope that you will at least support the County moving ahead with its formation and that you do not prevent the Town from participating in the future even if you do not choose to go forward as a joint commission. Here is a brief list outlining why I believe the Town should participate on the Environment Commission: 1. Although the current NRO with the majority of development opportunity is in the County, the Town holds a special position in the County - we are like a clog in the artery that is Jackson Hole. In addition, with "Town as Heart" we should consider the regional transportation system as part of the Town as Heart system. This premise places us squarely in the environmental discussions that need to occur in relation to development in the County (remembering that, in my opinion, our transportation system and habits pose the greatest threats to our environment - directly via wildlife mortality and habitat fragmentation, and indirectly through carbon driven climate change). 2. The Town still has a need for environmental planning particularly related to understanding and influencing cumulative effects of development on the environment. As I mentioned above, our transportation system within Town is part of the County's and cannot be treated separately. Perhaps closer to Town residents' hearts, people want to see wildlife in and around town. Yet, if we do not pay attention and plan our development and transportation footprints we could solidify our "clog" position in the valley. Proposed activities/developments in and around Karn's Meadow provide a perfect example of how consultation with an Environment Commission should benefit town - use the Commission to look at potential impacts over a larger spatial and temporal scale 2 and make informed decisions (don't just end up with something by accident/piecemeal that completely changes the ecological function of the property in the future). 3. Fundamentally, Town does not function in a vacuum. If in fact unified government (at least "unofficially") is a goal of our leadership, it seems we should take every opportunity to act as such. The Town could still position itself to be exempt from development review by the Environment Commission (e.g., lands outside the NRO), but we should not give up the opportunity to participate in critical discussions that will affect the ecological functioning of Jackson Hole - the entire area is or was critical wildlife habitat and contains critical ecological processes (e.g., hydrologic systems), and "Town as Heart" means we cannot ignore that fact. Thank you for considering my thoughts, and please do not hesitate to call or email me if you want to discuss this further. Thank you all for your hard work, and I hope 2010 is wonderful for you and yours, Geneva Chong

Date	Name	Comment
12/29/2009	Varley, John S. Interested Public	Planning Commissioners and Staff: I offer the following comments and suggestions regarding Theme 3 of the Draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan - Jackson As "Heart of the Region." Jackson Hole Gateways Recommendation 229, item 3, suggests emphasizing Jackson gateways, which is addressed in principle 3.5.a and 3.5.c. I believe we should include a specific proposal in the Comprehensive Plan to utilize our bridges as gateways. There are waterways with existing bridges at many of the natural gateways within the valley - especially within the Town. The bridges in the Valley could be built up and enhanced to offer visual gateways into the Valley, into Town and into Wilson. WYDOT has a Transportation Enhancement Activities program which may be applied to for funding. We may have a better chance of receiving state and federal funding if there is a specific enhancement program regarding bridges laid out in our Comprehensive Plan. The bridge enhancements could be designed with a western theme or ambiance and/or displayed or combined with adjoining public art projects. Creating more of a gateway effect would act as a powerful visual indication to drivers that they are entering a more dense area which would encourage them to slow down. This could be particularly useful at the bridge across Fish Creek into Wilson, the bridge crossing Flat Creek north of Town at the Dairy Queen, and at the 5 way intersection coming into downtown along west Broadway, and the intersection of Highway 89 and High School Road at Smith's. These gateways would also serve to emphasize the importance of our waterways. There is already a recommendation to emphasize the relevance of Flat Creek in this theme as a community amenity. The bridges across the Gros Ventre, Snake, and Hoback rivers, and Lake Creek could be utilized as well. The gateway bridges could also potentially become part of any future public art programs. Art installations could be installed on the bridges or nearby, perhaps incorporated in adjacent pathways. The bridges could also emphasize the Town As Heart theme. The bridges exist at those intersections and areas which are already commonly referred to as "gateways" - the bridge across Flat Creek into Town by Dairy Queen, the 5 way intersection as you come into downtown along Broadway, the bridge by Smiths - right at the south entry way into the Town. The bridge on Snow King by Karns Meadow could be enhanced as a local's gateway. The enhancements could be done with the Karns Meadow park and development plans. Specific recommendations: Include language that a specific plan be developed to utilize the bridges and waterways as a part of the plan to improve and emphasize our gateways to Section 3.5.c. Public Art Recommendation 228 suggests enacting a public art program. The discussion about adding language to encourage public art is appropriate given Jackson Hole's growing reputation in this area. Our reputation is not merely based on the visual arts with our collection of private galleries and the National Museum of Wildlife Art but also the Center for the Arts and, of course, the Grand Teton Music Festival. Any public art program should, however, be limited to public projects and public lands, schools, hospitals, the Town Square and other community parks, and, of course, the Center for the Arts. Private developers should only be "encouraged" to work with a public art program. Development benefits could be offered through the regulatory scheme to encourage participation. Private land owners should not be required to fund public art through exactions and such (and it may be unconstitutional in Wyoming). Funding for public art should come from a mechanism that taps all of the community equally and not just private property owners and developers. Developers already contribute to parks, schools, public utilities, affordable housing, and employee housing all of which bear some nexus to the impacts of their developments. Moreover, Jackson Hole is home to an extraordinary number of non-profits, including a variety of arts organizations, which are all a part of our community character. Another key component of our community character is our generosity in funding these groups. Land owners and developers should be free to make their own choices regarding the nonprofits they would like to support. They may choose community service organizations such as the Community Safety Network, the Jackson Food Cupboard, and the Community Children's Project, or environmental organizations such as the Alliance for Responsible Planning, the Jackson Hole Land Trust and the Grand Teton National Park Foundation. They might choose the Library Foundation, the Grand Teton Music Festival,

Dancer's Workshop or the Jackson Hole Wildlife Film Festival. The Four Seasons selected the Library Foundation to support and they have contributed substantially to that organization over many years. The visual arts should not receive such preferential treatment over these other organizations by receiving direct funding as might be had from a development exaction. Specific Recommendation: Include language in Principle 3.5 that we have become a regional center for the arts in addition to a regional center for "tourism, government offices, and a gateway to the nation's parks and forests." Emphasize the importance of the arts in Jackson Hole - both to our community character and our economy. State the growing reputation of Jackson Hole as a preeminent destination in the West for culture and the arts in addition to our natural beauty. Any language regarding the creation of a specific public art program should be included in section 3.5.a on maintaining and improving public spaces which states that public spaces are "the building blocks of a thriving community" and that "public spaces and civic facilities should be interesting, memorable, and reinforce our sense of community."

Town As Heart - Pedestrian Facilities Generally

This chapter on Town as Heart does not adequately address pedestrian facilities. An attractive pedestrian environment is critical to the success of downtown. Many pedestrian

projects may also be eligible for federal transportation enhancement funds. There are several recommendations (220, 222, 223) that add language to the current draft which

emphasizes the need for pedestrian facilities. However, mixed use development, particularly in the downtown core also encourages people to utilize those pedestrian facilities. It is not enough to say that if you build it (sidewalks) - they will come. See the example of West Jackson, where walking is encouraged not just from building more and better sidewalks but from the variety of businesses that have emerged in that neighborhood. Combining residential, office and retail use gives people places to walk to - from both work and home; places such as Picas, Hard Drive, Whole Grocer, Frost, the

Post Office, Linen Alley, Atelier Ortega and the Bread Basket. Of note is the fact that these are all locally owned businesses. This dynamic needs to be encouraged Downtown and in other areas.

Specific Recommendations

Add build "pedestrian facilities" throughout the chapter but in particular to policy 3.I. which lists the necessary elements of successful neighborhoods.

Town As Heart - Jackson As Population Center

Jackson is going to continue to be promoted as the population center of our community. Development is going to be encouraged and directed in Town and in clusters to avoid

suburban-like sprawl in order to preserve open space for both its scenic value and for wildlife habitat. Therefore, there will be larger buildings and denser developments in Town than what has existed historically, which may be labeled as "out of character." However, character is not just about bulk and scale - it about vitality.

Specific recommendations

As noted above add "pedestrian facilities" to paragraph 3.I.a, which lists the necessary elements of successful neighborhoods.

Add "encouraging mixed use" to 3.1.a and the list of elements to

successful neighborhoods and/or 3.I.b as a component to "creating new vital neighborhoods". Note: "condos" is listed in Policy 3.I.c as a housing type when really it is a type of ownership and not a type of housing that is physically different.

Town As Heart and Jackson As Retail Center

If Town is Heart - then the Downtown Core (the area three or four blocks around the Square) is the "Heart of the Heart". Mixed use, density and redevelopment around the

Square should be encouraged to prevent downtown sprawl development that keeps people in their cars. If too much regulation stifles development in the downtown core it

will have an adverse effect on the health and vitality of the downtown area. Newer development will go in at the 5-way and the "Y" at the expense of the downtown core, which will attract businesses and tourists away from the Square. The Town Square itself warrants special consideration and careful controls on development to preserve its character. Redevelopment in the rest of the Downtown Core, especially mixed use development with appealing pedestrian oriented activity, should be encouraged to enhance the Square and preserve and increase the retail tax base in Town (pursuant to policy 3.2.d).

Specific recommendations:

Add language that downtown core is "Heart of the Heart" to 3.2.c

Add to Policy 3.2.c that the essential sales tax revenue generated in the Downtown Core around the Square will need to be maintained and increased

to fund town services but the geographic boundaries of this area should remain the same to preserve this area's character and attraction.

In Policy 3.2.d regarding the lodging overlay state that the Lodging Overlay should be limited to avoid sprawl development within downtown and gaps in development in the Downtown Core. The Preservation of Historic Buildings and Sites - Principal 3.6 The Historic Preservation Board currently has approximately 117 buildings and sites identified as historically significant. This currently appears to be a completely subjective determination made by a relatively small group of people. A list of objective criteria should be prepared for how and why a site is designated as historically significant. The process and the parameters the Board uses to identify these building and sites should be transparent. The Historic Preservation Board should be required to present their research and findings for why a particular site is appropriate for being designated as historically significant in advance of such designation in a formal report and proposal. The public and in particular the property owner should be allowed a chance to comment on their findings

and conclusion. A report should be prepared for each of the 117 properties already on the list. The current regulation, with a potentially 90 day stay before receiving a demolition

permit, is too long. Especially given the current 90 day stay - property owners should receive advance notice that their property is being considered for the designation. It is

profoundly unfair and unjust, and could potentially cause significant economic hardship, that a property owner proceeding with development plans, having expended considerable resources both financial and other wise, should suddenly have their construction and development timelines and schedules interrupted by a last minute inclusion of their

property on this list with no notice. To the extent a property is not already included on the list; a process should be developed

to flag the attention of the Historic Preservation Board long before a demolition permit is applied for.. It is more typical for a property to go through a lengthy and substantial public review process for re-development before it is demolished. If a property is potentially historically significant - the issue should properly be raised by the Historic Preservation Board during the public review. The Historic Preservation Board should not

have the authority to delay a project once it has been through the review process if the Board did not participate in the public hearings and give the property owner a fair and reasonable opportunity to address any concerns over preserving a potentially historically significant site. After all, private property rights are a significant part of community character and our history here in the West. If the Town and County land development regulations allowed a "change of use" to

historically significant and/or unique buildings without requiring them to be brought in full compliance with currently adopted building codes, without compromising the health or safety of the public, it would encourage and promote more viable economic uses of these structures, which would help preserve them.

Specific Recommendations

In Policy 3.6.b - add language that the Historic Preservation board will develop objective guidelines and transparent procedures and conduct appropriate research to aid their efforts to identify and preserve historic properties. Add a new Policy 3.6.d - Encourage the Town and County to adopt provisions which would allow change of use and re-location of historically significant buildings without requiring full compliance with current building codes if the history of the buildings and its use indicates that there would be no significant increased risk to the health and safety of the public.

I would be happy to discuss any of my comments and can be reached at 413-7073.

Date	Name	Comment
12/28/2009	Bernstein, Robert Save Historic JH	TASK 1. PREPARE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED COMP PLAN GROWTH SCENARIO Prepare a complete traffic analysis of the Comprehensive Plan preferred land use scenario in each of the various County growth areas in order to provide the information needed to (1) specify the road network/traffic control improvements and expansions needed to serve the level of development anticipated in the 20-year planning horizon, and (2) refine County LOS and traffic volume standards. Task 1.1. Prepare daily and peak hour traffic forecasts for the proposed Comp Plan growth scenario. (This could be done either by running the WYDOT model for this scenario or by manually adjusting model outputs prepared previously for other scenarios.) Task 1.2. Analyze and evaluate capacity adequacy of all roadway segments and intersections; identify deficiencies. Task 1.3. Analyze and evaluate traffic safety for existing and future conditions. TASK 2. IDENTIFY ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS Identify the new roadways, capacity improvements, and safety improvements needed to: (1) meet the LOS and volume standards under the traffic loadings generated by the proposed Comp Plan growth scenario; and (2) provide safe and convenient access to all developed and developing areas of the County. Task 2.1. Identify and evaluate new regional/arterial road links; e.g., Tribal Trails Connector. (This analysis has been completed using the traffic forecasts prepared for an initial 'example' growth scenario; rather than redoing the entire analysis, the previously-completed analysis results and conclusions should simply be revised and reviewed based on the traffic forecasts for the proposed Comp Plan growth scenario. [Task 1.1.]) Task 2.2. Identify and evaluate the arterial capacity and safety improvements needed to address the identified existing and future deficiencies (roadway widenings, intersection improvements, etc). Task 2.3. Lay out a complete arterial/collector network to serve growth areas where the existing rural road network has neither the capacity nor the coverage to provide access to new development and accommodate the traffic generated by the urban/suburban development envisioned by the Comp Plan. Task 2.4. In cooperation with WYDOT, identify the State Highway intersection/interchange improvements and new connections needed to accommodate the traffic to be generated by Comp Plan growth. TASK 3. REVISE AND REFINE COUNTY ROAD AND TRAFFIC STANDARDS Evaluate the County's current Functional Classification Plan, street design standards, and Level of Service (LOS) standards, and propose revisions and refinements that will help provide (1) more effective guidance for the development of a complete road network in the suburbanizing areas of the County, and (2) a clear basis for fair and efficient review of individual development applications. Task 3.1. Review and evaluate the Functional Classification Plans, street design standards, and LOS standards of other counties that have addressed growth and development issues. Task 3.2. Refine/expand the County's Functional Classification Plan and street design standards: • Expand the number of classifications • Refine/expand the definitions and standards for each classification for all roadway and network elements, including but not limited to type of traffic (local, through), roadway width, number of lanes, on-street parking bicycle and pedestrian facilities, access management, connectivity, and arterial/collector spacing. Task 3.3. Revise/refine the County's LOS standards as they apply to system-level analysis and development review: • System-level analysis: Revise/refine the LOS standards used to evaluate the ability of the County road network to safely and conveniently serve anticipated traffic volumes, and to identify necessary road and traffic control improvements and expansions • Development review: Revise/refine the LOS standards used to evaluate the impacts of individual development proposals and identify necessary mitigation measures Task 3.4. Revise/refine the County's development review traffic analysis requirements to ensure consistency between the methodologies used to estimate trip generation for development review and forecast traffic for the system planning element of the Comp Plan Transportation Element.

Date	Name	Comment
12/18/2009	Bergeron, Mary Interested Public	I FULLY SUPPORT the recent commendations of the planning commissioners as reported in the JH News & Guide, including [at least partially] closing the Town Square to vehicular traffic. I have been advocating this for the 12 years we have lived here, having seen it done in other places, and know it does (as you said) "encourage cultural events and activities." As a person who has walked, rather than drive, from Town to Rafter J for no reason other than it is [if time permits] more enjoyable, I support any/everything possible that makesTown more pedestrian friendly. Just Tuesday I walked from Town to Indian Trails, and had great fun stopping in stores and new businesses. I did run into an obstacle where the tunnel under the highway was a river of ice (it was marked as a hazard which, fortunately, I managed to navigate safely). And I, too want a "lights-on" downtown, and I mean that literally. Many a late summer evening I have wished the holiday lights on the Town Square were on throughout the year, creating a vibrant focal point. I also like to walk at night to/from the Center from the Arts events, and it is a safety concern, as you mentioned when there are "dead streets," where there is little lighting/activity. Keep the wilderness wild, but if we really want Town to be "heart," we need to implement your suggestions. That includes access to groceries in East Jackson (how Helen's began, but morphed into "Bud's Liquor" -- something else entirely)! So, for what it's worth, I LIKED what you had to say,
12/18/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	While I realize this project is enormous it seems every update I get is one step forward and at least three steps back. It has become so convoluted and incomprehensible that the general public is giving up on trying to understand it. It almost seems like that has been the goal all along. Play the public, act like we're listening to their valid concerns, and then drag it on infinitum until they are totally discouraged and disgusted. THEN we'll go ahead and do what we planned to in the first place. I have written before asking if you are even listening to the public. That would still be my first question. But it all goes back to my original question at a Cottonwood meeting. "Why do we think they will listen to us?" I don't see it happening. It looks like money and greed are winning your hearts and pocketbooks rather than wildlife, safe schools and neighborhoods, and the voice of the public. I have to assume that your legacy is going to be the administration that allowed "development" to ruin this natural valley paradise.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Cap residential development in the Town at existing base allowances (1780 Units) unless there is a commensurate reduction in the county or a conversion of non-residential to residential.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Enhance historic preservation education, outreach, and awareness

Date	Name	Comment
12/17/2009	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment tonight. First, I wanted to thank you all for your hard work and dedication this year, particularly Larry and Michael, too, as the chairs of this joint Commission. We hope you will continue to ask the hard questions that are so critical in this planning process. The deadline that was set to complete your review of theme three tonight is not nearly as important as having hard-hitting, meaningful discussions about Town ??. As you go through the Staff's questions, which are really a great starting point, we don't think that your review of this theme is finished. There are numerous other issues that have been brought forward by members of the public that still need to be addressed. The outline many of you had written comments and actually provided 13 specific recommended actions. Here's a few of the key issues that we hope you'll vote on tonight. First, regarding future growth in Town, the public supported the idea of growth districts only with specific tradeoffs in mind, which means they are pretty articulated in the text of this theme. Second, the rewrite of this chapter should include much more detail on how character preservation is to be achieved during downtown redevelopment, including discussions of bulk and scale and how this impacts both the feel of Town and its day-to-day functioning. Third, the industry section needs value added to it as opposed to merely making changes over time. We've provided a number of suggestions in our written comments to help improve this theme through the years. Fourth, we recommend essentially what the community has said about this theme's sections in all the chapters. We either removed or corrected for accuracy and completeness. And lastly, we think that an additional principle to address the unique wildlife-related issues in Town should be added. For example, the STAG group identified ?? in Town, which could actually be highlighted as a new principle. And, of course, as we in the public have consistently asserted, the ?? the impacts of unpredictability that are currently used as discretionary tools particularly in this theme needs to be addressed. Thank you again for all your hard work. Happy holidays
12/17/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. Again, thank you very much, Larry, on behalf of all of us. I just wanted to make a comment or express concern about the recommendation to expand the Gregory Lane light industrial area next to the schools by transferring the sports fields across the road behind the high school because ??. I just worry that as busy as High School Road is, if we really do need any more light industrial off that road and, you know, complicating matters while the old school is there. And then plus the fact that a lot of other people's wishes on the wish list compounding the problem as far as maybe you should put some industrial behind the school also. I know I was just at a meeting the other day as far as the...I know it wasn't stated as a recommendation, but it does put more of the South Park at the top of the list as far as a place to have a gravel extraction pit. And I'm just worried about all these things coming to light that you're going to create some kind of industrial area that will just choke off Cottonwood altogether. And then in combination with the Indian Trails ??, or whatever you want to call it, so, basically I would think trucks would use that a lot, and then cutting through, you know, Cottonwood and any new development to the south on the northwest part of the Porter Estate. I just think in the future if this all comes to light, you know, all becomes reality, if somehow a gravel pit is proposed and passed because it's at the top of the list, you know, from the guidelines on the gravel pit study, and we get more industrial into Gregory Lane ??. I mean, I would love to see the road improved there. I think that needs it anyway. But I'm just worried about Cottonwood Park, the other neighborhoods and schools, because it means so much, especially Cottonwood Park being on the corner there, that we're just going to be cut off from the rest of the Town as a community and really just separated because of all this industrial that's on everybody's wish list for putting things and squeezing more things in there, so we don't have to put it anywhere else. I know there's a lot of problems as far as trying to find places, but I just think that's the wrong place in light of all these other plans and wishes that everybody wants. I just think again that comes into human wants where it really hard presses the human needs of Cottonwood Park and schools in that area. Thank you very much for listening to me. Have a merry Christmas and a happy new year.
12/17/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'd just like to say to outgoing Commissioners that regardless of any differences we may have had on issues, and especially the process, myself or anyone else in the community had the exact same opportunity to throw our name in the hat as you did. We didn't, and you did, and that's commendable. As Teddy Roosevelt said, the credit belongs to the person whose hat is in the arena, and we aren't and you are. Happy holidays.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Town Planning Commission/Town Council will review the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Board.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Encourage the preservation of historically-significant structures and sites

Date	Name	Comment
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Cap non-residential development in the Town at existing base allowances (3.6 million sf)
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The residential component of development in the area general know as the "Y" should emphasize workforce housing.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintain a mix of use (res/non-res) on a lot by lot basis in the area generally known as the "Y"
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Recommendation # 127 supported using density bonus incentives to encourage the conversion of nonresidential to residential uses. How should this goal be achieved? -Through changes to the Future Land Use Plan and zoning
12/17/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Thank you, both Commissions. Revision of the Comp Plan so far has been challenging to say the least. There have been some good discussions. Progress has been slow. Many people are frustrated, I know, including some of you. But you are making progress and doing good. But keeping things going doesn't necessarily mean avoiding hard issues that take time to discuss. A lot of times it takes courage to face the really hard issues right on. So, I guess what I'd like to do is call your attention to the 800-pound gorilla in the room. [Laughter] It's kind of hard to ???. That is the PMUD. Hopefully, no disrespect to anybody, but trying to use a little bit of humor here. I know at this point everybody is a little bit tired and a little cranky. But I do want to at least make the point that, you know, the Conservation Alliance, the STAG, Saving Historic Jackson Hole, a number of editorials in the newspapers, many individuals who all submitted comments calling for either the elimination or a major revision of the PMUD. And unfortunately it's not in the Staff Report questions and hasn't been discussed in the last two meetings, and we don't want to take a chance that it's going to slide by and be ignored like the proverbial 800-pound gorilla in the room. So, I guess I hope that you won't ignore it and comment and, if you will, discuss that issue before you leave theme three. I think there is a need to discuss both the benefits and the cost to the community. Hopefully, you've all had time to read Mike Whitcomb's letter to the editor. I think he had some good analysis there. There are really questions about the true benefits of the PMUD to the community. So, I guess our recommendation would be that you consider eliminating it, but hopefully, at the very least, you will have that discussion. Thank you.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Identify and document historically-significant structures and sites
12/14/2009	Whitcomb, Michael Interested Public	Town's Planned Mixed Use Development regulation (PMUD) is intended to generate substantial community benefit in exchange for development incentives. Unfortunately the PMUD is a serious detriment to the community when you examine its workforce housing impact. From the regulation's inception through 12/2008, PMUD projects were required to build housing for a total of 159 employees. A conservative estimate of the number of full time equivalent employees created by those projects is 1,250. Had all those PMUD projects been completed, roughly 1,100 new employees working in Town would need housing. Certainly a few of those new workers would find free market housing or rentals. Some would freely choose to commute to Town for work. But most will struggle to find a home in Town near their jobs. They will be forced to find housing in the County or in Idaho and bear the burden of a long daily commute. There is no escape from the conclusion that the PMUD is a failed regulation with respect to our workforce housing goals. It may even increase the transportation burden between the County and Town. Is this at all consistent with our green image? No, it is not. The Joint Planning Commissions working on the Comprehensive Plan have yet to have a serious in-depth debate on the merits and weaknesses of the PMUD. It seems that it would be wise to do so during their "Town as Heart" deliberations. Especially since their next Theme is "Workforce Housing".

Date	Name	Comment
12/11/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	I was heartened to learn that there was discussion among the joint Planning Commission members re parking around Town Square. I was upset when parking was suddenly allowed along the Cache section adjoining the Square, formerly a place for tourists to be let off to see the Town and the arches, and then be gathered up again. Then .. I was glad to see it blocked off once more for parking. It has been so nice to see the Square clearly as one drove by - rather than be cluttered with parked cars. I do hope that Cache open curb space will be continued as such. I really see no need to block parking elsewhere around the square. Cache is the most traveled and obvious place for all passing thru Town to see the arches and well-maintained Square. Thank you Elise Prayzich East Jackson
12/11/2009	Best, William Interested Public	I read with interest the possible closure of various streets in town to allow for greater pedestrian traffic. While this sort of permanent closure always sounds like a wonderful pedestrian friendly and beautification project, there are many negative consequences to such action. Jackson is no different. The issues include: · Closure makes it more difficult to get to stores on the street, which has reduced revenue consequences for the merchants along those streets. Please study the closure of State Street in Chicago, which was closed and upgraded for pedestrians, only to have it reversed a couple years later (at significant cost) when merchants found that their business had declined significantly (I cannot remember the percentage decline, but it was in the double digits). In other towns, this concept has worked, although not universally. · A significant number of parking spaces would be lost, in a town already stretched for parking spaces in our main tourist season. This seems to be counterproductive. · Traffic flow would be hindered. Many locals use Gill to bypass the Broadway/Cache intersection. Closing Gill would concentrate more traffic into the main intersection, leading to more congestion, frustration, and accidents. While the article below was not specific if you are considering Gill east or west of Cache, either is problematic. As you know, Gill east of Cache has one of the town's main parking lots. Access to that lot would be restricted. So any reasonable human being would assume that you are discussing Gill west of Cache, where bypass traffic flow would suffer. · Deloney west of Cache would be a poor choice since it can hardly be considered beautiful, given the backside of the Wort Hotel on the north side of the street. It would also restrict access to lodging parking. · Perhaps the only reasonable closure would be the one block of Deloney east of Cache, and possibly the one block of Center north of Broadway, although the parking space reduction remains a problem. I strongly urge the town planners to carefully study other mountain towns and the impact of street closures, especially on merchant business (I'm certain that the traffic and parking issues are being 2 considered). Before an informed decision can be made by the town commissioners, there must be an unbiased study of the impacts on the community and its merchants.
12/10/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Just a brief comment just to touch on something that was mentioned last night. I would encourage you tonight to revisit the Teton County Planning Commission recommendations from June, particularly recommendations number 12 through 14 that apply to theme two, but since Town was bypassed the discussions on theme two, it's important to go back and revisit those. And other than that, I would ask that you refer to our written comments for our additional suggestions. Thanks.
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Expand the Gregory Lane light industrial area into the state owned (school district) lands to the north. In order to facilitate this, the current sports fields would need to be relocated elsewhere. Along with this expansion the current roadways and other

Date	Name	Comment
12/10/2009	McNutt, Jim Interested Public	Good evening, I'm Jim McNutt; I'm a resident of Jackson. I also happen to be the President and CEO of the National Museum of Wildlife Art. And I'm speaking here for myself and as someone who's worked in the arts for a long time. And I've read the theme-three heart-of-the-region materials and I made a comment that I submitted via e-mail some time ago. First of all, I would like to endorse what Don has said and the work that the Center of Wonder has submitted in favor of public art. I'm not sure that the specifics of any given Plan are so important, but the idea that a place as original as Jackson ought to have such an endorsement in this Plan. And as I read this document, I'm, one, impressed by the work that goes into it, but I also am aware that there is a tremendous arts presence in Jackson and in Teton County that really needs some specific recognition in this document beyond what is here now other than the general terms of cultural work. I think historic preservation is highly important. And I think that the historic character of Jackson and Teton County is critical. I also think the arts through organizations like the Center for the Arts, the National Museum of Wildlife Art, the Grand Teton Music Festival, and so many other organizations that are represented through the Center for the Arts and in other venues constitute a significant economic impact in this community and a significant value going forward for what's here <<inaudible>>. So, I think it needs just a little bit more verbal recognition in this Plan, though I don't, you know, I haven't presumed to try to rewrite it or tell you just where it ought to go. But hopefully you'll think about that as you consider revisions to this, and I'll be happy to talk another time. Thank you.
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan identifies preserving historic structures and sites within the Town as an appropriate future vision for the Town including the following: -Identify and preserve historically-significant structures and sites -Support the Historic Preservation Board -Enhance historic preservation education, outreach, and awareness
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The Plan should recognize the importance of civic spaces and social functions as a part of maintaining a sense of community within the Town and should be implemented through the following: 1) Create, Maintain and improve public spaces 2) Make public investments in strategic locations 3) Enhance Jackson gateways
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Enact a public art program that is administered by Cultural Council. Insert Bland Hoke, III. recommendations (ideas) about public art.
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Along the corridors of South Highway 89 and West Broadway the land use pattern will be predominately non-residential with residential allowed on the upper floors.
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Allow a variety of lodging types that encourage active management for nightly occupancy, and the use of local/visitor amenities in the downtown.
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Generally maintain the lodging potential and areas allowed today (existing lodging overlay) for the following purpose: 1) Concentrate lodging in the downtown to preserve the remainder of the Town from lodging 2) Create a pedestrian oriented environment
12/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Enhance the greater downtown local /visitor service district described as the downtown areas outside of the town square area to include the following: -primary pedestrian focus with improved connectivity, sidewalks and other improvements, -provide public gathering places, -foster visitor/locals interaction during all hours of the day and night all year around, -encourage cultural events and activities, -street level building design and uses should engage the street including but not limited to considering limiting office and residential uses on the first floor, -encourage successful retail and lodging establishments, -"lights on" in lodging and residential structures

Date	Name	Comment
12/10/2009	Stewart, Karen Art Association of JH	Hi, I'm Karen Stewart, I'm the Director of the Art Association of Jackson Hole. And never before have the arts and the arts aspect of our culture taken a more important role in the economic and social development in Jackson Hole. There are facts and data that appear almost daily to tell the importance of every community's ability to stimulate the economic development, make our cities and towns attractive and vibrant places to live and work, attract tourists specifically for the arts and out-of-town visitors, educate our children to succeed in school and beyond and unify our neighborhoods, provide important social and creative outlets for all of our citizens, including seniors and those with disabilities, children and adults, and bringing people of diverse backgrounds together in productive ways. Public art, like the ravens on the fencepost, or the brightly colored free-standing sculptures at Jackson Hole High School, connect with us every day, often when we've forgotten about them. They raise not only a smile but also our spirit. There's no entry charge, no pre-learning to be done beforehand. You can just appreciate them the way they are and as you drive by or walk by a public art piece. Communities that support the arts and culture, including public art, not only enhance their quality of life, they also invest in their economic well being. The Art Association also supports the Center of Wonder and planned proposal to include a statement in the Comprehensive Plan including public art. Thank you.
12/10/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. This might be a theme-eight issue, if we still have theme eight. We have Cache Creek in a pipe and that's a golden opportunity for some micro-hydro generation that works 24/7, 365 on a relatively low wattage-to-cost ratio. It's something to investigate since we have all the other alternative energy and energy efficiency issues. I'd like to touch on something real quickly that Commissioner Nash said last night and that's relative his concern that the County houses its proportional share of workers in the future. According to the appendices, etc., Town has 77 percent of the jobs and houses 27 percent of the workers. I think the County is more than up to speed on that issue. Also, there should be some discussion at some point, especially in theme three, about our district impacts, micro regionalism. Regionalism obviously being we don't export our net negative impacts to Driggs, Victor and Alpine. We need...if the current path for Town and the Village don't export the negative impacts, and we create a dynamic where onsite housing is the preferred method of employee housing. Eventually, we must have some discussion on revenue sharing. The way that it's written now, it's proportional to population. Some of the changes in the Town/County dynamics and the allocation of housing, etc., that's probably something that's going to come up and probably we should engage in some free discussion. Also, the last thing is currency requirements. The really only effective way we have to do any type of growth management is be a codified to currency requirements where we don't allow development to proceed infrastructure and we actually create a set of parameters for that...again, it's codified and we don't let that occur, whether it be traffic, water, sewer, still water ??, etc. Thank you.
12/10/2009	Kushner, Don Cultural Council of JH	My name is Don Kushner. I work at the Center for the Arts, but I'm here tonight as the Chairman of the Board of Cultural Council of Jackson Hole. I'll keep this very brief; I hope you don't mind. For the past 15 years, the Town and County officials have entrusted the Cultural Council to advocate and administer tax-based funding on every path regarding arts and cultural activities in our Valley. So, in 1994, the Cultural Council retained its 501C3 status, its mission to bring together and advocate for the arts and cultural organizations in our community by supporting communication, collaboration, and promotion of cultural life in the Valley. Representing 21 member organizations that have exploded to almost every single resident in this County, we take our decisions quite seriously and always with respect and deference to Town and County officials. Thus, when we deliberate the merits of funding requests to date distributed throughout the three quarters of a million dollars in cultural help in Jackson Hole. In the Arts Advocacy Conference sponsored by the State of Wyoming this past September, it was clearly recognized that public art has a well-established and versioning presence in numerous communities across the state. It was further realized that public art and access to the arts has definable and documented economic success with the improvement of quality of life as a major component. Here's the crux of our position: With the inclusion of public art language in the Comprehensive Plan, we would be recognizing a quality-of-life tool that has a proven track record for success. The Cultural Council of Jackson Hole has a commitment in place to support the Center of Wonder and Grand Hope in their efforts to develop research and guidelines for a public art policy. And with consensus of the governing body, we the Cultural Council will apply our experience and resources to enable us, as designees of the elected officials, to deliberate and implement the public arts strategy. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
12/10/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you. Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Just some brief feedback from last night. I actually thought that these taken off the theme with some brainstorming on your thoughts of the statement of ideal was very productive and I hope you guys will continue to do that for future themes. We don't always want to bash you guys on the head; we want to give you guys a boy, a girl there. It also was encouraged to hear Commissioner daCosta acknowledge public input in some of the statements that she made. That's one of the basic, you know, things, learning skills is to repeat back what you've heard, and it is I think good for the public to hear you guys engage, when you make those statements, that you have heard loud and clear some of the statements that have been made. One issue I want to make on the comment of maintaining healthy residential areas last night. The thought, or the statement that one of the indicators might be having people living in houses. Certainly, it's preferable to have people living in houses, rather than having empty second homes, but there is a concern I know in some neighborhoods when you started going to where development becomes mostly rental homes, even though those are full, the neighborhood character does change. And I'm not sure that I have a solution there, but I think that's something that maybe you might want to mull over a little bit is the thought of not necessarily discouraging people having rental properties, but somehow a way to maintain that character that people still do maintain their homes to the same standards that the homeowners do. Last, I am concerned about the flexible zone that was proposed last night. I would caution you to remember that one of the comments that has been made repeatedly is predictability and I think that would be an issue. I would suggest that if there are character issues you want to maintain, if you look at those issues within that district or neighborhood, then try and maintain those, whether it's house trailers or something like that, but try and maintain it that way, rather than to have no zones, or flexible, because as has been quoted before, that's where all the mischief comes from. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	Hoke, Bland, III Interested Public	Introduction: Bland Hoke is currently coordinating a Public Art Task Force to develop a Public Art Plan. This document will outline the framework of a Public Art Program, prospectively administered by the Cultural Council of Jackson Hole, for the Town of Jackson and Teton County. The Public Art Task Force meets the second and last Wednesday of the month at the Teton Art Lab at the Center for the Arts at 5 pm. Please contact Bland Hoke for additional information, or visit www.artspotinfo.org to review draft documents of the Public Art Plan. Revisions to Theme 3 are listed below in an underlined format. Additionally, rationale is provided for background information/inspiration. It is hoped that public art will be considered as an integral aspect to specific sections within Theme 3. However, similar to Principle 3.6 ‘Preserve historic structures and sites’, a separate principle addressing ‘Arts and Culture’ (in which public art could be specifically addressed) may be necessary given the breadth and depth of the subject and it’s lack of representation in Theme 3. Page 38 Revised- Jackson as Cultural and Social Hub The Town of Jackson has long served as the cultural and social hub for the region and Teton County. It is the primary location for many art galleries, restaurants, cultural facilities and cultural activities for residents and tourists to enjoy. The growing reputation of Jackson as a cultural destination should be reinforced with public art, thoughtfully integrated into new development, contributing to the Town’s unique character, charm and culture assets. The town is also the primary location for municipal and county governments as well as regional headquarters for many state and federal agencies. It is also a “gateway” to the national parks and Bridger-Teton national Forest. Rationale: This paragraph should highlight the presence of the numerous cultural institutions and social activities with cultural significance such as; the Center for the Arts, the National Museum of Wildlife Art, over 60 art galleries, the Art Fair, the Fall Arts Festival and the Western Design Conference. These are mentioned under ‘Art and Culture’ on the Town of Jackson website. Additionally, the Town of Jackson and Teton County have made a large investment in the arts by providing 3.7 acres of downtown Jackson for the development of the Center for the Arts. This commitment to culture and local arts organizations is paramount, and should be reflected in the vision of ‘Town as Heart’. Revised-Principle 3.5 –Recognize the importance of civic spaces and social functions as a part of maintaining a sense of community Historically, the Town of Jackson has served as the cultural, social, and civic hub for the region and Teton County. Maintaining and enhancing public spaces and making strategic investments, increases the importance of Jackson as the regional center for tourism, the arts, government offices, and as a gateway to the nation’s parks and forests. Revised- Policy 3.5.a: Maintain and improve public spaces Public spaces are the building blocks of a thriving community. Jackson’s public spaces and civic facilities should be interesting, memorable, and reinforce our sense of community. The town will continue to promote high quality design of public spaces, including creating attractive gateways, preserving views, and providing attractive public right-of-way amenities. The practice of integrating fine arts professionals in the design of projects will be encouraged to create unique and visually engaging projects. New developments in the Town of Jackson should contribute to quality public spaces – including but not limited to sidewalks and walkways, parks, outdoor squares, landscaped

Date

Name

Comment

areas and public art.

Rationale: Public art, integrated into the overall design of a project, will contribute to public spaces that are interesting, memorable and reinforce our sense of community. The elk antler arches reflect the concept of integrating public artwork into the overall design of a public space, thus making it a memorable and interesting space. This concept differs from 'plopping' a sculpture in front of a building, or within a park.

Revised- Policy 3.5.b: Make public investments in strategic locations

The community will continue to invest in public facilities such as government buildings, parks, recreation, trails, workforce housing, arts and cultural facilities, and public art projects in locations in town that enhance the town as a civic and cultural hub...

Rationale: Integrating artists in the design of public facilities, parks, trails and cultural facilities is an investment in cultural tourism. Additionally, public art projects can be generated by the community to address areas in need of aesthetic attention.

Revised- Policy 3.5.c.: Enhance Jackson gateways

The town gateways play a special role in setting the community tone and atmosphere for the millions of guests that visit the Town of Jackson every year. The town will work to enhance the three major gateways including upgrades to both the public realm and on private property. Public art projects, which are reflective of the community, environment and character of Jackson, will be encouraged to provide unique and interesting gateway enhancements.

Rationale: Public art is an integral component of many gateways to cities and towns around the US. It is a defining and creative feature that identifies the transition from one area to another.

Strategy 3.4: Develop a Public Art Plan

-Coordinate with the Public Art Task Force to write a Public Art Plan for the Town of Jackson and Teton County.

Indicator

7. Completion of Public Art Plan- -monitor- -1 yr

12/9/2009

Ewing, Patty

Interested Public

My name is Patti Ewing and I really hadn't planned to make a comment tonight, but...and I just came in, but it's obvious that there is considerable conversation going on about possibly splitting the two boards. And I think that having observed almost every one of your meetings, I would highly suggest and encourage you to do that and give us an opportunity, those of us who live in Town and who come and observe the Town Planning Commission and then those who live out in the Valley can come and see the...watch the Planning Commission for the County. But I think that it would be a far more effective way for you to come together. Then in April, March, whenever, when you've both gone through the Plan and made significant input separately. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	Steve Harrington, Jackson. Just to expand a minute on the previous comment, because I've sat there for several meetings and watched. It seems like obviously the Town and County are different and they have different personalities. The people that are involved in each group are different and they look at things I think a little differently. The County seems to want to be a bit faster than the Town. The Town is more deliberate. And that's fine, rightfully so, but you could use the analogy of our famous federal government. The County being smaller could be the Senate and the Town could be the House. They both have the same interests at heart; they just proceed in a different manner. They just look at things a little bit differently. So, if the County felt like they needed to go faster and they were comfortable with that, then they could get their business done, you know, in a few weeks or however long it takes them. Tony said it could be done in days. And the Town could go at a slower pace and then at the end if you want to look at it coming together, you know, probably 90 percent of what you do is going to be the same anyway. That's sort of what's been happening here, but it's been on some little some other issues that where your perspectives are different. And so at that point, at the end, if you had the perspectives that were different and it would be readily obvious, and then the public and the electives would be able to see that very clearly. But I would like to remind you that this coming year is an election year and six out of the ten offices are up for re-election. So my guess is that those people particularly who are running for re-election would like to have something in hand that they can put their arms around that's pretty well crafted by you folks, so that some particular issue doesn't become for them an election issue where, you know, they could get pretty well scalded if they're on the wrong side of one of these issues. But they can take cover with you guys. If you guys put together a really good Plan, I'll bet my last quarter that they'll probably go right along with it. But if you give them something that's too wide open and has too many avenues in it, I don't think that they're going to be very happy with having to deal with that situation and go through a whole other public process in order to come to a final decision before the primaries in August and the general election in November.
12/9/2009	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Dave Kuhn, Teton County at large. Once again, thanks for all your planning work. You're volunteers and you've gone way beyond the call of duty. So, anyway, I do think that maybe it is time to take a look at parallel paths, and I think you've made a valiant effort to make the joint process work, but you are two really different boards. As long as I've been here, the Town and County have been a little bit like oil and water, so to expect a mix at this point probably you might kind of step back and take the parallel version. You can...your job is to give recommendations to the electives, and I think for good recommendations, you can split and still give clear recommendations and let them make the choice, because in the end they're going to do it anyway. I don't want to say your work isn't appreciated by them, but they will do what they want. It's all about clarity. The County and Town are different and give opinions, come back together at the end, and let the electives decide it. And if you do stay together as a joint Commission to meddle through the process, maybe consider a facilitator to kind of organize it a little more and keep it going forward. There's been a lot of this and that. And, anyway, those are just my thoughts. I'm not battin' a thousand on the meetings, but I've been to a lot of them and you can do better. You've done a great job but you can do better. So, thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Before we did submit some written comments this week in hard copy before you. We just did that this week, since you're not going to see a Staff Report before your next meeting. So, that's why we have them in that form tonight. Just a few comments, as you discuss theme three, we appreciate that you want to stay at broad level, but your discussions on theme three must extend beyond Town as an appropriate location for development, to one that really looks and considers the decisions that actually makes additional development in Town smart growth. This really will require looking at the details, the amount and the geographic scope designed in the type of proposed development. While some form of this I assume would be done in the FLUP map discussions, some of these details really need to be put in the policy chapter to make sure the FLUP maps are designed according to the community vision. As we've said before, in the Staff Report, Staff did a really good job of, you know, listing a good set of suggested questions to start discussion. In addition to those, I was just going to say a few brief comments on some of the questions you might get to tonight. As far as Staff question one, statement of ideal, something to consider, it include language about ecological and natural resource protection goals, other than just economic and social goals, which are the only ones that are there right now. As we stated before, also really brief, we do feel like further effort should be made to refine the small-town character in the chapter itself, and the '94 Plan is a good starting point for this. Question number three, in terms of mixed-use, it's really important to look at the balance of residential and commercial development in different districts. You know, using the mixed-use concept in commercial have far different results, depending on whether or not you're talking about an individual development versus a neighborhood scale. And we'd reiterate that the public has consistently stated its concern with excess commercial development, particularly given its impacts on the workforce housing shortages. An increase in commercial development potential beyond what is allowed by existing base zoning should not be a goal in this Plan. Question number four, in terms of identifying stable residential areas, this section could use some more clarification on what we mean by stabilizing an area. And the '94 Plan uses a specific sentence that relates to enhancement that new development in these areas should contribute to the existing character and not be allowed to start a shift or trend toward another more intense character type. I'm just bringing that up because there are...there's language that's available that I think can clarify some of the things in this new draft. Questions five or eight, just to make sure everybody's on the same page, it's important to clarify the geographic scale of what you mean by downtown Jackson. Regarding the issues of defining vibrant and balancing visitor and local-oriented development, the Plan should not lose sight of our Town's unique role as a gateway community to the public lands of the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem. Making our community accessible, particularly in terms of affordability to visitors, should be an important component of the Town's function as a gateway community. As for short-term lodging, this certainly provides a critical component of our tourism economy, but the actual benefits and costs really do want in the details. There really are thresholds at which the amount of certain types of lodging can impact the feel of being a community first and resort second, and whether lights stay on, as described by Staff. I feel like it's important to remember that if our community truly commits to being a community first and commits to high levels of residential and nonresidential development that is local oriented and puts deed-restricted affordable housing closer to the workplace, that it will have positive impacts for the visitors. In the long run, most visitors want to experience a real functioning town rather than an environment that feels like the primary goal is to be a resort. One thing regarding 7.B, before promoting changes to expanding lodging potential, an analysis of effective population as well as shifts in lodging capacity should be undertaken. I guess the question is is there data available such as a documented net loss of lodging units that could help inform the discussion or decide whether or not the overlay should be expanded? We feel that given the extensive development potential permitted by existing zoning, development potential ?? should not be increased, particularly given the impacts that arise from an increase in effective population, which is visitors and residents in the Valley. To close this up, in terms of the process, some good suggestions are already made by others in the room, so I won't repeat them. The Conservation Alliance does have concerns about the impacts of split votes and how it could potentially impact the final product. If you do decide to undertake a parallel, rather than a joint process, I would request that the meetings are on different nights to help the public. I really do feel the idea does warrant significant consideration and discussion because something does need to be fixed. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hi, Gail Jensen. You know, I sat through almost every one of these meetings, and I just don't see how we're really going to get a good Plan out of what's been going on recently. I see a lot of arguing, I see a lot of going over the same thing, the votes are inconsistent. I mean, you really need to get this back on track and the only thing that I can see that would be of benefit to really move it forward would be to separate the Town and the County, go do your separate reviews, then come together at the end and see if there's any common ground. I just don't see where we're getting; we're ending up with something that I don't think is really effective. It's almost worthless. I'm very upset about theme two. We didn't even discuss cost of growth. There was no discussion whatsoever. And then to leave the discussion, the review process, after the Planning Staff tries to incorporate any kind of recommendations that were joint recommendations at the end, I mean, just from meeting to meeting, you all forget about how you voted or what went on. What are you going to do when you put the review to the very end, you know, and you've waited months to go back to it? You're not going to remember what people said. You're not going to remember public comment. In fact, the public comment at this point I think you all are sick and tired...obviously, I heard it twice from Lisa last week, which I was very insulted—I don't want to hear public comment, I'm sick of public comment. And, you know, it's our Plan. It's the community's Plan. And that upset me very much. And I think we need to get past all this, and I see the only way we can move forward is to separate, come together before it goes to the Commissioners, and see if you can find common ground on your recommendations. I don't know how else you're going to get past it. So, that's what I would hope that you would consider doing. Thank you.
12/9/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. There was kind of a disturbing development last week, a discussion of consolidated shares. I don't even know if it's legal, but throughout world history consolidating more and more power into fewer and fewer hands generally doesn't work out. I'd like to suggest some discussion to create some efficiencies here. One, to self-limit public comment to 25 minutes. That's self-limit. It will give you a more high-value early-meeting discussion time. And, quite frankly, there's diminishing returns on public comment as it is. Also, I'd like to self-limit any redundancies, whether it be oral-to-oral comment or oral-to-written comment, or also any redundancies from you. We had quite a few last week on some specific issues. Relative to the vote you took last week, I'd like to acknowledge that, you know, as Einstein did, that continuing the same course of action while simultaneously, you know, expecting different results, generally doesn't work out also. We need to acknowledge that we have a responsibility to create a better model and a better template for the electives when they get this process. We need to ask ourselves how long do we review this process to the detriment of the product, and that's what's occurred to date, I think. We need to consider that we have two County Planning Commissioners who will be gone the entire month of January. We need to consider that we have two new Planning Commissioners at the County level and think of, you know, we need to remember our learning curve in this process. We need to think about how to best integrate the fresh eyes and the fresh ideas of the incoming Planning Commissioners. We need to acknowledge that 40 percent of the County Planning Commission will be new, while only 14 percent of the...one out of seven of the Town Planning Commissioners. If we couple this with the acknowledgement that several of the County Planning Commissioners will be absent January, then there's potential for a two-to-one input advantage from Town, and exactly how does that contribute positively to a joint Plan. So, what I'm proposing is very similar it sounds like to what Forrest's was—consider parallel paths, not a separation, you know, just for the four meetings in January in question. Also consider a soft target date—not a deadline—a soft target date. We need to incorporate the pragmatic realities of spring break, etc. Maybe transition that into a public-comment-type period that would transition this level of hearing into the next level, which will be the electives, which will help focus our time more efficiently and effectively on the big issues, which heretofore we haven't. That's part of the time delay. Thanks for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	Hamilton, Susanna Interested Public	My name is Susanna Hamilton and I'm a new resident of Jackson. My parents started coming here in the '70s, so we have a long relationship with Jackson and we've seen a lot of changes in Jackson. My business has been having 10,000 square feet on the corner of Fifth and Fifty-Seventh in New York across from Tiffany's, as well as 4000 square feet in the city of Atlanta, but additionally an office in the Rockies, where we've catered to a smaller market. And have been members of various Chambers of Commerce, historic preservation boards, working with contractors privately. So, my background is in building in the arts. That's my professional background. Having said that, having moved here, I came here tonight to offer you a perspective that maybe you don't see or hear very often. And that is that from the outside, when you look at this Town, this Town has incredible potential. There is incredible intelligence here, unbelievable talent, extraordinarily...well, except we flounder, absolutely are stagnated across the board, every board, every commission is strangled by gridlock, and everybody is complacent with the status quo to continue on in this way. And it is unbelievable. When you look at this economy and what's happening in this country, 2010 is going to be a pivotal year. And anybody who is in position, any Town, any school administrator, any hospital, any business, any individual, who is ready for 2010 is going to be extraordinarily wealthy and successful. And anybody who continues to be stagnant and polarized is going to fail. And this Town has the potential to be so incredible and it's just strangled. And it's horrible to watch that. And if for one moment we could all take ourselves out of this fishbowl of 6000 people, 9000 people, however big it is, and if you could look at this from the eyes of somebody, a potential investor, and whether that's a second-homeowner or a potential business investor, and if you came into Town and every day you open a paper and saw the kind of debacle that we had last summer with the hospital board, or the school board, or reading meeting after meeting that you come to no resolution and to no agreement, do you understand that after awhile it looks plain silly? We have got to have some movement. And people in the Town are extremely passionate about their views to the point that they would rather be polarized and rather annihilate somebody's reputation than work together on a consensus and move forward. And we are our own worst PR and marketing campaign, if you want to know the truth. And everybody in this Town should be able to make a living here and live here and work here and raise their families here, and we're not giving them that. When we have 100 percent of the population that has to go to Utah, Idaho and Colorado for medical services, for goods, we're not delivering to them. That does not mean we have to have high-rises and boxed stores, but we need to be thinking about the future. And if anybody thinks that's not going to happen, they're dead wrong, because 12 days ago, the Wall Street Journal, it was profiled, three of the best second-home or places to retire, places to move to—Lake Placid, New York; Aspen, Colorado; Jackson, Wyoming. USA Today ran a map on the front cover, saying of places for development and where the next generation of college graduates needs to move, the east coast and the west coast were a bloodbath of red—jobs are absolutely nonexistent, companies are saturated, schools are not doing well. Where do they want to move? The Rocky Mountain Corridor, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, right down on the mountain line. When you look at this room, look at the demographic in this room. There might be three people under the age of 40, maybe, I don't know, but not many. If you think change is not going to happen, you're dead wrong. So, you have the opportunity now to put some policies in place and to make some changes, because if you don't, I promise you the people under 35 are going to change it probably in ways that you don't want them to. So, I think that it's an opportunity. You have a great opportunity to move forward, to make this Town the best. It doesn't mean you have to rip it apart and change it in horrible ways, but take the reigns now and make those changes and move forward. Let's have something positive in the papers. We should have the best schools, the best hospital, the best newspaper, the best airport. We should be the best. We have all the resources, all of the intelligence, all of the money, all of the ability to do that. And yet we sit in this stagnant pool. So, I think whatever everybody can do to remove themselves from these polarized positions and start moving towards a place of consensus and agreement. And be an example for the other boards and commissions in this Town, because you're not alone. Every board and every Commission just beats itself to death. And when you look at it from the outside, it's just too valuable to waste. Thank you.
12/9/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Revise the Theme 3 Statement of Ideal to change "rely" to "support".

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	, Conservation Alliance	December 9, 2009 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions Re: Theme 3 Comments Submitted via email to Alex Norton and at Dec. 9 Joint Planning Commission Meeting cc: Town of Jackson Planning Staff: Tyler Sinclair and Jeff Noffsinger Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to Theme Three -“Uphold Jackson as ‘Heart of the Region.’” Similar to our review of previous chapters, attached is an analysis of Theme Three that identifies specific sections of the chapter that could benefit from additional clarification. In addition to comments calling for additional explanation on certain language, we have provided specific recommended actions to improve the chapter. While we appreciate the desire to stay at the broader level during the review, an analysis of land use issues in town requires particular attention to the details, including the amount, geographic scope, design, and type of proposed development. In upcoming hearings, the discussion should extend beyond town as an appropriate location for development to one that seriously considers the conditions that actually make additional development in town “smart growth.” Throughout this process, which is now in its third year, we have consistently expressed the need for this planning process to more specifically address the issue of character preservation as it relates to town redevelopment. To do so would improve and build upon the existing 1994 Plan, which was the original objective of the process. While such a task (defining community character) may seem daunting, it must be an essential component of this new plan. Again, the 1994 Plan provides a great starting point for refining a definition in terms of the built environment versus the natural environment. This expectation is not solely our own; Clarion Associates made the following statement in an October 2007 report: “The goal of preserving community character has not been reconciled with the pressures for redevelopment; this is a topic that will be more closely addressed in the [update].” At the broad level, the Conservation Alliance, along with the majority of the public, strongly believes that this plan must not increase the overall growth potential in the valley. Without additional “upzones” there are already high levels of potential development (beyond what is seen on the ground today) that are in the pipeline. This valley ultimately has a carrying capacity beyond which its unparalleled and irreplaceable resources will be lost. This recognition must be front-and-center as you discuss growth-related policies in the Town of Jackson. Thank you again for all your work on these very difficult and complex issues that face our community 1 Recommended Action: Add a principle and associated policies to this chapter specific to ecological and wildlife-related issues in town. (A possible title is: “Conserve ecological function of lands within and adjacent to town boundaries in order to protect the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.”) This addition would provide clearer direction on wildlife planning policies specific to town that are currently lacking in theme one. The policies should address town’s “interface” areas with adjacent public lands, ecologically sensitive and valuable riparian areas (Flat and Cache Creeks), and wildlife habitats, including south-facing slopes that function as crucial winter range. In general, the natural environment, including town’s unique topography and watersheds, is underemphasized in this chapter. Transportation issues specific to Town, including wildlife-related issues, should also be addressed more specifically. Recommended Action: Further refine the definition of community character as it relates to town redevelopment. This chapter should fulfill one of the main objectives of the Comp Plan process – to reconcile the pressures for redevelopment with community character preservation. It falls far short. Even though a common criticism of the 1994 Plan was its failure to adequately define character, this new draft unfortunately steps further back in terms of clarity. It refers to the word “character,” but then fails to provide adequate definition. Significantly clearer guidance about “compatible” and “appropriate” bulk, scale, and intensity as it relates to community character in a small mountain town, quality of life for residents, and the visitor experience, needs to be included. In general, this new draft, because it has less specificity regarding community character and less direction for appropriate resort and commercial development, in several ways it provides less direction for town-related planning issues than the 1994 Plan. For example, it provides no direction to place limits on building size (and

why this is important) or to restrict specific types of commercial development.

2 Recommended Action: Clarify the extent to which additional development potential is proposed in town, and to what extent this addition represents additive growth (as opposed to substitutive growth) for the valley overall. As outlined in our comments on theme 2, the extent to which the last sentence of this paragraph would hold, lies in the details of the draft's implementation. First, if adding additional development potential to town without assurances that "natural areas and wildlife habitat in the region" are actually protected, implying such as tradeoff, as this sentence does, is misleading. Second, with regard to transportation effects, the amount of growth targeted for town, particularly if it is additive growth, and not substitutive, could actually worsen traffic conditions overall, not "reduce vehicle trips." Also, the extent to which vehicle trips can be reduced will be dependent on whether redevelopment includes high levels of residential housing that is truly affordable to the workforce.

3 See point (1). Community character should be better defined in the new draft. This absence of definition raises again the question as to why this new draft did not more efficiently build upon the existing 1994 Plan. (See chapters 1, 3, and 6 from the 1994 Plan for a starting point.) If critical elements of character are not defined in the comprehensive plan, land development regulations will not be written to protect them. This is a major concern regarding future town redevelopment policies.

4 Based on preliminary votes in the theme two chapter review, sections of this chapter that refer to town-level development in "other identified areas in the county" should be edited. As we stated during that review, the town-level intensification of county "nodes", coupled with extensive town development, could actually accelerate a sprawling development pattern in the valley overall. The original draft proposed extensive creation and expansion of county "centers," which appears to be in conflict with the concept of "Town as Heart." For example, the scenario description in community polling for "Town as Heart" was outlined as having "little or no focus on creating or expanding other County centers."

46 Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan

5 More specific comments will be provided during the FLUP discussions. However, this plan should acknowledge the potential impacts of significantly increased development potential on the overall historic character of Jackson as a small mountain town. The 1994 Plan summarizes potential impacts of larger buildings on a small town, pedestrian friendly environment.

It is important to recognize that community concerns are not restricted to potential shifts in architectural style or aesthetics; concerns relate to the shift in bulk and scale of buildings and their associated impacts (potential traffic congestion, increased workforce housing shortages, higher maintenance costs associated with reduced sun exposure, etc.). Distinctions should be made between preferred architectural style and preferred scale in buildings.

6 Recommended Action: Remove or correct summaries of community polling. Caution should be taken in citing just several polling examples under the chapter's section "What the community has said about this theme." 2008 polling indicates other community input that is not reflected in this abbreviated list.

If the section is not removed, below are a couple examples that should be added:

- The University of Wyoming, Teton County Community Survey 2008, included the following "Key Findings" in a summary report:

- o "A far higher percentage (78%) of residents considers it a higher priority to build more deed restricted affordable housing than to allow additional commercial or resort development."

- o "Both overall development in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited." (61%)

7 Clarify these statements. The community has also expressed strong concern regarding a lost sense of community due to rapid growth and its associated impacts. The geographic scope of the "strong town core" should be described. Does it extend from the "Y" area to the Town Square?

8 Throughout the document, terminology regarding incentives should be consistent. (The Dec. 3 staff report

included a list of questions that should help clarify standards for incentives.)

9 Based on a comprehensive review of the polling questions, “most of the community” is not necessarily representative of the breadth of results across surveys. For example, the University of Wyoming “Key Findings” report of the phone surveys stated: “There was nearly equal agreement among residents that, “Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change,” (40%), and, “Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings,” (37%).

Recommended Action: Language should be included that acknowledges the extent to which survey questions, as a whole, focused on asking the public about tradeoffs. For example, when the public was asked questions about whether, for example, 2 or 3 story buildings were preferred, they were also asked to rate a degree of agreement with phrases such as “Designate sensitive resource areas (such as habitat, floodplains, steep slopes) as areas with greatly reduced development potential from which density can be transferred to the Town of Jackson.”

10 Specific comments regarding the FLUP will be provided during those discussions. It remains unclear the extent to which the new draft promotes mixed-use at the level of individual developments versus at the neighborhood scale. These are two very different concepts, and could result in far different outcomes.

Language should be incorporated that specifies the intent.

UPHOLD JACKSON AS “HEART OF THE REGION” (THEME 3) Y INTRODUCTION

Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan 47

11 See point (1) regarding the need to define character.

12 See point (8). Terminology should be consistent.

13 Recommended Action: Ensure that this new plan more clearly articulates “community benefit” in order to increase predictability in future decisions. Perhaps this articulation is appropriate in the “managing growth responsibly” chapter, where it can apply to both town and county land use decisions. - * During earlier discussions on the Introduction chapter, the importance of refining criteria for “community benefit” was discussed. When will this be revisited? The list, at a minimum, could include the top priorities.

14 Recommended Action: Ensure that contradictory statements regarding sales tax revenues are not included in the new plan. The language, “Maintained or expanded,” leaves the door open to broad interpretation.

How does this sentence relate to policy 2.5.c “Do not make land use decisions for revenue purposes”?

15 Recommended Action: Before promoting regulatory changes to expand lodging potential within town boundaries, an analysis of effective population, as well as of shifts in lodging capacity, should be undertaken. In terms of “desired future land use pattern” as proposed in this draft, what information was used as a basis to propose the expansion/shifting of the lodging overlay?

16 This principle needs further clarification. For example, factors or variables that contribute to fostering “healthy residential neighborhoods” should be described. It would be helpful to clarify the community elements (such as quiet streets, greenspace, a lack of light pollution, and an absence of crime) that people value and don’t want to see degraded. It isn’t simply a matter of not wanting to “[see] too much change too quickly,” as this text suggests.

We fully recognize the benefits of infill development in some areas of town, but we also feel language should be added to describe the real planning challenges associated with increased development potential in these areas. They include, but are not limited to: potential increases in crime, elevated noise, diminished “dark skies”, reduced scenic views, gradual loss of a sense of a small town community, reduced potential for buildings to use the sun as a renewable resource, lowered air quality, traffic congestion, parking deficiencies, and fiscal impacts.

Also, it is unclear what “stable” means in some of these districts. For example, according to Appendix I, in the East Jackson district, a higher number of residential units is proposed above what is allowed by current zoning, but it is still proposed as a “stable” district.

17 Recommended Action: Language that identifies requirements/conditions for additional growth in town should be included. Similar to point (2), is this extra allowable density in “growth districts” permitted only

Date

Name

Comment

in exchange for affordable housing units or permanent conservation in outlying areas?

18 Recommended Action: Language should be added to clarify that the community vision should guide the development of the FLUP, not the other way around. Only after a clear policy basis for the proposed FLUP is outlined should the FLUP guide future land use decisions.

19 Vague terms such as “attractive” and “high quality”, without additional defining criteria, do not provide increased clarity beyond the 1994 Plan.

48 Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan

20 This language, in terms of “strategic locations” is vague. For example, this policy states that amenities should first be located in “Downtown Jackson.” The plan should clearly define the geographic boundaries of “downtown” versus “within Town of Jackson limits” to increase predictability.

21 Recommended Action: Language should be added to clarify the meaning of “enhance gateways”. The proposed language does not provide clear direction. As one example, does it suggest that gateways should have minimal or larger setback requirements? The 1994 Plan provided some specific examples to define “enhance” in different contexts, and the importance of these entry points given our function as a gateway community.

22 This principle, and accompanying policies were formerly listed under the “managing growth responsibly” theme. The intent of this policy, to promote “a sense of place” should be a broader goal in the plan, and include both the town and county.

23 Recommended Action: To help meet the 10x10 goal, an additional policy to support reuse of existing structures should be added. The 2008 draft of the new Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan included an additional policy (2.5d – “support reuse of existing structures as an alternative to redevelopment.” This policy has been removed from the new draft, and should be reinstated. Emphasis on retrofits should be included in the new plan.

24 Recommended Action: First, better indicators need to be identified. Indicators should include measurable variables of concern to the community, such as percentage net gain or loss of affordable housing units. For example, if a primary goal of “Town as Heart” is to enable increased housing opportunities for the workforce close to the workplace, indicators should correspond to affordable housing loss, preservation and production within town boundaries. Indicators should also include factors for measuring transportation efficiency, watershed protection, and wildlife habitat preservation in outlying areas, all of which are factors to measure the success of “Town as Heart” vision and policies. Second, baseline conditions, as starting measurable points, should be included in the tables. For example, if the indicator is “number of annual community events”, the plan should have an initial column that provides the existing number of events. Third, “Consistent with FLUP” and “monitor” are not sufficient goals, and should be replaced with more measurable factors. (For example, we should not monitor for the goal of monitoring, and “Consistent with FLUP” is an unacceptable benchmark.)

The concept of “Town as Heart” is a planning approach that intends to implement broader and more comprehensive goals. This chapter should reflect this broader approach, and identify other indicators that evaluate how “Town as Heart” implementation strategies carry out county-wide goals.

12/9/2009 ,

Joint Planning Commiss

Identify pedestrian only areas around the town square including enhancement of pedestrian amenities and closing streets to vehicular traffic.

12/9/2009 ,

Joint Planning Commiss

Add an additional residential area category called; flexible areas where uses, character, etc. would not be defined in order to allow a more organic development pattern.

Date	Name	Comment
12/9/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Revise the definition of an active mixed use neighborhood to be: a 1/4 to a 1/2 mile walking area that generally includes all municipal utilities (water, sewer, and storm sewer), schools, a variety of housing types, and recreational amenities. These areas should also include local convenience commercial where compatible with surrounding neighborhood character and uses. These areas should be connected by full "complete streets" with sidewalks in addition to transit.
12/9/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Just a quick comment. Last week I was disappointed that when you guys did discuss some changes, really I don't think there was enough time devoted to...when there were suggestions, there really wasn't enough time, so I hope you will allow enough time tonight for some good discussions. Because, as you all know, we're inventing a process as we go forward with this product that we're trying to make, which is the Plan. So if you will allow enough time to make...for some good discussion. I think that was one of the reasons why you really couldn't get anything passed last week because there wasn't enough time to come up with any alternatives. It was either kind of take it or leave it, and that really doesn't work so well. I think there is a need to try something different. Certainly that's always been one of my personal philosophies in life is to try different things. Not everything works. You know, I've always subscribed to the management philosophy that says generate a reasonable amount of mistakes. A person who makes no mistakes is probably trying nothing new and probably not making any advances. So, I would suggest that you consider Mr. McCarthy's suggestion, certainly on a trial basis, and if it works better, then obviously keep doing it, and if it doesn't, then let's keep trying to make it work better. I do want to agree with Greg's comments earlier. I won't repeat them or any of those points. I do want to make one point on the topic of Town as heart. We keep hearing about Town being the center of the population. And according to the...actually the statistics that's in this draft Plan from Staff, the Town actually only represents 48 percent of the population. At one time, I think we could have made a clear statement that the Town was the population center. It is no longer. So, if we desire to change that, then we should be honest about that, but I do think we need to be honest with the fact that it is no longer the clear center of the population. And that causes some of the conflicts that we have and we need to recognize that. So, thank you.
12/9/2009	Varley, Jay Interested Public	My name's Jay Varley. I'm a resident just a few blocks from here really in the Town. And I just wanted to say something about the Town as heart and a distinction that I think should be made and that's what I call downtown as the heart of the heart of Jackson, and Town as heart generally. The term Town as heart I think scares the beejesus out of a lot of residents in Jackson, because they perceive that to mean that there's going to be a lot more density in the neighborhoods, there's going to be a lot more deed-restricted housing in the neighborhoods, all these things that for some people, it bothers them. And I think that the real heart of the Valley, not just ?? But potentially residential, or a good part of it, could be in downtown Jackson. It probably should be. So, I'd like, rather than just talking about Town as heart as the whole Town, if you've got some discussion dividing the parts of Town ?? In your overall discussions about Town as heart. Thank you.
12/9/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Second sentence in second paragraph revised to read: "However, it is also crucial that the character and charm of Jackson be protected and enhanced where appropriate, for they too maintain the hart of the region concept."
12/8/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	County commissioners, The planning commissions' comprehensive plan draft review is not working. A joint planning commission between town and county is sucking the life out of what could be a very positive valley tool. Is there some way for the county commissioner to say "time out" and separate town and county planning commissioners? (We could just rope off the conference room and let each planning commission send out its strongest guy. I could bring two sets of boxing gloves and by the end of the night if we don't have some results and least we'd be entertained.) I know this whole process is suppose to able to sort things out so when this plan gets to elected officials the "BS" has been sifted out and the ingredients are ready for the correct recipe. Please let county and town planning commissions come up with their own recipes for baking a cake. The electeds will then be able to sample both recipes, put in their own pinch of seasonings and spices and present to the valley a comprehensive plan that reflects "Life in the Whole Valley".

Date	Name	Comment
12/3/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'd like to try an attack on strategy 1.1, establish an Environmental Commission. There's so much public comment—and it's pretty inconsistent—for incorporating Game & Fish comments. So, I'd like to suggest that on the third bullet, the Commission would agree to make ?? studies related to wildlife and natural resource stewardship. It would help to coordinate that effort with multiple agencies. A possible compromised position that won't put anymore skin in the game for you is including but not limited to the Wyoming Game & Fish comments of June 26th. I'd also like to kind of a policy deal that goes directly to theme one. I'd like to request that a new concept be considered—a one-page preamble between vision and theme one, so that when current or future leaders encounter contextual conundrums, contradictions, omissions, oversight, ambiguity, opportunities for selective interpretability, selected enforcement—and they will. We encountered using the theme-one draft the other morning in a fencing workshop, we encountered really contradictory language, which somewhat stalled the discussion. So, this is going to be a problem when moving forward continually. If we insert this one-page preamble, it would act as a balance to the statement of ideal. A statement of ideal, I believe strongly, like Robert Browning said, that man's reach should exceed his grasp, and I believe our community has reached or exceeded its grasp. We should strive for ideal. But I think this ideal is relatively unenforceable. We're dealing with a lot of pragmatism here, so I'd like to balance that with a statement of intent in the form of a preamble. We had discussions last week with Commissioner/Mr. Palmer and Commissioner/Mrs. daCosta about inserting, as I have suggested in the past, private property rights into that equation. A sample...I was writing on my knee at the last meeting, I mean, it's subject to some interpretability, but a sample is the statement of intent for theme one hasn't been incorporated. One of the strongest requests from the community was to prioritize wildlife and open space. And if you need any public comment to back that up, we have 1300 signatures asking for exactly that. And my proposal for a statement of intent is that protection of wildlife, acquisition of open space, and protection of our natural resources prevail in all land-use decisions, except those regarding private property rights and the health and safety of the community. This...we could use this procedure throughout on each theme to provide a statement of intent so that there's, again, it will cover our omissions. And it'll help, you know, facilitate and back scratch the process somewhat. So, that's just a suggestion. That's just a suggestion. As far as the general procedure, I've noted that every chance we've had in this process to be bold, we've been timid. Every chance we've had to be visionary, we've been reactionary. Every time we've had a chance to put on our creative and critical thinking caps, we've instead reached for our concrete boots of the status quo. And this is called...that's the reason we're still discussing theme one at this late of a juncture. Mr. Duncker's comment of several weeks ago about mediocrity, I really feel like what we're doing here is much worse than mediocre. It's regret. One of the strongest human emotions is regret. One of the strongest forms of regret is that of lost or squandered opportunity. So, I'd just like to keep that in mind going forward. Whatever the process proposals are, I would also like to request that since we're using this time for theme-one comment, if there are any major process changes, allow maybe some subsequent discourse tonight for additional public, you know, abbreviated public comment on that process. So, it isn't just another, you know, Chairman Pruett said to Mr. Duncker that this is the process we agreed upon. I disagree. We didn't agree upon anything. This process was dictated to us and it was dictated to us without any opportunity for public comment. And so I feel like that's probably going to happen again tonight, so please give us a little public comment on the process itself later on. Thanks.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Geneva Comments Page 4 - change "Critical Winter Habitat" to "Critical Habitat" Add a statement to Policy 1.1 relating to wildlife and transportation. Add indicator to measure wildlife vehicle collision fatalities.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 1.2 - Agriculture may be excepted from wildlife friendly fencing standards.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Leave recommended 1.3.c as written in the draft Theme 1 redline published 10/30/09.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Limit scenic protection to State and select County and public roads
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Waterways Indicator - Measure water quality in addition to sediment loading; limit indicator applicability to natural waterways

Date	Name	Comment
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Endorse - as a rewrite guide - Lisa's recommendations on principle 1.7 and policies a,b,c to address responsible use of public lands
12/3/2009	Hoke, Bland, III Interested Public	My name is Bland Hoke and I'm a resident of the Town of Jackson. I'm the Public Art Ambassador to the Center of Wonder, and I'm here to make a comment in support of integrating public art into theme three. And what I have tonight is a very broad scope of public art. And currently Jackson Hole does not have an established or organized public art program. And I'm letting everyone know on the Planning Commission that I'm organizing and coordinating a task force to develop the plan of a public art program that's consistent with other communities of art in scope and scale. And in over 350 towns and cities across the U.S., established public art programs exist with ordinances and administration that oversees the funding mechanism and for selecting artists or placing art work in public spaces. And this is what I'm trying to facilitate the creation of, so it's not a whole new situation that you guys have to deal with. If these public art programs exist to enhance the gateways to other communities, they exist to improve public spaces and they also use artists to reflect the unique characters of communities. So, the results can range from sculptures or murals on buildings to fountains or artwork in other buildings. But they also range from placing public artists right in the design process of buildings so that the result is more reflective of the community and it's also a creative way that cannot be achieved in other means. So, what I hope the Planning Commission might consider when you look over theme three is how public art could be used to enhance the emotional appeal of the Town of Jackson and Teton County, or to enhance the aesthetics of the community character, or even promote a broad theme such as cultural tourism. That's it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
12/3/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I just want to...I brought a few brief comments tonight and say many thanks to those of you who came to one of my ?? presentations. ?? I appreciate that. As you know, the Conservation Alliance, throughout the lengthy review of theme one, we've made a number of specific line-by-line suggestions as to how to clarify and strength this chapter's policies. We will not reiterate those again tonight, but I'd just like to state that while we feel a number of issues have been improved, major concerns still exist, particularly given the split votes at the last meeting. In general, we still strongly feel that the policies in this chapter need to be backed up more by the best available science and data. I'm just going to provide one example of this that I have not mentioned in awhile. In July, we raised concerns about policy 1.1.C that includes a general statement that quote private efforts of successfully protected strategic lands that protect connectivity between crucial areas and enable migration. Some lands have been protected, but to our knowledge there are a number of strategic lands that have not been permanently protected. In the latest round of public comment on the rewritten version of this theme, I noticed that ?? has raised the same concern in one of his statements. And while these types of clarifications or changes may seem little, we feel at the end of the day the new Plan the community ultimately adopts should contain the most accurate information, whether it's on the detail level or the broad level. In terms of the process, if you at this point are not going to direct line-by-line changes to be made because you want to stay at a broader level, will there be a time prior to sending the draft on to the elected officials where these details will be reviewed by some entity regarding the level of science? Also some of the possible discussion points listed by Staff in your Staff Report, such as point one regarding responsible use of public lands, could better be addressed if these recommendations from other agencies such as Wyoming Game & Fish were noted and accessible in your discussions. As we stated at the September 10th hearing, the agency's comments on dispersed recreation and responsible use of public lands can be specifically integrated into this policy to increase clarity. You know, overall we hope that prior to your final review, before the electives see it, some of the detailed recommendations brought forth by organizations and agencies that exist in this process can be better incorporated. On this first theme three, we're going to be submitting detailed written comments on this chapter prior to your next meeting, but since you may be discussing some of the broad issues tonight, I just wanted to mention a few. Staff did a really good job raising some fundamental broad-level questions for your discussion, but I just wanted to mention a few issues that we feel are critical as a starting point in your review of this chapter. First, further refining the definition of community character as it relates to overall open scale, not simply architectural...not simply architecture in Town. You know, we've said it before, but I feel like if this Plan doesn't sufficiently define what we want to protect in Town, the Plan is not going to help in protecting it. There are other terms and goals such as enhanced gateways that can be improved by adding a little more clarity in terms of what do we mean by enhancing gateways. Second, further clarify the extension to which additional development potential in Town represents additive growth for the Valley overall, rather than substituted growth. Are the tradeoffs in this Plan to receive density from outlying areas and important habitat, scenic areas, etc.? You know, as the Alliance has stated before, we believe an overall amount of growth, in addition to the location of growth, is a critical point to discuss in Town issues. Third, further define in addressing potential planning in Town is associated with significant increases in density in Town and how it relates to the Valley overall. I'll just mention a few in terms of commuting rates, traffic, parking, potential road expansions, crime rates, to elevated noise, light, air pollution, incremental loss of the sense of small-town community. While we fully recognize the many potential benefits of increased density in Town, I feel like this Plan does a really good job about ?? bringing more workers closer to the workplace. We think that there needs to be more language in the Plan that speaks to the realistic potential cost and consequences. That way we at least have policies that address them and minimize those costs. And in general as you discuss Town, always consider how this is going to turn around and affect theme two, because we really don't want Town redevelopment to be discussed in a back view. One other thing, with respect to some of the lack of specifics, discuss the potential of adding a specific principle or policy that addresses things like wildlife and natural resources and their associated planning missions that are unique to urban town planning issues coming in to Town. I will close with that. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
12/3/2009	Varley, Jay Interested Public	Resident of Jackson. I've always been concerned and felt that too often the definition of community character seems to be ???. And I don't think that's at all broad enough for really describing what community character is about. I think it should incorporate things like the pedestrian orientations, the opportunity for interaction between people on the street talking to each other, all those kind of things. The way the architecture is, the public spaces, there's really a lot more to what I would call community character beyond the physical open scale of building structures. And I've always been sensitive to that, because I just don't think that that's the way...more density, you know, it's not...that's not all there is to community character by a long shot. And in a sense not preserving necessarily what we have today, but improving it and even making it more of a community character that I think Jackson had years ago. That was the kind of interaction we had at the post office, that kind of community dealing with each other on a personal basis. And that was more involved with a pedestrian environment. I'd almost like to go back to more of that, and not the suburban type that we have where we drive everywhere. I think it's worth attempting to go back to a little better community character. I note in here this comment that was put out about private property rights and historic preservation, and I'd like to say that isn't really a serious issue. And I also agree that there aren't really that many ?? properties in Jackson. But I'd also like to suggest there's been a problem with preservation of historic buildings, and one of those problems relates to the building code. If you should move one of these historic buildings, you have to bring it up...pretty much you have to bring it up to current code. That is really...a real impediment to moving any of these structures. There is provision in the building code. I don't think it's been used all that much to allow for historic, for example, ??, you know, that they, okay, it's been here 50 years <<inaudible>>. You know, there's provision like that, but I would encourage you in this Plan, in terms of historic preservation, to try to see if there's ways to facilitate some, because I don't think it's even feasible in most cases. I don't believe in just eliminating all discretionary incentives. I think there's a lot of merit to getting better projects with some discretionary incentives. An example is resort master plans, which were highly discretionary in terms of how it worked out in the past, especially on bigger parcels. There's abilities to get much better development if the Planning Commission and Council has some discretion within ???. We have to always think about, one, lack of development and a bigger development and the differences that can occur in those, or can occur in those, and maybe should, to create better development. I certainly encourage mixed use and <<inaudible>> more pedestrian orientation of that, more concentration and ability to be served by public transit and by pedestrian traffic. People are a lot more willing to do than the conventional wisdom would indicate if it's from ?? and encouraged. And it is real important also from our tourist economy to have a real nice pedestrian ?? and have them enjoy ??. The other thing with this community character thing is to have more use of the downtown area by ??. I've never believed, and it always seemed to me like, okay, the square in downtown is for the visitors. We'll let them have that. We don't want them to go anywhere else around here. And we don't want to go there. I think we'll have more successful visitor economy if they get more of a chance to interact with locals. And I think locals will enjoy the opportunity ultimately to deal with people that come from all over the world here. So, I'd like to see more interaction like that and more planning to get there. There's a provision in here on enhancing Jackson's gateways. I think for a number of years I encouraged utilizing the bridges that cross our waterways in a way of making really nice bridges, instead of just pipe columns that is the typical WYDOT thing. And to utilize the provisions that are in the general and highway funding for use of enhancements and really make those nice gateways. It turns out that our waterways are precisely at gateway places in many cases. It's a very gratuitous opportunity. I mean, we have the Flat Creek out by Dairy Queen, Flat Creek again down by ?? in that area. Those are logical gateways to the downtown area that could be very much in use. We have one in Carnes Meadow and Snow King, which is another one that's really entering the downtown, or a more concentrated...it's not a commercial downtown exactly, but it's still kind of a gateway. We have out by the, you know, by the ??. That one's really entering Town. And you have a Wilson, or if you have a Snake River bridge going to Wilson, which is entering the general area. These with some sort of a theme...and you have a Fish Creek going into Wilson, a gateway into Wilson. And you even have one on 390 going out, you know, at Lake Creek going out to Teton Village. Or even the Gros Ventre out going into Grand Teton Park. I mean, there's really...these things, these are actually in very interesting places. With some sort of a theme that wasn't a hokey, busy type theme, but some authentic theme of bridge treatments, we could really enhance the area with that, I think. And I believe there's this highway funding. <<inaudible>>. And I think you could raise money privately to help with that, too. Anyway, that's some comments. Thank you.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There will be no review of the recommendations for a Theme until all Themes are reviewed.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The intent of the Planning Commission is to apply wildlife protections everywhere, without universally burdening existing platted lots with additional environmental analysis.

Date	Name	Comment
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Beginning with Theme 3 there will be no review of the recommendations for a Theme until all Themes are reviewed.
12/3/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Hi, my name is Cindy Stone. I live south of Town. I missed the last couple of meetings; I was away, but I came back yesterday to get audio disk thing. And that's a good thing, that's a really good thing. Everybody should take advantage of it. And so on November 12th you were addressing the rural character, which should be included in Comprehensive Plan and don't, Staff, leave it out. It's not doing any good except satisfying the public. Now, I mean, that was a joke but it didn't come over real well ???. My washing machine in my front yard does not have the fastest spin cycle, but I'm pretty sure that on November 12th my rural character was insulted. And if you don't know that that provision of rural character, sometimes the correct answer is the simplest. So, I consulted Dan Webster and rural means country, country people, agriculture, character, distinctive quality, attributes. Now, in your public lives and your social networks, I don't really care nor is it any of my business what you think about rural character. But in this situation you are supposed to be representing the public, and condescending, ignorant remarks are noticed.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Discuss Future Land Use Plan following elected approval of the Themes.
12/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Implement a process calendar
12/3/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Rich Bloom, and thank you again for all your comments and <<inaudible>>. Just a few comments about theme three. Today I'll make comments about process and I'm sure there will be a discussion on that tonight. And I want to keep these back up to the 50,000-foot level we'd always love to go to, and it has to do with Michael Kinsey from the Rocky Mountain Institute and those discussions. I've been reading some of his papers and all and the idea of smart growth. And I had a conversation with Michael about smart growth works when it's substituted growth, when you're trying to move growth around. But when it falls in the realm of additive growth, when you already have huge potential growth within a community that you can't unwind, then it's not smart growth anymore. And I think we found how problematic that was and I think we had wonderful discussions there. I wish more of the Town Council and the County Commissions were here about transferrable development rights, about the Planned Residential Development tool, the PRD tool, about the discussions between permanent open space and temporary zoning and just how you move those units around. So, as you move into theme three, Town as heart, I think you're going to be looking at some stuff to get at growth within Town, which areas should be maybe have different types of uses or lower intensity, moving those to other more logical locations. But I think there's always a tendency to everything becoming more and more additive because it's so painful to downzone. It's almost as bad of a term as node I guess. And I think that's where nodes and the County came to a rub was great idea but how do we move that around without it being additive. So, that's going to come up within theme three. So, as you have discussions about adding and changing density, make sure it is substitutive growth within Town or from County to Town that is achieving those goals because I think we already know just how much growth we already have, commercial and residential, on our plates to deal with that we can't unwind. And I think that's going to become clearer when the Numbers Group presents. We've been able to quantify some of those numbers and they're pretty scary. They're actually very scary. Then the only other thing would be...really, that's kind of it. I guess as we have these discussions, just go back to that whole idea that Michael Kinsey was talking about that we're not just trying to do ??, that we're not trying to just add things. Why are we doing these things? Are we trying to achieve more vitality or property tax to achieve housing, and make sure we're achieving those goals and we're not just doing ?? versus achieving a goal whatever that goal happens to be. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
12/3/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. I'm not going to reiterate my comments from theme one. I put those in writing. I hope you all will still consider those, as we didn't get further along in the theme-one rewrite discussion. I have one comment for the Town as heart. I've officed here in Jackson for almost 30 years and I see a dramatic difference in how the sunlight comes into the Town, the denser Town-Square area, especially around my office where I get very little sunlight. And I would really hope that there would be some discussion on limiting the heights and that so that you can get some light in. It makes it a very unpleasant atmosphere in Town when you can't get some light into the buildings, especially there on the first floor and you're totally blocked by three stories above you. Another consideration also...the thing I've noticed, too, in Town is the lack of delivery access points. And that is a real problem. I've witnessed a number of fist fights and things over the years where UPS trucks, FedEx trucks, delivery trucks, trash trucks, whatever, coming in the front streetscape and blocking a lot of tourist vehicles in or local vehicles in for long periods of time, and there's been arguments. So, I'm hoping that maybe some sort of...I don't know if this is the place, or in the LDRs, but there certainly is a problem with that design-wise in our Town. So, anyway, those couple of comments. Thank you.
11/20/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Alex and Jeff, I would suggest you take a look at Fremont County ID Policy 4 before you begin work on a policy about private property rights for our Comp Plan. Policy 4 acknowledges one of the duties of the Planning Commission is "to protect property rights." I believe this statement will satisfy Joe and Lisa's concerns. It also goes on to acknowledge "with property rights comes the responsibility to prevent damage to neighbor's land or serious health and safety problems. Private landowners will have to take actions to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts." It then goes on to list 2 strategies to accomplish this balance. (ID state law requires a property rights element in a Comp Plan.) The statements are balanced and seem to address concerns on both sides of the issue. Let me know if you need me to resend the document. I hope you find this useful.
11/20/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Dear Joint Planning Commissions, I know you have taken your responsibilities seriously and some good work has been accomplished - but I – in the vein of Commissioner Lisa daCosta's comment last night – also often wake up at 3am anxious on where this plan process is – and is not going. Perhaps you, as I, would like to get a bit more sleep. I believe after last night's impasse – the current process is failing. We went on for hours with once again split vote after spit vote. I do acknowledge you were eventually able to get a few items to the point of consensus. Unfortunately as Paul Dunker was quoted this week in the newspaper – "Mediocrity is the price of consensus." I suggest two possible courses of action – you may have others. One would be to simply take a time out, enjoy the holidays – and remand the remainder of the draft, in its entirety, back to staff so they align it better with the public will. Then restart your review. If that is not acceptable then do something along the lines of our own federal government in crafting legislation – divide into Town and County planning commissions and associated staff – then discuss a chapter separately - coming back after each body has a completed draft and see if you can reconcile differences. In this way each will be free to craft a clear position. Our federal House and Senate does not sit down together crafting legislation – rather they craft it separately which is challenging enough – then try to reconcile the differences. In the end it then goes on to the President for signature. In our Comp Plan the idea is what is not reconciled then proceeds to the joint electeds to reconcile. At least the electeds – and the public - will receive clear - albeit at times different - direction from your two bodies. What you should seriously think about is whether you really want to continue "riding a dead horse". Respectfully - Rich Bloom

Date	Name	Comment
11/20/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Larry and Michael, Thanks for keeping at it last night. After a rocky start, I think some progress was made. Perhaps not as much as we would have liked, but more than would have happened if you all went home at 7:00. I have two suggestions to improve the process: There are 3 primary sources of input for the Joint meetings: 1) Staff input (including questions and requests for clarification) 2) Public input (written and verbal) 3) Input from the Commissioners (Primarily written points submitted with the staff report, verbal comments before a vote are a different issue) It is important to adjust the balance so no one source overwhelms the other two. I would suggest that the agenda for each meeting include a discussion period for each of the three sources. Since there is a natural advantage to going first, I would suggest the order of discussion be rotated. After asking for comments If there are none, the chair would move to the next item. The important thing is that it is on the agenda as a reminder. Last night, there was a great deal of discussion on written and verbal public comments, but very little discussion on the points submitted by Lisa da Costa. In other meetings Staff input has dominated the discussion with little discussion on public comment. Neither situation is the optimum. My second suggestion is that the real opportunities to work on are the split votes. These identify points of conflict between the two Commissions that need to be worked out. Instead of submitting a revised copy with a footnote, we need to actively pursue a solution. Perhaps that would be done after a "cooling off" period to see if there is room for compromise. Ignoring conflicts will not make them go away. Instead they will fester and resurface later. They hamper our ability to have a true joint process. At the very least, the Staff Report to the Electeds should identify the differences of opinion with a synopsis of the two opposing view points. I hope you will consider these suggestions as I believe they will improve the process.
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Defer further discussion of Theme 1 until review and recommended changes by the Env. Commission and/or Conservation Alliance are ready for review
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Move forward with discussion of staff questions as listed in the staff report
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #5: Add language that clearly explains how indicators will be used to draft and amend land development regulations. Language should be added that explains how a science-based monitoring program will be further developed
11/19/2009	Labelle, Ernest Interested Public	My name is Ernest Labelle. I'm a resident of Wilson. In my opinion, one of the most important criteria for a healthy livable quality-of-life environment in a place like Jackson Hole is to create opportunities for wildlife to move freely within the developed areas and through the developed areas. This is not a naïve notion. This can be done. One way to encourage it is to address the issue of fencing, which has been addressed at the Commission level, but it needs to be addressed at the neighborhood levels within the community. We are here in this Valley, among other things, a collection of subdivisions. I live in a subdivision. I'm on the board of directors. I'm the past president of the subdivision that I live in. And we have taken steps to see that we have a policy that sets forth the guidelines for stewardship within our subdivision. Stewardship that ensures that no fencing will be allowed that in any way prohibits the movement of wildlife within and throughout our subdivision. Can you imagine if every subdivision and neighborhood in this community, in this Valley, stepped forward and stepped up to the responsibility of making things like that possible? We will have achieved a great gain, what you want to achieve in terms of wildlife stewardship in your Comprehensive Plan. So, I would recommend to you that you find a way of putting guidelines and language in the Comprehensive Plan that will encourage neighborhoods to assume some level of responsibility with their own associations to ensure that we continue to maintain an environment that is friendly and accommodating and that encourages the movement, the free movement, of wildlife throughout our community. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	Good evening, I'm Scott Pierson. I'm going to ask you to think about planning now and for the future. I know you're trying to do that, but you're also thinking a lot about ???. When we don't plan for the future, certain things happen just because they happen to be at the right place and the wrong place at the right time. One example is the affordable housing planned unit development. Back in '94, the affordable housing planned unit development didn't exist. Suddenly the ??? trailer park on 390 and Wilson Road became available. So, they changed the Regulations to accommodate that so that the Housing Authority could put that project in there. Whether or not that project is the right place at the right time or the most suitable location, it was opportunist and we ended up with that project there. We also ended up with a legacy of the affordable housing PUD regulation that in hindsight may not be exactly what we planned on. Another instance of opportunistic things that happened, the Science School, now known as Hypocrite Village by a lot of people. But it was basically the Science School going into an untouched area with a good purpose for the Science School but probably in the wrong location. Another one that was a little outside the County's planning was WYDOT. WYDOT put a light industrial site down on Hog Island and now we also have two or three other light industrial things there in that area. It was opportunistic for WYDOT to put that in there. Another one that's more recent to especially the County Planners is the Search & Rescue site. It's in the Scenic Resource Overlay, it's in the NRO. It was the only site that they could get; they'd been looking for a site for ten years, so it was approved by the County Planning Commission two weeks ago. Why was it done? There wasn't any choice. What I want to go back to then is what were some of the better things that we came up with in '94 that turned out pretty well? The Valley View Subdivision light industrial park has turned out to be a well used, well utilized industrial area. It was planned for that. It was residential at that point in time and it transitioned from the residential because of its proximity between Lower Valley Energy and South Park Service Center into the light industrial area that's down there now. There's some mistakes down there as well with accessory residential units in a light industrial area that weren't contemplated. But that was another change to the LDRs that was made opportunistically. You know, there are some good ways to do things. If you plan for where growth is going to occur, maybe WYDOT wouldn't be where it is. Maybe Search & Rescue wouldn't be where they're ending up. And maybe the Science School wouldn't be where they are ending up, if you would just figure out, okay, where are we going to grow a little bit. You don't have to open the floodgates, but plan direction, most logical places and they've all been discussed, they've all been presented by Staff. Thank you very much.
11/19/2009	Shoals, Cindy Interested Public	Hi, I'm Cindy Shoals and as much as I'd like to speak for lots of other people, I'm only speaking for myself here. I'd like to urge the Commission also to consider the Game & Fish's comments in this version of the Comprehensive Plan. Not only are we working towards creating a Comp Plan that's based on the best available science, but let's think about how this community has evolved over, say, my lifetime, 30 years. One of the most impressive things that have happened in Jackson Hole and the ??? in the past 30 years is the designation of the Gros Ventre wilderness. I urge you all to think about the Gros Ventre wilderness. I urge you all to think about the various movements, the various energies that people on this committee have put together in order to really create a lasting legacy for our community. And I may be a little bit biased about the Gros Ventre wilderness. Not everybody can be at Darwin Ranch. But it's our responsibility to continue to preserve our open spaces and, most importantly, our wildlife for my grandchildren, for your grandchildren, to set an example for hundreds of years to come. Thank you for all of your efforts and I do urge you to consider the best available science in your decisions.

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Barash, Jean Interested Public	June Brash, Wilson, Wyoming. Today, Dave and I came home at noon and we walked into our living room and we were so excited because there on our pond was a fabulous swan. And at first we thought it was a trumpeter swan and then we looked and it had a big tag collar on it. It looked different. And we picked up the phone and we called Wyoming Game & Fish and we got Susan Powell. And we described what we saw and the number and so forth, and she was so excited and said, can I come out? It's a tundra swan. They don't often fly over Wyoming on their way to Utah. I urge you to incorporate Wyoming Game & Fish's comments into this Plan. They are such a hard-working organization. We have never called them as homeowners with concerns or questions that they haven't called us right back. They're so interested. They work so hard. I know they put a lot of time into writing this report. So, I urge you to please incorporate it into this vision statement. And then the second thing is this past weekend I took my grown children to Washington, DC. We hadn't been there since they were in grade school. And for whatever reason we had a chance to go back again. And we did all the tourist events. We had contacted Senator Lindsey's office ahead of time, and so we took a tour of the White House and we went to the Capitol, all of those things. My children were there the last time when they were ten, eleven, and fourteen. They're now thirty-nine, forty, and forty-four. And we had a wonderful time. We did all the things, went to all the memorials. It was great. It was a lot like what it was when we took them there so many years ago. And I was talking to someone at one of the memorials, saying, man, wow, this is so great, this is so fabulous. And I was at the World War II memorial and I hadn't seen it. And I said, you are so lucky that you can come and see all these things and it doesn't cost anything. And the person said, where do you live? And I said, Jackson Hole, Wyoming. And the person said, do you know how lucky you are to live in a place like that? And I know I've said this before, and it's so hokey, but this is a one-of-a-kind place. People can ski in other places. People can play golf in other places. People can have fabulous meals in other places. But there is no other place that has the wildlife values, the wildlife that we have. And whether it is because you feel a, you know, you're a tree hunter or you're a business person. If you're a tree hunter, you're going to come back because you love these places. If you're a business person, as people are in this community, it's good for business. So, that's all I have to say. Thank you all.
11/19/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	Thank you. I'm Louise Lasley and one of the benefits for working at the Conservation Alliance is how closely aligned my ideas and values are with theirs, but tonight I'm speaking personally. And what I would like to suggest most strongly is that this Plan incorporates the best and strongest language that acknowledges the scientific values and the premiums put on wildlife and make sure that's incorporated. And whether it's in the body and policies, it should also be in the indicators. I find that just the term monitoring without any kind of background scientific data to back that up and using that data in your monitoring that makes it way too vague to know you've accomplished anything. So my emphasis would be on making sure that wildlife in this theme and throughout the Plan is acknowledged, as the public would like to see it, as the number-one priority and everything else in this Plan goes from that. Thank you.
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #7: Add language that clearly explains why the protection of diversely sized-parcels is important. (The rewrite of what is now policy 1.4a, page 11, does not adequately capture this.) Vote to direct staff to include more

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Hoffman, Nancy Conservation Alliance	Hello. I'm Nancy Hoffman. I represent myself and I also represent the Conservation Alliance tonight. I'd like to thank you all. Every time we get our reports on the internet, I marvel at the amount of work you guys are doing and stick-to-itiveness. It must be kind of like rote at this point in time, because of the amount of time you've had to spend. But I am in awe of it and I want to thank you for all your work that you have been doing. It's fantastic. And I also wanted to recognize and thank you for including in your rewrite so many of the fundamentals of the planning and science that so often express, or are expressed by the public's wish to...wish list as well as organizing...as organizations get through the planning process. You received in your packet...I forwarded to Staff in the Staff Report for this Thursday's meeting seven issues from the Alliance of issues of concern that we believe, and that you believe, ours and the public consistent express key issues of concern and are worthy of examining. They should have been summarized in the points of discussion for tonight. We didn't realize you didn't have them. And if you don't have them, I have them, if you'd like to refer to them. Anyway, the Alliance and I personally are troubled by...about the lack of appreciation of the importance of both Town and County planning issues being intertwined, or not being intertwined, or the fact that they are under not recognizing. So many of the issues have been put at the bottom of the page and that is troubling because, first of all, denying wildlife issues that don't exist in Town and not taking the whole picture, especially when Town is adjacent to the National Forest. And no animal I know expects human political boundaries. And there is protection of Flat Creek just to mention another. I ask you to please implement the Game & Fish recommendations, which apply to both Town and County, and the other wildlife studies that have been done and anything that has come out of the old Plan that has been baseline that can allow you to move forward. And I compliment the Planning Commissioners who recognize and seeing that working together is for the best interest of the Valley. And that is of utmost importance. It is very important. Also, there's a great discussion concerning tools, the funding of purchase of open space, and that has been dropped, as I see it. Please reconsider the implementation of a dedicated funding source. And even in these hard times, economically, there are mechanisms that are possible that do not significantly affect the public financially. And I cannot say often enough that having a complete working set of current scientific documents and science-based language relating to wildlife and natural resources as a baseline, and the means of implementing them for future protection of them, must be the key part of your Plan that you're developing. Chapter one has to be...become the foundation and the guide for all of the chapters. In addition, the formation of a capable Environmental Commission is an excellent resource for good science. We have a unique ecosystem in Teton County which we have an obligation to protect and allow for everyone to experience. It also is our financial interest that we protect the natural resources and magnificent wildlife and scenic vistas, because if we lose our natural assets, we lose our very special uniqueness, and I'm sure you're all aware of that. And then we become like any other place with no value. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'd like to address the agenda items for tonight first. If possible, in the future, could Staff number those one, two, three, four, five and then a, b, c, d, e, so we can comment more succinctly on individual agenda items. I'm going to go straight to number five, the language that includes no value judgment. There has to be a value judgment in the acquisition of open space. The community should not incur the same externalized cost for land of varying ecological value. It also needs to be acknowledged that open space is the single greatest positive effect with the greatest number of issues, including wildlife. And there needs to be a stronger inclusion of language about smaller parcels, primarily critical habitat connectivity. You could have an extremely small acreage that has very high ecological value. Under why this theme is addressed in the rewrite itself, there's a statement privately owned lands in the County continue to provide critical winter habitat for many species. That actually should be most critical habitat. The official statistics of Fish & Game are 79 percent of the moose winter range, 80 percent for mule deer, and 73 percent for elk. So either I suggest enter the actual percentages, or a round up of percentage, or put most to indicate the importance of that statement. Moving right along to policy 1.1.C, conserve large contiguous connected open space. That's great. But again I would like some, you know, acknowledgement of the value of and the need to engage in acquisition and preservation and protection of smaller parcels also. Going into policy 1.2.C, I think instead of water bodies, very similarly to the indicators, the language, the verbiage used there is waterways. I won't go back into my argument why irrigation ditches should be included in that, so I think you all heard it. But we need to acknowledge also that irrigation ditches siphon off and reinvent water to perfect waterways, Snake and Gros Ventre, specifically. And they should be subject to the same setbacks for filtering, etc. Policy 1.3.A also goes to the agenda for tonight. I think the term road scars should be entered into the policy, possibly policy 1.3.A. It's relatively pertinent to the north Highway 89 project right now. I agree with Staff on all roads. That's too vague. Private roads obviously won't be included there, so public roads and parks. Staff's language is fine on that. That also extends to 1.3.B. I think there's all roads listed there also. I also agree with Staff on 1.3.C, berms and ponds should also be included in that. 1.4.A, there really is nowhere where there's sufficiently strong enough language that prioritizes high-value habitat and I figure that verbiage needs to be strengthened. Policy 1.4.B, remove regulatory barriers to continue agriculture. That's opening another tin can of selective interpretation potentially. Wildlife friendly fencing would come under that. We went through that. We need to really...Staff needs to probably tighten that up and delineate which barriers we're talking about so we can vote on non-open-ended language. 1.1 number of strategies, establish an Environmental Commission. If you're not willing to revisit what Game & Fish vote itself, which is very important, as you've seen in public comment, at least consider entering under bullet four there, the Environmental Commission will consider all Wyoming Game & Fish comments and recommend inclusion in theme one where appropriate. That's the absolute minimum that would be acceptable. Under the Environmental Commission, this is primarily the Staff, I feel very strongly there should be a bifurcated board, which has an advisory board or advisory council to provide like ?? recommendations, and these entities would have specific expertise and experience in the disciplines being discussed. LDRs, under policy...sorry, strategy 1.3, amend LDRs. Possibly direct Staff to examine how many LDR changes are necessary to implement theme one. We recently did a...thanks to Commissioner Wall and Commissioner McCarthy, the EA amendment took eight and a half months to do. We had relative little going on with...we need to be realistic about an LDR prioritization. Under indicators, I feel strongly we should add indicator thirteen, acres put under conservation easements and additive units ratio. Right now that ratio is fairly unacceptable and it needs to be addressed. And number 14, you voted on this also. It was an oversight in my mind. Miles of wildlife unfriendly fencing removed. It was a four to one vote in the County. Including it as an indicator, not as a severity of the problem, and it also illustrates the fact that corrective action needs to be measured in miles. We removed 110 miles of un-wildlife-friendly fencing in the last several years and that sort of drives them down into the disparity problem. Thank you.
11/19/2009	Jankowsky, Dorothy Interested Public	Hello, my name's Dorothy Jankowski and I'm speaking for myself tonight. I live in Victor, but for the past 14 years I've commuted to Jackson Hole to go to work. And like many people in the area, and like most of the people who have participated in the Comp Plan surveys and made comments, I believe that protecting wildlife is this region's number-one priority. Tonight I just want to ask you two things: First, as you discuss this latest version of the Comp Plan's wildlife chapter, would you please keep in mind what the whole point was of revising the Comp Plan. The point is to end up with a Plan that is better than the '94 Plan at protecting those things that the community has repeatedly said they want protected—wildlife, natural resources, and community character. Second, would you please ask yourselves honestly that the protections in this revision are stronger or weaker than what's in the '94 Plan. I believe that, although you have made some improvements, overall the protections in this document are worse, not better, than the ones in the '94 Plan. If this is the best we can do, Jackson Hole should go back to the '94 Plan. Thank you for listening.

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. I spent some time reading all the public input on the website and there were lots of good comments, and I certainly hope that they're discussed tonight. I also found the Staff comments to be very good. But I am disappointed, to Kelly's point, on...I think he brings up a good point, because there's no one better at telling us how to manage wildlife than Game & Fish. So, I'm still a little confused as to why we don't have that at least on the items to discuss tonight on how to better incorporate the Game & Fish comments into this draft document. And some of the good Staff comments I'd like to point out is, one of them is recommendation 84 to expand the SRO protection to the view points of all roads. As Greg pointed out, we definitely need to address this. I think it did go far out before. Perhaps this recommendation goes too far. Public roads and parks is probably a good compromise, but we certainly do need it, as you heard in discussion earlier, to protect our views. The Staff concerns about 1.3.C, modification to land forms, it certainly seems to merit further discussion. The language seems to be too vague. I have to admit myself not being, after reading it, not clearly understanding that that was the intent when I read what the intent was and compared it to what the actual language was. To Ms. daCosta's point on property rights, I think that's a valid point. And I haven't brought this one up for awhile, so I guess I'll bring it up again. The Fremont County, Idaho, Comprehensive Plan, which I gave you all copies of, actually addresses that and perhaps rather than, as Ms. daCosta's suggestion, to put it in a whole bunch of places would be possible to put one statement in there that says, as a principle or policy, that you would respect property rights. They thought it was important enough to add it as another policy, so I would suggest you think about that. And I also think there needs to be a priority discussed in terms of avoiding tax over mitigation. I sat in a meeting this week with the County Commissioners where there was talk about mitigating a project, and the landowner had to admit that there was no way to mitigate. What he was required, the amount of land that he needed to offset what he was doing. So, I think there's this idea that mitigation is a solution and I think the priorities should be in all cases to avoid the impact first, because that's always a better policy than mitigation. Mitigation should be a second choice. Thank you.
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #6: Add language that provides greater detail on potential types of exemptions and allowances for agriculture.
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #4: Wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions.
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #4: Wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions (While balancing the need to protect private property rights)
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #3: Add the following strategy: "Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation." (Through the vote of the
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #2: Ensure that the red-lined, rewritten draft of Theme One that is sent to elected officials includes an incorporation of Wyoming Game and Fish comments.
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Conservation Alliance 11/12 Action #1: Ensure that more specific data, language and mechanisms to protect wildlife are incorporated into the plan, and that existing data and knowledge are efficiently utilized. Science-based language from the existing 1994
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Incorporate all seven 11/12 recommended actions from the JH Conservation Alliance into Theme 1
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The staff rewrite met the intent of the previous recommendations made
11/19/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Insert into Theme 1, Why is this Theme Addressed, end of second paragraph: "while balancing the need to protect private property rights"

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Lockhart, Kelly Interested Public	My name's Kelly Lockhart. I'm speaking for myself and my family and properties that we steward in Buffalo Valley and South Park. I was out on Flat Creek the other day fixing a fence and Tommy and Betty Trout were coming back from ??, coming back to Snake, and they ran into Jake. And said, well, Jake, where's Martha? He said, well, Martha was up in ?? this summer. She was in this one hole and she kept trying to eat and she ate this bug and it hooked her right in the mouth and dragged her to shore and these people would come and they'd grab her, they'd stomp in the grass in the riparian area and they'd grab her and they'd throw her back. Sometimes she'd go belly up. They did that about three days in a row and all of a sudden she didn't make it; she died. So, she didn't come back. <<inaudible>>. And Tommy said, well, how did...did you get to lay the eggs? She said, well, we did but then there were all these people that kept stomping across the rocks to find beds where the eggs were and they just...people would come every day and every day and every day and just stomp across the spawning beds, and so I don't know, I don't know if we've been very successful this year. And I thought, boy, that's kind of an interesting story. So I was down at the house the other day on Spring Creek where my house is and Donald and Daffy Duck were coming by the house, swimming, and I heard them talking. Donald said, Daffy, what'll we do this afternoon? And she said, well, I don't know, you know, I was down on South Park feed ground the other day with Susie and Herb, and we were just going along and minding our own business and some people come up and wanted to talk. There were these loud bangs and all of a sudden my two friends were dead, killed dead right there in front of me. So, I don't know if I'm going to go back down there. And so I'm listening to these stories and I thought, well, gee, you know, the County's doing a Plan on chapter one on wildlife and natural resources and what's going on. So, obviously, the County must be doing something with respect to fish and ducks. So, I go to the first page and sure enough, you know, we're going to protect the resources. The community recognizes policies ?? development, transportation, recreation. So, obviously, <<inaudible>> down in South Park. Obviously, we're going to take care of killing wildlife, right? What could be of more direct impact on the wildlife than killing them dead. <<inaudible>> So, I get into the policies and sure enough, you know, I start to read some of these policies that talk about direct impacts on wildlife. I see policy 1.1, we're going to limit human noise, 1.2 we're going to talk about wetlands and riparian areas, 1.5 we're going to limit recreation to public lands, we're going to limit impacts on nearby public lands. I guess that might be Daffy and Susie and the ducks and the trout and so we're going to limit those. And I thought maybe the next sentence would then be that we would not allow humans to kill wildlife. But then it goes on to say we're actually going to build dog parks. I'm having trouble here guys. I really am. We talk about the impacts to wildlife and I think you have recognized that humans have impacts on wildlife. I think they probably do. I'm not sure what greater impact that we have than our intrusion into their habitats and into their life. And if we're killing 'em, which obviously continues killing wildlife, and you want to protect them, maybe you ought to limit ??. If fishing hurts fish, which I've seen some fish get hooked in the gill and I've seen them go belly up and have seen them floating on the river. They're dead. I haven't seen anything in here that limits humans' affect on wildlife and killing them. I can't find one sentence in the stewardship of wildlife and natural resources chapter. If I missed it, please point it out to me. I can't find one. I did see an indicator. I did see an indicator in that our access points to waterways and public lands. I guess that's people, trampling in the riparian areas, fishing, pulling their boats up on the rocks, wandering around in these habitats. We want to make sure there's no net loss. You've got to help me out here. How is no net loss of access points to waterways and public lands helping wildlife? What's it doing in this chapter? What does it have to do with wildlife at all other than putting more people in their habitat, putting more fishermen catching them, fondling them? All the fish don't make it. I'm on the river quite a bit. I see people wandering around. I would argue that perhaps something in fishing do do damage to wildlife and probably would kill them. Now, I'm not saying this is necessarily my point of view that you should prohibit that, but I'm saying in the chapter where you pretend to deal with recreational use and its impacts on wildlife, there's not a sentence about it. You do absolutely nothing. I think I know why. I think I know why. I think it might be that members of the public view themselves as having property rights for the access to the wildlife, to the use of the wildlife, and they view themselves as having some property rights to be able to kill them, to be able to fish for them, to be able to stomp around in their habitat, to be able to mountain bike right through the middle of their habitat, to be able to ride horses through the middle of their habitat, to be able to go climbing where the birds of prey often wander. And I believe that the public doesn't want to give up any rights to help wildlife here. And I believe that you did not put any of that in here because you felt that there might be a public outcry because you might have taken some of their property rights or some of their rights to enjoy their wildlife. And so it's not there. Lisa daCosta's public comment talks about property rights. What I see here is a lot—actually, every bit of it—that speaks to landowners and their rights to their property and how you're going to limit their...maybe the setback of their house. I can tell you my house sits on a stream and Daffy Duck swims up and down the stream every day. I didn't kill her. And yet you spend a whole chapter, two months, three months, four months, five months talking about my house and not talking about anybody who walks over the bank and shoots her. I don't get it. I suspect that's because there's not too many of us who have property rights that can come to these meetings and say, hey, you know, shouldn't we balance property rights and wildlife values, which I think you should do, which I don't think you've done here. I don't think you've done it at all. And, in fact, that one indicator to provide more public access into crucial wildlife habitat is exactly the opposite. Exactly the opposite. Show me a study where more public access to waterways is going to be beneficial to the wildlife. I'll give you my e-mail; please send me the study that says more people there will help. And yet there it is in your indicator in the final draft. Thanks for your time. If I missed something, please let me know.

Date	Name	Comment
11/18/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. I'd like to take this opportunity to fully support the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's position and recommendations to theme one of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan redraft. Everybody at the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance works very hard to make Jackson Hole the very best it can be, and they have my the respect, and by the looks of all the comments on the Plan's site, they have the respect and trust of a lot of other Valley residents. I hope that you still take into consideration a funding source that can help us achieve permanent open space. It is a worthy goal that the community already agrees with and wants. It starts in the Comprehensive Plan as a goal and then defines it later. We need to be creative in preserving open spaces and protecting wildlife, so this is not the time for mediocrity and overcompromising. On the subject of property rights, I hope that all residential property rights will be respected in the new Comp Plan. I keep repeating this and hoping that people do take it serious that about the general public and the small property owner taking/footing a lot of the bill for unchecked growth, construction and services. Most small residential property owners here don't enjoy the luxury of many of the tax write-offs and ?? In West Jackson another concern that negatively affects the small property owner and their rights is the suggestion of extending the industrial sector from Gregory Lane to behind the high school. This will just lead to more open spaces in the next Comp Plan rewrite. Another opened Pandora's box. I think we should stop at the Sewage...I think we should stop at the Sewage Transfer Station and go no farther. Hopefully, some day the Transfer Station will be gone and be replaced with something that will fit in with the school campus area along High School Road. I mean no disrespect to large landowners and their efforts to do what is right for their families' future while also being good stewards of the land. We should take every effort and opportunity to work with the ranchers and large landowners, i.e., for a funding source, to achieve a goal that will enhance everybody's life in Jackson Hole while protecting our surroundings. But along the way let's not forget the hundreds of hard-working small property owners who most times get lost in the shuffle and end up paying for the mistakes of overdevelopment through higher taxes, less services, higher crime rates, overcrowded roads, kids that slip through the education cracks, and degrading neighborhoods. Thanks a lot.

Date	Name	Comment
11/17/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	I wanted to thank you for agreeing to fully fund the additional review and analysis by Fehr & Peers, the transportation consultant for the Comprehensive Plan rewrite. I assume that you will also be formally inviting Rob Bernstein, P.E. to offer clarifications of his submitted analysis and recommendations for the enhancement of the transportation work to date - with his costs I believe covered by Save Historic Jackson Hole (SHJH). As I unfortunately missed both the Town and County meetings - from the staff report my understanding is there are to be two work sessions - the first in the morning would be in the form of a work session with the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). The second would be the same afternoon as a public briefing of the joint Planning Commissions and Elected Officials. The meeting of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) will now allow Fehr & Peers to present and discuss with the TAC their technical analysis and recommendations on Theme 6. This work session would also give the consultant retained by Save Historic Jackson Hole an opportunity to comment on concerns raised by SHJH about the technical analysis and content of Theme 6. My understanding is the second meeting would allow Fehr & Peers to present to the joint Planning Commission, Elected Officials and the public the work completed to date, proposed recommendations and possible revisions based upon the morning meeting. Most importantly, this meeting will now provide an opportunity to engage Fehr & Peers in a discussion and question and answer period to begin the community's discussion of the transportation portion of the plan. Likewise I trust you will give Rob Bernstein, P.E. - the consultant retained by Save Historic Jackson Hole - an opportunity at this second session to comment on concerns raised by SHJH about the technical analysis and content of Theme 6. In closing I felt you once again exhibited vision today when you agreed additional information needs to be gathered on the limited traffic analysis completed to date - and it is the responsibility of government to fund that work. I understand that Save Historic Jackson Hole offered to pay the full costs of the County traffic consultant if this remained a barrier. All of our conservation and neighborhood public interest groups I believe want you – the decision makers – to have the best information available to make the difficult policy decisions you must make. SHJH clearly “put their money where their position was” this morning. You already know my strong opinion that the best policy decisions are always based on the best and most complete information available. The costs of not doing so is inevitably much larger than the front-end cost in collecting the information in the first place. I only wish the Jackson Town Council would have affirmed the same decision last night and shared this cost with the County. Respectfully – Rich Bloom South Park Neighbors P.S. For transparency I am neither on the board, or a member,
11/14/2009	Marino, Marko Interested Public	Regarding section 5.1.e, Providing locations for light industry: The recommendations include a preference for the development of "green" industry. One thing to consider is that the infestation of the pine beetle has caused widespread devastation to the forests in northern Colorado and southern Wyoming, and it will inevitably spread to Teton County. In fact, it is recognized that the infestation has already begun in this area. This will result in increasing numbers of standing dead trees. As stewards of our environment, we have 3 basic options: 1) do nothing and let the infestation run its natural course, which will include forest fires, falling trees, and increased run-off erosion in burned areas; 2) use prescribed burns and pesticides in selected areas to control the infestations; 3) harvest the standing dead and infested trees and process them into usable products like wood stove pellets, building lumber, logs, and finished wood products, etc. As a past resident of Grand County, Colorado, I have seen the devastation and would highly recommend researching and designing a program to deal with the coming infestation BEFORE the forests have been destroyed rather than AFTER it has happened. We are about 5 to 10 years behind the Colorado curve in my uneducated estimation. I do not want to see the same thing happen here. I see this as an area to develop "green" industries, jobs, and manage forests to avoid a widespread beetle kill off. Believe me, dead forests are a turn-off to tourists.

Date	Name	Comment
11/14/2009	Marino, Marko Interested Public	When reading the overview and executive summary, I noticed a few planning priorities that do not seem to be adequately addressed. The following are my thoughts on the issues of workforce housing, wildlife conservation, and transportation:1) I believe that I read at the very beginning of the overview that protection of wildlife habitat and provision of migration routes through human inhabited areas was the topmost consideration and the PRIMARY parameter for design of the land use plan. As I read further, I did not get the sense that this was still the number one consideration. However, I have not yet read the nuts and bolts.2) The need for Workforce (ie: affordable) housing and Transportation (ie: growing congestion) issues seemed to be linked as a major cause/effect relationship in the executive summary. I believe that this premise is way off the mark! My view is this: It is obvious that this local economy is SEASONAL and is based almost entirely on TOURISM. I would assign an uneducated estimate of the impact of workforce on traffic congestion at 10% and tourist congestion at 90% during the "tourist seasons". To me, the logical approach to solving the North Cache--West Broadway traffic dilemma is to provide additional parking and pedestrian crossing solutions!!!!We already have 2 public parking lots in this area but it is not enough and the problem will continue to worsen. I propose to construct multi-level parking structures at these 2 locations and possibly at a 3rd location farther north. Additionally I would add crossing lights or construct several aerial crosswalks at the most congested/dangerous downtown locations. This may not be in keeping with the authentic Western look, and they may be little used during a portion of the year, but it is the peak season that defines the need. If the congestion issue is to be effectively addressed, then parking and pedestrian crossing MUST be addressed!3) Another problem I see is commercial truck deliveries to downtown businesses during peak hours. This causes major traffic tie-ups and delays. This is a difficult problem to address because many businesses are only open to receive deliveries during these hours. I think we need additional Loading Only--No Parking zones downtown, or at least instituting time-sharing of parking and loading zones. Ticketing of delivery trucks is not the answer, but allocating loading zones with time slots for deliveries will help. Try to get deliveries on a schedule! (ex: 06:00-10:00 and 16:00-18:00 hours)4) There is no room to add extra traffic lanes downtown, so providing small shuttles or carts for seniors and the handicapped could help alleviate some congestion during the high-traffic tourist seasons.5) Partnering with the National Parks toward the goal of reducing camping within the parks and increasing guided tours from the greater areas could help reduce ecological impact from traffic and increase economic benefits to local tourism businesses. Denali National Park has been using this system for years, refer to that as a model.
11/14/2009	May, Faith Interested Public	Please NO NODES and Open Space and wildlife must be a priority.
11/13/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Thank you for not reopening the vote on ARUs. Mr. Palmer needs to play by the rules. You can't change them because you weren't there for the vote. Too much time was wasted on the subject. And I thought I was stubborn! Kathy Tompkins

Date	Name	Comment
11/13/2009	Schreiber, Bill Interested Public	Dear County, Jackson and Planning commissioners, I would like to make the following comments about Theme 1 in the current draft Comprehensive Plan document. First, I would like to commend everyone directly involved with the drafting of this document on all their hard work on this critical but difficult task. I have lived in the valley for over 20 years and was involved with the drafting of the 1994 plan. Here are my general thoughts: 1. I believe that there is an overall direction in the community to place the protection of the wildlife in this county as the top goal of this plan. I support that notion but it need not come at the expense of economic development. If you don't grow at lease a little you will probably die. To me what is most important is protecting three critical wildlife protection measures. They are preserving the major migration corridors that exist today, the riparian areas around the valley and protecting the wildlife at road crossings. For example, when WyDot reconstructs highway 22 at the Teton Science school entrance, a moderately long section of elevated roadway (1/8 mile) will do more to protect wildlife and their migratory habits than any regulation ever will. 2. Providing affordable housing in areas throughout the valley is vital to the community. Although the concept of "Nodes" has become a dirty word these days, every land planner worth anything will tell you that our plan needs nodes to function more efficiently and to achieve the plans goals. I live in Wilson on 3rd street and I welcome and support some more density in this community as long as there are other nodes with increases around the valley. This will help protect critical wildlife habitat in other areas. 3. The issue of growth is important but a no growth concept is unrealistic and leads to a poor plan. One thing that needs to be address is the amount of guess houses currently allowed in the county. This development potential will have a huge impact on total build-out figures and needs to be address in the plan one way or the other. I know this is a political process but the leaders of this community have to take a strong stance on critical themes of the plan and try to maintain a balance in between human needs and wildlife needs.
11/12/2009	Jankowsky, Dorothy Interested Public	11/12/09Like its predecessors, the newest version of the draft Comp Plan's chapter titled "Practice stewardship of wildlife, natural resources, and scenic vistas" fails to include the policies necessary to achieve its statement of ideal: "Maintain healthy populations of all native species; and preserve the natural, scenic, and agricultural resources that define Teton County's character."Specifically, to reach these goals, this chapter needs to: • Incorporate the recommendations made by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (the local authority on wildlife in Teton County) on June 26, 2009. • Add a strategy to establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space in Teton County to protect wildlife habitat and preserve scenic vistas and agriculture. Most of the people polled in Comp Plan surveys during the past two years said they would be willing to pay more in taxes for open space preservation than for any other issue, yet there's no provision for this in the draft. • Incorporate specific language stating that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions. Our unparalleled wildlife species make our community unique from all others - their presence is a key factor in Teton County's economy and our community's quality of life. Let's protect the goose that lays the golden egg. All impacts of development on wildlife "direct, indirect and cumulative" must be considered and monitored. • Outline a science-based monitoring program and provide a clear explanation of how indicators will be used to draft and amend land development regulations. • Incorporate science-based language from the 1994 Comp Plan and recent scientific data to help inform decisions. This latest rewrite of the draft plan's wildlife chapter highlights what many in the community have been saying since the release of the second draft in April "overall, the draft Comp Plan (including this latest effort) is inferior to the 1994 Comp Plan that it was supposed to improve. It's high time to cut our losses and start back at square one. Thanks for your consideration of these points, sincerely,Dorothy JankowskyTeton Valley resident and commuting Jackson Hole worker for the past 14-plus yearsP.O. Box 656, Victor, ID 83455 &c dorothy@ninetyfivefive.com
11/12/2009	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	First, I want to thank you for all the time and effort you have put into the comprehensive plan rewrite. Wildlife needs to be the primary consideration always, in any land use decisions, development plans, etc. This has consistently been the public's mandate. I urge you to include the Fish and Game comments in the final draft.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Ewing, Patty and Frank Interested Public	Thank you again for your time, effort and attention to this grueling process of rewriting the 1994 comp plan. The overriding thrust of the Comprehensive Pan must to permanently preserve wildlife, open spaces and community character in each theme, district, and zone in town and county. It should be the primary consideration for all land use decisions. Theme 1, as proposed, still fails to provide “specific data, language and mechanisms to protect wildlife.” Please reinstate the verbiage from the 1994 plan which has “science-based language”, and update the Natural Resources Overlay maps with the most recent data. Collecting current data from all available sources, to be used by the proposed Environmental Commission is a good idea. However, the plan should start with the inclusion of the Wyoming Game and Fish comments submitted in June, 2009 into the comprehensive plan. Who has better expertise in monitoring wildlife than the Wyoming Game and Fish? Their specific recommendations should be a part of the plan. Protection of open space is critical, and to do so, the plan should have a permanent mechanism to fund open space. One method would be the additional (allowable by legislative statute) 1% sales tax which would ONLY be used for open space protection, not for a myriad of projects which are currently the result of misguided, unrestrained rampant growth. Consider that every visitor, every resident loves the open agricultural spaces and most of us recognize that large land owners are great stewards of the land and wildlife, and would, we believe, much rather see cows, horses, haystacks and wildlife on their lands than houses with all their impacts. Include the strategy to establish a dedicated funding source for the acquisition of permanent open space, for the protection of wildlife habitat, and for the preservation of scenic and agricultural vistas. We urge the Planning Commissions to be clear in directing the Planning Staff to adopt clear, concise language which unequivocally accomplishes the above. We support the succinct and accurate review (of the Theme One rewrite) made by the Alliance.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	McCloskey, Kelly Interested Public	Comments on Updated Draft of Theme 1 - Nov. 12, 2009I have been following the planning process, and have attended two public meetings in 2008 and 2009, however I have not commented up to the present. First I would like to let you know that the additional time and effort put into the plan since its initial draft release have resulted in a much improved plan.A general comment: Perhaps I missed it, but nowhere did I find mention of the fact that most/much development in the county is in 'winter range' for wildlife species identified as focal. This was covered in the 1994 plan as "crucial winter range" - it seems important to understanding the overall distribution of wildlife, and the importance of the 3% private lands in the county to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem to mention this somehow. This relates both to Principle 1.1 and to Principle 1.4, as well as Strategy 1.2 bullet #6 which I'll address below.Principle 1.1 c: "Private efforts have been successful in permanently preserving such strategic lands" Please change this to "some such strategic lands" - as written it sounds as though all the most important areas are preserved - I would add to this that little or none has been restored - thus the work really is not complete in a couple ways. I would also support, as others have, a mechanism/funding source for public conservation and restoration of such strategic lands.Related to this, in some ways, is the policy on conservation of Agricultural Lands - this seems to prize these lands for their agricultural/rural character over their habitat/wildlife value which while relevant today may be short-sighted and therefore not in keeping with the timeframe of the document. Strategy 1.2, Bullet #6 states "Map areas appropriate for public and private ecological restoration efforts." Does the Strategy somewhere suggest restoring these areas? Or using them to prioritize restoration should funding/mitigation be available? It seems that it should, else we are mapping for no reason.Principle 1.4 or Policy 1.4a fail to recognize that agricultural lands once were, and to a large degree still are, extremely important winter wildlife habitat. These lands are likely to be identified under Strategy 1.2, Bullet #6 as areas for restoration efforts. It should somehow be conveyed that if the agricultural lands are no longer economic as agriculture that they hold their highest value as areas for restoration and conservation of habitat. This was moderately clear in the 1994 plan, where ranchers were recognized for preserving habitat on ranch lands, but is not openly addressed in the current plan. If these lands are to go out of agriculture the highest use for natural resources should be recognized as restored habitat, a condition that, in fact, is more in keeping with the Natural Resource emphasis than the agricultural use they are currently in, and secondarily as open space, and thirdly as sub-divisions. This may be implicit in the land development guidelines that would give density bonuses for open space in these and other areas, but I believe it should be mentioned in Principle 1.4. As Principle 1.4 reads it appears that the best thing for Natural Resources is for the Agricultural lands to remain in Agriculture and that the County should do whatever it can to help ensure this - failing to recognize that native plant communities with ecological structure and function intact would indeed be more beneficial to natural resources should the ranching activities cease, or should there be an opportunity for restoration of some acres. The use of Ag lands and other open space as migration corridors is currently being deterred by some land owners, even at key times of the year, through the use of fencing, which is elsewhere, appropriately, addressed.Thank you for your continued efforts on the plan, and for your review and respect for the comments you receive from the public.-Kelly McCloskey
11/12/2009	Karahadian, Kathy Interested Public	Please get rid of the "node" concept and put the developement in town or in the village-where the JOBS are. What jobs are there in Wilson???? Everyone ends up driving on 22. The bus ridership is actually down.The community has made it CLEAR that open space and preservation of wildlife are the most important issues.Let's not forget that.Read Peter Pilapian's letter which was in the Jackson News and Guide a few weeks ago & take it to heart. It was well said. Thank you.
11/12/2009	Whitmire, Janet Interested Public	No nodes and open spaces and wildlife considerations are the most important topics
11/12/2009	Sobey, Pegi Interested Public	As you finalize your work on Theme One, thank you for the opportunity to provide a few reminders:1. Please be sure to incorporate maximum protection for wildlife into the plan by reinstating science-based language from the 1994 Plan and include an updated map of the Natural Resources Overlay into the new plan.2. Please make sure that the Wyoming Game & Fish Department comments are included in the rewritten draft of Theme One.3. Please do not abandon a possible strategy for establishing a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife protection and scenic vistas/agricultural lands preservation.4. Please make wildlife protection the primary consideration in all land use decisions.5. Please direct staff to outline a science-based monitoring program, with local agencies and partners, in order to provide language that clearly explains how such indicators will be used to draft and amend land development regulations.Thanks for all your efforts and hard work.
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Identify Hog Island (highway frontage south of South Park Bridge) as a home business area for light industrial uses by right with sensitivity to the gateway treatment

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Community Character should be defined by district as part of the Future Land Use Map
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Community Character should maintain a focus on our rural land use character in areas outside of the Town of Jackson as a key principle of the plan as discussed in the 94 plan as a ratio of open space to structure
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Community character should be based partly on bulk, scale and density of future structures should be compatible with existing neighborhoods in areas outside of the Town of Jackson
11/12/2009	Harger, Don Interested Public	We need to include the Wyoming Game and Fish suggestions in our Comprehensive Plan. Without adequate safeguards, we will lose our cherished wildlife and open spaces as have most of the other resort communities in the West. The loss of the above values in usually incremental in nature and this process will remove our area's single most important magnet for our visitors. The Chamber of Commerce membership has always rersponded overwhelmingly in favor of these cocepts in its membership surveys. The majority of our community also supports these values as you well know.
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Community character should consider allowing increased home sizes above 8,000 and 10,000 square feet as an incentive to obtaining conservation easements
11/12/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	Thank you for taking comments on the rewrite of Theme One. This process will serve to point out things that may have been missed, or things that deserve reconsideration based on subsequent votes. Thank you for engaging the public in this. Many positive changes were made in the rewritten draft of Theme One; here are a few of my suggestions for improving it further. First of all, to have completed the discussion on Theme One: Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (now “practice stewardship of wildlife, natural resources, and scenic vistas”), without a detailed and comprehensive discussion of the comments from the preeminent local wildlife agency is a pretty significant oversight. Please go back and review the Game and Fish memo from June 26, 2009. Important points from that memo to consider include: the importance of recent data and information about wildlife and habitat types in making development decisions, including an update of the NRO; the value of buffer zones; more discussion on the importance of wildlife permeability (including both daily and seasonal movements and the value of habitat that is not explicitly critical winter range); and the necessity of a buildout number and its impacts on wildlife. The memo will also be important when discussing transportation, infrastructure and the FLUP maps, so please keep it on hand. Second, the incorporation of recommendation #54 (“throughout theme one do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation in the NRO”) on page 6 of the rewritten theme only seems to go part of the way towards achieving the intent of the recommendation. Simply adding the line, “do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation in the NRO” would be sufficient. This theme needs to include language that prioritizes the establishment of conservation easements on agricultural lands and other open spaces. A permanent funding source would be a perfect addition to such a policy. Lastly, in regard to indicators, we need to acknowledge that we have a baseline already and are not starting from zero. We already have degraded water and air quality, suffering wildlife populations, loss of habitat etc. We need to do more than just monitor where we go from here but rather be proactive about management and restoration starting were we are today, not next year, or in five years. We have the data; we just need to commit to using it. And, under the strategy to update the NRO (strategy 1.2), there are provisions for under/over passes, road speed reductions and wildlife friendly fencing. These, per recommendation #54, should not be limited to the NRO, and so for clarity’s sake should be relocated to another strategy or made into their own strategy. I would also like to express some disappointment that many of the votes that would have enable the strongest protection for wildlife, open spaces and natural resources, were passed in the County and effectively stalled out by the Town. Thanks again for all of your hard work on this. And again, I appreciate many of the changes in this rewrite, including the language about human recreational impacts on public lands (policy 1.5a), habitat protection (policy 1.1a) and permeability (policy 1.1g).

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Community character protection should maintain residential home size limitations (8,000 square feet/10,000 square feet max.)
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Consider limiting home sizes in areas of critical wildlife habitat
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Direct staff to revise Theme 2 strategies and indicators to reflect the revisions to the text of the chapter with indicator goals reflecting policy not the Future Land Use Plan
11/12/2009	Blann, Jerry Interested Public	As the Planning Commissions are wrapping up consideration under Theme I, Wildlife please consider the following: While we know the people who have been represented at the various meetings favor wildlife over all other priorities this is not necessarily in the best long term interest of our community across the board. First of all wildlife is a very important component of the unique nature of our valley and community but in this case it is being used as a shill for no growth interests. There must be a balance of growth in specified locations within the plan. Wildlife is protected through our unprecedented public lands, open space and raparian habitat protection measures. Specifically, growth zones or nodes (while this is now apparently a negative term) should encourage growth within logical, supportable, transportation focused areas such as Town and Teton Village. All future growth and flexibility in our Master Plan should not be viewed through the priority lense of wildlife. Thank you for the opportunity to present my thoughts
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff should research and bring back additional light industrial areas for consideration by the Commissions and the public as part of Theme 2.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Thank you for all of the time and effort each one of you have put into the Comp Plan Review. Also thank you for considering all of the public comments during this process. Much of Theme I is good, however it is really the next chapter "Managing Growth" that is the main support for the policies in Theme I. After reviewing the re-write of Theme I, I have the following comments: • Page 2, paragraph 3. I feel that language should be added that states that wildlife should be the primary consideration in all land-use decisions. The amount of new growth regardless of where the growth occurs greatly influences our success in protecting wildlife and scenic values. The least growth solutions are a critical component of wildlife policies. • Please incorporate the Game and Fish comments into Theme I. • Please consider eliminating the box on page 4. I feel some of the statements are not absolute truths and this page is trying to justify the policies in this theme. The exact polling results should be included in the appendix and not here. • All references to "best management practices" should be amended to indicate "written policy decisions". Any member of the community should be able to look up what this means and what exact policies are required somewhere in the county files. • Policy 1.4.b. is in conflict with Strategy 1.2 last bullet. • Page 13. first paragraph: substitute "will" for should. "Should" lacks any real action or meaning here. This is very weak. • Strategy 1.1 second bullet. Please consider adding the following to the end: which will establish a current baseline for future monitoring. • Removal of vegetation via pre-scribed burns and establishing defensible space should be considered with regards to maintaining or improving wildlife habitat in Theme I. These policies have been successful in our National Parks and National Forests. • The public should be given a chance to vote on a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space in the valley. This should be one of the Strategies. • A corrective action plan needs to be added to Theme I in connection with a failure of one of the indicator goals.
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Existing "non-conforming uses" should be encouraged/allowed to be maintained and in some districts expanded to address community character and vitality.
11/12/2009	Mead, Kate Interested Public	Hi, I'm Kate Meade, and I guess I represent our family. I had a...God, I got this strange feeling that because we sit on a big piece of land, that we're being demonized here. Were it not for our family and our good stewardship, most of us in this room would not live here. The same goes for Kelly Lockhart's family down in South Park. To suggest that we somehow control the future of Teton County is hogwash. We don't. We do what we've always done—raise cows, enjoy our life here just like you do—and we're not in this to become big developers. If we were, we would have done it long before now. So, I want to suggest to you that if people want to have a workshop about the PRD, we are more than happy to attend. But since 1994, and even before that, we're saying the same things to commissions just like you, that we just want to be able to ranch. We have to do some things because the tax collectors come after us when members of our family die. It's not that we're all greedy young people wanting to divide up a family ranch. That's just not it. So, don't let people suggest to you that somehow the big job you have is limit the big landowners. Those are the least of the people you have to worry about. It would be great to have every inch of Teton County in private ownership on conservation easements. But quite frankly, I don't want to have a conservation easement on the rest of my ground. I want to be able to ranch. I don't want people telling me how I have to ranch. So, we're probably not going to do that. And maybe down the road, if our children come along and decide they don't want to ranch, well, maybe they'll use the PRD. But maybe they won't. Maybe they'll just keep ranching. So, I'm here to tell you that I'm really annoyed to come in this room and have people suggest that they're at the mercy of us, because there's no reason for anybody to treat us that way. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. I agree 100 percent with what Kristy Bruner had to say. She has some excellent points. The build-out number, which is extremely important to most of the community here, is being ignored again. We spent quite a bit of time coming up with numbers and that, and I feel that it's off the table now. It's not even being considered. And I think that the forum for a workshop for the PRD is an extremely important process that we all need to vent and to get ideas out, and I'm really disappointed that that did not pass. I think it's extremely important, and it still is, and I think it still can be done. So, I would really like to see that that vote be changed or at least somehow ?? happens. There's so many questions with the PRD, as what Greg had just pointed out, and those questions haven't been answered. I still have a lot of questions. And I know the PRD tool very well and I still have a lot of questions. So, I really hope that we can get that back on track. Thank you very much.
11/12/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you. Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. I'll be brief so you guys can get onto the rest of your agenda. What I'll just quickly say, I do agree with comments made by Kristy, Rich and a bunch of others, so I won't belabor or bore you with that, especially the comments on the PRD workshop. I do want to express concern about the vote for incentives for convenience commercial. I think one of the things we caution you is that you can encourage someone to build something, but I think, as Mr. McCarthy pointed out, you can't make it succeed. That's up to the marketplace. And I think what happens there is we end up in a case of bait and switch. It's happened I think in other things where someone comes in with something that everybody thinks is a good idea—I'm not going to pick on any particular project tonight—and then when it fails, they come back with another plan, which makes people suspicious that that may have been their initial plan all along but they went along with what they thought they could sell it by. Then one last thing I'd like to do is in terms of priorities, I do want to encourage you to maintain our rural character. It should remain a key principle in theme two. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. On the followup and discussion points for tonight on light commercial, I don't have any specific comments on light commercial, but it's a good time to ask the question, how are variances going to be treated moving forward? That's a good entry point to that question that should be answered for the public. On the second bullet point, nonresidential use outside of resorts, light industrial areas and areas formerly identified as nodes, there should be a focus on what we should strive for, conversion of nonresidential into residential out of those five potential bullet points. On the third bullet point, how can community character be addressed in theme two? I agree wholeheartedly with the first bullet. The second bullet I feel should be changed or modified slightly. And that it should state bulk, scale and density of future structure should be compatible with existing neighborhoods. And the third bullet point, residential home limitation should be maintained. I think there should be more. There's exponentially more employees and vehicle trips daily generated by larger residences because of their increased need. They aren't <<inaudible>> doing their own landscaping, etc., so there's a known cause for that. We enter into a pay-to-play society; that should figure in strongly. On the next page, which is page 3, I'll reiterate something that Kristy covered, conservation of wildlife habitat and open space, and their success should be determined by the open space conserved, not the development allowed as a tradeoff. That's treading on dangerous ground there, I think, the semantics of that wording, because there are varying values to everything we do. There's varying values to open space. Touching on something Ms. Tompkins said about SRA Shooting Star, Shooting Star Golf Course is 256 acres. That's considering padding the numbers for open space. So, there are varying degrees in values to open space. And nowhere in our daily life, or very few instances in our daily life, do we pay the same price for goods that vary in value. So, I don't think Mr. Reid said it tonight, but he had some excellent points that would or could have been discussed in a PRD forum about that very subject. Moving forward in policy 2.5.A, it states continue Town of Jackson/County coordination to address growth management and is a mutual concern. You missed a golden opportunity last week for this PRD forum. It's one of the best ideas that have come forward. It had universal support or nearly universal support. It's 5-0 the County. We all know that the County is disproportionately affected by the PRD. All the neighborhood groups, every large landowner I personally spoke with, and some that others spoke with, you know, to Mr., or I guess Chairman Pruett's comment last week that the PRD is working, I maintain that it is not working. There's...it has massive need of improvement. If the PRD is working so well, how come the noncontiguous PRD has only been used once? And that was a questionable tradeoff to the community. It's the amount per 35 that we spend so much time discussing. If it's so valuable, how come it's only been used once? We have 2300 acres of open space which has been directly generated by the PRD tool. And it's, you know, in a commensurate fashion, it has generated 184 additive units. That's only 12 acres of open space per additive unit. We could do that at 3 for 35. That's not for me to say. That's for, you know, we run a risk in this community, and we have for quite some time, that it's not one man, one vote; it's one acre, one vote. But this is the time when we need the large landowners to tell us why that this tool has been available forever and a day but yet they have not utilized it. It's been available for every possible position on the economic bell curve from hyperinflated market to the position we find ourselves in today. But yet they have not used it. Why? We need these answers from large...only the large landowners can give it to us. So that was the motivation behind having a PRD forum. And since it so disproportionately affects the County, I think it's going to happen anyway. It would be very beneficial to retake that vote, I think, at some time when everyone is here and try to allow the Town Planning Commission to have some input into this. If not, it's just going to occur at the County level and it's supposed to be a joint Plan. There's all kinds of questions we could ask and I'm going to go ahead and ask some of them now in hopes of stimulating this moving forward. Should we raise the acreage requirements from the 350? Should we raise open space percentages to 90 percent? Should we raise, believe it or not, or lower the multiplier? There's a...Brad Meade—I think I saw Mrs. Meade sitting here—Brad Meade had an excellent article in March that actually laid out some rationale behind why we should raise the multipliers in the PRD to lock some of this stuff up. Do I believe that? Not on the evidence I've seen, but it's worthy of discussion. Should we lower the multiplier and then add in different ones based on percentage of NRO, percentage of SRO, ??, whether or not the development is clustered beside adjacent development? You know, we also have to discuss things like projections moving forward for predictability, etc., because we've had a 78 percent utilization record of the PRD. In other words, 238 units could have been created, and we created 194, so a really high number which projected forward through the remaining potential is that very large number. We also have to ask ourselves very difficult questions, like assuming the County population of 20,000, how long should 19,990 of us sacrifice future predictability, long-term planning for ?? services, waiting on ten large landowners to decide to put in a conservation easement and why that hasn't occurred? This can only be done with a productive, substantive dialogue with the large landowners, because, you know, whether we want to admit it or not, they control the program here. We also need to discuss things like we have a generational time bomb. You know, this is something that's not discussed. We have a large landowner who has a very similar age demographic. Within the lifespan of this Plan or the next Plan, we're going to have a tremendous amount of development potential come online at the same time. I won't comment on any individual families because that's not my purview, but in other areas that this has occurred, it's been devastating, because the generations tend to stack and the kids tend to sell, basically, to put it in a nutshell. Should we institute quotas for the PRD? Should we make it a competitive system to address Commissioner daCosta's point last week about having the large landowners reluctant to come in and basically spell out their net worth. If it's competitive, they bring the proposal forward. We also need to discuss or think about how arbitrary three, six, nine is. We almost

Date	Name	Comment

act like we threw a dart at these things. There's no rationale economically. If you talk to our tax attorneys, they'll tell you the ultimate multiplier is somewhere around three, that nine is not needed, but I need to hear that in a large forum. And to finish up, something directly relative to tonight, maybe—indicators. We should consider entering into the indicator list conservation acreage additive units ratio. And we should also strongly consider externalized cost and fiscal impacts for additive units ratio. Thanks very much.

11/12/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public

Hello, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood. Just a few things. Just concerns and a couple of comments or recommendations. One is I like the idea of establishing a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural lands. And the other things that Kristy and Rich alluded to was that, you know, predictability, cost of growth, the burden it puts in these receiving areas to the people next door, specifically, you know, like Cottonwood Park and West Jackson. And also please correct the Staff estimate of the number of units created by the PRD. It was too low. It ignores SRA and other projects that use the PRD to justify their density. Saving Historic Jackson Hole stated Staff ignored the SRA project at Teton Village. This controversial project did not use the PRD for its 1517 acres but used the amount of development potential allowed buy the PRD on greater than 35 acres to justify 339 market units versus 331 that are outside the PRD. This was an increase of 296 units <<inaudible>> 43 units. This is almost twice the reported number of ???. This is just one example. Technically, these units were not created by the PRD mechanism, but the PRD was used for the justification. And I sent that out to my neighbors and friends in Cottonwood Park. So, people do read this stuff. And it's really important to go over it. Clarification, and this is, you know, I'm still learning this stuff. If we could have clarification that is needed on the creation of conservation easements though the PDRs [sic], can the development rights that were supposedly extinguished actually be transferred to somewhere else? So, I'm still learning, and if you guys could answer that for me, that'd be great. And I represent a group of families in Cottonwood Park and the common thread that runs through our families—retired couples and young couples just starting out—is that we matter, too. We would like to protect our future in Jackson Hole just as much as the ranching families in this Valley. The best way to do that is to sit down and discuss our needs and concerns to make this Comprehensive Plan work for everybody, not just a few families, only to give the burden to hundreds of small landowners who just happen to be next to a so-called desirable area for dense development in northern South Park. It is a misconception to believe that High School Road can handle any more dense development without seriously impacting the lives of so many working families that live off of High School Road. When the vote failed for the reduced PDR [sic] of three for 35, you are basically ensuring the further failure of High School Road and the neighborhoods around it. That means we are back to 370+ units—I think that's right—that could be built along High School Road with the nine per 35 PDR [sic]. When you combine that with the proposed Indian Trails Connector jumping onto High School Road, the die is cast to save degraded neighborhoods and unsafe roads for children walking towards schools in that area. This would make a mockery of preserving neighborhood character and the transportation ?? for West Jackson in the Comprehensive Plan. That is why it is so important to take into consideration the recommendations, corrections and concerns I made at the start of my comments. I also think you missed a great opportunity when you turned down the chance to have a workshop with the ranching families and on the PDRs [sic] to gather info and come up with possible alternative and creative solutions that would resolve their concerns. This Comprehensive Plan should be all about research, science and connecting people with solutions to the people with concerns. And we have a lot of concerns. Okay. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	Dear Commissioners and Planners, We would like to commend both the Planning Staff and the Planning Commission for their thorough and thoughtful review of the draft Comprehensive Plan thus far. Thank you for taking the time and energy to make this plan more reflective of the community's vision for the valley. Even with so thorough a review, however, it seems to us that there is room for further improvement. Specifically, we whole heartedly support the November 9th "Preliminary Comments on Theme One Rewrite" of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Two of these comments: 1- The need to incorporate specific language that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration for all land use decisions (re: recommendation 115); and 2- The need for a funding source for open space and habitat preservation (re: 105); are crucial if the plan is to reflect the true community vision for Jackson Hole. Several other comments: 3- The need for more specific science based baseline information, language, and mechanisms (re: recommendation 113); 4- The incorporation of the Game & Fish Department comments (re: 103); 5- The need for a science-based monitoring program and a clear explanation of how it would be used relative to land development regulations (re: 109); are critical if we are to have a fact- and science-based comprehensive plan which can be realistically applied, monitored and evaluated. We urge the Planning Staff and the Planning Commission to incorporate these recommendations into the revised draft of Theme 1 - Practice Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources, and Scenic Vistas. Sincerely, Bob & Kim McGregor Jackson Hole

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Yeah, Rich Bloom, and tonight I am speaking on behalf of South Park neighbors. And Ms. daCosta is right, 45 minutes is still in play because both groups <<inaudible>>. But in a given week, I ?? e-mail ??, or bump into 20, 25 neighbors from this County. In fact last night at 9 p.m. I got a call from ?? via Skype wanting some fact-checking before they submitted their comments their ?? in the Valley. So, ??, so anyway having talked to them again in the last few weeks, I guess I'm frustrated—sorry about that—but it has to do with the Staff's questions and the outlines that you've been working from. They are modified and agreed upon by Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Pruett, as I understand it, but I think you have to recognize some of us here our communication happens with a large segment of the population and the issues that we put forth are not our own but rather their representation of what you've been hearing for a year and a half. So when those do come up and are not on the outline and they get bypassed, I think there's something that could be improved in the process. I guess tonight, again, I was wondering whether I should come, as I imagine many of you have better things to do with our time. You know, I'm missing the entire season of Grey's Anatomy because I don't have TiVo. And I did want to go see Jennifer Lowe <<inaudible>>. But I think when the public does come here, they want to participate. When we're bringing things forward from a wide ?? in the community, we want to make sure it's on the topic at some point in the discussion. So, I hope you'll consider that. And with that in mind, please discuss—it's on your outline—the mix of growth in a bit more detail. You've touched on it. Job creating, commercial growth is considered hand in hand with residential and large homes versus small homes. We touched on local convenience and a few other things, but I think there more detail in the chapter that ??. The cost of growth, again, growth regardless of location or type residential or commercial should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing and constructing social systems. I think you need to go back a little bit on the total amount of growth in the end state because you had some confusing votes. And I think you're very clear what the public at large wants. And if you want, you can include some of these discussions in your community character <<inaudible>>. As far as last week, I think you missed completely Paul Hansen's request. That was a request, whether or not the electeds--?? is here tonight—they do listen to you from time to time. And they take your recommendations to heart. They did that with the environmental group. What was meant there was to try to get it out of your hands and get it to the County Commissioners, frankly. And really the only vote that matters I think are the County Planning Commission's. So, I hope you'll consider passing on or doing a joint vote that you have them start working on that. Jeff Daugherty and I had a brief conversation—you can always correct me—but I asked him what was done a few months ago when they extended the moratorium for six months, which runs out March 31st. And they directed Staff to work on two things as far as text amendments. And those text amendments had to do with the PUDAH and with growth caps, but no direction to Staff to do anything with the PRD tool. So, Staff is not working or reviewing the PRD tool as per a directive of the County Commissioners. It's very unclear if the County Commissioners intend to merely down zone rural areas. I'm unclear on that from what I've been told with the two for 35. I don't see a lot of large landowners in here, but I would be worried. So, please declare a vote tonight to recommend that the County Commissioners that they convene a workshop on the moratorium PRD tool that's going to run out March 31st, that includes all stakeholders, especially the rural landowners, the Land Trust, the conservation groups and the public. So, however you want to do that by process but I think it's critical. And again, Jeff can clarify if I got anything wrong here.
11/12/2009	Hess, Jeff and Melanie Interested Public	Dear Alex and Jeff: Everyone professes to put wildlife first. The largest impact is the inordinate number of dogs. The Town and County should put a desired cap on the number of dogs the Town and County can comfortably handle, and then discourage dog ownership beyond that number. While PAWS, the County Animal Shelter, and some of the other organizations have done a great job of instilling responsible pet ownership, they encourage people to have even more dogs such that the number continues to spiral upwards, to wildlife's detriment. Wildlife and dogs simply do not mix. There are many responsible pet owners, but the sheer number of dogs is taking its toll. Ideas to cap a number include: low income housing and certain other density housing projects should contain covenants that prohibit all dogs and outdoor cats, with the exception of seeing eye-dogs. The County Animal Shelter should cease importing dogs from Idaho Falls and Casper for adoption, if it has not already done so. Leash requirements should be mandatory within the Town limits, not just "under voice control". The Forest Service should require leashes in all of the Cache Creek drainage. Dogs should be prohibited from the Farmer's Market. The Town Ordinance against dogs in restaurants and on the outdoor decks where food is being served should be strictly enforced. There are no doubt other actions and ideas that could be implemented. Abandonment of pets should be a serious matter. This is no doubt a political hot potato, but it simply must be addressed if wildlife is to co-exist Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Just a few brief comments tonight. Thank you for all your hard work on this theme. As you know, the Alliance and public has submitted an enormous amount of written comments and presented verbally at hearings. I would imagine by now you know the issues that we see as important, so I will not reiterate all of them tonight. A lot of it is stuff we presented in hearings and are in your Staff Report here tonight. So, with that, tonight there are still a lot of broad-level issues that are missing in the discussions so far. I hope that those are addressed. A couple of other comments. One concern with the review of theme two is that much of the recent discussions has centered around issues that are not directly a part of theme two, but rather influence the future land-use plan and Appendix I, even though the future land-use plan is supposed to be off the table. It's not that these issues, such as the PRD multiplier, aren't important. The public did expect this Plan to establish a predictable end state. But many of these specifics relate to changes in the lot maps in Appendix I. And meanwhile we feel that many of the discussions directly pertaining to theme two and the overarching topics that the public has raised have been put off. And they haven't been included in the recent Staff Reports on the items of discussion, which are continuously driving the actions you vote on. One example would be a policy regarding cost of growth. You know, it was one of the original objectives for this theme, but it still hasn't been raised. It's should this theme have a policy on that? And second just a little bit on process given that we've now seen a rewritten chapter on theme one. It'd be great to clarify just generally what the public should expect with the theme-two rewrite to make sure we're all on the same page. Just a couple of questions, since you haven't discussed or revised the statement of ideal, are we to assume that the rewrite will include one? Another example is, you know, if there are incorrect, misrepresented statements in what the community has said about these themes, are we to assume they're going to be removed? It just seems odd to move to specifics on strategies and indicators if we haven't yet discussed, you know, a statement of ideal and some of the specific policies. And, you know, one last thing, we were really disappointed that the vote to hold a PRD forum failed due to a lack of support by the Town Planning Commission. This concern was particularly elevated due to one of the sentences in the Staff Report summary that says the success of the PRD should be measured in acres of conservation easements not the development allowed as a tradeoff. We agree that success should be measured by the preservation of open space, but we also feel like we need to have a realistic discussion on the costs associated with the highest multipliers of this tool, including the development allowed as a tradeoff. A PRD forum, which could have been supported by numerous members of the public, would have given us an opportunity to discuss this in an objective way, analyzing both the benefits and the costs of different multipliers. In general, the success of an action should always consider the net benefit which requires a look at cost as well. So, we would hope that you would reconsider your opposition to this forum tonight. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Varley, Jay Interested Public	My name's Jay ?? . I'm a resident of downtown Jackson. This theme number two is entitled manage growth responsibly. I'll explain the way I interpret managing responsibility here in a few minutes. And I don't think it's about numbers as much as it's about location, uses and smart development, and reduction of negative impacts through the location and uses. The assumption of the people who are talking about the absolute numbers are the most important thing, I think is that we're going to continue the kind of lifestyle that we have now out into the future. I don't think that's going to happen in this community, in this nation, and in this world. There's going to be a lot of changes in the kind of lifestyle people live going forward. I think they'll be positive. So, I think managing growth responsibly...I believe that growth has both positive and negative impacts. And I think that most of the negative impacts can be successfully mitigated. But if we just limited the number of people here by a lot, we'd give up the positive aspects of growth. So I want to talk a little bit about those. I think one of the primary negative impacts is the potential for traffic gridlock. And that especially...the most important there is in the peaks. If we can reduce the peak traffic, that will go a lot to limiting the impacts. And then there's the impact on government services, particularly infrastructure. And then there's the impact on wildlife. I think we need to do things to limit the negative impacts. And that's minus positive impacts. I think that's managing responsibly. Some of the positive aspects. If it's denser, particularly in downtown, that yields a more casual social interaction among people. An example of that...and which yields a better sense of community. An example of that is like what goes on at the ?? Street Bagel Shop in ??, and what goes on at the downtown Post Office in Cottonwood. When people are walking around Town because they live and work here, that I think strengthens the sense of community, not decreases it. You end up with more services and choice of goods. For example, more diverse restaurants, better air service, more diverse clothing and food sources, more economically sustainable cultural ??, things like a stronger center for the arts, music festival, the National Wildlife Museum. All these require critical masses of people to be successful. They don't have to be huge critical masses, but they do need a number of people. Another possible one is more choice in housing types, styles and price lots. Also better, more complete health services, a stronger ?? because there's a greater number of people that can be served. And so we can therefore offer more services cost effectively. I think you can have more competition, lower prices and many different kinds of activities. So, how do we deal with the negative impacts? Location of the development is critical. We need to have residences near sources of employment. We need them near schools. An example of near employment is obviously downtown. Near schools. I think norther South Park is an example. There's a high school and an elementary and a middle school there. And one of our peak traffic problems is people taking their kids to school. That really is a lot of our traffic in the peak times. So, both of those, the employment and the schools, impact peak traffic. Or they can be near public transit. Or near alternative means of travel, bus, bike and walk. And walk is a real big one and that involves location. Near existing water, sewer and electrical services. Near road and street map, especially in a few places where we have redundant street ??, which is basically Town. We don't have a lot of redundancy in most places. So, and then this involves development being in places like Town, Teton Village and maybe a few other places. Because that puts people close to employment, puts them close to a service that they want. West Jackson is another place. It's close to Albertson's. It's close to the post office. It's close to a lot of other things that people drive to. Anyway, I just wanted you to consider both of them and think about what managing growth responsibly really means. Thank you.
11/12/2009	Coon, Dave Interested Public	My name's Dave Kuhn, neighbor-at-large, Teton County, speaking for myself. I'll keep it real quick here. (Is that on now?) Okay, I'll keep this real quick. Thanks last week for voting to keep the meetings a little shorter. That kind of helps out everybody I think. And just as a matter of fact on that, you did cut public comment by 33 percent on the round down, and you cut your part of the meeting by 14 percent. So, you can either give us seven more minutes, or you guys drop off 40 more minutes, whatever, it doesn't really matter. And....Well, it did get cut down to 30 minutes. It's on for 45, but just to keep us longwinded people in line, there's a three-minute timer. Anyway, just commenting on this week's stuff, if we do get to the light industrial, that's probably one of the hardest mixes to fill in the community. Those are the people that do your electrical, do your plumbing, fix your lawn mower, install your stereo systems in your cars. Let's not eliminate any more of that space. It's going to be really hard to create more if there's a movement afloat to kind of start changing some of that existing space into residential units. Don't let that happen. But anyway that's an important part. On the summary statement for theme two, I guess my main concern is the way the PRD is being looked at. It is a tool to allow large landowners to do their thing with their land and preserve open spaces. Preserving open spaces and getting conservation easements are two different things. They're not the same. So, if you look at the wording in this, where are we really going with this? This says in exchange for conservation easements, that's one thing, but that's not the way it starts out; it's just preserving open space. Conservation easements was another step. If that's the step we go towards, you know, good, but make sure that is in the Regulations on that. And you can't just ignore the effects of increased density of a PRD and not weigh the costs of it, which are increased density and how do we pay for those costs and infrastructure and all that. So, just keep all that in mind when you're really looking at all that stuff. You can't just ignore overall growth and rate of growth as not considered necessary. So, that's pretty much it. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	important point and adds to misunderstanding. Perhaps a memo summarizing all errors (these things happen) certainly before this passes on to the electeds. Of course the draft sent along will have the corrections already made I assume? Also it would help if this one memo had the corrections all on one or two pages – in one location – and that be posted to the web site now. Meanwhile with the N&G's help – they can make the correction also next week in the paper. There is a big difference – Proposed NW South Park node (of course the joint PCs have now recommended dropping all nodes – keeping current zoning along with PRD option on Rural) = 8% actual zoned Suburban (92% Rural) versus reported/published 100% zoned Suburban and 210 actual potential units versus 370 reported/published potential units – all via current zoning along with the PRD option on the Rural acreage using the maximum multiplier of 9/35. Remember also the community would also be getting 85% permanent open space on all Rural acreage (92% of the identified node) if the PRD tool is used – and the 4 units per acre on the 35 acres zoned Suburban. Meanwhile 25% of any actualized units would be category 1-3 affordable per the LDRs. The devil is always in the detail.
11/12/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole wishes to express complete support for the Chair's decision not to revote or allow votes to be cast on issues covered in past meetings. It is an unfortunate fact that not all Commissioners will be able to attend all meetings. Reopening votes will slow the process tremendously as it would mean every vote could be redone at any time. We hope this ends the debate and no more time will be wasted on this discussion. Meeting time is too valuable to be spent beating a dead horse. Armond Acri Save Historic Jackson Hole
11/12/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	I would respectfully request that you allow time at an up-coming meeting to permit Save Historic Jackson Hole's consultant, Rob Bernstein, to comment on the Traffic element of the Comp Plan. This will be an extension of your consultant's work, and not criticism of it. Likewise, if you feel that you need Carlos Hernandez to be present during that presentation, I believe SHJH has offered to help defray that cost to the Town and County. Traffic is such an important element to the Comp Plan's success in keeping our Valley an attractive place to live, we hope all expert voices are allowed - and facilitated - to be heard!
11/12/2009	Mason, Tim Interested Public	Alex, though I am not a resident of Teton Village I do feel that the village lacks some of the basic amenities that other mountainside resorts offer. I feel that in the last thirteen years that I have been employed at JHMR, construction has been constant and the wildlife seems to adapt year after year. I do realize and cherish the valley we live and work in but finding the proper balance will not be easy. I feel you do need to concentrate on growth verses sprawl and Teton Village is an appropriate community to consider growth in the future. Thanks for allowing me to express my concerns. Hope to see you on the hill some time soon. Tim
11/12/2009	Woods, Becky Interested Public	I applaud your dedication, time and input developing recommendations that will make the draft Teton County Comprehensive Plan a document reflective of the community's wishes and preserving our wildlife and scenic values well into the future. A few items have yet to be included that I feel are quite important to secure these goals. First, please include in your recommendations the Wyoming Game and Fish' observation that no matter WHERE grow occurs, it greatly impacts wildlife and scenic values. Thus, the least growth or no growth beyond that is presently permitted is preferred. Second, please recommend creation of a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space to protect wildlife habitat and scenic vistas and/or agricultural preservation, also an important part of the valley's heritage. Finally, when conflicting land use arises, please specify that wildlife and scenic vista considerations take top priority. Thank you, again, for your valuable time and insight.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	, Conservation Alliance	November 12, 2009 Planning Commissions – Teton County and Town of Jackson RE: Theme One Rewrite released on Oct. 30, 2009 Submitted via email to Alex Norton Dear commissioners, On behalf of the members of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, we would like to submit the following comments regarding Theme One discussions scheduled for the November 19 hearing. As volunteers, thank you for your hard work throughout this process. We greatly appreciate that some positive steps were made as you reviewed Theme One. However, particularly given the high level of priority for wildlife protection by the community, we believe that a number of additional changes could be made to strengthen the chapter. On July 30, the Conservation Alliance submitted detailed written comments on this chapter, which were followed by broader comments verbally presented throughout the hearings on Theme One. While we still believe a number of detailed changes are warranted, we request, at a minimum and at this time in the process, that the following issues are discussed and addressed as you finalize recommendations on this very important chapter of our community's new draft plan. Below are issues and recommended actions organized via the preliminary votes taken in Theme One hearings: 1. Recommendation #113 – Add a strategy: creation of an additional Wildlife Stewardship Plan under the direction of the Environmental Commission to detail implementation of Principle 1.1 (County 2-2 Fail, Town 1-4 Fail) Action: Vote to ensure that more specific data, language and mechanisms to protect wildlife are incorporated into the plan, and that existing data and knowledge are efficiently utilized. Science-based language from the existing 1994 Plan, references to specific reports that can provide a basis for land development regulations, and recent data (including updated maps of overlays) should be incorporated into the new plan. If the new plan is not going to include this specific, but necessary, information, it should refer to a plan, process, or document where the information will be gathered and available. Background: Since the release of the new draft, the Conservation Alliance has repeatedly raised concerns regarding the removal of significant portions of the community's existing 1994 Plan that include specific language and mechanisms for protecting wildlife and wildlife habitat. While some positive steps have been taken in the new draft (such as the establishment of an Environment Commission and additional policies on wildlife permeability), far too much of the science-based language in the 1994 Plan has been removed. Some examples of language/topics that have been removed include: highly specific descriptions of the role of private lands for wildlife, statements of existing conditions and challenges (such as "wetlands have been severely impacted by development" and "current development trends pose a real threat to wildlife habitat now and in the future"), references to detailed science-based reports (such as the "Biota report") as a basis for policies and land development regulations, specific definitions and examples of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, specific descriptions of important habitat types, clearly outlined criteria for formation of the Natural Resources Overlay, clear rationale for the need to regularly update the Natural Resources Overlay, and a list of additional species of concern that are currently not included. To put it into practical terms, the new rewrite does not adequately integrate science nor does it efficiently use what our community has already spent considerable resources to produce – such as the Biota report prepared as part of the 1994 Plan or the recent Conservation Alliance-sponsored compilation of wildlife data conducted by the TSS Conservation Research Center. The idea of a supplementary "Wildlife Stewardship Plan" to compensate for the lack of detail in the new plan failed. Without this supplementary plan on the table, and to make the process more efficient and effective, staff should be directed to reincorporate and update language from the 1994 Plan. It appears that in an effort to be concise, essential components were removed that should not have been removed. Sections from the existing 1994 Plan should be built upon and in some instances clarified, such as adding new information on topics such as climate change and its potential impacts on wildlife habitat, rather than removed altogether.

Also, upon close review of the 1994 Plan chapter on Natural and Scenic Resources, it appears that there was not a lack of stated intention or vision, but rather a lack of enforcement to carry out specific actions (such as “regularly update all natural and scenic resource inventories”). To improve upon the 1994 Plan, timelines for specific actions must be identified in the new plan. The same concern with removal of important details also applies to the rewrite’s approach to scenic resources.

2. Recommendation #103 - Include all appropriate Game and Fish language into document (County 4-0 Pass, Town 2-3 Fail)

Action: Vote to ensure that the red-lined, rewritten draft of Theme One that is sent to elected officials includes an incorporation of Wyoming Game and Fish comments.

Background: In June 2009, Wyoming Game and Fish submitted five pages of comments that included sciencebased concerns with the draft plan, as well as recommendations for improving it. Unfortunately, these suggestions were not collectively reviewed. Some of the agency’s individual recommendations relate to: the need to update the Natural Resource Overlay, the need to identify a timeline for developing a list of focal species, a need to include important habitat types in the plan, a need to establish buffer zones, a need to realistically address the implications of a high buildout on wildlife health and landscape permeability, a need to add increased emphasis on the impacts of dispersed recreation, and a need to address a potential increased demand for wildlife management services. Wyoming Game and Fish provided the following statement in their comments: “The draft plan could incorporate more specific language, data and mechanisms to provide the degree of stewardship identified in the introduction of the Comprehensive Plan...”. Unfortunately, due to a failed vote by the Town Planning Commission, no attempt was made to incorporate the agency’s suggestions in the rewrite released October 30, 2009. As a result, the chapter rewrite currently lacks critical science-based language that would more accurately describe our existing conditions and the extent of action necessary to increase our chances of actually protecting wildlife.

3. Recommendation #105 - Add a policy/strategy creating a public funding source for the acquisition of conservation easements and/or open space (County 3-1 Pass, Town 2-3 Fail)

Action: Vote to add the following strategy: “Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation.”

Background: Across polling surveys done as part of the comprehensive planning process, 59.8 to 78 percent of citizens voiced support for a funding source for permanent open space conservation. Citizens expressed that they would be willing to pay more in taxes for open space over any other issue. However, unlike other issues in the plan (affordable housing and alternative transportation), a strategy to establish a funding source for conservation was not included. Continued acquisition of permanent open space is a critical wildlife protection and growth management policy, an ESSENTIAL component to uphold our top priorities. The Conservation Alliance believes that the public has a right to vote on this issue. While we are currently in troubling economic times, the plan should include policies with the long-term community vision in mind.

4. Recommendation #115 – Incorporate statement, “Recognize that any and all growth in the valley impacts both wildlife and natural resources” into Theme 1 where appropriate (County 5-0 Pass, Town 3-2 Pass)

Action: Vote to incorporate specific language that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions.

Background: We greatly appreciate that the above motion passed in preliminary votes. However, we believe that the rewrite did not go far enough to explain why “least growth” solutions are such a critical component of wildlife protection policies, and how the levels of growth, regardless of where the growth occurs, will greatly influence our success in protecting wildlife. By directing that wildlife protection be the first consideration in every decision, it is assured that all forms of impacts are considered, including direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts. Because wildlife needs can be incredibly dynamic through time, overall development in the valley must be comprehensively approached. Policy 1.1b should include strengthened language regarding the need to reduce cumulative impacts through “least growth” solutions (in addition to monitoring impacts as they occur).

5. Recommendation #109 – Look at indicators suggested by public and include in list for elected official

review (County 4-0 Pass, Town 5-0 Pass)

Action: Vote to direct staff to add language that clearly explains how indicators will be used to draft and amend land development regulations. Language should be added that explains how a science-based monitoring program will be further developed with appropriate agencies and partners. A baseline column, with quantifiable documentation of existing conditions, should be added to all indicator tables in the new plan. Background: The use of indicators to “monitor achievement” is a great, key improvement upon the 1994 Plan. However, as they are currently designed, their potential effectiveness is highly questionable. Since July, the Conservation Alliance has emphasized that this table must include an initial column that summarizes quantifiable baseline conditions. The goals should also be measurable and review periods should be realistic for the variable being measured. Variables that are critical in defining and implementing local land development regulations should be prioritized. Staff should also incorporate more language to explain how monitoring will be translated to modifying land development regulations and directing changes in policy. For instance, some of the Wyoming Game and Fish monitored populations (which are also identified as species of concern) are ALREADY below target. How does this affect future policy?

6. Recommendation #98 -1.6c: staff will rewrite to focus on goal of policy which is the last sentence (County 3-1 Pass, Town 5-0 Pass)

Action: Vote to direct staff to add language that provides greater detail on potential types of exemptions and allowances for agriculture.

Background: The title of what is now policy 1.4b “remove regulatory barriers to continued agriculture” could be broadly interpreted. The intent should be clarified given the range of possible regulations for which exemptions could be requested. Recent discussions on wildlife-friendly fencing come to mind. Conservation of agricultural lands is a community priority, but it would be helpful to have clarification beyond “remove regulatory barriers” in the new plan.

7. Recommendation #106 – 1.6a: expand to apply to all parcel sizes (County 4-0 Pass, Town 5-0 Pass) & Recommendation #54 Throughout Theme One do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resources Overlay (County 4-0 Pass, Town 7-0 pass)

Action: Vote to direct staff to add language that clearly explains why the protection of diversely sized-parcels is important. (The rewrite of what is now policy 1.4a, page 11, does not adequately capture this.) Vote to direct staff to include more language on the importance of maintaining connectivity throughout the valley as a whole. Background: While the protection of large, contiguous parcels is a top priority, policies should direct that diverse parcel sizes, including small parcels of critical importance, also be prioritized for protection. The edit in the rewrite is too concise and lacks clarity on the intent of the recommendation.

The draft lacks sufficient detail in explaining what is meant by “crucial habitat” and other lands between these “habitat” areas that wildlife use. As stated in our point 1, more specific policies should be included that clarify the need to consider habitat connectivity and seasonal variation in use of lands.

8. Other

In addition to the broad points raised above, attached are comments that we verbally presented at the Sept. 3 and Sept. 10 hearings on Theme One, which include more specific suggestions for implementation.

Again, we appreciate your work on this very difficult task. As we have stated before, our community should not lose sight of what we set out to accomplish in this planning process – an improvement of the 1994 Plan. While we fully recognize and appreciate some of the new positive steps in this process, we also note that the rewrite process has not adequately and efficiently included existing documents and data as strong components. This concern is not limited to Theme One.

Thank you for your hard work and consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole would like to acknowledge that significant improvements have been made in the revision of Theme 1 of the Comprehensive Plan. We appreciate all the hard work that has gone into the document so far. We feel there is still room for improvement and offer the following comments: -The current document acknowledges the goal of conservation easements is permanent protection of open spaces. Additional language is needed that states when conservation easements retire development rights, those rights are not meant to be transferred to other parcels at that time or in the future. This would only apply to easements that retire development rights. We cannot prevent future generations from upzoning land without easements, but we should record for future generations what the intent was when rights were retired. -Theme 1 should acknowledge that there is a maximum carrying capacity for human beings. We do not have to establish a hard number, but we should acknowledge that "least growth solutions" are our best protection to avoid displacing wildlife and degrading our environment. -Theme 1 should address the need to establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection and scenic vista preservation. -Any land use decision should use wildlife protection as its primary evaluation criteria. If there is any doubt, a "tie" must go to wildlife. -There needs to be a clear cause of action if the goals are not met for indicator species populations and WGF monitored populations. It could be as simple as stating that missing the goal 2 years in a row would require hearings to establish the cause and determine a course of action. -Wyoming Game and Fish is the recognized expert at managing wildlife in our State. Their comments should be included in Theme 1. -Policy 1.4.b should be changed from "Remove regulatory barriers to continued Agriculture..." to "Reduce regulatory barriers to continued Agriculture.." Removing all regulatory barriers for any industry is unrealistic and invites abuse. The goal should be to remove regulations that hamper Agriculture and provide little benefit to the community goals. The language should reflect that goal. -The last bullet point on Strategy 1.2 to eliminate all exemptions from wildlife friendly fences is in conflict with policy 1.4.b. The goal should be to carefully examine who should qualify for an agricultural exemption from the requirement for wildlife friendly fences and limit new installation of buck and rail fence. This style of fence is one of the most unfriendly to wildlife and is not practical for most "real" agricultural operations. Consider using this phrase "develop penalties for failure to remove fencing that fails to comply with the regulations." -Please remove the section "What the community said." Like the pictures it serves no real purpose in this section. It should be addressed in the appendix where the appropriate statistics can be included with the comments. This is more meaningful than the general statements in the text box.
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Nonresidential use outside of the Resorts, Light Industrial areas, and areas formerly identified as nodes should be addressed district by district in the Future Land Use Plan.
11/12/2009	Horn, Scott Interested Public	As you continue to work on the comprehensive plan I would like to provide the following input; while wildlife is important, it can not override every other aspect of the plan. There needs to be a balance with the economic development of our community. In particular Teton Village needs special consideration as it strives to compete with the variety of mountain resorts in the American west and the world.
11/11/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	Please know that I strongly support the JH Conservation Alliance's November 9, 2009 Key Points - Initial Recommendations. We ask that our hard working Planning Commissioners ensure that more specific data, language and mechanisms to protect wildlife are incorporated into the plan, and that existing data and knowledge are efficiently utilized. In short, reincorporate science-based language from the 1994 Plan and recent data (including a map of the Natural Resources Overlay) into the new plan.

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2009	Halloran, Gigi Interested Public	I urge to incorporate the JH Conservation Alliance's recommendations in language in the general plan. My husband, Michael, and I believe that wildlife and wildlife habitat protection should be the foremost consideration in all land use decisions. The uniqueness of Jackson Hole centers around wildlife. Without the wildlife that make their home in the Jackson Hole area, Jackson would be just another town in a very cold place. with pretty scenery. we need to remember what is special about the place we live.

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Theme 1: Practice Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources & Scenic Vistas Note: To supplement and reinforce my previous Theme 1 suggestions of 10.8.09 and 11.5.09. Incorporate Wyoming Game and Fish Comments: • Theme 1 needs to incorporate comments by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department submitted on June 26, 2009. • To not address the detailed and specific concerns from the state’s primary wildlife experts in this Theme is irresponsible. • Since Game and Fish comments were not incorporated - Theme 1 currently lacks critical science-based language that would protect wildlife. Incorporate the Concept of “Least Growth” Solutions into Theme 1: • Please strengthen language that the levels of growth, regardless of where that growth occurs, will greatly influence our success in protecting wildlife and scenic values. • You passed Recommendation #66 – “Insert in Vision chapter text a discussion of "least growth" solutions in order to meet human needs - emphasizing wildlife and natural resource protection while acknowledging private property rights.” (County 5-0 Pass, Town 4-3 Pass). You also passed Recommendation #115 – Incorporate statement, “Recognize that any and all growth in the valley impacts both wildlife and natural resources” into Theme 1 where appropriate. (County 5-0 Pass, Town 3-2 Pass). • In summary please address “least growth” solutions and its concepts in BOTH the Vision and Theme 1 chapters. Update or Rewrite – How will you Incorporate Critical Missing 1994 Comp Plan Language? • Why is this plan a rewrite versus a promised update? • We keep asking and the planners have never answered. There is specific, beneficial language from the long thought out 1994 Comprehensive Plan that still has not been included in this update rewrite. • Before finalizing this chapter, and moving on to other chapters where the same broad issue applies, an explanation should be presented as to why significant portions of the 1994 plan that include specific language for protecting wildlife, wildlife habitat and scenic vistas were not utilized in the plan update rewrite. • SO WHAT IS THE ANSWER – AND HOW WILL YOU CORRECT THIS BEFORE GOING ON TO OTHER THEMES? Connectivity Between Natural Resource Overlay Areas - Policy 1.1.c • As stated in my 10.8.09 comments: Please improve Policy 1.1.c: to add “connectivity between Natural Resource Overlay areas” so it recognizes your Recommendation #54 (“Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resource Overlay”) • Specifically suggest rewriting/adding in Policy 1.1.c: “Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay.” Open Space Funding Strategy: • As I have commented multiple times including in my 10.8.09 comments in detail. • Add the following strategy: “Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation.” Housekeeping Items: sent in my 11.5.09 Theme 2 comments also: • Vision Chapter: When will we see it and in what form?

Date	Name	Comment
		• Theme 1 and other chapter format: - o Drop the “What the community said about this theme” pages – this section is not scientific but rather staff’s interpretation of what we said - this is better served through the appendix with all applicable questions and responses from the various surveys and forums. - o Add back in critical maps and charts – such as the NRO map in Theme 1. - o Consider dropping the redline format before this passes on to the electeds – otherwise there is too much focus on draft planning staff language that was changed or deleted by the joint commissions. Keep the split vote footnotes – and color code them Town or County. In closing - thank you for all the hours you have spent on this process – it is appreciated
11/11/2009	Bloom, Kathryn Interested Public	I support the JH Conservation Alliance’s 11.9.9 Key Points – Initial Recommendations
11/11/2009	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	If wildlife preservation is truly your #1 priority, then how could you not include recommendations from the Game&Fish into the new plan? You use the term "healthy populations" throughout the "theme". Who but the Game&Fish is qualified to make judgments as to when or if a population is healthy? Without the latest scientific data on the current condition of the wildlife in the county, it would seem to me impossible to make any rational decisions about future development.
11/11/2009	Heilesen, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We wish to add our comments to the many others you've no doubt received asking that the Plan strengthen its provisions for wildlife protection. This was the highest priority identified by the citizenry in the pre-plan survey; together with our scenery, it is our greatest resource. It should be a no-brainer to beef up the protections in the Plan. In particular, Theme One should specify that planning decisions specify wildlife as the most important criteria in considering land use decisions. In addition, it should identify the need to provide some funding mechanism for the acquisition of open space -- in other words, other than density transfer -- to preserve land for wildlife habitat and migration corridors. Thank you for your attention; and for your consideration of the public's input during this planning process.
11/11/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	Dear Commissioners, I have read the updated Theme 1 of the Comprehensive Plan, and would like you to know that I consider it a BIG improvement over the previous draft. I also have observed some of your meetings, and understand that revisions were made with considerable thought and discussion. I am especially encouraged by the proposal to set up an Environment Commission. I hope that this body will focus on collecting and evaluating a range of scientific data in order to advise the community (planners, commissioners, public) about the specific impacts (known and potential) of our growth. This data-based assessment is critical for guiding, and controlling future growth. I understand that many in the conservation community feel that this draft is still not acceptable. I don't have a strong opinion about that. However, I think it would be an important act of good faith to review (once again) the 1994 document, and make sure that the more general language in the current draft isn't inadvertently stripping the power of the original plan. Thanks again for your diligence. Respectfully, Karen Jerger

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2009	Kirk, Jerry and Viesia Interested Public	We are writing this to express our support for the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's 11/9/09 Key Points in their Initial Recommendations. Wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions. Everyone should recognize that the "least growth" solutions are a critical component of wildlife protection policies. Please don't allow the area and values we love to be compromised.
11/11/2009	Payne, Charlie and Bett Interested Public	Bob Graham, with 30 years as a real estate broker in Jackson, said it best: "We can no longer afford our mistakes of the past" (paraphrasing). We agree with everything Kristy Bruner advocates in her Guest Shot in today's JHN&G. Please do not allow this opportunity to pass without incorporating these concepts into the re-write of Theme One.
11/11/2009	Richardson, Ann Interested Public	In regard to "Practice Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources and Scenic Vistas" I support the JH Conservation Alliance's 11.9.09 Key points - initial recommendations.
11/11/2009	Salter, Andy Interested Public	Thank you for all of your efforts and energy in connection with the rewriting of the Town of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. While this portion of the Comprehensive Plan has seen significant and positive improvement, I strongly urge you to also incorporate the key points and recommendations found in the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's November 9, 2009 "Key Points" memorandum. The comments you have received from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department should be incorporated as well. Wildlife protection should be a primary consideration in all land use decisions. The "least growth" solutions are critical components of wildlife protection policies. I also urge you to investigate and establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, the preservation of scenic vistas and agricultural uses. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.
11/11/2009	Shea, Nancy Interested Public	I wanted to email my comments on the plan before the deadline on Thursday. The protection of our natural resources is the keystone to the entire planning process so I support the most meaningful and clear messages in this section. In general, I support the items presented by the JH Conservation Alliance on this theme. Particularly the notion that ALL our growth plans in this valley impact wildlife and natural resource health and vitality. We cannot relegate protection to outlying areas in the county. Growth plans in Town are also dramatically impacting the long term health of the wildlands of Jackson. Thanks, Nancy
11/11/2009	Tank, Garry Interested Public	I support the JH Conservation Alliance's 11.9.09 Key Points – Initial Recommendations Include an incorporation of Wyoming Game and Fish comments. • How the levels of growth, regardless of where that growth occurs, will greatly influence our success in protecting wildlife and scenic values. That "least growth" solutions are a critical component of wildlife protection policies. • Add the following strategy: Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation. • Incorporate specific language that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Tomorrow, Nov. 12, is the deadline to submit written comments on the new comp plan's rewritten version of Theme One – now titled "Practice stewardship of wildlife, natural resources, and scenic vistas." Town and County planning commissioners plan to discuss this chapter one last time, Nov. 19, prior to forwarding it for review by elected officials. A good plan is critical to the future of this valley, so our community should make sure that we have the best possible plan moving forward, one that will help to protect a Jackson Hole that we still want to see in 20 years. If you appreciate our valley for the conservation legacy that it holds, you should be aware of the successes and failures of the recent chapter rewrite and how you can help make it better. We appreciate the hours and hours of work that the volunteer commissioners have put into this process. It is no easy task, and their efforts should be commended. Some important improvements were made during their initial review, such as the establishment of an Environment Commission, the commitment to identify more wildlife indicator species, and a reinstatement of the value of scenic vistas. However, there have been some significant failures, due partly to a lack of support from both planning commissions. Following are a few major issues that must be addressed in the next round of review in order to improve this chapter. First, the rewritten draft of Theme One that is sent to elected officials should incorporate comments submitted by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Unfortunately, despite numerous requests by the public, these specific recommendations were never individually reviewed in public hearings. Also, due to a failed vote by the Town Planning Commission, no attempt was made to incorporate the agency's suggestions in the rewrite just released. As a result, the new chapter still lacks critical science-based language that would increase our chances of actually protecting wildlife. Second, because the presence of wildlife is something that makes our community unique from all others and is a driving factor in our economy and quality of life, specific language should be incorporated that states that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions. This way, all types of impacts of development on wildlife are considered in a decision, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts. Also, the rewrite did not go far enough to explain how the amount of new growth, regardless of where the growth occurs, also greatly influences our success in protecting wildlife. Third, in the future, the public should be given the chance to vote on a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space in the valley. Continued acquisition of permanent open space is a critical wildlife protection and growth management policy, and therefore an essential component to uphold our top two priorities. While we are currently in troubling economic times, the plan should include policies with the long-term community vision in mind. Fourth, the role of indicators and monitoring needs to be better defined. While the intention to monitor achievement of different policies throughout the plan is a step in the right direction, and an improvement upon the 1994 Plan, its effectiveness is still highly questionable for a couple reasons. The new chapter still lacks a description of baseline conditions or quantifiable starting points for each of the indicators. It also lacks language to explain how monitoring will actually be used to direct changes in wildlife-related policies. For instance, moose and mule deer populations are already below agency targets. How is this observation expected to shift the way we make decisions? Currently, the new chapter provides no guidance on questions like these. Last, but not least, our community should not lose sight of what we set out to accomplish in this planning process – an improvement of the 1994 Plan. The rewritten Theme One chapter raises some fundamental questions about whether this process is efficiently building upon what our 1994 Plan already provides. Before finalizing this chapter, and moving on to other chapters where

Date	Name	Comment
		the same broad issue applies, an explanation should be presented as to why significant portions of the 1994 Plan that include specific language for protecting wildlife, wildlife habitat and scenic vistas were not utilized in the new plan. It appears that in an effort to be concise, essential components were removed that should not have been. Looking decades ahead, I think most of us want Jackson Hole to still be defined as a small, friendly mountain town amidst a rural landscape, including freely roaming wildlife, vast open spaces, scenic vistas, and unparalleled recreation opportunities. Now is the time for you to speak up for a stronger plan. Future generations will thank you.
11/11/2009	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Thank you for all the time and hard work you continue to dedicate to the creation of a better draft comprehensive plan. I especially appreciate your responsiveness to public input. I have read the JHCA Key Points 11.9.09 as well as the WGFD comments. I urge you to incorporate both of these documents into your revised draft comprehensive plan. It is clear that preservation of our ecosystem, wildlife and wild life habitat are first among community priorities and the basis of Teton County's quality of life and economic vitality. Why wouldn't we want to use scientific methods and all available data to insure that the comprehensive plan does that in an objective, analytical way? If wildlife and the environment are a priority, a sincere effort to make them so would be to start with this as a goal and plan for it (It goes without saying that this would be done respecting base property rights). It seems the original draft plan was written without first addressing the question of how much density (total buildout) is compatible with the goals of Theme 1. Measures of the cost of adding density (fiscal as well as to the environment) are absent. Planning for lots of growth in commercial and residential development might have made sense to planners and politicians, they might serve some special interests, but they clearly do not resonate with the general public and are way out of line with the community's goals. In the same vein, density bonuses to achieve goals might seem a tempting tool because the costs are not well defined, but they are a tax and the community knows it. More density means running down our natural capital. It also means digging deeper into our pockets for taxes to pay for infrastructure; roads, schools, water, law enforcement, etc. Our planners planned for as much growth as possible, putting their efforts into finding places to put it. The community, their employer, prefers they study the unique attributes of Teton County and create a plan that minimizes disruption of our ecosystem. Such a plan would be a least growth plan, a plan that does not increase the total buildout number. Quite obviously, this requires including environmental and wildlife scientists and their work in the process. While I appreciate your tremendous efforts and the improvements made (such as the recommendation to establish an environmental commission) the current draft continues to put growth first and conservation, the community's number one priority, second. Objective methods, scientific data and updates are available. Please incorporate them.
11/11/2009	Christel, Tammy Interested Public	Before I add my comments, I'd like to make an overall comment about the integrity of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance staff. In my opinion, the JHCA staff is composed of individuals driven whole heartedly by mission, and NOT by ego or personal agenda. That is why I support their efforts and will continue to do so. In truth, I can point to relatively few individuals and organizations in Teton County where I feel this is the case. The Alliance's efforts to conserve and preserve this region are at the core of progress achieved to date. I echo their recommendations to: Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation. Incorporate specific language that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions. Further work with appropriate agencies and partners to outline a science-based monitoring program and to provide language that clearly explains how indicators will be used to draft and amend land development regulations. Tammy Christel Jackson
11/11/2009	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I am in favor of the public given the chance to vote on a dedicated funding source for permanent open space in the valley. I am not in favor of nodes in Teton County. Wildlife and open space should be the foremost focus of this new comprehensive plan. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/11/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	Regarding Theme 1The staff and planning commissions are to be commended for their consideration and inclusion of many concerns regarding this theme. There still are gaps however to achieve the goal of protecting wildlife resources in the face of increasing population and development in the town and county.Still missing from consideration is the revised NRO map. To not have this as part of the draft makes it very difficult to comment on what areas might be impacted by new development--and what is actually being protected. Additional information has been available for months. Why is it not included? The 94 plan also had text to protect wildlife and habitat that is no longer part of the plan--what happened?Wyoming G&F has submitted information and comments for inclusion in the plan. To ignore this important resource is very strange==what is the problem? Why is it being ignored?Developing ongoing methods of monitoring whether plan policies are actually working is equally important. The cumulative impacts of development have been a serious concern for decades--and it keeps being ignored. We no longer have the luxury of assuming that animals/habitat loss will take care of themselves. WY G&F have expressed serious concern about this issue also. Please include language that will not only monitor and correct problems as they arise, but focus on how the LDR's will address wildlife issues on an ongoing basis. There are wildlife issues within and adjacent to the town and these can no longer be ignored.Some issues can only be resolved by outright purchase of some critical lands. Developing a long term funding source is important. One option is to provide local taxpayer funding through a vote.Again, thank you for all the time that is being put into updating the plan.
11/10/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	Theme One progress has been tremendous, and I would like to thank you all for your commitment to addressing the needs of the community in the revisions for the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. There remains some concerning points in the revision process I would like to bring to your attention. As so rightfully stated in Theme One, “Teton County’s abundant wildlife and natural and scenic resources are an international treasure. Most members of the community live in the area because of the unparalleled access to wildlife, natural resources, and recreation.” The international desire to live and/or visit Jackson Hole depends upon the continued stewardship of wildlife and natural and scenic resources.” Revision #113: Given the extreme importance we all recognize of our unique and valuable assents in Jackson, we should establish an Environmental Commission, dedicated to data collection from all local agencies, baseline study of current populations, habitats, and NRO criteria necessary to maintain the delicate balance of wildlife/human livelihoods. A Wildlife Stewardship Plan utilizing thorough and updated wildlife data would keep track of records and watch for new and existing migration patterns as predictors of stress among species. This group would work toward protection of scenic values, natural resources and proper maintenance of wildlife issues. Revision #103 & #120: Wyoming Game and Fish is an excellent resource for both Town and County. Their recent recommendations, sent in June 09 to the County Planning Office, were most appropriate. These recommendations addressed needs with specific outline on how to achieve key important wildlife issues and impacts going forward. These should be fully incorporated into Theme One to serve as an outline for considerations to future growth and planning, as well as the development of an Environmental Commission. Further stated in the Comp Plan, “Protection of wildlife and open space has consistently been identified as the highest priority of the citizens of this community.” Revision #115: We must continue to recognize that any growth negatively impacts our wildlife balance, and impacts natural resources to varying extent. Therefore, we must include the statement that all growth directly impacts wildlife and natural resources to assure that all consequences will be considered before any level of growth can occur. This strong attitude will further ensure our “needs vs. wants” criteria for upholding “least growth” policy going forward. Comp Plan statement “Scientific study of cumulative impacts is an ongoing and complex process from which the community may draw conclusions and make policy decisions, but it can not provide all of the answers. Local, state, and federal governments must work with local biologists to create, and keep current, a baseline inventory of habitat, wildlife and climate.” Revision # 109: It remains imperative that baseline data be established and easily measurable in order to monitor achievement and goals. As outlined by the Conservation Alliance, “goals should be measurable and review periods realistic” , in this way we can more accurately predict and control the outcomes we wish to achieve in reference to both wildlife preservation and natural resource allocation. Attention to collaboration among local agencies and staff members can assure that proper data is being collected, analyzed, and processed before potential land development can occur. Local agencies should be openly established between town and county staff to ensure comments and concerns are being transferred among all groups in a timely fashion.

Date	Name	Comment
11/10/2009	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I would like to ask you to please incorporate the comments from Wyoming Fish and Game in the Comp Plan, and make sure that wildlife remains the number one theme in all of your planning decisions.
11/10/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I have been assured that the red lined revised version of the comprehensive plan draft Theme 1 is status quo and I should get passed the fact that I find it hard to read, confusing and quite self serving towards the original draft. It is indeed a neon sign that the average citizen squints to understand. Wildlife and its habitat is our utmost concern in the valley. Please make sure Theme 1acknowledges wildlife and habitat in all land use developments regulations. I still have Wyoming Game and Fish comments on my computer from this summer and I am wondering if it was an oversight not to include them in the comprehensive plan or whether you chose to ignore them. The indicators in Theme 1 need to have base-line data that precedes further land development. That data should then be monitored and analyzed by agencies and individuals that have expertise in those areas. We can not hope that this responsibility will be met. It needs to be written into the plan. Moving forward, I find that dismissing the Conservation Alliance's suggestion for a public workshop on PRD tools a serious mistake. Anytime you can bring citizens together to educate each other, results are usually positive.
11/9/2009	Mahood, Ken Interested Public	I will keep this brief, Kathy Tompkins asked cottonwood residents to email you protesting adding density to the northwest corner of the Portor Estate. As a resident of cottonwood park I disagree with Kathy's opinions, the northern portion of the Porter Estate is exactly where density should go, I just ask that it is designed to respect the neighbors to the north, by adding a better pedestrian path and a possibly a linear park that both PUD's can use.

Date	Name	Comment
11/9/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	I am writing to urge you to improve the language in the draft comprehensive plan relating to wildlife before you send the draft of Theme One to the elected officials. It is disturbing to see how much of the specific language relating to wildlife and habitat protection in the current plan has been stripped out of the new draft plan. A great deal of work and thought and scientific expertise went into the current plan. In contrast, the language in the new draft plan is vague, incomplete, and weak—in short, a giant step backwards. This needs to be remedied if the plan is going to even begin to meet the community's most important goal, protection of wildlife. In the absence of information-based, specific standards for protecting wildlife habitat, it's easy to make endless incremental decisions, each of which may appear to have minor impacts on wildlife, but which cumulatively will mean the end of Jackson Hole's ability to support the numbers and diversity of wildlife we now have. Each new house, subdivision, commercial facility, road, power corridor, water diversion, and backcountry trail fragments and degrades habitat. There's no question that adding more human population to the valley will diminish wildlife populations, whether it's by blocking migration routes with fences and subdivisions, or destroying habitats of less visible but no less important species (such as amphibians) by modifying wetlands and watercourses. The most we can hope for is to use the very best information we have, combined with clear regulatory mechanisms, to try to minimize human impacts. The plan needs to guarantee that future officials will use the scientific expertise that is available, and the plan should incorporate as many science-based standards as possible to protect our remaining wildlife. Ongoing monitoring of wildlife, combined with clear direction for corrective actions if monitoring indicates unacceptable declines, are also critically important. Therefore, I urge you to incorporate language into the plan that makes it clear that protection of wildlife is the primary consideration in all land use decisions. The most fundamental component of protecting wildlife is to limit the amount of future human growth. I also ask you to incorporate the comments of the Wyoming Game and Fish Department in your rewritten draft of Theme One. The letter submitted by WGF contains many useful and specific suggestions, and these should be taken seriously. Also please reconsider the removal of so much of the wildlife standards and information contained in the current plan. Much of this is very valuable and useful and should be retained. Finally, I urge you to add a strategy to the draft to establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation, and agricultural preservation. No value, in my opinion, will be more important to future residents (wild and human) than protected open space, and we should establish a funding source and mechanism to make open space acquisition an ongoing program in Teton County. There are countless examples around the country of successful funding mechanisms for open space—in a place as special as Jackson Hole we should be able to implement such a program. Thank you for all your work, and for considering these comments.
11/9/2009	Smith, Emily Interested Public	Please include in the final improvements for Theme I to establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation. Thank you for listening to the residents. We appreciate what you are doing. Emily Smith

Date	Name	Comment
11/9/2009	, Conservation Alliance	Nov. 9, 2009 – JHCA Preliminary Comments on Theme One Rewrite (which was released on Oct. 30, 2009) Please Speak Up – Jackson Hole’s Wildlife Need Defense! Written comments on the Comprehensive Plan’s revised Theme One, “Practice Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources, and Scenic Vistas” are due Nov. 12. To help you get started on your comments, here are five broad issues we believe the town and county planning commissioners must address before the new Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan is sent to elected officials for their review. (To be incorporated in revisions to the draft Comp Plan, the town and county planning commissions must both pass the same recommendations. Here is a link to their preliminary recommendations as of Oct. 30: http://www.jhalliance.org/CompPlan/RecsToDate.10-30-09.pdf.) • Recommendation #113 – Add a strategy: creation of an additional Wildlife Stewardship Plan under the direction of the Environmental Commission to detail implementation of Principle 1.1 (County 2-2 Fail, Town 1-4 Fail) What You Can Do: Ask the planning commissioners to ensure that more specific data, language and mechanisms to protect wildlife are incorporated into the plan, and that existing data and knowledge are efficiently utilized. In short, reincorporate science-based language from the 1994 Plan and recent data (including a map of the Natural Resources Overlay) into the new plan. Background: Since the release of the new draft, the Conservation Alliance has repeatedly raised concerns regarding the removal of significant portions of the community’s existing 1994 Plan that include specific language and mechanisms for protecting wildlife and wildlife habitat. While some positive steps have been taken in the new draft (such as the establishment of an Environment Commission and additional policies on wildlife permeability), far too much of the science-based language in the 1994 Plan has been removed. Some examples of language/topics that have been removed include: highly specific descriptions of the role of private lands for wildlife, statements of existing conditions and challenges (such as “wetlands have been severely impacted by development” and “current development trends pose a real threat to wildlife habitat now and in the future”), references to detailed sciencebased reports (such as the “Biota report”) as a basis for policies and land development regulations, specific definitions and examples of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, specific descriptions of important habitat types, clearly outlined criteria for formation of the Natural Resources Overlay, clear rationale for the need to regularly update the Natural Resources Overlay, and a list of additional species of concern that are currently not listed. To put it into practical terms, the new rewrite does not adequately integrate science nor does it efficiently use what our community has already spent considerable resources to produce – such as the Biota report prepared as part of the 1994 Plan or the recent Conservation Alliance-sponsored compilation of data conducted by the TSS Conservation Research Center. The idea of a supplementary “Wildlife Stewardship Plan” to compensate for the lack of detail in the new plan failed. Without this supplementary plan on the table, and to make the process more efficient and effective, staff should be directed to reincorporate and update language from the 1994 Plan. It appears that in an effort to be concise, essential components were removed that should not have been removed. These sections from the existing 1994 Plan should be built upon and in some instances clarified, such as adding new information on topics such as climate change and its potential impacts on wildlife habitat, rather than removed altogether. Also, upon close review of the 1994 Plan chapter on Natural and Scenic Resources, it appears that there was not a lack of stated intention or vision, but rather a lack of enforcement to carry out specific actions (such as “regularly update all natural and scenic resource inventories). The same concern with removal of important details also applies to the rewrite’s approach to scenic resources. • Recommendation #103 - Include all appropriate Game and Fish language into document (County 4-0 Pass, Town 2-3 Fail) What You Can Do: Ask the planning commissioners to ensure that the red-lined, rewritten draft of Theme One that is sent to elected officials includes an incorporation of Wyoming Game and Fish comments. Background: In June 2009, Wyoming Game and Fish submitted five pages of comments that included sciencebased

concerns with the draft plan, as well as recommendations for improving it. Unfortunately, commissioners did not collectively review the agency's individual recommendations including: the need to update the Natural Resource Overlay, the need to identify a timeline for developing a list of focal species, a need to include important Nov. 9, 2009 – JHCA Preliminary Comments on Theme One Rewrite (which was released on Oct. 30, 2009) habitat types in the plan, a need to establish buffer zones, a need to realistically address the implications of a high buildout on wildlife health and landscape permeability, a need to add increased emphasis on the impacts of dispersed recreation, and a need to address a potential increased demand for wildlife management services. Wyoming Game and Fish provided the following statement in their comments: "The draft plan could incorporate more specific language, data and mechanisms to provide the degree of stewardship identified in the introduction of the Comprehensive Plan...". Unfortunately, due to a failed vote by the Town Planning Commission, no attempt was made to incorporate the agency's suggestions in the rewrite released October 30, 2009. As a result, the chapter rewrite currently lacks critical science-based language that would more accurately describe our existing conditions and the extent of action necessary to increase our chances of actually protecting wildlife.

- Recommendation #105 - Add a policy/strategy creating a public funding source for the acquisition of conservation easements and/or open space (County 3-1 Pass, Town 2-3 Fail)

What You Can Do: Ask the planning commissioners to add the following strategy: "Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation."

Background: Across polling surveys done as part of the comprehensive planning process, 59.8 to 78 percent of citizens voiced support for a funding source for permanent open space conservation. Citizens expressed they would be willing to pay more in taxes for open space over any other issue. However, unlike other issues in the plan (affordable housing and alternative transportation), a strategy to establish a funding source for conservation was not included. Continued acquisition of permanent open space is a critical wildlife protection and growth management policy, an ESSENTIAL component to uphold our top priorities. The Conservation Alliance believes that the public has a right to vote on this issue. While we are currently in troubling economic times, the plan should include policies with the long-term community vision in mind.

- Recommendation #115 – Incorporate statement, "Recognize that any and all growth in the valley impacts both wildlife and natural resources" into Theme 1 where appropriate (County 5-0 Pass, Town 3-2 Pass)

What You Can Do: Ask the planning commissioners to incorporate specific language that wildlife protection should be the primary consideration in all land use decisions.

Background: By directing that wildlife protection be the first consideration in every decision, it is assured that all forms of impacts are considered, including direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts. Because wildlife needs can be incredibly dynamic through time, overall development in the valley must be comprehensively approached. While we greatly appreciate that the above motion passed in preliminary votes, we believe that the rewrite did not go far enough to explain why "least growth" solutions are such a critical component of wildlife protection policies, and how the levels of growth, regardless of where the growth occurs, will greatly influence our success in protecting wildlife.

- Recommendation #109 – Look at indicators suggested by public and include in list for elected official review (County 4-0 Pass, Town 5-0 Pass)

What You Can Do: Ask the planning commissioners to direct staff to further work with appropriate agencies and partners to outline a science-based monitoring program and to provide language that clearly explains how indicators will be used to draft and amend land development regulations.

Background: The use of indicators to "monitor achievement" is a great, key improvement upon the 1994 Plan. However, as they are currently designed, their potential effectiveness is highly questionable. Since July, the Conservation Alliance has emphasized that this table must include an initial column that summarizes quantifiable baseline conditions. The goals should also be measurable and review periods should be realistic for the variable being measured. Variables that are critical in defining and implementing local land development regulations should be prioritized. Staff should also incorporate more language to explain how monitoring will be translated to

Date	Name	Comment
		modifying land development regulations and directing changes in policy. For instance, there are Wyoming Game and Fish monitored populations (which are also identified as species of concern) that are ALREADY below target. How does this affect future policy?
11/5/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'd like to thank the Alliance for that great idea. I support it 100 percent. We need more discourse on the PRD specifically. I have a suggestion on meeting duration. I think we should limit it to 8:30. I know that would be a hard pill to swallow, but there's a lot of research in group dynamics that shows that mental acuity and meeting efficiency is down that slippery slope at about two and a quarter hours, and it's over at three and last week was a prime example of that. We were spinning our wheels from 8:30 to 9:00. And if this in any way contributes to allowing Mrs. Chong to continue—I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth—but she could continue in every other meeting or when there's a known lack of quorum, she's an absolute asset to this process. We want her on board. And what we really don't want to do is bring somebody in cold off the street right now in the middle of this process. Additionally, January 1, we've got two County Planning Commissioners positions up. We don't know if they'll be reappointed or seek to be reappointed. It may contribute to their staying on if the meeting duration is less. We should be striving for meeting efficiency, not meeting duration. That's just a suggestion. The PRD specifically. In this County, where we value above all wildlife and open spaces, this should be the primary focus. Open space has so many values, not just to wildlife and to wildlife habitat, but there is scenic values, there's preservation of the agrarian esthetic, so to speak, and there's removal from development potential, quite frankly. We generally don't like to mention that one, but it's a part of the process. The 2002 transportation strategy included at the top of the list, believe it or not, for multimodal transportation needs, acquisition of open space. They did a study that showed that the first 1400-unit removal reduced the traffic demand average daily trips by 13,300 trips daily. That's equivalent to the Lake Creek traffic. Keep traffic demand on Highway 390, which we know is well traveled. The PRD potential, the PRD forum, or the workshop, is the best idea I've heard yet, because there's so many unanswered questions. You and we don't have enough information to make these decisions to send forth strong recommendations. I have a bit of a disagreement with something Commissioner, Mrs. Rutzick said a couple of weeks ago. (What's that?...Oh, Miss, I'm sorry, no disrespect.) Miss Rutzick said a few weeks ago and that is that she felt strongly that we don't...that you don't have a mandate or the duty to perform, to send forth certain recommendations, including multipliers. Well, I disagree. I think you not only have a right but the responsibility. We're forming our future here and the electeds are not going to kick you out of your position if you send forth strong recommendations. Six of the ten electeds are up for re-election next year. I feel strongly they won't make wholesale changes to what we do here unless it involves issues of budget or legality. They won't go line by line, mostly likely, and they won't go word for word. They'll accept a lot of the work that's done here. So, where the rubber meets the road is right here. There's a lot of outstanding questions as far as leaving the PRD multiplier at nine. As regards to school section, other communities have addressed this by grandfathering in the multiplier for the existing landowners to prevent potential for school sections or from property transfer. They've also addressed it by using quota systems for the PRD. The PRD has a very high utilization rate—77.3 percent. That's a tremendous potential right there. It bears a discussion on its own merit. We also have to address issues like according to the appendices, we have been successful at preserving over 37 percent of SRO, but yet we've been successful only in preserving about 26 percent of the NRO. This brings up something that Mr. Reid, I think, was getting at last week. This is a...having a qualitative assessment of these large parcels, these ten or so landowners that have the 350-acre parcel size or greater. And engage in a targeted acquisition based on value. And there's something that really resonated with me last week when Mr. Wilson's presentation with his spearheads, that the value of broken spearhead is less than that of the intact, the large intact parcel. That resonated strongly. And we should seek to target these areas of high biological value, scenic value, etc., etc. Thank you.
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be no expansion of the land area designated as Resort (Teton Village, Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis, Snake River Sporting Club (Astoria), Grand Targhee)
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be no expansion of allowed non-residential floor area in designated Resorts unless it is exchanged for residential floor area
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Hold a workshop on possible PRD multipliers and bases, with PC, staff and community groups

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	In designated Resorts local oriented nonresidential use should be incentivized to reduce the impact on transportation and wildlife.
11/5/2009	Hansen, Paul Conservation Alliance	Thank you. I'm Paul Hansen, Executive Director of Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance and I have a brief summation, starting with thank you again for all your work on this. Last week, a number of groups met together and we listened very carefully to large landowners. We know that they love land as we do and we also know that there needs to be a Planned Residential Development tool. We want to be sure that it's one that will properly incentivize voluntary land conservation agreements. However, we also do not want to see this tool potentially raised to build-out our community or force current residents to subsidize growth that many of us don't want. We have a recommendation. This is a recommendation of the Alliance and many of our colleagues in the community. Our recommendation is that we agree that we need a PRD tool, and in the next few months we hold a PRD-specific workshop that includes large landowners, the Alliance, the Land Trust, Saving Historic Jackson and others. We think in this way we could find common ground and come up with what the multiplier should be. We don't really know what the multiplier should be. I don't think any of us do. And I think by getting together in a fashion like this, I think we could figure it out and we could have a win-win solution to this. We certainly need to do this in an informed basis for an LDR. Rather than have a lot of the other groups come up and repeat this recommendation, I'll just ask people who agree with this to just stand up so that you can see that there are a number of others out of respect for your time and ??. Thank you. I have a couple of other things. We hope that you'll consider as part of this theme again leaving open the option of letting voters decide on public funding for land conservation. I know you're taking a look at this. Laurie Andrews mentioned it last week. A lot of people think it's critical. The strategy and indicator section needs to be discussed and I believe you're going to take this up. We need a way to measure progress against our goal, obviously. The community has expressed a strong desire to let there be no new resorts or resort expansion. We hope that will be discussed. And of course the draft, as written, theme two covers both Town and County, as it should be, and cumulative impacts of growth in any portion of our community should be accounted for. And of course we hope that the statement of ideal will be discussed and amended as part of the work on this theme. I wanted to end by speaking for myself as a relatively new observer in community planning, though as someone who has been in conservation for many years and one who has worked with business a great deal over the years. And it seems to me that I wonder if we don't have a disconnect in our discussions on this issue that kind of hampers the progress and fuels mistrust a bit, right or wrong. It seems to me the public has asked time and time again for a vision on how much growth will be enough eventually. We know this will be eventually. Planners properly plan on the lifetime of this Plan, 10 or 15 years, which is primarily answers on how we grow and where we will grow. I think a lot of the public still wants assurance that our leaders here are all for this Valley and our desire that at some point there will be a limited growth. We realize that this reassurance or reaffirmation of an end state is a community value that will have very little tangible effect over the life of the Plan. What's on the books already will ensure robust growth for many decades to come, probably for my entire lifetime. But we think that this ?? that this reassurance that we as a community share this vision that our Valley will never look like ?? or even Vale would go a long towards bringing us together a bit more and understanding that we do indeed share a strong vision for the ?? moving forward. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Yeah, Rich Bloom speaking for myself. Thanks again for allowing public comment and all your hard work, and I do think you did get some thank you's via e-mail. You probably don't get enough of that. A couple of housekeeping items. Vision chapter, when will we see it and in what form? Another one is just light industrial. I already turned in my comments, but I hope we would not focus on location, because that's totally a future land-use map discussion. You already have my concerns on that. Theme one and the other chapter format is be thinking ahead. A suggestion is a straw on what the community said about these theme pages. That section is not scientific, but rather Staff interpretation of what we've said. That's better served through the Appendix with the actual questions and responses from the various surveys and forums. I would add back in critical maps and charts, such as the NRO map, and also consider dropping the redline when this passes on to the electeds. Otherwise, there might be too much focus on trying to decipher language that has changed or been modified by this group. And I'll put those in writing formally if you want. Growth management, these are not in the ??; I just want to talk about them briefly and cover a number of them. One is I strongly feel that you need to have a principle followed by policies and strategies that talks about cost of growth. A lot of the drivers of growth has been sometimes we're chasing sales tax revenues, sometimes we're chasing visitors between Town and Jackson, sometimes there's a chase to try to solve housing issues. It's very simple as far as principle, growth regardless of location or type, residential or commercial should pay its full share of directive tax on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. I just want to talk briefly about impact fees, if you're not up to speed. Most of you are. I think you know that impact fees exaction and mitigation can only legally be assessed on the direct incremental impact on new development a business produces. It's never used to catch up on past shortages or past mistakes. So, there's...don't confuse the ask that new development pay its full share that you're asking it to pay anything more than it's ??. It covers infrastructure, roads and sewers, social systems, parks and schools, affordable housing, which will be re- visited in theme four. I think there's always a worry when you're looking at impact fees or mitigations or exactions that it'll impede development/redevelopment, and yet we're only asking for what that impact is. If you don't do that, you end up privatizing the profit on projects, and eventually having to pay the cost which you end up socializing those costs on the public at large. You eventually have to pay for those costs. It has to come one way or the other. As far as impeding development/redevelopment, I guess I'd go back to this winter. We were looking at raising the employee mitigation, the current mitigation rate for the Town of Jackson to match the County. If you remember that, it was a 15 percent rate on the seasonal month giving up to 25 percent on that arcane methodology on a seasonal month. And we found out in the process, thanks to Jay Barley, that we did our map on in 2006 when it was converted to numbers of people per square footage, they had raised the rate all the way to 25 percent three years previously. They found out we didn't have to do it. So, here the mitigation rate was raised for three years. Nobody knew it. Yet, the submittal of ?? and regular redevelopment plans were at the same pace. So, if you create a level playing field that's not too onerous and it's level across the board, everybody will still come and play and planning and development will rule projects. Of course, we're in a different economic climate now, but we're looking at out 15 years. The last is mix of growth. You already have my comments on that. I think that's a very important principle that you get back to, because we know that that mix of growth between commercial and residential, large second homes versus regular residential homes, is critical to this Plan. Thank you.
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintenance of the existing residential and/or nonresidential pattern allowed today is the desired land use pattern in the areas formerly known as nodes
11/5/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Good evening, transcriber. I'm Cindy Stone. I live in south of Town. I have a beagle and I wanted him to be here tonight, but my husband won't let him stay out that late. But if you could, rabbits, if you know about bunny rabbits, a rabbit will run in a circle. And I can put my beagle out to hunt and ?? but he will not go catch that rabbit ??. When I put my beagle out to hunt, he will track it and he will chase it and he will <<inaudible>>. And he will continue to do that until that rabbit comes back around and ??. Now, my point here is that what I'm seeing here is a lot of chasing and a lot of baiting, and that rabbit <<inaudible>>. You know, I printed out the theme one rewrite. And I showed it to some of my family and talked to some neighbors and we all agreed that this is not a good representation of the hard work that all of you are doing. It does self-?? the Planning Staff, but this is a convinced highlighted copy of this. Now, you go to...I'm sure you all have, maybe not right off the bat, but have copies of this. If you go to page 15, it talks about the indicators, and that's a really good idea. But that indicator goals are vague and there are no consequences. Now, for those of us who have raised children, we don't know about that—vague goals and no consequences ??. Such as in five years if on, number four, <<inaudible>>, which is right here, if that increases, what are we going to do? Are we just...are we going to be chasing that rabbit?
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintain existing potential outside of the areas formerly known as nodes and add PRD options

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I did submit some written comments. I'm not going to repeat them out of respect for Mr. Palmer ?? I did want to make one point. Any talk about, and I think this has been one of the speaking points in the past, to transfer or retire density does have to have a realistic estimate I think of what the actual potential was to develop as it gets retired. That's been a sticking point I think on a lot of contentious projects in the past, so I just wanted to throw that out as something that hopefully you will consider. I do also want to agree with Paul on the need to limit resorts. Hopefully, you will discuss that tonight. I think the public was pretty clear on that in the polling. And last, a real quick point, I want to agree with Greg on the suggestion to end at 8:30. My dad always said quality over quantity. You know, you guys, I appreciate you sticking on, but the productivity does go down and, you guys, I believe you need to stay in the long haul. I do appreciate what you're doing. We want to see you still here at the end of the process, that's all, so please consider that. Thank you.
11/5/2009	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	Tim O'Donoghue with the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce. Actually, I'm of the opinion that in a caffeine-free environment, 8:30 is a good end time, but I suspect that if you go a little longer with a little bit of help of caffeine, which I suspect some of you have. I understand that commercial development may be something that's going to be discussed this evening or in perhaps the next meeting. An important set of information for this discussion should be what kinds of business the community needs and wants. Based on the kinds of business the community needs and wants, we think a square footage estimate can be derived. For instance, in order for Teton Village to be assessed a sustainable Village center that can compete with other destinations, a study should be conducted to determine what kinds of business and associated square footage is needed. Obviously, building a center in Teton Village will lessen traffic on 390 and Highway 22. The outcome of such an analysis could be a recommendation for keeping the amount of commercial space allowed under the '94 Regulations, or perhaps more or perhaps less. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce is offering to be a resource for getting this information and supporting such an analysis. We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to the employee generation, the Task Force in the future effective population studies, and studies that show where commercial development the community needs and wants. So, thank you. I hope you'll think about the opportunity or the offering that we're making here to support the work that you're doing, and we really do appreciate all the time and effort you put into this, whether it's assisted by caffeine or not.
11/5/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hi, Gail Jensen, speaking for myself. Just a quick comment on the rewrite of the theme one. It's very difficult to read. I thought we were going to have different colors for the comments at the bottom, because now they're all in red. And it was my understanding that the votes for Town and County would be different colors so that you could really...it's very difficult to read and to follow it because they're all in the same color. And it would be very, very helpful if we could get them color-coded into different colors. And anyway that's the comment for tonight. ??
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Development location – larger multiplier for clustering on-site or off-site development potential in a desired area should be a basis for the PRD: -Outside crucial habitat areas (i.e. NRO, certain habitat types) -Outside scenic areas (i.e. SRO) -Adjace

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Housekeeping Items: • Vision Chapter: When will we see it and in what form? • Light Industrial: see my comments on District 12 - HWY 89 along South Park. o Specific locations should only be discussed during the FLUP map discussions. • Theme 1 and other chapter format: o Drop the “What the community said about this theme” pages – this section is not scientific but rather staff’s interpretation of what we said - this is better served through the appendix with all applicable questions and responses from the various surveys and forums. o Add back in critical maps and charts – such as the NRO map in Theme 1. o Consider dropping the redline format before this passes on to the electeds – otherwise there is too much focus on draft planning staff language that was changed or deleted by the joint commissions. Keep the split vote footnotes – and color code them Town or County. Growth Management – Theme 2: • In Theme 2 address the Principle: Cost of Growth o Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. o Need a principal, policies and strategies o Impact fees, exactions and mitigation can only legally be assessed on the direct incremental impact that a new development or business produces. It is never used to catch up on past shortages – do not confuse that you cannot legally fund past shortages via current impact fees. This covers infrastructure (roads, sewer water), social systems (parks and schools) and affordable housing – a very important point which needs to be reinforced in Theme 4. o Always a worry of impeding development or redevelopment. • In 2006 the TOJ inadvertently raised its commercial mitigation rate for affordable housing from 15 – 25% of the seasonal employee bump when it converted its methodology from ‘employees to be housed’ to ‘square foot required’. During last winter’s discussion to increase the migration rate as the County had done the previous year – Jay Varley brought the mathematical error forward – and we discovered we had raised the rate three years earlier – with no impact to the rate of building permits and applications for PMD’s. • Simply when accidentally raising the rate – which achieved an even playing field which went unnoticed but was immediately applied – there was no disincentive to continued development & redevelopment. • In Theme 2 address the Principle: Mix of Growth - that job creating commercial growth is considered hand-in-hand with residential development. o Address the mix of future growth – discuss and address the balance between job producing commercial and residential. Address the balance between resident housing verses large second homes.

Date	Name	Comment
		o Recommend reducing and/or converting some of the proposed commercial square footage into residential instead.
11/5/2009	Saunders, Allen Interested Public	Thank you for taking the time last week to visit with me about the Teton County Planning Commission's recommendation to eliminate from the Comprehensive Plan the allowance for property owners to build "guest houses". Per your suggestion I am emailing my comments on the matter to you for the record. I own a home on Plot J of the Rogers Point Subdivision at Hoback Junction. In the fall of 2007 I began the construction of a detached building I designed for enclosed shop and vehicle storage space and a roofed storage space for a motorhome. Construction was completed in 2008. The enclosed part was designed for the option in the future of converting it into a two bedroom guest house with bath, kitchen, and living area. Windows, plumbing, electrical circuits and raceways for future circuits, residential insulation standards were installed for the potential conversion at substantial additional expense over the cost of the garage/storage option. The bathroom was completed. Only a few partitions, electrical wiring, kitchen, and change out of the overhead door would be necessary for the guest house conversion. It has not been our intent to do that while we own the property, but could be a possibility. The potential would be a valuable attractant if we decided to sell, and the initial additional cost would be recovered. There are other Rogers Point properties which currently have guest houses. If there becomes, in fact, the elimination of allowable future construction of guest houses, we, and possibly other property owners, are being denied the privilege enjoyed by those with such existing facilities. Our investment would be lost. The current guest houses I am aware of are providing rental homes in a rural setting for valley workers, at affordable rents.
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	All the bases for PRD multipliers listed in the staff report should be included for consideration in the plan
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	County nonresidential development should be addressed in Theme 2
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Site area (status quo) – larger multiplier for larger sites - should be a basis for the PRD
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintain current PRD basis and multipliers
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Habitat value – larger multiplier for conservation of higher value habitat (could be determined by EA, NRO mapping, other) should be a basis for the PRD
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Scenic value – larger multiplier for conservation of more scenic land should be a basis for the PRD
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Property value equity (see attached discussion from Ben Read) – multiplier defined on a case-by-case basis for desired transfers, so that development potential in the receiving areas is equitable to the development potential of sending areas should be a b

Date	Name	Comment
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should not be a policy regarding cumulative PRD potential, development potential will be determined as a function of achieving the stated program objectives as determined above
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintain existing potential in the NC-SF(Superseded by Recommendation 171)
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintain existing potential in SR zoning(Superseded by Recommendation 171)
11/5/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Direct staff to develop two PRD tools - onsite and offsite - to incent the conservation of high priority lands (as defined by Game and Fish Memo, NRO, SRO) and direct the transfer to more appropriate areas
10/30/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole would like to submit these comments on discussion at the October 29th Joint Planning and Zoning meeting. -We think it is worth noting that the number provided by staff for the number of units created by the PRD on large parcels is misleading. It ignored the SRA project at Teton Village. This controversial project did not use the PRD for its 1517 acres, but used the amount of development potential allowed by the PRD on greater than 35 acres to justify 339 market units (vs. 331 allowed by the PRD). This was an increase of 296 units over the 1/35 allowance of 43 units. This is almost twice the reported number of 184 units. This is just one example. Technically these units were not created by the PRD mechanism, but the PRD was used as the justification for what was approved. Much of the controversy over this project centered on the value of the open space provided by the project. If you decide to continue the tiered incentive for open space, we hope careful consideration will be given to ensure that open space truly has value. We would begin that conversation by asking if golf courses are valuable open space. We agree they are open and they are space, but recent events on 3 Creek cause us to question the value of golf courses for wildlife. -We support the suggestion by Chairman Pruett that the Joint Commissions communicate with members of the public who do not attend the meetings. We acknowledge concern by Commissioners Allen and daCosta that the chairs cannot speak for individual members, but believe this issue can be addressed -We support the suggestion by Commissioner McCarthy that the final vote on all recommendations remain on the screen long enough for those in attendance to read it and take notes. -In regard to Commissioner Duncker's question if development will occur in "difficult" rural areas, we believe the experience in other communities has been "If it is legal to build, someone will try." Forty years ago no one envisioned there would be many people living on the West Bank or down Fall Creek Road. We must plan for what is allowed by law. When it will happen is out of our control. We agree with Commissioner Read's statement that we need creative tools to accomplish our goals. The current Comp Plan prefers to use incentives to accomplish our goals. It appears the Joint Planning and Zoning Commission is leaning in that same direction. We believe a creative solution would be to consider other incentives in addition to density bonus. Density bonuses are not free. The cost to the community is reduced predictability and a change in the character of the area with increased density. A creative solution would be to acknowledge all properties in Jackson Hole are not equally desirable. Allowing the same density bonus for a steep hillside and flat agricultural land makes no sense. The cost to develop the steep land is much higher so the profits are lower.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Since we're running out of time, I had a few pages to present, but I'll just submit those in written form tomorrow. But just one thing, you know, we do want to thank you for all your work and we do appreciate that we do feel a lot of progress has been made on some fundamental areas in theme two to get the Plan more representative of community vision. I'm just going to ask one thing just because there was mentioned that you would possibly finish on theme two tonight and that was quite a surprise given we still feel like there are a number of issues to be addressed. So if you can just clarify the process with Staff. Just clarify how this broad level rewrite will differ from theme one, if you could just do a clarification on that. And just moving forward in terms of clarification for the public, are you going to continue to do broad-level rewrites on each of the chapters moving forward? Or was this just something specific to theme two? Again, I'll submit the others <<inaudible>> in light of all the things we heard tonight about the importance of open space. As for strategies and indicators, on the strategies and indicators section of theme two, we would really request that you add the following strategy to establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas, preservation and agricultural preservation. As you've heard, in order to protect open space into perpetuity, our community and landowners need diverse options to secure open space. I know this funding source came before you in theme one, but we really feel it's also critical and would be the most important strategy in managing growth responsibly <<inaudible>>. Thanks.
10/29/2009	Mead, Kate Interested Public	And I'll be short. Brad has the seasonal flu and did not provide me with his script. So, I'm at a loss for words, which is rare for me. I would reiterate what all of these wonderful ranch landowners have stated tonight. Are we lucky to live in this gorgeous County that has all this beautiful open space, a lot of which of course is public land, but a lot is private land. And considering real estate values in this County, that is really a miracle in itself. There is no other place I'd want to live and no other place I intend to live. And as ?? Hansen said just the other night, days before he died, I don't want to live anywhere else but Teton County. And Martha said, that's good, because if you do, I'm staying here. [Laughter] So, you know, when you think of these ranches, you have to think of the history. We have six housing units on our ranch within a hundred yards of our home. What people did, which was practical in the old days, was to have one well, one sewer system, and put everybody right where they worked. And that was historically how it was done here. It's no mistake that the Snake River Ranch or our ranch or the Lucas Ranch that there's little clusters of houses, because that was the smart and the economical way to do things when people were dirt poor here. I think that that example is an important one to keep in mind. Now, we are a family that had a loss, a death in our family. We didn't have time to come to the County for planning, and by golly we probably wouldn't have anyway, because we knew to move quickly, we sold 35-acre ranches on the ?? and there are not many houses up there still. And it's on a hillside. Thankfully that that has worked out really marvelously and I think for us, as well as the County, because you still have the ?? Meadows open and that's really thanks to the genius of my husband, I want to tell you right now. We hope that the rest of Spring Gulch will remain open. You may not notice, but there are less people living in Spring Gulch today than lived there at the turn of the century. There was 160-acre homestead parcels. So you can imagine that good ranchland was divided up heavily into 160-acre parcels. Well, now, it is in bigger parcels. So, if you think about that and look back and think what could have happened. While I wrote 30 pages of notes for the 1994 Plan and I wasn't happy about it and I still don't think it was the greatest thing. Some people act like it's ?? or something. Well, I don't think so. But the point is is that if you allow the additional amount of density in the PRD, then you're going to get these little nodes, just like on our ranch, with all the great open space around it. Terry Cleveland, who's a friend of mine, who used to be the Commissioner of the Game & Fish, once told me that Wyoming, 49 percent of which is public land, has over 70 percent of wildlife habitat on private land. Not on public land. Ranchers, farmers take care of the land. Believe it or not, wildlife likes ??. So it's really important to maintain that. I would say that Billy Resor had very, very good arguments for why this should remain the same. And the Porter Ranch, you know, you start to feel a little bit like, because you're the last ones in the game, that you made a huge mistake for your family by not maximizing what you could have returned on your ranch earlier. But there are some of us that still love to raise cattle. These ranches, Billy's ranches, the Porter ranches, and our ranches are the oldest commercial operations still undertaken in this County. The oldest. Our family started raising cattle a hundred years ago. Some of you may think that ranching is a hobby, but you know really it has supported many families, many, many families for many, many years. It remains a commercial business. We're not zoned commercially, so we have to deal with the hand we've been dealt. But we hope that you don't once again cut down on our options. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2009	Wilson, Meredith Interested Public	Good evening, Town and County boards. My name is Meredith Wilson. Wyoming ranches and farms are disappearing at an alarming rate. Farmers and ranchers have withstood drought, economic downturns, development pressure and other man-made and natural threats to their livelihoods. Wyoming's agricultural families, however, have managed to preserve these important places that make up our state's agricultural heritage. The farms and ranches are not just history but remain vital today and highlight the importance of agriculture to Wyoming. You need to know that as you consider passing this Plan, you may be looking at the last generation of farmers and ranchers in Teton County. As this discussion continues, it is not my desire to cash out on the land that I have. My heritage is important to me. However, I have a fiduciary responsibility to my family. My mother is 72 years old and her sole income at the present consists of her retirement as a teacher's aide in the school district and Social Security. Before my father passed away, he said that he intended the land to be my mother's retirement. He also supported me in my desires to continue ranching. When one thinks of view corridors on this side of the Tetons, probably one of the most photographed views of the mountains, is the ?? with Grand Teton National Park and the Tetons in the background. It is our ranch on the west side of the Tetons that probably has that distinction. It is the view across our ranch that is seen on numerous postcards. It is the view across our ranch that the entire Alta community and most traveled Grand Targee look across as they gaze up the Tetons. It is the view across our ranch of our lands every spring and big draft horses pulling a sleigh every winter that you see in our local newspaper. I opened the National Sheep Industry Magazine recently and saw our ranch with the sheep in the foreground and the Tetons in the background as the first-prize winner in a photo contest for mountain state photographers. As I before stated, our ranch is a migratory route for big game animals. We are conducive...we live right next to...our place is right next to the National Forest. We have moose, deer, elk, coyotes, the occasionally wolf, bears, mountain lions, Sandhill cranes, gold and bald eagles, hawks, pheasants, ducks, geese and more. Haven't I heard others here say how important wildlife is. Wildlife don't respect political boundaries. How will the view corridors on the west side of the Tetons be affected by 35-acre ranchettes? I have here two spare points that I found on our ranch. If the chair and board would care to look at those. One was broken into pieces when it was run over. If you would care to look at that. And even though it has been glued back together, it is not as valuable because the divisions can be seen and mar the beauty of the whole piece. The other spare point I found is three years ago, which would be the white point. It is much more appealing to look at and it has more value to the observer because it is intact. My analogy is that land is similar in that if it is broken into pieces, it loses its value, but kept all together and it's untouched and unchanged, it's a beautiful piece of art. If my mother is to have a better retirement than she currently has, we need to have tools to help that happen without subdividing her land. If valuable view corridor and wildlife habitat areas are to be maintained, we need to have the tools available. One of the tools could be transferring my development rights to someone else's property where a greater density is appropriate. Another tool may be a noncontiguous development, who I part with my cousin, Lauren Wilson, who you met last week, and others to move development rights from one of our properties to another, thus allowing larger tracts of land to continue being ranched and farmed. Let's keep all the options available. I don't know what the number should be in the PDRs, PRDs, excuse me, but don't eliminate the tools that provide for these options in some way. We all want the same thing, I believe, all those who are here. We're not in opposition in the truest sense of things. I strongly feel that my ideas allow for both in the Plan—open space with the ability to realize value from that open space. I feel that a Plan that has more vision will have a better result for all our futures in beautiful Teton County. Walter Williams, a noted professor of economics at George Mason University, states that many today think, and I quote, that in a democracy, the majority rules. But America's founders didn't found a democracy. They founded a republic. The authors of the Federalist Papers arguing for ratification of the Constitution showed how pure democracy has led historically to tyranny. Instead, they set up a limited government with checks and balances to help ensure that the reason of the people, rather than the selfish passion of the majority, would hold sway. Unaware of the distinction between democracy and a republic, many today believe that a majority consensus establishes morality. Nothing could be further from the truth unquote. I'm asking you as a Planning Commission to do the right thing with this process of redoing the Comprehensive Plan. As Cody Lockhart stated last week, you will get what you plan for. Don't eliminate the tools that we use to take care of all the people. Let's maintain our open space for a better life. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2009	Varley, Jay Interested Public	My name's Jay ??, resident of the Town of Jackson. I was distressed to see the decision made on nodes and because, as I've said before, I don't think it's the total number of people that are here that is so important, as to where they are, to where they're located in relationship to their jobs and to the other activities that they have. And the nodes I think we're trying to address. And I also don't understand, I mean, I think north South Park, given that there's grocery stores there, that there's schools there right on High School Road, that should minimize transportation in Jackson. And I think transportation in Jackson is one of the most important things in a lot of development patterns. It's what I think people find most maddening and has the most impact in Town. I think Teton Village, also from a transportation standpoint, I think that there ought to be more, particularly workforce housing, but housing out there so that they're not ?? I just I would urge you to pay close attention to these landowners when you talk about conservation easements and the Land Trust. And, I mean, they need some financial incentives to do this, too, to do these conservation easements. And they have federal tax problems of various kinds that they need to deal with. And in some cases the conservation easements help them with that. It's a very important consideration. On that note, it sounds like the only node that's acceptable is Town. And if people end up living in Town, if they don't work in Town, they are going to take transportation ??. And I think that would be pretty troublesome to the County. I meant to mention something else on the PRD, that discussion, and that was regarding...I don't think you should ever forget how many platted lots you already have and folks are likely to be where the residential development will occur. And I don't know that the PRD is actually going to create that much new development. It does get us front and center to the conservation easements, though. Thank you.
10/29/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, speaking for himself. Yeah, I won't overly revisit my ongoing support for retaining the PRD tool. I've been doing that for over a year. I'm glad all the large landowners are here. And I also do not want us to go backwards and revisit the discussion on nodes. I think they're really separate and we've been there. I think we do know that this whole process ended up not being the forest for the tree. I think the whole process got bogged down on trying to control pattern of growth and lost sight of too many things, which is trying to control the total amount of growth and also how to preserve permanent open space. And I think by now we know that the creation of permanent open space versus temporary zoning is the end goal, and that's why I've continually been supporting this PRD tool or to be part of it and not going down the idea of up zones and down zones. And that's exactly what nodes are, they become up zones. As far as new information, a couple of things here. I want to make sure you visit before we get out of theme two, and clearly we're not going to get out of it tonight, one is a request that you have a task force or direct Staff to have a task force look at excessive population. In fact, the Gills have wrote a good article on that. That's what was promised in this Comp Plan process. It's what we did in '94, and it brings in the idea...it's not more work for that group, just bring in what the effect of all the lodging units and camp grounds and commuters into those numbers, because that gives you an idea of impacts on social systems, police, fire, sewer, water, roads. Theme two, I want to make sure you revisit that it does cover both Town and County. And there was significant language in there saying it covered both. Obviously, you're going to go into more detail in theme three, but theme two does cover Town and County. That you do, before you get out of this theme, which is solely focused on pattern of growth, that you go to cost of growth. It's not been addressed in your discussions. Growth regardless of location pays its fair share of its direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure, social systems. That you address the mix of growth, the whole reason why we are continuing to try and grow. which is chasing sometimes it's housing, sometimes it's chasing jobs, but you address that mix of growth and then you balance that commercial versus residential. Third, and next to last, please make sure you're clear to Staff that you are remanding this theme to them and that you don't then go back to it line by line until they do a rewrite based on your directives from this. And then last I'll just summarize again. Please do not go backwards. Don't go to nodes. Let's have a good PRD discussion, understand how it's really used and also how it's really used to achieve conservation that many times doesn't even end up in development units. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2009	Verdone, Jim Interested Public	My name is Jim ?? I'm here on behalf of Robert Gill and his family, but I'm also here as somebody who has been involved in the planning process at least five days a week over the last 30 years on a board similar to your board that long, which is longer than I care to think about ?? What I'd like to do now will be brief, because I know there are a lot of people here to speak, your action last week and your vote, at least on the surface, you come across as a one-size-fits-all kind of approach to the question of the PRD and how the PRD is used <<inaudible>>. Having been involved in the 1978 Plan intimately and I'd been involved in the '94 Plan, a step that was taken between the '78 Plan and the '94 Plan, as I mentioned to you last week, was we wanted to get away from the three-acre-grid subdivisions to create a stronger direction to cluster development <<inaudible>> and drop the underlying zoning of one per 35, but what we got was one per 35's. I don't think that that's necessarily been bad in all cases, but I think if we're going to advance the effort this go round to the next level, that we need to be thinking in terms of what do you want for 35's somehow and, or at least doing it in a way that we get significant amounts of open space. And to do that you've got to look to these large ranch owners. You can say that three per 35 works across the board throughout the County and it's an incentive, but it's working with the market and isn't really being accurate to say that the market that exists on the West Bank and the market that exists up in Buffalo Valley is the same as the market that exists in the South Park. So, to take a broad sweep, that's what concerns us and concerns me is that you have disincentivized the desire for large landowners to come in and conserve significant large open spaces. And landowners come in at this juncture and in future because the way the state statutes are set up is that they have few choices. They could come in through the planning process and the LDRs, or they can come through the state statute of 35-acre tracts. And they could bring those tracts in individually through the County process, or they can sell them off and then come back through the planning process. And you could get open space that way. But you're not going to get the kind of significant large chunks of open area that I think this board has been striving to achieve. And I think it would be the step to elevate this effort above and beyond the core Plan. I think you've heard testimony that the PRD process is good. I think there was a lot of effort in '94 during the PRD process. There's a lot of tiers of incentives in there, including incentives to not come in as 35-acre parcels but bring it in as larger contiguous parcels. The vote last week on the surface would imply that you're disincentivizing that by dropping that multiplier down to three per 35. I see that on your discussion points tonight that you are going to discuss tiers of multipliers ?? I would urge you to consider that as you move your discussion forward. I would also urge you to take a step back and look at the other side of the equation in terms of what you want for these rural areas to look like. I think you need to go a step beyond that to begin to look at areas by areas. When the '94 Plan was done, four of the people that sat in your positions at that time, pulled out the map and they'd go around and look at parcels, mostly <<inaudible>> because they realized each one is different. At that point in our process here we're getting down in margins smaller in terms of our planning and our choices. So, I would encourage you to do that. I made the suggestion last week to perhaps bring in people on all sides of the equation that could help, the Land Trust, Staff, large landowners. Look at that issue in more detail. I would encourage you henceforth to do that. And reconsider your votes from last week and really kind of look at and be more strategic about how you're going to approach getting results that you want to see <<inaudible>>. So thanks for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Given that the Theme One rewrite will be released tomorrow, we just want a clarification on when the public will see the rewrite of the vision/intro chapters. For example, direction was given to the staff to draft three different vision statements for the entire plan--When will the public review those again and be able to provide input? We recognize the process has changed since, but moving forward, we just wanted this clarified. Second--Could you clarify how broad level rewrites will differ from the line-by-line approach of Theme One? For example, for Theme One, staff was only going to make red-lined changes to the draft in the case that the recommendations passed both boards. In other words, the rewrite was very narrowly focused to your specific, jointly passed, recommendations on Theme One. Is the process moving forward going to primarily include broad level rewrites on the individual chapters? And if so, will the planning commissions do line-by-line review at some future date? Or was this broad approach just for Theme Two? A practical example--since you haven't yet discussed modifying the Statement of Ideal--is it expected to be generally changed by the staff, or would you need to make a specific recommendation tonight? We also ask these questions about process given the motion to discuss town issues only/primarily in Theme Three. We're not sure where the idea of separating the town discussion from "managing growth responsibly" originated (it was very strongly implied even in just the powerpoint presentation last week that omitted town numbers). Because it is quite clear, as a joint plan, and the way Theme Two is written, that it is supposed to apply equally to both jurisdictions. Also, there are some issues of relevance to town in Theme Two that are not addressed in Theme Three. So, to clarify, if you skip discussions about town until Theme Three, will you wait to do a rewrite of Theme Two until discussions on Theme Three are finished? We think that if you move forward with the proposal to skip town issues in Theme Two, there need to be assurances that town issues will be directly addressed in the rewriting of Theme Two also. Overall we believe that it is confusing to suggest separation of town from the Theme Two chapter, as all the issues of growth management cross jurisdictional boundaries. And one more thing about the rewrite process-- Given the repeated references to the Future Land Use Plan in Theme Two, will staff no initiate a rewrite of the Future Land Use Plan chapter and associated district characterizations? Or, is that going to be addressed as a separate issue later? Are you largely skipping line-by-line comments on Theme Two given the need to first drastically modify the FLUP? A clarification on next steps would be helpful. If you are going to vote on additional broad level directives for Theme Two at this time, please vote to direct the following as essential elements that still need to be in the new plan: Incorporation of an effective population study component in this chapter--See chapter 2 of the current plan for direction. ncorporation of text regarding "least growth" solutions--including a more objective sampling of public polls in the section "what the community has said about this theme" regarding preferred amounts of development; Incorporation of language that that addresses issues that planning typically addresses such as age population demographics and makeup of economic industries--that enable use to adequately plan for schools, housing needs, etc.; Incorporation of language that addresses the importance of the type of development (Setting maximum structure sizes, type of commercial, balancing growth in different sectors, etc); Reinstatement of the objectives for which the public supported "managing growth responsibly"--For example, not all of these issues have been addressed--One key example is to "fully address the costs of growth"--Not only is fiscal responsibility an issue of great concern to the public, it is typically a huge component of responsible growth management and should be specifically addressed in this chapter. n line with documented community will, please add the following strategy for Theme Two--"Establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural preservation." In order to protect open space in perpetuity, our community and landowners need diverse options to secure open space. Alongside the use of lower density PRDs, a funding source is critical. Please take a vote on this issue and establish it as the first strategy of this theme. Pointing to a fundamental point of this chapter, and the plan as a whole--A clear underlying framework for defining desired land use characteristics (not just "according to Future Land Use Plan") should be reintegrated--We strongly recommend building upon efforts of the 1994 plan. As we have stated before, the new plan must clearly provide a foundation/legal underpinning for future land development regulations. So far, it doesn't. This chapter should also define community character--first defining the type that exists, and second, what to protect or create. While it certainly could use refinement, the 1994 Plan clearly laid out guidelines for regulating character using relationships of density/structural mass to the site area/open space. We would recommend that staff be redirected to refine the framework of community character during the rewrite of Theme Two, to be consistent with an earlier position to incorporate community character into the overall vision statement of the plan.

Date**Name****Comment**

10/29/2009

Bloom, Rich
Interested Public

Effective Population: Make sure you allow the numbers task force to identify the EFFECTIVE population of current and potential housing units, commercial AND lodging units plus commuters.

- o This was our understanding of what the comprehensive plan would provide. The process needs this understanding as it is directly related to our transportation network, water, sewer and other infrastructure – along with implications on police and fire capacities among other social services.
- o I have attached the 8/27/07 Defining Issues and Concepts piece again with highlights that this information on effective build out was a promised outcome of the comp plan review. These defining issues were the agreed upon plan role and also identified key issues to be further defined as part of the process. Effective population build out has been something we all have expected as a promised outcome.
- o Direct staff to have the task force deliver an estimate of the future EFFECTIVE population.
- o My understanding is members of the task are requesting to do this – but planning staff has said that is not part of the work they have been assigned by the planning commissions. Please correct this misunderstanding.
- o Still also let the task force complete the work on the job creation effects of commercial square footage and also large second homes.
 - Then address what is not in balance rather than simply going to additive growth via considering density incentive tools whether they are tied to possible nodes or Town.
 - Light Industrial
- o Specific locations should only be discussed during the FLUP map discussions. I will be addressing the FLUP map for District 12 (South Park) – later and its intended increase for light industrial that is in direct conflict with our current comprehensive plan.
- o Current Comp Plan language – chapter 4 - Natural and Scenic Resources Visual Enhancement Areas

Some areas along and adjacent to major roadways could have been designated as scenic vistas or scenic corridors, had they not already been developed with visually intrusive or distracting structures. These areas have instead been designated as visual enhancement areas.

The most obvious such area is along Highway 89 in South Park. In this area, haphazard development of heavy industrial and commercial structures has blocked vistas to the west, and has diminished the scenic qualities of one of the gateways into Jackson Hole. be permitted to be built forward of the front setback line of existing structures. Extensive landscaping should also be required, to screen parking areas and to soften structural mass.

Comprehensive Plan
Chapter 4 – Natural & Scenic Resources Page 4 – 12&13
Third Printing, October, 2002
Growth Management – Theme 2

- Theme 2 currently covers both Town and County – although you can go to

Date

Name

Comment

more detail in Theme 3 on Town – please remand Theme 2 to staff with the understanding it still covers the County as a whole (including Town).

- In Theme 2 address the Cost of Growth – this has not yet been addressed.
 - o Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems.

- In Theme 2 address the Mix of Growth - that job creating commercial growth is considered hand-in-hand with residential development.

- o Address the mix of future growth – discuss and address the balance between job producing commercial and residential. Address the balance between resident housing verses large second homes.

- o Recommend reducing and/or converting some of the proposed commercial square footage into residential instead.

- Please REMAND Theme 2 to staff – and ask for a draft back BEOFRE going through line-by-line.

- Finally - during the non-contiguous PRD discussion tonight – please do not revisit the nodes. Let's not go backwards.

- o The non-contiguous PRD is not tied to nodes and is more of an organic flexible process between various large landowners to achieve permanent open space protection.

Date	Name	Comment
10/29/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commissions, my name is Bill Resor and I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my family, which owns the Snake River Ranch. I also was a Planning Commission member for a number of years leading up to the adoption of the '94 Plan. I gave a letter for your...I submitted a letter for you on September 3rd, which I was out of Town for, and I think Brad Meade read parts of that letter. So, I'm not going to reread that whole thing, but I wanted to just to read one part of it and then make a few other comments. The basic thrust of what I want to talk about tonight is how do you get real open space created that's permanent, that protects wildlife values underlying and protects community character? Because, as Jim ?? just pointed out, you can't just do it with regulations. The state has not given the County the right to just zone down certain, you know, one per 35, it can't be done by just under state law, and that really isn't what we're talking...real open space, that's not what we're talking about. It's critically important to encourage landowners to work with the Land Trust so that the public and wildlife get real permanent protection of open land that we want. Development gets the attention. Conservation easements are hardly noticed because nothing happens. Indeed, that's the point of conservation easements. I think it would be good to look back...have your Staff do this for you, and I think they've done a lot of work already, from '94 till now how much land that was in a rural zone in '94 has been changed? Has gone from rural zone to something that's been decided? It's either gone to conservation easements, or it's gone to rezoning to something else, or it's been developed under the rural zone. From my review of that, it's amazing how much of it has gone to conservation easements. There's been very little development within the rural zone without just plain up zones. The development has not come from the PRD being used in the rural zone. It's come from rezoning to something else. Most of what's changed in the rural zone has actually been really good from '94 till now. Teton County has been incredibly successful in preserving its private lands. I hope the Planning Commissions retain the key regulations that encourage land protection. We cannot zone our community into real open space. The real open space happens when we maintain fair Regulations and let the Land Trust work with landowners. And you can ask me, you know, what I see is great for me. I'm one, you know, I represent one group of landowners and a large extended family. And you should ask others. And we will give you different answers. If you want to protect more open space, you want to come up with regulations that encourage as many landowners as possible to work through the County, through the Land Trust, to plan big pieces. The difficulty is it's so much simpler to chop things up into 35- and 40-acre pieces. This even happened under the old '76 Plan. There were people who—I won't name names—but, you know, people who said, well, I want to sell land. And I said, why are you doing it in 40-acre pieces? I don't want to go to the courthouse. You know, you could just send your attorney down there, file a 40-acre, you know, map 40-acre pieces and sell them. That doesn't get you very good development—sometimes it does, if it's done thoughtfully—and it doesn't get you good open space. So, if you want people to go through the process, your difficult job is how do you make the process welcome it? How do you make landowners want to use the PRD options? So, basically, the more flexibility there, the more incentives, the more real wildlife protection you'll get permanently and the more thoughtful development you'll get. I know on the other side you've got the peaking interest of having...of people wanting assurance that something totally out of character is not going to happen there anyway. And that's very understandable. If you go back to the '94 Plan, one of the things we failed to do was we did not designate a town-expansion area like there had been in '76. In '76, the Plan said what is now Cottonwood was the Town-expansion area. So, between '76 and '94, when developments came in, if somebody wanted to do up zoning, they would have to get a change in the Plan and then get the project approved. They tried to do that with Kelly. The County approved an up zoning in Kelly with commercial and other stuff. Well, the Jackson Hole Alliance sued, because even though it was allowed by the regulations, it violated the Plan. Because the Plan had certain expansion areas, primarily what became Cottonwood Park, and the County lost the lawsuit. So that development never happened. On the other hand, after '94 when you had no nodes, no Town expansion, everything is through gain. You've got a suburban up zoning on Log Island, you've got affordable housing PRDs on the Village Road. And I'm not saying...in some of these projects there's good aspects to them, but the decisions were made on a spot basis. So, when...I know you for now tossed out all the nodes and fine, you know, this process takes a number of iterations. If you throw out the nodes, what you're really saying is development up zonings can go anywhere in the County. Seherr Thoss came through twice since '94. The first time it was proposed by the County Planning Director for a thousand units, and that failed basically because of financial reasons. Then it was proposed by a private developer for about five hundred units, and that failed for lack of approval. But the problem there was that you were making the decision on Seherr-Thoss, not by looking at the whole County, but by just looking at Seherr-Thoss, and if a couple of votes had gone the other way, you would have had a development there. That does not give the people in that neighborhood security. If you come up with nodes and say, here's where development will go—and I know that's very hard to do, it's hard to draw the line on the map. We failed to do it in '94—you know, we didn't have the guts or whatever—but if you do that, you're saying that everything else is not in the node. So, in those zones, in those areas of the rural zone, an up zoning cannot be done without a much more difficult process. And so those people are safer. And those areas would be developed only using bonuses that are allowed within the rural zone. And getting to that, a couple of people asked me, you know, what are the right level of bonuses? That's an impossible question really to answer. The more bonuses you offer, the more open space you will get. I think, from my personal perspective, for actual development in most areas of the rural zone that are not near sewer lines or, you know, close to nature, infrastructure or other major development, in general 3X has worked pretty well. I'm just going by what's happened from '94 till now. It's created, I think, over 2000 acres of open space and created

Date

Name

Comment

about 80 new units. That's a pretty good deal. So, I think the 3X is very useful; it's working; and sort of my attitude on that, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. You know, leave that for everywhere in the rural zone. If you are taking density to the rural zone and moving it closer to infrastructure around the high school or maybe there are certain areas in South Park that are served by the sewer line. Higher bonuses will get you better results. It'll get you more open space. It'll get you the development where you want it, not scattered out. So, I think you should be looking at these tools for what they can do for you. And at this point, you're only dealing with the Plan, you're not dealing with the Regulations. So, whether it's three or nine or fifteen, or whatever, you don't even need to worry about it now. But conceptually, I think it's very important to say, yes, we want to use bonuses within the rural zone, some kind of bonus, to get better planning and permanent open space. And, yes, we want to have bigger bonuses, bigger density allowed. If you take that density and move it and stick it where there's a sewer line or, you know, not just a sewer line but an area that's pre-approved, whether it's near the high school or the center of Teton Village or maybe there's some areas inside Wilson, you know, that's your decision. But if there's an area where this is a good place to get development, why not allow density to be moved in, because your other options are just simply up zoning it, and just, you know, you're putting in new money for that spot. Or, you know, dealing with it on sort of an ad hoc basis when it comes along. I think if you leave those significant density bonuses for moving density into an appropriate area, you'll get landowners that will do that. The funny thing here is that the people that still own large tracts of open space here, you know, frankly own because they like it. And if you give them options to do permanent things that leave open space here and development there, they'll try to do that. If the people who really didn't, you know, who frankly are probably smarter or more flexible or more reasonable have sold land and sold it very profitably. And the simplest way to do that is into 40-acre pieces. The people who ?? that own land today, large pieces, are looking for ways to keep a lot of it open, for each individual, each family, for different reasons. But leave those options there. If they get used, it's to everybody's benefit. So, anyway, the gist of what I'm really saying is, you know, there's a lot of land still undecided in the County that could go to development, one house per 35, which really does not do anything for ranching and doesn't do...it actually doesn't hurt wildlife that much mostly. But it's a lot for distance and for ranching, it's better if it's in bigger pieces, and for wildlife, it's better if those lands have conservation easements, because then all the little things that matter to wildlife, like fences, dog control, stuff like that, are monitored and are much more involved there. So, whatever you can do to encourage more permanent protection through open space, more clustering, I think is really to the County's benefit in the long run. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/28/2009	Schwartz, William P. Interested Public	On behalf of Robert Gill and his family I am writing to express concern over the votes taken at last week's joint planning commission. . While I was out of town and unable to attend the meeting, it is my understanding from press accounts and others who attended the meeting that the joint commissions voted to limit future density outside the legal boundaries of the Town of Jackson and Teton Village to 1 density unit per 35 acres, with the exception that 3 density units per 35 acres could be authorized as part of a contiguous Planned Residential Development ("PRD"). If my understanding of the votes is correct, the effect of them would be to divest the Gill family and other ranching families of the bulk of the development rights they hold under existing regulations. As a drastic down zoning, the votes are very unfair to the very people who have stewarded the land and livestock so enjoyed by this community for generations. Beyond that, as explained below, the votes are directly antithetical to the long-established community goal of discouraging sprawling 35-acre "ranchero" developments for wealthy parttime residents. It should be remembered that a great deal of time, thought, and expense went into developing the 1994 Comprehensive Plan & LDRs. Just as you might appropriately think that future generations involved in planning efforts will respect and give due deference to the efforts you are currently making, I would hope you agree that fundamental goals and concepts established by prior planning professionals and elected officials after a lengthy public process only 15 years ago should not be summarily disregarded by the current planning regime. Yet, by its votes of last week apparently eviscerating critical development options outside the Town and Teton Village, the joint commissions appear to have done just that. The authors of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan (the "94 Plan") went to great lengths to explain the special nature of Teton County and to identify specific community values they believed the public wished to preserve. Of paramount importance was the preservation of "rural character." They wrote: "A fundamental objective of this Comprehensive Plan is to preserve rural character and enhance it where possible; to allow development, but to make sure that new development is consistent with rural character. Primarily, rural character is defined by large amounts of open space in relationship to the floor area and volume of structures. Therefore, reserving rural character requires that very large amounts of open space be set aside as development occurs." Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, May 9, 1994, at p. 3-2 (emphasis added). The authors of the 94 Plan noted that, of all open space, ranch lands provide "the most powerful statement for the image and character of the County." 1994 Plan, at p. 3-3. Yet, they observed, because of many factors ranching had become "at best a marginal business venture in Teton County" and ranchers faced many pressures, including estate taxes, to sell at least some of their land for development. Under county regulations existing at the time, the drafters noted that ranchers were authorized to create "rural subdivisions" with lots ranging in size from 3 to 20 acres. Beyond that, state subdivision statutes empowered them to avoid county regulatory authority through the sale of 35-acre parcels. According to the drafters of the 94 Plan, if ranchers continued to break up their ranches into 3 to 20 acre lots as "rural subdivisions", or if they sold them off in grids of 35-acre parcels as permitted under Wyoming Statutes, the County's rural character would be destroyed through sprawling estate-type developments affordable only to wealthy part-time residents. Id. at p. 3-3. To discourage such undesirable development, the authors of the 94 Plan concluded that "it is necessary to create flexible regulations which insure that clustered developments which support preservation of open space, rural character, and the agricultural base, are as successful in the market place as conventional subdivisions have been." Id. at pp. 3-3, 3-4 (emphasis added.) The promotion of "clustered development" is the key implementation strategy identified in the 94 Plan to preserving open space and rural community character. According to the 94 Plan, the "technique of clustering is based on "linking" open space to development, meaning that open space is dedicated in perpetuity when the clustered development is approved." Id. at p. 3-9. Notably, according to the 94 Plan, the promotion of clustered development would not only preserve open space (and discourage 35-acre grid development), but it would also help ranching to remain viable. With clustered development, the 94 Plan observes: "A rancher only need sell off a relatively small percentage of his land holdings in order to receive an economic return on the development potential of the whole property. Agriculture is established in the regulations as an accepted use of open space which means ranching can continue on the remaining land. This also makes it easier for the 2 rancher to pass the ranch on to his heirs, as the real estate development value will be gone, sold off with the cluster development land. For estate purposes, the remaining ranch land will be taxed on the basis of its agricultural use rather than at its "highest and best" potential!." Id. at pp. 3-9, 3-10. The Land Development Regulations associated with the 94 Plan created specific tools to promote clustered residential projects in lieu of undesirable 35 acre-grid developments. The principal tool established for this purpose is the Planned Residential Development ("PRD"), which is defined under the 94

Date	Name	Comment
		LDRs as a specific "development type" separate and distinct from other development types, such as "Planned Unit Developments", "Conventional Single Family Subdivisions", and "Working Ranch Subdivisions." See Teton County Land Development Regulations, May 9, 1994, at Section 2220 A. Section 2230 and Table 2200 of the 94 LDRs identify the uses allowed in various zoning districts, and designate those uses which are "permitted as a matter of right", those uses which are permitted subject to the issuance of special or conditional permits, and those uses which are not permitted under any circumstance. The Gill family's ranches are located primarily in lands zoned as "rural" with some land near high-school road zoned "suburban". Notably, the PRD development type is identified in both the rural zone and the suburban zone as a "use permitted by right." See 1994 LDRs at Table 2200 (emphasis added). Table 2400 of the 1994 LDRs goes on to specify the number of density units available as a matter of right in the rural and suburban zones utilizing the PRD development type. By way of example, for properties with a minimum base site area of 360 acres in the rural zone, Table 2400 provides that 9 density units per 35 acres are permitted as a matter of right, so long as 85% of the land is protected as open space satisfying the performance standards set out in Division 4300 of the 94 LDRs. Given the nature and location of the Gill family's ranches, no one could reasonably argue that preserving 85% of them as open space would not meet-and indeed far exceed-the "public benefit" performance standards set out in Division 4300. Much public comment has included the assertion that the density units associated with PRDs are a "bonus" to be awarded on a "discretionary" basis by the County and that therefore PRD density units are somehow not part of the "base density" associated with all rural lands. That commentary, which posits that current regulations allow only 1 base density unit per 35 acres, is misinformed and misleading. As noted above, the 1994 Plan and LDRs clearly provide that 9 PRD density units per 35 acres are available as a matter of right to landowners, like the Gills, who own sufficient land in the rural and suburban zones that can satisfy the open space performance standards of Division 4300. 1 If the language of Section 2230 and Table 2200 of the Those PRD density units were what ranch owners like the Gills received in lieu of the "rural subdivision" rights they held before the 94 Plan. Perhaps not surprising, the exchange of PRD density units for preexisting rural subdivision rights was not an equal trade and, in fact, resulted in the net loss of significant development rights to the Gills and other ranch owners. Thus, current efforts to reduce the number of PRD units available under the 94 Plan represent a further down zoning of ranch lands that were already down zoned in 1994. 3 I 94 LDRs are to have any meaning, then PRD density units "pennitted by right" should properly be considered as "base density" and not some sort of potentially illusory "discretionary bonus" less worthy of legal recognition or protection. With the above in mind, it should be apparent why Robert Gill and his family are very troubled by last week's votes, as we understand them. By voting to reduce the maximum number of density units available through the PRD development option to 3 per 35 acres (as opposed to the 9 per 35 acres currently available to the Gill family), the planning commissions have effectively voted to eliminate 2/3rds of the density units currently available by right to the Gill family on their rurally zoned lands. Who among us would not be terribly upset by a public vote in favor of taking away 2/3rds of their development rights? But last weeks votes are even worse than that for the Gills. By apparently voting that lands outside of the Town and Teton Village should be unifonnly treated as rural lands with only I base density unit per 35 acres, the planning commissions have seemingly voted to eliminate the suburban zoning previously approved by the County in the North West corner of the Gill family's upper ranch. Under current regulations, that suburban-zoned-land (consisting of approximately 26 acres) is permitted by right for approximately 105 density units utilizing the PRD option. That would be a particularly devastating loss for the Gill Family, who as part of the process of dividing the Porter Trust with the Lockhart Family, received the 26 acres of suburban zoned lands in part to equalize the disproportionate value stemming from Mrs. Lockhart's receipt of a greater number of total acres of the upper and lower ranches. The planning commissions' votes must thus be seen for what they are-a vote to dramatically down zone the property of those few remaining large land owners in the County who have not heretofore chosen to develop their property for real estate sales. Putting aside the legality of such a down zone, it is a bitter pill to swallow for the people who have forged the "rural" character that the community now clings to preserve. Bruce Porter and his descendants have for over 70 years continuously operated the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch. They have tended to their cows and hay, while in every direction around them other ranchers threw in the towel and sold off property for residential real estate. They have helped the community in many ways over the years, providing the school district a large piece of land in the middle of their ranch at a heavy discount and donating land for the installation of a sewer line that now serves persons throughout the County, including the West Banle They have participated in hundreds of hours of community meetings going back to the early 1980s in the spirit of crafting long-term plans for their ranches that would provide them a fair return for their property while at the same time creating important community benefits, such as land for public facilities, land for affordable housing, park land for public use and enjoyment, and the protection of open space for scenic vistas and wildlife movement. While they are not asking for any reward for their past efforts, they have been expecting careful consideration of the very unique attributes of their property as well as honest recognition of their

Date	Name	Comment
		property rights and interests in the planning process. Now it appears, in service to perceived public sentiment that treasures "reduced density" over any other value, the planning commissions have seemingly voted to draw a line in the sand at High School Road beyond which neither urban nor suburban density shall occur. Those votes, whether intended or not, have sent a clear message to the Gill Family that its ranches will not be 4 needed to accommodate the exigencies of future growth---even though the ranches have been identified for decades by countless prior planners and elected officials as the single best area in Teton County to accorrunodate future town-like densities and associated public facilities. Not only does this represent extreme short sightedness to the future needs of the community (which surely can be known by no person, no matter how well informed), but it results in a final bitter irony. That is, by voting in favor of measures that would strip the Gill Family's land of all its suburban-zone density and 2/3rds of its PRD density, the planning commissions have signaled their desire to remove most all "clustering" opportunities available to the Gill Family and, thereby, most all of the incentives created under the 1994 Plan to preserve large portions of open space. Lacking strong incentives to cluster development through the PRD process or otherwise, the cheapest, easiest, and likely most profitable way for the Gill Family to address its long-term financial needs would be to sell off those "35-acre rancheros" in the second-home market under the authority of Wyoming subdivision statutes. Perhaps that is a result desired by some, but to most-including the drafters of the 94 Plan-it would be both a pity and a planning failure. In closing, I hope that you will reconsider the votes taken last week and that you will abandon any notion that Town-like densities should never be permitted beyond High School Road. Beyond the impact on the Gill Family, that is a policy decision far too blind to the goals and objectives of the 94 Plan and far too constraining on future generations to be a proper part of the task before you.
10/26/2009	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I want to express to all of you how thankful I am for the direction you took last Thursday evening, October 22, 2009. I have been so worried over the last several months, that our valley was headed down an irreparable path of growth and, in many instances, destruction. Now I feel as though this sensitive issue has really been embraced by all of you, and that Jackson Hole will remain the incredibly special place that it is today. The significance of that meeting is on a par with the first adoption of a plan. It's an enormous statement of values! Thank you for listening and for all of the unselfish time you're contributing!!
10/25/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I always miss the good stuff. Thank you for realizing the future of the valley. It does my heart good.

Date	Name	Comment
10/24/2009	Hansen, Paul Conservation Alliance	A narrow focus on development pattern as the only important element of "managing growth" is, as we have stated throughout this process, a flawed approach. This theme must more adequately address not only the location of development, but also the overall amount, rate and types of development. Changing the Meaning of "Managing Growth Responsibly" since public polling (see handout presented today and included in our July 30th written comments.) Please address why some of the four original key objectives of the "manage growth responsibly" theme were largely changed/ignored in the current iteration of the Theme. (Obvious important ones are "defining the end state" and "fully addressing the cost of growth" that are now completely absent in this theme.) It is questionable to substantially change the basis of a particular theme that people voted for as a priority and still identify the second priority in the overall plan and the first priority in a majority of districts. Language will need to be rewritten so that this document does not imply that the Future Land Use Plan and accordant maps will guide the formation of the policies. Unfortunately, the policies as written, instead of describing values/types of character that are preferred and that would then be depicted in the FLUP maps, primarily includes language that "development should be consistent with the FLUP." While we support concentrated development patterns as a general principle, this plan misapplies the concept by essentially proposing sprawling "nodes" throughout the county. The idea of planning for both county "nodes" and town intensification would be defined by many as sprawl. It is critical that the nodal concept be rooted in the unique contexts of the county (wildlife issues, transportation capacity, etc) as well as in the acknowledgement of existing development patterns and the establishment of clear node boundaries. This plan's language is inconsistent and unclear regarding growth in "nodes." Specifically, in some instances, it is suggested that growth in "nodes" is intended to be substitutive growth (i.e. not adding, but shifting growth). Other sections of the plan, including the FLUP itself and Appendix I, clearly demonstrate additive growth. This plan rests on a fundamental assumption in many areas about shifting growth, but it is highly vague about realistic applications. What is missing--a few examples: An analysis of the amount of growth allowed and a recognition of the community's preferred amount of growth are critical aspects of managing growth responsibly, and are currently absent from this Theme and from the plan as a whole. The community strongly supports limited growth. This must be incorporated. This theme must address our unique planning challenge as a gateway community with high visitor population (growth-related issues regarding permanent population, visitor population, commuters, seasonal variations in employment numbers, etc...). We should be establishing clear goals (growth rate/cap) based on adequate understanding of where we are today. This chapter must define character--without defining what we want to protect, we won't end up protecting it. This theme needs to ensure growth in one sector (e.g. commercial) does not outpace growth in another sector (e.g. residential accesible to the workforce). This theme needs to include other key aspects of planning responsibly--age population demographics, makeup of economic industries, etc... to be able to adequately plan for future community infrastructure needs. This theme must ensure that new growth pays its way regardless of location. This theme must mention heritage preservation. The indicators in this theme must actually measure growth impacts and help us determine whether or not we are "growing responsibly."
10/23/2009	Muschaweck, Erika and Interested Public	we want to thank you for your good work in moving the negotiations for the comprehensive plan forward. We appreciate very much your listening to the people of Jackson and Teton County. We are very happy about the result of the votes that were taken yesterday. I attended the meeting last week and will attend more meetings in the future to support our wishes for a good and sustainable comp plan.
10/23/2009	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	I just wanted to thank you all for your hard work. We really appreciate the time and energy you are taking in helping to keep Teton County the wonderful place it is live for the entire population.
10/23/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Good work on Thursday night. Many of my neighbors who could not attend are smiling today as the news of your votes circulates.
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Include a policy limiting the use of on-site PRDs to a maximum multiplier of 3 units per 35 acres.
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Eliminate Wilson, Aspens, Teton Village, and northern South Park as nodes appropriate for increased development potential.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Base development potential in the county should be reduced from the current base zoning potential identified by the buildout taskforce in order to preserve wildlife habitat.(Superseded by Recommendation 171)
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Residential ARU's in County should be eliminated.
10/22/2009	Goralski, Jim and Linda Interested Public	We would like to add our comments to the many other residents that are against the usage of nodes as a planning tool for our valley. Public feedback has repeatedly shown a lack of support for these nodes, and residents in the targeted areas (i.e. Aspens, South Park, etc.) do not want them or need them. The addition of high-density nodes adds costs to the total community -- significant infrastructure will be needed including roadway additions and other expansions negatively impacting our wildlife and the quality of life for residents that currently live here. Unlike other communities, we do not have a surplus of lands for expansion. The parks, forests, wilderness and their wildlife are why we are unique and frankly why we're here and why this is a tourist destination. The type of sprawl inherent in the current planning models is inappropriate for this area and threatens this incredible landscape and the values of the community. We ask you as stewards of the ENTIRE community to focus on controlled, limited growth, which has been clearly identified as the priority by the community, and limit the expansion of commercial development and the resulting residential growth. You have an incredible opportunity to keep this special place special. Please take advantage of it. Nodes are not the answer. Thank you for your consideration
10/22/2009	Swope, Linda Interested Public	South Park is NOT the density solution. Our unique character, wildlife and rural entrance into Jackson Hole is treasured. Please help us preserve it!
10/22/2009	Swope, Linda Interested Public	I agree with every premise, idea and statement out of Rich Bloom. He is my voice. Please listen to him. Thanks for your time!

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	I want to add my voice to the many Teton County citizens who are urging you to SAY NO TO NODES. As many others have pointed out, the enormous increases in density and numbers the draft plan proposes for Wilson, South Park, and the other “nodes” will mean the destruction of all we most value about Jackson Hole. These “nodes” do not have the services people require and do not have on-site jobs for the majority of residents, so if they are developed the way the draft plan anticipates, this “planning” will simply add to the traffic on County roads as the residents drive back and forth to town, increase air pollution, diminish wildlife habitat, and decrease the quality of life for all residents. IF the proposal for vastly increased development in the “nodes” were matched by a precise and realistic plan for preserving the open space between the nodes, then there might be grounds for considering them (and even then I’m not sure they’d be desirable, for the reasons I mention above). But I haven’t seen any such open space plan. Have you investigated how other communities are using transferable development rights in combination with open space protection, and the measures that would be required to make them workable here? Which areas of the County would be downzoned for open space protection? What minimum size acreage would a land owner have to deed restrict for no development in order for the landowner to receive one TDR? How would you create a market for TDRs? Unless there is a strong incentive for a landowner to deed restrict his/her property (as in severe County restrictions on development rights combined with a market for TDRs) then the system won’t work. If landowners are already entitled to develop their property, why would they purchase TDRs? Only by imposing strong restrictions on existing development rights can a market for TDRs be created. It can be done—Pitkin County in Colorado is one example I know of that has a workable TDR system—but the underlying system of zoning and restricted development rights had to be put into place for the system to work. One of the many frustrating things about the current comprehensive planning process is that we’re being given only part of the story. The plan proposes huge increases in density and population, along with the flawed “node” idea, but speaks in only vague terms about the other necessary part of the plan, the part the community has vocally demanded—protection of wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and open space. I can’t support a plan that destroys Wilson, South Park, and the Village Road area with no rational reason, and that also fails to protect the remaining open space in the valley. I urge you to drop the node idea, and focus on really constraining growth in Jackson Hole. I don’t consider it “progress” if the new plan increases proposed growth over what’s allowed in the current plan. Even under the current plan, at least 6,000 more homes and 6,600,000 square feet of additional commercial space can be added to the town and county. Isn’t this enough? The bottom line, in my opinion, is that Jackson Hole has world-class resources of wildlife habitat, scenery, and open space. We aren’t any community in Ohio or Illinois or New Jersey, dealing with standard questions of how to meet human needs in an already degraded locale. We have something worth protecting, something that should take precedence over the never-ending demands of humans for houses and roads and jobs. The easy path is to ignore the voiceless needs of wildlife, allow the incremental destruction of the scenic values of this valley, and continue eating away at open space, until we end up much like any other place. It’s far more difficult to put on the brakes, and really plan for preserving what still remains here. I urge you to eliminate the nodes from the plan altogether, and focus your energies on genuine, far-sighted planning to limit growth and protect open space. Thanks for all your work on the plan, and for considering these comments.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, everybody. I'm Kathy Tompkins from Cottonwood Park. I did have a letter that I sent to you. This is just kind of an extension of that. Our single-family neighborhoods are becoming less inviting and <<inaudible>> and more inviting for landowners to make a quick buck by turning their heads and renting to a group of unrelated transient workers, who can chip in together to afford the rent. Job generators like the Village and Town each provide seasonal rentals on their property or close to it. This will lighten the load on the roads and help to keep single-family neighborhoods safe and inviting for the owners and caring homeowners. This will also, with the help of the reconstructed High School Road, which includes pedestrian and bike paths, convince moms and dads near the schools that it is safe to let their kids walk or bike to school instead of driving them. We have no more busing close to the schools and there is a lot of people who live, including myself, <<inaudible>> all of the traffic on High School Road. And then, plus, if you wind up sticking hundreds of more houses across the road with no qualms of what parallel roads, it is going to be a real mess. I remain optimistic that we can change these negative resort market-controlled outcomes, but if we don't start now, this will only continue into the ill-proposed high-dense neighborhoods, and the same problems with even more negative intensity will repeat there. We can't afford to allow established neighborhoods, especially near the schools, to transform and degrade into transient ?? with resorts and unmitigated commercial growth. Job generators need to take most of the responsibility for this. Only then will the Valley have a symbiotic relationship with the resort and high-end developments. This will be an important part of achieving the goals of a caring and thoughtfully rewritten Teton Comprehensive Plan. And thanks again, guys; good job.
10/22/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I...I am Cindy Stone and I don't really know where I'm from, and you'll understand that in time. Last week, you talked about nodes and how the community was opposed to them. And then somebody came up with the idea, well, maybe that's a bad word, maybe we need to think of a different word. Well, I graduated from ?? and I want to tell you that if you put in a different word for node and it mean county areas that will accommodate proportionate town-level density, I'm not sure ?? and I don't think my neighbors will either. Last week one of the things that was mentioned, communities. Well, this...everyone's been trying to hold this Valley together as a community for years. I grew up on the Village Road. The ski areas were ??. I went to Wilson School and my business is in Town and I live in South Park. My parents' address is at the Gros Ventre. You can find me in the summer usually down the Hoback on my horse. My husband mowed the plains of Golf & Tennis in high school and his folks had the Heart Six Ranch in Buffalo Valley. That's community. That...<<inaudible>>, but now I'm wondering maybe I need psychiatric help because I'm not sure which community I'm from.
10/22/2009	Turner, Sheri Interested Public	Hi, my name is Sheri Turner. I wasn't planning to speak, so this is going to be a little bit disjointed. I'll just give this thought on one thing. It's not your decision exactly on what's being done ??, but the public has been giving you their input on what they want. And it feels to me like that's what you need to be listening to and what they want to go for seems be ?? or ?? or down zoning. I've loved what we've had to say. That was the voice of our community on all aspects of valor. I thought that was terrific. My daughter stood before you guys and talked before. She's 29. She's one of the under-30-year-olds who no longer lives in the Valley. She stood before you and said she wasn't entitled to anything. She didn't feel that you owed her something. She recommended that you have more rentals for people. She's choosing to live outside of the Valley because she knows it's too expensive for her here. Maybe sometime she will come back. But she doesn't want neighborhoods to suffer and change their characters to accommodate the 20-to-30-year-olds. You know, maybe they should be renting, not owning. Her <<inaudible>>. Anyway, so I'll just give this thought on that—listen to what people have been telling you. Listen to the entire Valley, their opinions. I don't think anyone wants nodes, whatever turn you might put on them. I don't think that's what people want. I think they want to feel a cohesiveness with each other and to preserve what we have. There will always be people who want to come in. There's always going to be people that want to have it denser. But is that what we really want? Thank you.
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Use of on-site PRDs should be included as a policy in the Comp Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, speaking for myself. Really, last week I commented on the exclusion of the Conservation Alliance from the Numbers Task Force. I regret that I compared the Alliance's work with Staff's work. And while I greatly respect the work of the Alliance, I also believe the quality of work and integrity of all Planning Staff is at the highest ??. Theme two comments: I would ask that the county nodal development concept just be dropped, including the 1500 units for South Park. Last week's votes on the TDR made the necessity of nodes irrelevant. Absent the northwest South Park node, again, I would strongly refer you to go towards the letter of September 17 on behalf of Robert Gill. Not only are there significant connectivity in South Park to Highway 89 connector road, impediments pointed out in the letter by the family, the family also highlighted their ranching conservation interest, and believe me, we're all paying attention. Please reread that significant letter. If you also look at the maps, you might have noticed that it showed how the property would be broken up between the Gill's and the Lockhart's. Both families have noncontiguous parcels holding about 700 acres. Either or both families can move forward at any time and ask for an exemption from the present moratorium to cluster development near the high school via the PRD tool and permanently protect 85 percent of their noncontiguous and separate ?? parcels, the ones down by the river. In addition, any housing created with the tool will still have to meet the 25 percent Category 1 through 3 affordable housing requirements. So, both open space and housing benefits are achieved. The community will support them with an application. I will support them. Even with a 9 per 35 on Lockhart's parcel of 700 acres, that would be 180 units on about 100 acres with 85 percent permanently protected. Of that 180, 45 of those would be Category 1 through 3 affordable. If we take away the PRD tool, or got it to zero, or just up zoning and down zoning, you remove that opportunity. Do not replace nodes with simple up zoning and down zoning. Tim already talked it and I've worked with Tim on a number of conservation easements. As the only areas of significant possibility are the rural zones, and you've already recommended a reduction of the PRD 9-per-35 multiplier. Do not remove any remaining incentive for the creation of permanent open space. Permanent open space is the holy grail. Zoning is temporary. As the Land Trust and Brad Meade testified—and Laurie is here tonight, she can speak for herself—but the great majority of the use of the PRD tool overwhelmingly has never resulted in an extra housing unit. Mostly, it ends up as a conversation between the landowner, the Land Trust, their appraiser, and the IRS. So, when you see the grid later tonight about moving these units or reducing them, a lot of those are phantom units that never would have occurred, not because of topography but because of how they've been used in the past as a way to devalue the property, get an IRS write-off, and make the conservation happen. The noncontiguous PRD tool needs to remain intact except for a consideration of a modest reduction and you've had that conversation. Nodes should not be used and are not needed to achieve affordable housing. We're currently comfortably above our goal of 65 percent and that's improving each month. Look in the paper. The housing bubble has burst, we're coming out of this recession, but the number of condos, town homes and homes, the affordable rentals, are all moving. Workforce housing is best achieved going forward by keeping up as new development occurs. And keeping up, and the way to address affordable housing, is talking about positive growth. So, if we can get past nodes, please include in theme two a conversation that's not in the chapter now about cost of growth. That growth, regardless of location and type—residential/commercial—should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure, and social systems, like parks. Then when you get to theme four, revised housing mitigation rates, especially on commercial, take a look at those. Residential I think we have covered Town and County. And in theme four again identify a permanent funding source for any misses or gaps. Do not use nodes or up zoning to achieve affordable housing, because they're not needed, it's not supported, the community has asked for something else. Please, in theme two, address the mix of growth, that job-creating commercial growth is considered hand in hand with residential development. Recommend reducing or converting some of the proposed commercial into residential. Revisit the role of ARUs. As to the concern that Lisa has brought up about the very large homes in the County also contributed to job creation, revisit that section in the LDRs. Right now, if you're on a 35-, 50-acre parcel, you can even build 15,000 square feet, 8000 of those habitable. If you're on a half-acre parcel, you can build 10,000 square feet, 8000 habitable. Maybe that's too high. Maybe that should be reduced to reduce the job creation along with commercial. Thank you and I'll submit these online.
10/22/2009	Lewis, Becky Interested Public	Hi, my name's Becky Lewis. Short and sweet. Under existing developments right now, we can have over 6000 new homes in the Valley. You've just denied transferrable development rights, which would have put some of those homes in a greater cluster in a node. Since that is no longer a vehicle, a node ?? represents more growth than the 6000 homes that are currently permitted. Say no to nodes. We don't need that kind of growth. Public comment has consistently been against it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Ewing, Patty and Frank Interested Public	Thank you again for the time and effort you are volunteering to rewrite/update the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. As you are considering Theme 2 and growth management, we urge you to drop the node concept particularly for Wilson, South Park and the Aspens. Neither growth nor density as a result of growth is desired nor needed. Nodes are not the solution to workforce housing, which currently, we are told, exceeds the 65% goal. A quick review of available commercial space, affordable rentals, and homes/condos on the market seems to confirm that. The plan update does not need to be driven by affordable workforce housing. Theme 1 identifies the community value of wildlife, open space and community character. Growth and density, wherever in the valley, impacts those values. We urge you to cap growth in town as well as the county. We have long supported the concept that any growth should pay for itself. Maintaining the integrity of Theme 1 throughout the plan review process will be difficult. Current allowable growth numbers already exceeds the capacity of the valley. Instead of seeking more growth, identify ways to reduce growth.
10/22/2009	Lockhart, Cody Interested Public	My name is Cody Lockhart. I would like to encourage the Planning Commission to keep the noncontiguous PRD in the new Plan and to continue to explore the concept of TDRs. My family has been and continues to be dedicated to ranching in this Valley. And with that, we're committed to continue to provide all the community benefits that come along with ranching, such as open space, wildlife habitat, and community character. However, there are and continue to be obstacles that will change the way our ranch and many other ranches in the Valley operate and look. I think it is fair to say that our ranch will not forever look the way that it does today. At some point we are going to have to seriously explore our options. One of the questions that has been put in front of this Commission is what will our options be and what will existing ranches in this Valley look like. I believe the answer is quite simple. You will get ???. If you take zoning down to basic property rights, one house per 35 acres, and take away or dramatically change current by-right property rights, PRD, you'll get what you asked for—a Valley full of 35-acre ranchettes and McMansions and no more permanently, truly protected open space. I think we can do better than that. I believe in proper use of the noncontiguous PRD and some type of TDR concept if the future in the Valley is to remain ranching intact and provide true permanent open space and maintain our community character, last on the list. When I look at potential units that exist today on the ground with by-right property rights in the County and compare that to the numbers that are proposed in the new Plan, it appears to me that it's a 15 percent reduction in growth, or a less-growth plan. I'm not making the concept or idea of nodes—that would be responsive to something different—but what the nodes do do is they simplify the noncontiguous PRD and the TDR concept. Without the nodes, we'd just end up fighting about receiving areas on a case-by-case basis, just creating one more obstacle to protecting permanent open space. I would like to encourage you not to get bogged down in the details of how this will transfer or the development rights concept will work today. There will be plenty of time for that when the Land Development Regulations are written. You just have to embrace the idea of moving density from areas of high natural resource value to areas that make more sense for growth. Thank you.
10/22/2009	, Interested Public	Please vote down nodes for west Jackson and Cottonwood Park. In fact, doing away with nodes in South Park or anywhere, so that a fair zoning map can be developed Jackson and county folks. Thank you all for your hard work during this difficult and anxious time for most of us.
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Base property rights in the County should be the minimum level of development.
10/22/2009	Wilson, Loren Interested Public	My name is Lauren Wilson. I'm from Alta. ?? families over there. And my family's been in agriculture since 1888 and this family just a very long time, and which I'd also state that our interest is in conservation and taking care of the open spaces available. And my worries is that this group is going to take away options that we have. Most of the ranching and farming families that I know of need opportunities to cash out, if you will, those members of our family who no longer live here. And so we need tools left in place. The TDR, particularly noncontiguous, the opportunity to do conservation easements. If all these things are taken away, I think Scott said it best, you're going to end up in this County with nothing but 35-acre ranchettes and I don't think that's what anyone wants to see. So, please, I encourage you to keep in place the controls that we have, as well as the opportunity to have density bonuses and transfer those in appropriate ways. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Wilson, Meredith Interested Public	My name is Meredith Wilson and I'm a cousin to Lauren who just spoke to you. And it's been a month and a half since I was at one of the meetings, because I make my living from agriculture and it's been harvest time, it's been a busy time, but thank you for your time. I live on the original homestead, Lauren's and my great grandfather's homestead back in the 1800's, and agriculture is very important to us. And the open space and maintaining that is important to us. And because of what we've done, we have wildlife of various kinds and species that reside on our place, and we feel that we've been good managers of the land. I would concur with Mr. Lockhart when he said that if we have all the options that are currently on the books, that I'm afraid will be taken away from us, you will see 35-acre ranchettes, and that's detrimental to livestock and, excuse me, that's detrimental to the wildlife and the migration corridors and so forth. So, please don't take away the options that we have as far as the noncontiguous, the TDRs—and that's already gone in this ?? anyway—and also by reducing the option that we have for the base density, which, in my mind, almost <<inaudible>>. Thank you.
10/22/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	I'm Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. We've submitted a number of written comments on some of these issues you're discussing, so I'll keep it brief. I'll look at the broader topic of the node. First, scattered nodes that quote town-level densities, which is how this Plan uniquely identifies them throughout the County, doesn't represent the public vision. One, take a brief objective look at public comment, and it's abundantly clear the public doesn't support the idea of nodes as this Plan identifies them. One just specific example, the compact centers and housing scenario, which this theme and the associated ?? was the least-liked scenario of all those that were presented and ended up being the basis of the new Plan. We don't feel like this is okay and neither is promoting an across-the-board town-level characteristic throughout different communities in the Valley. Also, the rationale for the approach, town-level densities and nodes is not explained in this Plan. The benefits of this approach are not clear in the language of the Plan, and it doesn't appear to be realistically tied to other elements in the Plan, like transportation, community character, preservation of wildlife protection. At the heart of this, we shouldn't be identifying places for additional growth without first clearly articulating why it is needed in the first place. No one else <<inaudible>> would result in net community benefit. For example, what were the alternatives? Are we assuming increased density is the only means to achieve current open space and workforce housing? Given this lack of analysis, and the formation of the maps, the public's desire for limited growth, the fact that we still have ample development potential under baseline zoning, and the fact that our highest priority, such as wildlife protection, would benefit from a reduced development potential, please keep allowable densities at baseline in the proposed county centers. In summary, please remove this concept of expanding county centers and nodes as this Plan finds them from the Plan. This combined with the PRD at lower density allowances and the options for noncontiguous PRD would result in a Plan that's much more in line with public vision and with the land-use pattern that will actually help us meet our highest community priority to protect wildlife. Second is regarding Town. Do not simply up zone parcels throughout the Town. A lot of speakers have already addressed the problems with the temporary nature of zoning, so I won't elaborate on that, but if you just up zone also additional development not assured to result in the type of development that the community supports. The last thing you would want is the use of density options on top of an increased baseline development potential in Town, because right now the Plan isn't clear about this fundamental point. Are you promoting increased baseline zoning and the potential use of density options in Town? And one quick item just to clarify the process. When you went through the vision chapter, you made a recommendation to reinstate the concept of community character. Will this concept be reintegrated throughout the entire document as Staff rewrites each chapter? I guess more specific to this theme are you going to use community character definitions to frame the way in which growth will be managed in the Valley? Thanks again for your work.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	I ask that the County nodal development concept be dropped including the 1,500 homes targeted for northern South Park. • Due to last week's votes that recognized the near impossibility of transferring density from rural areas to receiving areas via the TDR tool – then the primary reason for nodes has been removed. • As to the NW South Park node. • Again I will refer you to Bill Schwartz's letter of 9/17/09 representing Robert Gill. • Not only are there significant connectivity and South Park to HWY 89 connector road impediments pointed out in the letter - the Gill family also highlighted their ranching and conservation interests. Please re-read their submitted letter and review the attached maps. • The accompanying maps clearly showed that both the Gill and Lockhart families have their own separate non-contiguous parcels each totaling approximately 700 acres. • Either or both families can move forward, at any time, and ask for an exemption from the present moratorium to cluster development near to the High School via the PRD tool and permanently protect 85% of their non-contiguous and separate family parcels. In addition any housing units created with this tool will still have to meet the 25% Category 1-3 affordable housing requirements. So both open space and housing benefits are achieved. The community would support them with such an application. I would support them even under the 9/35 option. • Do not replace nodes with simple upzoning and downzoning as the only areas with significant possibility are the rural zone and you have already recommended the reduction of the PRD 9/35 multiplier – do not remove any remaining incentive for the creation of permanent open space protection. • As the Land Trust and Brad Mead testified - 90% of the time the PRD tool has been used - it has resulted in no additional housing units – but rather was a private conversation between the land owner, the land trust, their appraiser and the IRS. • The non-contiguous PRD tool needs to remain intact except for a reduction of the upper multiplier of 9/35. • Nodes should NOT be used - and are NOT needed - to achieve workforce housing objectives. • We currently are comfortably above our goal of housing 65% of our workforce and that is improving each month with the recession generated opportunities for more affordable homes and abundant affordable rentals. Just look in the newspaper on the available inventory of affordable housing, increasingly affordable rentals, condos, townhomes as well as single family homes. • Workforce housing is best achieved going forward by “keeping up” as new development occurs. • With 'keeping up' – this is the way to address workforce housing without needing any density incentives. Again then the nodes are not needed. In Theme 2 address the Cost of Growth • Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. • In Theme 4 revise the housing mitigation rates especially on the commercial calculation (both Town and County) that now only is calculated on the seasonal bump in employment – so is wholly under mitigating the commercial workforce housing impacts. • In Theme 4 identify a permanent funding source to correct any past under mitigation issues. Increasing build out and density is an onerous tax in of itself. The community does not need – and does not want - solutions that increase build out and unnecessarily put our other higher community values

of wildlife, open space and small town character at risk.

-

In Theme 2 address the Mix of Growth - that job creating commercial growth is considered hand-in-hand with residential development.

-

Recommend reducing and/or converting some of the proposed commercial square footage into residential instead.

-

Revisit the role and effect that ARU's may have.

-

As to the concern that very large homes in the County also contribute to under mitigated job creation – then consider reducing the upper limit of allowable square footage from 10,000 to 8,000 square feet also in Theme 2.

In summary:

-

Remove all County nodes, including South Park. Let's move forward.

-

Retain a significant portion of the PRD tool – do not simply downzone the rural county further and upzone certain locations. This would be the worst approach as permanent open space protection (versus temporary zoning) will not be achieved.

-

Address the costs of growth in Theme 2 – that all future development, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems.

-

Make sure in Theme 2 and in Theme 4 we address commercial mitigation rates.

-

Address the mix of future growth – discuss and address the balance between job producing commercial and residential. Address the balance between resident housing verses large second homes or possibly problematic ARUs.

-

Make sure you allow the numbers task force to identify the EFFECTIVE population of current and potential housing units, commercial AND lodging units. Let the task force complete the work on the job creation effects of commercial and also large second homes.

o

Then address what is not in balance rather than simply going to additive growth via considering density incentive tools applied to possible nodes.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	First--scattered nodes at "town-level densities"--which is how this plan uniquely identifies nodes--throughout the county do not represent the public vision. If elements of the plan do not represent the community vision, they should not be included. One can take a brief, objective look at public comment, and it is abundantly clear that the public does not support the idea of nodes as this plan identifies them. (One specific example--the "compact centers and housing" scenario which this theme and the associated Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) promote--was the least liked scenario of all presented...yet it ended up being the basis of the new plan.) This is not ok--and neither is promoting an across-the-board town-level characteristic throughout different communities in the valley. Also, the rationale for this approach--town level densities in nodes--is not explained in this plan. To be blunt, the benefits of such an approach are not clear and they are not realistically tied to other elements of the plan like transportation, community character preservation, and wildlife protection. We shouldn't be identifying places for additional growth without first clearly articulating why it is needed in the first place. No analysis was done to show that this preferred pattern and amount would result in the greatest community benefit (For example, what are the alternatives? Are we assuming increased density is the only means to achieve permanent open space or workforce housing?) Given this lack of analysis in the formation of the FLUP maps (i.e. any proof that this added density will actually have net benefits for the community), the public's desire for limited growth, the fact that we still have ample development potential under baseline zoning, and the fact that our highest priorities would benefit from reduced development potentials, keep allowable densities at baseline in the proposed county centers. In summary, remove the concept of expanding county centers, and nodes as this plan defines them, from the plan. This, combined with the PRD at a lower density allowance, will result in a plan much more in line with the public vision, and with a land use pattern that is more likely to help us meet the highest community priority of wildlife protection. Second--related to town, do not simply upzone parcels throughout the town. By doing so, additional development is not ensured to result in the type of development that the community supports. The last thing you would want is the use of density options on top of an increased baseline development potential--and, as of right now, the plan isn't clear about this fundamental point--are you promoting increased baseline zoning AND the potential use of density options in town? Regarding some of the earlier votes on reinstating community character in the vision chapter, will this concept be integrated throughout the entire document--are you going to use community character definitions to frame the way in which growth will be managed in the valley?
10/22/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	My name's Justin Adams and I live here. I first want to say that I'm fascinated with Mr. Lindstrom's idea about noncontiguous PRDs, with the exception of one word he used and that's multiplier. You start moving density with a multiplier, I think you've defeated the purpose. Now, this meeting is about nodes. I just want to tell you, every time I hear that word node, I think of tumor and tumor all too often grows in the ugliest way. Thank you.
10/22/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Cottonwood Park. I wasn't going to speak today since I spoke last week, so I don't have anything prepared. But obviously something has hit me and I do want to talk to you tonight about something. Last week at this meeting there was a member of yours that in my estimation embarrassed himself and I was embarrassed for him. He made some comments about worrying about the large landowners and the millions of dollars that they could lose potentially. He was concerned about the large landowner's rights. And I have to tell you, after hearing words tonight about large landowner's obstacles, options being taken away from them, their rights, talking about high-density losses, I keep thinking I've been involved in developmental issues approximately <<inaudible>> since 1991. And I have never once heard anyone at a table in front of me argue about the rights that I might lose due to a large landowner developing across the street from me. Never once have I heard anyone say, well, what about the rights of Cottonwood Park and how much money they might lose without in their homes if high density goes across the street from them. I feel bad for that neighborhood. This neighborhood has been crying, well, what about me, since 1999, when the annexation issue came into play. And we're still talking about high density across the street. And we still hear people saying, well, what about the rights of the large landowners and how much money are they going to lose. I don't want to hear anyone mention to me their concern about how much money they might lose.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	Good evening, I'm Scott Pierson. I'm talking on behalf of myself. I've been in Teton County for about 34 years now and I think ?? development community for that entire 34 years, starting as a surveyor and then a planning and development consultant all through the Valley, as well as surveying landscape architecture and those things. I think everybody in the Valley acknowledges that up until about a year ago, the community was growing at too fast a pace, growing too fast. And I think that's a national dilemma, as well as just a Jackson Hole dilemma. I've been here, as I said, for quite awhile. My family's here. My wife's family has been here since the '50s off and on. I think you guys need to go back and take a larger view as to where you want the community to go. That's what the Plan part is supposed to be about. It's not about the LDRs. During the planning process, during the chapters that you're generating, create the ability and all the tools that you need and all the reasons that you need to direct growth as it happens in the future to where you want it to occur and how you want it to occur. There are still too many tools now. In particular, I want to make sure also that you provide for the people that are under 30 years old, you know, and some of the people right now that seem to be moving into the Valley and staying in the Valley are over 55. So, they're retired people that have the wealth and the money to move into the Valley, and reducing that middle-aged group of people that a lot of you are representative of but you see your friends moving out of the Valley as well. We want that middle-aged group to remain here through this Plan so that you provide for them. Part of that I believe involves villages as well as density in the Town. You're headed that way. You talk about nodes. A lot of Wilson right now that doesn't have an existing ?? on it is one unit per 35 acres, NCSF. It really doesn't make a long-term lot of sense to let it sit there at that density when we see the changing character of what's going on. We want to create the places that we can serve with transit. I think that's the intent of the Plan when we generated this. If you don't have a critical mass in these villages, it's hard to sustain transit ?. Every time you try to run transit out, you can't run it frequently enough to service those ?? to get the people to come back into Town. It just doesn't make sense to run empty buses ?. Some day in the future this Plan, as we go...it's at least a 10- to 15-year Plan. It's been 15 years since the '94 Plan. It looks like it will be about three before this one is done. So, it will be close to 20 between Plans. The one you're generating, it's going to be around 15 to 20 years probably. Luckily, you won't have to do it again probably. One last thing with regard to the PRDs. Some people have said that it's not an entitlement for the additional density. The additional density for a PRD is an on-the-ground entitlement. If you give the open space and it's acceptable to the community, you get your density. It's not a question of, oh, it's a bonus. It's an outright density. Where that came from was when in '94, they took those ranches, larger parcels that had been RA3, RA6, RA10, RA5, RA20, and they took those and they decided what we wanted to do is get mandatory clustering that people develop large parcels like that. If you take the nine units on the biggest parcels, 340 acres, or twenty acres and you clustered that to 85 percent, you get nine units, which brings us back to about RA3. That's where the nine units basically came from. If you go to 35, it's about 12 units. The other thing that happened that additionally down zoned at that point in time, since then, was in about '96, we went and instead of rounding up, you could have 24 acres and get ?? in Teton County until about '96, when we stopped rounding up and we started saying give us a round-down type figure. So, you needed a full base-site area of 23.66 units to be able to get two point units on 35. Previous to that, you could get two dwelling units for 11.33 acres, 3-4 acres, because you round up the next dwelling. That all changed in '96. A lot of the development that we've seen in the past 15 to 20 years since '94 is legacy development, Melody Ranch, the Wilson area, Cottonwood Park building out. Three Creek Ranch is a legacy from the pre-'94 Plan. That density was part of a Master Plan that included the dairy that transferred those units from the dairy down to the Three Creek Ranch and enabled the Three Creek Ranch to develop the way we've seen it. So, a lot of that density that we're still seeing over the past ten years in the County, okay, actually is a legacy from the pre-94 Plan and the pre-94 Land Development Regulations. I want to encourage you to plan with looking towards the future. What you plan for, you're going to get. When we planned for three-acre parcels, we got three-acre parcels throughout the County. Since then, we've planned for 35's. We've got a lot of 35-acre parcels now. What you plan for, we're going to get, more or less. This should be a Plan for the future. And it should include the community that hasn't passed away so far by now. It should be more about the next generation than the past generation, like myself, who's closer to the grave <<inaudible>>. Thank you.
10/22/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Discuss the Town in Theme 3 - Town as Heart

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Nader, Sharon Interested Public	I'm Sharon Nader. I was talking to a colleague at work last week and she grew up in Sun Valley, Idaho, which is quite a similar community to Jackson, and was saying that she returned last summer and was shocked that some of her favorite businesses had gone out of business and so many large homes were up for sale and, you know, that aspect was distressing to her. But then as she spent the summer there, she said, you know, what I noticed was that there was a really positive side to this, because the core community of Sun Valley reemerged and came back together and actually started working together like neighbors to recreate the community that they are and that they have always been. And she saw that as a very positive side of a very scary recession for many of us. And I thought about our community and, you know, I think we have that some potential here and that the constant growth and pressure and drive to build here has really created a lot of divisions between people in our community. And I think the slowdown, although I'm extremely sensitive to people's losses and, you know, businesses going out of business here in Jackson, I think also gives us an opportunity to slow down, take the heat off of commissions like yourself and really think about who we are and where we want to go. I think the concept of nodes is distasteful to me. I think it pits neighbors against neighbors and it doesn't allow us to work together as a community, because, you know, Wilson, you know, gets ?? about the level of the density discussed there. And they say, well, let's push it to South Park. And South Park comes back and says, okay, well, put it, you know, adjacent to existing growth like Cottonwood. And the point is that we're not at a point anymore where we need to consider those extremely high-density developments and that is what nodes connotate. They represent high-density development. And, as I go through this Valley, I was really involved with the ?? series on national parks, and it struck me how, you know, despite all the specific history that has occurred throughout this Valley, the best way to explain it is through stories. And I love the national parks, but I also love the views of Wilson and I also love the character of Town and I love South Park, my backyard. You know, last year, when we were going through the whole thing about the Teton Meadows development, there was a whole dialog about whether this represents wildlife habitat or not. And I had a funny experience at the end of this winter where an animal had died out on the ranch behind my house, and my neighbors had guests in Town and they said, well, where's the best place to see wildlife. And they said, well, come in my backyard, because there was a constant procession of coyotes, of foxes, of eagles, of hawks just moving through that ranch. And I just think that it's not about sacrificing one part of our Valley for another. We really need to recognize that as a community we have to work together. And I don't think nodes are a productive part of this conversation. And I do believe that taking the heat off is helpful for us in this discussion, and I hope you will make some very thoughtful decisions about how we can move forward and work together as a community and not have one area of our County or another be a receptive node for unwanted high-density growth. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Lindstrom, Tim Interested Public	Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, these two Commissions, my name is Tim Lindstrom. I'm here on my own as an attorney in Jackson, and I'm going to speak briefly about something that I typically wouldn't give you any background from myself, but since I don't think you need to know who I am, I'll give you a little bit of background. I've spent 22 years teaching accounting and planning at the University of Virginia. I have a masters in planning from Virginia. I've written books on zoning and planning in Virginia <<inaudible>>. And I also have been very involved with conservation easements and represent the Jackson Hole Land Trust, although I'm not speaking for the Land Trust tonight. I did send an e-mail communication back in September to the County Commission and, Mr. Chairman, I'll give you that...Mr. Norton circulated that, but it does sort of summarize what I'm going to talk about tonight. I know that you had a vote that was reported in the paper to dispense with transferrable development rights, and I'm not here to talk about TDRs, but I am here to talk about a tool that you already have in your Land Development Regulations that I believe, with very little additional structure, can be used, if what you are trying to do by increasing density in some places is to reduce density in other places. I don't want to talk about transferring density. I know that's a hot button for some of you. If your Plan ultimately ends up saying, well, we really don't want to change anything, then you don't need any tools. You don't need to make any changes ?? But if you plan to increase density, either by saying we want more density here or there, or by having a point system where land can be scored without identifying in advance, or ?? density. If there's a increase in density and there's also, as the Plan certainly indicates, and as the poll certainly indicates, a desire to reduce density potential in the rural areas, then you have a tool right now that you can implement as soon as you wish—it's not a five-year plan or anything else—with a noncontiguous Planned Residential Development. That is already on the books. And I know that TDR programs are complicated, but the noncontiguous PRD program is not. You have all the tools in place to do it, and literally it's as simple as saying we are going to recommend in this Comprehensive Plan that there be no increases in residential density unless by zoning <<inaudible>>... unless the zoning application brings with it a conservation easement on land in the rural area in the same form that you currently have for noncontiguous PRDs. And you don't have to have nodes. You don't have to designate growth areas. You simply say if there's any rezoning to increase residential density, and whether you want to do it one for one, or you want some multiplier, that's a function of whether you want to zero some gain, i.e., we don't want any increase in overall density, we just want to reduce it here and increase it here. Or if you want to increase density, which the initial Plan suggested, then you have a slight multiplier. As far as setting the value of these things, the markets do that. If somebody knows that in order to get a rezoning they have to bring in a conservation easement, they will find a landowner and they will negotiate a price. You don't have to create a market. It's a publicly managed market. It's a market that sets itself up. Now, I know there's also talk about reducing the potential density in the rural areas, and the initial thrust of the Plan was we're going to up zone here and we're going to recommend or create the potential for up zonings here and down zonings here. I spent 12 years on the ?? County Board of Supervisors, which is the equivalent of your County Commission, which is where ?? grew up, and I worked to use zoning to try to control growth. And I can tell you when the economics are there, zoning is here today and gone tomorrow. And that's why if you are interested in increasing density and interested in reducing density in the rural areas and only secure even <<inaudible>>. But you can do it with a conservation easement. That is not going to change when the next County Commission takes office. And what you're doing right now is talking about changing zoning. Zoning changes all the time. So, it's a simple—not foolproof—you may have to test it, but you haven't got anything to lose. If you implement it and it doesn't get used, that means we're not getting any up zonings, we're not getting any down zonings. You're simply status quo. You can afford to change it. The last thing I'll say is that one of the virtues of using the noncontiguous PRD is if...there's been discussion we're going to reduce density in the rural areas and we're going to increase density elsewhere. Well, that's what's <<inaudible>> get the up zoning, all of a sudden you get the nice economic benefit—they only have to pay their lawyers and their planners to get it. And if there's a down zoning, there's no compensation. Whatever value, and I think there's a huge oversupply of development potential in the Teton County rural areas now, so I don't think that development is really worth that much. But psychologically it's worth something. And so if you say, well, okay, we're going to let them use three or nine potential units in the rural density cluster, and you can sell the other six, you've automatically created a market. You've got people moving there. You've got things that they can sell that they can't use. You've softened the blow of that change in zoning. Now, again, you can make this as elaborate as you want. You could have sending zones and receiving zones and all of that stuff. But it can be done as simply as saying no up zoning for residential use unless there is a corresponding reduction in rural density by the use of conservation easement ?? I'm more than happy if anybody has any interest in pursuing that further or to talk about it more. It's something I spent years working with ??. And TDRs and transfer of density usually don't work, simply as most communities are so horribly overzoned that you can't even begin to get to the heart of the problem. In Teton County that's not the case. You can literally have a zero sum indicator where we're simply going to increase density here and reduce it here. You aren't so horribly overzoned that you really have to cut back across the board and work at planning to ??. So, it really is an opportunity that's unique and I think the thing, more than anything else, as an academic matter, it strikes me as a truly unique opportunity to make a very simple tool, which it really is, that you already have, work in a slightly different way to accomplish what I think is one of the key parts of the Comprehensive Plan. So, thanks very much.

Date	Name	Comment
10/21/2009	Parker, Jon Interested Public	Please drop the "node" concept. South Park does not need a high concentration of new homes. It is an important scenic and wildlife area. We need to set an overall growth target rather than looking at each development separately. We should also reevaluate density bonuses.
10/21/2009	Thomas, Shirley & Dan Interested Public	Please accept our comment on the Theme 2 discussion. We do not at this point see any point in increased development & use of the nodal concept. With the amount of space currently available in the town/county, we should first be utilizing those spaces. By creating more growth we increase the need for more infrastructure & jobs, that we cannot fill currently. Thank you for your great work in this plan.
10/21/2009	Stephens, Donald E. Interested Public	As a resident of the Town of Jackson for 20 years and Teton County for 40 years I urge you totally abandon the idea of "Nodes" as a method of directing/controlling growth in Teton County. I believe it is the wrong way to achieve planned growth in this community. If you want to direct/control growth, build it into the Comprehensive Plan uniformly. The Node approach is too susceptible to politics, government, and money. Set the rules for growth/development and the "end game" (i.e. total build out) in the Comprehensive Plan and stick to it.
10/21/2009	Smith, Emily Interested Public	I recommend that the county nodal development concept be dropped including the 1,500 homes targeted for the northern South Park area. Say NO to all county nodes. We do not need nodes to achieve workforce housing objectives. I recommend constraining growth equal to or less than allowed under the current plan minus all discretionary density tools. Nodes are damaging to current neighborhoods.
10/21/2009	Stephens, Donald E. Interested Public	As a resident of the Town of Jackson for 20 years and Teton County for 40 years I urge you totally abandon the idea of "Nodes" as a method of directing/controlling growth in Teton County. I believe it is the wrong way to achieve planned growth in this community. If you want to direct/control growth, build it into the Comprehensive Plan uniformly. The Node approach is too susceptible to politics, government, and money. Set the rules for growth/development and the "end game" (i.e. total build out) in the Comprehensive Plan and stick to it.
10/21/2009	Mckay, Rick Interested Public	please, drop the designation of south park for growth specifically and drop the concept of nodes in general. thanks r.m.
10/19/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Any discussion involving nodes is a very difficult one. Your thoughtful discussion last week showed the difficulty in making a decision. I would like to respectfully suggest that you ask the following high level questions that are simple yet definitive: a) Is my vision for this area that it is suitable/capable of absorbing greater density than defined in the 1994 Plan? b) Is my vision for this area that it should remain the same density as defined in the 1994 Plan? c) Is my vision for this area that it should have lower density than defined in the 1994 Plan? Pick one answer for each of the proposed nodes, the Rural County (break it down if need be), and Town. Subareas of Town can be discussed with the same questions later. For now just ask the question of the Town as a whole. Do not combine areas. To use Commissioner Wall's analogy it would be like asking if he likes ice cream when he only likes chocolate. Ask the question for each "flavor." After you answer the question of your vision for each area, you can drop down in detail and discuss "how much" for each area. You can also ask if it is consistent with your prior recommendations. Rather than struggling with the definition of nodes, these simple targeted questions should help your discussion. Keep up the good work. We appreciate the efforts you are making.

Date	Name	Comment
10/19/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to respond to a comment made at last week's Teton County's Comprehensive Plan rewrite meeting, during the public comment segment. A gentleman said that the Northern South Park area around the high school should be a receiving area for development because the area is already "messed up" or ruined. Please don't treat the residents of the neighborhoods around the high school as if we don't matter. I hope that the planning commissioners and the elected officials respect the small home owner's future in West Jackson as much as they respect the large landowners, concerning their property rights and the money they may gain or lose on their land investment. West Jackson also has a lot to gain or lose in the rewrite of the comprehensive plan, not only in our home values but the very existence of viable and safe family neighborhoods. There is a simple formula that we can aspire to for the location of any needed housing. If housing is needed, it should be placed where the jobs are generated. Affordable homes and rentals should be placed near or where service people are needed for the upkeep of high end homes, high end developments and resorts in town, Teton Village, The Aspens and the Wilson area. There should be a shared responsibility by everyone who generates the need for service people. If we dump dense new bedroom communities in Northern South Park, people will still rely on their cars to get to and from work in town, Teton Village, Wilson, and The Aspens. We do not need more traffic on the already overburdened High School Road, which will be even more dangerous if the Tribal Trails connector road goes through. It will threaten the safety of all our children in and around the schools here. It defeats the purpose of smart and managed growth. We need to keep commercial and unneeded residential development to a minimum in all areas, protect wildlife, open spaces and preserve our family neighborhoods. Most of all, everybody should share in these responsibilities, not just the small homeowner who works very hard to call Jackson their home. Please be considerate of the neighborhoods in West Jackson. We matter, pay taxes and vote too!
10/15/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Last week was one of the more focused meetings that we've had. Thank you. TDRs, I think they're on the agenda for tonight. TDRs are basically the foundation of this Plan. I don't agree with a straight TDR program. I think it requires a funding source to implement. There are some indications for the Pitkin inclusion that maybe there will be some discussion of competitive-type TDR programs, whether it's a hierarchy or prioritization of project. TDRs, as proposed in this Plan, require a two-and-a-half multiplier, for one thing, an additional 4000 units that are allowed to the 10,000 that we had in the Appendix. Sun Valley tends to do their TDR program and requires a three-point-four multiplier. You have to have something to make that program go to potential to connect essential for lack of a better phrase. And we haven't asked ourselves the question, is what we gain temporarily worth what we lose permanently? You have to have a pre-identified ?? This will allow targeted acquisition of properties that have high biological value—habitat, interconnectivity, etc. If not, we'll end up with a program where landowners who weren't planning to develop or sell will get into the fray simply because there's now a monetary value attached to the TDR itself. We'll end up with more the cow-pasture, hayfield-type preservations as patterns, instead of targeted, high-value habitat. The Montgomery County inclusion from the planning pamphlet either last week or the week before was very interesting. I've studied a lot of these proposals and that probably, with Pitkin, or a combination of the two, is the most interesting, because what they did is downzone the agricultural area but allow the existing landowner to trade TDRs at the existing rate prior to the downzone. This makes for ?? growth, which is what I think the community wants. That should move forward and discussed very thoroughly; it might help you. The competitive system also holds promise, if we even go to a TDR program, because it allows a prioritization, a hierarchy, so to speak, of getting an equitable exchange for what we're giving away. So, that's all I had specific to the TDR discussion. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Varley, Jay Interested Public	My name is Jay Barley and I'm a resident of Jackson downtown area. I'd like to encourage...I've always been upset that the '94 Plan was to me pretty much an American suburban plan. And I always...I think that the United States is going to be changing and I think certainly a place like Jackson Hole should at least try to ???. So much has been done here already making it that kind of development ?? that it's hard to change. I mean, there's I don't know how many different private lots there are in the County, which I don't think you have any real affect on limiting the development on those in terms of at least one house. So a lot of that is outside the purview of the Plan now. But I believe that it's not so much while the number of people in the Valley matter, it's the extent of their impacts is what really bothers people. And their impacts are heightened the more spread out they are, the more driving they do instead of walking, more they drive instead of ???. So, I think the key thing is to get people to walk and that means your land-use planning. And that's really...I think we should be gearing towards that, so try to make it convenient for people to walk where they want to walk. I think there's going to be behavior changes anyway in transportation, but it won't be enough unless the land-use plan is crafted. The other thing I'd like to comment about is, and these are really kind of broad concept things, is the danger of map looking at a complex system of the community as a complex system. And what I really mean by that is the tendency to take and try to break down every issue into pieces, hoping that if we solve each one of these and put them back together again, we'd end up with a good solution. As one who has been trained in systems analysis in my college years, we used to refer to something called sub-optimization and what it meant was if you took every piece and you optimized that piece and you put it all together in a complex system, you'd end up with a system that's about 60 percent of the optimal solution of the overall system. It's not a very effective ?? and it's not easy to do it that way. But it's a very human thing to try to take pieces and try to solve all that and hoping to put it all together and, you know, it works out right. In fact, it tends not to. And that's because of the interaction ??. Then I guess the one other issue I'll talk about is the whole idea of growth caps and things like that. The big problem with that is how to implement it. And to have a certain rate of growth every year regardless of market conditions, which are very, very important, as we all well know right now, and it just...I don't like the implication that sometimes people take that we can control everything that happens by regulation. The markets...the best regulated, the strongest <<inaudible>>, but they are the strongest, so somebody can't make any money doing development, he won't do it, regardless of whether the regulation allows them to. So, we have to consider those things. And I'm sorry I didn't offer a lot of solutions, but I'm not...I wanted to issue some warnings. Thank you.
10/15/2009	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Dave Coon, a neighbor at large, Teton County. First off, thanks to all of you for the hard work and time you've put into this, Staff, too, and everybody from the public that keeps showing up; it's really appreciated. I commend you on all your work on theme one. That is the most quality stuff. And don't lose sight of that as we go finishing managing growth and we talk about incentives because in the end more people is probably the biggest detriment to the wildlife and the open spaces that we have worked so hard to deal with in theme one. Quickly, as kind of hitting on what Pete talked about on TDRs, it's going to get down to how we are who is going to pay for that, so keep that in mind on nodes. I think that's a very tough subject. And nodes, just keep in mind when discussing nodes, how are we really going to deal with the infrastructure and the transportation that goes along with those. They'd have to be in place before the nodes can go, so just keep those in mind. Thanks again very much.
10/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you. Armond Acri representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. I'll be real brief in respect of you guys' time here for being here. On the subject of nodes, our opinion is that we've become too big if we need nodes. It means that we've failed to adequately manage the growth rate. The issue really is predictability, and if we start doing these nodes and expanding what the people had expected, we've lost our predictability. With respect to South Park, we've consistently said that any attempt to change density anywhere, regardless of South Park or anywhere else, needs to look at the overall impact in terms of traffic and things like that and not just on one particular road but in terms of the whole network. We've consistently asked that things be looked at that way and we still think that needs to be there before we even agree to add in more density to South Park, we need to make sure that there is a plan, a true plan to connect ?? whatever the impact would be for that additional growth. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Pilafian, Peter Interested Public	Peter ??, Wilson. Actually, I'm a proponent of slow growth. I'm glad to see it's taking effect with the actions of this Commission, which is going extremely slowly. It's a good thing in my view. I want to thank all of you for your patience in seeing this thing through. Let's see, a couple of things, I just have something, I think it's in the record, so I won't bother to read that. But one thing that occurred to me as a very early advocate of new urbanism. I, of course, have a little bit of a tough time of applying that exact phrase to Jackson Hole and I just realized maybe we should have started calling it new villages, because with the idea of mixed-use urban density, we are starting to make this thing look like a city. So, that's just something I think in general to...that got carried along in some of these early concepts. Or maybe it's going in kind of the wrong direction and that's one of them. But the Village <<inaudible>>. I'd also ask that another...be supportive of the idea of the Town and County. I think they're really separate and I'm personally one of those that does not particularly like to see <<inaudible>>. The situation is like joint houses of congress, you know, the senate and the house talk and then talking together afterwards. The ?? business, well, one thing, the SRA out there as developed has got so many people in it. I think there was a flaw in that commercial approval, which reduced the commercial and retail. I would sure like to see that brought back into balance with the number of people. If you want to call that new village a node—I don't think is the right word, I think it should be a town or whatever you want to call it—but it really needs to...I think you look at it in terms of a balanced amount of residents who are living there and the commercial services, local services that are going to supply that number of people in its estimation. So, I think the node idea is...I hope it goes away. I don't like to hear that word; it implies a huge amount of density. And I can only close by quoting the Mexican bandito in the <<inaudible>>. He says, nodes, we don't need those stinkin' nodes.
10/15/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom. Thanks again for all your comments. The idea of nodes again are really just tied to the pattern of growth issue and about the transfer of development rights and about unit-to-unit transfers. Yet, the danger of nodes and why I think at this point in this conversation we should just say no to all county nodes period. If you feel the TDR is not going to work, then the only thing that will occur is the simple up zoning of an area and some temporary down zoning in other areas. If you were to do that in the northwest corner, then you're going to disincentivize the ?? potential of the 1800 units in Town by having a new subdivision across the street. We certainly don't need nodes other than for the TDR. If you decide the TDR does not work, the nodal concept falls away. You have an operative as PRDs, which is to achieve a lot of the transfers that we want. As far as workforce housing, we're at 70 percent of the workforce living here right now ?? We have mitigation rates that have been put into place leaving residential at 25 percent. If we would only address the commercial mitigation rates as we go forward with development paying its own way for both infrastructure and workforce housing, we'll be fine. With a little bit of money when we come to that statute in the theme to fund some of the retirement issues will go into solving those problems plus the creativity in Town. South Park, if you read the letter that Bill Schwartz delivered on behalf of Robert Gill, the node that was identified now lies three quarters on Robert Gill's land. He seems to tell Ralph he has a very different interest. He wants to ??. Perhaps it will work in the County but more importantly to keep it open space and agriculture. That's being listened to by those well-to-do neighbors around there and the Land Trust as far as potential. He points out in the letter again <<inaudible>> an east/west connector is very problematic. Then you may not be able to consider that. Simply, do not go to these nodes where they're simple up zones not tied to the TDR, or it will be additive growth, absolutely. Last is the Task Force numbers, the Task Force, you address that tonight, Staff was asked to come up with numbers on the existing baseline housing and commercial and where that would take us in population job creation. A memo was sent out two days ago to invite everybody from the existing Task Force to participate but excluded the Alliance and invited Tim O'Donoghue from the ??. I'm fine with having Tim on that, but I don't know...I don't have a clue why the Alliance was excluded from the Task Force to generate those numbers. Those two, Paul Hansen, who would probably delegate Kristy Bruner, should be invited back on the Task Force, along with Hal Hutchinson, Armond Acri, Mike Whitcomb, and Scott Pearson, who were invited on this new one. So, I hope that's an oversight. I've asked Alex directly about why the Alliance was dropped, as they...me as a citizen in the Valley tend to believe whatever the Alliance produces, it has a higher level of credibility than sometimes what the Staff delivers, so I'd like to see them involved. Thank you.
10/15/2009	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for listening. This is going to be really brief because we've already submitted pretty extensive comments on where we stand on a lot of this. To begin with, as we've said before, this Plan should aim to provide solutions to growth-related problems, which includes answering the question of how much, not just the question of where. In regard to the task of nodes, we urge you to not oversimplify this. And I just wanted to state for the record that we cannot support the concept as it is presented in this Plan, as town-level density development without clear boundaries. This is inappropriate anywhere but the Town, as ?? from the way the concentrated growth was discussed in the '94 Plan. We know you guys had significant discussion on this and we really appreciate all of your efforts. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Wilson shall retain its existing base zoning(Superseded by Recommendation 147)
10/15/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity. I'm Franz Camenzind, a Jackson Hole resident. First of all, I'm going to say I'm probably going to leave the meeting early tonight and I don't want you to think there's any disrespect meant by that. I have some out-of-town friends I'd like to have dinner with later on, so I wanted to let you know. I want to cover a subject that maybe isn't on the agenda but keeps coming up and that's this crazed growth caps. And I think it's an extremely misleading phrase. In the context that we're working here, we're dealing with setting up a Plan and in fact putting sideboards around what we're going to do for the next ten or so years. That's all it is, is sideboards on the Plan that's going to be in place and then reviewed in about ten years. I think using the word, or the phrase, growth caps, is very inflammatory. I think it's very polarizing. I think it sets the wrong, you know, agenda and the impression here in the community. So, I wish we'd come up with something else. This is a planning sideboard; that's what we're dealing with. We all know it's going to be reviewed again in about ten years, plus or minus, and let that generation then, you know, make the next decision. So, I think what we need to do here is figure out what those sideboards are. In other words, how big that bag is so we know how much stuff we can put in it. And I think that's what we're dealing with here tonight. And to define those sideboards, I'll go back to what I said a month or two ago—nothing more than what is okayed in the '94 Plan, the legally defensible minimum numbers. And if we could find any way to even shrink those, I think we should. It's as simple as that. And that's still going to give us a great growth potential for the next ten years. And that's what we're talking about. We're not talking about a forever cap. Things that are forever are the things that you allow to happen for the developments that occur. Those are forever. They don't just break up. But when you say, no, or limits, those are temporary. They can always be reevaluated, readdressed. So, let's just put this in that concept. I think another one of the things that we have to do, not only to just stay with the '94 Plan, but I think we really have to get rid of those density bonuses, those incentives that we have out there, perhaps with one exception, and that would be when we can apply growth or development that will absolutely meet workforce housing needs. Very clear, very necessary items, not just growth for growth's sake. When you talk about growth rates, personally, I don't see the growth rate as a big issue, as I do think the markets will take care of that. I don't think we've ever had a growth rate here that's been a problem. I think the problem is not monitoring what's happening when growth occurs. And then not having the triggers that will instigate reaction. In other words, monitoring and find out what's going on. Are our public services holding up? Our infrastructure holding up? And at some point, if they aren't, is that trigger pulled so that it comes back to you all and the electeds to say, okay, timeout, folks, we need to readjust this? I think that's really as important as just saying some arbitrary number that you're going to have to place some name with. That's just my own personal impression on growth rates. It's what happens and how it's monitored and the triggers that are involved. The idea of nodes, you know, I don't really care what you call them. Wilson is there. Teton Village is there. South Park is there. Aspens is there. It's what we do with them, that's what matters. Whether it's called a node or not, I don't really care. And, again, I'll go right back to saying, it's the '94 Plan. Nothing more than the '94 Plan. There's a lot of growth potential and maybe too much growth potential in some of those things. The one place where I would like to have some discussion represented—Jorgensen brought it up this evening and I know it's been in the minutes that I pulled out, or the summaries from the last couple of meetings on this. The idea of taking South Park and considering it as a special zoning district. How would two special zoning districts, the north and the south, and looking at that for that reason and looking at finding ways to make that happen, but not let what happens there spill out into other areas. In other words, a special zoning district that has special advantages or restrictions. It might be one of those places where a density bonus is okay if the bonus is used to provide workforce housing only, not just more housing. Workforce housing only. Maybe there's some formula there, and I would love to have this community and I'd love to have the Planning Staff and you all have a really informed discussion on this. What would be that bonus? If we have a three-times density bonus just for the rural lands, should there be then a three-times or another three units that are workforce housing? And if they can't build the workforce housing, maybe we should have two parcels of ground that are buildable for workforce housing. Or three—I don't know what the right ratio is, but I think that's what this community should be discussing. I think that is the logical place where growth can occur and when that workforce housing is looked at, it should be applied to what is being developed in South Park, or it should be made available to appropriate other developments that may not want to put or be able to put that workforce housing on their property. It's a concept that I bring forth. I think it's worth discussing. I think we should have that open, and I think that's the only place that we should be putting density bonuses and looking at anything more than what the '94 Plan gives us. I guess I'll just leave it at that. Again, I do want to thank you all. This is taking an awful lot of your time. I think it's time to start making some of these hard decisions and it's time to start identifying the specific things that you want to talk about. And looking at, you know, what the '94 Plan gives us. I haven't had the chance to look at commercial property and how many units or, excuse me, how many employees that would generate, but it's a lot. It's probably more employees than the housing units that we have in the Plan right now. There's a total missing, and I think those numbers have to be worked out. And again, thank you for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	Thank you. Pete Jorgensen, state legislator. Commissioners and members, I appreciate the time you're putting in. I think you're probably doing a lot more than you expected to do when being asked to do essentially Planning Staff work here. As all of you know, this has all been looked over before and done before. So, I guess I would just like to make a comment based on the short period of time I sat in on meetings previously, and my experience here in the Valley of planning since 1960. We seem to do these things over and over and over and the issues are the same. It appears to me that the attitude of the public is pretty clear that, whether they're valid reasons or not, their attitude is pretty strongly towards controlled growth. How do you do that ?? If you make it complex, you'll probably never do it. If you depend on funding TDRs, I don't know where the money is coming from. There are only two sources that may...private folks contributing, such as the Housing Trust for the public money, the Housing Authority or some other organizations. And believe me, there's no more public money in this table. We've had eight good years on a thirty-year binge, so it's seriously ?? It impacts these towns and counties and impacts the social programs and in fact everything. Other things I've heard are will you get help from state legislature and legislation that deals with zoning and will it be appropriate to Teton County. This is not going to happen. If the Teton County Commissioners who have the zoning authority don't use it, no one else is going to help that happen in the state. If this County can't do it, no one can. There are a couple of things I'd like to say as background. No piece of property in this County whose value represents an inadequate concern to the owner didn't involve the market. I'm not saying an inflated market ??, but normal markets you can expect that in the next five to ten years. No piece of land will return a ?? for the owner unless they speculated within the last five years. But the rate that was going on previously is going to continue. We won't know no matter how many papers you read or what papers you read <<inaudible>>. The importance of planning I think is only underlined by any of you who may have seen the ?? film series on parks. National parks and public lands ?? our state <<inaudible>>. It's very different than the rest of the economy. And it almost is an obligation on us in this County to not degrade the value on these lands to what we do on private lands. The impacts of development on private land in this County do impact all of those other resources. And we all acknowledge that ?? TDRs, as I said, <<inaudible>>. As to the Plan and, excuse me, public comment, I was reassured to read in the paper today, <<inaudible>> the paper, that you're going to talk about nodes. And it seems to me that the only node that makes any sense at all is the north part of South Park, because that's adjacent to Town, should be contiguous to the Town. I believe that folks say Town is heart. I think that's important. This is not a big enough County to have competing Centrex, if you will, density and services. Every other node that's listed has adequate local services, as well as <<inaudible>>. As far as the north part of South Park, I think that will probably be a separate zone in the County Plan designated for future annexation to the Town of Jackson and with some conditions to be considered in annexation, such as street setbacks, highway setbacks, types of uses. I would expect only disagree with residential and public uses, such as schools or libraries, or ?? But you get into commercial, ?? I think the whole question of what happens with the density in planning by virtue of that would reside within the PRD presented to the Town. It depends on the Town, it depends on the Town. Counselors who may have heard from Planning Commissioner that if you folks could see your way clear to separate the County part off of this to the extent that that's off the table, I think a lot of the folks that are objecting <<inaudible>> will be taken care of. I heard at the recent meeting some comment that all this density that can't be accommodated because there's no bonus deal in the County will have to be held in the Town. It doesn't have to be done in the Town. Just as you can up zone, you can down zone. And just to draw a parallel, we're used to having raises every year, public employees ?? Colorado has now indexed their minimum wage to inflation ?? and they're lowering their ?? payments. So, the whole concept of I've got what I've got and it's going to keep increasing and getting bigger and bigger and bigger, it's not the ?? And we in this Valley should be extremely sensitive to and aware of that and realize what it takes in the long-term right now ?? Thank you very much. Thanks for the time that I know you're putting in. I hope you keep doing it. Thank you.
10/15/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	TDRs are viable option to include in the plan
10/15/2009	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	To begin with, as we have said before, this plan should aim to provide solutions to growth-related problems, which includes answering the question of how much, not just where. Regarding the concept of nodes, we urge you not to oversimplify. We cannot support the concept as it is presented in this plan--as town-level density development without clear boundaries. This is inappropriate anywhere but in Town, and is a clear departure from the way that concentrated growth was discussed in the 1994 Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	During your 10/15/09 meeting a comment was made that perhaps having a ‘node’ in Wilson was not a good idea because the START bus only comes to this person’s Wilson neighborhood twice an hour. According to her, this is not enough to ‘get people out of their cars’. Thus, according to her thinking, a ‘node’ in Wilson is not a good idea (and later in the meeting another Wilson resident voted the same). I utilize the START bus system in Jackson and I was almost sure most stops in town are twice an hour; Wilson at no exception to its Jackson counterparts. So, I called the START Bus offices and verified that, yes indeed, most all stops are scheduled for twice an hour (stops increase for all areas during the Holiday Season). Thus, if START bus stops are governing where to place a node (affordable housing areas) and where to not place a node (affordable housing areas), I see simply changing the START bus schedule as a valuable tool. I highly disagree in the thought that nodes (affordable housing areas) should be withdrawn from Wilson and the Aspens. Is this Comp Plan not called the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan? Wilson and the Aspens are just as much a part of Teton County as Jackson and Teton Village. The affordable/workforce housing issue must be shared by all communities in this valley. One of our county’s largest employers is in Teton Village - and arguably you could say Teton Village as a whole. To steer the Village’s employees to find affordable housing in Jackson is ridiculous when Wilson and the Aspens are so much closer. I suggest that all communities/neighborhoods in this valley share the need for areas for affordable housing. ‘Employees’ live all over this valley! Keep in mind the definition of ‘employees’ – just not food service, office & retail workers. Where are most of the residences in this valley located that require maids, housekeepers, greens keepers, grounds keepers (gardeners) and caretakers? It’s along the Westbank, Fall Creek Road and North of Town. Where are most of the construction trades (a huge section of our workforce!) driving to each day? Certainly not in the town of Jackson. Please, I don’t care what you call the areas provided for affordable housing (zone, node, or developments), just don’t treat Wilson and the Aspens as if they don’t need it or deserve it. As I said before – EMPLOYEES ARE EVERYWHERE IN THIS VALLEY! And face it, you know as much as I do that the majority of employees will always drive. Do you? Of course you do. Most of us do. I suggest a couple days a week you take a ride on a START Bus all the way around Jackson ... and actually see WHO uses the START Buses. Don’t plan on affordable housing areas only where the START Bus stops. I have yet to see a START Bus take carpenters and subcontractors to their jobsites, or stop at the Pines or Crescent H Ranch to drop off the ‘house help’. Gardeners, landscapers and groundskeepers will always drive their trucks to work (you can assume most not into Jackson proper). And how many people on any given weekday or on weekends do you think drive to Teton Village to ski or golf at the Pines or North of town? I hope I’ve proven my point We are doing something (playing, eating, working ...) everywhere in this valley, all the time! Every community (the Aspens, Wilson, Teton Village, Jackson, and even north of town!) should be in this thing (providing affordable housing areas) together. No community should be exempt from pitching in and providing its share to affordable housing areas or higher density housing or nodes or whatever you want to call it.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	WE NEED TO RESIST THE IDEA OF USING SOUTH PARK AS A NODE. WE NEED TO SAY NO TO NODES ALL TOGETHER AND PROVIDE HOMES IN THE ALREADY DEVELOPED AREAS THAT PRODUCE THE NEED FOR HOUSING WHICH WOULD BE IN TOWN AND THE VILLAGE. USING SOUTH PARK AS A RECEIVING AREA FOR PHANTOM DENSITY FROM ALTA, BUFFALO AND OTHER OUTLYING AREAS IS UNFAIR TO THE RESIDENTS OF WEST JACKSON AND ESPECIALLY AROUND HIGH SCHOOL ROAD. WE GET NOTHING IN RETURN EXCEPT MORE GROWTH AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS. THIS DOES NOT SOLVE THE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS! IT WILL ONLY MAKE THEM WORSE! ANY NEW RESIDENTS FROM A DENSE NODE IN NORTHERN SOUTH PARK ON HIGH SCHOOL ROAD WILL STILL NEED TO TRAVEL TO GET TO THEIR JOBS IN TOWN AND THE VILLAGE. THIS WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THE PROBLEMS ON HIGH SCHOOL ROAD AND AT THE Y INTERSECTION. HOUSING SHOULD BE PLACED WHERE THE JOBS ARE GENERATED! WE CAN NOT CREATE MORE BEDROOM COMMUNITIES AND OPEN UP SOUTH PARK TO DEVELOPERS. WE NEED TO ADDRESS THE GROWTH PROBLEM DRIVEN BY COMMERCIAL AND UNNEEDED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESIST LOOP HOLE INFESTED DENSITY BONUS TOOLS. KEEP THE PRESENT DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS BASE NUMBER OR EVEN LOWER THEM AND SOUTH PARK MUST BE TAKEN OUT OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHELL GAME OR THE HUMAN WANTS FRENZY WILL NEVER END! WE NEED TO TAKE CARE OF THE RESIDENTS WE HAVE; NOT THE UNFORESEEN TRANSIENT RESIDENTS CREATED BY COMMERCIAL AND UNNEEDED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. PLEASE LET US BE HEARD AND RESPECTED. TO SAY WE HAVE IT WRONG IS PUTTING YOUR HEAD IN THE SAND. THERE WILL BE NO CHANCE OF SAVING SOUTH PARK AND ULTIMATELY THE VALLEY IF YOU DON'T TAKE BIG AND SWEEPING ACTION NOW. BABY STEPS WON'T DO. THIS IS NOT ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD AGAINST NEIGHBORHOOD. IT IS ABOUT WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES COMPETING WITH UNCAPPED AND EXCESSIVE GROWTH. WE NEED TO THINK HUMAN NEEDS VS. HUMAN WANTS AND NOT NAIVELY LUMP THE TWO TOGETHER UNDER HUMAN NEEDS. HUMAN WANTS HAS NO ROOM FOR WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES. HUMAN NEEDS INCLUDES PROTECTION OF ALL WILDLIFE, OPEN SPACES AND FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS NOT JUST FOR A SELECTED AND LUCKY FEW. THIS IN TURN CREATES A MODEL SCENIC AND HEALTHY GATEWAY COMMUNITY THAT WE ALL CAN BE PROUD OF, FAR INTO OUR CHILDREN'S AND THEIR CHILDREN'S FUTURE!

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	My name is Barbara ?? <<inaudible>> It is a reminder of the letter that was sent to you approximately a month ago from a lawyer of the northwest corner, a landowner in South Park. And I was hoping that you would take a look at that again and really study it and see what it has to say. It's important. I don't like to speak in public and I'm glad that Franz said a lot of what I was already going to say, so you can just say that Barbara ?? That will save us some time. But I'd like to be more specific of what I want to say. And that is the node that you call the northwest corner of South Park. I know a lot about it. I've lived on High School Road since 1991, and I say on because I live at the corner of High School Road and Ranch View Drive. And I've seen what development in all of South Park have done to this road, in particular High School Road. In 1999 or 2000, the Town decided that we needed a ?? in order to deal with the situation that was happening at High School Road. Jim ??, who <<inaudible>> steering committee for the annexation of South Park attended. I was one of those eight members. At that time Jim ?? of ?? Associates had deemed that High School Road had already met its match, so to speak. But yet South Park development has increased and will increase, obviously, with the node at the northwest corner of South Park. High School Road can't take anymore development. We already know that the Travel Trails Road is going to be the buffer. Eventually, it will happen regardless if anything gets developed in this northwest corner. The traffic on Travel Trails Road will eventually find its way to High School Road. Will eventually find its way, unfortunately, to someone walking on that road can be hit. I, unfortunately, have had the opportunity to repair my fence, which borders High School Road, a number of times because of traffic, traffic sliding off the road and hitting my fence and going through it, and I can only be happy to say that my daughter was not building a snowman on the other side of that fence, or my neighbor's boys. It could have gone through their fence. And this is going to happen again. The ?? are going to increase when the northwest corner of South Park is eventually developed. I know everybody says, but that's the most common-sense place to put development. And just because it's a horizontal surface, doesn't mean that you need to put everything you can on it. Please, when you talk about the northwest corner of South Park, please consider what it's going to do to High School Road. You have multiple owners in South Park. Some want to develop; others do not. You have a connectivity issue with this. There's a strong possibility that you're going to be having high density in the northwest corner of South Park and there's not going to be any way to develop an east/west connector or connector road meeting Highway 89 to South Park Road. Then what? We'd like to see this all in writing before you say how many people and how many units you can put in this corner. Let's not think about how many people. Let's not even think about how many houses. Let's think about how many vehicles this development will entail. All I can say is at this point South Park cannot handle any more development. It's not the way it's set up now. It's not the way that the owners want to do with their...the letter states that one of the owners wants to continue ranching. Unfortunately, this owner is in the middle of South Park. But that's where all the people want to put high density and the development. All I can say is, please, think about High School Road and the students that are on it and the people that live on it. You're going to be affecting all of their lives by what you decide about that corner. Thank you.
10/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Good evening everybody. My name is Kathy Tompkins. I live at Cottonwood Park. And again I'd like to express my gratitude for all the hard work you guys are doing and keep up the good work. We need to revisit the idea of using South Park as a node. We need to say no to nodes altogether and provide homes in the already-developed areas that produce the need for housing which would be in Town and the Village. Using South Park as a receiving area for phantom density from Alta, Buffalo and other outlying areas is unfair to the residents of West Jackson and especially around High School Road. We get nothing in return except more growth and traffic problems. This does not solve the traffic problems; it only makes them worse. Any new residents from the dense node north of South Park on High School Road will still need to travel to get to their jobs in Town and at the Village. This will only exacerbate the problems on High School Road and at the Y intersection. Housing should be placed where the jobs are generated. We cannot create more and better communities and open up South Park to developers. We need to address the growth problem driven by commercial and unneeded residential development and resist loopholes such as density bonus tools. Keep the present development rights base number or even lower them. And South Park must be taken out of the development ?? or the human-wants frenzy will never end. We need to take care of the residents we have, not the unforeseen transient residents created by commercial and unneeded residential development. Please let us be heard and respected. To say we have it wrong is wrong. There will be no chance of saving South Park and ultimately the Valley if you don't take big and sweeping action now. Baby steps won't do. This is not about neighborhood against neighborhood. It is about wildlife and open spaces competing with uncapped and excessive growth. We need to think human needs versus human wants and not naively or smartly lump the two together on meeting human needs. Human wants has no room for wildlife and open spaces. Human needs includes protection of all wildlife, open spaces and family neighborhoods, not just a selected and lucky few. This in turn creates a model scenic and healthy gateway community that we can all be proud of far into our children's and their children's future. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	My name is Barry ??, and I hope I'm not too far behind the curve, but I've been gone for a month on grandparent duty. So, I will pick up maybe too far behind. But first, I'd like to thank you all for redirecting this process and getting us back more in line with what I think is a reasonable outlook for the community. I do not, however, with respect to the '94 Plan, I would ask you to look at the amount of commercial that would be permitted within that '94 Plan. In my view, that still is too high. I've been told by planners that it would be something <<inaudible>> square feet of additional commercial space. If one were to use a factor of one employee per 400 square feet, which is actually pretty high if we're moving more toward office space as seems to be occurring, which would be in the 150 to 200 square feet per employee. But using the 400 to be generous, it would say that we...if we built another 1200 or, I mean, two square feet of commercial, we would have approximately 3000 more employees in this County that might, considering double up between employees, that might mean 2000 new homes just for employees. If you put a ratio of three to three and a half people per dwelling unit, that would put us to about 6000 to 7000 more people in the County, just employees. That's almost a doubling of the population of the Town of Jackson at this point in time. So, in my judgment the commercial allowance under the '94 Plan really needs to be reconsidered. With respect to South Park, which is a special interest of mine, the community has spent a lot of its money, the Land Trust has spent a lot of its time to protect the view corridor along Highway 22. It's very appropriate. It seems to me that Highway 89 is just as, if not more, important as an entry to Jackson Hole than Highway 22. So, the view corridor along 89 I think is of utmost importance. And, therefore, I don't think that the growth in employee housing or any other type of housing should be figured all to be in South Park. I think first of all I have no idea what Robert Gill's views are with respect to his future. When I heard that he wants to continue ranching, I would be most happy. But in my judgment the placement of the High School where it is on the south side of High School Road has, excuse me, but already ruined the northern end of South Park. So, it seems to me that development as deep as the high school property is to the south on either side of the High School would not be a tremendous detriment. And if you talk about nodes, that is the South Park node there already. With respect to the balance of the unplatted land in South Park, which is if that great geographic computer system we have is accurate with this, and I know how to use the area calculations, there remains about 1500 acres that is unplatted. In my mind, that area would be a good area to use bonus densities for open space. I think it would be important to keep open space along 89. I think it would be important to keep open space along South Park Loop. And making some calculations, it seems to me that if we were to allow six to one in the remaining areas, with 70 or 80 percent open space, and if there were more density allowed in the depth of the high school property, that the owners, if they wished to develop, could gain what under current procedures they would be allowed, which is nine to one, and therefore they would not have a loss of economic value. So, there are the two points that I would like. I think South Park, I think it's got to develop in some respect but the amount and how I think is the key question. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/13/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	As Theme Two approaches its final analysis, it has become quite clear that we as a community have the answers right here in front of us. For far too long we have made, and are continuing to make, this Comp Plan process far too complicated. Community opinion has been surveyed, studied, calculated and recalculated. The answer is always the same; limited growth and wildlife protection are our priorities. At no time have we expressed interest in increased footprints or density build out. I keep asking the question who is driving this build out? Who will actually benefit from more congestion in the Valley? The quick answer might be developers, retailers and large land owners ready to sell family holdings, but 20 years from now what will our town look like? We will be Anytown, USA. We will be left without the precious qualities that bring thousands of tourists and pleasure seekers to our beautiful town. To date, the town planners and elected officials have done an incredible job with solid solutions for supply and demand of services, schools, utilities, and medical care. There will always be a continuum for revising and upgrading infrastructure, but to continue to expand a small town and deplete its natural beauty makes no sense. This brings up the Comp Plan buzz word, "node". By labeling Comp Plan's expanded development ideas as nodes, it will not make us "swallow the pill" easier. Nodes constitute a sterile pattern of development which produces anti-community behaviors. Nodes establish segmentation of a community by their design, forcing the surroundings to be self contained, thereby limiting social interaction. Nodes do not encourage public transportation or shared services. Nodes are a big town design strategy, not a small family oriented community vision. Furthermore, current proposed nodes are aggressive in some areas, non existent in others, establishing an unfair burden of commercial services, traffic, and density in these targeted nodes. Just because there is available land to build does not make it a responsible decision. The few "blank slates" we have left in this Valley need to be held in the highest of regard for quality design, not quantity. Any limited growth patterns should be shared equally and dispersed among the communities of Jackson so as not to alter established scenic value. The idea of trading densities, phantoms, or easements for wildlife in order to surpass established buildout numbers is unacceptable. The only "node" which should be considered for further development would be our Town of Jackson, to include accessible public transportation. This effort will bring us together as a community for enhanced work opportunities, shopping and entertainment. The outcomes would build life long opportunities for a continued small town atmosphere of cooperation and support, while exciting the tourist market. Our town could incorporate pedestrian friendly shopping and restaurants in cohort with business settings. Upgrading public transportation could bring both public and visitors alike to all parts of the Valley. We could build a lifestyle for other communities to admire much beyond LED light bulbs and sidewalk upgrades. Now this is a pill that is easy to swallow.

Date	Name	Comment
10/13/2009	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	Let me first congratulate you all on the cooperative and scrupulous way in which you are addressing issues in the current draft Comprehensive Plan as well as the extensive public input you have received on same. Your efforts will result in Jackson Hole remaining the unique place that it has always been. The community has spoken very clearly of its desire to limit future growth and to effect policies that protect wildlife and open space. The question is how to implement these two preeminent values. In general there seems to be a consensus that future development be limited to that allowed under the 1994 Plan, but even here the issue of accessory residential units (ARUs) may cause actual buildout numbers to be modified. Zoning and land use planning tools ought also to be specified so that unintended consequences do not stem from approved policies. The issues of density bonuses, transfer of development rights and the concept of "nodes" are particularly critical to assure that policy is not frustrated by planning tools. One cannot deny that Jackson, like virtually every municipality, contains a plethora of special interests, each of which construes what is allowable in terms most closely aligned with their own interests. Your job is to approve a Plan that conforms most closely with the majority opinions expressed to you. I would recommend that the concept of "nodes" be stricken from the Plan since the three areas specified (Aspens, Wilson, South Park) should not be singled out for high density housing. Each area wishes to have development transferred to another node and does not wish to accept densities from unaffected areas. Similarly, density bonuses which "promote community goals" are dangerous in that they are vague and subject to abuse.. The only clear mandate emerging from throughout the county is: limit growth, preserve open space and foster habitat connectivity. Policy needs to conform to these values above all. The community is opposed to the nodal concept and the upzoning recommended by Planning staff. Some will say that limiting growth will not work. Yet this is the only way to protect the Jackson Hole that the community wishes to preserve. The task force of local residents which has proposed new buildout numbers can be seen as representative of the community and provide Commissioners with a balanced view that both protects future growth while accomodating the values Jackson residents hold dear. I think it may be fortuitous that Commissioners are making these critical decisions in the middle of a recession. Recessions force individuals to make decisions by focusing on the difference between needs and wishes. Growth is not inherently good or bad, but it can only proceed if infrastructure and social systems are in place. As economies contract, allowable growth should be reduced; as they expand growth should expand if it sustainable. So too the concept of nodes can be useful if they address shifting growth patterns rather than specifying mandated areas of new growth.. When they are used to impose growth on certain areas, at the expense of open space and habitat preservation they will encounter strong opposition. The Plan should not impose 'workforce housing' on any area. Jackson currently undermitigates the commercial workforce housing impacts and thereby adds to the jobs/housing imbalance. The Plan cannot be designed to mitigate needs that are exponentially growing without trampling on the majority views concerning wildlife and open space. This problem must be addressed outside of the Comprehensive Plan--and soon. In conclusion, I applaud the Commissioners' efforts to put in place guidelines that honor community ideals and tools that assure their preeminence. A balanced and flexible Plan that treats each area of Jackson Hole equitably and promotes sensible compromises on the basis of future realities will be your real legacy to the Jackson Hole community. Thank you for your kind consideration of the above thoughts.

Date	Name	Comment
10/12/2009	Pilafian, Peter Interested Public	To the Teton County Commissioners and the Joint Planning Commissioners: As an early advocate and proponent of Traditional Neighborhood development and the New Urbanism, I have seen the erosion and pre-emption of those values in the hands of profit-motivated developers across the country. Instead of looking at the ways in which small towns, villages, and communities have grown organically to nurture a pedestrian-friendly, neighborly, sustainable way of life, developers in America have turned front porches into a sales gimmick, exploited density as a way to increase profits, and insisted on a fast turnover so they can move on to the next county, or the next state. As elected and appointed officials, I suggest that it is your duty and your right to take the long-term view, and to look out for the interests of the people who elected you. Time and again we have spoken out loud and clear in favor of the quieter, traditional values. Wildlife, a sense of community and family, and sustainable long-term neighborhood stability – these are fundamental to the Big View of life in our valley. Giant holes in the ground, unaffordable, un-rentable office space, more and more transient population – this is what comes along with the kind of high-density, commercially-based growth pattern that is being proposed under the guise of a New Comprehensive Plan. To be blunt about it, profit-motivated density increases fly in the face of community values and neighborhood stability. The very word “node” connotes an extreme degree of density. By targeting certain areas around the county as “nodes”, you are virtually guaranteeing that they will get built up much more quickly and at a much greater density than if you just leave it alone and allow basic neighborhood services to fill in under the existing limitations. High Density encourages increased population. No two ways about it. It is not a solution! It exacerbates the problem it attempts to solve. JUST SAY ‘NO’ TO ALL NODES, and please try to think about future community and wildlife values, not profit-motivated short-term commercial exploitation, as you work through the complexities (and the long hours) of creating a New Vision for our future. And on a personal note, we here in Wilson are horrified by what will happen if you continue to designate Wilson as a Node. Please remove that word from the draft.

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	I understand that Nodes and density bonuses within them are going to be discussed at tonight's meeting. I am glad that they are finally on the agenda as these concepts are at the heart of what is wrong with this plan revision as written. Nodal development patterns may work in larger areas such as the suburbs of Salt Lake. Nodes are probably discussed in the textbooks planning staff may have studied recently in school. Jackson Hole is a special place and planning tools from Anytown USA simply do not apply to our special valley unless that is what we wish to become. First what is a node? What are the nodes meant to accomplish? My understanding is that a node is an area that has sufficient services in a pedestrian friendly environment so that people may work and live in an area. I would assume that the main goal of nodal development would be to reduce traffic. There are only three areas that remain as "nodes" that are targeted for high density housing which are the Aspens, Wilson, and the northern portion S. Park. The first two areas simply do not fit any reasonable definition of a "node". With Highway 22 bisecting the town of Wilson will it ever be pedestrian friendly? Anyone who lives in Wilson knows that the answer is no. No one coming from Idaho obeys the posted speed limit. Maybe a traffic light would solve the problems? Do you want to be sitting in a line of traffic when a tractor trailer is speeding off Teton Pass? Every year there are multiple runaway trucks. Adding more pedestrians and traffic at the base of Teton Pass is not only bad planning but it would be irresponsible. It is a serious public safety issue that must be taken into consideration. Neither area has or ever will have a sufficient commercial core to reduce traffic trips to town enough to justify any additional density. If you were to allow density bonuses in these two areas you would be putting dense islands of housing in areas that by necessity people would be taking their vehicles to town to Albertsons, Smiths, work, kid's school, soccer practice etc. People may occasionally pick up a gallon of milk at Hungry Jack instead of making the trip to town but the vast majority will not be working in Wilson. In the real world people simply do not ride public transportation. The current ridership in Teton County is 1.96%. If you put thousands of more people on these islands and even assume that ridership increases by 500% (not going to happen) you would be putting substantially more cars on the already strained roads of Highway 22 and 390. It is time we start planning for the real world that we live in; not some utopia that will never exist. Increasing traffic not only would impact our wildlife in the short term but in the long term the nodes would increase the pressure to expand Highway 22 and 390 to 4 to 5 lanes which would kill even more of our wildlife in the long term. The nodes will not only have disastrous impacts upon our wildlife but will impact our quality of life. The people of Wilson have dealt with this issue for over seven years through the mixed use village planning process and I am shocked that this nodal concept is even up for discussion. In the Fall of 2007 the planning staff offered the people of Wilson the choice of a Density neutral Option "A" sub area plan that would allow for Wilson to grow to roughly twice the size within the development rights of the current zoning. They also offered option "B" which was proposing an additional 98 units in Wilson. The people of Wilson "overwhelmingly chose option "A". They chose option "A" for sound reasons. Wilson and the Westbank already had accepted the majority of up-zones since the 94 plan. The additional housing proposed in option "B" would negatively impact the character and quality of life in Wilson. Traffic, noise pollution, light pollution, and degradation of critical wetlands/ wildlife properties such as the Waldron Property were all valid reasons to allow Wilson to only grow to twice the current size. Staff said that option "A" was Wilson's preferred subarea plan with the caveat that it 2 could change during the Comprehensive Plan Revision Process. Change it did as they are proposing up to 500 additional homes making Wilson 4 times the current size. I attended nearly comprehensive plan meeting. I read the data provided by the surveys etc. There was little support for the nodal concept and zero support from the citizens of Teton County for the type of up-zones the planners are proposing. Just as the planning staff had done throughout the Wilson Mixed Use Village Planning process they failed to listen to the feedback provided. If they were not listening to the people who have they been listening to? They have been listening to a handful of special interests including commercial interests, affordable housing advocates, certain elected officials, and large land owners. While the above interests are part of the fabric of Teton County they do not represent the

Date**Name****Comment**

will of the majority of the people. I do not envy the position that this has put the town and county planners. You have to reconcile the irreconcilable. You are not getting the feedback you once were because people have been worn down by this lengthy process. The public comment you received in May is just as valid as the comment you are receiving today. If this plan moves forward to the County Commissioners with the nodal concept/density bonuses for the Aspens and Wilson areas the people of this county will see this process as the illegitimate farce it has been thus far. You have the power to make recommendations for responsible growth that reflect the people's will and are good for our quality of life into the future. I applaud the concept of a growth cap and I think that you are on the right track. My opinion is that the only reasonable areas for "receiving areas" are the north of South Park near the High School and the town of Jackson. The reasons are simple. The majority of the schools are in walking distance. Smith's and Albertson's are readily available. The highway is already four lanes. You have a blank slate to create the pedestrian friendly environment that is critical to a "node". The vast majority of jobs are available in the town. The numbers that the planners are proposing for either area are not justified and should be lowered. There should be language assuring South Park and Teton County that there will be no up-zones allowed outside of these two areas in the future. Thank you for all you hard work and taking the time to read my letter.

10/8/2009 ,

Joint Planning Commiss

Under "Indicators" heading in all Themes: change "will use" to "should consider using"

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Previous straw votes – Theme 1: Recommendation #105 - Adding an Open Space Funding Goal – This passed the County 3-1 and failed the Town 2-3 on September 10. Both Jessica Rutzick and Forrest McCarthy expressed their lack of support unless public money was spent for open space that ALSO allowed for PUBLIC ACCESS. As an alternate then please consider a separate vote on this point with PUBLIC ACCESS added. Also allow the partially supported recommendation #105 to still move forward as a ‘footnote’. • Specifically add a policy under 1.1, 1.5 or 1.6 that is consistent to other language from this draft plan used in the transportation and housing themes: - o Policy: establish a permanent funding source for open space acquisition THAT ALLOWS FOR PUBLIC ACCESS. - o Strategy: Dedicate a seventh cent sales tax, additional mil property tax, or other funding source to the acquisition of permanent open space THAT ALLOWS FOR PUBLIC ACCESS. • May 14, 2009 - The Jackson Hole Land Trust recommended: “Creation of a permanent funding mechanism, such as proposed for affordable housing and transportation (both important but neither at the top of the list of goals for either the Plan or the community for the purchase of conservation easements...” • Taxing ourselves first for the acquisition of Open Space will leverage the enormous philanthropic potential that exists in this valley. See the JH Land Trust’s 1989 Hardeman Barns/Meadows story following. • In the end - any and all funding strategies will take a public vote by the electorate to implement. Let the public decide to tax themselves to achieve broad community goals. • Public polling overwhelmingly supported this policy as well as recommendation #105. • This is not an unfunded mandate as there should be no administrative costs. The Teton County Scenic Trust Preserve (TCSTP) already exists with the County Commissioners as its board and a portion of planner Maggie Shilling’s time allocated to this area. In addition the Jackson Hole Land trust will likely offer assistance on the crafting of easements and has been willing to accept easements from the TCSTP in the past (see the last page of the following Land Trust article) in order to provide privately funded stewardship oversight, in perpetuity, to protected lands. • Please see the following article I shared last night on the history of similar public private partnerships in 1989 with the Hardeman Barns/Meadows with the County and also again in 2003 with the Town of Jackson on Karnes Meadow. Recommendation #71 – “Leave Policy 1.1.c as is” (Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces) Recommend improving Policy 1.1.c: to add “connectivity between Natural Resource Overlay areas” so it recognizes your Recommendation #54 (“Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resource Overlay”) • . Specifically suggest rewriting/adding: - o “Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay.” • STAG recommended: “The group agreed that connectivity of open space is important. Further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated into this theme.”

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 1.2 third bullet: add "floodplains" to focus
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Incorporate statement, "Recognize that any and all growth in the valley impacts both wildlife and natural resources." into Theme 1 where appropriate
10/8/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I had major problems with last week's meeting. First of all, I implore us all that we must do better. We, I included we, I didn't say you. We're not playing tiddly winks here. We're planning our very future. Some, most or all of us, chose this place to make our stand. We owe it to ourselves and the future generations to give it our best shot, and last week was not a good example of that in my opinion. I feel it was so bad, if we held some of the same votes right now, some of them different hands would go up. That's how disjointed and disorganized last week's meeting was. I also had a problem with what I'll mention that's already been covered and that's when you get up and leave and essentially abandon a quorum. I would suggest if you're going to leave, I understand why it happens, believe me, but if it's going to happen, at least inform the Chairman so that we know a quorum may be lost and Ms. daCosta covered that one, so I won't chime in further. We have a major problem that's been developing and nearly came to a head last week and that's Staff's relative comfort at chiming in whenever they want. I understood the procedure, and Mr. Pruett evidently went and signed off on an alternative procedure, that Staff would speak when spoken to and then only to explain and not to defend. To their credit, I would think they crossed the line last week. I think they came really, really close a couple of times, picking up the microphone, and it actually guided some of your discussion internally and some of the votes up there. But that's my feeling; if no one else feels that way, then so be it. Also, some of the votes I feel were voted on in haste based on Staff interpretation ?? . And, you know, we had too much impetus to finish that checklist instead of having meaningful discussions on each and every point. A couple of other items which I feel tie in. There seems to be some question, and I've spoken to some of you in the interim, on when to rewrite. Are we going to rewrite this thing by chapter as recommendations become finalized, such as theme one, or are we waiting till the end? That's a major question. That literally is the question. I don't know the answer to that. So, maybe someone could answer that question later on. Also, when we come...we really needed it in theme one, and we definitely need it in theme two, and that's traffic analysis, traffic impact analysis, etc. At the GYM meeting on Monday, they explained that it's going to cost \$4800 to bring the traffic consultant here for one day. I wish you would discuss this internally and recommend that maybe they teleconference or either you mail him questions to answer and then anything that's unclear at that stage, we can teleconference to save the community some money. Because we have to talk about it again for the electeds also. I'd like to just, you know, suggest to you that you send a recommendation to the electeds, especially the Town level, there's been some quite good movement that most of us can agree upon, and that's the real-estate-transfer tax. I have no problem with allocating that fund to lobby for that not to be constitutionally prohibited, so keep that open and that ability for us to decide amongst ourselves whether we want to tax ourselves. So, that can be an actual something that most people in the room can agree upon anyway. And lastly I don't know how long...this has been the tenth straight meeting that I don't think anything we do here is going to be very successful as a public funding source. You know, at the Town level, selling or suggesting the selling of ?? T-shirts, I don't have a problem with that either, you know, so whatever creative mechanism is available. But I really don't feel the TDR program, which they're going to present tonight, in other areas has been effective without an ID funding source. Thank you very much.
10/8/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I'm Cindy Stone, south of Town. And I've only been to the last meetings. Life has just been hitting me hard lately. But I have teenagers coming and asking a questions that I couldn't answer. So, now <<inaudible>>. And the first one is who's running this show? <<inaudible>> Because I heard that last week ??, so you might think about that. Then the second one that I couldn't answer was I had to get on my computer and I'm not good at that, but as all of you voted ??, there should be density bonuses for community values. What in the hell is that? I mean, for Joe citizen, goes on the computer to see how you guys are coming along, and we get, there should be density bonus for community values. I couldn't answer it. Here's another one. This one is directed towards the Town. Density bonuses should be discretionary incentives. I mean, are we wasting our time here? Why are we even doing this? We all have better things to do <<inaudible>>.

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	Springet, Jeff Interested Public	Yeah, Jeff Springer. And I'm just back again from the meeting before last, and I really want to...would like to discuss the importance of adding an air-quality-monitoring system, especially for elevated ?? ozone to the development regulations. There's been some monitoring done in Jackson ?? in the past, but I talked with the Environmental Health Department and no one has ever tested ozone layers in the County at all. And just to go over for the last time, elevated ?? ozone is an expected occurrence. Strong temperatures, ?? winds, altitudes, snow-covered blanket and sunlight facilitate a photochemical reaction in terms of pollutions from the combustions, fuel combustion, cars, trucks, buses, heavy equipment, jets landing at the airport, to the ozone. Last year, a person by the name of Perry Walker, he's a retired Air Force and probably the most knowledgeable person over in Pinedale on elevated ozone. I had a reading in Wilson of over a hundred. A reading of a hundred over in Pinedale <<inaudible>>. So, ozone is one of the few air pollutants that the Federal Clean Air Act sets specific thresholds for, specifically because it's so toxic. And it was a totally unexpected occurrence in Pinedale, and we have no idea what ozone levels are here in Jackson. It seems to me the air quality monitoring is a major piece that hasn't really been tested out. And it could at some point bring the whole build-out question, it could be irrelevant, because once you...it's basically against the law when it gets to these levels. And the state government will step in and can regulate for you, and if the state doesn't monitor it, it doesn't work, the communication doesn't work, the federal government comes in. So, it's very important that we ourselves take care of this problem. Thank you.
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 1.1: Define the Environmental Commission's role to make land use and transportation recommendations
10/8/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hi, Gail Jensen. First of all, I want to thank everybody on the Planning Commission for all their efforts. We're all trying to move this process forward. But the public input is extremely important and it is supposed to be the community's Plan, so public comment is real important here. So, thank you for keeping it at the beginning of the meeting. I think it's real important that you consider our comments while you're considering the Plan and the specific ones that day. I also want to thank you for putting the wildlife as the first priority, because it is the community's desire. I was very disappointed in last week's meeting. The public comment was nonexistent in the Commissioners' discussions. Instead of asking what the community had said over the last six months, Commissioners followed the script produced by Staff and questions that were directed at Staff for their input. For the result of the straw poll votes, much of the 1994 Plan was re-emerged and in density bonuses and incentives both performance and discretionary based. The total build-out number or growth cap is no longer the high priority the community has demanded. Call it management growth, limiting growth, whatever you label it, the numbers of humans matter with all of our needs, wants and impacts. The community has said, let's keep the numbers at the base 1994 entitlements end state. We need to work towards a better Plan, the community's Plan. Thank you.
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: Air quality

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	Chong, Geneva Interested Public	Please forward to planning commissioners as a comment from me regarding the importance of noise pollution and current legal procedures with the National Park Service and US Fish & Wildlife Service National Wildlife Refuge System. Grand Teton National Park has participated (may still be ongoing?) in noise research, but I am not sure if the results are out yet. Note, many communities regulate trucks, for example (e.g., jake brakes), and how late people can make noise, so there are many precedents for regulating noise. Also many studies on negative health effects of noise (e.g., in Swiss (?) valley communities where traffic noise reverbrates off mountainsides as reported in National Geographic). Thank you for your consideration, Geneva PARKS: Solitude becomes exhibit A in battle over NPS management (Thursday, October 8, 2009) Scott Streater, special to E&E Great Sand Dunes National Park Superintendent Art Hutchinson was walking in the remote south-central Colorado preserve last year when he was startled by the ringing of bells from a Catholic monastery 8 miles away. "If I'm hearing these bells," he recalled this week, "they can hear what sounds are out here," in the park, home to North America's highest dune, formed by ancient lake sediments piled high by winds from the nearby Sangre de Cristo Mountains. Then he thought about an energy company's pending proposal to drill two oil and gas exploratory wells in the adjacent Baca National Wildlife Refuge, 2 miles from Great Sand Dunes' western border, and another realization sunk in. What was later confirmed by NPS's Natural Sounds Program Office to be the quietest national park in the United States could become an echo chamber for the state's burgeoning energy industry, Hutchinson feared. Now Great Sand Dunes is at the center of a lawsuit and growing national debate about the effects of sound pollution in national parks and wildlife refuges like Baca. Two environmental groups are suing the Fish and Wildlife Service to block the issuance of permits to Toronto-based Lexam Explorations Inc. that would allow for the drilling of two 14,000-foot-deep wells on the Baca refuge. Their argument hinges in part on sound monitoring data collected by the National Park Service in Great Sand Dunes, which they maintain would be ruined by the pounding hydraulics and thundering machinery of oil and gas wells. 2 A federal judge in Denver last month handed a partial victory to the environmentalists by issuing an injunction against any drilling at Baca until the lawsuit is resolved. U.S. District Judge Walker Miller concluded that plaintiffs "presented adequate evidence that the drilling of these wells is likely to cause irreparable injury" not only to wildlife but also to the refuge's "significant 'sense of place' and quiet." If Miller's view becomes law, it could have far-reaching effects, park advocates say, by forcing federal agencies nationwide to more seriously evaluate the "natural soundscapes" of the lands they manage when permitting nonconforming projects, including roadbuilding, logging, energy development or other activities. "Noise pollution, like light pollution, is becoming an increasingly big problem at our

parks," said Bryan Faehner, associate director for park uses at the National Parks Conservation Association. "The uniqueness of a national park and the special experience you can have at a park is less special if you can't see the stars or if you can't listen to the amazing songs of migratory birds."

Faehner pointed to a recent string of court decisions endorsing the notion of natural soundscape preservation at national parks, including U.S. District Court Judge Emmet Sullivan's landmark 2008 ruling that the managers of Yellowstone National Park must account for snowmobile noise in the park's winter use plan. Among other things, Sullivan wrote that stewardship of park resources "apply equally to the conservation of the parks' natural soundscapes."

And while the 1916 legislation creating the Park Service orders the agency to preserve "natural soundscapes" along with the scenic vistas and wildlife at each park property, only a handful of the 391 park units nationwide address sound issues in their general management plans. And none have formalized parkwide sound management plans, despite a 2000 NPS director's order that called on park managers to develop plans "to preserve and/or restore the natural resources of the parks, including the natural soundscapes associated with units of the national park system."

So far, two park units -- Zion National Park in Utah and Minute Man National Historical Park in Massachusetts -- are writing noise action plans that will be incorporated into park management rules, said Frank Turina, a planner with the agency's Natural Sounds Program.

The value of sound, or no sound

The Baca wildlife refuge drilling controversy further highlights the Park Service and Interior Department's ongoing struggle to balance conflicting land uses and competing public interests on federal lands. And for critics of government regulation, it raises the thorny proposition that even activities not directly occurring on a park property may somehow be subject to government restrictions.

image removed

Sound monitoring done by the National Park Service has found that Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve in Colorado is the nation's quietest park. Photo courtesy of NPS.

3

Stefan Spears, vice president of strategic development for Lexam, said the company went to extra lengths to address noise concerns, which included an agreement to use quieter diesel-powered rigs and fit "muffling equipment" on all engines used in the field.

"We were disappointed," Spears said of Miller's injunction. "We're going to try and keep things on track and see if it can ever reach a logical conclusion."

The Park Service, too, has been trying to reach a logical conclusion about noise in parks since 2000, when it quietly launched a research program aimed at determining whether cars and trucks, maintenance equipment, park buildings and recreational vehicles such as Jet Skis or off-highway vehicles (OHVs) diminish the enjoyment of park visitors by filling their ears with unnatural sounds. A separate line of research is examining the effects of noise pollution on wildlife in the parks.

Date

Name

Comment

The goal, according to Park Service officials involved in the effort, is for each park unit to have a sound management plan that accounts for the variety of unnatural noises at each park and ways to mitigate such disturbances.

"When people talk about hearing quiet or having a quiet experience, you hear them use words like 'soothing' and 'peaceful,'" said Peter Newman, an expert on protected areas management at Colorado State University in Fort Collins. "An essential part of the park experience is to have relaxation."

According to visitor surveys done by Colorado State researchers on behalf of the Park Service, the hearing of natural sounds remains an important component of park visitors' experiences. Among the sounds visitors most value in park settings are the movement of water and wind and bird songs, said Newman.

Such findings support NPS's own extensive surveys, done nearly two decades ago and reported to Congress in 1994, which found that roughly as many people said they were visiting a park to enjoy "natural quiet" as to take in the visual beauty of the place.

Among the sounds that visitors do not want to hear, surveyors found, are loud talking, truck and car engines, and aircraft noise, Newman said.

Wildlife impacts

Meanwhile, a growing body of research suggests that certain unnatural sounds -- particularly loud, repetitive noises -- affect wildlife and impede certain animals' ability to evade predators. Other research has found that such noises can disrupt the breeding cycles of some animals and may even discourage birds from singing. In a forthcoming analysis to be published in the journal Trends in Ecology and Evolution, Park Service and Colorado State researchers cite clear evidence that unnatural sounds can be highly disruptive in natural settings, with a range of impacts from mountain goat migration times to habitat locations chosen by greater sage grouse and mule deer.

4

Among the findings cited by the NPS and CSU researchers was a 2007 investigation by the University of Alberta that found noise from compressor engines at oil and natural gas drilling sites created a "significant reduction" in ovenbird pairings. "We hypothesize that noise interferes with a male's song, such that females may not hear the male's song at greater distances, and/or females may perceive males to be of lower quality because of distortion of song characteristics," the researchers wrote (Land Letter, Aug. 7, 2008).

Similarly, a 2006 study by the University of California, Davis, found that noise from wind turbines in remote sections of Northern California interfered with the ground squirrels' ability to warn each other about approaching predators.

These and other findings prompted Park Service and Colorado State researchers to conclude in their upcoming analysis that "the preponderance of evidence argues for immediate action to manage noise in protected natural areas."

Moreover, they noted, "Quieting protected areas is a prudent precaution in the face of sweeping environmental changes, and a powerful affirmation of the wilderness values that inspired their creation."

Ongoing battle

But questions remain about whether the proposed drilling project at Baca National Wildlife Refuge should be subject to restrictive noise standards.

The case is complicated by a number of factors, including that Lexam acquired mineral rights on the Baca ranch before Congress authorized purchase of the 92,500-acre property in 2000 and designated it a wildlife refuge. Lexam has sought to move quickly on its drilling project because the surface-use agreement it negotiated with the property's previous owner expires in 2011.

The company has already obtained the necessary permits to drill from the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, and drilling would not last more than 180 days and would directly effect 14 acres, according to court records.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, in its final environmental review of the project, concluded that the initial drilling activity would have no significant impact on the surrounding environment. If the exploration revealed large deposits of oil or gas, regulators would complete another environmental analysis before the project could proceed to the development phase.

The two plaintiffs in the lawsuit -- the San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council and the Citizens for San Luis Valley-Water Protection Coalition -- argue that Lexam officials had undue influence over the environmental assessment process and that the focus of the assessment's scope was narrowed to avoid examining concerns about noise on the refuge and the adjacent Great Sand Dunes National Park.

image removed

Data from sound monitoring equipment like this unit in Denali National Park could be used to determine whether activities both within and beyond park boundaries are permissible under federal law. Photo courtesy of NPS.

5

"We just thought it was a very superficial analysis," said Christine Canaly, director of the San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council in Alamosa, Colo.

NPS also was not happy with the analysis, submitting comments criticizing FWS for failing to adequately analyze the project's noise impacts on the park, much of which is designated wilderness.

Among the points NPS's Hutchinson challenged in the FWS document was a finding that the proposed drilling would not be audible "under most atmospheric conditions." In submitted comments, Hutchinson said a review of FWS's analysis "does not allow us to reach that conclusion."

Hutchinson further noted that the criteria FWS used to analyze noise impacts was "designed for use in urban areas when studying the impact of aircraft noise on humans during the nighttime hours.

"These are inappropriate metrics for use in a natural area, particularly an area adjacent to a unit of the National Park System," Hutchinson said.

Perhaps most critical, however, are the NPS sound studies carried out by the agency's Natural Sound Program, which found the Great Sand Dunes park is exceptionally quiet.

"We view the soundscape or the acoustic environment as a resource to be protected," said Karen Trevino, director of NPS's Natural Sounds Program. "From our perspective it goes to the heart of what we are in protecting these resources." At least for now, however, FWS has no plans to revise its findings.

Date	Name	Comment
		"Right now, we'll wait," said Michael Blenden, FWS project leader for the San Luis Valley National Wildlife Refuge complex, which comprises three refuges in south-central Colorado, including Baca. Scott Streater is a freelance journalist based in Colorado Springs, Colo. Want to read more stories like this? Click here to start a free trial to E&E -- the best way to track policy and markets. About Land Letter Land Letter is written and produced by the staff of E&E Publishing, LLC. For more than 20 years, Land Letter has been the publication professionals have turned to for objective, accurate coverage of natural resource policy issues. From lawsuits over national forest management, to water resource allocation in the West, Land Letter is the source all sides turn to for clear, timely, objective information. Land Letter publishes Thursdays at 10 a.m.
10/8/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you. Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Every week after these meetings, like tonight or tomorrow morning, people call me and ask me how things went. And generally up until last week, my report has always been the same. I'm cautiously optimistic. I recount what I thought happened to them, and I have to tell you that my comments to everybody last week was that I was disappointed in the direction. I felt the exchange drastically and not in a good direction. I think the votes were made, they were confusing and in conflict with public comments and some of your past votes. So, hopefully, we can do better this week. In terms of some of the points that were discussed last week, I think one of the most was on density bonuses to convert commercial to residential. And I guess I would submit that we already have a tool and it's called the PMUD and nobody likes it, with a few exceptions. So, I would ask you to reconsider that vote. It is a discretionary tool. In theory, it's not, because there are criteria, but two of them are so vague, they're not numerical, they're completely qualitative instead of quantitative, so I think it becomes a de facto discretionary tool. And also in terms of the build-out numbers, there was some discussion on the count of ARUs that aren't allowed by CC&Rs. I would suggest that you continue to leave that in for the simple reason that we don't have jurisdiction over those CC&Rs and they can be changed by a small group of people. So, since we don't have the discretion, for the ones that you do enforce it, it makes sense to me that you not count those ARUs, if you continue to do that. But in terms of the ones that you have no discretion over, whether they're allowed or not, I would suggest that you count them because you don't have control of them. Lastly, I'd like to comment on a comment by Chairman Pruett on...I think he was dead on when he said last week that we need to base your Plan not on the current economic conditions but it has to be a vision of what you want to be. Then all the LDRs and all the other things won't matter. If you base it on a vision and not fret about the current economic conditions, that will truly be a strong Plan. That's I think what the people are asking for. Thank you.
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: acres rehabilitated
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 1.4 third bullet: remove beginning of sentence and start with "Establish requirements..."
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: Indicator species populations and population trends
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Indicator 4 should look at sediment loading in all waterways
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: ambient night light

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: Game and Fish monitored populations, with a goal of the WGF targets
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: meters of wildlife unfriendly fencing removed
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add indicator: ambient sound
10/8/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, speaking as an individual. I almost didn't come tonight. I left last week also confused. I think some of you may have been confused, too, the ones I talked to, but also very disappointed also, trying to interpret what the votes meant last week. I don't want to reiterate the points you've already heard, but the community has been crystal clear that they do not want to have the growth. They are willing to consider substituted growth in a unit-to-unit or density-neutral shift to address the patterns of growth. I want to remind you that nodes are really only tied to the transferrable development rights tool, the TDRs. The TDR, if you find tonight, is not feasible or not something you want to recommend, then there's no reason to have a discussion about nodes. You already have noncontiguous PRD, the Planned Residential Development tool, that's not integral to the whole node concept. As far as the process, because I have yet to write any of the folks that I communicate with on a regular basis for several weeks because I'm not sure on what happened when to weigh in. My understanding was from Michael Pruett when he published a new structure that we were to consider chapter by chapter when recommendations are finalized, and that would include portions that are remanded to Staff for verbiage changes. So, I'm hoping what we see, before we have that two-week window, is not only your final votes, but all the suggested language changes from Staff, so that then the public can respond how that chapter's going and they're given adequate time to do it. There is confusion that that's changed from how Michael had first laid it out that we may not see those changes until the end of the whole Plan. Well, then, I cannot invite anybody to the table to give you feedback on theme one when we don't have a finished theme one. So, I'm hoping that those portions remanded to Staff, the first draft of their work will be what we're to do as a public perhaps at this October 22nd meeting. Tonight, when you're revisiting theme one, I want you to go back to recommendation 105, which was a split Town/County vote on a funding source for open space. And I'd like you to consider having an additional vote either tonight—I think it would be tonight or when you review it—and that is one that would supplement that after talking to Forrest McCarthy and hearing Jessica Rutzick's concerns, and that's consider an additional vote which would to pursue a permanent funding source for open space that agency either directed purchases or provide a public access. So, that means we're very positional about the public access, which I can understand that concern. These I'll deliver by PDF so it will be in your reports next week. But there is a good picture of Tony Wall in here from 20 years ago. I just did three copies. Tony's on page two. That is just to remind you that the public/private partnerships that were successful 20 years ago, the Hardeman Barns, the Hardeman Meadows project was a public/private partnership where the County took in \$500,000 to achieve open space, but in their portion there would be public access in some hayfields on the north side of the road. And you can see Tony there flippin' burgers as a fund-raiser, or making chicken or something in there. So, I highlighted into that a couple of other things, too, because you all are familiar with the Carnes Meadow, which is another public/private partnership where the Land Trust, the Town of Jackson came together on projects. Those are projects that didn't move very fast, but I really think there's going to be opportunities coming forward where a critical public access like on Fish Creek across that private land now that was problematic under the Forest, the mountain bike route, that would be nice to generate a sum of money so that when those opportunities come up, the County can buy an access and buy the parcel, the County and Town. It would not include any bureaucracy. There's no Housing-Authority-type unit that would have to be created. There's already a Teton County trust preserve with the County Commissioners. There's already Maggie Schilling ??, and I did test with the Land Trust today that they would be happy to assist in writing easements, and even accepting easements for the management of those easements, you would have the Town and County became the parcel like in Carnes Meadows. So, I think it would be something that wouldn't be a burden to steward, to manage, and give you opportunities. So, I would like to see an additional vote on a permanent funding source for the acquisition of land or public access for open space, to tie it to that, as Ms. Rutzick and Mr. McCarthy are quite concerned about. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. As one Planning Commissioner stated at one of the first hearings, it's time for Commissioners to show whether they have reviewed and are going to respond and listen to the community input. I will speak for not only those in the room tonight but for all the individuals from over the last two years that have dedicated time, energy, and research to provide feedback. We really feel that now is the time to show you are willing, as appointed officials, to recommend a revised Plan that truly speaks to the public's long-term vision. At this point in the process, one of the key musts is to include a policy that calls for providing the end state and limiting growth. I understand some of these topics were discussed last week but without these fundamentals on a preferred amount of development, it's difficult to move forward with discussion on development patterns, nodes, etc. At a very practical level, as an example, if you support nodes, as this Plan defines them, without supporting the concept of an end state, you are essentially supporting a never-ending expansion of the development footprint in Jackson Hole. Why is defining the end state so important for your discussion on theme two? Number one, which we presented before, defining the end state was listed as the first objective of the community's second highest priority at the time of gathering community feedback. The second, the importance of defining a predictable amount of development, the concept of density-neutral planning, not just pattern, was very clear in the June 2008 draft of the new Plan. Now, it's no longer in this Plan. And as a joint board, as of the recommendation you voted last week, you voted to not reinstate this high community priority in the Plan. We see this in direct conflict with public will. Until this Plan includes an end state that represents the public support for limited growth, this Plan is not going to benefit our community. At a very basic level we ask you to reinstate the objectives for which the public supported the concept of managing growth responsibly. As far as the specifics for tonight, I understand you're going to discuss nodes, a future land-use plan, while we support the concept of a concentrated development pattern as a general planning principle, we do not support the way this Plan applies to concept. It oversimplifies it. It essentially fails to acknowledge the scale at which we are planning and, by doing so, proposes sprawling nodes throughout the County or places with sensitive wildlife habitat and nodes that lack transportation capacity. Arguably having both County nodes and Town ?? is promoting a sprawling development pattern. Second, in your discussions, please do not oversimplify the public vision. Always keep in mind the tradeoffs on which the public was asked to vote. We hope that blanket statements such as the public supports density in Town are avoided. These statements misrepresent the outcomes of the public process and what the public truly supports. Specifically, the public voiced more development should be pursued in Town, but only in cases with specific tradeoffs and assurances are met for the protection of habitat in the County or truly affordable housing. Overall, even with this preferred pattern, the public supports limiting growth overall in both the Town and County, which this draft unacceptably avoids. We recognize you were trying to stay at the 30,000-foot level of the details of whether or not the policies in theme two are effective or feasible lines of details, our community must be assured that development within these strategic locations you're going to be discussing tonight would occur only in the case if it's really helping density-neutral redistribution from outlying areas. There's some language in the current Plan regarding tradeoffs, but at this point it's far too vague. This Plan should not move phantom density from outlying areas, particularly at a level of development that would not have occurred anyway. By doing so, it can actually accelerate the rate of growth valleywide, and the public has made it very clear that the acceleration of growth is unacceptable. At the end of the day, in your discussions, it's important to understand the rationale for limiting the amount of development in Jackson Hole. As our organization has expressed before, limiting growth is in and of itself not the top community vision. However, it is a fundamental, necessary goal to meet in order to protect the most important assets of Jackson Hole. These include its small town, its rural landscape, it's home to irreplaceable wildlife, amazing scenic vistas, and a high quality of life and experience for residents and visitors. As for other specific comments, including those on theme one, we will submit them in written form. We know this task is difficult and we thank you for your efforts. But please always keep in mind that this Plan should be the community's Plan. To be effective, it must, moving forward, better incorporate years of public input, and how you vote to amend this theme, again, will demonstrate to what extent this process is on the right path. Thanks.
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Move to Theme 8, Energy Conservation: Strategy 1.4, bullets 3 and 4; and Indicator 6
10/8/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strategy 1.2, first bullet: strike "Wyoming Game and Fish" leave it as "most recent data" and include Wyoming Game and Fish as the primary partnering agency

Date	Name	Comment
10/5/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Thank you for all of the time and effort each of you have spent on the Plan in addition to the regular duties of a planning commissioner. The commitment to participate at your level is beyond reasonable for volunteer boards. Though the discussion of Theme 2 last Thursday was to be held to the 40K level, I really feel the density bonus and incentive tools need to be analyzed much more closely. The community has been and is very concerned with including any of these in the Comprehensive Plan. Predictability is of utmost importance. If included in the Plan, none of the tools, especially in their present form, can offer the growth limits and buildout numbers with absolute certainty that the community has demanded. The discussion on growth cap (total buildout number) was very discouraging. I feel that many of you, had forgotten what the community has said. Jackson Hole is at a very critical turning point. The numbers of humans is of greatest concern as this drives all of the following: increased traffic, loss of open space, diminished quality of life, losing community character, wildlife impacts, etc. Yes, with proper planning and regulation one can hope to control some the negatives of growth but let's not kid ourselves - it is the numbers of humans. The numbers task force did an excellent job of showing where the concerns were and again confirming the base entitled building potential. I do feel that the rate of growth will be more economy driven. A rate of growth number that averages the last 10 years of growth and also takes into account an averaging of maybe 2 years at a time for regulating this could be more acceptable. The concept and this tool should be a part of this plan so that there is a mechanism to do something if we can not keep up with infrastructure needs as development occurs, as is currently happening. Please consider my comments I read at last Thursday's meeting and pasted below. The mechanics of each tool need to be seriously analyzed to really evaluate the true value verses potential impacts.
10/4/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	It amazes me that the powers that be feel they can bulldoze public opinion with no repercussions. One meeting I hear about is all positive and you are actually listening to the public. The next meeting you reverse your vote and go with what the planning commission set forth. Why would this happen?? Why would you allow density to be higher with incentives for that?? The only answers I can come up with are not pretty and lead me to think that the public, let alone wildlife and the environment, are not the consideration. The vote is only influenced by what the moneyed people want and it follows that somehow you as elected or employed officials will also benefit. I sincerely hope I am not right and that the public and the environment and their well-being will finally be the major consideration. We, the "common" citizens are confused and bewildered by the process. It seems to me that's the way you want us. Drag it out as long as we can and they'll give up so we can do what we planned to do all along. Not a pretty picture, is it?
10/2/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole requests that the Town Council and County Commissioners authorize Staff to bring in the outside consultant used for the Transportation Theme for discussions with the Joint Planning and Zoning Commissions. A proposal was made by staff at the last JIM that Carlos Hernandez be brought in to meet with Joint Planning and Zoning Commissions. We feel there is great value in having Mr. Hernandez meet to answer their questions and discuss issues. We also would like to have Robert Bernstein P.E. a traffic consultant retained by Save Historic Jackson Hole participate in the discussions. Mr. Bernstein has submitted comments for us that detail the concerns we have about the traffic component of the Comprehensive Plan. Traffic is an important issue that is connected to other themes. There were several questions on traffic raised at last night's Joint Meeting. We feel the most effective way to address the concerns and answer the questions is to get all parties involved at a meeting. We hope you will approve the request to bring Mr. Hernandez to Jackson for meetings.

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Growth Management • What we have said that Theme 2 should focus on - managing growth which includes: - o Defining the end state – the total amount of growth Constrain growth to be equal to or LESS THEN allowed under the current plan and LDR's minus all discretionary tools – PMD, new or expanded resort districts, the PUD-AH, PUD and the PMD (PRD discussed later) - o Address the rate of growth Restrain the rate of growth so we can “learn from our mistakes” and that infrastructure (water, sewer and roads) and social systems (schools and jails) can keep pace - o Address the type of growth That job creating commercial growth is considered hand-in-hand with residential development. Address the cost of growth Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems Address the pattern of growth – this theme only did this one bullet and very poorly Find growth REDUCTION opportunities beyond our current plan minus the discretionary tools: Down zoning is legal if done uniformly. Reduce the accessory residential units in the county (ARU) Reduce the Plan Residential Development (PRD) tool in the County and do not replace those "saved housing units" anywhere. Convert commercial density via rezoning to residential density in Town. Recommend a permanent funding source to achieve open space thus removing development potential further. Nodes versus no nodes • Why are citizens reluctant about nodes – why does it not seem there are no acceptable receiving areas? - o The nodes were additive growth as proposed in the draft plan - o The nodes were much too aggressive in footprint and in total housing numbers - o The nodes did not appear to solve any problems such as achieving the permanent protection of open space. - o The approach in the plan appeared to not be sustainable. • The community will be willing to support the concept of nodes if it is considered WITHIN the following constraints: - o Absolutely can not be ‘gamed’ to achieve additive growth. - o That nodes be used to address substitutive growth only – not adding, but shifting growth patterns. Rich Bloom – October 1, 2009 • Nodes should NOT be used to achieve workforce housing objectives - o Workforce housing is best achieved going forward by “keeping up” - o Revise housing mitigation rates especially on the commercial calculation (both Town and County) that now only is calculated on the seasonal bump in employment – so is wholly under mitigating the commercial workforce housing impacts. - o Recommend and identify a permanent funding source to correct past under mitigation and the emerging retirees’ issues. • The Planned Residential Development (PRD) tool does NOT depend on the node concept to work. So nodes are not connected to the PRD. • The node concept only should be considered if tied to the use of the to-be-determined Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) tool. Do not include Nodes if you do not link it to the TDR concept. • Nodes should be much more modest in footprint and housing units. Reduce both. - o Given a 10-15 year plan – then the total of all receiving areas should be no more than 500-750 housing units as that is all that is foreseeable - especially if the PRD is reduced to 3/35 within the same rural land parcels or 6/35 if ‘exported’ to these receiving areas (nodes). • Change the word node – every one hates that word - to “Designated Receiving Areas” - o Still a danger that by identifying these areas - the land itself will by default become more valuable – almost as with an upzone. • Sending areas should be regional. Simply potential density from Alta or Buffalo Valley should not be exported to South Park or Wilson as an example. - o If the TDR tool is connected to these designated receiving areas – then in addition to the nodes identified there should be additional areas in Alta and Buffalo Valley as well as Hoback Junction. Again these need to be modest in footprint and scale to COLLECTIVELY only gather a maximum of possible 500-750 transferred development units.

Date	Name	Comment
		• Designated receiving areas should be fairly spread o If reduced dramatically in footprint and dwelling units along with a compatible allowable neighborhood density - plus if clearly used only to receive potential rural density via permanent protected open space achieved WITHIN THEIR REGION – neighbor acceptance is much more likely. • Make sure ‘phantom densities’ are not transferred. O Example is the 9/35 in Game Creek proposed under the Three Ranchers LLC – the topography and water supply issues would likely have never seen development levels occur at those levels yet it was proposed to move these “phantom densities” onto the Lucas and Robinson parcels. O Simply you do not want to transfer phantom densities from “swamp land to buildable land”.
10/1/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I’d like for you to revisit something that I requested very early in the process and that is codify this Plan for a lifespan of 10 years, not 10 to 15 years as was stated. There’s numerous pros and very few cons to this. Number one is predictability. There’s nothing predictable to the public about a 50 percent ???. If we leave it at 10 to 15 years, it will be 15 years. That creates a problem because there’s nearly universal acknowledgement that a lot of our problems were created or exacerbated by allowing the ‘94 Plan to go to map. So, we’re repeating the sins of the father, so to speak, and those who don’t know history are bound to repeat it. Another reason to do this is we have an ethical imperative for future generations to provide them the insight or the experience that we learned. And we learned the lesson that we went too long in revisiting this. World, national and local events change with increasing frequency, so we need to account for that in the 10 to 15 years and reduce that to a period from the date of adoption of this Plan, 10 years, must be revisited. That’s just my opinion. Also, I’d like to take a different direction with the node concept, and my good friend, Mr. Bloom, here. I’ll maintain this node capacity is not needed for the period of the next 10 years. Staff lets us know that on page 86 of the Plan that, based on the 2000 and 2008 growth rate in both commercial and residential, that the residential requirement will only be 1200 units. So, I don’t understand why we’re planning decades and decades ahead and dragging ourselves through some of these battles when what we should be doing, in my opinion, is focusing and targeting the next 10 years in a manageable chunk and concentrating on how best to site the development instead of concentrating on numbers in the build-out analysis like the 9880 units would be four to 5,000 units of discretionary density bonuses, which will provide the transferability of some of its development rights. Throughout this process the Town numbers have been virtually unchallenged on both potential and existing units. The reason for this, in my opinion, is because in the parcel-by-parcel analysis that they engaged in. The numbers only moved 17 units between Clarion, Build-Out Task Force, Town Planners, all manner of documents throughout this process, whereas the County numbers, as we saw last week, I think could benefit from parcel-by-parcel analysis. It’s relatively unacceptable to me as a taxpayer, as a citizen, that we don’t know how many ARUs are in the Valley. And we’re counting as potential units in the future NCSF zoning, which probably has less than a 5 percent utilization rate of that RA 6-to-3 split that was presented last week. CC&Rs are going to figure heavily into this, and I really don’t see any other way to do it except for parcel-by-parcel analysis because, empirically, the Town numbers are so unchallenged and accurate and consistent throughout this process. On a relatively unrelated note, theme eight, energy conservation, I think you voted to include that. I really think we should get on it so that once we arrive at that point you’ll have it to peruse and the public can comment on it, instead of waiting for that time to...maybe that’s already being done, I don’t know. Growth cap keeps being mentioned and surprising to some. I’m against a growth cap because it’s never been a force. We’ll have to wait 40 to 50 years for the municipalities who have instituted growth caps to see if it actually worked, if it withstands 10th and 14th Amendment challenges. And it’s probably a waste of time because we won’t do it anyway. I’d like to reiterate another request I made in the past, and that’s for public funding for open space. It’s incredibly high polling...the lead article in the paper yesterday, Open Space Dwindling, is a statewide think tank from UW that’s contributing to this that there are all types of reasons to do this. More cost efficient to preserve the open space in perpetuity now than it is to provide infrastructure for potential development later. So, in other words, to the taxpayers, it’s actually cost effective. Whatever we do, moving forward into theme two, we have to strive for density neutrality. In other words, a unit-to-unit transfer. I don’t think that anything less will fly off the public. There’s a disturbing, on page 86, once again, the Staff has let us know that based on growth rates, 2000 to 2008, which is a Town chunk they chose to break off, that we build on average 195,000 square feet of commercial a year. That will project in 10 years to 1.95 million. Based on the charts which are provided to us in the appendices, that we’ll have a job creation of 8125 people. We don’t have the capacity in units now to house those employees, so we really need to think long and hard about using the currency requirements to slow commercial growth. In other words, infrastructure, everything from schools, water, sewer, waste management, etc., etc., etc., has to be in place as a requirement before some of these commercial entities can go forward, or else we’ll be spinning our wheels with trying to house...we could even consider forcing the commercial entities to house their employees in district and on site, etc., etc. It’s something that’s a macro problem that needs to be addressed. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Okay. Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Like last week, we'll be focusing our comments on probable issues. As you continue to review this theme, we hope you will refer to our written comments submitted on July 30th that raise specific questions, concerns and recommendations. To start with, this theme needs significant attention. We appreciate your taking the time to properly review the overall concepts central to this theme. First, we believe that the community has voiced strong support for limited growth below what is currently allowed in both the commercial and residential sectors. We must keep below baseline and then have incentives that are only there for the type of development the community actually wants. Anything above baseline would have to be exclusively for community benefits, specifically for affordable housing and permanent conservation. These incentives must be performance-based and not discretionary, and they must be prescribed in the Plan's policies, not just in future land-use plan and maps. We support the concept of infill development in Town, but want to ensure that the community character and the community benefit are considered in the creation of meaningful policies and strategies. Development in the Town must directly result in reduced development in the County. While redeveloping in Town, it will be extremely important to balance commercial and residential growth because, among other things, <<inaudible>> supply of and the demand for workforce housing. And when we do grow, we need to be aware that impacts, particularly cumulative impacts, of increased development anywhere in the Valley do not stop at property line. We have responsibilities to our overall region <<inaudible>> as possible. Overall, this theme needs to acknowledge the amount, rate, type of development matter, in addition to location of the growth. Lastly, we're very concerned that the meaning of managing growth responsibly has been changed so dramatically between public polling and the current draft. This has to be addressed. Two of the main goals of the theme used to be to define end state and to fully address positive growth. These are exceptionally important goals and must be reinstated. It is questionable to substantially change the basis of why people voted for a particular theme or policy as a priority, and then still identify it as a priority. Again, we believe that the best way to move forward with this theme would be to return it to Staff with some high-level advice and some suggestions to be addressed and incorporated. Thanks.
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Density bonuses should be performance based incentives

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Okay. Rich Bloom, I'm speaking for myself. Thanks again to Staff and the Numbers Group. It is clear now that this discussion is about growing, to grow or not grow. As we saw last week, there's a huge amount of growth potential that we have and we're going to be able to unwind. So, I think that discussion's off the table about a no-growth agenda. Growth management, I'll be very short on this, and then I want to talk a little bit about nodes versus no nodes, because there's been a lot of questions, and I had a few conversations last night at a party, mostly about this issue. I think what the public has said on this theme two in general is managing growth, which includes defining the end state, which is the total amount of growth, addressing the rate of growth, addressing the type of growth, mostly commercial versus residential, addressing the cost of growth, addressing the pattern of growth, which this theme did address and was one of the few things. And then also let's not forget looking for reduction opportunities of what we already know on the table. And last week was a good example because I think ARUs are promised Accessory Residential Units that we need to define more carefully and look if there's opportunities for down zoning. The PRD tool, which we're looking at reducing, which is a way to reduce growth, and we certainly don't want to remove those numbers anywhere, and other things like funding source. The ?? already know, the nodes versus nodes, there's been a big conversation. I would share with you my summary of why citizens right now have been reluctant about nodes and why they pushed back initially. They saw the nodes as presented in the Plan as palliative growth, not just moving patterns that was going to be pushing our numbers out further. The nodes, as they were proposed, were way too aggressive in footprint in local numbers. In my region in areas zoned for 210 units, both were 1,500, half a mile went to three quarters of a mile. The nodes do not appear to solve any problems, such as achieving permanent protection of open space, because there didn't seem to be a connection. We didn't see how they were connected. And the approach in the Plan appeared not to be sustainable. It seemed like it was a never-ending trying to have growth to solve this goal and housing problems and that was ??. I'm saying the community would be willing to accept the concept of nodes within the following constraints, and Ms. daCosta has pointed this out, and I've talked to folks in the Aspens and Wilson and all these areas, would you accept additional density in your neighborhood? What would it take? And it comes down to these things: It absolutely has to be to be not be able to be gained to be additive growth. It has to be truly moving those patterns of growth. They need to be addressing the substantive growth only, the pattern, it should not be used to achieve workforce housing. I've been hearing that loud and clear. Workforce housing is best achieved by keeping up, since we're not in a deficit right now revising housing mitigation rates, especially in commercial, looking at funding sources for emerging problems like some employees retiring into their homes and those homes not being available. The PRD tool does not depend on the node concept. So, unless the PRD tool has been placed, there's no need to have this node concept. The node zone concept only should be used to this whole idea of transfer of development rights, and whether the PRD is morphed into some sort of TDR, then it starts becoming acceptable and making sense. The nodes should be much more modest in the footprint in housing units. If you go back to the numbers report last week and then you reduce the PRD down to three for 35, or six for 35, there's not that many units that need to be transferred. So, instead of some 4000 that are in the nodes, a more reasonable number of 500 to 750 across all and every node over a 10- to 15-year period would seem reasonable. Otherwise we're just looking at additive. Change the word node. Everybody universally hates the word node. Designated receiving areas, I mean, that's what we're talking about. Still there's the danger that once you designate it, that land may become more valuable. It's just like an up-zone. So that...Tony Wall has brought that up. Sending areas should be regional, if possible. Simply, potential density from Alta and Buffalo Valley, as an example, should not be exported into South Park and Wilson. That just feels bad to people. If the TDR is used, then what you might want to consider is actually adding more small receiving areas into Hoback, in Alta, in Moran, to accept densities from those areas, so they see a regional impact plus a regional benefit. Designated receiving areas should be fairly spread. This Plan doesn't start on that, but it is way too modest and way too big, but if people are seeing a benefit, and from the South Park perspective, it was so hard when we saw our whole region being taken off the map, which you all have rewritten. All of a sudden South Park would be accepting of some density near Cottonwood Park if they saw a part of Game Creek and the Lucas Ranch and areas in our region being protected. It's much more acceptable if people can see that. Then make sure that phantom densities aren't moved. The best example I know is the Three Ranchers, LLC, which disappeared under the moratorium, but the idea was that some densities on Game Creek was going to be moved onto the Lucas and Robertson properties. But everybody knew that Game Creek is never going to be able to be built out at nine per 35, because of topographic and water-supply issues. So, it seemed like it was moving density to the swampland on the buildable acreage. And so that's sort of the game that since then needs to be tied into that. If those things were done, you would actually see people supporting the concept, because they would see the regional benefit to their local impacts. We are all ?? by nature. I spent all my life teaching people about their backyards so they could care about their backyards, and it's only natural when people do reach out to the region when they see a benefit and if it's a problem being solved, it will accept impacts. When problems are not being solved, they're not going to accept impacts. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. First of all, I'm not going to repeat what I had put online, that I noticed was in your Staff report that...my general comments from the meeting, 9/17, I think that was cancelled and that as a bulletin was just some kind of global issues that I had gone over. I would expect that you all would have already read that. What I did review was...I missed last week's meeting and I missed the actual presentation, though I did look through the presentation on the build-out numbers from the Numbers Group. And with looking at that, looking at their report, I do have some comments that I think I'll just read to you, which I'll also put online this evening. After reviewing the build-out report presented at last week's meeting, it is clear that one of the most significant issues affecting potential growth, especially in the County, is the PRD tool. With 3651 additional residential units possible, due to the PRD tool, we double our current base residential build-out number. If the PRD tool is kept, a major down-zoning of many entitled properties via the 1994 Plan would need to occur just to keep up within the build-out numbers we have been discussing. If the only reason to keep this tool in place is to incentivize more conservation easements, then how can we justify this? The plusses and minuses with respect to public benefit need to be weighed. I feel actual scenarios need to be reviewed that show the true reality of whether there is a real significant gain to the donor via tax credits, and/or whether the real benefit to the community is accomplished using the tool, versus just keeping the base zoning of one unit per 35 acres without PRD. Is the PRD tool still a real motivating factor for donations of conservation easements? What is the real value in tax dollars that somebody receives who gives a conservation easement? I feel the real net dollar amount of tax credit minuses the cost to go through planning process, etc., may be insignificant and will not influence the decision for someone to get an easement. Why should we include the PRD tool unless the numbers, dollars really add up to a motivating factor? I know these Jackson Hole Land Trust have said they do add up; however, let's do the math to prove this is the case. The most recent easements may have been donated anyway without the tax credits and the PRD tool that helps you establish those. With our current rural zoning structure, how do you get around only offering the PRD tool to only conservation-easement situations without endangering the viability of a donor to receive tax deductions? To create a new different zoning classification which includes an incentive tool just for specifically targeted potential conservation properties make more sense. Now I've got a number of comments on the transfer of development rights. We need to do the math on what potential receiving areas per unit values could be. The highest and best use via the market value approach in many rural areas is one per 35. I question how the math could possibly work when the value of a 35-acre parcel is so high. Currently, in our multiple-listing service per the Realtors Association, the average is about \$5 million per every 35-acre parcel that is listed. This would mean a ten-times increase in density for the receiving area if one used a generous \$500,000 unit value to achieve an equal value spot. Transfer of development rights appears to be an interesting idea, yet the huge one-per-35-acre value surely cannot match up with higher density, lower value no-node development. Where in Teton County are there receiving areas capable of accepting such additional densities above the 1994 base zone? The Rock Springs Stilson swap, which has been used as an example for TDRs, works; however, you had to have the same on or moving density around their property, and this was a very unique scenario. I believe a better way to retain open space on rural zoned properties of 35-plus acres could be to limit the size of the potential building envelope and restrict to specific types of uses on remaining property on each parcel. Many existing conservation easements are already structured this way. They allow minimum building site or sites, and sometimes agricultural or other non-structured use on the remaining part of the property. Why not take this example and require similar restrictions on development permits within the rural zone? Essentially, that is what has to be done in order to develop with our current regulations that in the real zones and also have a natural resources overlay. Why not eliminate the PRD and just use development restrictions on 35-acre parcels? Yes, not having a conservation easement may allow the potential rezoning of property in the future; however, are we not planning now to control that potential event? The maximum build-out number, growth cap, could protect us from the up zones if density is reduced somewhere else in the Town or County. Thank you for considering my thoughts. There are no easy or simple ways to manage imminent growth. I thank all of you for all of your time and energy.
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Create a predictable land use plan based on community values with buildout numbers compiled to determine consistency between community goals and land use policies

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Hansen, Paul Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment. This is a short memo regarding two specific issues that arose in your review of Theme One of the April 2009 draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Both of the issues will come before you as a joint body again when you finalize your recommendations for Theme One, and then for a third time when you finalize your recommendations for the entire draft plan. The first concern has to do with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department's comments, dated June 26, 2009. While the County planning commission voted in favor of a request that the planning staffs incorporate Game and Fish comments into the draft plan where appropriate, the Town planning commission did not. We urge the Town planning commissioners to revisit their dismissal of these recommendations from the local government wildlife agency as they relate to Theme One and wildlife. The Conservation Alliance agrees with the County planning commission that the Game and Fish recommendations should all be incorporated into the draft plan, and we also believe that the memo deserves your reconsideration. Please re-address this vote and the Game and Fish comments before finalizing your Theme One recommendations. Our second concern is two-fold, regarding both your willingness as a joint commission to listen to public sentiment and the issue of a permanent funding source for conservation easements and open space preservation. Again, the County planning commission voted in the affirmative for a policy that would allow the residents of Teton County to consider options for public financing of land conservation and to have a chance to vote on a permanent funding source for conservation if they so desire. The Town planning commission voted against it. Again, we encourage the joint commission to revisit this vote, particularly considering the overwhelming public support for public funding, as acknowledged in the draft Plan. Because the public has voiced such strong support for public financing, it seems an odd thing to remove from the table. We will submit comments regarding some of the other recommendations shortly, but before moving on to Theme Two, and before finalizing the joint commissions' recommendations for Theme One, the Conservation Alliance believes that it is critical that at the very least these concerns be addressed. Thank you for all of your hard work, and please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions.
10/1/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Commissioners and Planning Departments:At the 9/24/09 meeting, I read the following suggestion for the revision of the Statement of Ideal for Theme 2:Preservation of the community values of wildlife protection, community character and quality of life will be the determining factors to limit buildout and rate of growth.I'm sure these comments are part of the public record. Hopefully, you will revise the Theme 2 to reflect the priorities of all community comment.Thank you. Patty Ewing

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	After reviewing the buildout report presented at last weeks meeting, it is clear that one of the most significant issues affecting potential growth, especially in the County, is the PRD tool. The 3651 additional residential units possible due to the PRD tool would double our current base residential buildout number. If the PRD tool is kept, a major down zoning of many entitled properties via the 1994 Plan would need to occur just to keep within the buildout numbers we have been discussing. If the only reason to keep this tool in place is to incentivize more conservation easements, then how can we justify this? The pluses and minuses with respect to public benefit need to be weighed. I feel actual scenarios need to be reviewed that show the true reality of whether there is a real significant gain to the donor via tax credits and/or whether real benefit to the community is accomplished using the tool verses just keeping the base zoning of 1 unit per 35 acres without the PRD. Is the PRD tool still a real motivating factor for donations of conservation easements? What is the real value in Tax \$'s that someone receives who gives a conservation easement. I feel the real net \$ amount of tax credit minus the costs to go through the planning process, etc., may be insignificant and will not influence the decision for someone to give an easement. Why should we include the PRD tool unless the numbers (\$) really add up to a motivating factor. I know the JHLT has said they do, however, let's do the math to prove this is the case. The most recent easements may have been donated anyway without the tax credits the PRD tool helps to establish. With our current rural zoning structure, how do you get around only offering the PRD tool to only conservation easement situations without endangering the viability of a donor to receive tax deductions? Could creating a new, different zoning classification which includes an incentive tool just for specifically targeted potential conservation properties make more sense? Transfer of Development Rights. We need to do the math on what potential receiving areas per unit values could be. The highest and best use via the market value approach in many rural areas is 1/35. I question how the math can possibly work when the value of a 35 acre Parcel is so high (current MLS average of \$5 Million). This would mean a 10x increase in density for the receiving area if one used a generous \$500,000/unit value to achieve an equal value swap. TDR's appear to be an interesting idea, yet the huge 1/35 acre value surely can not match up with higher density, lower valued, nodal development. Where in Teton County are there receiving areas capable of accepting such additional densities above 1994 base zoning? The Rock Springs/Stilson swap worked however, you had the same owner moving density around their property - which is a unique scenario. I believe a better way to retain open space on the rural zoned properties of 35+ acres could be to limit the size of the potential building envelope and restrict to specific types of uses on the remaining property on each parcel. Many existing conservation easements are already structured this way - allowing a minimal building site or sites and sometimes agricultural or other none structure use on the remaining part of the property. Why not take this example and require similar restrictions on development permits within the rural zone? Essentially that is what has to be done in order to develop with our current regulations that are in the rural zones and also have a Natural Resources Overlay. Why not eliminate the PRD and just use development restrictions on the 35 acre parcels? Yes, not having a conservation easement may allow the potential rezoning of the property in the future; however, are we not planning now to control that potential event? A maximum buildout number (growth cap) could protect us from the up zones if density is reduced somewhere else in the Town or County. Thank you for considering my thoughts. There are no easy or simple ways to manage and limit growth. I thank each of you for all of the time and energy you have given to us! Gail Jensen
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be density bonuses to incentivize conservation easements for wildlife habitat
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be density bonuses to incentivize conservation easements to protect scenic resources
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be density bonuses to incentivize conversion of nonresidential use into residential use

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	First, we believe that the community has voiced strong support for a limit to growth below what is currently allowed in both the commercial and residential sectors. We must keep a low baseline and then have incentives that are ONLY there for the type of development that the community actually wants. Anything above baseline should have to be exclusively for community benefit (specifically affordable housing and permanent conservation). These incentives must be performance-based and not discretionary, and they must be prescribed in the plan's policies, not just in the Future Land Use Plan and maps. We support the concept of infill development in town, but want to ensure that community character and community benefit are considered in the creation of infill policies and strategies. Development in town must directly result in reduced development in the County. While redeveloping in Town, it will be extremely important to balance commercial and residential growth, because, among other things we need to focus on both the supply of AND demand for workforce and affordable housing. And when we do grow, we need to be aware that the impacts, particularly cumulative impacts, of increased development anywhere in the valley do not stop at the property line, or the neighborhood, or even the County line. We have a responsibility to our overall regional ecosystem to minimize our cumulative impacts as much as possible. Overall this theme needs to acknowledge that the amount, rate and type of development matter in addition to the location of the growth. Lastly, we are very concerned that the meaning of "manage growth responsibly" has been changed so dramatically between Public Polling and the current draft: This has to be addressed. Two of the main goals of the Theme used to be "define an end state" and to "fully address the cost of growth." These are exceptionally important goals and MUST be reinstated. It is questionable to substantially change the basis of why people voted for a particular theme or policy as a priority and then still identify it as a priority.
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Density bonuses should be discretionary incentives
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be density bonuses for the provision of affordable housing
10/1/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Thank you. Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. A couple of quick comments. Before the meeting I reviewed the public comments on theme two, went back and reviewed them all, and it seemed that they're all consistent with past surveys and two referendums in the Town. And it seemed that the message was pretty clear, that people do want limits on growth. People want to maintain rural character; they want to limit the heights, and it's pretty clear that they would like to eliminate a PMUD. One other point that I think ties in with this from a study I read on the socioeconomic impacts in resort communities and the lesson there that kept coming back to all these other resort communities was that, if they can build there, they will. And I think, you know, when people start talking about not being able to build on certain parcels, I think when the financial driving force is as high as it is in this community, you have to recognize that there really are no sites that won't be built on to the fullest that's allowed by law. There's a way around almost everything. Discussions on limiting development in the County, the base potential last week was good; we're very encouraged by that. I'd like to see a similar discussion about the Town. I don't know if they'll come to the same conclusion, but I'd like to at least hear that discussion about that concept. Also, the data from the Numbers Task Force last week shows potential commercial will create many more jobs, as was mentioned earlier, than the potential residential we have. And I think that brings up the need to consider shifting some of that commercial entitlements to the residential as a solution that would respect property rights and start solving the problem without requiring any type of down-zoning. Thank you.
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be density bonuses for community values
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Determine an end state buildout and implement it through a defined land use plan
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The concept of regionalism should be considered in the Plan pertaining to the impacts our decisions have on transportation, natural resources (air, water, wildlife), workforce housing, and waste management in the greater region

Date	Name	Comment
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	As a concept, include a rate of growth cap in the Plan
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	As a concept, include a cumulative growth cap in the Plan
10/1/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	There should be density bonuses for the provision of workforce housing
9/25/2009	Smith, Margaret E. Cree Interested Public	Please amend Theme 1 in the plan to recognize and reaffirm the wildlife, connectivity, scenic and agricultural values in the greater South Park region. Every day I see sand hill cranes, eagles, ospreys, hawks and many other birds that are living in this corridor. Also there are lots of elk, foxes, cows, horses, occasional moose and pronghorn antelope. There are beautiful vistas, and it would be a crime to turn this scenic area into a congested housing project. High density is what we would like to avoid. Please think of all the schools that are already here and the traffic we currently have.
9/24/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, speaking as an individual, and I also thank the volunteers for this effort. A couple of things. As far as what was presented tonight, three areas here that might be helpful. As with the ARU, that's probably the most shocking number, but I think what Paul Duncker asked for is important. Although I'm speaking as an individual, I am on the board of the Melody Ranch Homeowners Association and I know our CC&Rs and maybe we don't allow ARUs at 330 units, to change those CC&Rs would take two thirds a vote of all owners, not just a two thirds vote. And anybody that's gone through the process, it's very, very difficult to change CC&Rs, especially something at that level. So, it would be good to know because we need to know how shocking that number really is. Second, the PRD again I think the utilization rate, I'll just remind everybody, the Land Trust is not here today, but a lot of that is utilized and is never visible to the Planning Office. It's a private conversation that goes on with the landowner, the IRS and the Land Trust and the appraisers. Meaning that they're valuing the property stripping off the development potential, donating amounts. And so when we look at what that potential is before we move it anyway where we need to make sure we're not counting what I would call phantom density. The last one, again I'm speaking as an individual, but I am on the Blue Ribbon Panel. We just had our second meeting. We still have another five and a half months to go, but we were just presented with very complete data on all the employee and affordable housing in Town and County. So, Emily's here and I think I'll ask Christine to deliver that, but we have a very good breakdown of every type of employee and affordable housing in Town and County plus what's in the pipeline. I mean, those are the ones that are being produced as we speak. So that might be helpful and thus you want have to do it. As far as an approach to this chapter, I guess, having looked at the first chapter, I would have given it a C and you were able to go line by line and improve that greatly. I would say that I would rate this chapter, as far as representing community will, as a B-, and as you work into this chapter I think the overall approach would be to really have these discussions come up with those dozen to 15 to 20 key things that you'd be on or vote on, and then basically remand the whole chapter back to Staff. To go through line by line on this, I think it might be very, very difficult. And I say that because I go through certain sections like the statement of ideal, meet the human needs of the community and locations identified through development, I think the public said their clear intent was to work within the current development potential minus the floating density tools, and the only one that maybe look at was the PRD about how that could be revamped. When I look at the section here about what the community has said about this theme, I won't break it down, but that is so far from what the questions were asked and so does not represent what the community said. You know, again, I would just really emphasize and taking a different approach on this chapter than the last one when you get to that point, instead of getting bogged down in that line by line. Because it may be...it's going to be an interesting conversation already among this diverse group, especially between Town and County, and to do that in a wordsmithing way I don't think that will work. Again, thank you for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Verdone, Jim Interested Public	Thank you. My name's Jim ??, Teton County. Again, I would like to thank the Task Force and I hope you don't let them go because I think there's...I appreciate...[Laughter]...they're regretting that. I appreciate their assumptions that they put into this, and I think that they touched upon some of the nuances of the ARUs and the PRDs. You don't talk much about the PRDs and I would appreciate hearing from the Task Force about any kind of assumptions in the PRDs, particularly with relationship to trends, because I think what's surprising here is those are the two biggest numbers that surprised everybody here. But the flip side of that is that they've been in place for 10 or 15 years and those numbers are still there. So, I think it says something to the fact that those potentials haven't been realized over the last 10 or 15 years, why, or the assumptions, and that would go I think a large degree to whether or not you look at that as something that is of large concern, such that you throw that tool out, or that maybe you just...there's some tweaking that needs to be done to that tool or either one of those tools. So, I would encourage this board here to direct the Task Force to have either pull those numbers forward or I'd like to see more discussion on those nuances of those two tools as we go forward. The other thing I would like to know and this as a question of whether or not this will get posted someplace? We didn't talk much in terms of the last page, and I can't read mine at all, even with my glasses, so it would be helpful to know where that would be available.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	This is a list of the Conservation Alliance’s broad, high-level concerns regarding Theme Two. We hope that throughout the review of this Theme you will refer to our written comments submitted on July 30 that raise a number of specific questions, concerns, and recommendations. This theme needs a lot of attention and work to get it to a place that accurately reflects the community’s priorities. There needs to be a focus on not only what is currently written in Theme Two, but, more importantly, what is missing. General • A narrow focus on development pattern as the only important element of “managing growth” is, as we have stated throughout this process, a flawed approach. This Theme must more adequately address not only the location of development, but also the overall amount, rate, the types of development. Changing Meaning of “Managing Growth Responsibly” since Public Polling • (See handout presented today and included in our July 30th written comments.) Please address why some of the four original key objectives of the “manage growth responsibly” theme were largely changed/ignored in the current iteration of the Theme. (Obvious important ones are “defining the end state” and “fully addressing the cost of growth” that are now completely absent in this theme.) It is questionable to substantially change the basis of a particular theme that people voted for as a priority and still identify it as the second priority in the overall plan and the first priority in a majority of districts. FLUP maps • Language will need to be rewritten so that this document does not imply that the Future Land Use Plan and accordant maps will guide the formation of the policies. Unfortunately, the policies as written, instead of describing the values/types of character that are preferred and that would then be depicted in the FLUP maps, primarily includes language that “development should be consistent with the FLUP”. “Node” Concept • While we support concentrated development patterns as a general principle, this plan misapplies the concept by essentially proposing sprawling ‘nodes’ throughout the county. The idea of planning for both county “nodes” and town intensification would be defined by many as sprawl. It is critical that the nodal concept be rooted in the unique contexts of the county (wildlife issues, transportation capacity etc...) as well as in the acknowledgement of existing development patterns and the establishment of clear node boundaries. • This plan’s language is inconsistent and unclear regarding growth in “nodes.” Specifically, in some instances, it is suggested that growth in “nodes” is intended to be substitutive growth (i.e., not adding, but shifting growth). Other sections of the plan, including the FLUP itself and Appendix I, clearly demonstrate additive growth. This plan rests on a fundamental assumption in many areas about shifting growth, but it is highly vague about realistic applications. WHAT IS MISSING – a few examples • An analysis of the amount of growth allowed and a recognition of the community’s preferred amount of growth are critical aspects of managing growth responsibly, and is currently absent from this Theme and from the plan as a whole. The community strongly supports limited growth. This must be incorporated.

Date

Name

Comment

- This Theme must address our unique planning challenges as a gateway community with high visitor populations (growth-related issues regarding permanent population, visitor population, commuters, seasonal variations in employment numbers, etc...).
- We should be establishing clear goals (growth rate/cap) based on an adequate understanding of where we are today.
- This chapter must define character – without defining what we want to protect, we won't end up protecting it.
- This Theme needs to ensure that growth in one sector (e.g. commercial) does not outpace growth in another sector (e.g. residential accessible to the workforce).
- This Theme needs to include other key aspects of planning responsibly - age population demographics, makeup of economic industries, etc... - to be able to adequately plan for future community infrastructure needs.
- This Theme must ensure that new growth pay its way regardless of location.
- This Theme must mention heritage preservation.
- The indicators in this theme must actually measure growth impacts and help us determine whether or not we are “growing responsibly.”

Given that many broad issues are not addressed at all, it is likely more effective for you to give broad direction for revisions to staff prior to a detailed line-byline review. Many important concepts related to “managing growth responsibly” must be incorporated for this chapter to be an acceptable representation of community vision and goals.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Hansen, Paul Conservation Alliance	I have to refer to one and [Crosstalk]...Mr. Chairman, Commission members, I'm Paul Hansen, Executive Director of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. An interesting part about coming to the last of our meetings is everything's been said but not everybody has said it. I passed around a couple of handouts. I'd like to review just a couple of the broader level issues for this theme, but I'd also like to ask that on theme one you set the date for clarifying the hearing schedule and let us know when the meeting date will be for re-reviewing theme one, so we can plan for it and put this on our calendars. The first handout tonight is the guiding principles for managing growth responsibly, which is part of the public polling that was done as the Comp Plan was beginning to be written. There were four key objectives there and two of the key objectives don't appear in this theme. They are very obvious and important objectives to discuss in broader...but one is the finding of end state. We feel we need to know what the end state, what the limited growth in our County, in our Valley, will be going forward. We also need to fully address the cost of growth. As you know, most of development doesn't pay for itself and we need to certainly have a robust conversation about impact fees and other means of addressing a growth mixture. That growth pays its own way and that citizens are not forced to subsidize growth by higher taxes or higher utility bills. We also need to focus in on not just answering the how questions, how to manage growth, but how much growth. And the key question of what limited growth will be. We're certainly supportive of the concept of concentrated development patterns, the general principle nodes. We want to be assured that nodes will be substantive growth, substituting for assisted growth, not additive growth. We don't want to end up with more growth in nodes and of course more growth in rural areas as well. The community has been clear in its support for limited growth, and we hope that this end state will be defined. The theme also doesn't really contain a robust discussion on the policies that are unique to a gateway community such as ours with high-density populations. The 1994 Plan included a concept of analyzing effective population, and the Alliance has done some work pertaining to commerce to develop some of this data. And we found that an effective population was in the summertime of course about three times what it is, or about three times as many nonresidents as residents here in the summertime. Even in the shoulder season, in the spring, 22 percent of the people in Town are not residents. So, we have a significant nonresident population. We certainly need to include that in our considerations and have that become part of your deliberations. In this chapter is a principle to predict, to protect existing character but the chapter doesn't define character. We know that's difficult, but how can you protect something if you haven't defined it? We know we need to strategically plan to be sure that our sectors are in balance, that we don't have commercial development that outpaces our abilities to meet those demands with residential development, and there was some that were reflected in the numbers that we discussed tonight. We should take a look at some demographics, age, makeup of our industries, impacts on schools and housing needs, which other people have covered already tonight. And of course we need to again address the fiscal impacts of growth and make sure that growth pays its way so taxpayers won't be responsible for subsidizing new growth. The theme doesn't mention heritage preservation. We think that's also important and of course the indicators and metrics that we decide and measure this going forward will be a great favor to the people down the road, who will be trying to follow this work and to measure it in the future. There are a lot of broad issues that Staff is...that are not addressed at all. We think that it probably would, as has been mentioned earlier, may help the Commission to ask Staff to kind of revise some of this beforehand so we don't get quite so bogged down in the line by line. And I appreciate all the work the Commission has done. That was tedious for you and us, too, and hopefully we can move that forward a little more expeditiously and efficiently. Finally, I always thought it was a privilege to participate with Staff and others on the build-out panel. I'm certainly the person on the panel that has the least background in community planning, but Kristy Bruner did the lion's share of the work on behalf of the Alliance, and I appreciate Kristy's work. I will say on the subject of acronyms, I, starting at the beginning of the meeting, charge \$1 per acronym use and I have now \$13,412 coming into the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance budget. However, I do anticipate collection from some of these ??.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Anderson, Ernie Interested Public	My name's Ernie Anderson. I first came here to Jackson in 1969 and maybe just a couple of sidebars to lighten up the atmosphere a little better. I was <<inaudible>> and I asked the tram conductor who was the ???. He said, well, you're not going to be ??. So just watch out for cliffs, and if you do get back down to the bottom, we'll give you a ride back up again. [Laughter] So, I did make it. So, in 1977 I decided to move here. I've lived in a couple of other resort mountain communities and with some very favorable experiences, although I did move from one Town, which I won't mention....All right. Specific to one of the towns that I moved here from, which I won't mention, because we don't want to draw parallels and we're not like such and such a Town, but I saw some perfectly good buildings and houses being scraped, and that was in the mid-70s, and I thought, well, okay, maybe it's time to move. So, anyways, getting back to goals and objectives and statistics and how to gauge build-out, and quite frankly I'm just going to touch on a couple of things that I can't imagine each and every one person in this room isn't experiencing. And to be specific to guidelines, quite frankly, I think they can be gauged. One would be traffic flow, commute time. One would be sewage flow and water treatment plant capacity. Another one would be air quality and another one would be energy use. And in any of these meetings and/or where I've read in the paper and what I've seen tonight, I've not seen any of those goals or objectives being outlined. Quite frankly, I think each and every person in this room would be asking themselves by coming to Town tomorrow morning or traveling to Town, you go to the Y, you're at the intersection of ??, whatever it might be in Town and you're in Wilson, all right. You're coming across <<inaudible>> and the amount of traffic flow. Unquestionably, it's increased dramatically here, okay. The sewer plant, I'm not sure where it's at right now, as far as build-out and water treatment plant as far as capacity. The air quality can be moderate. It has been moderate to a degree, but I know it's been affected. The energy use, we're like a little red hot spot on the universal map, right. And, you know, it's just that I'm baffled that there aren't statistics and you're not just going in circles here debating so what's the maximum traffic flow? What's that going to look like? What's that number going to be? What's the maximum amount of commuter time, if we're going to be, you know, ??? from here to Wilson or Teton Village? As long as you build a planned unit development of some type, and I'm told, well, okay, while our ??? is about two more years out and it's maxed and then it's going to be ten years before we can have another capacity that's going to accommodate your 555 units that are going to be in South Park, whatever it might be, okay. So, without berating these points too much, you know, beyond this, quite frankly, you know, with all the statistics that are put down in LDRs and Comprehensive Plans put in place, you know, I think you have to look at who's in the room today and who's going to be here five years from now or ten years from now and is going to be interpreting the Comprehensive Plan much less the line-by-line items that are in the LDRs. Because I've been in a few situations where I've had to come before the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners, and I was really quite baffled at the interpretation that was made of the LDRs that I thought were in very simple plain English, but they were interpreted in a way that, quite frankly, I couldn't understand. So, that's all I'm just saying is that whoever is being paid by the taxpayers, and I've been a taxpayer for a few decades, if you could add into your Plan statistics, goals, ??. I mean, I know places that put chips on license plates and they can determine if it's a local commuter, if it's someone who's in a rental car, someone who's an out-of-state commuter, and you can verify very easily, you can have a stream of information that comes into your database and tells you, okay, this is what's going on with the traffic, right. So, thank you for your time, right. I hope I was specific enough. At least I shed a light on who I am and where I'm coming from and that fact that I'm still here.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Kingwill, Elizabeth Interested Public	Hi, my name is Elizabeth ?? and I live in Town. And I'd like to thank the Staff as well. I'm sure this is like struggling with an octopus. So, thank all of you for...including Council, I mean, you're all volunteers, so thanks a lot. I'd like to offer a suggestion to occasionally use real words when you explain this because I think we can get caught up in the letters and not only just because of my ignorance, I think when you talk about a letter and it's really a house, why can't you call a house a house? And I think there are aspects in the community that actually have people and account services, you know, the guys down there that turn the water on and off, they know how many people they're serving. And the hospital and the EMTs and the rest of it, if they didn't know, we wouldn't have water to flush those toilets. So, I think there is an estimate out there for real people. And the other piece that I'm not really hearing and maybe didn't want to, you certainly were asked to do it, was that as you project what our build-out is, I would assume that isn't just house here, and I'm not saying you have any control over it, but you have all those people living in all these other places who actually come here. They drive here, they eat here, they drink water here. Occasionally they sleep here, but most of the time they go back to ??. And they should be counted because they are part of this build-out. It's not just the number of houses that we're allowing to be...or guest houses to be constructed. They may not be something you can control, but they better be counted. And I guess that speaks to the piece of it that more of a systems approach. I kind of agree with a couple of the people who talked about this. And the systems approach could include, not necessarily at this point, but admission of a limiting factor. And what is a limiting factor in any good system? It is the weakest member, whether you're a mouse or an eagle or a person. It's what's going to happen when you double the number of actual residents and then have all the people out in this County come here to serve them. All of those things. What's going to get squeezed? Not just the traffic, but all those other things that we value that are hard to quantify. And I would suggest those are the real limiting factors here. You know, there aren't going to be any more bunny rabbits or elk on the street or moose that you have to avoid. Those are the limiting factors in the ecosystem that we currently have. I'd like you at least to consider those as part of it and not just the number of units. Thank you.
9/24/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Limit development in the County to current base (by right) zoning with allowance for as yet to be determined incentives for conservation easements through acquisition and the use of PRDs and TDRs

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. The first thing I'd like to do is answer Tony's question, page 105 of the Housing Needs Assessment, Table 60 outlines employee generation for every known category of employment, and the average is one per 240 square foot for a total of 4.17 employees. Obviously, restaurants higher, they're around 11, and lodging is around one. But that information does exist. The next thing I'd like to do is enter, since we're moving into chapter two, actually the next thing I'd like to do is thank these guys, Staff included, that this incredibly difficult task, 500 hours, wow. I would like to introduce for the public record, whoever I could hand it to, this is ?? County's transferrable development rights. Staff, okay. It's their feasibility report for its language and graphics. They have a whole different take on it in some of the other...some of the areas of it. As far as a multiplier goes, they generally use 2.37 people per unit. But when the University of Wyoming did their sampling, which was supposed to be more statistically valid, they actually called on households, and if you extrapolated that information, it came out to about 2.6 per household, the 500 and some households they contacted. So that deserves some more discovery also. As far as census data goes, Jonathan Schechter said for years, and he's pretty much the numbers guru, that the census data understates the people on the ground here by at least 10 percent. So that's something to consider also. I have a question about ARUs. There were actually more ARUs than there were dwelling units, and if they're assigned to a dwelling unit, I don't really understand where the discrepancy comes from. So, that's a question also. I'd like to echo some of the sentiment I think Franz touched on and then Tony. A lot of the Town numbers are better received because of parcel-by-parcel analysis. I really think to clear up some of these questions in the County we should also engage in whatever time it takes to do parcel-by-parcel analysis. This would end some of these floating questions, which no one...this is not sloughing off on the panel here, but I really think that would be valuable. There's so many unanswered questions here and so many deviations in the numbers, I don't see how it could hurt. As far as chapter two goes, I would like to say that we change the statement of ideal to protect our wildlife and open space...sorry, protect wildlife, open space, and quality of life by limiting development to the smallest possible. As it reads now, human needs will only escalate in the future for future generations, and what we will do, and we all know that it will occur, we'll just simply create another node. So if we don't have some open space offsets...Chairman Pruett made a comment last week about the 97 percent. That's...without commenting on Chairman Pruett specifically, that's too simplistic an argument to have right now because we should focus, in my opinion, our discussion on the 30,000 plus acres that are still in play to be developed. Fifty percent of our population lives on 1000 acres. So, it's not a question of available land. It's a question of how much we value our wildlife and open space to create a public funding source, which the public has called for in incredible percentages. It's actually essential. I had discussions with planning directors across the west, including PhD planner in ?? County, the information I received there, it took ten years to do a project. They transferred, in the very first project this year, five acres of agricultural land...sorry, five units of agricultural land transferred into 17 units in suburban not even urban. That's the first time they used the three and a half times up zone. TDR by itself requires up zone. That's one of the inherent problems with it. So, it has to be accompanied by some public funding for ?? and valuable habitat. I'd like to comment on a ?? capacity not being needed. I don't think we should even be discussing Aspen, Wilson and northern South Park other than to desensitize clustering of existing entitlements, because Planning Staff tells us on page 86 that the growth rate from zero to '08, 2000-2008, was 1.2 percent. That's telling us, and it's actually doing that on that page, that we only need 1200 units in the next ten years. So, why are we talking about 9880 units? It's an error problem. It will solve a lot of grief. There's also a problem with the whole concept of Town ?? moving into the next theme where there's a linkage here. Town ?? states the Town will continue to be the primary location for Town-level density. However, this Plan entitles 62 percent of the vote in County and only 38 percent in Town. If we're going to stick to that, we should eliminate theme three, because it's not Town ??. It's disingenuous. As far as growth caps and that type discussions go, Boulder, since 1995, has capped at 1 percent growth rate. They've had no economic downturn; it's worked like a charm for them. It actually has put development into the downtown area and revitalized downtown because of the preferential permitting. The indicators, conservation easements as a percentage and as a total should be added to the indicators. There should be a hierarchy of placement for where this development will go has to be assigned. And policy 2.5.C, for the lodging overlay expansion, we have a situation in almost half of the Forest Service because that has allowed several hundred thousand square foot of commercial to that ??. So, we have all these unanswered questions, which are all additive to build-out numbers, and it warrants some serious discussion. Thank you for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Franz Camenzind, a Jackson Hole resident. I'm going to just keep my comments focused on what occurred tonight and, believe me, I'll have to sit down and look at this a lot closer. But one thing I do want to say is absolutely thank you to the volunteers that put this together. I can't express enough thank you for the effort that went into this, and having said that I also can't not say that we're almost two years in this process, \$250,300, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars into this process, and it's a group of dedicated volunteers that have given us some of the most important information so far. And, I don't know, it's rather troubling to know that we spend so much money but the most important information comes from some really good volunteers. I appreciate that. One of the things I'm very concerned about, and Commission daCosta brought this up right away was the ARUs. This is definitely the wildcard here in this community right now. The numbers are all over the map. ARUs will affect so many things—the density, scenic overlay, NRO value and the integrity there. Do we have any kind of multipliers on people? I think a number of you have asked that. I would certainly reiterate that and see if we can't come up with some numbers and multiplier. There's a good chance that these people, if they are the working people in this Valley, they will have a number of children, too, so how that impacts goals. And then obviously the traffic. The ARUs, the traffic impacts are just huge. Until we get a better handle on this, I think we're really punching clouds in the dark to try to get the solutions. Another thing that I think would help me ??, and again I haven't had time to see it, the distinction between employee housing and the affordable housing. Right now, I think I'm seeing primarily employee housing. And, obviously, one is financially restricted and one is employee restricted. It would be helpful to get a breakdown there. And then I think it was Commissioner Wall and a number of other Commissioners that asked this question, too, that I would really support, and that is do we have some kind of multiplier to determine how many employees are going to be generated by commercial uses? And right now we don't have...that's a blank on the graph. And some kind of ballpark figure I think would be very helpful. The Town of Jackson, the lodging overlay units, and this is a question of clarification, the numbers that are in here include all the units both within and without the outside of the lodging overlay, but do they include any prediction on PMUDs? I don't know if they do or not, and what would that be? And again I can't emphasize enough the number of the occupancy rate for both employee units or the denser units and then the Town units. Are we up to date on this? Are we still using numbers that are valid? Or should they be corrected? And then I would hope that when this is all said and done—this may be quite a ways down the line—but you can generate a new Appendix I. But again I really do want to thank the citizen volunteers on this. I think this has been incredibly helpful. Thank you.
9/24/2009	Varley, Jay Interested Public	I'd like to start off by saying the whole build-out scenario I think misses the point. My name is Jay ??, resident of the Town of Jackson, property owner in the Town of Jackson. I think that the whole build-out, the idea of build-out, sort of misses the point. For one thing, it doesn't consider the affect of markets. It assumes a long period of time, I mean, if anybody...people ought to know the affect of markets ??. I mean, they're significant. There's the kind of the assumption that the build-out could occur during the life of this Plan, which I don't think any person really thinks about or could ever believe that would be the case. It doesn't really take into adequate account the idea that there's a lot of people that choose not to do what they could do in terms of allowances. It doesn't take into account the fact that FAR is not the only thing that determines how much development you can do. At least before recent times what was really the limiting factor was the ability to provide parking. And you combine that with the affect of markets, that's still important. Even if the Regulations don't require you to provide the parking outside, that doesn't mean you can sell or rent anything if you don't. So, I mean, it's not a totally useless exercise. But I'm saying it has such limitations and such lack of ability for decision-making based on it. The real method of growth management that works is by land use. And the idea I think should very much be to consider transportation factors of land uses, because that's one of the biggest impacts of overdevelopment or a higher amount of development is the transportation ??. If the land uses that are allocated in areas which allow public transportation to be effective, which allow walking, biking, to be effective and a real choice that people would likely make, then the impacts of greater development are <<inaudible>>. So, the key is really the land uses, where they are, how they're done and the incentives for development that limits the impacts of growth. I get very concerned, too, of any growth management thing that says, okay, we want an average of 3 percent growth a year, 2 percent growth, 1 percent, some number. And if we're going to only let that amount of development occur because that ignores markets again. Sometimes nobody's going to want to do it during the time. Other times the factors are there that allow it to happen. So, to set it in any kind of regimented thing...and I don't know if you've considered these things. I haven't been coming to these meetings. I've been out playing <<inaudible>> to get a PhD in something. But I'm just saying these are the problems with this whole idea. I would actually focus more on land use and transportation before any effort is set to try to limit growth in an artificial way. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
9/24/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	I'm Patty Ewing and I won't reiterate all of the situations that the public has made, but I do want to thank all of you because you are all volunteers, as well as the Task Force that has been asked to put it together, incredible numbers...an incredible amount of information for us. I just have one thing that I would like to propose, and reading the documentation that came on the internet, I looked at the theme that directed to rewrite the statement of ideal, and it seemed to me just at first glance that the order of importance should have been to read something like this—I just took the same statement and put it in the order of importance that I feel the community has definitely talked about. I said, preservation of the community values of wildlife protection, community character, and quality of life will be the determining factors to limit build-out and rate of growth. And I'd like to propose those and have you put those perhaps as something to consider. And then just one other quick thing. Perhaps going forward too quickly, but it is in theme two on page 36, in terms of strategies, I would promote the idea that in order to provide any kind of predictability that both the Town and the County needs to eliminate any discretionary incentive tools. The PUD, the PRD, <<inaudible>> PUD for affordable housing and the ???. Thank you.
9/24/2009	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	Steve Harrington, the Town of Jackson. First of all, I'd like to, because everybody has, thank everybody for all the work that has been done. But several members of the audience have commented and kind of skirted around the issue, but I would like to ask this one simple question that the Staff or the committee actually go through all of the different groupings that we've had, whether it's dwelling units, auxiliary units, whether it's long-term rental, short-term rentals, whether it's employee housing, whether it's affordable housing, and actually put the multiplier to it that's appropriate, the 2.6 or whatever it is for dwelling unit or, you know, 1.4 for motel unit, and take those categories and project those numbers, be they units on the ground currently or projected units or possible units, so that the public can actually get a feel for the number of people that we're talking about that can be here on any given day. Because, as has been talked about in your previous discussions regarding wildlife and quality of life and so forth and so on, and particularly the wildlife situation, the enemy of wildlife is people. So, if you're looking at...I can't even comprehend the numbers that we've looked at today when you actually set a multiplier to them. And I think that would be very, very appropriate for future public comment and for yourselves in terms of public discussion and when others have talked about infrastructure. What is that? How does that affect the roads? How does that affect your sewer? How does that affect anything? I mean, any engineer can back those numbers out once they have a total to work with and make some serious projections. So, I think that would be most appropriate. Thank you.
9/24/2009	Springet, Jeff Interested Public	Jeff ???. I'm not quite sure when in the process this is the best place to bring this up, but it's definitely related to build-out in a very serious way. And that is air quality. And over Labor Day, we were at ??? Lake. We ran into some friends in Pinedale who are very actively involved in monitoring their air quality there for ozone. And they've done a lot to educate themselves. They've brought in outside consultants. They've brought in scientists and experts in the field of air quality. And so, as we move towards build-out, one of the things I think the Plan needs is an environmental...to use ozone as an environmental and air quality indicator that is added to the development Regulations. And just for kind of a brief overview, ozone is an air pollutant that causes respiratory health problems, especially for children, the elderly and those with existing respiratory conditions and weak immune systems. And ozone acts as a poison that accumulates in the body. Once it's inhaled, it cannot be eliminated. Children are especially at risk because infections from ozone can inhibit lung development. Ozone pollution typically occurs in large cities in the summertime with a lot of daylight and it's hot. But elevated winter ozone is an unexpected occurrence, which is being studied by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality in the Green River Basin. Strong temperature inversion, slow winds, high altitudes, snow cover and bright sunlight create a photochemical reaction that turns glutens into fuel combustion such as cars, trucks, buses, and heavy equipment into ozone. Jackson has almost the same exact weather conditions as the Green River Basin and although it's a little lower in altitude, it doesn't have the gas fields, it still has the potential for ground-level ozone, which means we're not talking about ozone like on the top of a building. We're talking about ozone from road level to head level, the air that you actually breathe. And so the potential for this ground-level ozone build-out is increased by the proximity of surrounding mountains and our larger volume of traffic. Wyoming's Air Quality Division recommends the general public avoid strenuous activity when an eight-hour ozone level reads between 85 and 105 parts per billion. A Pinedale resident working on monitoring ozone in the Green River Basin on one occasion met with ozone level in Wilson at over 100. And what they've done over there, there's these ozone badges that you can place around, you can wear them on your coat, put them on a fence post, throughout schools, on the side of the road, and it will give you these ozone readings. And especially after when we have these like a large snow fall, the weather clears off, the temperature drops, it's a perfect scenario for ozone increases in the air quality. So, air quality is probably the most important indicator for the health of our community. And it should be monitored closely as we bring more development and people in vehicles into the Valley.

Date	Name	Comment
9/23/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole feels any proposal to schedule more than 2 meetings during any week for Planning and Zoning Commission members is unrealistic and will be non-productive in the long run. We do not support the proposal to increase the number of Joint Planning and Zoning Commission meetings to allow time off for the Holidays We have consistently stated we feel the process to revise the Comprehensive Plan must respect all three groups involved: 1) The Members of the Planning and Zoning Commissions 2) The General Public 3) Staff Having more than 1 Joint meeting in addition to the regularly scheduled Planning and Zoning Commission meeting in a one week period will result in reduced public participation and will burn out your Board Members and Staff. Neither is desirable. Revising the Comp Plan is a long term process. The key to success in a long term event is to pace yourself. We hope you will keep this in mind as you plan a schedule for the Holidays. We do support taking time off around Christmas and New Years to allow all the participants to celebrate the Holidays and spend time with friends and family.
9/19/2009	Hoffman, Darrel Interested Public	COMMENTS â€œBUILDOUT, NODES ETC.Sept. 17, 2009Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments- â€œYour challenge in this process - Recognizing that our greatest financial asset in Teton County is something that came to us for free-our wildlife and incredible scenery, we can conclude we do not have to build it or advertise it- our greatest asset is already in place.â€œHow do we welcome new residents without losing our greatest asset? We have a critical and challenging balance to achieve. The saying â€œbuild it and they will comeâ€ has been proven true time and time again, but here in this unique valley, we donâ€™t have to build to â€œget um to comeâ€. They will come anyway. â€œMy point is- incentives for development are unnecessary to preserve the wildness of this area. Market forces will drive the residential developmentâ€œIn my opinion, conservation easements, although wonderful and accomplish the preservation of open spaces, it is a long shot to expect the dollars to be available to purchase lands for preservation unless we use a segment of our sales tax for this purpose. If everyone pays, everyone benefits in this case.â€œIf there is a place for incentives to not develop, they should be to create density connectivity, â€œhighwaysâ€ for migrating animals and their food, for parks and other public spaces, pathways, and agriculture.â€œCompliments to the planning commissions for their acknowledgment of the huge community support for addressing further development in nodes, considering conservation easements as a tool, specifically identifying our flora and fauna baseline to determine our starting point for managing these resources in concert with our growth potential.â€œBest of luck to you all. This doesnâ€™t have to be a daunting task.Nancy Hoffman, Teton County

Date	Name	Comment
9/17/2009	Schwartz, William P. Interested Public	The Porter Trust ranch properties have been the subject of a great deal of public discussion over the years and they continue to be a large part of the ongoing debate over the shape and scope of future development in Teton County. As revisions to the comprehensive plan move forward, it is important that public officials and others involved in the planning effort understand recent changes concerning the Porter Trust and the ownership of the Porter Trust ranch lands. As the attorney for Robert Gill, I am writing on his behalf to inform you of those changes. Robert Bruce Porter established the Porter Trust in 1960 for the initial benefit of his daughters, Jeannine Porter Gill and Roberta Porter, and upon their death, for the benefit of his grandchildren. Under the terms established by Mr. Porter, upon the death of his children, all remaining trust assets were to be distributed equally to his grandchildren. Jeannine Porter Gill and Roberta Porter are now both deceased, leaving Robert Gill and his sister, Elizabeth Lockhart as the only surviving grandchildren of Mr. Porter and the sole beneficiaries of the Porter Trust. As directed by the terms of the Porter Trust, Robert Gill and Elizabeth Lockhart have been engaged for sometime in the process of dividing the trust assets in equal shares between them. Those assets include the Porter Trust's interests in the "upper" and "lower" ranch properties located in the South Park area. Although the ranch properties have not yet been completely transferred, the division of the ranch properties has been determined and the transfer documents are in the process of being prepared. I expect that the transfer process will be largely complete within the next month. I am enclosing for your reference two maps which depict the pending division of the "upper" and "lower" ranch properties. As can be seen in the maps, the western side of the "upper" ranch and the southern portion of the "lower" ranch will be conveyed to Robert Gill or his designees; the eastern side of the "upper" ranch and the northern part of the "lower" ranch will be conveyed to Elizabeth Lockhart or her designees. The pending conveyance of ownership of the Porter Trust ranch lands to two separate families represents a changed reality that should be taken into account as the planning process moves forward. Among other things, the separate ownership could have important implications on planning for interconnectivity between the ranch parcels, other parcels and public roadways, as well as the future location of density, open space, and public facilities. For his part, Robert Gill presently intends to continue the family ranching business on the property distributed to him for as long as he can, recognizing the challenges created by the division of the ranch lands as well as surrounding development. He is mindful that the planning process will no doubt result in decisions that will impact the uses he and his family can make of their ranch properties. Nevertheless, he does not feel he has the expertise to represent the interests of his family in the planning process without assistance. For that reason, Robert has asked Jim Verdone and me to monitor and advise him in the planning process. You should feel free to contact either of us as questions arise regarding the properties to be distributed him. In closing, at this time of transition for the Porter Trust, it only seems right to recognize its remarkable stewardship of the South Park ranches. The Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch has operated continuously on the land for approximately 70 years. While surrounding lands have undergone significant development, the Porter Trust ranches have remained open and largely unchanged for generations. But for the longstanding dedication to ranching and agriculture of Bruce Porter and his descendants, the public would have considerably fewer planning options to debate going forward. Robert Gill is pleased that he will be able to continue the ranching legacy and traditions of the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch on his property. At the same time, he recognizes the public significance of his family's property and is willing to work with the community to address the needs of working families and other individuals who make Jackson Hole such a remarkable place.

Date	Name	Comment
9/17/2009	Wolff, Susan Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Teton County, Wyoming, Comprehensive Plan update. As stated in the Wyoming Local Sage-Grouse Working Group Charter “The purpose of Local Sage-Grouse Working Groups (LWGs) is to develop and facilitate implementation of local conservation plans for the benefit of sage-grouse, their habitats, and whenever feasible, other species that use sagebrush habitats. The plans will identify management practices and the financial and personnel means to accomplish these practices, within an explicit time frame, for the purpose of improving sage-grouse numbers and precluding the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act.” Although our working group area is dominated by public lands and our group’s plan (http://gf.state.wy.us/wildlife/wildlife_management/sagegrouse/index.asp) reflects that, Greater Sage-Grouse are directly affected by development and human impacts on private lands and public rights of way in Teton County. In addition, the Jackson Hole population constitutes one of the core sage-grouse populations in Wyoming as designated by the Wyoming Governor’s Office. Recommendations: Sage-Grouse Species of Special Concern Based on the comments submitted by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (June 26, 2009: Tim Fuchs, Regional Wildlife Supervisor and Rob Gipson, Regional Fisheries Supervisor) we request that Greater Sage-Grouse be considered as a species of special concern with subsequent consideration related to: the Natural Resources Overlay (NRO); Indicators and Monitoring of Ecosystem Health; Inclusion of Important Habitat Types, Buffer Areas between Nodes and adjacent NRO Designation; Build Out; Maintain Viable Populations; Dispersed Recreation; and Wildlife Vehicle Collisions. We expect that the Planning Departments and, eventually, the Environmental Commission will work with the Local Sage-Grouse Working Group and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department regarding impacts (initial and cumulative) of development on Greater Sage-Grouse. Development in Critical Habitat Specific development impacts of concern include, but are not necessarily limited to issues related to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. Greater Sage-Grouse are sagebrush obligates although recent research in Teton County has found birds using treed areas for winter shelter even as feeding occurs in the open sagebrush (B. Bedrosian, Craighead Beringia South, unpublished data). Winter habitat should be considered as limiting, and critical winter habitat on private land (e.g., East and West Gros Ventre Buttes) thus requires special consideration during development. Although dependent on sagebrush overall, Sage-Grouse have different seasonal habitat needs for breeding, nesting and brood rearing in addition to crucial winter habitat. Transportation Issues Transportation has significant impacts on habitat connectivity and direct mortality and additional development can be expected to have additional, cumulative impacts on Sage-Grouse. The airport and its surroundings are a critical area for the local Sage-Grouse population because they use the area year-round. Transportation issues include direct mortality (e.g., airplane strikes, vehicles driving to and from the airport and through the Park) and, potentially, disruption of other life-cycle phases (e.g., breeding, nesting and brood rearing). A significant number of Sage-Grouse mortalities resulting from vehicle collisions have occurred recently on HWY 191 and the Gros Ventre road and should be included in data regarding wildlife-vehicle collisions. At a minimum, speed reductions should be enacted on Highway 191 to benefit all wildlife. Development of the new pathway between the Town of Jackson and Grand Teton National Park adds an additional bisection of critical habitat (e.g., the National Elk Refuge and the pastures and cottonwood forests between Highway 191 and Spring Gulch Road) and potential negative impacts due to increased human presence on the landscape. Impacts will need to be monitored and mitigated (e.g., through seasonal and potentially other closures as identified in the Environmental Assessment). Conservation of Open Space Conservation of existing open space could be beneficial to Sage-Grouse on several fronts. Restoration of pasture and hayfields to native sagebrush vegetation could increase habitat connectivity and/or availability. Research ongoing in Grand Teton National Park will contribute to the development of best management practices for such restoration (J. Moeney, Grand Teton National Park, unpublished data). Removal of fencing and/or requirements for wildlife friendly fencing that includes consideration for birds could increase connectivity and reduce potential direct mortality from collision with fencing. Prohibition of man-made or altered water features that permit mosquito breeding will reduce potential direct mortality from West Nile Virus. Effects of Fire on Habitat Development can both increase the risk of fire (e.g., many fires are ignited by humans) and alter the patterns of fire (e.g., buildings in the wildland urban interface (WUI) force fire fighting to focus on saving property). Historically fire would have played an important role in maintaining functional sagebrush habitat over large areas. Currently, however, local sagebrush habitat has become fragmented by human use, and fire has removed areas that historically were important grouse winter range. Protecting key sage grouse habitat is now essential for the survival of the local population. Therefore, current fire management plans need to recognize that some high-value sagebrush areas may need to be aggressively protected from fire even if fire may have been beneficial in the past. That said, creation of defensible space could permanently remove sagebrush habitat, and such development actions must be required to be mitigated (e.g., restore meaningful habitat elsewhere).

Date	Name	Comment
		Summary Development in Teton County, Wyoming, can be expected to affect the local Greater Sage-Grouse population particularly in relation to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. However, development planning through specific consideration in both the Comprehensive Plan and subsequent Land Development Regulations can ensure that the negative effects on Sage-Grouse are minimized and the potential to improve and restore habitat is realized. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions now or in the future.
9/17/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Theme 2 General - Overall Comments Keep the 1994 baseline zoning entitlements numbers without incentives or bonuses for the total buildout number for this new plan. Do not increase the total buildout number for any reason, including conservation easements or affordable housing. Build any potential incentives into the total number. Infill existing neighborhoods with the same present density. This assures predictability. The relationship (nexus) between commercial and residential buildout numbers must be quantified and balanced. Monitoring, identifying indicators, triggers and an action plan must be very specific in the plan so that growth is controlled. Redevelopment of older neighborhoods and commercial areas with possible density increases must be considered within the buildout numbers. Development patterns, densities and scales should be strategically implemented to protect wildlife (connectivity), ecological functions, maintain no net loss of level of service and ideally improved level of service, and retain a high quality of life. A growth rate mechanism should be implemented. Transportation and other infrastructure needs, impacts, capacity and costs to the community for all growth to be entitled with this plan must be analyzed. All needed expansion and improvements should be in place prior to any new development approvals. Only after all of the above issues/concerns are addressed should any "nodes" of high density development and their possible locations be considered. Thank you for considering these comments!
9/16/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	THEME 2 COMMENTS:1) I strongly recommend that the focus of the remainder of the Plan re-write should be first: Protect (as in cause to be perpetuated) our current wildlife populations, numbers and distribution, second, do whatever it can to protect open space short of compromising the first concern and third, plan to have workforce housing at or near work places and/or existing community infrastructure (schools, food markets as well as public services including, but not limited to the START system).2) I recommend that all growth and development categories be reduced to the lowest, legally defensible base-line zoning numbers(based upon the 1994 Plan) and that these new, reduced numbers become the maximum values for the the new plan. (I am convinced that even these numbers will far exceed what can be built in the life of this new Plan.) 3) The Planned Residential Development should have the maximum density bonus lowered to 3 units per 35 acres and applied only to proposals/parcels of 35 acres or greater. 4) Transfer Development Rights should be included in the new Plan. However, TDR's should be applied only if they create conservation easements and/or deed restricted and permanently protected open space.5) In the Town of Jackson the Planned Mixed Use Development must be eliminated. (I can think of no single thing that has changed, and in my estimation degraded the character of the ToJ than the application of the PMUD.) 6) It matters not what they are called- nodes, neighborhoods, or communities, it is what happens within them that matters. None of the developed areas should be allowed to exceed what is legally defensible in the current (1994) Plan.7) Workforce housing: If the community goal is to house 65% of the work force and we are currently housing that portion, then we have met our goal and we have no back log in housing needs. Consequently, all new workforce housing should be directed at and should meet the needs generated by new development only.
9/11/2009	Frechette, John Interested Public	The public art in the valley has been a fantastic new addition to the art scene as a formal institution. Although it has been around for as long as art has, highlighting public art the way Center of Wonder and other local organizations local have are imperative to our community.
9/11/2009	Morris, KJ Interested Public	Jackson is a symbol in the west as an "art town" and yet we do not have supported public art program. more specifically public art is not recognized in the town or county comprehensive plan as an integral part of our community. it seems counter-intuitive that a community known for such events as the Fall Arts Festival and for creating The National Museum of Wildlife Art, has more artists in residence than most communities our size does not support public art with more zeal and importance. as we look toward the future, what a great opportunity for Jackson to really be a leader in wyoming and the greater western region, lets include Public Art and the arts as an important, valuable and integral piece of our community. the legacy can be started today.
9/11/2009	Scott, LeeAnna Interested Public	I grew up in Jackson and now amazingly have become a property owner and would like to see a portion of my property tax used for public art,for example decorating the exterior of the parking structure with local art. thank you,

Date	Name	Comment
9/11/2009	Desorcy, Dan Interested Public	brightin up the joint!
9/11/2009	Stathis, Jaime Interested Public	I have spent most of the past 9 years in missoula, mt and public art has greatly enhanced my experience there. even the BIKE RACKS are art. Missoula **IS** art, so why can't jackson be? it should be. there is more money here and more resources. missoula has public art in most of the parks, on the walking bridges, along higgins avenue. missoula isa mix of old and new public art and has skillfully preserved the historic while adding modern art.all in public places. jackson can do it. i just know it.
9/11/2009	Valenstein, Brett Interested Public	Don't underestimate the importance of public art and the effect it has on the residents. A Professor of mine designed the award-winning civic center parking garage in Santa Monica, CA -- not only is it LEED certified, it is, in itself, a work of art.I am shocked that JH hasn't yet developed a public art program. We are on the cusp, let's push it over the edge and make it happen.
9/11/2009	, Interested Public	I think only good things can come from public art. In a society where art is slowly being weeded out because it is deemed less important than science or math, any chance we can expose todays youth to creative outpouring, the better chance we will have more well-rounded and engaging adults in the future.
9/11/2009	Venard, Ed Interested Public	I have seen many different public art spaces around the world. I have witnessed how it moves people! It makes life exciting and inspires creativity. Andy Goldsworthy would be a great candidate for this area.
9/11/2009	Trucco, Shannon Interested Public	"Jackson needs more art to compete with the natural beauty of it's town."
9/11/2009	Daniels, Sydney Interested Public	More public art in Jackson Hole!
9/11/2009	Williams, Jason Interested Public	sounds good - what about the new bouldering park - climbable art!
9/11/2009	Henderson, Doug Interested Public	Jackson Hole has made an extraordinary commitment to the arts through the creation and use of the Center for the Arts. Allowing this commitment to be supported and expressed publicly would allow for more opportunities for creative expression and would enhance the visual character of the valley. This is my opinion, not that of my company.
9/11/2009	Farnsworth, Sarah Interested Public	I believed that creativity is an extremely important outlet in any urban setting. With such a low income base for the average worker (myself) in Jackson, it is very difficult to make projects happen, and any funding through the town of Jackson would be appreciated.
9/11/2009	Burns, Keverin Interested Public	I commute from Victor 5 days a week. The wonder of winter wild life (animal shadows on the side of the roads) was interesting and fun. I actually would looked forward to my drive. It made my commute so much more enjoyable. Thank You.
9/11/2009	Dunstan, Wade Interested Public	Public art offers constant recognition of the importance of creativity and innovation in our daily lives. It strives to inspire or challenge you awakening you from your busy day and breathing in a fresh perspective. I am all for pushing the for collaboration of local artists and fabricators and I am not the only one.
9/11/2009	Grimes, Matthew Interested Public	In every city I have lived in, they have a 1% for Art program. This simple concept has led to some amazing works of public art that spark dialogue as well as imaginations. It enriches the community on so many levels and supports the art community. Allowing people to visually comment on and document the place they live allows them to feel ownership and investment in their surroundings which ultimately leads to positive growth and development.

Date	Name	Comment
9/11/2009	Yogg, David Interested Public	I support this proposed program because I feel that public art plays a role in making people aware of their surroundings on a municipal level. Just like an icon like the Grand Teton makes draws peoples awareness and attention the the natural environment.
9/11/2009	Stauffer, Curtis Interested Public	I am writing in support of incorporating a recognition of the importance of public art into the revision of the comprehensive plan. Public art greatly enhances public spaces and helps improve our urban environment.
9/11/2009	, Interested Public	Public art is important to the vitality of an area. It is enriching to a community and our everyday experiences.
9/11/2009	Burch, Christian Interested Public	Public art in Jackson is a wonderful thing for our community. I have seen the ArtSpot sign act as a motivation for conversation amongst all ages. I have known kids who have been excited about joining in on public art classes that have kept them occupied and engaged, helping them to make good choices in other areas of their lives. Public art is a necessity to our town as it provides a cohesion.

Date	Name	Comment
9/11/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	These comments are presented in order of appearance in the April 2009 Draft Comprehensive Plan and are meant to reflect my opinions only. Thank you for considering these comments and for your dedicated work on this important process. Principle 1.5 Maintain the scenic resources of the area The last sentence should be re-written as follows: "Interruption of those natural forms by built forms detracts from the character and will be regulated." Rationale: This simply gives direction to write LDR's that will regulate this activity, it does not say to what degree. Without this, is a weak directive. it Policy 1.5.a: Maintain natural skylines. I agree that this language should be tightened to include "...as seen from all public roads, streets and parks. Policy 1.5.b: Maintain expansive hillside and foreground vistas The last sentence should be re-written as follows: "...landscape that screens natural vista will be restricted." Rationale: Again, 'restricted' does not prohibit, it only strengthens the directive when writing specific LDR's to allow such activity under determined circumstances. This does not prohibit berms and vegetative landscape screening, it simply allows for the LDR's to establish standards that would avoid the unreasonable blockage of natural vistas. Policy 1.5.c: Maintain natural landforms The last sentence should be re-written as follows: "All land disturbances will be completed and mitigated implementing "Best (Landscaping) Management Practices" so as to resemble the natural landscape. Rationale: "Resemble natural landscapes" does not mean recreate, it allows for a reconfiguration plan that blends with the natural, surrounding landscape. It gives direction without requiring the development to exactly replicate the former, natural landscape. Policy 1.5.d: Maintain dark night skies The third sentence should be re-written as follows: "Some lighting is required for safe urban transportation corridors; however, non-essential lighting will be limited and all lighting will be designed to meet dark skies "Best (Dark Skies) Management Practices." Rationale: This allows for lighting in urban areas, but not along rural roadways and pathways etc. throughout the county. ADD: Policy 1.5.e: Maintain ambient sound conditions Quiet environments, like dark skies are signature features of Teton County. Restrictions should be put into place protecting natural, ambient sound levels within and immediately adjacent to Residential areas and those areas designated as NRO and SRO. Rationale: We know that not all humancaused sound can be limited everywhere, but with recognition of the importance of noise control in residential areas and within the NRO and SRO, we should manage as best as possible longterm humancaused noise pollution in and adjacent to these special areas. ADD: Policy 1.5.f: Establish a Scenic Resource Overlay for the County and Town of Jackson The scenery found in Teton County is world-class and is a major component of our community character and quality of life in addition to being a foundation of our tourism economy. Updating the current SRO map and accompanying standards is central to guiding future development so as to best protect our unparalleled scenic resources. Rationale: Adding the Town of Jackson is appropriate because it has many scenic viewpoints and with the majority of our visitors spending some time within the town, we should do what is reasonably possible to retain views of the surrounding mountains. For what is this place called but Jackson's Holea valley surrounded by mountains? Lets us not forget nor degrade this asset. Principle 1.6 Conserve remaining agricultural resources Policy 1.6.a: Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County The second sentence should be re-written as follows: "The county will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve all parcels of land being used for agricultural purposes and/or determined by professional land trusts and resource management agencies to have importance as open space, wildlife habitat and/or as wildlife movement corridors." Rationale: We should not suggest to any landowner that their parcel is not worth putting into a conservation easement. In the end every acre thus protected is an investment in what makes this place unique and therefore it is an investment in our future. Policy 1.6.b: Prioritize conservation of agriculture in Alta Alta should not be given special attention over other agricultural areas of the county. Remove exclusive reference to Alta. The first sentence describing this Policy should be removed. The remainder of the Policy should be re-written as follows: "Viable agricultural practices operate through the county and should be encouraged to continue so as to maintain historic lifestyles, open space stewardship, and the calming rural setting residents and visitors alike have come to associate with Teton County. The county will continue to explore incentives to assist landowners in conserving agricultural lands." Rationale: This should be obvious, doing this will not only perpetuate historic uses but will also maintain open spaces and wildlife values throughout

the county. This effort should not be focused on Alta only.

Policy 1.6.c: Recognize agriculturalists for their stewardship This entire policy can be eliminated as it only re-states what is in the Principle. In particular, the last sentence must be removed because as currently written- ("Regulatory exemptions and allowances will be provided to ensure that continued operation of agricultural stewardship..."), it allows for a complete circumvention of all land use plans that now apply to rural, agricultural lands. This provides an open door to non-planning.

Rationale: As now written, this Policy allows for an agriculturalist to propose nearly any activity if he/she can make the case that it will help perpetuate agricultural use. That could include a request to simply develop a portion of their property without regard to existing LDR's so as to "increase operating cash flow." However, IF this is meant to apply only to activities directly tied to and supporting continued agricultural practices (developing new or modifying existing irrigation systems etc.), then this should be made clear in this Policy so that the LDR's can be written to only accommodate such circumstances.

Principle 1.7 Maintain public access to public lands This title should have the following phrase added to the end: "...while minimizing impacts"

Rationale: Protecting the public land environment from degradation brought on by inappropriate types or levels of recreational uses is as important as retaining

authorized public access. In addition, this Principle is confusing and should be re-written for clarity and consistency- is it meant to address public lands only or in combination with private land recreational uses?

Policy 1.7.a: Provide recreation opportunities on private land The last sentence should be removed from this Policy and placed at the end of Policy 1.7.b. It should also be re-written as follows: "Additionally, public and private efforts will be made to prevent resource damage on public lands from harmful recreational activities.

Rationale: It is a public land concern and fits better in Policy 1.7.b and I don't believe we need to promote recreational activities which are self-starters in this community, we n

eed to protect the resource from damaging recreational activities. Or: The last sentence should be re-written as follows: "Additionally, public and private efforts will be made to prevent resource damage on private lands from harmful recreational activities.

Rationale: Perhaps by separating the public lands recreational activities from the private lands opportunities this confusion can be eliminated.

Policy 1.7.b: Provide continued access to waterways and public lands The second sentence should be re-written as follows: "Local government and private interests will coordinate with state and federal agencies regarding the (omit: creation and) maintenance of access points to"

Rationale: I am not aware of any situation where reasonable access to public lands (or waterways) is now being denied. In addition, with every access opportunity there comes the danger of increasing impacts to native habitats and wildlife populations through more habitat fragmentation via establishment of new human use corridors. Maintenance of existing access points is the most that this Policy (and subsequent LDR's) should address.

STRATEGIES

Strategy 1.1: Establish an Environmental Commission The wording should be re-written to say that this commission will make recommendations to both elected officials and planning commissions.

Rationale: Environmental information should be available to both the Planning Commissions as well as the elected bodies.

The first bullet point should be re-written as follows: "The Environmental Commission should be made up of 5 or 7 individuals with a majority having a professional background in the environmental sciences and with at least two but not a majority of members who are not required to have a professional background in the environmental sciences, but have a significant interest in and familiarity with local environmental conditions and are fulltime residents.

Rationale: This Environment Commission should have members familiar with environmental sciences as well as individuals who have a significant interest in and familiarity with local environmental conditions. This combination of backgrounds should generate credible and representative perspectives to environmental stewardship discussions and recommendations.

Strategy 1.2: Update Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) mapping and natural

resource protection standards Added to this should be "Update Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO)." This addition should be reflected in each 'bullet point' where appropriate and should incorporate all defensible data, not just that coming from the Wyoming Game and Fish Dep

artment. OR- There should be a new Strategy 1.3 (Moving the remaining Strategies down one count): "Update Scenic Resource Overlay (SRO) mapping and view shed protection standards. This should incorporate the existing SRO district and be reviewed by the Environmental Commission with consultation with professional land trusts and with public input."

Rationale: The discussion on including an updated SRO with a review of standards is

essential. Where it appears in this Comp Plan should be left to staff. The second bullet point should be re-written as follows: "Reevaluate and amend where necessary standards for development location, density, intensity, and design within the NRO to reduce development footprints and minimize

Date	Name	Comment
		impacts to native wildlife and their habitats.” Rationale: Placing more emphasis on habitat protection is warranted. The third bullet point should be re-written as follows: “Evaluate and amend where necessary natural resource protection standards to increase protection of water bodies, wetlands, and riparian areas.” Rationale: As now written, an amendment could also include weakening standards. This Strategy should direct the LDR’s to maintain current protection and where possible/necessary, to increase protection. The fourth bullet point should be re-written as follows: “Create or adopt a bestscience vegetation cover map of the county.” Rationale: It may not be necessary for the Town or County to “create” a vegetative map if a scientifically defensible map is available from a government agency or private sources. Strategy 1.3: Map natural hazard areas The three bullet points are adequate, but there should be a concluding statement (for each point or collectively) that directs the LDR’s to minimize these threats, set standards, including restrictions on development etc. Rationale: As this now stands, it asks for data/information to be collected but neglects to direct that standards be included within the LDR’s. Strategy 1.4: Amend Land Development Regulations and the zoning map This is clearly a ‘catch-all basket’ of concerns, all of which deserve more attention luded: than one-liners. Having said that, there should be at least one more item inc• Adopt standards for the recycling/disposal of items generated through re-development projects. Rationale: We generate a great deal of refuse through our redevelopment projects and this will only increase as we do more infill and redevelopment both within the county and the town. INDICATORS Number four should be re-written as follows: “Water quality and sediment loading in all waterways.” Rationale: Clearly, every waterway in the county is subject to sediment loading, some naturally occurring but others not so. There should be at least five more indicators added: • Acres of land rehabilitated to improve either or both wildlife value and scenic view sheds (In support of Policy 1.1.f). • Population and distribution changes of the ‘Focal Species’ • Air quality • Dark skies • Noise pollution Rationale: Rehabilitated land can be measured with the assistance of land trusts and county records. Focal Species data should be available from government agencies and from information gathered through private/public partnerships such as the Nature Mapping effort now underway. Air quality data should also be available from existing monitoring efforts and where inadequate data exists, programs that will provide the necessary data should be explored, and when possible implemented. The last two points, noise and dark skies may be a challenge, however, listing them as Indicators respects their inclusions within the Policy section AND should encourage the incorporation of such information when monitoring techniques are available. The discussion of inconsistencies regarding the wording of access to public lands can be addressed in the Goal column of the Indicators section by adding: No net lossof authorized access points.
9/11/2009	Resor, Turner Interested Public	Jackson Hole draws over 3 million tourists to the valley annually. People are drawn for a multitude of reasons and as a result Jackson has a unique opportunity to set new precedents, to show its visitors what a small tight knit community is capable of doing. Visitors are stunned by the valley's scenery in the mountains, why not add to what they can experience visually in the town with the addition of public art works. Not only does public art make for a more enjoyable visual experience but it brings community members together - artists and builders, town employees and more abstract thinkers. The opportunity to bring public art to jackson is greater now than it has ever been since we are in the process of drafting a new comprehensive plan. Let's act now and get some language that includes community and public art out on the streets for us all to enjoy.
9/11/2009	Nocchiero, Peter Interested Public	Public art is key to a town's cultural significance and residential ambiance. For example, the giant blue bear at the Denver convention center is inspiring and tickle's the soul. Jackson needs art like this. Do it.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	I'm Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks again for all your work on this. Tonight I'll just provide a few brief comments on the topics that you'll discuss. First, and then second, I want to be as brief as possible but I'd like to take some time to specifically address the need to incorporate Game & Fish comments in some of the earlier policies and principles you discussed. We feel it's critical to revisit some of these policies since these important agency comments were not widely reviewed by all Commissioners prior to our discussion on these earlier principles. First, on principle 1.7 that you'll discuss later tonight, to better describe the types of broader policies that are listed under this principle, we're requesting modify like it currently reads to include the concept of responsible stewardship of public lands, not just access. And then if you read down on policy 1.7.A, the last sentence should actually be it's own policy. It's not directly related to the policy above it and it directly relates to responsible land stewardship. And then as part of that new policy, you can incorporate some of the Wyoming Game & Fish comments regarding responsible use. And a lot of that language tonight, there are too many specifics but just to give broad directions. Point nine of Game & Fish comments regarding disbursed recreation, they include some good language in their comments. It's just that the cumulative effects of an expanding human population may well require an expansion of human needs restrictions to early and spatially, and it goes on in the next sentence. So, I would recommend that some of that language be an additional policy. In terms of strategies, it's already been echoed, but I feel in the Wyoming document, if the community will plead that, the strategy number one to establish a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation, agriculture preservation. As we've stated before, in themes four and six, when you go look at their strategies, they list dedicated funding sources for housing, multimodal transportation, even though that was actually a less preferred over the conservation objective and it's absent in theme one. So, please reinstate that. Regarding strategy 1.1, insert language under the Environmental Commission that should be sufficiently funded to carry out its duties, including high levels of Staff commitment. I mean, in short, the wildlife protection as the community's top priority and our investment of resources should reflect this and the Plan should direct that. It would be good to insert another bullet point when describing the Commission, that the Commission should work with agencies and private citizens, including the Nature Mapping Program to acquire more comprehensive knowledge of the County's wildlife resources. And to echo what Gregory mentioned, it seems...is there a way to propose that this Commission is established as soon as possible, because when you look at some of the tasks that they're set to do, it would actually greatly benefit this process? So, it should be established now, or a timeline should be established so this Commission should be identified there. The same with strategy 1.2, a timeline should be established for these. We would ask that the NRO should be updated prior to a review and adoption period of detailed future land-use plan maps. And I would ask that a timeline is distinguished for an updated map specific to the current species of concern we have versus the other objective, which is to create another map including a broader scope of species. So just timelines for both of those. And for contacts ?? from Wyoming Game & Fish regarding their concerns about not using the most recent information. Strategy 1.4, perhaps add just a little bit of clarification, if possible, about the criteria by which the SRO will be remapped. Moving on to indicators, you know, the commitment to monitoring indicators is a welcome change in this Plan. It wasn't in the '94 Plan, but we feel like in order for it to be effective, they have to be a right one. We agree with the County Planning Commission recommendation that Staff shall work with other agencies and organizations to develop a plan for these indicators. So what that means to me, specifics, we would just ask that you give direction to Staff to develop a better framework for monitoring indicators. These indicators should include wildlife population numbers and trends. There should be a column for baseline conditions. And then the group of these scientists, including agency employees and citizens, should identify this ?? and also in a way to make sure they can help us actually be able to monitor cumulative impacts. We want to make sure we're identifying the ones we need to. With one part of that as a new component of this is I think it's important to remember that the desire of the community is not to weigh and to monitor the impacts of land-use decisions, but it's to prevent the impacts from occurring in the first place. So prevention of impacts whether the documentation of them is the ultimate goal. For this reason we would also ask...it's also just to make sure the indicators have a very clear role in the writing and implementation of the Regs, that you direct incorporation of some more language to explain how monitoring will be translated in modifying the Land Development Regulations and directing changes in policy. For example, what happens when an indicator demonstrates a decline in wildlife population? In terms of land-use policy, what will be required to be changed? The Comp Plan should give some direction with that. Along incorporating some more specifics, in early discussions, Commissioner Chong mentioned the idea of a wildlife stewardship plan. The ?? of this idea was going to be revisited before you concluded ?? on theme one. We do feel it's really important given the removal of a lot of the specific language that we already have in the '94 Plan, and as Wyoming Game & Fish summarized, that the Plan could include more specific language, data and mechanisms to provide the degree of stewardship outlined in the Plan reduction. So we would just like to see some discussion on that in terms of where it would be most effective to have our specifics. Not just too much or to provide too many specifics on the other recommendations that you've already made, but we do feel that it's important to revisit some of the earlier policies just at the broader level with Wyoming Game & Fish comments in mind. Some just broad level ones. I'll just mention some broad ones and will submit the rest of them in written form. Policy 1.1.A, Staff should reincorporate additional specific language regarding habitat and vegetation types. See Wyoming Game & Fish point four for a reference. Related to policy 1.1.B, which is monitor cumulative impacts, we appreciate the recognition of the need to

Date Name Comment

monitor cumulative impacts but also feel like there should be a policy that actually gets more at the targeted goal. So, we would recommend a policy that actually says reduce cumulative impacts. And as part of the overall under that you could reference a lot of the Wyoming Game & Fish language that talks about the amount of development impacts on wildlife as build-out levels are approached. I highly recommend an additional policy that's very clear that we're not just monitoring cumulative impacts, but we're actually trying to reduce them. Also within this new policy, Staff could incorporate the concept of buffer zones and their function in lessening the indirect cumulative impacts. And that's Game & Fish point six. Policy 1.1.B concerned that states repeatedly that impacts can be easily mitigated. We would like the language to be added that not all impacts can be mitigated and would ask that language be taken from the existing Plan that defines direct and indirect cumulative impacts, and that's paragraph number seven on page 2 of our existing Plan, just pull that language directly. Policy 1.1.G regarding permeability, again, Wyoming Game & Fish has a lot of language that could be integrated into this policy to make it stronger and clearer. And there in section ??, it says many wildlife species can be found even in higher density areas and how remaining development directed the level and type of development allowed all determined by wildlife facilities that move through such areas. We ask that that language be put into that policy. Also part of this policy related to permeability, we would also like to see a much stronger focus on wildlife friendly fencing. It doesn't have the emphasis that it deserves right now. Quickly, sorry, to wrap up, in terms of permeability, 1.1.G is very specific mostly to individual developments. It says permeability with development design. But the possibility to have another policy 1.1.H that would be broader policy related to transportation and habitat connectivity issues related to permeability where you could have clear language about wildlife crossings, travel speeds, goals to limit new road location and expansion, and other activities that relate to that. So, I'll stop there. Thanks.

9/10/2009 ,
Joint Planning Commiss

Recommend to electeds that Environmental Commission is established now

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Recommendation #54 – Strongly support - “Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resource Overlay” Recommendation #71 – “Leave Policy 1.1.c as is” (Conserve large, contiguous, and open spaces) • Recommend improving Policy 1.1.c: at a minimum to add “connectivity between NRO areas” so it recognizes your recommendation #54. Specifically suggest rewriting/adding: - o “Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay.” • STAG recommended: “The group agreed that connectivity of open space is important. Further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated into this theme.” Recommendation #93 – Strongly support – thank you for putting South Park back in this policy: “The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve intact parcels of land throughout the County.” • Suggest also encouraging other permanent open space protection, regardless of size, initiated by landowners and/or land trusts. • Teton Science Schools specific example of 3.5 acre Cody Creek. Tonight’s discussion: Conclusion of Theme 1: Recommendation - Making Open Space it’s Own Principle – • STAG recommended: “The group thought more emphasis should be placed on obtaining conservation easements to protect natural resources and open space by inserting it as its own principle.” • STAG further recommended: “The group agreed that connectivity of open space is important. Further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated into this theme.” • Have staff add a principal that consolidates open space policies in 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6 - o The 1994 Plan focuses on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: scenic preservation, agriculture and wildlife habitat protection - o Expand with language from 1994 Comp Plan language related to Open Space. Recommendation - Adding an Open Space Funding Goal – • May 14, 2009 - The Jackson Hole Land Trust recommended: “Creation of a permanent funding mechanism, such as proposed for affordable housing and transportation (both important but neither at the top of the list of goals for either the Plan or the community for the purchase of conservation easements...” • Add a policy under this new Open Space Principle (or in 1.1, 1.5 or 1.6) similar to other language from this draft used in the transportation and housing themes: - o Policy: establish a permanent funding source for open space acquisition. - o Strategy: Dedicate a seventh cent sales tax, additional mil property tax, or other funding source to the acquisition of permanent open space. • Taxing ourselves first for the acquisition of Open Space will leverage the enormous philanthropic potential that exists in this valley. - o Personally TSS fundraising experience – “always start the big asks with the bake sale” •

Date

Name

Comment

In the end - any and all funding strategies will take a public vote by the electorate to implement. Let the public decide to tax themselves to achieve broad community goals.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Lindstrom, Tim Interested Public	I am writing on behalf of no one but myself to comment on the possible expanded use of the “non-contiguous planned residential development” in the implementation of the pending comprehensive plan. Subsections 2460.A.4 and 4330.A.5 of the current Land Development Regulations already provide for PRD open space to be located on a parcel separate from the location of increased residential density provided by the PRD. A major part of the current comprehensive plan proposal is devoted to a reduction of potential density in the Rural Areas, and increased density other areas of the County and Town. The risk in relying entirely on zoning to accomplish these goals is that, in the long run, the increased density recommended will be achieved, but the reduction in density will be reversed as economic and development pressures build. Zoning is always reversible. It seems to me that the non-contiguous PRD is an excellent tool to accomplish both the density increases and reductions suggested in the pending plan. If the result of adoption of some version of the comprehensive plan is to recommend specified areas where increased density is recommended, and if actual increases in density can only be achieved through use of the non-contiguous PRD, the County can be assured that density increases will be offset by corresponding permanent density reductions in the Rural Areas. An additional benefit to use of the non-contiguous PRD in this manner is that owners of land recommended for increased density do not receive a “windfall” when their land is rezoned: they must acquire offsetting open space from rural landowners before they can utilize the increased density. This is very like the requirement for affordable housing that is tied to re-zonings, and is compatible with current affordable housing requirements. Provision of affordable housing and open space protection are not, and should not be, mutually exclusive. Furthermore, requiring that increased density be tied to open space protection through use of the non-contiguous PRD will also help offset some of the loss that rural landowners may suffer as a result of density reduction in the Rural Areas. There are two keys to the successful use of the non-contiguous PRD for the purpose described above: 1. Allow no increase in density that is not paired with the preservation of open space in the Rural Areas. 2. Make permanent the reduction of Rural Area density that has resulted from increased density elsewhere with permanent conservation easements, as is presently the case with all PRDs. There are several alternative means of dealing with existing Rural Area density: 1. Allow existing density to remain and create a market for this density outside of the Rural Areas by requiring that density increases be offset by permanent Rural Area reductions through use of the non-contiguous PRD. 2. 2. Allow some existing Rural Area density to be used on the rural parcels to which such density currently pertains, but prohibit use of density in excess of such amounts except when “paired” with density increases in areas where density is planned through the non-contiguous PRD. Elimination of, or substantial reductions in, Rural Area density by zoning alone will not ensure the long-term protection of the Rural Areas. For this reason any reduction in existing Rural Area density should allow such reductions, along with allowed Rural Area density, to be used to offset increased density in other parts of the County through the non-contiguous PRD. Clearly the County believes that the non-contiguous PRD is a lawful zoning technique or it would not be part of the existing LDRs. I believe with very minor modification this existing tool could be made to facilitate desired density increases in a manner that ensures permanent reductions in Rural Area density. For what it is worth, I have an extensive background in both planning and conservation easement law, including density transfer programs quite similar to (but more complex than) the non-contiguous PRD provisions of the LDRs. I would be happy to discuss all of this with you at your convenience. Again, the contents of this letter has been neither authorized nor reviewed by any organization or person other than myself and should not be taken as representing anyone’s views but my own.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Page #17 the 2008 polling indicated that: and following verbage should be stricken. Generalities and conclusions that are stated are not necessarily accurate. Please consider eliminating the right hand side of the box. Policy 1.1.b. Last sentence. "behavioral best practices" This is not measurable " what does this mean? replace with: New data will be used to amend Land Development Regulations and written policies related to the cumulative effects of human impacts" Policy 1.1.d. Private property rights - What happens to these? Which is not what happens today. Numerous variances have been granted. Properties within the NRO should be consistently regulated. That is why a mapping of all habit needs to occur. Agricultural use alters landscape " will this no longer be allowed if in the NRO or similar defined area? private property owner should still have some use of their land. Policy 1.1.e. Mitigation policy already exists in the County. The recent LDR requirements are so onerous that I challenge any Rural land owner to try and deal with them. Our current regs require in some cases that a land owner would have to purchase another piece of property, that needs mitigation , a permanent conservation easement must be placed on it and inspections and bonding are required to assure the mitigation is forever successful. How much more restrictive can one get? A list of disturbs properties that need and can be mitigated need to be listed and part of approved mitigation projects the land owners could fund that have the off site mitigation issues. "74. Policy 1.1.f. Is this only on properties to be developed? Is this fair not to include existing developed properties? How can this be required? Can these areas be mapped and identified as areas for off site mitigation? "76 Policy 1.1.g. What about ag uses? "best management practices" Be specific! Too vague! This would be interpreted by planning staff " if so, not appropriate. The more you limit the rural areas the more property rights you are infringing on! An owner should retain some use of their land. Are you now saying ag uses are not exempted? How do you control trespassing, keeping livestock and horses in, protecting dangerous slopes from travel? Come up with a better wildlife friendly fence design that works with ag use. Maybe break away rails yet allowing the height to keep animals in? Policy 1.6.c. is inconsistent with this policy."80 Policy 1.2.b. "best management Practices" This again is not specific and clear. Don't you mean to say new regs will be written. I have heard this terminology used at the planning office yet they can never give you a specific document to refer to. This is a way of manipulating the regulations in a very vague way. "81 Policy 1.2.c. Why not just say Town and County will do baseline studies in various areas of Teton County so that any net loss of water quality can be mitigated."82 Policy 1.2.d. Most roads are private. How can this be measured and who pays?" Policy 1.4.f. Some of the LDR's with required mitigation are in direct conflict with wildfire mitigation " sagebrush is extremely flammable yet the County requires this to be mitigated when removed for development. Bridger Teton and Grand Teton are doing prescribed burns of sagebrush to lessen the fire hazards."84 - Policy 1.5.a. This policy and the SRO LDR's are poorly written and do not respect the construction that may occur at the bottom of a hill or butte that because of the road being recessed, a home can be classified as a home that skyines " Bottom of south facing Bar Y Estates on W. Gros Ventre Butte. Numerous complaints were made to correct this error were made yet the language has never been change. I hope that this wording can be changed to reflect the true intent.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. For about four or five weeks now I've requested that we commit sending forth to the electeds very strong recommendations in regards to wildlife friendlier fencing standards. There's been virtually no discussion on that, even though it was policy number six on the County's list of recommendations. In some areas it's the number one human cause of wildlife mortality, period, that's away from roads, etc. It's very important. And I really think we should adopt more stringent standards in regards to wildlife friendlier fencing and this is something that needs to be open to discussion. The Environmental Commission, I think it needs to be established now, even if it's in an informal or ad hoc capacity, because we desperately need to be making future decisions on the best available science. The electeds could best use expertise on this committee prior to and during the deliberations, not afterwards. So, I think you have the power to make that recommendation, so that the electeds, when they get these proceedings before them, they have the ability to ask this Commission or this committee pertinent science-based questions. It would simply be more valuable now than later. I'd like to reiterate my request for an open space conservation easement PRD-type forum or workshop. The prime time would be to have it next week. I know that's short notice but it's a bridge theme between theme one and theme two. It ties into theme one and theme two in many ways. To obtain the best available information on the PRD, which will be a primary topic of discussion in theme two, managing growth, because it leaves so many units out there so to speak. I'd like to reiterate the call for a viable...for discussion about a viable open space funding source. I mean, this request has come from the Land Trust and the public at large. It's reflected in polling, etc., etc. And it's a discussion we need to have. Too often we spin our wheels talking about real estate transfer taxes, which are illegal unless voluntary. We spin our wheels talking about ?? taxes, 40 percent or more, and that's to be used for promotion. We spin our wheels for ??, which are not going to be passed because of ?? tax. So, we kind of narrowed it down now and I'd at least like to have that discussion. Indicators, there's fairly strong...I mean, I have a list of about 40 indicators. That's probably something that would be better sent in written form, but on indicator number one on the last page, wildlife, it's a conservation easement NRO-type balance of open space procurement. Some research I've done in the appendix indicates we've been successful in preserving over 37 percent of the SRO, but we've only been successful in preserving under 26 percent of the NRO. I really feel that, you know, habitat priorities should be emphasized in procurement of open space. And whether that ties into the funding source remains to be seen. I have a real problem with semantics on 1.1.G. I know Mr. ...sorry, Chairman Pruett indicated that he had that on his list, but I wanted to, since this is our last shot at theme one, the potential mischief so to speak...there's enormous potential harm out there leaving except in 1.1.G instead of either. It permeates through the rest of the themes. That one word change could affect the entire Plan as we know it as far as wildlife permeability, etc. And the last problem I had is page 10, first paragraph, and page 14, last paragraph, the word tradeoffs. I really think that word should be removed. That also has a lot of potential for mischief and selective rationalized interpretations by electeds in the future. And we're going for predictability and the word tradeoffs doesn't always figure in predictability. Thanks.
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Stronger language in 1.1.g
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Strengthen 1.1.g language regarding transportation
9/10/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	Regarding Policy1.5 recommendation, I support the wording passed by the county....."and will be regulated" instead of the wording "and will be prevented as much as possible". The phrase "as much as possible" is far too vague. It will lead to compromises that undermine the intent of this policy.
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Include all appropriate Game and Fish language into document

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Franz Camenzind, Jackson Hole resident. I'll have some written comments in to you tomorrow and I won't dwell too much on what we did last week, but there are a couple of points I'd like to go over with you and just indicate my reaction to them. I think where we were dealing with policy 1.5.F, establish Scenic Resource Overlay for qualifying areas of the County and the Town of Jackson, I think incorporating the Town into this, I think is important. There are many important viewpoints in the Town of Jackson, and I think that nearly every visitor that we have coming into Jackson Hole, spending some time in Town, I don't think we should try to keep from them the view that's here. This is, of course, call Jackson Hole, which means it's in a valley and I think we should be able to see the mountains around us. So, I think having an SRO in the Town of Jackson I think would be important. Policy 1.6.A, conserve agriculture lands, I would suggest that the second sentence should be written as follows: The County will support efforts of the landowners and Land Trust to permanently conserve all parcels of land being used for agricultural purposes and/or determined to have importance as open space, wildlife habitat and moving corridors by professional Land Trust or resource management agencies. The rationale there is we should not suggest to any landowner that their parcel is not worth putting into a conservation easement. Conservation easements are done between the landowner and the party that will take charge of that, and I don't think we should ever indicate in this Comprehensive Plan that any lands that would fit both the landowner's desire and the Land Trust's desire. We should be encouraging this. It is, in fact, an investment in our future. So, I would take out the words large parcels, and I wouldn't just emphasize agriculture. And again we went over this somewhat last week with Alex, I think ?? would really agree with that. All these lands in the County are important. Anything that's being used as agriculture I think, if we can work with them to keep that in place, I think that would be a good move for not only our character, but our historic value and our scenic and wildlife areas. I do have a serious problem with 1.6.C. To me, this entire policy 1.6.C could be eliminated because it only really restates what's in the principle itself. However, the last sentence, I am very serious about, must be removed because of its wording. And the wording is regulatory exemptions and allowances will be provided to ensure that continued operations of agriculture stewardship. When you put a sentence like that in there, will be provided, that basically negates all planning on rural land. Just about anybody who says I have agriculture land and I want to maintain that will be able to come into the Commission and say, I want an exemption, and this says they will get it. And that exemption could simply be I want to build ten homes on it without any conservation easement. To me, this provides an open door to non-planning on our agriculture lands. And I think I know what this is supposed to do. It's supposed to encourage agriculture and the continuation of that and open space, but when you put that sentence in there, I think you negate so much of what you're trying to do. Moving forward now to what will be discussed today. There are a number of things. In 1.7.A, provide recreation opportunities on private lands, I'm not sure about the entire sentence here, but I think it should be removed from this policy and perhaps placed at the end of policy 1.7.B, because it refers to the public aspect and this is private. I don't know why this got put in there. But also additional public and private efforts will be made to prevent resource damage on private and public lands from harmful recreational activities. The rationale here is that recreational activities in this community are self-starters. Everybody's coming up with new recreational activities. I don't think we have to encourage new ones. I think what we need to do is protect our environment, both public and private lands, from the abuses that could occur with certain kinds of recreational activities. And I think this thing has to be reworded to do that. I don't think we need to go out there and encourage recreational activities. They're going to come to you. They're going to come to land management agencies. So I think what we need to do in the County on private land is have a mechanism that says we can respond to that to try to protect private land interests and resources on there. Strategies in this section, now strategy 1.2, update Natural Resource Overlay, now here we can do I think either one of two things. We should either add Scenic Resource Overlay to this, but I think we might be better off just adding a new strategy 1.3 and dealing with the Scenic Resource Overlay as a separate issue. A lot of the same things will be coming into this, the same kind of wording, the same kind of input into determining what are our scenic resource values. I think we should go back to the '94 Plan and start with the scenic resource definition and description and map and work from that point. I think it would be cleaner to have it as a separate strategy. I'll jump down to strategy 1.4, amend Land Development Regulations in the zoning map. I think we should add at least one thing here, one of the bullet points I guess, depending on how they're designated, and the wording should be something in effect of adopt standards for the recycling and disposal of items generated with green building projects. That's really not pointed out in here. A lot of development now is green development, tearing down older buildings and infilling and so forth. And I think there should be some recognition that we need to start looking at how we're going to deal with these wastes. We call them waste but they are a resource and they should be looked at as a resource. So I think we should try to find some wording there that would highlight that. And then last year, when we get down to indicators, I think number four indicator, water quality and sediment loading, I think it should be rewritten. Water quality and sediment loading in all waterways. It's not just Flat Creek. Now, I recognize that a lot of our waterways and sediment loading is a natural occurrence. But we do have other situations where it could be man-caused. So I don't think we should be singling out just ??. I think it should be put off waterways. And last I think we should add at least three more indicators. The first one would be acres of land rehabilitated to improve either or both wildlife value and scenic vistas. Rehabilitation should be one of the what we're looking for here in our new Comp Plan, not just protection but also rehabilitation where we can. We're not mandating it anywhere. I think it should be an indicator, because we do talk about rehabilitating some of our??. Another one would be monitor

Date

Name

Comment

population and distribution changes in our indicator species, and I'm using the phrase indicator species. You all may adopt a new phrase for that. But the point is we have these species but no where is it stated in here that we should be monitoring and check what's going on with them, probably on a yearly basis or certainly a five-year basis. And then the last one that should be added, or at least what I came up with so far, monitoring air quality. That's not been designated very clearly in this document. It will give us a basis then to start adding. So, with that again I will try to get this to in written form tomorrow morning, and I apologize for going over the details here tonight but I hope it provides a little bit of direction. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, Teton County. <<inaudible>>. Speaking as an individual, one housekeeping piece for Staff. It's a little bit hard to understand what's going to get final vote, what's got a straw vote, what's coming up for a final vote or would be topical that evening. I assume you're talking about theme one tonight, but in the future it might be helpful so we...especially if we choose to invite anybody here, you know, that maybe that policy will be voted on that evening or revisited that evening. A couple of things, and I do want to ?? 5000-foot level and a 2-foot level and I did bring a piece. I put some colors and I've got a couple of stories and I'll try to be brief. I think you'll will wait. I added green and blue. The first one is I guess just a story. I think when we work on this Plan, I would hope that we see parts of it be a vision and a possibility and a statement of ideals. I think we've been constrained in some of our discussions and I got <<inaudible>> last week where he walked out of the meeting and was a little bit negative on the possibility of finding a funding source for open space. And I guess the parallel I'd use is two things, one that occurred to me this week. I was invited over to the dedication ceremony for the new public school, which is gold LEED. I was an assistant member of the design group. Everybody said that would be impossible to be a partnership of that ?? gymnasium or to get state funding of LEED certification. And that's a concrete example that things can be done. Relative to this Plan, I've been making some comments through other venues and on page 65 under transportation strategy 6.3, they put in my ?? mail delivery as a goal. We'll get to that when we get to that chapter. But I had to speak to that quite a few times. And it's a small thing, but home mail delivery, as I found out, has a capture rate of over 5 percent over transportation ??. That's equivalent to the whole START system. When I pursued home mail delivery for Highway 2 and Highway 22, nobody said we could get it there for my six homeowners up in ??, and they were able to do that. I've was appointed to the board of Melody now, on the board of directors, and we had discussed it for awhile and we started moving forward. And ?? was very direct that we would never achieve home mail delivery in Melody Ranch. It was an impossibility. The post office would not work with us. David ??, the developer's representative, said in the PUD we were told not to ask for that and we would never get it. But the board went ahead and we pursued it with our management company and the post office has agreed to do home mail delivery at the ??. The board was then cynical that folks in the subdivision would not participate. So, we did mailing to all of them and we had overwhelming response without one person out of 350 homes wanting to participate. Some 50 people responded back to us, knowing that was going to cost money. Our mailing this month is to have a committee to look at the ??. The money's been set aside; we have a commission; we have a commitment; and next spring we'll have home mail delivery at our subdivision. So, as we're looking at possibilities in this Plan, stretch goals, statement of ideals, please don't limit yourselves. And I'll come back to that. On a couple of items that I put forward here, 54 you know the feeling there about wildlife protected throughout. I wanted to come back to recommendation 71, leave policy 1.1.C as is with a recommendation. I guess I'd like to remind you that a lot of minds think alike. STAG recommended that the group agreed that connectivity of open spaces is important. A further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated into this theme. So, I'm giving you the same language as I did last week, I've parted down. So, please put that in about...in that policy, adding not only the NRO but connectivity between portions of the NRO as a minimum. Recommendation 93 is similar to what Franz said, which had to do with a big thank you on 1.6.A about conserving. And, by the way, some of you were concerned that the public maybe didn't get that South Park was back on the list the list, might not be, even though they were on the list, and the public gets that and they appreciate that. I hope they talked to you. But I would say, again, like Franz mentioned, encouraging all open space protection regardless of size. And my parallel to that is a year ago I was called back to the Science School to unwind the Indian Springs Ranch Equestrian Pool Center near Boyles Hill and to do a boundary lot adjustment, but as part of that we were able to get 3.5 acres of Cody Creek into permanent conservation easements. And 3.5 acres, it cost the School a fair amount of money to do that, move the boundary and to unwind that property, but it's riparian, it has a lot of values and it's about 630 acres of protected conservation easements. Across the street are 212 acres of conservation easements that the School owns on the other side of the highway. So, small parcels, maybe we can change the language there to along Franz's line to encourage all land. Tonight's discussion, I'll go back to STAG about making open space it's own principle, because it is all mixed up, scattered between 1.1 and 1.5 and 1.6. STAG recommended the group thought more emphasis should be placed on obtaining conservation easements to protect natural resources and open space by inserting it as it's own principle. And STAG also went along and had further explanation of what open space means should be in here. So, I would strongly recommend that you have Staff just add a principle that either repeats or pulls out some of the policies in 1.1 and 1.5 and 1.6, that you also bring in some of the 1994 Plan, the provision chapter and the open space chapter that also broadens open space for that scenic, agricultural and wildlife values. And then the last general comment, and I'll tell you another story to keep you awake, is most of you know that I worked at the Science School for a long time when they embarked on the second campaign, which turned out to be a \$40 million capital campaign. I was mostly in charge of spending the money when in that position, building, but I was pretty familiar with doing apps. But in that, as we launched that campaign, the board first had to tax themselves before we went out. And of the 36 board members, every single one of them had to pledge money to the maximum of their ability until we were able to get actually eight million pledged. And they went to staff, 50 staff working at nonprofit wages, wanting 100 percent of staff commitment. All the staff signed on and that brought in another \$100,000 in pledges. The graduate students in the ?? campus who were paying for the semester thought that was pretty cool. And every one of them, all 24, pledged money to the tune of five thousand to that campaign. Then we went out and did the apps. I

Date

Name

Comment

personally was involved in a \$25,000 app, a \$50,000 one, and I did on my own go to a donor and do an app for \$100,000 for the ?? property, on a project that's on the campus. But the biggest one, I was sent out to revisit with ?? on the purchase and conversion of ?? Ranch. <<inaudible>> out there to ask this donor for \$3.3 million and that was to close the deal. And when you have those conversations, the first thing they ask is have you taxed yourself. Have you contributed to this project? Do you have a strong vision? And will you take care of my money and use it wisely? Without that, we can't close the deal. And we did close that deal. So, coming back to this on thinking big, thinking bold. They put up mailboxes in Melody Ranch this spring and the new red school that's green. The Land Trust submitted comments May 14 about the creation of the permanent funding mechanism. It says to promote for affordable housing and transportation <<inaudible>> for either the Plan or the community for the purchase of conservation easements. I would add a policy under the new open space principle, or however you want Staff to structure that—let them do the work—but I'd fold the language what's in the transportation and housing section, if there's a policy about establishing a permanent funding source and then there's a strategy that's mentioned. And whatever you do throughout the document, you might want to be consistent. I think all these are actually possible. Including a real estate transfer tax. It just means going to the state and getting some changes, and ?? wife is the head of the state democratic committee, and I'll be talking to her. But taxing ourselves first for the acquisition of open space will elaborate the enormous philanthropic potential that exists in the Valley. If we can get a real funding source going, the other money will flow with that. We saw that two weeks ago in Wilson where we taxed ourselves for Pathways. An anonymous donor came forth with a half a million dollars to build an underpass to the school. The County doesn't really know what to do with offers like that, but hopefully they'll find a way to say, great, let's work it in and figure out the solution and see what maps we need. The last is with all these funding sources they're always going to come back to the voters. They're always going to go to the polls. So, there's really no risk cause in the end the voters will either vote them up or down no matter what mechanism we find. So, I do feel very strongly about that. And thank you for your time.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. I just uploaded to the online site a few of the comments that I made last week in writing because they were kind of detailed and I'm sure you don't want to listen to all the specific words I have initiated. So, those have been uploaded. And I just thought I'd just touch on a couple of the...just a couple of the same points I made before after you had discussed the best management practice wording, which I don't know if you all had decided or have done a recommendation on how to deal with that. There was some discussion about that, but I strongly recommend that you not include that in this Comp Plan. I had a couple of very specific issues with that going through some applications this year and none of the best management practices written policies ever came to pass. I never saw anything in writing. It was a very vague and just was put in there or was approached from a flexibility standpoint so that some of the LDRs could be negated or some of the Master Plan wording could be negated in some of the applications. And I got extremely upset about it and I really feel this wording doesn't belong in here unless you have specific LDRs. And why not put the specific comment back to the Regulations instead of some best management practices where nobody can find manuals or even tell you what they are. I just think it doesn't belong in this document. And with regard to policy, or to recommendation 76, it's with regard to policy 1.1.G, and 1.6.C and 1.1.G have or contradict each other actually. And it's about ag uses. And it goes into a little best management practices, but it's very vague and it's saying that in one of them it's saying that we're going to respect ag uses and exempt them. And, similar to what Franz was saying, one of them says it's going to exempt ag uses and the other one indicates another direction. And part of this goes into my feeling about fencing, too. And we all would like the all wildlife friendly fencing, but if you look at the LDRs, the wildlife friendly fencing isn't compatible with ag uses. So, why don't we design a wildlife friendly fence that is compatible with ag uses? Then you can get rid of this exemption stuff. It's all about the height and for some reason and some of the people have been designing ?? or something like that. So, you know, if you could change the LDR, making it exempt, you could get rid of the exemption for ag uses, but you can't do it unless you come up with a better description of wildlife friendly fencing because it just doesn't work for keeping horses and livestock in. And that's kind of a disconnect with that this whole fencing thing. So, I don't know if you can work something in connecting it with a description of wildlife friendly fencing that also works with ag uses and put that as some sort of policy in there. Maybe that would solve a lot of those fencing issues. Let's see, in recommendation 81, policy 1.2.C, why not just say that the Town and County will do a baseline studies in various areas of Teton County, so that any net loss of water quality will be mitigated? And just, you know, have a strong policy on that if there is. Set the baseline, do studies and just make sure that we don't regress. I mean, it would be nice to improve water quality but at least not regress. And recommendation 82, I think this has to do with...I don't have it right in front of me, but I think it has do with dusty roads. Well, most of our roads are ??, so I'm kind of confused with this one. Is this saying that we're going to require that all private roads be paved or that all of them have to do the dust ??? I mean, it's a...I don't know, I have a little problem with the way it's worded. I mean, it would be nice but I don't see that you're going to be able to require to go back to private roads and require that they do real expensive pavement or improvements on them. Policy 1.4.F, some of the LDRs, and I know we're talking Comp Plan, but his kind of goes with required mitigation for vegetation. A lot of the LDR does not...it conflicts with wildfire mitigation for controlling wildfires. For instance, sagebrush is extremely flammable. Grand Teton National Park and the Forest Service are both doing prescribed burns to get rid of sagebrush and that. And yet the LDRs and the mitigation, the vegetation, they're protecting sagebrush. So, you know, what is it? These seem to be in contradiction to each other. And policy 84, or, excuse me, recommendation 84, policy 1.5.A, this has...you wrote a recommendation as far as skylining goes. And the '94 Plan never was corrected for a proper definition of what skylining is. My...the home I built and lived in for 30 years at the very bottom of West Gros Ventre View meets the definition of skylining. And does this because the Highway 22 is sunken down and was dug down into the hill. And so every single house at the bottom of West Gros Ventre View, along Highway 22, meets the definition of skylining. And we were promised that it would be corrected and it never was. And the Regulation still reads the same. And your wording here is a lot better because it says hilltops, but it doesn't say that in the LDRs. So, you've got be a little careful when you want to add in SRO to Town and to various areas, that you write the proper definition. It depends on how the road height is and you can look at the rough, and the old definition was if you can see the sky, any blue sky behind the rough, then it skylines. So, you might do little exercises. You might drive around the County or Town and you look. A lot of places skyline that are in Town, that are flat as can be and, you know, the definition needs to be worked on, so that it really is hilltops and ??. Anyway, those are my comments, and I went ahead and put them online so they're there now. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. A couple of brief comments. One, this was in my written comments, but I think it's important and I'll bring it up again real quickly. For the Environmental Commission, consider at least maybe two non-professionals in there. I think there would be some benefit in having some diversity and not having it limited to just professionals. Also consider using citizen scientists for updating the NRO. I think ?? at Wildlife Mapping is a good example of something where you can leverage from the pubic and not spend a lot of money doing that. A quick comment on the best management practices. I think Gail talked about that. I think the only way that is going to work is if you specify a goal I think tied to a specific practice and recognize that it's going to need revision periodically, because best management practices means just that, that as things go along and evolve, you come up with better practices. So, recognize, if you do go that route, it's going to require revision. I do support wildlife friendly fencing. And one last suggestion on the indicators, I think there would be some benefit to using a rolling average of some of those things, rather than taking a yearly data point, because some of those data points are going to be up and down, especially... a good example would be the conservation easements. One year you might get a big easement and you're going to look stellar, and then the next year, because those things tend to come in, you know, drips and drabs, or a big-hit homerun, and then the next year, you go to bat. So, I think a rolling average will probably give you a little bit more meaningful information. And look at that <<inaudible>>. Thank you.
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Make Conservation of Open Space its own principle
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add a policy/strategy creating a public funding source for the acquisition of conservation easements and/or open space(Superseded by Recommendation 196)
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6.a: expand to apply to all parcel sizes
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Rework 1.7 to clarify staff's intent considering public, Lisa's and Jessica's comments(Superseded by Recommendation 108)
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Rework 1.7 to clarify staff's intent.
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Look at indicators suggested by public and include in list for elected official review
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add a strategy: creation of an additional Wildlife Stewardship Plan under the direction of the Environmental Commission to detail implementation of Principle 1.1
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Take "creation" out of 1.7.b
9/10/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Include a glossary in Comp Plan of terms and acronyms

Date	Name	Comment
9/9/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	I was in the audience last evening as you were hard at work hammering out wording for the Comp Plan, most specifically, the Dark Skies segment. I wanted to get up to the microphone and say :) Dark Skies does not necessarily mean NO light .. it means limited light, BUT what IS used should cast it's light DOWN and not OUT or UP! That is accomplished by using "can" lighting on homes, and guards such as the newest lighting exhibits. The newer lamps cover the source of the light, so it shines down only and not out. One should not see the source of the light. It's the old "You don't need to light up your neighbor's back yard to see your back steps." You may visit darksky.org (International Dark-Sky Association) to see examples and definitions. I am delighted that that section will be in the comp plan .. My first "nomination" for correction is Flat Creek Motel! I can see those lights from the other side of the Refuge!
9/8/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	Thank you so much for changing the wording in 1.6(a) to read ... “support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land throughout Teton County.” We are impressed with your willingness to incorporate this information, received during public comment, into the revised Comp Plan! We look fwd to when the document is completed and sent to our Mayor and Council and the County Commissioners for final adoption, that they will follow the joint planning commission’s recommendation and not unwind this statement affirming South Park’s value - and value of all large, open parcels. Again, thank you for your tireless work to get the planning document for the Town and County right - instead of quickly done!!
9/6/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	"Dear Commissioners: I attended the Comp. Plan meeting on 9/3, and want you to know that I appreciated your attention to public comment, and the discussion that followed. I was pleased with your decision to leave out specific area references when acknowledging the importance of open space, scenic vistas, agricultural activity, and wildlife habitat and travel corridors. This was a better solution than the initial proposal to re-insert South Park into the text. Thanks again for all of the thought and work that you are putting into this important effort. Sincerely, Karen Jerger"

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Previous straw votes: Recommendation #54 – We strongly support - “Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resource Overlay” Recommendation #71 – “Leave Policy 1.1.c as is” (Conserve large, contiguous, and open spaces) • We recommend improving Policy 1.1.c: at a minimum to add “connectivity between NRO areas” so it recognizes your recommendation #54. Specifically we suggest rewriting/adding: - o “Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay.” • Further we suggest the following changes to Policy 1.1c (Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces) to recognize you recommendation # 54. - o “Large and contiguous open spaces of habitat are the most valuable to wildlife because they protect connectivity between crucial areas, enable migration and reduce human conflict. Private efforts have been successful in permanently preserving such some of these strategic lands. Continued public, private and cooperative efforts are critical to conserving open space, particularly with the Natural Resource Overlay. Continued public, private and cooperative open space acquisition efforts for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged. Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay.” Tonight’s discussion: Open Space Conservation Strategies, South Park: • This plan must encourage the continued acquisition of permanent conservation of large, contiguous open spaces in order to uphold the community’s top priorities of both wildlife and open space. Open space conservation, for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged and not be limited to the narrowly defined NRO. The 1994 Plan focused on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: scenic preservation, agriculture and wildlife habitat protection. • Expand with language from 1994 Comp Plan language related to Open Space. Policy 1.6.a: Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County: “The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land and to continue farming in South Park, Alta, Buffalo Valley, the Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and south Fall Creek Road.” • Add South Park to this list. - o South Park is first on the list in the section of our current legally binding 1994 Comp Plan. The new language inadvertently strips South Park of such protection, implying that the entirety of the South Park district does not deserve conservation and directly unwinding the protection in our existing plan. Whether a node is or is not included on one very small portion of the South Park region – as in the 1994 plan, the greater South Park area should be prioritized for conservation. • Expand in this section Principle 1.6 (Conserve remaining agricultural resources), under Principle 1.5 (Maintain the scenic resources of the area), and under Principle 1.1 – (Maintain healthy populations of all native species) by utilizing some form of the 1994 Plan expanded language which focuses on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture. - o Recommended using some form of the following language from our current 1994 plan within Principles 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6: “These are lands on which ranching should continue, wildlife habitat preserved, and the visual qualities of scenic vistas protected. These areas should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting

Date	Name	Comment
		scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community's character. The County should encourage the preservation of the rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and corridors, and encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community character. Where possible, the County should be flexible with its development regulations as an encouragement to landowners to permanently protect these wildlife, scenic and agricultural areas. In addition, where nonregulatory options are available, these should be encouraged."
9/3/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	I feel very strongly that wildlife permeability MUST be protected in ALL areas. Writing off wildlife in the county nodes is unacceptable and clearly will cause harm to the existing wildlife populations, year round or seasonal. Therefore, the preliminary recommendation on policy 1.1.g, "do not except any areas from policy" should be made a final recommendation. On policy 1.1.f, the recommendation to change 'support' to 'require' should be enacted. This definitely should be made a requirement. The concept of mere support is not strong enough. The changes to the wording of paragraph 1, Theme 1, that was passed by the county and not passed by the town, are infinitely preferable to the original wording. That recommended new wording is more precise and a far more accurate statement of the community's desires and intentions. I strongly urge that this change be made in spite of the fact that the town planning commissioners did not pass it.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. I tried to make my comments based on the recommendations that you had formally passed last week, which I'm sorry I wasn't here to listen to those, so I'm giving you comment on what I've read. And generally I've got some pretty specific things and I don't know if you want to hear them now or you'd rather look at them online. Some I think you're voting on this tonight, correct? Okay, well, I'll try to make them a little bit more general because I have these things written out and it might take a little period of time. But, generally, you know, quite a few of your changes and comments and recommendations were pretty good; however, what I saw consistent failure was to respect private property rights and the acknowledgement that right now developing, for instance, a 35-acre piece is extremely, extremely difficult and very restrictive already. And it seemed like a lot of the recommendations was going to be restricting it even more, which I have just helped a landowner with a project and it took almost two years to put it through. And they didn't ask for one variance, nothing. And it took almost two years to get it through the process. And a lot of the process was written with innuendos and not based on the LDRs either. It was extremely upsetting to the landowner, who has owned the property since 1918, and they are still writhing with the anger of what went on. And so I would caution you to be extremely careful and respect the private property rights, because if you don't really think hard about it, it's going to be a litigious period of time for the County coming up, if you aren't a little more thoughtful and careful in what you do. And something a little bit...and I won't go into complete specifics on it, but the mitigation part of our Regulations, and you touch on this in the Comp Plan, and saying...it's almost written like you don't have mitigation or vegetation mitigation. There is an extremely very difficult Regulation in place that...and landowners can't even comply with in a lot of cases where they are required to buy purchase property that they don't...outside of their ownership in order to mitigate something, and there aren't options. I mean, the values are so extreme in Teton County for purchasing land, it just makes it impossible. And you really need to think about what you're doing in trying to tighten up some of these things, because I think they're so tight already that it's impossible to deal with. And these mitigation rates for vegetation and these changes have just happened in the last two years. So, they haven't been tested and there haven't been a lot of people that have had to go through this. And when you really read the Regulations, it is unbelievable. You will not believe it if you really understand what one would have to go through. The other thing that bothered me generally in a number of the policies is the wording best management practices. What does that mean? Does that mean the Planning Staff sets the Regulation? What does that mean? I've heard that a number of times when I've been dealing with some complaints through the Planning Office on some Regulations, and they come up with this wording, but they can't give you any written policy. I'm upset about this wording, because there are no written policies to back these best management practices up. They pull these things out of the air, out of the sky, and you have no idea where they came from. So, I would avoid that terminology in the Comp Plan. It's not specific enough and it doesn't direct any very specific policy. So, if you could please look at eliminating, or changing the wording wherever it is—it's in about three or four of the policies. I'd appreciate it if you'd consider that. Let's see, my other comment, and I don't know if you've discussed this yet, but on the Wildlife Commission, I feel that the structure of that Commission should be kind of a mixture of scientists, of people from the public, some of the Wildlife Foundations, and a contributing interest of Game & Fish. I think it should...any kind of recommendations, they should try and produce specific and current data to back up any recommendations. And that's where it should be more of a research type of Commission, instead of a policy-setting Commission, because I feel that policies should be set by the electeds. And so this should be kind of a gathering-information Commission, rather than a Commission that's trying to dictate policy. I did have some...I have some good comments. I liked your wording in 70, in recommendation 70, which is why is this theme addressed. And one more thing that I really did take issue with, on page 17, in the box, it says, what the community has said about this theme. The second column 2008 polling indicated that, and I took offense to this, because it was drawn, this whole side of the box was drawing conclusions that I don't think are necessarily accurate from the polling. I think it was...I don't know where some of these comments came from and I don't think some of the numbers even support them. And I would suggest that we leave out that whole side of the box. So, the left-hand side was all right; the right-hand side I thought drew some conclusions that I don't think are supported. And one comment about the presentation that we just heard. Being a real estate broker for many years here, I understand the whole concept of transferring development rights and doing the conservation easements, but as our values have gotten so skewed and so extensive, I find it very difficult to make the math work between the non-connected PRD, non-contiguous, I guess it's called, PRD and also transferring development rights. I find that the value of these 35-acre rural parcels are the rural areas that's gotten so valuable where people coming in that want to purchase them that I don't know how you're going to make the numbers work with transferring that to no development. I just don't see how it can work with the numbers. So, those would be my comments. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Hansen, Paul Conservation Alliance	We're happy to see some positive steps in the right direction. For purposes of efficiency, we will not reiterate all the comments that we have already submitted in written form on July 30 regarding theme one. In that correspondence we raised a number of questions, and provided a number of recommendations, that we hope you will consider in your discussions on this theme. With regard to the recommendations you made last week, we will submit specific comments and suggestions in written form prior to the hearing at which you will take final votes. We do this also because we anticipate that there will still be a two week time period between when you finish discussing theme one and when you take final votes, allowing the public to submit written comments in time to be included as part of your staff report. So, tonight, I'd primarily like to simply provide a few comments on broader level issues that we hope you'll consider as you finish the first round of theme one recommendations. Wyoming Game & Fish The first regards the Wyoming Game and Fish comments released earlier this summer. In our written comments, we repeatedly referred to their comments and we urge you to direct the incorporation of the many issues they raised into the new plan. Given the lack of reference to them to date in your recommendations on theme one, and the hope that they will be considered more specifically tonight, we anticipate that you will make some additions/changes to the principles/policies you already discussed to better incorporate their suggestions. We feel that Wyoming Game and Fish raised some fundamental issues that must be addressed and did an excellent job articulating the importance of using available science to inform policy decisions. Principle 1.1 As I mentioned earlier, we will submit comments specific to the initial recommendations you already made in written form, but right now we'd just like to make the broad comment that policies under principle 1.1 need more work. For example, regarding recommendations 71 and 72 to leave policies 1.1c and 1.1d as is, we disagree, and feel that policies should be strengthened. Commissioners that voted against this, for purposes of either including specific language about conservation easements or strengthening the level of priority for permanent protection of open spaces, made excellent points, and we hope that you will reconsider your votes on these policies. As we stated in written comments, policy 1.1 c (regarding conservation of large, contiguous and connected spaces) should include stronger language and play a larger role in the plan. This topic gets to the clearest departure from the 1994 Plan's fundamental objective to protect "rural character" (which by definition directs that significant amounts of open space should be protected.) In the 1994 Plan, rural character preservation was a fundamental objective to protect wildlife habitat, scenic vistas and agriculture. This plan should carry on that objective; to date, it doesn't far enough. Moving on to issues that you will likely discuss this evening...we have a few brief comments: Principle 1.5 We appreciate "scenic vistas" being added to the title of this theme. In general, this section should include more specifics about desired scenic policy. (Referring to the 1994 Plan chapter, which we submitted alongside our written comments, is a good starting point.)

Right now, what's listed as an objective under strategy 1.4 "to evaluate and remap based on changes in scenic policy" is too vague. What are these "changes"? This section, principle 1.5, should include a map of the SRO. Also, as we have raised with other issues, why are we removing so much of the specificity and clear guidance about scenic vistas preservation that we already have in our existing plan?

Principle 1.6

At a minimum, those geographic areas called out as targets for preservation in the 1994 Plan, should remain so in the new plan. (In this section, the obvious omission is the South Park region. If geographic areas are called out, this should be reinstated as a priority for conservation. Given all the community benefits that accompany open space protection, we feel that permanent conservation of large parcels of land should be encouraged whenever and wherever possible.)

Principle 1.7

To be brief, we simply ask that you refer to Wyoming Game and Fish comments regarding cumulative impacts of human activities and their specific discussion on dispersed recreation.

Beyond existing principles and identified policies...

To be objective, a "least growth" policy is appropriate in the wildlife theme, to clearly acknowledge the links between the amount of human-related development and activities and potential impacts on wildlife. Without recognizing the linkage clearly, regulations are not likely to address this critical issue. (It could be logically incorporated more clearly in principle 1.1.)

Indicators

We agree with the recommendation that staff should work with other agencies and organizations to develop a plan for indicators. Perhaps existing collaborative groups, including some members of the Technical Advisory Group, could work on focused task forces to come up with the best indicators for each theme. A Task Force could begin work now to identify indicators, including some that we have baseline data, to be ready for review at the end of your final recommendations on the entire plan.

As for indicators, and to always keep in mind with this plan – the community's wish is not to simply wait and monitor the impacts of our decisions – it is to prevent irreparable degradation from occurring in the first place.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Hiddleston, Marv Interested Public	Yeah, my name is Marv Hiddleston. I live in South Park. Actually, I'm a neighbor of Rich's. I want to just comment on my overall impression of the presentation. It all premised on the fact that, as I think Laurie said, landowners who wish to protect the land. And God bless 'em. I mean, my family, my grandfather was born in Freedom in '88, '89, I mean, where I went to law school. I was a Future Farmer of America. But I'm a member of ???. And so what my concern is, as I listen to this...I also have a Planning Commission background in our cities and the like, so I'm attuned to this and I did a lot of land-use work in California and I've had developers in the plan, so I think I understand what's going on. And so you have to anticipate people like most of my former clients who don't wish to protect the land. And so I'm just saying we're in a dilemma, and God bless anybody who wants to protect the land and who would grant conservation easements, although I'm not really aware of a lot of conservation easements that they've granted in South Park. And I really wonder why. We've have all these tools, there's been a lot of great work done to get conservation easements, but somebody needs to ??? in South Park. And what's concerning me as I see this whole process is, you know, transfer, density rights or non-contiguous PRDs, well, you have to put the density somewhere. And what is making me nervous is that South Park is not, at least up to a lot of the point in the Comprehensive Plan the discussion in the works, viewed as really worth being protected. And so it's sort of a dumping ground for density is how I read it. And that can't be because we've heard so much about how valuable the South Park area is to the greater Jackson environment. It's ???. You drive in the from the gateway coming from the south, it's just as important as the gateway coming from the north. The gateway coming in on Highway 22. I can understand there's a lot of conservation easements that have landed in that area. And that's why it looks so beautiful. So, we've got to work out tools to preserve this. And just to really be smart. If we do continue to use non-contiguous PRDs, the key is, as I think Rich said, where you put the density. <<inaudible>>. Also, you know, we had this Teton Meadows battle. I mean, that would have been a beautiful area to have had somebody grant a conservation easement, but nobody did. So, you have these bonus density tools and it's a two-edged sword. The good guys can utilize them to help their families and realize on their land, but the bad guys can do a Teton Meadows. And so how do you prevent that? How do you have the tool sort of just produce for people who want to protect their land and not people who basically want to destroy the land? And then I also want to just finish by saying, you know, there are no guarantees at all in life. And Brad was saying how there's no assurance through zoning that there can be protection. Well, actually, there's no assurance you can even do it through conservation easements. Hell, there have been condemnation of conservation easements in the past. So, I mean, nothing is for sure. But I wouldn't get overly carried away. I think we can do a real good job with zoning. And I hope we can work out some scheme where the ranchers and those who wish to protect the land can utilize these things. But I surely am worried that if we don't have some type of control, people who do not wish to protect the land can wreck havoc on the land. Thank you.
9/3/2009	Heilesen, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We sincerely hope the two commissions will respond to the views expressed by the public and amend the Plan to preserve the scenic, wilflife and historical/agricultural values of South Park. The current Plan recognizes the importance of South Park to the overall environment of Jackson Hole, and no compelling reasons have been estalished why this should change -- in fact just the opposite. The visitors and residents of the valley, and certainly the wildlife dependent on it, recognize that the Park, the town and all the surrounding neighborhoods are part of a unified ecosystem and scenic landscape. Please modify Theme 1 and Policy 1.6 accordingly. Present and future generations will be eternally grateful to you.
9/3/2009	, Interested Public	I'm Denise ??? from East Jackson. And I want to first thank these two bodies for their mammoth undertaking here in revising this Comp Plan. It's going to be long and time consuming and we appreciate your efforts. I also appreciate your efforts of realizing that you need to include wildlife and open space in every portion of this Comp Plan, not just in one place. So I thank you. I would like to also support putting South Park back into the 1.6.A. That's an area that certainly needs protection. And I would urge you to also keep in mind that focus on wildlife, connectivity and agriculture values as well. That's all. Thank you very much.
9/3/2009	Scheznie, Esquene Interested Public	I'm Esquene Scheznie. <<inaudible>>. And I'm interested in knowing, this is sort of new, how many acres of conservation easement <<inaudible>> in 2009 ??? compared to 2008? And under the options you have now for conservation easements, how does it look for the future?

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Harger, Don Interested Public	In your discussions on our new Comprehensive Plan, please keep in mind what makes our area so special: wildlife, open space and the uncrowded feeling of a small, connected community! Most communities with these values lose them within a generation because of growth pressures and an absence of sound long-range planning. As you are well aware, our resources are not inexhaustable and can disappear in the relative blink of an eye. Breckenridge, Aspen and Vale are excellent examples of what can happen to our special valley. Elk Ridge, North Carolina no longer has elk and the last sighting of a grizzly bear in the Los Angeles area was in 1903.
9/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am Kathy Tompkins of Cottonwood Park. Let me say again how much we appreciate the time and effort you are putting in to achieve a workable comprehensive plan that benefits wildlife and defined human needs. I am a small property owner in Cottonwood Park. I can vacuum my whole house from one outlet. I don't need a slew of house cleaners, landscapers, nannies or personal assistants. I do all the above. I take pride in taking care of my small home and sharing what I grow in my garden. There are two things I do need help with though; property taxes and property rights. My property taxes have gone up over a thousand dollars in the last year. With all the new services needed in the future because of the large increases in residential and commercial development in the new draft comprehensive plan, I am afraid I will be taxed right out of the valley when my husband and I retire. I am also concerned that only the property rights of the large landowners are going to be respected in the new comprehensive plan. Even though our homes are modest, cottonwood Park stands together as a community and as property owners we have rights too. By protecting wildlife and open space in all of South Park we will be protecting the reasons why we work so hard to stay in this valley. We are not "no growers"! South Park must be put back at the top of the list when it comes to protecting wildlife and open spaces. This will then guide and help us properly plan how much and what kind of development will happen in the NW corner of South Park after infill in town has been completed. We need to keep the base development rights that exist now without density bonuses. Both protection of Wildlife and open spaces and managing growth by limiting growth are needed for South Park. They are inseparable. One without the other will result in failure of any new plan. On the subject of managing growth, all too often the small homeowner is left to fend for him or herself to protect their property and its value. We are shuffled between town officials, police and our home owners associations when we alert them that our neighborhoods are deteriorating from overcrowded homes that are being used as boarding houses and employee dormitories. We need to attend to this problem or we will find our most precious commodity, working families, being exported to areas outside the valley. The town of Jackson will be then known for its boarding houses and the problems they bring with them. This does not mean building thousands of new homes. This will only lead to abandoning the older neighborhoods and supports what we don't want; growing our way out of our growth problems. We need to manage what we have by working together. That means town government, employers, homeowners associations, and especially landlords and rental management agencies. The burden to protect a neighborhood falls on the shoulders of the small property owner who lives in his or her home; while absent landlords and rental management companies profit from encouraging over crowded single family rentals by looking the other way. Employers need to help more by housing their employees on or near their job site. We should be mindful of the unintended consequences that unchecked growth resulting in over crowded rentals has on the single family neighborhood however you define a family; whether they are straight or gay couples, unmarried couples with or without children or the traditionally defined family. However we achieve it we cannot afford to have a laissez faire, not my problem attitude toward the small property owner. If you want to preserve community character and make a revised comprehensive plan work, it starts with protecting wildlife and open spaces, managing growth by limiting growth and last but not most important, stabilizing and protecting our family neighborhoods. Without them we are just another spot on the map.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I have a lot to say here; it's going to be long. I guess I'll start out with due reference to the forum you have here about open space. I think we should have a dedicated forum about open space like a workshop where you could get more information. I find it troubling that the Land Trust, and believe me I love the Land Trust, can't come up with more concrete data on where that PRD should be based on historic uses patterns current utilization rates, etc., etc. I've heard in previous forums that only 12 percent of the land we preserve is a direct result of a PRD. I'll defer to Mrs. Andrews. It's actually in a recent newspaper article, about 2300 acres. Mr. Resor at the workshop echoed this forum. So, I have a problem with concentrating so much of our dialog in a way, the discourse on something that has proven 88 percent inefficient in the past. There has to be a PRD, obviously. But we need to focus this number down, where it's going to be. We're going to be running out of time for you to provide that recommendation to the electeds, etc., on where that should be. We should just have a knock down drag out about what the number should be and send forth that recommendation. Primarily because it's almost all a matter of the negative impacts and the effects of unintended consequences are lower and lower base number. And this PRD, as is currently written, maybe not down to the three but somewhere in between, leaves too much discretion to our electeds and that hasn't proven ?? I'd like to...I'm very sympathetic to the agriculturists and families and ranching families. Whether you acquired your land nepotismly it doesn't matter. You only hold onto it by the sweat of your brow. I grew up working the land also. So, if we could even find out a way to ID viable ranches and have maybe a different rate for those ranchers, maybe that's something to consider when we move forward with the PRD. Because as people so eloquently stated here, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Meade, the agriculturists historically have been disproportionately responsible for our open space. And we need to recognize that and maybe maintain that going forward. If we do it in viable properties, it doesn't lead to opportunity to selectively interpret development applications. It may or may not be, you know, of benefit to the community. As far as the TDRs go, a little bit of research reveals and the way it's currently written into the Plan more or less, it requires up zones. It requires entity uptakes. It's probably not the best Plan. I would like to propose right now that we put our money where our mouth is in this community. Mr. Hansen touched on it. A polling data, was it 77.8 percent in one poll for, and 13.8 against having an additive tax, two hundred bucks a year ?? If we propose a six cents non-additive tax at a 70 percent procurement for open space and 30 percent for affordable housing, it's something we'll probably get through. I doubt Mrs. Christine Walker would turn down three and a half million dollars a year, and I doubt Mrs. Andrews would turn down six and a half million dollars a year, especially since the unbelievably successful campaign for the Valley generated twenty-six million in four years. That's six and a half million dollars a year. And it makes one unbelievable ??, 1200 acres of targeted high-value habitat. I think that's it. Again, I'd really like to see an open space forum. Mr. Resor, I mean, Mrs. Andrews, Mr. Meade, Mr. Wilson, you have so many large land owners. If we could do it in a more relaxed fashion with that as the only topic for the night to extract maximum information. I think that's ?? As far as the wildlife you've discussed so far, I'd like to echo several speakers. Since policy 1.6.A, open space and wildlife habitat, connectivity, scenic value in South Park. It needs to be re-added. I'd like to say in going forward as we're going through this process, keep in mind as we move out of theme one that the largest impacts of theme one will occur in theme two. So let's keep this wildlife and conservation and community character and quality of life focused moving forward. Theme two will have the most impact on theme one. Environmental Commission, great addition. Strategy 1.1, I think we should convene it now, even if it's ad hoc. Convene it now. We're making decisions in a vacuum of information on wildlife. The expertise is here. It doesn't have to be a formation of a committee, but let's start extracting information. We've got people here that are world class sitting in this room right now. You know who I'm talking about. We can engage the Wildlife Foundation, the Alliance, Fish & Game, Park, everyone. Let's get on it; it's important. Again, I'd like to reiterate that on page 1 the very first table, what is a Comprehensive Plan, does not list wildlife. That's a, you know, in a lot of ways this Plan in some ways is being adjusted with a scalpel and a pair of tweezers, and we should adjust it with a machete and sledge hammer. But that's one area where semantics, you know, work. I have a real problem with policy 1.1.G, the language, even instead of except needs to be inserted. Moving forward, we don't know what's going to happen in district maps, ??, etc. But if we leave the except in there from just how wildlife values for South Park, Aspens, Carnes Meadow, the Flat Creek deer herd, etc., all these districts should be permeable. If we make the Carnes Meadow and Radio Grounds district impermeable, that could be disastrous to the Flat Creek deer herd. Access to water and ?? I agree with 1.3 going into a dedicated energy efficiency chapter, which was suggested previously. It's so important moving forward in our community and globally that we need to focus attention on it by giving it its just due, which is its own chapter. Also, going back to the first part of the open space, whatever we do and however we choose to implement it going forward, there has to be a unit-to-unit offset for any density transfer. It has to be. It has to be achieved. Density neutrality. The public commented on this ad nauseam. So, right now, we're looking at 4020 units in the County and Town combined as base entitlement. Yet the Plan allows 9880 units potentially but via density transfer. So, whatever we do, it has to achieve density neutrality moving forward. That's about all; that's enough time. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	I'm going to talk for a minute or two before I get to this piece, but I just want to leave this as a leave-behind piece for you. Rich Bloom, Teton County. First I want to thank Meredith and Laurie and Brad. I think most people know that I've been a strong supporter of the PRD and I've been trying to broker understanding amongst the conservation groups and neighborhood groups <<inaudible>>. Not to say that it doesn't need perhaps retooling the upper end of nine per 35. And I do think too one of the issues we had in the planning process was an assumption that it was going to be used at a rate that was not reasonable in these rural areas like Alta and Buffalo Valley, what I call ?? in that they took that number and then moved those to the nodes as a way of coming up with the upper end of the nodes. Meaning I think there was an assumption that the PRD would be used on 70 percent of the remaining rural land, yet the pattern of experience hasn't been that. But anyway I support the PRD. I think it's an important tool. And I think it's critically important. The non-contiguous portion of it has damages. I think Ms. daCosta's point of, yes, identifying receiving areas is an important piece of it so everybody can support it. And there are those areas in the Valley that people will accept it, especially if they see conservation occurring somewhere else in the greater region. I think that's a major key. A couple of things I wanted to touch on from the previous week. One is the Fish & Game memo I think is critically important for the Game & Fish, excuse me, of June 26. And I hope you highlighted a few points on that. One, I read under build-out for the first time it talked about the inescapable connection of not just pattern growth but pure numbers that we have on off-site impacts. They mentioned identifying certain districts for wildlife and open space as top priority is very important, but it is an opportunity and important for other districts for wildlife. They've done a lot of talking about the NRO right now as a tool, but it doesn't mean that a place that doesn't have the NRO does not have values, especially when you add in scenic and agriculture. But they mentioned that the future land-use map is not available, although they recognize that. We have concerns regarding the picture of how the community would look if development themes in the Plan are fully implemented, which is the upper range that we've all been talking about. Wildlife in Teton County depends upon access to seasonal habitats that are often separated by developments, subdivisions and roads. While the Comprehensive Plan does not provide guidance regarding appropriate location of open space and development, the Plan should acknowledge that moose, deer, elk, bears and other wildlife will be negatively impacted if maximum build-out is approached. Permeability is crucial. So, with that in mind, a couple of things. Recommendation 54, they had a straw vote on it, which was throughout theme one, wildlife protection policies to be implemented only in the Natural Resource Overlay. We also know that there's a scenic and agriculture value of open space. I think we've got hung up on open space only applies to wildlife but there's three very distinct values we're trying to achieve here. Our agricultural history, thank God for the ranchers who have been the best stewards we've had in this Valley. And continuation of ranching is something we want to achieve currently with them and help them out. Scenic is another value and wildlife. But even wildlife gets focused on in the NRO is not achieving. You've already approved that in 54, yet in recommendation 71 that was the large and contiguous open spaces. Under the wildlife principle, you left that policy as is. And I would recommend at the very least if you approve that policy, to add connectivity between NRO reference. There's a focus sentence in there that talks about additional efforts of ?? open space that line ???. My alternative language is consider either lies within or provide connectivity between portions of the NRO. Connectivity, what I will tell you that these animals, even though the critical winter range might be in one area or not, they move between them and achieving open space between those are something that can support wildlife. Somewhere in here you have to hook in some of the other ??, which is more strongly acknowledging scenic and agricultural. Policy 1.6.A will be coming up tonight. That's the only place where you talk about what's done in a whole chapter of our current Plan about conserving agricultural lands and agriculture throughout the County and that the County will support efforts of landowners. And you list Alta, Buffalo Valley, the ?? area, Spring Gulch, and Fall Creek. But South Park, which is number one on the list in our currently legally binding '94 Plan, has been left off. South Park is a region of 5000 acres. The current Plan identifies the same node. It mentions a node up by Cottonwood Park. But it doesn't throw out the baby with the bathwater. It doesn't say because there might be a node or some sort to achieve some goals, both open space and housing, that you all of a sudden take the whole 5000 acres off the list as a focus, as a vision, to achieve scenic, wildlife and agricultural goals. So, I think you've gotten plenty of input from the public on this. We've visited this over numerous times in our community, a new neighborhood back in 2001, down by the Seherr-Thoss property. To support an organization which was not handled well by the community because that's a good family down there and yet they've ended up in referendum where the folks in the Town of Jackson overwhelmingly voted against the annexation plan as it was done. Teton Meadows Ranch in 2007 and 2008, you know how that turned out. There was over a thousand people that commented on that Plan. Surveys and polling and then the most recent published ?? bibliography of all the studies that the Alliance lead on. So, obviously, I would like to see on behalf of South Park neighbors and the community at large that South Park is back on the list. That does not preclude the discussion about a node or no node. We're talking about a very big region from the Snake River over to Highway 89 all the way up to really Highway 22, is what's considered biologically or in our minds as South Park. Lastly, in principles 1.1, 1.5, 1.6, which is where we touch on open space, I'm not sure of the appropriate location at the last page here some of the language that's in our current finding the 1994 Plan. I think we need to expand upon why we're achieving open space beyond wildlife and NRO to kind of include agriculture and scenic value as well. All this acknowledges at the base of all this are private property rights. We've always know and we've never stipulated private owners. So there's some language there. There's actually a whole other part in that chapter. I think there's some very good

Date	Name	Comment
		language that could be pulled from the current Plan if it's truly an update and moved into all or one of these sections. Thank you.
9/3/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	I am looking forward to attending your meeting tonight, but do not plan to speak unless I feel that something is being left out of the conversation about South Park. My main concern is that the proposed plan disregards the important scenic, agricultural, and wildlife attributes of the South Park Area. These qualities are recognized in the previous (current) plan, and should not be ignored in the new plan. I have lived in the Rafter J subdivision for 21 years. There have been alot of changes in the areas south of us over that time. I do not see that the current plan has deterred thoughtfully planned growth. But without formally recognizing the importance of open space and connectivity for wildlife, developers/planners have little incentive to consider the significant impacts of their proposals. We need to continue to publicly state in our Comp. Plan that South Park has qualities that are to be (at the very least) carefully considered and creatively addressed. Thank you for your consideration. Please do the right thing by maintaining the descriptions and protections already provided in the 1994 Plan.
9/3/2009	Thompson, Colleen Interested Public	I would like to add my voice to those who see wildlife conservation as the #1 priority in not only South Park, but the entire county. Growth cannot continue forever; it will have to be strongly constrained at some point. Wildlife, once pushed out, may find it impossible to recover. So let's stop developing now, before we lose any more. I believe we have more than enough commercial development already. So much commercial space is standing empty. The amount set aside for commercial development in the recent proposal was way, way too much.
9/3/2009	Simms, Barbara Interested Public	I would like to offer a comment I'm not sure I've heard mentioned in the many discussions about South Park: the "view corridor" approaching the Valley from the south, just after the little rise north of the South Park bridge, is beautiful. The remaining open land and hayfields with horses and grazing cattle provide a sense of continuity with the Valley's ranching history and a quietly stunning welcome to the Valley. I believe we need to value that open, spacious view corridor and all that it represents.
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.5.c: add "all land disturbing activities will be required to fit natural contours by conforming to construction standards for land moving"

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, I'm Kathy Hopkins of Cottonwood Park. I think what I have to say here all ties into theme one, even though it might touch on a little bit of growth management. Let me say again how much we appreciate your time and effort you're putting in to achieve a workable Comprehensive Plan that benefits wildlife and defines human needs. I am a small property owner in Cottonwood Park. I can vacuum my whole house from one outlet. I don't need a slew of house cleaners, landscapers, managers, personal assistants. I do all the above. I take pride in taking care of my small home ensuring what I grow in my garden. There are two things I do need help with, though—property taxes and property rights. My property taxes have gone up over a thousand dollars in the last year. With all the new services needed in the future because of the large increases in residential and commercial development rights in the new draft Plan, I'm afraid I will be taxed right out of the Valley when my husband and I retire. I am also concerned that the only property rights that will be respected will be that of the large landowners. Even though our homes are modest, Cottonwood Park stands together as a community, and as property owners we have rights too. By protecting wildlife and open space in all of South Park we will be protecting the reasons why we work so hard to stay in this Valley. We are not ?? . South Park must be put back at the top of the list when it comes to protecting wildlife and open spaces. This will then guide and help us properly plan how much and what kind of development will happen in the northwest corner of South Park after ?? has been completed. We need to keep the base development rights that exist now without density bonuses until we can figure out a fair way to do this. Both protection of wildlife and open spaces and managing growth by limiting growth are needed for South Park. They are inseparable. One without the other would result in ?? of any new Plan. On the subject of managing growth, and I know this is going to be down the road a little bit, but I think this just will tie in. All too often the small homeowner is left to fend for him or herself to protect their property and its value. We are shuffled between Town officials, police and our homeowners associations when we alert them that our neighborhoods are deteriorating from overcrowded homes that are being used as boarding houses and employee dormitories. We need to attend this problem or we will find our most precious commodity, working families, being exported to areas outside the Valley. The Town of Jackson will then be known for its boarding houses and the problems they bring with them. This does not mean building thousands of new homes. This will only lead to abandoning the old neighborhoods and support what we don't want—growing our way out of our growth problems. We need to manage what we have by working together. That means Town government, employers, homeowners associations, and especially land and rental management agencies. The burden to protect the neighborhood falls on the shoulders of the small property owner who lives in his or her home while absent landlords and rental management companies profit from encouraging overcrowded single-family rentals by looking the other way. Employers need to help out more by housing their employees on or near their job site. We should be mindful of the unintended consequences that unchecked growth resulting in overcrowded rentals has on the single-family neighborhood however you define a family, whether they're straight or gay couples, married couples, with or without children, or the traditionally defined family. However we achieve it, we cannot afford to have a laissez-faire attitude toward the small property owner. If you want to preserve community character and make a revised Comprehensive Plan work, it starts with protecting wildlife and open spaces and managing growth by limiting growth and last, but most important, stabilizing and protecting our family neighborhoods. Without them we are just another spot on the map.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Hansen, Paul Conservation Alliance	Good evening. I'm Paul Hansen. I'm executive director of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I want to start by expressing our appreciation for the positive movement and all the hard work that you folks have put into this process. I know it's long and tedious. And I'm glad to see things moving in a positive direction. We're going to be submitting specific comments and suggestions in paper form in a timely fashion for your consideration for final vote, and we have submitted a number of recommendations for your deliberations tonight and I hope you've had a chance to read them. I'd like to provide a few general comments and start by echoing our feeling on the importance of the Wyoming Fish & Game letter that you received in late June. We feel that the professionals at the Fish & Game Department have surely done an excellent job in discussing and incorporating many issues of Fish & Game and science into the Plan. We hope that you'll consider those comments more specifically tonight. I understand from prior meetings that some of the Commissioners have not had a chance to read some of those comments, so we think they really do have a great deal of importance for some of the topics that you considered at the last meeting, Sections 1.C and 1.D, and for many of the topics you're going to consider tonight. But wildlife mortality, for instance, on the highways. The number is 236 animals per year in the letter and of course this underreports what's actually killed on the highways because we only count what's killed instantly and stays next to the road. I have lived a couple of miles off the highways several times in my life and we had deer that would stagger in and die or we'd find back in the woods. So, most of the science, the wildlife science would suggest that the actual mortality figure is about two or three times that. And we feel like this is an area that most of us really could come to some agreement on and really do some things to reduce this mortality. And it doesn't really even reflect at all the difficult decisions on development. It's just a positive mitigation strategy and think that the Game & Fish folks really they expect some recommendations in this area. In the 1994 Plan we think had particularly good recommendations when it comes to scenic protection. And the scenic vistas, the title being added to this theme, we appreciate; we think this is a good idea. We also would recommend you take a good look at the 1994 Plan chapter. We think it would provide a particularly good starting point for your discussions on the scenic vistas issue and we certainly would recommend that there be a Scenic Resource Overlay map included, as you've done with the Natural Resource Overlay map. We certainly agree with previous comments of geographic areas that have been pulled out as targets. And in principle 1.6 we think South Park really needs to be added back in and stipulated as one of the key areas. And given all the benefits of open space protection, we feel that a good deal of emphasis needs to be included in this area. I'm sure a couple of weeks ago there was a conversation about science and the need for wildlife science in the NRO and we had some questions as to why particularly for private lands. And it took me, drawing on that in my business and my conversations with the private landowners in the Valley. These folks love the land as much as any of us. And I'm absolutely convinced that we have good science beyond its use in regulatory framework. It would be very useful to these private landowners. I believe that each and every one of them if they knew that development here was going to cost less probably than development there they would find time to attend and put the development in a place where it was less intrusive. And so I think that we all need to remember that our neighbors that own these lands love this land as much as we do and respect the fact that we enjoy the amenities and scenic vistas there and really would pay anything for it. And I certainly agree with Brad that we need to really find a way to establish some public funding mechanisms to help the land conservation in the Valley. I've lived in places where there were real estate transfer taxes. I know it's a tough lift here in Wyoming. But there's a great deal of data now in the country that there's a strong willingness to pay the people for land conservation. In the last 20 years, people have voted in ballot initiatives throughout the nation in strong Republican districts, in strong Democratic districts, \$53 billion on themselves. The most recent examples was my own state of Minnesota, which in November voted to create a 1 percent sales tax dedicated to conservation. It would be \$250 million a year and it would be \$50 per person but about a 4 cents on a \$10 purchase. And it won by a very strong majority of 59 percent to 37 percent. It got 60,000 more votes than the President did in Minnesota in spite of the fact that the vote was taken in the deepest recession in 70 years and when 90 percent of the state's newspapers opposed the initiative because they don't like ballot initiative government in Minnesota. Just not what Minnesotans like to do. So, as you probably know, we've had polling data here in the Valley, two professional scientific polls that were done. Both found that by strong majorities that a two-to-one margin in one case that people really did favor an establishment of public funding. One of the polls found that people favor by a strong majority, not quite two to one, but as much as \$200 per person. So, I think we need to explore this deeply and find a way that we can all fairly share the cost of protecting wildlife and scenery that we all value so much. And do it in a way that respects private landowners and their rights <<inaudible>> of their land. Finally, once again referring to the Game & Fish letter, there was some excellent thinking in there about ?? and how there really is a direct relationship between growth and between the fate of wildlife. We hear a lot about only 3 percent of the Valley being private land. We need to keep in mind that that 3 percent incorporates about 40 percent of crucial winter habitat for ??, which of course are the fundamental basis of the food chain. Scavengers and predators all depend on these ??. In the summer season, the percentage is even higher in the low elevation river valleys. By some studies account for about 75 percent of the birds nesting habitat and this includes species like the bald eagles and trumpeter swans. So, I think we need to pay particular attention to Game & Fish's comments in this area. On the subject of indicators, we agree with the recommendations that Staff should work with other agencies and organizations to develop a plan for indicators. I've had the pleasure of serving on the build-out data committee and found that to be an excellent structure for kind of doing some work on the side that we can bring back to the Commission, and we

Date	Name	Comment
		recommend that model in the area of indicators, too. Again, thank you for all your hard efforts on behalf of our community, our wildlife and our open space. Thanks.
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6.a: delete the list of places in last sentence
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Define and clarify "Best Practices" usage throughout document
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6.c: staff will rewrite to focus on goal of policy which is the last sentence
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6.c: language should provide incentives for permanent open space
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6.b: prioritize conservation of agricultural use throughout Teton County
9/3/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Franz Camenzind, Jackson Hole resident. Thank you for this opportunity. I do want to thank the previous members that came in here early this evening and talked to us about the conservation easements. I appreciate that a lot. Last week's discussion, one of the things that was brought up was this idea of growth caps. If it's been sort of subverted into a different discussion, population control or population caps, I think that's unfortunate. I would just like to recommend that all growth and development categories be reduced to the lowest legally defensible baseline zoning numbers that exist today, and that these new numbers become the maximum values for the new Plan. I think that's as simple as that. It's something you can defend and roughly looking at the numbers that have been available to the community and what I expect to come out from the spilled-out committee, I think this is still going to show a potential for about 50 percent growth in most categories. And I can't imagine any developer invested not being enthusiastic about the potential for 50 percent growth within the next 10 or 15 years. So, it wouldn't be cutting down growth. It's not a no-growth scenario. But it's one that is legally defensible. So, I really urge you to weave that into your thinking as this process goes forward. I would also like to emphasize the need for the Environmental Commission. I would recommend that that Commission be made up of five to seven members and that the majority of them have some kind of environmental science background, but that there be a clear number of people there that are full-time residents of this community and have first-hand experience and not necessarily that they're environmental scientists. I would also like to, and I will emphasize the information that was presented in the Game & Fish letter of June 26th and, as an aside, I'm a little frustrated last week to hear that many of you hadn't seen that yet. And this was late August and this letter was submitted in June and again tonight I may have misheard this, but apparently the Resor letter hadn't been distributed to all of you. And I think that's a little frustrating to know that there's good input from people who have a lot of good information that is not getting to your hands in a timely manner. And I would hope that would be addressed. I think the last thing that I'll talk about right now is the...my population viability scenario that I talked to you about in the past. And it is number eight I believe in the Game & Fish letter and they make that point also. So, if we're dealing with a future Plan here that is going to be science based and if you're not going to incorporate the recommendations of the one committee, or the one organization in this community that is totally dealing with Game & Fish on wildlife issues, then I don't know where you're going to turn. So, I think you should put their recommendations right on the top of this. Viability should be defined as much by population goals that the federal and state agencies put out, not just the biological definition that was done over the past 46 years.
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6.a add: "The conservation and agricultural use of large contiguous private land is also the most consistent land use with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Efforts aimed at the permanent conservation of such lands have the greatest potential to posi
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.5: staff will research the addition of Scenic Resource Overlay policies for Town

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.5.d: add language addressing pedestrian and/or public safety
9/3/2009	Creel, Margaret Interested Public	Margaret Creel. I live in Rafter J, and some of you in the room know me and some don't. I've been very outspoken over the years about development in South Park. And I have no problem in stating that South Park has tremendous wildlife value. It has for years and continues to have tremendous value. One of my hopes is that the Game & Fish at some point will change their paradigm in giving some sort of importance value to small mammals that include rodents. Because the agricultural meadows in South Park as well as a large portion of Teton County is just ripe with small rodents that are the base of what so many of the animals eat. Elk, you know, they're certainly at a different place on the food chain, but at any rate, I just want to...I don't want anyone to ever forget how much value small rodents do have in agricultural meadows to ?? and bears and wolves and raptors and eagles and weasels. Every member of the weasel family, which includes everything from skunks to badgers to martens to river otters and so on and so forth. So, of course, I would like you to put South Park back into the Plan where you removed it. Something else has been really curious to me and, having just read the letter from the Game & Fish that have a lot of tremendous and valuable information, is that I haven't heard anyone address the chronic waste disease that's on our doorstep in Teton County. And one of the places it would profoundly affect is South Park, a well-known elk refuge. No one has talked at all about what is going to happen when those thousands of elk come down with this disease and start wandering aimlessly through the developments in South Park and elsewhere in Jackson Hole. And I think this is an issue that everyone involved in planning and involvement in this Plan have to address because it is on our doorstep. The first documented case of chronic waste disease in elk and moose was documented in this past year I think in Teton County or one other county. It is coming. For one thing, I was trying to do a little bit of work reading some of the work that you all have done in terms of changing maybe some of the...I don't have that either, do I...something that I'd like to be changed because I took tremendous issue with usage of sustainable development from ?? report from, where was it, the 1980s? Where are we right now, 2009? I thought that was incredibly outdated and, I'm glad, it seems like you removed that. Am I correct? And so kudos for that because I was going to fire off a letter to say, come on, you know, we're in the 21st century. So, sorry, I was disjointed but thank you again.
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.6: staff will draft language that recognizes permanent conservation of large contiguous properties as one of our highest land use priorities
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.5.a and 1.5.b: expand skyline/foreground protection beyond public roads/parks to all roads
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	1.5: add a policy of continuing support of a Scenic Resource Overlay for the County
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 1.5: ...as much as "reasonably" possible
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 1.5 "... and will be regulated" instead of "...and will be prevented as much as possible"
9/3/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff will research the legality of a policy regarding noise pollution and insert the appropriate policy in the appropriate location in the Plan

Date	Name	Comment
9/2/2009	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Thank you for volunteering your time and for all the work you are doing to insure that the Comprehensive Plan Update is a transparent, public process reflecting community priorities. Below is my input for tomorrow's themes. Please maintain the commitment made in the current plan to conserve the scenic rural beauty and wildlife of South Park. Removal of this theme is arbitrary and unacceptable. Transferring development rights from rural areas (e.g. Buffalo Valley, Alta) where growth is not likely to occur to areas where growth is most likely to occur (South Park) does not conserve agricultural land. To the contrary, it makes development of such lands more likely. The community has expressed in several polls and in numerous public comments, it prefers slow, smart growth, that it does not want increased build-out. There are sufficient development rights to grow for many years. Up- zoning South Park would serve no community purpose. It would make a few individuals wealthy (or wealthier) and that's about it. The cost of the proposed scale of growth in terms of infrastructure and run-down of our natural capital are high. Imagine the mess an enormous, 500-home development like TMR would be now had it been allowed to move forward. Growing slowly makes sense from an economic as well as an environmental perspective, especially for economies like ours that are heavily dependent on natural capital.
9/2/2009	Greger, Art Interested Public	Just a follow up asking you to consider the enormous input of public opinion asking for the protection of South Parks scenic and wildlife value as the plan moves forward. Please also consider the costs of growth as it impacts the quality of life for all residents. The public has asked for low growth and protection of South Park...please listen.
9/2/2009	Salter, Andy Interested Public	The broad South Park area contains critically important wildlife areas and migration routes. Its scenic vistas are precious and must not be lost. Theme 1 must recognize and affirm the scenic, wildlife, connectivity and agricultural values of the greater South Park area. These values were recognized in the prior version of the Comp Plan and must be affirmed once again in whatever version the County and Town Planning Commissions develop.
9/1/2009	Omlor, Kristen Interested Public	We find it very disheartening that the new comprehensive plan places low priority on the wildlife and scenic values of the South Park area. We have lived in Jackson Hole for 13 years and in Melody Ranch for 4 of those years. In those 4 years, we have seen and heard a variety of wildlife. We have had moose, elk and fox in our backyard. We have eagles, osprey, hawks, cranes and numerous other small birds fly around our house. We have heard the coyotes and frogs/toads. We have incredible views of the Tetons, Glory Bowl and Munger Mtn. We love driving by the open space whether on the highway or South Park Loop Road. Being affordable home owners, we understand the need for affordable units and are very grateful that we are able to live in this beautiful place. However, we are very aware that the wildlife and the scenery are reasons we love living here.
8/31/2009	Thomas, Shirley & Dan Interested Public	As concerned citizens we would like you to take into consideration the value of the South Park area. It remains a wildlife corridor. We have moose, fox, coyote & elk even in our back yards during the migration & the Winter months. It has wonderful scenic value & serves as agricultural land for several farms. Please do not lessen this value for our future generations.
8/31/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	Thank you for your difficult and hard work on revising the comprehensive plan to more closely represent the feelings of the community in their desire to protect wildlife and open space. Crowding anywhere in this Valley will result in degradation of the land, water, habitat for wildlife, and our quality of life. Most especially, I trust you will see the wisdom of reaffirming the wildlife, connectivity, scenic and agricultural values in the greater South Park region. South Park needs to be needs to be returned to Policy 1.6a!!
8/31/2009	Parker, Jon Interested Public	Please leave us some open space and wildlife corridors in South Park. The people have consistently said this is what they want.

Date	Name	Comment
8/31/2009	Healey, Bill Interested Public	Commissioners----as a resident of the South Park region ---Dairy subdivision---I strongly believe that Theme I needs to be amended to recognize & reaffirm the wildlife,connectivity,scenic & ag. Values in the greater South Park Region-----I further find particularly disturbing the proposed connector road intersection at South Park Loop & Boyles Hill rd.---while I recognize this road was approved many years ago the affected area/ neighborhoods have changed / grown so much that the connector road & the amount of traffic---16,000 cars per day?---would effectively change a rural atmosphere to a urban one----the Real problem is the “Y”---where are the in depth traffic studies & designs to rectify the real issue??----
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	P9 graphic - Community Vision. Replace with a "Nortonian" Teeter Totter
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.1.e: Staff to rewrite to clarify intent of mitigating primarily development impacts and relationship with 1.1.[a]
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Leave Policy 1.1.[a] as is(Superseded by Recommendation 54)
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Leave Policy 1.1.[d] as is(Superseded by Recommendation 202)
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	"Why is this theme addressed?" replace Paragraph 1 with: Because Teton County's abundant wildlife, natural and scenic resources are an international treasure, and the protection of these resources is our community's highest priority. We recognize that our policies regarding development, transportation, recreation, and energy consumption all have impacts on these resources, so it is our responsibility to create policies and enact regulations which protect them. Permanent Conservation Permanent conservation of private lands has resulted in about 20,000 acres of conserved open space. Another 15,000 acres are still in agricultural use. Agricultural use of large contiguous private land is most consistent with the goals of this Comprehensive Plan. Efforts aimed at the permanent conservation of such lands have the greatest potential to positively impact Teton County's wildlife, scenic and natural resources, and should be our highest land use priority.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Begin each policy with an action verb
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add language in the introduction about the administration chapter annual and five year reviews
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Remove all pictures, but keep diagrams, boxes, etc.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	3rd check on page 8 amended: The impact of decisions must be understood in a local, regional and global context because of the impacts that development and other human activities have on ecological processes.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Insert in Vision chapter text a discussion of "least growth" solutions in order to meet human needs - emphasizing wildlife and natural resource protection while acknowledging private property rights

Date	Name	Comment
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Vision Statement: Preserve and protect the area's unparalleled natural ecosystem while meeting our community's needs in an environmentally responsible manner that celebrates this significant and unique place on our shared planet. Have staff add commun
8/27/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Thank you, Commissioners, Franz Camenzind, Jackson Hole resident. I would reiterate what I said two weeks ago on sustainability, but I know you wrote that down and have it tucked away nicely and incorporated into your comments or your thoughts now. So, I won't go over it. But I will dwell a little bit on this character base. I know there's been a lot of discussion through the community on this new Plan not being character based. Some people say you can't have a character-based Plan, that's what caused part of the problems. Well, I say you can have a character-based Plan, if you define what character is. And if you take each neighborhood or each area, if you will, and start saying, okay, this is a rural area, this is a single-family-home neighborhood, and say that's the character. And then when you say maintain the character of your single family homes, that will direct the LDRs. It should direct them and keep them from intensifying those neighborhoods. It should write LDRs that wouldn't allow commercial. I think character base is a huge issue in this community. I think you just have to go to each neighborhood or community and say, this is the character that exists now, and do we want to maintain it or not? That will be the decision to come forward with. But character has meaning, it has a lot of residents in this community, and I think you just have to take the neighborhoods, define it and then say whether we want to deviate from that or maintain it. The other question that comes up a lot, and I'm talking more as a biologist here, caring capacity is very...it sounds great, but it's a tricky phrase. Because if we're looking at human caring capacity in Jackson Hole, we've already exceeded it, if we're looking at it and defining it in any natural sense. We're hauling in our energy in a pipe, we're hauling in our energy in high voltage power lines to Memphis coming into the Valley. We've already exceeded our caring capacity, human natural caring capacity. So, I would rather that we think, at least, in terms of tipping points. Where are we on tipping points? Where are we...How close are we to losing migration corridors, losing, you know, our terration areas, losing the quality of life here? This caring capacity, particularly if you start defining it around humans, we are good at creating environments and we could live on golf holes now, where naturally we couldn't have done that. So, I think we have to be careful about the way we use that phrase. So, I would think we should think more about tipping points, which means we have to have good, scientific, environmental data. And you have to use the best that you have and try to ascertain where you are in some of these tipping points. And I think that's going to be critical to the future of this Plan. Thank you.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add a statement in the Vision chapter text about a "sustainable community, not dependent on growth" similar to what is in the 1994 Plan
8/27/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. Real quick, one simple solution I think to reduce the size of the Plan by about 40 percent...this is a plan that I've already submitted...is to consider taking out the pictures and the text boxes. I'd ask you to think again about things in the future and what the point of this document is. The point is to be as a reference document, not a sales brochure. And certainly we do need to sell people on the document, but I think the final document should be typed, so that's a simple thing, or that it's already written, but I want to reiterate that one more time. Secondly, I'd like to agree with the comments that Mr. Schechter submitted after his presentation two weeks ago, and would echo comments that have been made about using his suggested filter for statements of ideal that's in the Staff Report. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
8/27/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello. Gail Jensen. I just have a few tweaks that I feel to clarify or simplify on the vision statement. I would like to have while meeting our community needs crossed out in the vision statement. I just don't feel it belongs there ???. And I know that was a comment that a few of you all had at the time, but <<inaudible>>. My second comment is the definition of sustainable. I would like to replace it and just tweak it a little bit with the language, a system of practices that are healthy for our environment and for our community and can be maintained indefinitely. And the reason I have done this, I crossed out economically viable and I feel strongly about this, because whenever you consider a private property application at the planning level, economics are not to be considered. And that's kind of in a review in various statutes and legally in that and you're not to consider that. Why is it in here, then? And adding the economic viability to this Plan when you're not considering it. When you bring an application for review, you're not supposed to for that individual owner or applicant. My next comment is on the teeter-totter. I find this a very manipulative, possibly, concept that is not real clear, and I feel like it could be interpreted too many different ways, that I find a simpler, what's existing on page 9, I find is what the community wants, and it's simple and it's meaningful, and it really can't be messed with. I see this teeter-totter changing constantly, depending on who's reading it, who's looking at it. I don't see it's very clear and concise, and I think the community would like something simpler, that this wildlife and natural resources right up here on the top and there's no question about it. That's what the community comment has been, and I would like to see it stay that way. Those are my comments. Thanks a lot.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.1.f: Change "support" to "require"
8/27/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	My name is Louis Wang, and I live in the County. I'd like to make a comment on sustainability in the vision statement. And I know you've redefined sustainability and the ?? Commissions' definition is no longer quoted. But I'd say the more poignant issue, the more important issue, is whether we focus on community, or we focus on growth. One of the major changes between the draft as it now exists in the old Plan is a change to a focus on sustainable growth, rather than sustainable community. The old Plan centered around sustainable community not dependant on growth. And it's really a mega change to go away from community as the focus. So, I'd like to see it go back to the community. Also, in terms of this room for interpretation, if you have a kind of a Plan that is to get from point A to point B, or any other kind of plan that you want things well defined, you lay it out in terms that are obvious, not open to a lot of interpretation. And I see in this Plan terms that are open to interpretation. And I don't think that's helpful. It's going to create chaos down the stream eventually. Now, I'll just talk to one term, vibrant. Certain people in government, elected officials, are fond of this term vibrant. Vibrant community. Before I looked up vibrant and started to play with it, it just sounded healthy to me. Who could be against a healthy community? But vibrant to a business man means growth, often times constant growth. And healthy to somebody who lives here is a focus on community and keeping the precious things we have as a pretty unique community. And I'll just close with that. Thank you very much.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.2.d: add "vehicle exhaust" to list of exacerbating effects
8/27/2009	Sobey, Pegi Interested Public	Peggy ??, Town and County resident. I agree with everything that Kristy Bruner and Gregory Griffith have said here this evening. But before we get much further down this road, I'd like to comment on this process...at least my interpretation of this process, a kind of majority determination to continue with this long draft Comprehensive Plan. I understood that the public would be invited to join in the conversation with the goal of improving this draft, and I want to express my extreme disappointment with this process, particularly last week, of how the public was made to feel. You were all looking at your watches and mostly ignoring the public's comments and, in addition, I strongly object to the lack of, you know, your discussion on the public comments as they're brought forward to you weekly. We all express our comments and then we all just walked away, and there really isn't any, you know, conversation. So I just really feel, before we go any further, if we could just kind of address at concern, or those concerns. I'd appreciate it. Thank you.
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.1.g: Do not except any areas from policy
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.1.g: Change "use best management and design practices" to "implement policy directives"

Date	Name	Comment
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Principle 1.2: Change header to "Preserve and enhance water and air quality"
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.2.a last sentence changed to: "Consequently, development will be designed to protect water bodies..."
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.2.b: Strike the word "urban"
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.2.c: Staff to redraft language to clarify intent of surface water protection beyond requirements of other jurisdictions
8/27/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff will insert County recommendation 8 into Theme 1 where appropriate
8/27/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. The first inset on page 1, I mentioned it before, on what is a Comp Plan, there's no mention of wildlife. I think that's minutia, but I think it should be inserted. Also on page 1, next 10 to 15 years, I feel very strongly that should be changed to a concrete 10 years from the date of adoption of this Plan. We see from '94 to the present that 15 years is too long. So, I think that should be...that's ambiguous also, 10 to 15 years. Let's just concrete it to 10. Also, I think there should be some mention or explanation in the introduction of the vision chapter on why this Comp Plan will work when others have failed. And that could be something we do afterwards in an administration chapter, or something...but we need to delineate why seriously we think this Plan will work when the others have obviously created angst and acrimony in the community on various issues. I feel the vision statement's too long. It should be, as Mr. Schechter pointed out, made more measurable, except I really don't like the language about export our values. I think it should be changed to something...that's in the sustainability definition. It should be changed to something about lead by example, because exporting our values gets into some shaky ground. The teeter-totter itself, I really, really am opposed to the teeter-totter concept. If we do have a teeter-totter, let's put wildlife on one side, existing property rights on the other. Everything else can be the bulk. Nothing should come in the way of our wildlife and open space values, except existing property rights. It leaves too much, as I think it was Louie who pointed out, of selective interpretation. Selective interpretation got us into some of the problems we're in today. And that can go back to predictability issues also. And the complies as conditions syndrome from Staff, they have no choice but on contentious developments like ??, SRA, Teton Meadows, etcetera, if they don't have that predictable element. We get 23 items of conditions, which generally don't make a good Plan, for any development. I really enjoyed...I think it's was Ms. Allen's attempt to insert language about this goal. I've spoken to this previously. We really should put it in there because there are restoration projects going on all over the County right now, and it's ideal to attempt to adhere to. I like Ms. daCosta's economic reality argument...very valid...and her property rights. It should be mentioned early and often, if for no other reason than that we are on the way toward removing this ridiculously simplistic sophomoric rhetoric about no growth...there are no no growth. Believe me, there were no growth cause I would know. There are no no growth, you know, there's no one proposing any reduction in existing entitlements, any involuntary expenditures. The question lies in the 4400 units that are allowed without any density bonuses to the ?? units proposed in this Plan now. That's where the rub comes in. We need to acknowledge wildlife is in fact a human need. The public has some comment on this ??. I enjoyed Mr., I think it's was Duncker's, open space, attempt to insert stronger language about open space and its procurement. Hopefully, maybe that can come up with at the next meeting with Mrs. Andrews and Mr. Meade's attendance. And I could go on and on, but I'll sit down at the meeting and all, but whatever we do, whatever we write, whatever minutia we focus on has to be ethical, has to be identifiable, it has to be verifiable, and it has to be enforceable. If not, we get the selected interpretation from these development applications that's ripped the community apart. What the community really doesn't want is anymore SRAs, ?? and Teton Meadows, and angst and acrimony today assuredly without predictability, we'll just have, you know, as soon as the moratorium's over, and this Plan is adopted, and we're right back to ??. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
8/27/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, Teton County, speaking as an individual. Thank you for all your time in these meetings, really. Just a few things, and it does reinforce some concepts, but ...I guess reinforcement is okay. I've spent a lot of my life as an educator, and I do have, along with some of my other background as a financial Planner and ??, I was trained in ecology and I have a masters in environmental education and worked as ?? in this Valley for some 20 years. But I would reiterate that I think what's missing that we're almost there, there does need to be something stronger about these growth solutions while respecting private property rights. A worry on this Plan as it was delivered to us by the Planning Staff and was talking about an overriding concept of using additional density as currency to achieve affordable housing and open space above and beyond where we are already going. And I think what's missing in here is that there's an unlimited demand for this place, as we all know, yet it has a caring capacity, as we mentioned before, both on public lands and infrastructure, road systems, etcetera. So, a recognition of that insatiable demand for this place, yet there's a limit to how much we can ultimately grow. And then going back to that end point, that we have to eventually reach an economy and community that's not continually dependant on growth. At that time we were looking at ??. At some point, we'll be at build-out and we should have a sustainable economy that can replenish itself within that. And that, I think, is what troubles us is it seems like it's focused on continually pulling ourselves out of growth issues instead of realizing there are limits to that growth. That's really it. I think it does apply to the sustainability issue, though. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
8/21/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	First I would like to say thank you for the time and effort you are putting in to change the comprehensive draft plan to represent the input from the concerned residents of Teton County. Cottonwood Park greatly appreciates what you are doing. I would like to put in writing what I tried to say at the meeting last night. It was a long day and my brain was definitely somewhere else. I read Rich's letter below the other night and liked the changes that were made. Where Rich and I differ is the map he presented and where he represents a new development in the NW corner of South Park. This area should only be developed when infill is complete in town and other developed areas of course. We respect the present base unit development number (around 200 with out any density bonuses which should be done away with, as described in the county planning commissioners recommendations along with doing away with all nodes. The difference is; Residents of Cottonwood park would like to see open space along High School Road set back further to the southern border of the High School property and continue to South Park Loop Road. This area can serve as a wildlife corridor and improve the connectivity of the area. Bringing the fences down will allow the wildlife to pass through Cottonwood Park to South Park with out any of the detours they have to make presently. This should hopefully reduce the nuisance calls that Cottonwood 1 (Corner Creek Lane) makes to game and fish officials about the wildlife that gets backed up in their neighborhood. Yes we do have have wildlife (no bears yet Forrest). Coyote, moose, deer (an eight and a four pointer were feeding on my broccoli stumps in the winter), osprey, etc. We do hear the elk at night in the fall bugling from across the fields to the West. The antelope mate and feed in the fall right across the road in the NW corner of South Park where future homes are planned. The other purpose this open space can serve is as a park for West Jackson and all the schools along High School Road. You have probably heard me mention this before but it is worth mentioning again. Even Kelly Lockhart liked the idea when he came over one morning for coffee and a walk through Range View Park and the immediate area to show him what works and doesn't work here. He loved Range View Park and the way it leads right to High School Road. He said he would like to continue it across the road. Of course we respectively disagreed on the amount of development. I liked his base number development rights without any density bonuses and he liked, well, way too much. The schools could use it for the xcountry running instead of running on the streets and winter cross country ski track loops that can double as a running track in the green months with exercise stations. Outdoor learning facilities for the schools like solar panels that can operate the rest rooms, lights etc. xeriscape areas and native species areas, playgrounds and maybe even a farmers market on the weekend. A parallel road that connects 89 and SPLR on the other side of the park can alleviate the traffic on HSR while using the back entrance to the high school for bus loading and unloading. I would like to see High School Road narrowed using woonerfs; European style traffic calming, no curbs. Instead pavers that delineate the bike and pedestrian paths on both sides of HSR. Covered bus stations like the ones in town. Removable posts that separate vehicular traffic from pedestrians. The posts then can be removed in the winter time for a clean sweep with the plows that don't have to worry about curbs and plowing separate paths. Wildlife friendly snow fence can be put up in the park along HSR to prevent build up of snow drifts on the North side against the long wooden fence that was just replaced because of the weight of the snow on them. They don't last very long there. High School Road should be a campus road that will encourage the use of biking, xcountry skiing and walking and keeping Mom and Dad's car at home because it will be a lot safer for kids who don't have bussing being so close to the schools. I know a lot of the above is too detailed for the comp plan but if you set it up in the plan as a goal, this could happen. Don't get hung up on funding. Like Rich said "there are some deep pockets here that would like to help keep South Park open space for wildlife" which in turn helps our economy and quality of life in

Date	Name	Comment
		the valley. I also respect the landowners' right to build what is allowed them, but you also have to take into consideration the negative impacts on wildlife and landowners across the road in Cottonwood Park that the larger landowners' actions will have. Give me a call and I will gladly show you around. It's a great area. We want to work with you to make it better for wildlife and people who already live here. Kathy Tompkins 734 6211
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Staff will Insert the County's 2nd and 3rd recommendations regarding Theme 1 into Principle 1.1 where appropriate
8/20/2009	Wang, Louis Save Historic JH	Under the umbrella of transportation, Travel Demand Modeling is a subject for this evening's meeting. Unfortunately, many of us at Save Historic Jackson Hole are on vacation and unable to attend tonight's meeting. A volunteer has graciously agreed to read the following comments during the public comment portion of this evenings meeting. The current plan noted that we were "exceeding the capacity of the existing roadway network" in the mid-1990's when it was published. Deterioration in roadway level of service has continued to the point where incoming traffic from the north on highway 89 was recently seen to be backed up beyond the museum. We have a serious problem that's getting worse. The Appendix H study is well intentioned but lacking in substance. The "Technical Transportation Analysis" concludes that we "measure the progress" by "monitoring travel behavior" and that we "create a master traffic study for all new development." This lightweight treatment is unsatisfactory. It simply sweeps a clear and present community-wide problem under-the-rug. Appendix H notes traffic has been growing at 3.5% annually but projects future growth at 2.0%. We will have a 50% increase in traffic in only 12 years if recent growth continues. We need a real plan based on comprehensive facts and analysis. Simply "monitoring" and studying "new development" will not do. As a community service, SHJH hired an acknowledged traffic expert to assist local planners in executing a comprehensive traffic study/plan. He is privy to all the technical material in Appendix H and has spoken with both Clarion and our local professional staff. On August 20, 2008, one year ago today, he laid out in writing what needs to be done to complete this comprehensive work effort. He followed that up with additional comments and guidance on May 6, 2009. Unfortunately, his work appears to have fallen on deaf ears. Mired in pretense, 'we have an elephant in the room' that no one wants to see. And all the while, full traffic gridlock gets a little closer year-by-year. We now appeal to you commissioners to direct a real 'comprehensive' study and plan be accomplished before we find ourselves in an unrecoverable traffic calamity.

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	APPENDIX H Travel Demand Modeling Uses WYDOT travel model . Assign motor vehicle trip to roads in the network using the Shortest Path Possible. This method does not take into account wildlife, school zones, and neighborhood density,quality of life. Looking at Future Scenarios: #1 No land use or roadway network changes. Not acceptable. We already have failing intersections, the first being the Y intersection. Clearly, we need to address our main intersections for cost effective, green methods of resolution, ie roundabouts. #2 Existing network with Indian Trials Road connection. This proposal seeks the shortest path possible approach, and does not account for neighborhood density, majority (6) of schools in area, or wildlife migration/habitat. This proposal violates community values and places a great risk to the above established circumstances. This also represents the greatest impact on existing area of all the scenarios presented. We are appreciative of the current Micro study being conducted by consultants FHU, to study these issues on a much closer look. We are anxious to see the results. At the very least, this study should show origin-destination surveys, traffic counts, and intersection turning movement counts. Only then can we get a glimpse of the impacts this cut thru would have on the area. Future projection of population numbers must be considered as well ,with Comp Plan build out included for South Park region/node. This section also admits that “improvement to the Y intersections to facilitate motor vehicle, transit, bike, and pedestrian travel may still be warranted after the Indian Trails Road connection” THEREFORE, we should be addressing the Y intersection as a FIRST PRIORITY, then reassess traffic patterns as necessary. Y redesign could easily accommodate traffic demand without new road construction thru existing neighborhoods/wildlife corridors. #3 Existing network with Spring Gulch Road improvements: Could reduce 20% of traffic on Broadway , results in 6% more traffic at Y. Again, let’s take the 20% reduction on Broadway, and redesign the Y so that a 6% increase there would be deemed insignificant ! No new road construction, limited neighborhood density in this area, no schools. Must be combined with Y redesign, can not evaluate individually. #4Existing network with North Bridge crossing: Shortest Path Possible approach again. No regard for wildlife community values. Redesign at the 22/390 intersection would relieve congestion. Possibilities are another round about. With combined improvements at the Y intersection, Spring Gulch Road, and the 390/22 intersection, we would see significant traffic flow and quality of life benefits for everyone. Let us examine the problems at our current “failing” traffic intersections and roadways and address these issues. We are ignoring the obvious solutions. I have a lot of information on roundabouts for discussion and how we could make this a 2 community effort in a “Gateway design.”
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Focus on a predictable, measurable plan
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add a Theme: Energy Conservation - and have Staff compile principles and policies that belong in the new theme and relocate principle 1.3 into the new theme
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Policy 1.1.[c]: Replace "behavioral best practices" with "policy decisions"

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Kathy Tompkins, Poplar Wood Park. About the connectivity analysis Biota has been...is when you take down those fences, when it comes time to take down those fences, which I would like to see at the South Park at the north end across from Cottonwood, and then automatically you have greater connectivity through ranging park area, or through that ranging park itself, right across the road instead of the wildlife not knowing which way to go and everything. And the map that Rich gave you for South Park, I agree with most of it, but I would say even extend, widen, that setback on the northern part of South Park along High School Road, the width of the high school, and make that a beautiful transition area for wildlife from the surrounding areas. And double as a park, which would serve the community and the wildlife also at the same time. Bring down those fences and minimize the development there as much as possible. And I think that the medium that you have here in the analysis that is at right now in the northern part of South Park, I can guarantee you that would go even better if we could get rid of those fences and widen that area as much as possible. So, that's it.
8/20/2009	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	I only have one, just quickly. Steve Harrington, I live in Jackson. I applaud what you're doing this...I'm excited about your public on the wildlife situation which just seems like what the community wanted. But I would encourage you to do one thing. It seems like one of the things that is missing regarding wildlife is any kind of baseline data as to what you have currently. It would seem like that if you spend an x-number of days and weeks and months going through this whole Plan and then the first thing you know when you get some official data on wildlife and you find that certain populations are already in decline, then what do you do? Because you've gone through this whole process and you're talking your first principle is viable, or wildlife populations, healthy wildlife populations is the word you used. But what if they're already unhealthy, then what happens?
8/20/2009	Barrett, Dave Interested Public	I'm David Barrett from Teton County and I want to reiterate my appreciation for all the hard work you guys have done in the past. I mean, it's incredible and it's highly appreciated. I also want to support I'm not in your position <<inaudible>>, but I would like to bring and it may be a simplistic concept that I haven't heard by anybody here tonight, and that is wildlife being our number-one priority. And the question is what is wildlife's number-one threat. And it's the population and classically we have seen throughout the ??, historically and currently, that population displaces wildlife. And if we allow the population to dominate and grow and expand and not have limits in this County, we won't have wildlife. It's pretty simple. And so the basic things that we've talked about in terms of stewardship and health and abundance and roadways and barbed wire and all that are really good things, but unless we begin to focus on how we manage our population growth in this County, then the rest will be <<inaudible>>. And so I would suggest a couple of possibilities. I can't remember all that was offered by the County Planning Commission and the 35 suggestions or whatever it was, but among those suggestions there was some excellent concepts I thought. And I want to throw the possibility in a general sense as you are trying to be global. It might be reasonable to take those suggestions and maybe add to them and focus on those as an organization, as a committee, and come to some resolution amongst all of you and then pass those on as you are doing these other items to the planners and let them do some writing on those 35 or so items as agreed upon collectively by your group. And then I'd like to suggest that we consider doing a build-out based on our current rights, current platted rights. And find out what that generation in terms of densities, locations of populations, and do a projection based on that in terms of where there are going to be people based on without additional bonuses. Take the bonus plans out. And find out where we're going to have population sites, find out how they're going to be moving, what the roads are going to need to look like, and then decide whether we should go further in this Plan. Because I fear that, you know, I've had this crazy notion from the time of this process in saying planning should be based on the size of the roads we can tolerate to allow for sustainable wildlife. And so if it's a two-lane road, that determines where people are going to live and how people can travel <<inaudible>>. And to be talking about five-lane roads I think is becoming ?? in terms of preserving the valuable wildlife. I'm not sure <<inaudible>>. So, I would suggest that we do a build-out thing and then I would suggest we take a serious look at a long-term commitment to capping population in this Valley in a sustained to preserve the values we say that we want and that we should allow for that cap to be achieved through a growth rate that is very slow and <<inaudible>>. So, I guess that's kind of where I'm at. I would certainly support and encourage conservation easements and that there's a public funding potential for that to aggressively create monies that could go out to purchase lands as they become available with some incentives. ?? the Land Trust and ?? I think that would be <<inaudible>>. So, anyway, thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I'll keep it short as possible. I think we're at the point that we should drive it home. We should utilize all possible methods of mortality mitigation, whatever they may be—electronic, overpasses, underpasses, wildlife friendlier fencing, etc., etc. One other point was brought up, Town absolutely has wildlife value, 100 percent, and those need to be considered just as strongly where they exist as County values. Two quick points. I'll try to keep it only on what we've discussed, but one was very important to me and it was irrigation ditches. Policy 1.2.A includes all water bodies, except irrigation ditches. Irrigation ditches, some of them existed for 70, 80, or 90 years. They're the ecological equivalent of ?? and the upper Gros Ventre. Multigenerational usage, families have learned these areas of respite, loaf and play, etc., etc. Habitat connectivity of ?? species just as ??, bald eagle, raccoons, whatever is utilized, cottonwoods and the willow fields that accompany these ditches. Ditches should be indistinguishable to us as they are to the animals that utilize them in our LDRs, etc. The last thing I want to present is wildlife friendlier fencing statutes. They need to be strengthened. After developmental displacement or habitat loss and, of course, wildlife collisions, wildlife unfriendly fences contribute probably in third place to our loss of wildlife. We had a situation. Here are some pictures and I'm presenting this to Staff. These are some pictures. What's special about these pictures, they were taken weekend before last, is that there's nothing special. This occurs on a daily and nightly basis throughout the County. We received permission from various, it was collaborative, from the land owners who removed the bottom strand of this fence. We received it one week too late for this elk calf. This is nothing new. I pulled a second fence less than a mile that had four entanglements in it. We absolutely have to adhere to wildlife friendlier fencing statutes. There is no wildlife friendly fence. So, friendlier is semantics, I know, but... the picture, this impetus for the importance of this, absolutely have known standards that numerous fences, in fact, most fences in the County do not adhere to. So, we need to remove all those exemptions. We did all this with volunteer labor, volunteer equipment, and we provided the materials also to replace some of these barbed wire strands with smooth wire, which is just as efficient as wildlife containment. It was collaborative with the land owner, who graciously allowed us to do it. And we really need to hammer home these standards into the LDRs. So, I'm asking...what I'm asking of you is to send forth a very strong recommendation to the electeds that we adopt and adhere and enforce these standards in the County. We're losing a lot of wildlife. We have hundreds of pictures like that. We don't take them because, you know, for our health. We take them because, by analyzing them, we can best determine the method and manner of entanglement, so we can design fences that adhere to that. Thanks.
8/20/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	: I'm Gail Jensen. I just wanted to say that thank you very much for adding information to the website. It really did improve. I was able to get information from it. What I have not been able to get from it is any current comments from some of these...there is no ongoing blog, but it says there is. And I know I've entered a few comments and I can't find them anywhere. So, I don't know what's going on with an ongoing blog that doesn't exist. So, that's...but it's way improved. Thank you very much for adding all the information. Now, you can really follow what was said at the meeting and think about things and really see what's on paper. Cause it's hard to scribble everything down as you all are talking really quickly, so that was very helpful. And then I'm also pleased to see that a lot of my comments on theme one were reflected in a lot of your comments. So, I think everybody's thinking in terms of similar direction, so I'm very pleased with that. And one more comment. I really do believe that the ag interests, agricultural interests, are really missing from this Plan, and that was one of my major comments and it was so prevalent in the '94 Plan. And if you really want to try and conserve or protect those ag lands, you really need to work in a cooperative way with the land owners. And it sounds like there's some hostility there with the large land owners and these 35-acre parcels. And I think it would be to everybody's best interest to work some language out that is, yes, has some direction that the public wants to go with how to keep in mind those are private property owners and they need to be respected and a lot of them have held their property for many, many years without developing it and they need to be respected. And I guess I just got kind of a tone, negative tone, with, you know, the large land owners. I don't know, guys, maybe I'm too sensitive, but I would be very careful and tread lightly there but yet still take the Plan in the direction that the public would like to go to. So, anyway, thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Yeah, Rich Bloom, Teton County, and I am going to change hats up here; somebody else made a request of me. A couple of things here. I have a suggestion, you know, because I talk to large land owners. I have a masters in ecology. I've worked with conservation easements and large land owners. And I think this debate we are having, especially in going forward with some of these critical policies, until it kind of resolves, this discussion that Lisa brought up, my suggestion is because I don't want to...I think we should bring the experts in, because I see a very different thing. I see this as a vision document where we should strive for. We all know there's basic property rights and this has to do with Paul Duncker's ideas and his inputs and kind of the reaction to that. And those two people I would invite and tried to get them here tonight, but I don't think it can occur until you do a specific jumping shepherd kind of approach. Now, that would be ??, as a rancher, someone who's dealt with conservation easements and nodes, ?? and all the other issues, and how to work with also the private sector, and Laurie Andrews from the Land Trust. I think the discussions on open space, because I would support Paul Duncker's comments as well. He's actually listened to developers. That is what the public wants. I think what you're talking about is it is achievable. I am not naïve. David Quinn here, he and I chat all the time. We connected with the Robinson family, the ?? family, the Lucas family. And the South Park area can be critical in the discussion cause in the southern portions, the Land Trust is already working with the Lucas's just south of South Park Loop where they've set aside 300 of their acres and they're trying to do the additional 600. And there are private efforts. We don't have to get hung up on this funding source. It would be nice, but it also applies to how applications come forward. When Melody Ranch application, that was old. Let's look at Three Creeks. When Three Creeks came forward, using, because they could have done a PRD, they didn't do any more testing, rearranged the property, got a whole bunch of permanent open space and ??. I don't necessarily agree that a resort community is what we want for our Valley, but I got to present to the homeowners association on Monday. I was invited to talk about the Comp Plan at their annual meeting. I was talking to so much money in that room. Had about 45 people that attended. And they're committed. They have now formed their own network of a neighborhood group. And they are committed to start caring about what's on the other side of their gates, which is the other Lucas family and the Porters. If we can establish a vision for this Valley, it doesn't ever strip away private property rights. But it tells the land owner, it tells the Land Trust, it tells the public what we value and where we'd like to get to. And there's a whole bunch of comments I submitted on behalf of my network, and I would say, unequivocally, because these were put out to my network, not one person disagreed with these. Some people disagreed that there should be a node or any node at all. Some disagreed about a east/west connector. Some disagreed about the Tribal Trails Connector. But nobody disagreed about what I submitted. And it really has some language in there. So, that's my suggestion. I think Brad, me, Laurie Andrews, come up with a different arrangement, if you want, could I think enlighten and answer some of these questions, or we're going to get hung up as we move through the next policies. A couple of other things. When we get to South Park, as far as an affirmation for that area, we'll worry about how you actually achieve it, or even achieving it. I think the affirmations...my discussion with Three Creeks was wonderful. The discussions I've had with other land owners. And <<inaudible>> and Indian Springs Ranch and ?? subdivision. And I fund raised. I worked in an organization where we raised 40 million dollars to achieve things, including conservation easements on lands. We may not like where the journey's going and up as far as private lands being steward and work that's being done on restoration and ?? is incredible. I worked with Indian Springs Ranch. I am tying those people in the discussion and getting them committed and they will partner with Ralph Gill and Lucas and even Roger Seherr-Thoss to try to achieve some things, all right. So, that's the suggestion on that. Let me just switch hats, because you have my comments and I'll be bringing more next week. One thing I wanted to give...this was submitted as public comment, but in case nobody printed out the map, I just wanted to give those to you, pass those around. And those just came to you as e-mails as a map. That's just one to help frame the discussion where the NRO is, SRO is, Land Trust is, etc., and the idea of connectivity that's so key. The South Park region has values in all three areas, established wildlife values on the land, connectivity values between the land, scenic values and agricultural values. To switch hats here, because transportation was talked about as if there's been a transportation study, and I am more familiar with transportation than you'll ever know, dealing with the Mad Dog Ranch, Jackson campus projects, Teton Meadows Ranch, working with Rob Bernstein on traffic. So, I am not a member of Saving Historic Jackson Hole. I do not give them money. I am not on their board. But as everybody knows, I collaborate with everybody and everybody. And there is a comment Lewis submitted from California today, so I'll pass that out...could you pass this to the right there for me? And he wanted me to read that, but it's not in my voice so I prefer not to read it. But that is the head of a conservation group in the Valley that's modified not for profit. I will, because I know how it is with thousands of pages of input you have, reissue some things he refers to there. Robert Bernstein was contracted last summer to submit suggestions on what should be covered in a transportation analysis and in a transportation plan. That was submitted as part of the public record and I'll pass that out shortly. Then Bernstein reviewed everything that ?? saw, everything in the Plan you saw, talked to Clarion, talked to Paula Stevens, talked to County Engineering, and he is an expert, and has submitted on May 6th, and some of you have this by e-mail, so this is a repetition, but...I just want to pass these around <<inaudible>>. He already has commented that there have been no comprehensive traffic analysis done. What you saw was a macro-simulation that purely looked at the Y-Intersection, Spring Gulch, and Tribal Trails. It's a very focused one, it's based on the initial Clarion work. And I think Tyler alluded to that. Even that simulation that came up with the Tribal Trails Connector, WYDOT and the County met on that, agreed that was not by itself enough information. So, they're spending WYDOT

Date	Name	Comment
		money, the County is, to do a micro-simulation, which is a process now is actually knowing if that was built, where that traffic would go. And so this is the RFP in the hiring. And again I'm not stating an opinion about the Tribal Trails Connector. I'm just trying to cover for Lewis and Armond, who's backpacking, and even ?? who was going to come. He's taking care of his wife in Salt Lake City. And then the last thing to pass out for kind of institutional record is what Robert Bernstein, on behalf of Saving Historic Jackson Hole, did suggest on August 20th 2008 a year ago should be components of the traffic plan and traffic analysis. I think you have this by e-mail. The only thing I wanted, lastly, and I'll get off the podium, but I'm trying to be, you know, I don't want to be <<inaudible>>. I'm just trying to do them a favor because they couldn't be here, was in August 27th of '07, defining issues and concepts, I highlighted a few things on what would be done by the Comprehensive Plan. And I want to move forward on the Plan, but I want to say our frustrations about no fiscal analysis, no traffic analysis, no housing analysis, all the things that were promised. And the key points, this was what Clarion and the County had promised back then. And they had promised that the Plan process would evaluate consequences of overall growth in the County, fiscal and environmental, social, infrastructure, transportation, public service, visual, transportation in determining our traffic needs in the future in order to obtain our vision for the Valley. And economic, fiscal, evaluate whether the County can afford the public commitments in the Comprehensive Plan and that revenue is greater or at least equal to the cost of services. I think when you have time over the weekend, or next week, to read through some of those memos that you already have in your piles, I think you can then understand some of the concerns that <<inaudible>> last week was nobody's told us, but we can assume Highway 22 is going five lanes if not six lanes. We can assume the Y will get worse, even with a roundabout, we can assume the Village Road will go to five lanes. We were promised we would be told that this Plan would lead us there or not. Same thing with this workforce housing get better or not. Can we afford where this is going if we <<inaudible>>, and I would say the traffic analysis, which is not an analysis, is kind of the epitome that that was not done. So, these, I'll just let circulate, but this was promises that were made to the community in August of '07. They have those; those are all part of the public record. And that's probably...I think I would be in the same position as you. You guys have been given so many things. It would have been nice if Staff had pulled those out perhaps and put that as a part of today's Appendix H to sort of say a nonprofit group commissioned and spent a lot of nonprofit money giving suggestions to the County about how it could be constructed a year ago and then also make an evaluation of how it missed it's mark, presented that before WYDOT actually and even WYDOT agreed with that. I don't want to beat up on Planning Staff, but I want to just say that we're missing a lot of important information to make decisions. And again I'll take off my...I never wear that hat, but I was trying to just advocate on behalf of some Saving Historic Jackson Hole board members who could not make it here. Thank you so much.
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Amend the title of Theme 1 to: "Practice stewardship of wildlife, natural resources, and scenic vistas"

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	Hi, Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. First, we recognize how difficult of a process that this can be and you're all volunteers. We really appreciate all the work that you're putting into this. One of the things that we've stated before but I really think it's important. That's why when we submitted our comments regarding this theme, we did submit the 1994 Plan existing chapter. We really encourage you to revisit the structure of the existing Plan for guidance on some of the things we talked about tonight, as it outlines a very clear structure of the difference between goals, objectives and limitation strategies. If you look on page 16 of the existing Plan, it breaks down recommendations and regulatory actions versus non-regulatory actions and it's very specific. So, just in terms of discussing future things, I just encourage you to look there. In terms of a lot of the discussion on the specificity, I think sooner or later it would be good to talk about whether or not this concept for wildlife stewardship plan would be promoted. That is one of our concerns that we raised about some of the things that were removed from the '94 Plan, is that there's a lot of specificity in areas where it is warranted. Wyoming Game & Fish brought up this same issue. They expressed the concern of why, you know, the identification of important habitat types were removed. So, I just hope that you look closer at that. It was good to see that you discussed the wildlife protection policy should extend beyond the NRO. We will continue to push and hope that there is language in this theme that wildlife protection will be the primary consideration in all land-use decisions, whether it's the prevention of direct, indirect or cumulative impacts. Again, protecting wildlife cannot be successful focusing on development pattern only, so we do hope that somewhere in this theme that there's a policy that clearly calls out the effects of the amount and rate of development. It could be in principle 1.2 when it talks about human impacts and resources, but we feel like it needs to be more explicitly stated. Wyoming Game & Fish, in their comments, you know, spoke to this quite a bit on cumulative impacts, ?? recreation, a lot of those factors about the amount of development on some of these. We need to see that more. I'll try to...I know you all want to move on. We'll submit some things more in specific comments. Other things, I feel like if the idea of how much specifics are going to go in this theme is absolutely essential, and I think Game & Fish summed it up the best in their comments when they said, the draft Plan should include more specific language, data, and mechanisms to provide the degree of stewardship identified in the introduction of the Comp Plan. So, everything else is submitted in written comment, but thanks for your efforts.
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Relocate Principle 1.4 and associated strategies and indicators
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Make no further changes to Policy 1.1.[b] and Principle 1.1 beyond recommendations 49, 54, and 55
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Amend Principle 1.1 Sentence 3 to read: Without supporting all native species within the ecosystem the web of support for all native species begins to weaken and the intact ecosystem begins to break down. (or similar, tighter language)
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resources Overlay
8/20/2009	Ewing, Patty and Frank Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to again voice our opinion, and for allowing public comment during each of your Joint Planning meetings. We recognize the huge expenditure of your time, energy and effort to thoroughly improve the draft plan line by line. Thank you. Attached are a few more signatures of Citizens of Teton County who some time ago included their names on the "Wildlife and Open Spaces, values this community has cherished for decades, will be reinstated as the Community's top priority and become the organizing theme of the entire Plan petition. Please include these in the public record. The new Vision Statement which was approved last week, in part states "preserve and protect the area's unparalleled natural ecosystem." To ensure that wildlife and open space is protected, theme 1 in the comprehensive plan must clearly be the guiding principle in each section of the plan. Please consider relaxing the schedule of meeting. The existing schedule is burdensome for everyone. Would you consider scheduling the joint meetings every two or three weeks instead of every week. It seems to us it is expecting a great deal from volunteer commissioners as well as members of the public who continue to be interested. It is difficult to attend each meeting.

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Replace "viable populations" with "healthy populations" in Statement of Ideal and throughout theme, and add an indicator of 'health' and associated strategies
8/20/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. Just wanted to submit something Patti Ewing gave to me and then I have another comment from ???. It is more petitions for wildlife and open spaces. And she would just like me to read this letter for you. Dear Commissioners and Planners, thank you for the opportunity to again voice our opinion and for allowing public comment during each of your joint planning meetings. We recognize the huge expenditure of your time, energy and the effort to thoroughly improve the draft Plan live online. Thank you. Attached are a few more signatures of citizens of Teton County, who sometime ago included their names on wildlife and open spaces. The value this community has cherished for decades will be reinstated as the community's top priority to become the organizing theme of the entire Plan. Please include these for the public record. The new vision statement, which was approved last week in part, states preserve and protect the areas unparalleled natural ecosystem to ensure that wildlife and open space is protected. Theme one in the Comprehensive Plan must clearly meet the guiding principles in each section of the Plan. Keep considering relaxing the schedule of meetings. The existence schedule is burdensome for everyone. Would you consider scheduling the joint meetings every two or three weeks, instead of every week? It seems to us it is expecting a great deal from volunteer Commissioners, as well as members of the public who continue to be interested. It is difficult to attend each meeting. Thank you. Sincerely, Patti and Frank Ewing. And then I just have a comment being from Cottonwood. Rich Bloom submitted a memo this week about policy 1.1.C, 1.1.D, and, let's see, on the second page of his memo, he has some changes to what was that <<inaudible>>. I just got these last night and so I just ran through them and I just wanted to mention that 1.1.C, 1.1.G, and 1.6.A, I do like some of the changes that you've made and I just want to concur with that. And I speak for quite a few of my neighbors who would like to see those changes, too. And that's about it. Thank you.
8/19/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole would like to submit the attached document from the Fremont County, ID Comprehensive Plan on Property Rights. After listening to discussions in the Joint Planning and Zoning Commission meetings, we believe there may be some confusion on the issue of Property Rights. That is understandable as the topic is very complex. We hope this document will help the Joint Planning and Zoning commissions as they revise the Draft Comprehensive Plan. I have marked three key points. We believe the most important point is that property owners have a right to reasonable use of their land. There is no guarantee of the most profitable use. The Idaho Attorney General's checklist is also helpful in evaluating the impact of zoning regulations with regard to property rights. My apologies for not providing this document electronically. Time constraints prevent me from converting this to an electronic document in a timely fashion. Please include this in the packet for the next Joint Meeting. Thank you for assistance in this request. Armond Acri Executive Director Save Historic Jackson Hole

Date	Name	Comment
8/19/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	For anyone who cares about this valley's wildlife and scenic treasures, a recent report from the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is well worth reading. "The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources" assembles 30 years' worth of information on the southern end of the valley. It is an amazing and rich portrayal, pulled from existing records and accounts from multiple sources. What I walk away with is the following: greater South Park is as consequential to wildlife and scenery as any other part of the valley, and as deserving of conservation. Because of how interdependent each element of the ecosystem is, degradation in this one place could not be isolated and would inevitably have impacts elsewhere. Picture this: It is winter. You are a moose. You are hungry, thirsty, and need to get to your next resting place. You may have a calf with you. You have to travel between crucial winter range in the Cache Creek or Game Creek drainage and along the Snake River. As you move through the South Park area, you take refuge among tree stands, adjacent hillsides, and in the open meadows of ranch land. You must forage and find water as you thread your way, attempting to avoid humans and their domestic animals and get across or around their fences and buildings. You would be better off if you could avoid crossing roads, but this is impossible. You should especially avoid 'hotspot' areas, such as Highway 22 between Spring Gulch and Skyline (the road with the highest rate of wildlife-vehicle collisions in Wyoming), and Highway 89 from High School Road south to Melody Ranch. Maybe you're not a moose. You might be a big-horned sheep, mountain lion, river otter, bald eagle, great horned owl, trumpeter swan, cutthroat trout, chorus frog, or any of the over 80 mammal, bird, fish, reptile, and amphibian species catalogued as residents or users of the South Park ecosystem. You confront your own survival issues every day. OK, you are not any of these creatures. But you are a first-time visitor to the valley or you live in the area. You are driving up from Hoback, the road just widening from two lanes to four, WYDOT's wildlife crossing / kill zone sign flashing. At 55 mph, it might be hard to stop for that unfortunately-timed elk or moose crossing - wish there were a tunnel or overpass for our mutual protection. The valley opens up, to iconical foreground, mid-range, and far views that are familiar and loved, or heart-strummingly new. If instead you were coming in from the pass and Wilson, you'd have a similar 'gateway' experience, with all the same elements - wildlife traffic and rural viewscape included. The Conservation Alliance documents what we already know if we have been observant, and makes vivid what a first-time visitor might experience. No longer can we just toss away South Park as inconsequential to wildlife and scenic resources valley-wide. We should make planning decisions based on the best available information, including what is in this report. The low prioritization of South Park's wildlife and scenic values in the current Comprehensive Plan draft is not supported by the evidence. Significant language from the 1994 Plan, recognizing and prioritizing these values, should be restored as the present draft goes through planning review. Further development in the northwest corner of South Park should also be reduced in footprint and scale. As development occurs, significant portions of adjacent lands should be protected permanently, giving attention to continuity with other protected areas. Finally, the potential Tribal Trails connector should be evaluated with full recognition of the habitat types and wildlife movement that exist in the area, and the disturbance and fragmenting impact that such a road would have.

Date	Name	Comment
8/18/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	I have a few comments for this Thursday's joint Comp Plan review of Theme 1 that are focused on the South Park region. I can attest that the now 400 members of my network have complete and universal agreement on the following suggested changes: • Policy 1.1c is a critical policy in this plan and is very relevant to the South Park region. This plan must encourage the continued acquisition of permanent conservation of large, contiguous open spaces in order to uphold the community's top priorities of both wildlife and open space. Open space conservation, for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged and not be limited to the narrowly defined NRO. The 1994 Plan focused on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: scenic preservation, agriculture and wildlife habitat protection. - o We suggest the following changes to Policy 1.1c "Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces" "Large and contiguous ... Private efforts have been successful in permanently preserving such some of these strategic lands. Continued public, private and cooperative efforts are critical to conserving open space, particularly with the Natural Resource Overlay. Continued public, private and cooperative open space acquisition efforts, for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged. Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay. Of equal importance are the continued efforts to protect important gateway image setting vistas as well as community character setting agricultural lands." • Policy 1.1 g: "Permeability of development for wildlife: In all areas, except those designated for mixed use or more intense development in the Town of Jackson or County nodes, development will be designed to accommodate wildlife movement." - o See changes above: We believe, to achieve Draft Plan Principle 1.1 (maintain viable populations of all native species), the design of development in ALL nodes identified for growth must allow for wildlife movement permeability. Likewise perhaps this policy should be removed in its entirety as wildlife movement issues also apply to town. Staff has publically acknowledged this language was an oversight and that especially the County nodes (if in fact they remain in the plan) be designed for wildlife permeability. • Policy 1.6a: "Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County: The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land and to continue farming in South Park, Alta, Buffalo Valley, the Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and south Fall Creek Road." - o South Park is first on the list in the section of our current legally binding 1994 Comp Plan. The new language inadvertently strips South Park of such protection, implying that the entirety of the South Park district does not deserve conservation and directly unwinding the protection in our existing plan. Whether a node is or is not included on one very small portion of the South Park region – as in the 1994 plan, the greater South Park area should be prioritized for conservation. - o Below is the specific language from our current Comp Plan (with emphasize added) - from Chapter 1, Community Vision, Third Printing, October, 2002: 2 "In Teton County, the major issues tend to be broader and were of necessity mapped at a much smaller scale. The County Issues Map primarily depicts three areas of concern. The first is "open space." These are lands on which ranching should continue, wildlife habitat preserved, and the visual qualities of scenic vistas protected. Examples include the hay meadows of South Park, the Spring Gulch scenic area, ranchlands along the Teton Village road, Buffalo Valley and the western most entrance to Teton County from Alta. These lands also include the Snake, Hoback, Gros Ventre and Buffalo Fork river corridors and those hillsides and butte sides which are crucial winter range for ungulates.

These areas should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community's character. The County should encourage the preservation of the rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and corridors, and encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community character. Where possible, the County should be flexible with its development regulations as an encouragement to landowners to permanently protect these wildlife, scenic and agricultural areas. In addition, where nonregulatory options are available, these should be encouraged. For example, a land trust's resource analysis in preparation for a conservation easement, may be sufficient to replace the County's site analysis."

Respectfully,

Rich Bloom – South Park Neighbors

P.S. Please note the attachment which contains a proposed land use map by myself for our South Park region which helps to put the rural zoned land in context of it's relationship to the NRO, SRO, federal and state lands, and protected open space easements. Also attached is a two page summary plus species list of the JH Conservation Alliance's very detailed The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources delivered to you via hard copy June 23. The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources A Report by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance
Release Date: June 23, 2009

Report Summary

Introduction/Purpose:

Balancing competing objectives – preservation and development – is a monumental task. South Park is a microcosmic representation of this struggle in Jackson and Teton County, between preserving and protecting wildlife, scenic vistas and habitat, and providing for our community's housing needs. In response to a draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, released 04/13/09, that slates South Park for massive development potential with little data or analysis to justify it, the Conservation Alliance, with the support of several neighbor groups, collected existing data to document and bring forward the wildlife and scenic values in the region.

South Park is defined in this report as the area between the National Forest Boundary near highway 89 to the Snake River, and between the southern end of South Park Loop Road and Highway 22, and includes District 12: South Park and portions of District 5: Eastbank, as defined in the draft plan. A majority of South Park should be prioritized for wildlife and natural and scenic resources protection even as one portion (the northwest corner) is called out as a node.

This report focuses on South Park because it is slated for the most potential residential development of any district in the draft plan, and because the draft plan places very low priority on the protection of wildlife and scenic values in the area, which represents a significant departure from our community's existing 1994 Plan. The draft plan also proposes up to 1,500 units in northern South Park, and includes unclear language about the extent to which the remainder of District 12 should be slated "as an extension of the town development pattern." By allowing for dense development in the northwest corner, and without prioritizing the preservation of wildlife, scenic and natural resources in the remainder of District 12, the draft plan leaves an open door for similar levels of density throughout the district in the future.

Due to the drastically proposed changes in land use in the South Park (from rural to town-level densities in certain areas), it is critical to take into account the area's documented and understudied wildlife and scenic resources before the community considers a plan that stands to eliminate those resources and values.

Key Findings:

Baseline inventories, environmental assessments, wildlife-vehicle collision data and citizen and expert observations all indicate a significant wildlife presence in the greater South Park area. Elk, mule deer and moose, raptors, songbirds and migratory birds, along with a variety of waterfowl, amphibians and reptiles utilize the region to both live in and move through. Cumulatively, the habitats provided in and around South Park contribute to the overall ecological health of the larger Snake River ecosystem, and establishing protected connectors both north to south and east to west are crucial in ensuring successful wildlife utilization of the area. (Attached is a list of species that were documented in the area; citizen observations would add to the list significantly.) According to Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation data, roads in the study area present some of the highest fatality rates for large ungulates in Teton County. While there is not much data regarding ungulate use of private lands not protected by easements, there is documented evidence of ungulate movement across the roads and through the study area. Specifically, both the Highway 22 area proposed for the Tribal Trails connector road, and Highway 89 near the junction with Game Creek have been considered appropriate areas to construct wildlife overpasses, due to the high ungulate use and road-related mortalities in those areas. Wyoming Game and Fish Department has also designated the area flanking Highway 22 from Town to Wilson as crucial range for a variety of wildlife species and as an enhancement area for future rehabilitation work. The true gateway from the south to both Town and the resort facilities, South Park has long been epitomized by its scenic hayfields and long-range vistas of the mountains. It is one of the most widely noticed and clearest materializations of our rural character. Maintaining these scenic viewsheds is an important community objective and should be noted and prioritized in the Plan.

Recommendations:

There are several formidable data gaps in the wildlife studies for the area, particularly on private lands; for example, there is no consistent, long-term ecological monitoring program, no vegetation map, and no comprehensive analysis of the health of the County's wildlife populations and habitats. Aside from the wildlife-vehicle collision data, there is very little data on ungulate movement throughout the County. The Natural Resources Overlay needs to be updated and must include a broader set of indicator species. It is important to acknowledge, for example, that a map depiction of an "absence of use" by wildlife does not necessarily indicate that the area lacks importance. Filling these gaps and others with the most up to date data is an important first step; we must base our development decisions on the best available information.

While some residential development is appropriate in the northwest corner of District 12, the new draft should not recommend significant intensification of development in the greater South Park region (or any district) given the community's goals to limit overall growth and protect wildlife. And, as development occurs, significant portions of adjacent lands, within South Park, should be permanently protected to balance development and conservation goals in the area. In addition, significant language from the 1994 Plan should be reinstated in the new draft to call out for recognizing the importance of this region for wildlife, scenic and agricultural values.

Teton County, and the surrounding ecosystem, should be looked at comprehensively, with an eye toward the cumulative impacts of growth and development on the ability of wildlife to both utilize and move through the region. While one development might not hinder the movement of an entire mule deer herd, for example, taken together and compounded, many of the proposed and existing developments most certainly will. Likewise, preserving a large portion of the habitats in the greater South Park area will increase the utility of the surrounding areas as well.

This report intends to initiate discussion on the direction of future growth to be sure that it is guided by the best available information. The Conservation Alliance has consistently asserted that planning in the greater South Park region should not be carried out in a vacuum, isolated from the

Date	Name	Comment
		bigger picture planning issues in Jackson Hole and lacking in important data and research. As the community determines how, where, and in what amount Jackson and Teton County will grow for the next decade, it is important to take into account the cumulative impacts of that growth; the amount of development targeted for South Park and the surrounding areas stands to have significant localized and community-wide effects.
8/17/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	Please refer to the Wyoming Game and Fish comments, submitted 6/26/09 regarding Theme 1, as they bring forward some critical issues for discussion. Thanks.
8/16/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	SHJH believes the Comp Plan could be improved and simplified if the pictures and text boxes were eliminated. The text boxes are redundant and are not appropriate for a reference document like the Comp Plan. The pictures will get very old to the people who refer to the document often and will do little to help the people who read it once. The core of the document should not be a sales pitch. That should be in the Executive Summary and the Appendices. The core document should be focused on documenting the vision of the community on the key issues as they guide us through the life of this plan. Simple and dense should be the goal. Avoid the tabloid newspaper approach. It is appropriate for selling newspapers but not for a reference document.

Date	Name	Comment
8/13/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom, Teton County. I'm speaking as an individual. I only say that you'll see me throughout this process. I will mention that I have been assigned to the Blue Ribbon panel for ?? So, I do wear that hat; I'm not wearing that tonight. I'm also an elected board member of Melody Ranch Homeowners Association. <<inaudible>>. But my comments tonight are as an individual. Missing data, the only thing I would mention on that, the one that's glaring, and that is achievable is on transportation and traffic. Meaning with this numbers and where this Plan's going, what does that mean for current infrastructure and needed infrastructure? It was a promised component <<inaudible>>, and I think that's a piece to have, so you know the implications of where we're heading or where we might head. Current data, that discussion you had on wildlife, I just wanted to make sure you were aware of the alliance piece. I think you all have that, the Greater South Park Region study. That is a wonderful piece of work that I was glad to see. In that, in the appendix, there's a whole series of collision data maps, critical range, vegetation maps, etc. <<inaudible>>, and I'll point that out to the Planning Staffs, too, was put together by the Wildlife Foundation and Biota. And it's in there in your document. So, there's a really great start point. And those maps do not just focus on South Park. Those are the whole County. So, you don't have to recreate the wheel while that data's there. Vision, on Lisa's, well, for lack of a better word, Lisa's sentence there on property rights, I would add base to the property rights, because it works both ways, Lisa. Some people don't understand that, yes, the state has a right to develop that land to those one per 35, but at the same time, a lot of private property owners feel like they should be allowed to do anything they want on their property. And I don't know if base would help that, adding that word, to kind of clarify, because the community is confused on what private property rights mean. And we know it doesn't mean zero, and doesn't mean anything we want to do. So base might help that. The values, especially how to define scenic values, prioritizing open space, that whole discussion you had that's going to come up in theme one, and it will come up to the future land-use maps in areas 12 and 5. I think it is important for three reasons. One is I think we're heading towards looking at a transfer of development rights, and within that, I think communities know ?? that should be sending areas or prioritized in receiving areas. So property owners know that, hey, we'll be looking towards you to be a receiving area or a sending area and we have a priority to try to preserve your open space. You can do one to 35 but if you work with us on TDRs, we might be able to compensate you and achieve community goals. So, it has value there. I've met with the Land Trust numerous times, and I can't speak for them, but they have publicly said, and they said this in STAG, that they also want to know which areas in the community it values for scenic open space. So they can keep those on their list to work the land owners with private money or conservation buyers to achieve community goals, just like they do in ?? Ranch and other properties. And that will come up in parts of South Park, so it's a value to put this there, even though the ?? don't have capital to work with them, at least the ?? knows we as a community value that area. And then the third is I think we'll still maybe be working with the state on looking at real estate transfer tax as a funding source to purchase open space, and that will come back and maybe that will be in a County pot, but that certainly has been done in other communities. It's surfaced. So, I think it's worthwhile in this Plan to keep that scenic open space, all those values, while recognizing base property rights, because there's ways to achieve it while compensating land owners. And then the last thing is just for the future, and Michael and I had a discussion on it, maybe you can give us all direction, because I would like to on a few issues over the course of months represent a larger constituency about how to do that. And whether you want that 50 people to show up or to say that we've talked and we have consensus or we have a petition, the idea would be to try to kind of come to consensus in neighborhoods or regions, and then somehow share that with you so we don't burden you with 20 people all saying the same thing. At the same time, we've got to be careful because we can't say we represent every person in the subdivision. But a number of subdivisions are working on this. I'm actually meeting with ?? on Monday. So, direction would be appreciated. Thank you.
8/13/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	I'm Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Just a quick comment tonight. We'll be submitting comments specific to your recommendations at a later date. As we've mentioned in previous correspondences, we really hope that with regard to the overall vision of this new Plan, and particularly as you move into discussions on individual themes, that you really revisit the information that we already have in our existing 1994 Plan. There's a lot of information there. This process was supposed to be an update. That's stated many times in the vision chapter. So, we just ask that you look at this because there's a lot of information that shouldn't be removed. So, thanks.
8/13/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	I'm Cindy Stone, I'm south of Town. I'm unprepared for any kind of comment because I didn't think you'd let us, but I want to thank you for letting us comment. I know that you'd rather see it on the web because it's not personal there. But this is personal to us, and it's personal to my neighbors and the people that talk to me and care that I'm here. And so if you don't let us talk to you in the heat of the moment, if you would make me...I'm not good with computers and I don't take notes. So, that's probably the downfall of my college career. So, I mean, two weeks from now, I'm probably going to make a mountain out of a molehill, because I'm going to be thinking about this for two weeks. I would appreciate it if you'd just let us say what we need to say. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
8/13/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory ??, County resident. In the introduction, two quick points. Page 1, what is a Comp Plan? It mentions everything but wildlife. That's on page 1, in the inset box. Just a small point of contention there. Also on page 1, it says in the next 10 to 15 years. I think that should be changed to a hard number like 10 years. Fifteen years, as we found in '94, is just too long to go without revisiting some of these issues. Also, on the vision statement itself, I actually preferred Tony's, some combination of Tony's and Forrest's. I think the one we're looking at now is pretty congruous. I also enjoyed the comment that Mrs. Allen made last, whenever it was, about the ???. I don't think we can leave out the ??? because we're engaging in restoration projects today, whether it be beetle kill, invasive weeds, improving spawning habitat, irrigation, I could go on and on, but I want to be brief. So, I really think it should include a goal to strive to restore some of these degraded habitats. And that was struck down at the previous meeting based primarily on semantics of enhanced or restored. I also enjoyed Tony's, I think it was Tony's, vision statement that mentions specifically quality of life and community character. We can get into the semantics of, you know, qualitative, quantitative, etc., but most people...it's like a Supreme Court ruling once was predicated on, it was ??? obscenity. They said, I can't tell you what obscenity is but I know it when I see it. Most people have a...could verbalize, given enough time, community character, the quality of life as it pertains to wildlife, traffic, open space, scenic vistas, economics, etc. So, if you do revisit that, I would really like to see some quality of life and community character and restoration language included. I had a real problem with, I think it was Mr. Duncker that brought up share our values and influence opinions around the world. We're 4 percent of the world's population. We use 25 percent of the world's resources. Other nations have much better highly developed alternative energy systems, etc. There are things we can learn from outside us. It's almost a pathantic type statement. Again, we're getting down to semantics, especially these two first chapters. One final thing, in these processes, I understand this is the process now and this is what we have to go through, but we as a species tend to focus on minutia. We tend to focus on semantics. And we tend not to address the real big hard-hitting problems until it's...we're exhausted of energy. We're exhausted of...the community's exhausted of etc., etc. so, I understand we're going through it chapter by chapter. I'm not arguing with that principle now. I just want caution that we maintain the will and the energy and the commitment to address the really, really tough issues when it comes to growth caps, wildlife, open space, etc., etc., etc. Thanks a lot and appreciate the public comment for what it's worth.
8/13/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. I'd like to also thank you for taking public comment. I think there's real value in having timely comments right after your discussion. One point I think you might want to investigate a little more in terms of the vision statement is this keeps coming up this issue of takings and property rights. I know you guys have heard—I don't want to keep beating a dead horse—but ??? County Idaho actually has a whole section on that. You guys might want to look at that as a model. It's actually an appendix. Because they felt it was obviously an important enough issue, so it's something you might want to look at is to address that issue. The other thing is to look at this idea of takings because they actually talk about that in a lot of detail, and I think you might want to get an opinion on how it applies to Wyoming law. I think it's going to be similar to what Idaho is. And an important point that they make is that you can down zone property as long as you are consistent and fair to everybody. So, if you make a decision, and notwithstanding Ms. daCosta's comment on her point, which is well taken on the state law for the 35 acres, there is a legal basis to down zone as long as it's done consistently and there's a lot of detail. I won't bore you on that, but you might want to have maybe Mr. Rada can give you a little bit more on that. And the only other point I would like to do is I'd just like to accolade the comments on traffic and viable ??? and concerns about that. So, thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
8/13/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen, and I really do appreciate you allowing the public comment, because I did write one of the comments last week about, you know, when you're in the heat of this discussion, that's the time to make comment and to have more of a community discussion. And I really do appreciate this, because it is very difficult to write down all of the discussion points and then try and revisit them three weeks, or how many weeks later it ends up being. So, I really appreciate that. Thank you very much. I do have just a couple of comments. First of all, the one thing that I guess maybe you all don't understand, or maybe I haven't read the statute correctly, but as I understand it, it's only when you get up into those larger parcels is it 35 acres at the state level. It's the County that can restrict it now and the County has chosen not to make the minimum of 70 acres, instead of 35. And there's much more to that statute than just spelling out 35. So, somebody needs to investigate that and really read the statute because you're mistaking on just strictly the 35s. That's what changed. You can't absolutely do 35s on every piece of 70 acres in the County. It changed to 140 being the minimum until you get up to those larger acreages. That's why there was a huge rush to do the 35s by all these large land owners because they thought that the County in turn would change it to a 78 minimum. So, you need to kind of look into that statute and make sure you're being correct on that, because that's how I understand it to read. Anyway, the other thing that I had was I would like the sustainable definition to reflect by putting as the countywide priority putting the environment first. For instance, you'd say, a system of practices that are first healthy for our environment, second for the good of our community, and can be maintained indefinitely. I think for the good of the community also includes the economic issue there, instead of breaking that out separately. So, and I'll put that in as a comment online, too, but I think you could even simplify it a little bit more. And you could also put the environment, which is the number-one theme for the County. Why not put that first in your definition of sustainability? I also have a problem with the definition of sustainable, whether it be mine or whomever's definition or group definition that one comes up with, because if you read through this whole document, sustainability is used hundreds of times, and you need to take every single sustainable wording here and make sure this definition fits it, or you're going to have to change this whole document throughout. I mean, it's unbelievable how many times everything is sustainable. And as far as Webster's definition for it, it means prolonging or maintaining. That's what Webster's definition for it—I looked it up—it's what sustainable means as far as Webster is concerned. So, I don't know. I still have a problem leaving sustainable in here because it's used so much, and I don't know that you can use one definition for all these situations. Let's see, I guess the other comment I have is a little bit on the process. I got on the website, and all your comments and recommendations, the only ones I could come up with on the website was just 6, 17, 18, and then just what you wanted for studies. There wasn't a vision statement. I don't know where to find it. I clicked on everything I could click on and new information just isn't there. And plus the most recent public comments, I couldn't get either. The only ones I could get, for instance, I made comments, but I couldn't find them anywhere. So, I don't know what's wrong with the website or how, you know, I'm pretty good with computers and I couldn't get the information on that. So, I felt a little unprepared for this meeting because I came with just two little sheets with not even a fraction of what recommendations were here. That could be prevented. So, anyway, maybe you could kind of work on that and correct it, or get on the site and really play with it yourself because I sure couldn't. It wasn't simple. And if it's there, it's really hidden. The public...like I said, I'm pretty good with computers, and I couldn't come up with information online, so.
8/13/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Yes, Patti Ewing, resident. Two short comments on your vision statement. It seems to me that we could fix it very easily by simply saying preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and natural resources, period. And then I concur with what Franz said in terms of the definition of sustainability. It seems to me that it's important to acknowledge the sustainable...sustainability does not have to rely on growth with all its inherent cumulative costs and problems to really be sustainable. And I'd like to see that concept, as Franz suggested, be a part of your sustainability definition. Thank you.
8/13/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Franz ??, Jackson Hole resident. One, I do really appreciate the opportunity to make public comment, and I would suggest you do it at the end of every meeting wherever you are, because it's fresh in your minds, our minds and so forth. Two points. One, which it was mentioned that the County workshop a few weeks ago by the Game & Fish representative that the idea of viable populations really doesn't sit well with some of us biologists because, as an example, a viable elk population may be a few thousand here in the Valley. We want more than that. And the Game & Fish representative here, and I would certainly support that, is use agency numbers. Use agency objectives and things like that and not just viable numbers, because viability is a technical phrase that could be a whole lot less of a lot of species than what we have now. Or current numbers, that sort of thing. The second thing is the sustainability question, and I think we have unequivocal evidence in this community that's hugely supportive that our environment is the number-one feature here. So, I would just suggest, and I'm not saying these are the right words, but a sustainable statement that is a system of practices that maintains indefinitely our environmental diversity and functionality while allowing for a healthy economy. I would put our environment up first, while allowing for a healthy economy. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	P9 graphic - Community Vision. Replace with a "Nortonian" Teeter Totter to be brought back to PC's for final approval.(Superseded by Recommendation 65)
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	P8, Amend second check, under sustainability: Ecosystem preservation may at times preclude growth and development activities above and beyond those needed to meet our community's human needs.
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Definition of Sustainable: Replace 1987 BCR definition with: A system of practices that are healthy for our community and the environment, economically viable and can be maintained indefinitely.
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	On P8, first paragraph: Delete second check: "ecosystem preservation does not preclude . . ."
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	P9 after "...growth patterns" and before "It recognizes..." insert: Ecosystem and open space preservation may be adversely affected by State Statutes and private property rights which may not be controlled or managed by the County or its residents.
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Change the process to allow for public comment following Planning Commission review of each chapter. Public comment will occur prior to the Planning Commissions review of the next topic or chapter.
8/13/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	3rd check on page 8 amended: The impact of local decisions must be understood in a regional and global context because of the impacts that development and other human activities have on ecological processes.(Superseded by Recommendation 63)
8/8/2009	Cheramy, Shirley Interested Public	I support the Theme 1 statements 2 and 3 about over passes, underpasses and speed reduction in high traffic wildlife corridors, as well as wildlife friend fencing. Fencing is important in all areas, including open space to provide wildlife movement.

Date	Name	Comment
8/6/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Thank you, both Town and Planning Commissioners for reading and listening to public comment as many of your comments and discussions reflected the public's concerns. I am worried that the public will not engage in this complicated process you have setup. Without public comment at each meeting, the moment is lost, and important thoughts will be lost in the weeks of delay. The public needs to comment at the time the discussions are held because the background of what you said is critical to a real community discussion. I do not see big turnouts at your meetings in the future. Are you afraid of the time it will take for comment? You will get more public involvement if you ask for comments on proposed recommendations before a vote like in a normal planning commission hearing - limit each comment to a few minutes. I doubt this will take a lot of extra time. If attending public feel you got it right then the meeting will move quickly. The written comments procedure will of course still be needed. When I click on the Preliminary Recommendations on this page only #10, 11, 16, 17, and 18 are listed, why not all? I have only commented on these as none of the others are here yet. Please see my comments below: #16. I feel just having the Housing Authority writing a white paper themselves is not appropriate. Many in the community, including myself do not agree with the reviews and conclusions reached by TCHA. In the last year, when asked to comment on a particular application, a real review of the Land Development regulations or Master plans were not done and strictly a push for approval whether right or wrong, sighting the "human element" was rendered. This has not installed trust in the TCHA to truly analyze regulations or data. The blue ribbon panel maybe another source for unbiased information, however, this panel was also a handpicked group. During the discussion you had talked about maybe the blue ribbon panel doing some of this work veres the Authority. An independent, third party, citizens review committee needs to confirm whatever is presented on the 65%. I would also like the recommendation to indicate current numbers are used and not the numbers used in the 2007 assessment which are now very dated especially in our current economic times. I know this is what is intended but the wording does not reflect that.#17. The current migration patterns were not part of the recommendation. I would like to see the the sheer number of humans not just vehicle collisions and how that effects wildlife populations. Counting cars and collisons is not the only factor is really by-product of human numbers.#18. The buildout information is good but again a third party needs to confirm accurracy of the data. I am assuming after the numbers are gathered that a nexus will be set that compares how much new residential housing and what kinds/types are needed to supply the needs of the commercial numbers.Thank you for considering my comments in your review of the draft plan.
8/6/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Right after my comment was psoted, I noticed that the time stamp is an hour later than actually done.

Date	Name	Comment
8/4/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	I would like to start off by saying Save Historic Jackson Hole is glad to see we are making progress in reviewing the Comp Plan. We feel the initial meeting had good discussions which is encouraging to us. We appreciate your efforts and offer the following suggestions to you as chairs for improving the process: -Consider allowing limited public comment, up to 1 1/2 hour after about 1 1/2 to 2 hours of discussion by your boards. This would have a number of benefits: Relevant comments from the public on the discussion you are having are more valuable when they are offered in a timely manner. They can enrich your discussions and could shorten the overall process. One of the things that made the "round table discussion" that the county had so valuable was interaction with the public as part of the overall discussion. Many of us left the meeting last Thursday frustrated that the only option for participation is to submit written comments that will not be reviewed until 2 weeks after the discussion or to wait 2 weeks to make verbal comments. It would also give your members a short break from discussion. -You are on the right track starting to wrap up the meetings at 8:30. At the end of 3 hours most of you seemed pretty burned out. -Only having one opportunity for verbal comments on a theme means many people will only have the option of written comments. Many people have plans that conflict with the August 20 meeting. Many people believe face to face communication is more effective than written comments. You might not agree with this belief, but we believe it is important to respect the belief and make a reasonable attempt to accommodate it. We believe a short verbal comment period would achieve this. -We are sensitive to concerns about verbal public comment being repetitive, so we would support the right of chairs to politely ask someone who is repeating a point from previous meetings to not repeat themselves. On the other hand we know limited input in the process is a source of great frustration among the public. If you err, it should be on the side of allowing more verbal public comment rather than not enough. People wish to be heard. We do not believe people will abuse the privilege of making verbal comments. The most important thing is to encourage public participation. -Do not overschedule the process. By placing too much on the agenda, it discourages thorough discussion. Commissioners should feel comfortable discussing concerns in detail. They should not feel pressure to "get back on schedule." The final product is more important than the schedule. It has been said before but is worth repeating so we do not lose sight of that fact. -Since this is a joint process, We believe the districts should be discussed jointly. As you have pointed out, what happens in the County affects the Town and vice versa. This may take longer but we believe it will result in discussions that will produce a superior product in the end. - One last suggestion is to not get bogged down in the details of data. If you design the proper framework for managing development in Teton County it will accommodate to changing economic and environmental conditions. It will not matter if we are in boom times or a recession, a wet year or a drought. Remain focused on what you want to accomplish first, then determine what needs to be changed to reach that goal. That is the key to successful control of any process. Save Historic Jackson Hole remains committed to developing the best possible Plan for the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We hope you will consider these suggestions as you move forward.

Date	Name	Comment
8/2/2009	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	I share the opinion of many that the current draft Comprehensive Plan does not reflect Community goals, and should be delayed for a major re-write. But I want to raise a different issue. The current draft was designed for an economic era that no longer exists. The new economic environment poses different challenges that this Plan does not address. You are well aware of how the local economy has changed. Town and County face serious budget difficulties. Property values have plunged, and business turnover has fallen sharply. Homes are being foreclosed and businesses shut. A bank has failed and credit is tough to get. This is a new world, and you see how tough things are. The key point you should consider is that this crisis is not like the recessions we have seen previously in our careers. It is a paradigm shift. After many years of easy credit and unrealistic increases in asset prices the old system collapsed. Things will recover, of course, but not back to where we were. The economy will take years to digest a glut of unsold homes, bad loans, and massive increases in public debt. People will save instead of spend. Demand for travel, resorts, and second homes will not return to pre-crisis levels for years. Before the crisis you could view development as responding to limitless demand. Your main concerns were how to pick among projects, limit the flow, and extract the best concessions. A huge industry arose to feed this demand: developers, realtors, builders, architects, planners, mortgage bankers, appraisers, etc. The construction and development industries provided employment, tax revenues, and affordable housing. The current draft plan was built around that paradigm, to try to manage it but also to get it to continue to pay for infrastructure and public services. The trouble is, development has lost its supports of high real estate prices, cheap credit, and external demand for resorts and vacation homes. That creates two very important challenges for you. First, the construction and development industries cannot support the community any more, at least not to the scale we are used to. Second, they will not just fade away; they will fight to survive, and vainly claim that the good times will return. They will put additional pressures on you to approve projects and use up environmental capital in the name of saving jobs. The Plan needs to shift focus from managing strong growth to coping with slow growth or even none at all. It needs to recognize that new development will further reduce prices for existing properties and businesses. It needs to recognize that affordable housing may become less important than preserving public services. It needs to recognize that developers will ask for more and offer less, and maybe put Jackson in competition with other communities. It needs to recognize that developments can fail, and put in place capabilities to ensure financial viability. One of the few silver linings in this crisis is that gives you the time to slow down and reflect. There is zero demand for fresh development – if you don't agree with me call a local banker and ask him. We have just gone through the most severe economic dislocation in a century and it is hopelessly optimistic to expect the economy to bounce back any time soon. To persist in a planning process grounded in the pre-crisis economic thinking is to willfully ignore what we all see around us. I urge you instead to take the time to understand what this new world means for the Comprehensive Plan and the best way to react. I'd be happy to discuss these points with you further.

Date	Name	Comment
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Build out info. *Existing Dev. Potential of 94 by dist. w/separate cat. By district for ARU's - No Density bonus. *Large parcel not yet platted into 35 ac. *platted vacant lots *Remaining Undeveloped in Resort Dist. By Use *Core Comm. Areas - By right commercial

Date	Name	Comment
7/30/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to the discussion items scheduled for the August 6, 2009 meeting: Themes 1 and 2. The Conservation Alliance will submit additional, detailed comments specific to each remaining chapter, theme, and future land use plan in the future as those hearings are scheduled. In general, the fundamental issues of this plan must be discussed and corrected prior to detailed review of policies. It is difficult to provide recommendations for specific language in individual policies because the underlying, base issues have not yet been resolved. The review of Themes 1 and 2 makes this challenge particularly evident. First, the public has demonstrated strong support for this plan to place wildlife and open spaces as the number one priority in all land use decisions in Teton County and the Town of Jackson. The plan's approach, foundation, and language must reflect this. Second, the public has demonstrated strong support for this plan to limit overall growth, and acknowledge a carrying capacity for the valley's unparalleled wildlife resources. Theme 2 must address how the amount of development will affect the community's ability to uphold its top priority, as well as other community issues, such as workforce housing. The new plan should direct that baseline densities should not increase, and that the public concerns (unpredictability and inconsistency with community vision) regarding incentive tools be remedied. We also have concerns regarding the absence of data and analysis to inform the policies and maps of the new plan, particularly considering the geographic specificity of the Future Land Use Plan maps. Many of the policies, as they are currently described, lack an adequate basis, foundation or rationale for their inclusion in Themes 1 and 2. That the statement of ideal for Theme 2 has been dramatically changed since the earlier phase of this process is also troubling, particularly given the overall prioritization of this theme throughout the plan. We provide the attached comments, and raise questions, to encourage increased clarity in the new plan and to ensure that its policies will work to protect the assets that define Jackson Hole. (One of the original objectives of this process, which we support, was to ask and answer the hard questions now, as part of this comprehensive planning process, rather than have to debate isolated planning decisions in the future, application by application.) Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for all of your work. Sincerely, Kristy Bruner Kristy Bruner Becky Tillson Community Planning Director Community Planning Associate JACKSON HOLE CONSERVATION ALLIANCE, JULY 2009 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS on April 2009 Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Draft THEME ONE: Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources Key Issues: • Based on the community's consistently voiced top priority, Theme One should be the foundation of the entire plan. Strategic conservation of the county's unparalleled wildlife and natural resources should be the basis/organizing theme of the plan and of land-use planning decisions. • The policies should speak to the context of this valley, and what it means to be a gateway community committed to the stewardship of two premier national parks and one of the last relatively intact ecosystems in North America. • Given the parcel-level specificity of the FLUP Maps, and their role in the formation of zoning maps, more wildlife/natural resource data must be compiled prior to map review/adoption. • The detailed definition of community character from the 1994 Plan needs to be reincorporated. If the resources aren't defined/identified, how can we preserve them? • Smart "development patterns" should also include discussion of the total amount and intensity of development, the rate of development, traffic and other infrastructure demands, and dynamic vegetation and habitat conditions, to name a few. • The plan should identify the major threats to wildlife populations and habitat availability and

then outline policies and strategies to remove and minimize those threats.

- Indirect and cumulative effects are substantial threats to achieving our community’s goal to protect wildlife and habitat; monitoring must include an analysis of these different “effects.”
- Where data is lacking or outdated, we should be cautious while making land-use decisions. A lack of data does not necessarily indicate a lack of importance of an area to wildlife.
- Habitat connectivity needs to be addressed in significantly greater detail.
- Overall numbers (residents, commuters and visitors) matter. Increased human activities in the region threaten the health of wildlife populations.
- The plan must consider wildlife permeability, focusing on areas of threatened permeability, as well as on thresholds, beyond which both permeability and viability are endangered.
- Stronger language should be incorporated into this plan regarding permanent conservation of critical land and open space, for character-defining rural, agricultural and scenic purposes.
- Air and water quality are essential to the health of the ecosystem, economy and community. This plan’s proposed development potential will impact these resources.
- Language must be strengthened throughout the theme; replace “suggest” with “mandate.” Scenic resource policies need a much closer look, particularly as they relate to this theme.
- Often, the direct loss of specific habitat cannot be mitigated for or replaced.
- According to survey data, a majority of the public voted to support taxes/the establishment of a funding source for permanent conservation. Why is this not listed as a strategy in this theme while it is for workforce housing and transportation, which received less community support?
- The plan must establish a funding source and specific role for the Environmental Commission.
- The plan speaks to the importance of monitoring, but needs to specifically identify a framework and timeline that is funded and feasible, as well as guidelines for monitoring and for the subsequent modification of land development regulations.
- The potential role of climate change on our wildlife populations and our economy are not adequately addressed in this theme. There needs to be more language specific to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem within the dynamic context of a changing climate.
- As stated by the Wyoming Game and Fish, “The draft plan should include more specific language, data, and mechanisms to provide the degree of stewardship identified in the introduction of the Comprehensive Plan as the community’s primary values.”
- The concepts and ideals presented in Theme One must be incorporated into the rest of the draft plan in a way that ensures that the larger community goal to protect wildlife will be met.
- A separate theme should be added to address energy efficiency and climate responsibility.

7/30/2009

,

Joint Planning Commiss

Housing Information

- *Further analyses of 65% - Whitepaper to be produced by Housing Authority.
- *Is 65% a defensible #
- *Rental info.
- *Breakdown of WF housing by type (deed rest., rental, etc)
- *Apts.
- *

Date	Name	Comment
7/30/2009	Thal, Lawrence E., AIA Interested Public	This community is trying very hard to plan for a positive future. It's a statement of the obvious to say we should be planning for the future we are likely to see. It's funny how the obvious is sometimes missed for the 1001 details we have to work through. It appears that we are now at a fundamental turning point with possible futures being significantly different than our current situation. The buzzword sustainability will likely transition from a trend to a lifeline for a viable economy and decent quality of life going forward. To count on anything else is too risky. We are either at or very close to world peak oil production. That means that future thriving economies will not have the type of fossil fuel dependence that we now see. We've known that for a long time, the only uncertainties have been the timetable and the best response. The time is now. On these issues we tend to respond like the large ship with a small rudder, very slowly. The smart response is to chart a good course well in advance. Many have been saying for some time that reduced fossil fuel use will be good for the environment, climate, national security etc. It may also be the only sure path to ensuring a vibrant and sustainable local economy. Last week at the Wolfenson Challenge Climate Solutions presentation, ambitious goals of making Jackson Hole an exemplary community on independence from fossil fuels were discussed. We should take the challenge and set goals for serious reductions in energy consumption. Now is the time to chart a course to reach those goals as our smartest path forward. I thus make the following proposals. 1. Embrace the Wolfenson Challenge. The response proposed by Climate Solutions is only an outline of possible paths we could take. Their program is full of good ideas but generally void of the specific recommendations. Many of those solutions could come from within the community. This community is full of talented problem solvers. We are also familiar with our local climate, both natural and human. We should make sure that the response to the challenge is comprehensive including reductions in all fossil fuel dependence. 2. Use our comprehensive plan as a tool to guide local development toward sustainability. The current draft plan is already moving in that direction but the sustainability ideals need to be elevated from platitudes to defined goals with target levels of performance defined. The task is monumental, Without goals and a coordinated response, our efforts will fall far short. These goals should become an organizing theme of our planning efforts. All future regulations, reviews, policies, programs and planning should be viewed through the lens of our sustainability goals. Two such goals already present but buried, as afterthoughts in the draft plan are energy savings in buildings and transportation. I support the plans stated goal of carbon neutral buildings by 2030. The goal of energy conservation in transportation should be clarified and strengthened. I suggest we show commitment to transportation efficiency by setting specific goals for reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita. I suggest a goal of a 50% reduction by 2030. This would correspond to national goals currently being generated. 3. Use the best planning tools to implement our planning goals. Our current LDR's (land development regulations) fall short. Much of the recent bruhaa over "The Plan" and creation of those nasty nodes represents a lack of confidence that the planning process can actually protect community character. Much of that loss of confidence is justified based on recent performance ie. the stuff built in denser areas of the valley over the last 15yrs. I suggest we create professionally designed, carefully customized, form based codes for our future LDR's. They are a more precise and character based tool. 4. Look for synergies. Where the sustainability goals help achieve our other goals such as enhancing quality of life, community character and the protection of wildlife, our efforts should be amplified. 5. Get commitments from strategic partners. Along the line of broad community support, buy in and total commitment from important organizations will be incredibly helpful. A few that come to mind are, The National Park and Forest Services, the chamber of commerce & the local tourism industry, the local architecture and construction industries, the local board of realtors and local conservation organizations. Closing thoughts. Too many discussions related to "the plan" have recently seemed to focus on build out numbers. I do not wish to minimize their importance but have to emphasize that these raw numbers are just a part of our impact equation. Numbers of people or buildings do not alone define character, traffic generation or energy use. Character is created by the complex interaction of land use / building patterns, our transportation systems and most importantly our community. Many of the concerns we hear about growth relate to transportation, specifically auto traffic. Interestingly neither our planning goals or energy goals will be accomplished if we do not confront auto use and traffic head on. Now is the time for our community to pull together and take significant positive action to control our destiny. This is our responsibility to a hopeful and promising young generation. I am interested in feedback. lthal@me.com
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Vision Statement: Preserve & protect the area's unparalleled natural ecosystem while meeting our community's needs in an environmentally responsible manner that celebrates this significant and unique place on our shared planet.(Superseded by Recommendation 64)
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Add "without sacrificing the natural environment" after second to last sentence of paragraph 2 on page 7

Date	Name	Comment
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Split the Vision Chapter from the Executive Summary
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	ENV. CONSIDERATIONS *NRO Study *Habitat by dist. *Permeability *Rd. Kill Data *Vegetative Coertype. *forest serv., parks serv, cons. Alliance, sust. JH
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	End of second paragraph, P 7 insert: As a community, we have a unique opportunity to lead by example, share our values and influence opinions around the world. We need to embrace this opportunity and step up to the challenge of leadership presented to us.
7/30/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Consolidate plan into fewer chapters - not changing text of individual chapters by passing this vote.
7/26/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	As the Comp Plan begins the challenge of a joint review/ rewrite process, my concerns over Theme six Transportation issues remain in the forefront. The redesign of the "Y intersection" as the primary concern for future traffic planning for Jackson is imperative. Please take a look at the article attachment below on the benefits that a round about design would offer our community. This "gateway" approach could save millions of dollars in unnecessary new road build out and provide a safer, greener solution to many of our traffic backups. This concept could be continued at both the 22/390 Moose -Wilson Road and the Spring Gulch light to allow greater vehicle throughput and reduce traffic accidents overall on Highway 22. My colleagues and I have had conversations directly with WyDot District Engineers in Rock Springs, as well as Governor Fruedenthal regarding the Y round about concept. All are favorable to the idea, and are looking for support and cooperation from our town elects to put this back on the priority list of road projects. As you consider Theme six alternatives for transportation improvements, Highway 22 upgrades, and funding sources, a priority placement of the redesign at the Y could prove to be the most prudent improvement we could make for the community. I believe the town would rally behind this process, and I have ideas how to make this a "community effort" project. We need to bring the town back together more than ever before, and this could be the catalyst.

Date	Name	Comment
7/20/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to know what definition the Teton County Draft Comprehensive Plan used to define human needs. It states at the beginning of the plan in the Community Vision chapter that "Ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs." The following quote is from a workbook on Landscapes, Wildlife and People; "The needs of people are more complex than the needs of animals, simply because people have something that animals lack: wants. Wants and needs are often used interchangeably to describe the essential things that people require in life. Dictionary definitions of the two words even use one to describe the other. Yet human wants can go far beyond human needs in both benefits and impacts. The driving consumer impulse of wanting something--- a new car, a vacation, a lifestyle--- causes people to overlook the basic needs of humans and animals alike. In our quest to satisfy our wants, we might leave our needs, or those of others, unmet. It is important to distinguish between human needs and wants as you explore the ways that community growth and development have an impact on the basic needs of living things." I believe that human needs as defined in the draft comprehensive plan go far beyond needs and morphs into the category of human wants without regard for wildlife protection and preserving open spaces. True human needs for Jackson Hole's success as a healthy gateway community are woven into ecosystem preservation. You can't have a socioeconomic successful Jackson Hole without putting wildlife and open spaces first throughout the county. We have to protect the needs of wildlife and humans to have a balanced, healthy, economically viable place to live for everybody, not just for some people in some parts of the County. There needs to be an annual cap on growth and development to stop the sprawl into South Park and other areas that the present draft comprehensive plan would allow. We need to go back to the build out numbers of the 1994 regulations without any up zoning or bonus density tools. The list of recommendations put forth by the county planning commission is a good start towards realizing the true needs of our unique community. Although as you know I do not agree with moving the rodeo, fairgrounds and Start Bus facilities to northern South Park. That would only lead to 'wanting' more commercial there and continue the sprawl southward. "Sometimes we forget that all living things share the same environment and basic needs."(Project Wild). In order to grow and develop responsibly in Jackson Hole, you need to prove we need it, not just want it! Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park
7/20/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	I have been very disappointed that the current draft plan was and will not be corrected to reflect the overwhelmingly consistent public comments prior to the step by step review by the planning commissions. The vision, the themes, FLUP and the supporting appendixes each need to be changed with basically the same nondisputed adjustments. Why not fix those items right now so that a more focused review of each part of the plan can be done without duplicating the same issues at every joint planning commission meeting. When the wildlife priority, growth and buildout numbers are adjusted, as the community has requested, much of the plan will have to change significantly and should become a different document entirely. Please take a leadership role now insisting on the "global corrections" and by that action, you will restore my and the community's trust that we will have a plan and a process that reflects our goals. Sincerely, Gail Jensen

Date	Name	Comment
7/17/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	I have a few comments to submit for next week's joint Comp Plan review: Teton County Planning Commission Recommendations I attended the long meeting where the County planning commission discussed and modified a long list that they had intended to give to the planning staff as formal recommendations so that the draft of our comprehensive plan would be much more in-line with public comment before your joint commissions started your review. These 35 recommendations, although not all-inclusive and with one recommendation I can not agree with (moving the START, Fair and Rodeo Grounds to South Park) – did capture the majority of public comments and concerns to date and I know my neighbors felt they had finally been heard for the first time. The issue for me is you are still starting with a document that is so seriously flawed it was due to be sent back to staff before you even started your work. Given last week's unsettling events and questionable ethics – that vote was shockingly reversed. I commend the County planning commissioners' efforts, despite reversal, to recognize our citizens' concerns that this draft was not ready to be reviewed. Now as I attempt to move forward (after what I firmly believe first should be a convened joint electeds meeting – see next point below) – I am sure those of you familiar with Roberts Rules of Order may believe those recommendations have also not moved forward due to the vote last Thursday evening. If there is any question on whether the vote last Thursday was only about whether to remand the draft to staff – or not - versus the validity of a very long public process to arrive at the 35 recommendations – then please start your meeting with the County planning commission reaffirming - with a vote - that these 35 recommendations (each approved on a majority basis) are still formally a start point from which they should continue the process. Need for a Joint Electeds Public Hearing Given what the public has learned Wednesday in the News and Guide newspaper, and what has been witnessed to in differing levels and in multiple ways by many of us over the past year-and-a-half, I believe holding the scheduled July 23 joint meeting is ill-advised. The meeting should be postponed until a full public hearing by the joint electeds can be held, addressing the complete breakdown in the process and involving Town Council, County Commissioners, and both Planning Commissions. The hearing should address three key questions: 1. Why has a preferred plan been issued (and reissued), when it is so out of sync with consistent and documented community input? 2. Why has a promised 'update' to the 1994 Comp Plan (sound and legally binding, although lacking in some detail) become a full 'rewrite' that diverts massively from much of the community-supported intent of the existing plan? 3. What occurred / has been occurring among the County Planning Director and any others, to influence the outcome of the draft and/or process outside of the public forums? Introduction and Vision Statement Given recent events, my concern about proceeding until the process issues I have already outlined are addressed - not simply 'swept under the rug' - and the short time frame since last Thursday's vote - I regrettably do not have additional specific recommendations that I had intended to submit for the Introduction and Vision Statement sections beyond my comments that are already part of the public record. As a citizen though I was invited to review the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's updated comments you have received today (July 17) and I fully support the detail you will find in them. In closing it is important to say that I and the public appreciate the hard work you perform as volunteer appointees. Do not misconstrue out intent when I or anyone from the public challenges positions, process, and/or decisions or when we continually show up and engage in the public process. It is unfortunate I have found myself needing to raise my 'voice' simply to be heard. Going forward - I trust that you will still listen to the valid concerns that I and others have communicated – and will communicate - in our specific plan comments despite also having to challenge the process, decisions and some actions in the past. Simply - do not kill the messenger – at least not until you have heard and listened to the message. Respectfully, Rich Bloom

Date	Name	Comment
7/17/2009	Bruner, Kristy Conservation Alliance	July 17, 2009 Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions cc: Jackson/Teton County Planning Team: Jeff Daughtery, Tyler Sinclair, Alex Norton, Jeff Noffsinger Board of Teton County Commissioners, Mayor and Town Council Dear Planning Commissioners, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Following are comments specific to the discussion items scheduled for the July 23, 2009 meeting. The Conservation Alliance will submit additional, detailed comments specific to each chapter, theme, and future land use plan in the future as those hearings are scheduled. The Conservation Alliance has been deeply involved in community planning over the years and particularly during this plan revision process. We join the public, the planning departments, the planning commissions and the elected officials of both the Town of Jackson and Teton County in our shared desire to create a plan that builds on the will of the majority of the community. To this end, we offer the following comments to the planning commissions with the hope that they will be discussed and explicitly addressed in the new and updated version of our community's Comprehensive Plan. This correspondence regards the following items: • Recommendations regarding the Teton County Planning Commission's 35 recommendations • Recommendations for four primary issues related to the new plan's process, vision, and organization • A summary of comments and detailed comments on the Introduction and Community Vision Chapters of the April 2009 draft. Teton County Planning Commission Recommendations We watched as the Teton County Planning Commission presented, discussed and modified a series of recommendations that they had intended to pass on to the planning staffs to help them in creating a new draft of our Comprehensive Plan. This focused approach seems to have captured many of the public's concerns. By our account, these actions represented a position that planning documents, of this level of importance, should be at a near complete form prior to entering public hearings and should be more representative of community will. Now, instead of sending the plan to the staffs, the Planning Commissions have chosen to proceed with the Draft Plan as presented in April 2009. As we have already voiced, we were very disappointed with this turn of events given the extent to which the new draft does not represent community vision. We commend the County Planning Commissioners' initial efforts to uphold the public's message that this new plan was not ready to proceed through the hearing process. That said, moving forward, we fully expect that this list of recommendations will serve as a jumping off point for discussions between the Commissions, and that they will play a strong basis for the Planning Commissions' comments and revisions. Key Issues Rewrite versus Update After hundreds of hours of examining the new draft and working to outline specific recommendations to make this draft become a workable and effective plan for our community, we find ourselves continually arriving at a core question – Why did this new draft end up being a complete rewrite and overhaul of our existing 1994 Plan? We feel that answering this question is not simply “water under the bridge” but instead is a critical first step in terms of moving forward. Answering this question is essential for a number of reasons, including the efficiency of the review process and identifying how to best reintegrate concepts of the 1994 Plan into the new draft. The original objective of this process was to update the 1994 Plan, essentially improving the elements of the plan that needed to be fixed and increasing predictability in decision-making. Initial meetings related to the update process, consultant interviews, and a short projected timeline all indicated that this process would not be a revision or rewrite, but simply an update. In April 2007, when the Conservation Alliance first held a citizen information forum on the process, planners specifically emphasized the importance of alerting the public to

expect that this process would be an update and not a revision. This terminology in describing the process, “update” versus a “revision” or “rewrite” was framed as important distinction. Why was it determined it would be better to do a rewrite? Not only did the polls and public comments indicate that long-standing values of the community continue to remain the same, but the timeline and funding allocations were more realistically suitable for an update and not a rewrite.

Removal of Community Character-Based Planning Approach & Inconsistency with Community Will

This draft removes the 1994 Plan’s community-character based planning approach, which was the foundation of the Plan. The 1994 Plan included considerable language defining community character and the role of rural character preservation in both the town and county. In the 1994 Plan, the goal of rural character preservation led to policies and regulations that worked to protect open spaces (for scenery, agriculture and wildlife habitat) and small town character (modest scales of development and low-density characteristics). Maintaining this language would be more representative of our current community vision. Also, because the new draft removes the underlying character-based foundation of the 1994 Plan, it does not have a cohesive foundation or organizing theme upon which to base land development regulations.

Specifically, the 1994 Plan states, “In pursuit of the goals listed above, Jackson and Teton County hereby formulate a land development regulatory system which protects the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Teton County by responding to the components of community character.” What cohesive planning framework does this new plan provide to form the basis of land development regulations?

First and foremost, this plan should work to protect the qualities of Jackson Hole that matter most to its residents, and that contribute greatly to its culture and long-term economy— our diverse wildlife, rural landscape, open spaces, and scenery. As currently drafted, it would fail in this objective.

Also, the community surveys have clearly demonstrated that there is support for limiting overall growth potential, which this draft does not address.

Future Land Use Plan Maps

In short, we have major concerns with the disconnect between the degree of specificity outlined in the Future Land Use Plans and a lack of analysis of what they propose. Overall, this new draft does not simply encompass a “big picture” community vision and therefore should not be reviewed as such. The parcel-level specificity of the maps, without accompanying analysis, represents a key issue in the review of the new draft. It is troubling that the new maps send the message that elevated levels of development are appropriate without analysis of impacts. If analysis is absent, we question the “predictability” these maps bring to the draft. A fundamental disconnect exists if data and information was not used to form the maps given that the plan suggests they are the key element of the plan to give “predictability” in future land use decisions.

The Future Land Use Plan maps raise more questions than they answer. These maps provide some level of predictability in development location only. Given the extensive ranges of scale, intensity, and density of development represented by land-use characterizations and Appendix I, minimal predictability is provided on these major factors in land use decisions. These factors are of major importance to the public. In general, the manner in which the future land use plans are organized is not user-friendly or clear, leaving the door open to unpredictable future land use planning.

Data Gaps, Studies and “What’s Missing?”

General

Repeatedly citizens have asked for more data and analysis to support this planning process. This lack of initial data raises the question about the feasibility of analyzing and monitoring important indicators in the future, when these actions have not been priorities for a major comprehensive planning process. If this analysis is not done as part of a major planning process, where it is of the greatest need, what future conditions (particularly with regard to available budgets and staffing) would enable this analysis to be carried out?

Also, in general, the new draft loses key language of the 1994 Plan it was meant to improve, both in terms of specific topics and detail. How can this new draft be expected to provide clearer guidance on important community issues such ecosystem preservation, workforce/affordable housing, and transportation when it

provides far less specificity and detail on those topics?

Wildlife Data Gaps

The geographic specificity of the new draft's maps pose particular challenges. The new maps propose nearly parcel-level recommendations in each individual district, without the inclusion of an underlying amended and updated natural resources map. Particularly given the specificity presented in the proposed district maps, identifying 1) documented sensitive environmental resources, 2) geographic or species-specific data gaps, and 3) consideration of additional species for protection, are critical steps to take prior to the adoption of such detailed future land use plans.

Clearly Defined Buildout

Please heed the recommendations drafted by Teton County Planning Commission that highlight the major studies necessary to justify the new draft's policies and maps. Given that it is very difficult to construct a road map to the future without an idea of where we are now, we feel it is essential to have a comprehensive (and corrected) documentation of the development potential, to include baseline entitlements, in all 25 districts prior to review of the Future Land Use Plan District Maps. The collection and presentation of this data should be presented in simple tables and based on the same techniques and assumptions for both the Town of Jackson and Teton County. Assumptions should be clearly outlined. (In cases where consistency cannot be achieved across jurisdictions, then a clear explanation should be given).

As part of this compilation, it would be helpful to summarize other key measurable units in a consolidated format such as: best estimation for existing and potential accessory residential units, the number of already-built deedrestricted residential units (ownership and rental), total square footage of already-built commercial property (this needs to be defined as to whether it includes lodging or short-term rentals), the square footage of alreadyapproved but not-yet-built commercial property, and existing and already-approved but not-yet built commercial, residential, and deed-restricted housing at each of the five Planned Resorts.

Introduction and Vision Chapter Comments

Please see attached comments.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. To make this process more effective in the long run, we hope that you will address fundamental issues related to the plan prior to proceeding with page-by-page modifications of the draft. The language of the Introduction and Vision chapters will have far-reaching and underlying implications throughout the rest of the plan. Essentially, we hope that modifications to the plan throughout the rest of the document can enable it as a whole to uphold many of the statements and claims made in these initial chapters.

Thank you again for your hard work on this plan and for your volunteerism on behalf of the community. Please contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

Kristy Bruner

Community Planning DirectorJackson Hole Conservation Alliance Comments

1 This statement of ideal needs to be changed. Refer to the Teton County Planning Commission June 29, 2009, motion, which included possible new statements. In particular, recommendation 3a, "Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem, natural resources, quality of life and community character in a sustainable and predictable manner" is more representative of community vision. As it is currently drafted, there is no central framework or filter through which all land use decisions can expect to be guided. "Meet the community's human needs" is far too vague of a concept to provide any clear guidance in protecting what makes Jackson Hole unique. Also, it is important to acknowledge that through consistent polling in our 'human' community, citizens strongly identified a desire and need to remain responsible stewards of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and one of the most unique communities in the world that sits within it. In this new plan, it should be clearly articulated that Theme 1 is the primary goal, and that through other approaches and actions (such as growth management and responsible transportation, etc.), this

goal can be achieved. By meeting this primary goal, Jackson Hole can be sustained as a community that meets the needs of many humans, both residents and visitors, including those of future generations. Our community's role as stewards of this unique ecosystem requires an approach that extends beyond meeting short-term "needs".

2 This figure is approximately three, not seven, percent.

3 This process should specifically define these characteristics, as well as the "intense pressure" that stands to threaten them. The 1994 Plan provided far greater definition of unique community characteristics than the new draft, as well as what types of "pressure" or development types would degrade these characteristics through time. If our attributes are not clearly defined in a major planning process in a comprehensive way, they will not be protected.

4 See discussion in note 1, above.

5 Discuss the inclusion of more specific language regarding sustainability that is unique to Jackson Hole, including the challenge to protect the rare assets that set it apart from other places, and the challenges of living in a remote area with a northern climate. In general, this plan inadequately addresses key issues such as the potential impacts of climate change in our community, and other factors that have particular relevance to sustainability in Jackson Hole.

6 The new plan, with Theme 1 as the foundation of the plan, should define what it means for land use decisions to be "sensitive" to the ecosystem. To provide clear guidance, it should define what factors are necessary in order to achieve this goal, particularly in regard to the appropriate location, scale, and rate of development and locations for permanent conservation. The best available science should be used to inform these decisions, and when comprehensive data is lacking, the "precautionary principle", to err on the side of caution, should be applied.

Also, this new draft does not appear to be based on directing "sensitive" development, given the amount of development, residential and commercial, that it deems reasonable in Appendix I and the Future Land Use Plans.

7 This statement is inaccurate. Conservation science has long indicated that conservation thresholds can be crossed. And, given the lack of baseline data on Teton County's private lands, including 2009 JACKSON / TETON COUNTY COMMUNITY VISION Y RELATIONSHIP OF THE THEMES TO THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

16 Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan

vegetation cover, is it hard to determine whether some of these thresholds are already being passed, in terms of habitat loss. At least two species of concern, moose and mule deer, already have declining populations.

The plan does not recognize that our community must face, and answer, tough questions about carrying capacity. Increasing the potential for direct, indirect and cumulative effects associated with human-related development impacts, increases the potential for crossing thresholds (in terms of survival of local wildlife populations). At the core of the sustainability concept is the need to recognize limits. In many ways, the new draft indicates a fundamental shift from acknowledging that there are limits to how much development can occur here (as described in the 1994 Plan) to assuming that "ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth," as described in the new draft. At a big picture level, the new draft takes a huge step backward in terms of integrating a "sustainability concept" because it no longer emphasizes that our economy should not be dependent on population growth. The 1994 Plan's emphasis to encourage a sustainable economy not dependent on population growth should be reinstated.

Impacts from developments can be minimized, but at some point, regardless of "mitigation" approaches, the amount of overall levels of development need to be conservative to achieve the community's top priority.

8 See Introduction discussion. The new draft identifies Theme 1 (Promote Stewardship of Wildlife

and Natural Resources) as the community's top priority. However, in other key areas of the plan, such as this section and in the Introduction, it identifies Theme 1 and Theme 2 (Managing Growth Responsibly) as the community's "primary values." As stated earlier, the vision statement "Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and natural resources and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable manner" is clearly based on meeting the primary values, but does not distinguish a prioritization and introduces vague concepts such as "needs".

Additionally, in this new draft, the meaning of Theme 2 was fundamentally changed in the new draft in comparison to what "managing growth responsibly" meant in the early visioning process and in survey questions. Following is just one example. The following objectives, 1) establish and define the "end state" for development of the town and county and implement it through regulatory and programmatic approaches, and 2) fully address the cost of growth, were listed as two of four objectives that this theme would address. This new draft either doesn't address these objectives at all or doesn't elevate them as a key principle in the theme. Similarly, the ideal statement for Theme 2 has fundamentally changed since earlier drafts to just refer to "human needs." Specific recommendations regarding Theme 2 will be provided separately.

9 This section should specifically refer to indirect and cumulative impacts of growth on the ecosystem.

10 Clarify - What are these "tools"?

11 This Plan should primarily be about finding solutions to uphold the community's top priority.

12 First, we recognize that the 1994 Plan has needed an update to provide increased clarity, and in a way that responds to current community challenges. However, this statement and discussion that the 1994 Plan was more fragmented and less cohesive than the current draft is highly debatable. Specifically, the 1994 Plan used a community-character based approach, a common planning approach that can be very helpful in solidifying how different community goals are related and in 2009 JACKSON / TETON COUNTY COMMUNITY VISION Y INTRODUCTION

Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan 17

linking diverse goals in a cohesive, comprehensive manner. This approach is absent in this new plan, and is not replaced by a more predictable approach.

Specifically, the 1994 Plan states, "In pursuit of the goals listed above, Jackson and Teton County hereby formulate a land development regulatory system which protects the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Teton County by responding to the components of community character." What cohesive framework does this new plan provide to form the basis of land development regulations? If the answer is that the future land use plans, along with land-use characterizations, are the key guiding element, what is the rationale for the maps presented, and what criteria would amendments to maps (or land use characterizations) be based on? If these maps are the "predictable element", it is particularly concerning that no analysis was used to form these plans and maps.

Given the benefits that community-character based planning approaches can provide in comprehensive planning, particularly in gateway communities, we recommend reinstating a community-character based approach, with increased clarity in definition and parameters. The 1994 Plan would provide an excellent starting point, particularly Chapter 3. A character-based plan can be quite specific in its language and direction. Refer to Chapter 3 of the 1994 Plan for specific examples, which describe topics such as the importance of clustering and open space protection, and scales of development. While pages 9 and 10 of Chapter 3 in the 1994 Plan could benefit from further refinement, they provide much clearer direction than the new draft for land development regulations.

13 See prior discussion. The new draft does not consider community issues in an integrated and balanced way.

14 As we stated in an earlier correspondence, we question the approach to prioritize themes in individual, isolated land use planning districts. Without an accompanying larger scale approach, the currently proposed approach could result in planning and decision-making that underemphasizes the importance of cumulative, valley-wide impacts. The new plan should include a more comprehensive framework to evaluate all land-use decisions. This new plan should include a comprehensive, larger scale Future Land Use Plan map that depicts how different districts are related across the town and county. For example, there should be a comprehensive Town map that includes all Town districts. With the current approach, a piecemeal, isolated approach to planning is promoted. The very general map for both jurisdictions on page 11 is inadequate.

15 Despite the new approach to use monitoring to allow for increased accountability and measurability, and some new specific policies to promote energy conservation and the use of renewable energy, the plan, at the big picture level, falls far short in integrating the concept of sustainability. In short, the plan does not recognize that our community must face, and answer, tough questions about carrying capacity. To sustain our area's key assets, this plan should promote strong growth management policies, including significantly lowered development potential.

16 The ranking of priorities proposed in the various districts, particularly with regard to natural resources, wildlife, and scenic protection, lacks a scientific basis and is flawed. Detailed comments will be provided specific to each district.

2009 JACKSON / TETON COUNTY COMMUNITY VISION Y RELATIONSHIP OF THE THEMES TO THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

18 Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan

17 The land-use scenario most strongly supported by the community did not include the expansion of county "nodes" with town-level densities, which is depicted in this map. Why is this land use plan being promoted in the new draft when it does not represent the community vision?

Comments on THEMES 1-7 summaries, pp. 10-13 of the Vision Chapter*

* Detailed recommendations will be submitted specific to each theme-based chapter and Future Land Use Plan in subsequent comments. Below are just a few comments to contribute to the discussion about the themes' summaries. There are many statements in this chapter that describe what the plan does. Unfortunately, in many cases the remainder of the plan falls short in actually carrying out some of the claims outlined in this chapter. This disconnect between what these initial chapters say that the plan does versus the proposed principles, policies, and Future Land Use Plans that the plan contains is a major concern.

18 Preventing the "exporting of impacts" is a good goal, but the new draft should first and foremost provide policies that prevent impacts overall, whether within the local valley or in neighboring communities. A lot of focus is given to the prevention of exporting impacts, but in general, the impacts that will occur from the proposed level of development within the valley are strongly understated throughout the document. Where is the discussion of the role of lowered development potential and its implications?

19 This goal is the top priority. Scenic resources preservation should also be reinstated as a primary element of Theme 1.

20 While minimizing impacts to the ecosystem is a worthy goal, the new draft includes no analysis of the impacts expected to result from "town-level" densities in these nodes. There's no data suggesting that the nodes could handle the amount of development proposed without significant ecological, social and fiscal impacts.

21 "Community needs" is consistently referred to; this document should give clearer guidance as to what this entails.

22 What is the basis for this assumption? Specifically, how does town redevelopment remove growth pressure from crucial wildlife habitats? The current plan lacks assurances that

intensification of development in town is linked to conservation opportunities in the county. These statements should be removed if they lack a basis in the principles and policies of the plan. It appears that the underlying premise of the plan – that tradeoffs in certain geographic areas will be required to uphold the overall community vision – is resting on false assumptions.

23 These outcomes will be based on the types of development promoted in town redevelopment. If redevelopment results in primarily high-end lodging, commercial and resident development that is largely inaccessible to workers, these outcomes will not result as described. Given the extensive level of commercial development deemed reasonable in the new draft, an increased dependence on commuters is likely. Also, development has direct, indirect and cumulative impacts in this valley, regardless of where it occurs. This plan understates this fact.

24 The new draft includes a number of strong policy recommendations under Theme 4, including the emphasis on preservation of workforce housing. A few key concerns include: consequences of shifting the definition of workforce housing to include market, affordable and deed-restricted units, a failure to emphasize the impacts of excessive commercial development potential and how it will impact the ability to achieve a 65% goal and reduce regional and local impacts, unresolved reconciliation between regulatory and incentive options, and a lack of emphasis on the production

2009 JACKSON / TETON COUNTY COMMUNITY VISION Y INTRODUCTION

Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan 19

of rental units. Without a focus on a more comprehensive set of drivers for workforce housing shortages, many policies are not likely to result in long-term solutions.

25 Theme 5 needs a lot of work. Theme 5 should emphasize the importance of promoting “economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth,” as stated in the 1994 Plan. Theme 5 must address, in a more meaningful way, how Jackson Hole’s long-term economic wellbeing depends on the protection of our natural resources, wildlife, scenic vistas, and small town character.

26 As stated earlier, Theme 6 needs a lot of work. Reinstating significant portions of the Transportation Chapter adopted in 2000 is essential. Currently, this theme’s chapter completely lacks the analysis necessary to form sound transportation planning policies. This chapter, in many ways, begs the question of why so many policies and recommended strategies from the 1994 Plan have been removed.

27 One of the original objectives of this process, “evaluate whether the town and county can afford the public commitments in the Comprehensive Plan, and that revenue is greater or at least equal to the cost of services” was not addressed.

The new draft directs the creation of a countywide Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), but provides no analysis of the fiscal impacts of the proposed development potential and policies. Given the parcel-level specificity in the Future Land Use Plans, this lack of analysis is a huge concern. Also, in general, the new draft contains a number of policies and descriptions that assume the economic benefits of additional growth; however, the anticipated costs of growth are consistently underemphasized. In terms of infrastructure demands, this chapter underemphasizes the impacts of the “effective population” in the county and town, which would include residents, commuters, and visitors. This variable is a critical component that is addressed in the 1994 Plan, but is completely lacking in the new draft.

28 We have major concerns with the disconnect between the degree of geographic specificity (and development characterizations) outlined in the future land use plans and a lack of analysis of what is proposed in terms of development potential. It is troubling that the new draft maps send the message that certain levels of development are appropriate without any accompanying analysis of impacts. In general, the manner in which the future land use plans are organized is not userfriendly or clear, leaving the door open to unpredictable future land use planning.

Date	Name	Comment
		The relationship between Appendix I and the Future Land Use Plan characterizations needs to be addressed. 29 The new plan should include an additional theme entitled "Energy Conservation and Efficiency" which will address the widespread community desire to be more climate responsible. The Theme will include Provisions for: A -Residential and Commercial Green Building Standards B- Demolition standards that mandate the recycle of used materials in the most sustainable manner C- Alternative transportation D- Incentives for residents and businesses to use renewable energy, i.e. solar, wind and geothermal E- Ensuring that all renewable energy provisions are wildlife-friendly and utilize the most up-to-date science and technology.
7/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole believes we need to go back to "a sustainable community not dependent on growth" as an overall theme as stated in the 1994 Comp Plan. "Sustainable growth" is an oxymoron that is not good for Jackson Hole.
7/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi Paul, Leland, Hank, Ben and Andy, I hope your summer is going well. I think I can confidently say that a lot of Cottonwood Park residents are very worried that what we have commented on so far; in the comprehensive plan survey that was poorly interpreted by planning staff (Jeff D. has admitted that to me at the July 9th joint commissioner's meeting) and the comp plan website itself will be lost in the shuffle of power plays that is going on right now over the plan process. Cottonwood Park residents want to know how many times do we have to comment before our concerns about the plan are acted upon. We liked the idea of sending the plan back to staff with directions to include public comment and the 35 recommendations by the county planning commission. We do not approve of the fairgrounds, rodeo and start bus depot being moved to South Park though. We are already dealing with the problems caused by six schools, a sewage transfer station, a grocery store that services the whole community and light and heavy industrial that surround us in West Jackson. Please don't choke our neighborhoods off any more. Even some people who say why not move the facilities are backing off after I emailed them Cottonwood Park's perspective. I think I emailed it to you also. I hope you read it. We are not nimbys. I get pummeled with that term all the time but it just makes my resolve even stronger because of what we have here already. I envision High School Road becoming an academic road and I think I have told you some of my ideas. I would like for you to hear about my walking tour with Kelly Lockhart through Range View Park where I live. We are the front lines for either an excellent symbiotic relationship with South Park or a disastrous erosion of great neighborhoods here in West Jackson due to the proposed over development of South Park. Please keep Tony and Forrest on the county planning commissioner's board. They seem to be the only ones that understand the frustration residents here are going through. What do we have to do to get our comments and the public survey acted upon. STAG and the way planners interpreted the plan do not represent us. How many times do we repeat ourselves that this is not the plan we wanted. If the wearing out of the public involvement is what the elected wanted to get this through as is with few changes; I can only say I hope that is not the strategy but many are believing that is the case. My phone number is 734 6211. Maybe we can get together so I can show what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. Please let me know what you think so I can believe that our concerns are your concerns. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park, Jackson Wy.
7/13/2009	Acri, Armond Interested Public	Teton County and Town of Jackson Planning Commissions voted on Thursday to adopt a new process for reviewing the Comprehensive Plan. By adopting this major change in the process without taking any public comment, those who voted in favor have betrayed the public trust and insulted the community. It is more proof that public input is greatly appreciated, but has no real impact on the process. It appears some elected officials are not willing to wait for their turn at the Comp Plan. They continue to inject their input and try to pass it off as what the public wants. Why are they ashamed to let us see their input? The current process and the current draft are a sales job for something we do not want. When the plan reflects the wishes of the public, no sales pitch will be needed. Armond Acri Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
7/13/2009	Kreps, Bonnie Interested Public	We are writing to express our disappointment regarding this latest step by the Teton County Planning Commission. Like a number of people we have talked with, we would like to know from the Planning Commission just how it sees this step as a move forward towards honoring the will of the people. And we wonder just how many rounds of "public reviews" will be required before the Planning Commission acts on what the community already has declared to be its preferences. We ask you to support a comprehensive plan and process that represents the will of the people and respects our wishes for the future of our community. Sincerely, Bonnie Kreps Inger Koedt
7/9/2009	Swope, Linda Interested Public	As residents of Melody Ranch, we were not surprised by the results of the survey by the Conservation Alliance, confirming what we know to be true: that our neighborhood provides both habitat and migration corridors for a huge variety of wildlife. The writers of the Draft Comprehensive Plan, who put wildlife as the second lowest priority for South Park, must not have seen what we see: the great horned owls who nest each season in the adjacent cottonwood trees, the various waterfowl who visit the pond behind our house, the ducks who winter over there, the elk who migrate through, the moose who spends each winter here with a calf, feeding on our neighbor's willows, the coyotes, foxes and other small mammals, even the mountain lion who paid our neighbor a visit last winter. We own and operate a photography business that is largely dependent on visitors who have chosen Jackson Hole as a destination location. Time after time, they tell us that the wildlife and the scenery are the reasons for that choice. It's been well established that wildlife needs habitat beyond GTNP in order to maintain healthy populations. The Draft Plan, calling as it does for wall-to-wall high density in South Park, would drastically impact not only our neighborhood quality, but our business as well. We applaud the County Planning Commission for taking a stand for preservation of what we all cherish about Jackson Hole, and sending the Plan back to staff for a major overhaul. And we urge the Town Planning Commission to do the same. Thank you for your time, Linda Swope Linda Marquis Swope's Mountain Photography

Date	Name	Comment
7/9/2009	Thal, Lawrence E., AIA Interested Public	I offer these insights to help get our planning process on track. There should be a strong link between the challenges of our time and the responses of our plan. We are living in a transitional time, we face monumental challenges both locally, nationally and globally. We will not solve our problems with minor course adjustments. Now is the time for creative holistic thinking and cooperation. Lets clarify our goals and get on with it. SUSTAINABILITY Sustainability We need to ask ourselves if we are committed to these goals. If the answer is yes, if we want to preserve wildlife, our economy and be a pioneer city for energy conservation, then success will only be achieved if these goals are treated as central rather than peripheral to the plan. The synergistic potential of these goals is significant. The current plan has made a start in this direction but the dots have not been sufficiently connected. I thus agree with the intent of the planning commission in elevating the place of energy use to a central organizing concept of the plan. This will take considerable attention but for starters lets agree to concepts already roughed out in the plan. Policy 1.3.b: is "Reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with development patterns and transportation" I suggest that there be a goal associated with this policy. The goal of policy 1.3.c is to achieve carbon neutral buildings by 2030. I agree with this goal and suggest that for 1.3.b that we adopt the goal of a 50% reduction in (VMT) vehicle miles traveled per person by 2030. This would correspond to national goals currently being generated. The long term community benefits associated with this goal will be significant. They would include: - Reductions in transportation energy - Reduced traffic - Greater walk-ability and improved quality of life. - Reduced wildlife vehicle conflicts. - Improved air quality - Financial savings to municipalities through law enforcement, school bussing, etc. - Financial savings to individuals through reduced transportation expense and time save by driving less. The current plans discussion of this very worthy goal have caused significant concerns in part because of reactions to terms like "Node" and "density". This is where the process and the plan have significant room for improvement. (We may be well served to find other terms) One of the reasons people are having problems with the perceived "certification" of the "nodes" is that the character of new growth in these areas is not defined in the plan. That may be an Achilles' Heel of the plan. It is understandable that people who like what they have are afraid of change. This is particularly true if the change in the form of growth and development is defined in terms of numbers and not character. Numbers alone are not the key. There has recently been significant focus on build out numbers, I do not wish to minimize their importance but have to emphasize that these raw numbers are just a part of our impact equation. Numbers of people or building do not alone define character, traffic generation or energy use. Character is created by the complex interaction of land use / building patterns, our transportation systems and most importantly our community. Introduce Form Based Code Planning now. I believe that one of the next steps in the planning process should be to develop the tools that truly define the character, scale and intensity of the places created and recreated. This should be done before the comprehensive plan gets much further along. There are very sophisticated planning tools available. I suggest use of form based codes. Smart Code is probably the best available as a starting point. See http://www.smartcodecentral.org/ Don't finish the Comp plan, then write the LDRs Do use a Form Based Code for LDR's, start now. Create a transect based system of LDR's Use the transect language as a cohesive strategy to link the Comp plan and the LDR's Predictable placemaking is the strength of the form based codes. These tools will not eliminate all disagreements but it will make the options and choices clear upfront so better more informed choices can be made and subsequently the process should be better understood and the results more predictable. Smart Code is open source and free of charge. It is to be used as a starting point, It has to be locally calibrated by professionals who understand both Smart Code and the needs of the community. The SmartCode is a transect-based code. A transect of nature is a geographical cross-section of a region intended to reveal a sequence of environments. It helps study the many symbiotic elements that contribute to habitats where certain plants and animals thrive. Transect based planning takes advantage of lessons learned from study of natural ecosystems. This logic should be appreciated in Teton County. Many of the concerns we hear about growth relate to transportation, specifically auto traffic. Interestingly neither our planning goals or energy goals will be accomplished if we do not confront auto use and traffic head on. We have a very inefficient land use pattern which generates significant traffic for the number of people here. It will be a very challenging, long-term and tedious project to rectify this but the alternative is failure on some of our central goals. (energy & quality of life/community character, Wildlife will also greatly benefit from reduced auto traffic.) The reduction of auto dependence mentioned above is part of the monumental task of retrofitting the Suburbs. This will be one of the more significant land use trends in the nation. We are primarily rural suburban thus face similar issues & are often further behind to begin with. It is not too late to begin this process. The form of development and redevelopment will either add to or reduce our traffic generation and energy use. There is the potential for significant redevelopment in coming years. Thus I disagree with the belief that it is too late to undertake this process in our valley. I have been working with transect based community design for over a decade. It appears that now could be an opportune time to introduce this elegant tool into our Jackson & Teton County planning efforts. I would be glad to work with the town or county in this regard. Please feel free to contact me. Lawrence E. Thal AIA Design for a better tomorrow Sunlight Design & MountainSide Village 2160

Date	Name	Comment
		Coyote LoopWilson Wy. 83014phone: (208)787-6873 (307)733-9003cell: (307)-690-6696fax: (208)787-9003 (307)733-8326www.sunlight-design.comwww.mountainsidevillageidaho.comlthal@wyom.net
7/9/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Dear Commissioners, As you begin looking at revising the draft Comp Plan, I would ask you to examine the attached document. It will only take a few minutes to read. It is a copy of the Fremont County, Idaho Comp Plan. (Island Park-St. Anthony) It was completed in the end of 2008. Some observations: 1) Our draft plan has an 8 page Vision Statement. Theirs is 2 pages. 2) Our draft plan is 142 pages. Theirs is 20. They share many problems and concerns with us: a large amount of public land, preserving rural character, affordable housing, and protecting resources. Why is our plan so much longer? One reason is because our plan contains pictures and text boxes intended to sell the citizens on the plan. Their plan includes all supplemental information used to form the policies and goals in an appendix instead of in the main text. Their plan captured the community vision so they do not need to sell the citizens. Our goal should be to produce a simple to read, easy to understand document that does not intimidate average citizens. If the Comp Plan reflects the vision of the community no sales job will be needed. We hope you will consider this model as you go forward. Armond Acri Save Historic Jackson Hole
7/9/2009	Harger, Don Interested Public	Dear Larry, Tony, Paul, Forrest and Joseph, Thanks for all your tireless efforts and courage in recommending revisions to the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan. There is no question about our community's wishes and these need to be reflected in the current plan. Otherwise, we are just another resort community without the special values we cherish. Thanks, Don Harger
7/9/2009	Jorgensen, Arne Interested Public	County Planning Commission Members Town Planning Commission Members I appreciate the discussions last night concerning joint planning commission review of our comp plan process. I believe that the significant work that has been done by the County Planning Commission can be incorporated into the draft document while preserving a predicable joint process. Thank you for your on going efforts for our community. Arne Jorgensen
7/8/2009	Jones, Richard A. Interested Public	Like many other citizens of Teton County, my wife and I wrote to you last month, objecting to the April 3rd draft of a new Comprehensive Plan. But, then we were greatly heartened last week, by the newspaper's report of your thoughtful recommendations for substantial revisions of the initial draft. These recommendations made by your commission reflected careful consideration of the numerous letters and messages you received from the many segments of our community. Surely many hours of hard work were required to formulate such a thoroughly detailed report to our County Commissioners. All of the many citizens who have been so concerned about the unfavorable impacts threatened by the new plan, are indebted to you for your service. As volunteer members of the Planning Commission, you have undoubtedly given much more time, work and even stress to this effort than you could ever have imagined when you took on the responsibility. But, it has been worth the effort. Whatever direction the planning process takes from this point, your outstanding service has already been of great value to the community. My wife and I, like so many others, are very grateful to all of you for your contribution to the future of the valley that we all love. Thank you very much. Respectfully submitted, Richard A. Jones

Date	Name	Comment
7/8/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	Can you tell a servant from a tyrant? Some folks are wondering: is there a difference? President of the U.S., governor, mayor, county commissioner, planner, or dogcatcher, it's all public service. If you've seen the British TV comedy "Are you being served?" on PBS, then you know service sometimes comes with side agendas. Personality quirks and the offhand grandiose gesture are part of the human fabric; at a certain level we accept it. But there are limits. If you order meat loaf at the restaurant and the server brings fish, there's a problem. If you complain and the manager comes over and says, "Fish is better for you; eat it," then there's a bigger problem. And when voters' order up wildlife and open space but are served nodes and big growth, then the problem is out of hand. The servant has become a tyrant. The servant helps you get what you want. The tyrant uses you as a pawn to get what he or she wants. It's pretty simple. You won't go wrong if you do a "reality check" now and again. My grandson is pretty exuberant, just turned 3, and when he overdoes it, he gets a time-out. He's taken to the other room to calm down and think things over. A few minutes later, he's back without his "agenda" and we start anew, on a better footing. The difference between grandkids and elected officials is grandkids have adult supervision. Our public servants could use a time-out to read the public surveys, petition, and comp plan comments. If they sat down and reflected on what their customers wanted, maybe they'd drop their agenda and start anew. Works for my grandson. Part of getting back on track is seeing you're off track. County planning commissioners tried to point that out, and instead of saying thank-you, the oligarchy got mad. One commissioner had a tantrum. Didn't say he was sorry either. That's where 3-year-olds have an advantage: They're more flexible. And, they learn quicker. Of course not everyone is cut out for public service. I've often wondered why folks with strong personal agendas would want to masquerade in public service? But I digress. So far, local government has said they don't plan by surveys, don't plan by referendum, and don't plan

Date

Name

Comment

by petition. Well, what do they plan by? Ask them.
They can't show you what they've used as the basis
for their plan; maybe it's their own personal plan?
Tyrants do what they want and rarely explain
themselves.

Now, with the Fourth of July celebration fresh in
mind, a time-out would be useful. Since it's "selfevident
that all men are created equal," let's stop
ignoring the thousand-plus public voices that have
spoken out against the comp plan.

Louis Wang,
Jackson Hole

Date	Name	Comment
7/8/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Forrest, Thanks for your reply to my letter about the new recommendations. Sorry for not getting back to you sooner. I had to put on my tour guide hat for friends and relatives who were visiting over the Fourth. I had talked to Tony who was recommending just the fairgrounds be moved to South Park but he stated he did not want them close to High School Road for reasons I mentioned in my letter to all of you. Somehow it turned into the whole enchilada and near High School Road. It is a great idea to keep the work force housing in town near destinations of employment. I understand the planning commission's frustration about making it happen without exporting the problems to South Park. My fear is that if it all comes down to South Park what's to prevent the NW South Park node from still being overdeveloped in the future. Things promised today can easily be changed with a vote to permit it after the public facilities are moved. Commercial is one of my concerns around the High School and and the easement would be a great idea. I actually do like Kelly's idea of a higher education campus connected to the high school sometime in the future. He suggested a dormitory that could double as employee housing during the summer. I don't know about that but maybe for summer forest service employees, or summer seminars could be introduced to utilize it. I can also see a small Mom and Pop old fashioned coffee shop bakery, deli (owners living upstairs) servicing the campus. Where I disagree with Kelly is that he wants to put light industrial there too. My fear is that we would never see the higher education campus and the light industrial would take over. I talked to Kelly and Jeff Daugherty about High School Road being turned into a true academic campus road, creating a park the width of the High School and extending over to South Park Loop Road along High School Road. We have 6 schools there already. Let's foster the concept to really take advantage of the area. The park could have a cross country ski track in the winter and double as a running track with exercise stations along it. There could be outdoor learning facilities for the school children covering environmental and conservation concerns (future green jobs). Science tech stations for learning about solar energy and other alternative energy sources that can double to actually support the park, like lighting and bathrooms. I went to a rest station North of Monument Valley where it doubled as a learning station for Solar that ran the complex. Very cool! The park would then act as an East West wildlife corridor. The barbed wire fencing would be down and then the wildlife would have an easier time migrating through neighborhoods. High School Road then can be treated as a pedestrian and bike friendly road instead of the car and truck being the dominate transportation vehicle. If you google 'woonerf' (traffic calming measures) it will show you what the Europeans have been doing for years with their small towns and roads. It would be nice if homes are built that they would be offered to school teachers and employees that keep the area schools running. Now that would make the transportation chapter in the comp plan work! (I would still like to see infill in town first to take advantage of infrastructure already there.) The small neighborhood could be on the South side of the park I just suggested. Keep it to the 200 (preferably less) units that are allowed under current zoning. There would be an East West collector Road (from South Park Loop Road to Route 89) to alleviate traffic on High School road. That would be located on the southside of any new residential development. Those are some alternative suggestions that I think would improve High School Road for the surrounding neighborhoods and valley school children. My neighbor Carolyn (she's an architect and Mom) and I want to get together and draw something up that would include what I tried to explain. Maybe I can say it better with a map. Tony Wall suggested that we do it and if we ever get the time in the next couple of weeks we will. Thanks for letting me ramble on. I want the Hole to be nice for my son who will hopefully live in our house if things work out and we're not taxed out of it! Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park 734 6211 From: forrestmccarthy@hotmail.com To: wozkins@hotmail.com Subject: FW: Public facilities in South Park Date: Thu, 2 Jul 2009 08:28:23 -0600 Kathy, Thank for sharing your thoughts. I have mixed feeling about the idea of moving the fair grounds to South Park. It is an interesting idea worthy of consideration. However, until we consider all the consequences it is hard to form an opinion. Certainly the impact to the existing neighborhood needs be serous consideration. In your comments one of your main concerns was commercial being developed to the South. What if a permanent green belt (conservation easement) was including in the plan that would prevent that from happening? Forrest G McCarthy PO Box 21 Teton Village, WY 83025 307/733/3742 From: iadams@tetonwyo.org Date: Thu, 2 Jul 2009 08:14:43 -0600 Subject: FW: Public facilities in South Park From: Kathy Tompkins [mailto:wozkins@hotmail.com] Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2009 10:25 AM To: Irina Adams; County Commissioners Subject: Public facilities in South Park Dear County Planning Commisioners, Thanks for all the work you and your colleagues did on the recommendations and taking our comments about the plan into consideration. I am worried however about moving the Start facilities, rodeo grounds and fairgrounds near High School Road. I think it will only trade one group of problems for another. I don't think that West Jackson should be dealt that kind of either or scenario and be made to look like we don't want to sacrifice anything. We have already with 6 schools, the public school transit system, heavy industrial, a sewage transfer station, a supermarket that services the whole valley and roads that are school children and pedestrian unsafe. How will South Park deal with the added traffic, light, noise, air pollution and industrial runoff from the new facilities that would include oil, gas, antifreeze etc. How will the traffic in the summertime be mitigated and not just put up with? Will the town's plowed snow be transported to South

Park also on to the new fairgrounds only to melt off into Flat Creek down here instead of in town? We can't just move the problems around. We have to solve the environmental and neighborhood unfriendly problems these needed facilities continually generate. Will LEEDS type regs be applied to these new facilities such as nonpolluting and quiet engines for the new start busses before the complex is moved. Will there be park and ride to the rodeo and fairgrounds from within town? Will town find somewhere else to dump their snow or use it in the summertime by implementing a gray water cistern system? How do we deal with the garbage that is produced from these public facilities, especially the fairgrounds and rodeo? Can we somehow tie into the composting facility located at the county dump site to accept compostable beer cups, plates, etc. and reduce the amount of garbage being thrown out? How close will the rodeo and fairgrounds be to the High School in relationship to the beer that will be sold; will it be too close to school grounds? Will there be sound and light mitigating measures like heavy landscaping with large Cottonwoods and low shrubs? The most important question is if South Park gets all these public facilities what's to prevent South Park from attracting more commercial in back of the High School and still pack the homes into the NW corner of South Park Loop Rd and High School Road if your other recommendations of reduced build out and dumping density bonus tools aren't included in the final comp plan. It seems that history will repeat itself on High School Road. Haven't we learned a lesson with all the problems that condensing all the schools on HSR generated? Kelly accepted my invite for coffee and a walk around Cottonwood to show him what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. We met one morning a couple of weeks ago. He loved Range View Park and would like to continue something like it across High School Road. Do we now lose the open space incentive idea along HSR? I respect Kelly's family's right to make money off of South Park but at what price to their neighbors in Cottonwood Park and the surrounding neighborhoods? The transfer of these facilities to South Park I believe will embolden the South Park owners to continue with more commercial behind the high school. This only galvanizes Kelly's belief that this is what the community wants there (The 2008 community survey doesn't support that belief). Although, at the end of our conversation he did say that he personally doesn't want to see commercial by the high school. He would rather see a community college campus. I think that statement was just a feel good statement. Will the numbers in The NW corner of South Park be brought back down to the original 200 allowed under present zoning without the bonus density tools? Or will that be negotiated from a higher rate. Kelly seems to think that between 600 and 800 residential units in the NW corner is fine. I animatedly but respectfully disagreed with him. These are Cottonwood Park concerns as well as my own. I have to admit I can't speak for the rest of Cottonwood when it comes to the transfer of the public facilities to South Park. But I can guess the initial response will be no. Personally, I don't want them in South Park. Although I am trying to keep an open mind about it. We would like to work with everybody to create a plan that is beneficial to everyone, but we are not willing to be dumped on again and then forgotten about to deal with the consequences. It would be nice if the hardworking people of West Jackson could escape to a quiet home in the evening and not have to deal with the tourists they deal with during the day. Thanks again for all the hard work you are doing to make this plan resemble what the community is speaking up about. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park 734 6211

Date	Name	Comment
7/6/2009	Elletson, Roger Interested Public	I am introducing a Revised Comprehensive Plan, sponsored by “We the People, and the Community, of the Town of Jackson and Teton County, Wyoming, rather than the beneficiaries of the “Growth Machine.” The structure and analytical methodology of the current Plan is the product of its Community Vision catalyzed by its concept of “Sustainability” — “The Plan is organized around community values and seven themes . . . Each theme relates to the community vision and the concept of sustainability.” The problem with this structure, however, is that it is conceptually undercapitalized, mischaracterizes the Community Vision, cherry picks the definition of “Sustainable development” from the 1987 Brundtland Commission Report — “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” — that speaks only in terms of human “needs” in a way that provides no constraint on limitless development and ignores the priority expressed by our Community for protecting wildlife and the ecology. In the context of the current Plan, it permits an uncontrolled agenda of “nodal development” that deliberately circumvents Community concerns and is self-serving for the mammonic philosophy of “growth for the sake of growth”. To purge the Plan of these infirmities, I submit the following six-part statement as a more faithful declaration of the Community’s Vision for a Revised Comprehensive Plan, and as a starting point for a more encompassing conversation: 1. To preserve the area’s ecosystem, natural resources, and wildlife from the adverse impacts of unrestricted “Growth” by establishing core “No Growth Zones” in all areas of critical wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and open spaces. 2. To adopt a “New Paradigm” of Community and Ecology Centered development and sustainability rather than an anachronistic mammonic conception of “growth,” and to protect the area from wanton development that disrespects the Community character or externalizes and socializes its costs in order to maximize and privatize its profits; 3. To meet the Community’s human needs in a manner that is organically sustainable, ecologically regenerative, and comports with the Community’s character; 4. To recognize the mutually exclusive nature of “development agendas” that require the merciless marketing of our natural resources to accommodate the demands of incessant “Growth”, on the one hand, and “conservation agendas” to protect the area’s “wildlife, natural resources, and open spaces,” on the other hand. 5. To recognize “Interest”, “Usury”, “Growth”, “Development”, and “Sustainability”, as indispensable conceptions for any Comprehensive Plan, and to define their meanings not in a self-serving way for the beneficiaries of “Growth”, but in a way that addresses their dependence on the jurisprudence of compounding usury, and is thus economically, professionally, and legally sufficient; 6. To manage “growth” and “development” through “Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability” by establishing a formal arm of the Planning Department, codified in the Land Development Regulations, specifically beholden to the Community and charged with the responsibility of identifying, quantifying, and accounting for the Community and ecological cost and 2 other externalities of all development applications, and reviewing the validity and sufficiency of all applicant submissions. And I submit the following definition of “Sustainable development”, distilled from scholastic conversations on the subject, as being more appropriate for Jackson and Teton County. “Sustainable development is development that improves the quality of human life without detriment to wildlife or compromise to the carrying capacity of supporting eco-systems.” An acceptable Plan, therefore, must be concerned with more than just the Community’s Vision and “Sustainability”. It is intimately concerned, as well, with the indispensable conceptions of “Growth” and “Development”, both of which are grounded on the jurisprudential foundations of compounding usury, and both

of which are essential in raising the conceptual foundation of any Revised Comprehensive Plan to an acceptable level of scholarship and professionalism.

In the case of Jackson and Teton County, the jurisprudential realities of “growth” and “development” mean that the survival of the area’s wildlife habitat, ecosystem, and open spaces requires that they be physically insulated from the various manifestations of development such as urban and commercial sprawl, highway construction, and conspicuous consumption and construction. And this can only be achieved through the establishment of core “No Growth Zones”. Those who petitioned to express their concerns on the Plan’s failure to protect “wildlife and open spaces” can now petition to remedy those concerns through the ecological guardianship of “No Growth Zones” in a Revised Plan they themselves can help determine.

Recognizing that any Comprehensive Plan must be grounded on transparency and good faith, and in order to move the current Plan forward from its present impasse, I have taken the initial step of revising the Plan’s “Community Vision” chapter to provide both a foundation for an expanded conversation, and to commence the unavoidable imperative of revising the entire Comprehensive Plan. Copies of the “Revised Community Vision” chapter can be obtained from the County Planning Department or the Commissioners.

The next step is for both the Town and County planners to return to the drawing board and reconvene their earlier Community discussion groups with one specific mandate: to determine where to establish core “No Growth Zones” to satisfy the community’s priority of protecting wildlife and open spaces, rather than just paying lip service to it. Once these “No Growth Zones” are established, we can then move to a broader conversation on the determinants of the Community’s Western character, and how best to determine, direct, and locate the specifics of future development.

2009 Jackson / Teton County Revised Community Vision

We the People, and the Community, of the Town of Jackson and Teton County, Wyoming, hereby declare our Vision for the future of our Community and County and request the adoption of this Revised Community Vision statement as the foundation for a Revised Comprehensive Plan:

3

1. To preserve the area’s ecosystem, natural resources, and wildlife from the adverse impacts of unrestricted “Growth” by establishing core “No Growth Zones” in all areas of critical wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and open spaces.
2. To adopt a “New Paradigm” of Community and Ecology Centered development and sustainability rather than an anachronistic mammonic conception of “growth”, and to protect the area from wanton development that disrespects the Community character or externalizes and socializes its costs in order to maximize and privatize its profits;
3. To meet the Community’s human needs in a manner that is organically sustainable, ecologically regenerative, and comports with the Community’s character;
4. To recognize the mutually exclusive nature of “development agendas” that require the merciless marketing of our natural resources to accommodate the demands of incessant “Growth”, on the one hand, and “conservation agendas” to protect the area’s “wildlife, natural resources, and open spaces”, on the other hand.
5. To recognize “Interest”, “Usury”, “Growth”, “Development”, and “Sustainability”, as indispensable conceptions for any Comprehensive Plan, and to define their meanings not in a self-serving way for the beneficiaries of

"Growth", but in a way that addresses their dependence on the jurisprudence of compounding usury, and is thus economically, professionally, and legally sufficient;

6. To manage "growth" and "development" through "Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability" by establishing a formal arm of the Planning Department, codified in the Land Development Regulations, specifically beholden to the Community and charged with the responsibility of identifying, quantifying, and accounting for the Community and ecological cost and other externalities of all development applications and reviewing the validity and sufficiency of all applicant submissions.

Introduction

It is the aim of the Revised Comprehensive Plan to adopt a "New Paradigm" of Community and Ecology Centered development and sustainability rather than an anachronistic mammonic conception of "growth," in order to more accurately reflect the Vision and aspirations of the Jackson and Teton County Community as a whole, and to address more completely the full complement of considerations that impacts the planning process. It is also hoped that the Revised Plan can serve as a framework, reference, and guide for other Communities across the nation, and beyond, that are similarly situated and struggling to protect their own wildlife, natural resources, open spaces, and character.

4

The Community Vision and the Concepts of Interest, Usury, Growth, Development, and Sustainability

The proposed Comprehensive Plan addresses the meaning of "Sustainable" in Jackson and Teton County, but conspicuously avoids discussing the meanings of "Interest", "Usury", "Growth" and "Development" that are indispensable conceptions for any Comprehensive Plan. The Revised Comprehensive Plan corrects this deficit and specifically addresses each of these issues and includes them in the "Community Vision" in order to raise the substantive content of the Plan to an acceptable level of professionalism and legal sufficiency.

The Jackson/Teton County Community is integrally tied to the unique natural environment in which it is located. Yellowstone (the world's first National Park), Grand Teton National Park, Bridger Teton National Forest, and the National Elk Refuge, all of which are wholly or partially contained within Teton County, confirm the special ecology and international significance of our valley home. These roughly 2.6 million acres of federally protected and resource-rich land foster a strong ecosystem stewardship ethic in the residents of and visitors to Jackson and Teton County. With only 73,000 acres (or 3%) of land in our county available for private development, there are limited resources available to meet the demands of the many people who want to live in and visit the area. This intense pressure on the limited supply of land threatens the very environmental, social, and economic characteristics that define our Community. This is a pressure, however, that has been created to a large extent by the incessant marketing of our natural resources by the beneficiaries of the "Growth Machine."

The 2009 Jackson/Teton County Revised Community Vision Statement, however, expresses the public's recognition of the mutually exclusive nature of traditional ideas of "growth" and "development" and the protection of the ecology and wildlife of Jackson and Teton County. And it also expresses the Community's insistence on subordinating all the prerogatives of "growth" and "development" to maintaining the ecology, wildlife and open spaces that the Community has cherished for decades, and that the current Plan preordains for extinction over the long run, by establishing and enforcing "No Growth Zones" for critical wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and open spaces. The Community desires to meet its challenges in a way that maintains and enhances our Community in the context of our ecologically unique location.

What Does "Growth" Mean in Jackson/Teton County?

"Growth" is the conceptual progeny of "Usury", and the compounding power of usury impels the exponential power, production, and predation of "growth".

A Commentary on “Growth”, “Interest”, and “Usury”

“Growth” is a central and indispensable conception of any development discussion, and in common parlance the term is often used interchangeably with the idea of “Development”. To understand the essence of growth, however, it needs to be distinguished from development, particularly in its jurisprudential foundations that rest on the mathematical power of compounding usury. And although the mammonic power structure and the “Growth Machine” take pains to ensure that the usurious facet of growth is never acknowledged or discussed, this dimension now needs to be fully understood if Jackson Hole as we have known it is to survive.

The drafters of the proposed Comprehensive Plan addressed the meaning of the concept of “Sustainability” for Jackson and Teton County, albeit in a mammonically self-serving manner, but they conspicuously ignored any

5

definitive discussion on the concepts of “Interest”, “Usury”, “Growth” or “Development”, omissions that clearly serve the agendas of mammonic power and the “Growth Machine”, but that now need to be placed on front and center stage in the on-going discussion on the Revised Comprehensive Plan and the future of Jackson Hole and Teton County.

The concepts of “Interest”, “Usury”, “Growth”, “Development”, and “Sustainability”, therefore provide the expanded foundation for the Revised Comprehensive Plan, and no matter how difficult this conversation might seem initially, it must be understood if Jackson Hole as we have known it for decades is to be saved and prosper.

Any informed discussion on “growth” must start with a clear understanding of one of the seminal scholastic advances of the twentieth century — the correct distinction between “interest” and “usury”.

Webster’s defines interest as: “a charge for borrowed money generally a percentage of the amount borrowed”. It defines usury as: “the lending of money with an interest charge for its use; an unconscionable or exorbitant rate or amount of interest; specif : interest in excess of a legal rate charged to a borrower for the use of money”. Both these definitions are inadequate, but the usury definition is not only mammonically self-serving, but deliberately mischaracterized.

The correct definitions of usury and interest are as follows:

Money created by a private lender, when loaned, gives rise to primary debt and the fee for its use (while commonly called interest) is correctly defined as usury.

Earned money, when loaned, gives rise to secondary debt and the fee for its use is interest.

Roger Elletson: Money: A Medium of Power (Jackson, WY: Grand Teton University Press, 1998) at 35.

Keeping the distinction between usury and interest in mind, “Growth” and “Development” can be instructively viewed as symbiotic conceptual progeny of usury that as a practical matter are often used interchangeably.

While growth is primarily a monetary phenomenon, development can be viewed as the physical expression of that growth. And, under the current monetary system, growth is a jurisprudential and legal mandate to infuse new streams of debt into an economy in order to service the systemic foundations of the compounded costs of capitalized usury.

“Growth”, as a product of compounding usury, is by mathematical definition unsustainable under any definition of “sustainability”. And the collapsing national economy, along with the breakdown of an increasing number of state economies, all quintessential victims of “growth”, speaks eloquently to the disastrous and unavoidable consequences, for both Communities and the ecology, of a long-term allegiance to “growth.” Any Comprehensive Plan adopted by Jackson and Teton County, therefore, must inevitably confront the costly effects of the recessionary economy on the structure and character of our Community, and this conversation needs to start with a comprehensive discussion on the legal foundations of “growth”, “usury”, and “interest”.

What Does “Development” Mean in Jackson/Teton County?

“Development” is the symbiotic counterpart of growth that gives physical form to the infusions of debt impelled by “growth”, and adds to that form a quantitative expression of the cost and value of capitalized usury.

6

A Commentary on “Development”

“Development” is an indispensable conception for any Comprehensive Plan and can instructively be viewed as the symbiotic counterpart of “Growth”. And in whatever form of physical phenomenon development occurs, it simply gives physical expression to the infusions of debt impelled by “growth”, and that physical form must then absorb those capitlized usury payments into their costs of production. The consequences of this legal foundation of usury are profound. It constitutes the wellspring of inflation, and is the cause of the progressive diminution of the real purchasing power of wages and therefore also of the “housing crisis.” And in Jackson and Teton County usury fuels the engine of “Growth” that impels the usual indicia of “development” namely expanding suburban housing and commercial developments, downtown areas that are forced to expand downward and skyward, beyond any requirements of the Community, but justified on the well-grounded assumption that armies of visitors will heed the siren song of the interminable marketing of our natural resources, and the “conspicuous consumption and construction” of ever more luxurious homes and hotels to accommodate the exponentially increasing demands of the creditors of usury, and the attendant degradations of our wildlife and ecology.

In addition, the ever increasing armies of visitors are also needed to fuel the revenues necessary to sustain the development and meet its usury exactions and then leave an adequate surplus to provide an ever diminishing level of real wages to an ever expanding labor force required to maintain it, while the Community has to deal with the attendant “housing crisis” that inevitably follows. And all these considerations need to become an integral part of the scholastic and professional foundtions of a Revised Comprehensive Plan for Jackson and Teton County.

What Does “Sustainable” Mean in Jackson/Teton County?

“Sustainable development is development that improves the quality of human life without detriment to wildlife or compromise to the carrying capacity of supporting eco-systems.”

A Commentary on “Sustainability”

The concept of sustainability, like the concepts of “growth” and “development”, is a vitally important foundation for any Comprehensive Plan and thus needs to be fully addressed and understood.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan adopts the “widely accepted definition of sustainability” of the 1987 Brundtland Commission Report, stating that, “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

The Brundtland Commission’s definition is understandably the most quoted definition of “Sustainable Development” as it is vague enough in its terminology of present and future “needs” to avoid any meaningful accountability for the economic and ecological effects of the growth agendas of mammonic power and the mandates of the jurisprudence of usury.

In other words, the Brundtland Commission’s definition reflects a sanitized and mammonically self-serving conception of “sustainability” that implicitly advances the sustainability of the usury system and the “growth machine” rather than that of affected communities, ecology or wildlife. It thus has no place in any Comprehensive Plan for Jackson and Teton County.

7

Some observers, however, have noted that the Brundtland Commission’s definition “is not universally accepted and has undergone various interpretations.” [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainability>, at 3.]

The following are some of the dilemmas, discussed in Wikipedia, that have developed within the Community of scholars trying to grasp the “elusive concept of sustainability” and the essence of “development”.

“Definitions of sustainability may be expressed as statements of fact, intent, or value with sustainability treated as either a “journey” or “destination”. Where we are now, where we need to be going, and how we are to get there are all open to interpretation and will depend on the particular context under consideration. This difficult mix has been described as a dialogue of values that defies consensual definition.” [Ibid.]

Underlying this “dialogue of values” are also the undisclosed “mandates of monetary law” and the dictates of compounding usury that, as a practical matter, co-opt and routinely trump the values of an unsuspecting

Community in order to advance the agendas of the “Growth Machine.” These realities of monetary and jurisprudential power therefore become indispensable conceptions in any meaningful and transparent discussion on “growth”, “development”, and “sustainability.” And without them, the reality of “sustainability” is mischaracterized either willfully or unwittingly. Once catalyzed with monetary understanding, therefore, within the contexts of organic and mammonic law, a “dialogue of values” becomes far more amenable to “consensual definition.”

And by deliberately excluding this monetary frame of reference, the mammonic power structure has effectively deprived preorganic scholarship of conceptual access to the essence of “sustainability” with the result that it “has been regarded as both an important but unfocused concept like “liberty” or “justice” and as a feel-good buzzword with little meaning or substance.” [Ibid.]

Some prescient scholars have also realized that, “The idea of sustainable development is sometimes viewed as an oxymoron because development inevitably depletes and degrades the environment.” [Ibid.] And the oxymoronic nature of “sustainable development” becomes even more self-evident and indeed axiomatic when it is viewed in the context of the jurisprudential mandates of compounding usury. As a result of this contradictory reality, “some definitions [of “sustainable development”] either avoid the word development and use the term sustainability exclusively, or emphasize the environmental component, as in “environmentally sustainable development.” [Ibid.] And numerous influential organizations have embraced these environmental concerns. “The concept of living within environmental constraints underpins the IUCN, UNEP, and WWF definition of sustainability: “improving the quality of human life while living within the carrying capacity of supporting ecosystems.” [Ibid.]

Paraphrasing this definition gives us a more appropriate definition of sustainability for Jackson Hole and Teton County, and for the greater surrounding eco-system, a definition that exposes the pretensions, superficiality, and lack of accountability of the Brundtland Commission definition, and one that is mutually exclusive of the costexternalizing agendas of the “Growth Machine.”

“Sustainable development is development that improves the quality of human life without detriment to wildlife or compromise to the carrying capacity of supporting eco-systems.”

The reality of the Brundtland Commission’s concept of sustainability, therefore, is that it has been selectively adopted internationally as a sanitized and mammonically self-serving framework within which to placate mounting concerns over the use and abuse of the world’s finite natural resources and ecological treasures. Only recently, however, has the concept of sustainability been placed within the power parameters of monetary understanding and the jurisprudence of compounding usury. Under the Revised Comprehensive Plan, an organic conception of sustainability is embedded in the Revised Community Vision for Jackson and Teton County and it needs to be formally addressed by an arm of the Planning Department charged with identifying, quantifying, and accounting for all Community and ecological impacts and ensuring that all externalities are

capitalized into development costs rather than passed on to the Community at large. Our location in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, coupled with the high demand for our limited private lands, magnifies the importance of instituting organic rather than mammonic principles of sustainable development in Jackson and Teton County under a New Paradigm of Community and Ecology Centered development.

The concept of organic sustainability within the context of a Revised Community Vision delineates that:

All decisions should be committed to the preservation and protection of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and the area’s natural resources;

Wildlife, open spaces, and ecosystem preservation are mutually exclusive objectives to those of “growth” under the jurisprudence of compounding usury and they require the ecological guardianship of core “No Growth Zones” for their maintenance, protection and survival;

Our Community’s human needs should be advanced by subjecting development applications to “Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability” that identify, quantify, and account for all cost and other externalities; and,

The impact of local decisions must be understood in a regional context because of the ecological significance of our surroundings and the inevitable export of some of our development impacts to neighboring communities.

Organic rather than mammonic sustainability provides the framework within which we are able to actualize the Community's top priorities:

1. Protect our Wildlife and Natural Resources by affording them the ecological guardianship of "No Growth Zones" ; and

2. Manage Growth through Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability.

These two priorities are the first of the seven Community themes to be outlined in the Revised Comprehensive Plan and that express the Community's priorities and intent in a regional context. As a result, the Community's recommended priorities along with the judgment of our success in acheiving the Community Vison will include consideration of monetary and legal causation as well as local impacts, and the impacts to surrounding public lands and neighboring communities.

Prioritizing Community Values

The Jackson/Teton County Community Vision for the future has become increasingly concerned with maintaining wildlife and ecological integrity in the face of the increasing capitulation of Town and County planners to the pressures and agendas of the "growth for the sake of growth" philosophy. In this Revised Plan, the Community is expressing its formally intent to have its Vision implemented without being co-opted to serve mammonic agendas.

Past Comprehensive Plans have lacked meaningful accountability and left the Community vulnerable to development abuses

According to the current Plan, "The Community has traditionally addressed our goals and values in separate plan elements, with the hope of achieving them all. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan incorporated nine Community issues into a vision chapter that addressed each issue, but focused more on the balancing and prioritizing within each individual chapter than the balancing and prioritization between the issues." The 1994 Plan, however, like the proposed 2009 Plan, failed to disclose the interests of the mammonic power structure

9

and the constituents of the "Growth Machine" in the Plan. And these are not merely omissions of material fact, but also omissions of indispensable parties and conceptions that are essential elements of any Comprehensive Plan legitimately professing agendas of transparency and Community concern and accountability. And the 1994 Plan, like the 2009 Plan, also lacked any formal dimension of Community accountability, such as Community Impact and Ecological Analyses, with the result that the Plan was peppered with a proliferation of variances and became the object of rising Community resentment.

The Revised Plan also recognizes that the housing, transportation, and industry impacts of Jackson's and Teton County's future development will continue to impact neighboring communities and the ecosystem, and should be minimally intrusive.

The Revised Plan codifies Community priorities using "No Growth Zones", and the concepts of interest, usury, growth, development, and sustainability

The Revised Plan therefore transforms the foundations of both the 1994 and proposed 2009 Plan, and the 2009 Plan's Revised Community Vision is a comprehensive statement that serves as the guiding principle for all the themes of this Revised Comprehensive Plan. This Revised Plan acknowledges the Community's priorities and the interrelationships inherent in the Vision statement and between the revised themes that express them, thereby providing guidance and predictability to future decision-making.

Through this Revised Plan, the Community prioritizes two values: (1) the stewardship and protection of wildlife and natural resources through the establishment of the ecological guardianship of core "No Growth Zones", and (2) the regenerative management of development through the formal adoption of Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability. The Revised Plan thus recognizes the need for both organically responsible and sustainable development patterns that include "No Growth Zones" to protect wildlife and

natural resources, particularly from “growth” impelled primarily by the legal demands of compounding usury. The Revised Plan also recognizes that these principles should be extended to neighboring communities in order to broaden the protections afforded to the regional ecosystem as a whole.

The Seven Themes of the Revised Plan

Theme 1. To ensure the protection of Wildlife and Natural Resources by affording them the ecological guardianship of “No Growth Zones”.

Theme 2. To recognize the indispensable conceptions of Interest, Usury, Growth, Development, and Sustainability, and to manage Growth and Development organically and regeneratively rather than usuriously.

Theme 3. Maintain the Town as the “Heart of the Community”.

Theme 4. Advance Our Community’s Housing Needs in an Ecologically rather than Mammonically Regenerative Manner.

Theme 5. Provide a Diverse and Regenerative Economy.

Theme 6. Advance a Community-Centered Transportation Strategy.

Theme 7. Provide Quality Community Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure.

Addressing Community Priorities

The Revised Plan is organized around the Community’s priorities and seven themes discussed in the following sections. Each theme relates to the Community Vision and the establishment of “No Growth Zones”, and to the concepts of interest, usury, growth, development, and sustainability. The themes are organized in order of 10

Community priority and recognize that realizing the Community Vision within our regional context will require tradeoffs and accommodations in certain geographic areas.

Protect Open Spaces, Wildlife and Natural Resources through the Establishment of Core “No Growth Zones” (Theme 1)

Jackson and Teton County are located within the largest generally intact ecosystem in the lower 48 states.

Preservation and protection of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and the area’s natural resources is the top priority of our Community. And to this end the Revised Plan requires the establishment of the ecological guardianship of “No Growth Zones” to protect critical wildlife habitat and migration corridors, and open spaces. In addition, the Community understands that all future public and private decisions will have local and regional ecological impacts, and in order to control these impacts in the most ecologically compatible manner, all development applications will be subject to Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability. All local decisions must be ecologically sensitive to honor the Community’s top priority to protect and preserve natural and scenic resources and maintain the ecological integrity of “No Growth Zones.”

Exporting impacts to neighboring communities should be controlled so as to minimize the overall impact on the ecosystem, traffic congestion, and commuting.

Control Growth Regeneratively through Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability (Theme 2)

The mammonic power structure speaks incessantly on the importance and inevitability of “growth” and concedes only that it needs to be “managed in a responsible and sustainable manner.” The Community, however, recognizes that the very idea of “sustainability” in reference to “growth” is an oxymoron because while it implies that the growth in question is sustaining the Community or environment being impacted, from a mammonic standpoint any sustainability is directed to sustain the monetary system and power structure under the dictates of compounding usury while being deliberately destructive of communities, wildlife and the environment.

The Community thus recognizes that ecosystem preservation and protection is incompatible with the traditional notion of “growth”, particularly when that “growth” is driven by the monetary dictates of compounding usury. The Community recognizes, therefore, that in order to achieve its primary goal of protecting Wildlife and Natural Resources, critical habitat and migration corridors must be insulated from the predatory impacts of

“growth” through the ecological guardianship of core “No Growth Zones”. At the same time, the Community recognizes that human requirements also need to be advanced organically.

The Community accepts a responsibility to minimize the export of our impacts to other jurisdictions within the ecosystem and to work with surrounding local, state, and federal jurisdictions to develop regional and Community and ecology-centric solutions to meet our shared challenges.

The revised priority of our Town Council, County Commissioners, and planners, therefore, will be to reconvene their public meetings to identify and delineate appropriate “No Growth Zones” necessary to achieve the Community’s top priority of wildlife and ecological protection, including, where necessary, in areas currently designated in the Plan as “growth nodes” such as “in Town, northern South Park, Teton Village, Wilson, and near the Aspens.” Once these “No Growth Zones” are established, the Community conversation can then proceed to determine how best to advance the topics of other themes. The first two themes of this Plan define and explain the Community’s top priorities; the remaining five themes focus on a specific human need. To

11

realize the Community Vision, each of these themes must be achieved consistent with the land use patterns described in Themes 1 and 2.

Maintain the Town as the “Heart of the Community” (Theme 3)

The policies suggested in Theme 3 build on the Community’s Vision and the foundation of Theme 2: Control Growth Regeneratively through Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability. And while the current Plan speaks of maintaining the Town as the “Heart of the Region”, the Revised Plan speaks instead of maintaining the Town as the “Heart of the Community.”

The policies of this theme define how to meet Community needs for an urban center through the controlled advancement of the Town of Jackson as the “Heart of the Community”, without adverse externalities, and in keeping with its current character and height restrictions.

Permitting housing, commercial services, and civic and cultural centers in the Town of Jackson reinforces the Community Vision for “No Growth Zones” by reducing development pressure on crucial wildlife habitats and natural resource areas elsewhere in the ecosystem. The Town of Jackson has already developed the social, transit, and municipal infrastructure to allow for the provision of Community needs with a reduced ecological impact. Controlling future development within town limits improves the likelihood that residents will walk or bike to work or to shop. It also promotes a Community that is potentially environmentally, economically, and socially more contained and sustainable.

Advance Our Community’s Housing Needs in an Ecologically rather than

Mammonically regenerative Manner (Theme 4)

Providing for our basic housing need in a sustainable manner is complicated in our Community by the high demand for private land. Much of this demand comes from individuals who make their income elsewhere in the country and can pay more for a home than someone employed in our Community. It is further complicated by the monetary forces of our economy that dictate ever diminishing levels of real wages for labor through the necessity to service the compounding exactions of usury. The effect of diminishing real wages is that those who labor must seek more jobs to subsist, a necessity exacerbated in a shrinking job market, they have less and less time to recreate and participate in Community activities, and “affordable housing” continues to be just a gesture for a few while providing a pretext for an enormous increase in development for the “Growth Machine”. The appeal of an exclusively local provision of housing needs thus increasingly becomes an economically Sisyphean task, and politically problematic.

In short, while commuting has certain negative ecological, social, economic, and transportation impacts for our Community and throughout the region, our housing affordability issues will continue to impact neighboring communities. And while Jackson and Teton County will continue to provide the primary axis for Community housing, neighboring communities will continue to play an important role in housing our work force, and commuting will remain a part of life for many.

In other words, providing for the basic human need of housing in a manner responsible to ecosystem

preservation and protection requires geographically diversified housing for our workforce.

Provide for a Diverse and Regenerative Economy (Theme 5)

It has been a long standing principle in our Community that we are a “Community first, and a resort second.”

Through this theme, the Community acknowledges that the resort characteristics of our Community provide for a strong economy and the provision of a number of Community services that would be otherwise unattainable.

12

And while the Community welcomes a variety of local employment opportunities, some of which are not resortbased, this Theme reinforces the Community Vision that extends priority to protecting our natural resources over marketing them, and rejects the mammonic promotion of the agendas of the “Growth Machine” through the incessant marketing of our natural resources behind the pretext of striking “a balance between the marketing of our natural resources and their protection.”

Commercial businesses that serve the local population and provide a variety of local employment opportunities are all important components for maintaining a viable local economy. As noted in Theme 4, however, our economy is regional in many ways for both businesses and labor, and our Community rejects any attempt to destroy Jackson’s character by foisting upon it a path of conventional urbanization under the pretext of promoting Jackson’s economic and housing “autonomy”.

In short, Jackson’s future is inextricably bound to its neighbors, even if that does “further complicate the ecological, economic, and social challenges of our region.”

Advance a Community Centered Transportation Strategy (Theme 6)

Theme 6 is essentially an ultimatum to the Community to adopt a “Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy”. It is based on the implicit assumption that policies of “growth for the sake of growth” will be able to continue to indefinitely foist their enormous externalities of visitor expansion, highway congestion, and habitat impairment, for example, on our unsuspecting Community like massive unfunded mandates. It is also oblivious to the “No Growth Zones” contemplated under the Revised Community Vision that could be established in areas of both the Town and County, including those currently earmarked for “nodal development”, and it also lacks the Community centered dimension of growth management and control through “Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability”.

Theme 6 calls for developing a “Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy” ostensibly to correct our excessive reliance “on transportation by Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOVs)” that, we are informed, “primarily results in negative ecological impacts of higher traffic volumes, increased carbon emissions, and wider roadways that are more dangerous for wildlife and human traffic.” And it also requires us to address the fact that our “major roadways are approaching capacity tipping points”. We are also informed that our only option to avoid the necessity for “road widening and other traditional traffic solutions,” and “[t]o limit transportation infrastructure expansions and their ecological impacts,” is to immediately implement the “policies of this Theme” and adopt a “Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy”. The alternative, of course, is not mentioned, to wit: “To limit transportation infrastructure expansions and their ecological impacts, the “Growth Machine” has to modify its merciless marketing of our natural resources.”

There is no question that as a result of the current “growth for the sake of growth” policies being advanced by both businesses and Town and County planners, and the never ending and unaccountable marketing of our natural resources, “Many of the Community’s major roadways are approaching capacity tipping points that will necessitate road widening and other traditional traffic solutions.” And it is equally certain that the “Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy” envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan is one logical extension of these maximized policies of “marketing” and “growth” that our “Growth Machine” now wants to foist upon the Community.

The reality of this Theme, however, is that our planners are so confident that the Comprehensive Plan will be accepted over any Community objection that they have already predetermined that we will have a “nodal development pattern” implemented “by placing people in closer proximity to services” and then providing them with “alternate modes of transportation such as transit, walking, carpooling, and bicycling.” And to accept this

Date

Name

Comment

reality as a fait accompli, we are informed that “the Community has to change the way it travels” and also change “the way we think about transportation options.”

13

Our Community priorities, however, clearly require that wildlife and natural resource protection trumps the “growth for the sake of growth” agenda fueled by the relentless marketing of our natural resources. And the Community recognizes, as well, that over the long run these are two mutually exclusive goals. In short, a Community centered Vision requires the adoption of a Community centered Transportation Strategy predicated on an organic increase in population rather than the distortionary effects of a “growth” centered strategy through another artificial bubble of “growth” fueled by bloated marketing budgets and with the constituents of the “Growth Machine” as the sole beneficiaries, and the Community left to fund the massive externalities and deal with the subsequent bust.

Under a Community sustainable transportation strategy for Jackson and Teton County, transportation requirements need to be tempered with a corresponding monitoring and modification in budgets promoting our wildlife and natural resources in order to maintain a more sustainable relationship between visitors and our current infrastructure and our priority for protecting our wildlife and natural resources.

Provide Quality Community Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure (Theme 7)

The policies of this Theme under the new Community and Ecological centered paradigm of development, address the ways in which the Community will ensure its health, safety and welfare. Fire protection, medical service, water, sewer, schools, arts and culture, and social services are all required by residents and guests of the Town and County. Defining acceptable levels of service, providing the necessary facilities and infrastructure, and ensuring adequate funding is essential to realizing the Community Vision of adequately meeting its human needs. Appropriate service levels, along with Community and Ecological Impact Analyses and Accountability, will help the Community better understand the ecological, economic, and social cost of development decisions and to ensure that development rather than the Community pays the cost externalities that are attributable to growth.

Relationship of “No Growth Zones” and the Themes to the Future Land Use Plan

The Revised Plan assumes that the realization of the Community Vision and all the themes in the Revised Plan might require tradeoffs and accommodations in different parts of the county and Community, but does not compromise the ecological integrity of the “No Growth Zones.” The themes in the following chapters provide guidance to where development or conservation is appropriate. The Future Land Use Plan will provide additional discussion on maintaining the ecological guardianship of “No Growth Zones” while also discussing the priorities of permissible development in specific districts of the Town and County.

7/3/2009 Kaplan, Dale and Jay
Interested Public

My husband and I have lived in Indian Springs Ranch for 10 years. Before there was a house built in either Indian Trails or Indian Springs, there was a master plan that showed PLAINLY and CLEARLY the road connection to Hwy 22. Anyone who built or bought homes in either community only needed to do their homework before buying; the plan for the road preceded their homes. Now some are screaming that they don't want the road...looking for reasons to stop it. To compound this, there is a major safety issue on 22. The Teton Science School traffic turning towards town and the increased traffic load along 22 are AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN. It wasn't too long ago that someone had to DIE to get a light installed at Spring Gulch. Please don't wait for this to happen at this intersection. EITHER put a light at the intersection of Hwy 22 and the Science School/ISR Entry, or build the master planned connector road.

7/2/2009 Wilmot, Jason
Interested Public

Dear Friends,
Dr. Clark, a 35+ year resident of Jackson, asked me to forward the attached document to you. This was published in 2001, and is specific to planning processes in Teton County. Many of themes and comments will be very familiar to you in light of the recent developments regarding the comp plan.
Thank you for your important work and diligent efforts.
Jason {referenced document available in hard copy in the County Planning Department}

Date	Name	Comment
7/2/2009	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Hot off the press, please look over this new paper by Todd Litman on Mobility Management. There is no question the comp plan should include robust TDM goals and solid actions to move JH along a path to better managing travel. This paper can help justify these, and may help provide some guidance on setting up the right action steps. Chapter 8 includes statements that Town and County will do such a program, but we need to be honest - very little beyond some Teton Village steps has been done. I believe Jackson could easily realize a 10% VMT reduction with a very smart and inclusive mobility management system. Todd Litman has been a past Bike Week speaker for Friends of Pathways. He is not an expensive consultant if you wanted to pull in some real focused help on getting the TDM part of the plan right. {reference attached to email; available hard copy at County Planning Department}
7/1/2009	Jay, Chris Interested Public	I know, as usual, many local residents have expressed their concern for the development of the South Park area. They state that some of their concerns are for the well being of wildlife and their migration corridors. I have heard implications and some out right suggestions that development should be focused away from Teton County, WY and into the surrounding areas. I am not sure who is naive enough to believe that increasing traffic flow further from town (where animals dwell) as opposed to closer to town (where animals don't dwell) will benefit the wildlife. I, therefore, dismiss this suggestion as reasonable. I also find it disturbing that the people so opposed to the idea of developing ranch land are currently living on just that; developed ranch land. So, whether they are actually concerned for wildlife or the value of their property, I don't know. I am not too concerned with their intentions. What I am concerned about is the potential of a Comprehensive Plan that makes no provisions for folks like me. As a local young professional making a seemingly unwelcome attempt to establish himself and his family in this area, I would appreciate any attempt to protect my family's future here in the valley. I am strongly in favor of the development of the South Park area and any other potential affordable housing possibilities. I would love nothing more than to be able to stay and continue to contribute to this community, but with housing possibilities within my reach steadily declining, that prospect is diminishing.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2009	Jaubert, Jessica Interested Public	As a young professional resident here in Jackson for 4 years, I am asking that you keep housing/affordable housing as the most important aspect of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan. That especially includes development in the South Park area as well as East Jackson. The South Park area is a great example of land that is vacant and could be used for housing residents that would like to stay and be a part of the community. Instead they are forced to move out of Jackson, primarily because of housing costs and availability. South Park and East Jackson areas help expand our need for housing while keeping the “heart” of Jackson: Town Square, South Cache, Snow King available for businesses and tourism. I think it is important to keep the “Heart” of Jackson in its historical character since this is one of its greatest charms that draws both residents and tourists alike to Jackson. South Park and East Jackson are much less visited by tourists, so these areas seem like a natural destination for our expanded housing to be located. I know that many residents from Cottonwood, Melody Ranch, and Rafter J subdivisions are the main voices in this community regarding this plan, and have made no secret about how much they do not want to see the South Park continue to grow. I find this incredibly hypocritical being that all of their subdivisions were created for the continuing need for housings years ago. It seems that there is an attitude in this valley that as long as I have a house, why should I care about my fellow citizens in this community who want to stay, but can either not afford housing or have none available to them. Residents of these above referenced subdivisions mention traffic, wildlife, air pollution, and increase in crime as the reasons to keep the amount of units that are essential to Jackson out of the South Park area. As mentioned in the Teton County Comprehensive Plan, “A workforce that commutes adds traffic to Teton Pass, Snake River Canyon, and Hoback Canyon, which reduces safety for both humans and wildlife. Moreover, the impacts of development are displaced to adjacent valleys; and the additional vehicle miles traveled increase carbon emissions, reduce air quality, and require new transportation infrastructure.” I believe this contradicts their whole argument for wildlife, traffic, and air pollution. Air pollution will be increased because of workers driving two hours round trip everyday to neighboring towns where they live instead of fifteen to thirty minutes if they lived in the valley. To be honest, I do not think the residents of these subdivisions are concerned about wildlife so much as their current mountain views from their home becoming semi-blocked from development and the price of their home decreasing because of housing supply increasing. These residents have lost the meaning of community and are only looking out for themselves, however if they continue to block housing development, Jackson and they will suffer in the end because Alpine, Victor, & Driggs will continue to get financial revenue and taxes that should be in Jackson. Who will help continue paying the costs of buildings such as the Center for the Arts and the Teton County Recreation Center when all the young professionals and families are living in neighboring cities and giving their sales taxes to those cities? We need young professionals and young families to stay here in Jackson where their tax dollars can help continue these great civic structures that our town has worked hard to establish and maintain. We need young adults who care about their community, who want to spend money at the Farmer’s Market in the Summer, participate in Old Bill’s Fun Run in the Fall to raise money for our non profits, stand in the cold and cheer at the Pedigree Dog Sled Race, and participate with their families in the Spring Easter Egg Hunt at the Town Square. What will happen to these cherished events once all of our young professionals and families are living thirty to sixty minutes away from Jackson? Are we going to go the Driggs Farmer’s Market? The Alpine Dog Sled Race? When we talk about “Saving Historic Jackson Hole”, aren’t these community events part of what we should be saving? Also, what will happen to all the shops, restaurants, and bars in Jackson once the young adults and young professionals are living elsewhere? I know these businesses rely on tourism heavily, but they also rely on our own community members just as much. I wanted to make my feelings known as a young professional, mother, wife, and community member of this town. If you do not do something to provide housing for young professionals, seasonal workers, and families now, I think it will be a complete detriment to this town and its character very near in the future. Please do all you can to increase housing and make this comprehensive plan a success. Thank you for all your hard work and everything you do for Jackson and the members of this community.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2009	Mahood, Ken Interested Public	As a Cottonwood park resident, I have an opinion about the comprehensive plan and its encouragement to increase density south of the high school road. If I look at the idea of increasing density in this area from a purely self-centered NIMBY attitude I do not like it, it will affect my way of life. However, honestly it is one of the more logical places for higher density development. It is close to the schools, it is on a public transportation route and it is right across the street from a very similar development...The Cottonwood subdivision. I would be a hypocrite if I were to say that the comprehensive plan should not allow the develop ranch land into a subdivision because I live in a neighborhood that did exactly that. There have been a number of emails circulating from residents of Cottonwood to you that are against this idea and the idea of a tribal trails connection, they want the number one priority to protect wildlife, and I am not one of them. I believe the number one killer of wildlife is automobiles, if we increase traffic from outside of this valley because there is no workforce housing in the valley close to town how is that protecting wildlife. Secondly, density has the smallest impact on our environment and will reduce carbon emissions because people will not have to drive as far to school, store or work, I know this because that is one of the reason I live in Cottonwood. I hope you do not abandon encouraging density to the south of high school road or the tribal trails connection, it is the most logical solution for future growth. As far as the comment of "exhausting all areas of town with higher density prior to allowing development south of high school road", this would only work in a socialist government structure, which I do not support. I do support one of notions of this vocal minority, a larger setback from high school road that could be a linear park is a great idea, also existing traffic issues need to be addressed prior to development.
6/30/2009	Sobieski, Mona Interested Public	Please consider the impacts that the Teton County Comprehensive Plan will have on the scenic and wildlife values of Grand Teton National Park. The wildlife values of this County continue to be of foremost concern to Jackson residents. We ask that you weigh the impacts growth will have on wildlife and specifically to Grand Teton National Park. Our fear is that increased growth on the Westbank will have adverse affects on the scenic and wildlife values along the Moose-Wilson Rd. and Southern Grand Teton. We also ask that the County update the Natural Resource Overlay with the most recent data and include critical private lands within the Park as valuable wildlife habitat within this overlay. Protection of wildlife and open space has consistently been identified as the highest priority of citizens throughout this process. We ask the Planning Officials to limit growth that may have broader impacts to the scenic and wildlife values of GTNP and Jackson Hole.
6/30/2009	Gabriel, Karen Interested Public	Please consider the impacts that the Teton County Comprehensive Plan will have on the scenic and wildlife values of Grand Teton National Park. The wildlife values of this County continue to be of foremost concern to Jackson residents. We ask that you weigh the impacts growth will have on wildlife and specifically to Grand Teton National Park. Our fear is that increased growth on the Westbank will have adverse affects on the scenic and wildlife values along the Moose-Wilson Rd. and Southern Grand Teton. We also ask that the County update the Natural Resource Overlay with the most recent data and include critical private lands within the Park as valuable wildlife habitat within this overlay. Protection of wildlife and open space has consistently been identified as the highest priority of citizens throughout this process. We ask the Planning Officials to limit growth that may have broader impacts to the scenic and wildlife values of GTNP and Jackson Hole.
6/30/2009	Rieser, Larry Interested Public	The first meeting I went to, it appeared as if you were gathering so much data from so many sources, you could then put forth whatever you wanted. That seems to have been born out. Please go back to put wildlife where it belongs at the top, community character and affordable housing way up there. The growth numbers in Wilson and South Park are un -conscionable if a theme is te tain community character
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	All indicators of success must have a realistic action plan that relies primarily on outside sources for secondary data. Staff should work with other agencies and organizations to develop a plan for these indicators.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	This document lacks three major studies that are necessary to establish and justify a basis for the policy therein. These analyses should have been performed before the drafting of a new plan - and doing so before going any further would be the recommended approach. Fiscal reasons make it impractical to do so now so it is imperative for the new plan to require that all three studies be commissioned as soon as they are economically feasible and that the results be incorporated into the document when it undergoes a one-year review. The studies to be completed are:a) a countywide EA for all private land in Teton County,b) a study to establish the rationale for a % of workforce to be housed locally, andc) a comprehensive documentation of the development potential in all 12 County districts and all 13 Town districts broken down by zoning district with a separate column for Accessory Residential Units.

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Amend the Vision Statement. Three possible new statements are:a) Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem, natural resources, quality of life and community character in a sustainable and predictable manner.b) Preserve and protect eh area's unparalleled natural ecosystem while meeting the community's human needs n an environmentally responsible manner that celebrates instead of degrades this significant and unique place on the face of our shared planet.c) Be an environmentally, socially, and economically responsible community.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Amend the title of Theme 1 to: "To promote stewardship of wildlife, natural resources, and scenic vistas".
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Designate areas appropriate for under- and over-passes and speed reductions in heavy volume wildlife-crossing areas.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Include the language from Section 3010.A of the Land Development Regulations with changes to indicate that tourism is one base of our economy, to delete specific statistics, and replace "Land Development Regulations" with "Comprehensive Plan".
6/29/2009	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	First, I would like to commend Commissioners Hamilton, Wall and McCarthey for stopping what had every appearance of a run-away freight train. It would have been a waste of your time and the public's to hold meetings to discuss details while the problem with the draft plan is with the basics. I was encouraged by your meeting with the Board of Commissioners who gave you complete authority to direct the county staff to make the revisions you believe necessary and to revise the hearing schedule.I look forward to you directing them to take a whole new approach to developing a meaningful plan. I was even more encouraged by your meeting on Tuesday with representatives of other departments and with stakeholders from the community. You were given some very useful information by most of the participants, but the comments by Franz, Bill and the gentleman who spoke of transportation issues where most cogent. Your questions and comments also gave me hope that you will take this plan in a new direction. Preservation of our wildlife has been the community's top priority and it is in the plan's vision statement. Would it not be logical, then, to start the planning with consideration of the needs for wildlife habitat and migration corridors? Expertise with this issue could come in consultation with Game and Fish, Bridger-Teton, the Park and the Alliance. Having identified the necessary land for wildlife, the land left for human development would be identified. Perhaps the next consideration should be what kind of a road network would be acceptable and would maintain community character. Would we want a five-lane highway from Wilson to the Village? Would we want a five-lane highway on Route 22? Would we want a four-lane highway on South Park Loop and the Indian Trails connector? Would we accept a cloverleaf at the Y? Would we want to create a corridor along Flat Creek from Broadway to North 89 for a town bypass? If not, what would be acceptable and what would be the vehicle capacity of that network? That capacity would start to quantify limits for population growth and commercial and residential development. What is the prudent capacity for solid waste disposal and wastewater treatment? How many schools are we able to build and staff? How large can St. John's MC grow and how much staff and doctors can it attract? All of these issues need to be considered and answered before total build-out can be quantified. I was concerned by Christine Walker being so sanguine about the ability for housing to keep up with the commercial development permitted in the draft. If we develop another eight million square feet of commercial space, we would need another 16,000 employees to utilize that space. If there were 1.5 employees in each dwelling unit, there would be a need for approximaately 11,000 new dwelling units. Do we have the land for that? Would community character br maintained? Would not a logical step-by-step process such as this be a more meaningful way to prepare a plan than just coloring in different pieces of land and assigning a maximum FAR for that land? I look forward to you taking control of this process and giving the planning staff clear direction to develop a new plan through a logical consideration of what is really possible without harming our wildlife and our community charactor. My experience says that the development permitted in a plan WILL happen and probably a lot sooner than first thought. Whether it is 40 years from now or 50, the amount of development permitted in the draft will make it impossible for the valley to achieve any of it's stated goals and we here and now who accept this draft will be the culprits.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Recognize that abundant wildlife, daily interaction with nature, and panoramic scenic vistas are central to the quality of life of Teton County residents; and the quality of the visitor experience and the foundation of our local economy.

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Recognize that any and all growth in the valley impacts both wildlife and natural resources.
6/29/2009	Lenz, Bob Interested Public	Bob Lenz, Town Council. See, I have great faith in you people. I am very impressed with the diligence and the, you know, the minutia that you have come up with. I know a lot of people have put in a lot of time. And so I'll tell you where I am coming from, is we have had a joint Planning process going on now every since we decided to bring in the first consultant on this thing. And I have never heard anything from the County Commissioners or from the Town Council or from the Town Planning people or the Commission that it ever changed until you people remanded it back, unilaterally, to the County Commissioners. See, my vision was, is that, okay, now we have taken all of this stuff from the public and from the STAG Committee, and then it was time for you two boards to sit down roll up your sleeves and do just what you've done tonight, except as a joint planning effort. See, I don't think you are any smarter than the people on the Town Planning Commission. I don't think that the Town Planning Commission is any smarter than you are. I don't think that, you know, I think they are just as involved in seeing a good plan come out of this as you people are. And now you're about 11 hours in front of them as far as public input and discussion goes. And yet you start out the meeting and you say, well, this is a joint planning process. Are you going to spend another five hours with the Town Planning Commission, plus your ideas and repeat them tonight? You know, they should have been able to listen to you people and all of your great ideas, the ones that flew and ones that didn't. See? So, anyway, you know, I think it's...I have great faith in the fact that it can go forward. It is too bad that the Town Planning Commission, thinking that it's going to be a joint plan all along, is now 9 or 10 hours behind in the process. See, so anyway, I don't know what we are going to decide on, but that was my vision. And so, you know, I see this great work, but where are the other seven people? And that's my problem. I don't know where you go. I am dedicated to the joint planning deal. As far as remanding it back, I mean, you guys have to get it back here, you know, in a formal form. There are a lot of ifs and buts and whatnot. You've got to get it back and decide is this really what we said and so forth. So, you have that to go through. And the other thing is is we have a situation where we have 130,000 bucks in this thing. And so we deserve, you know, if it's going to be remanded, and these people are going to put in all this time, then the two elected bodies should jointly have the opportunity of saying, yeah, Planning Staffs, go back and redo it, and here's the ideas we have. So, as we go forward, I am dedicated to it being a joint plan. Otherwise, I'd have to ask for my money back, and its only \$130,000. So, anyway, that's where I come from. Where the rest of the Council comes from, I don't know. But it's really a shame that you people are 9 to 11 hours in front of the Town Planning Commission. That's the saddest part of it all, if you talk about joint planning. So, we'll see how it comes out. I hope it's good. I feel good about it, even though I think it's kind of difficult, but we'll see where it goes.
6/29/2009	Thal, Laurie Interested Public	I applaud the efforts you are making on the Comp. Plan, it's a tough and often thankless job. I wanted to note in writing some of the key points discussed the other day.-I believe that one of the next steps in the planning process should be to develop the tools that truly define the character, scale and intensity of the places created and recreated. This should be done before the comprehensive plan gets much further along. There are very sophisticated planning tools available. I suggest use of form based codes. Smart Code is probably the best available as starting point. Don't finish the Comp plan, then write LDRs Do use a Form Based Code for LDRs , start now. Create a transect based system of LDR,Âs Use the transect language as a cohesive strategy to link the Comp plan and the LDR,Âs -I agree with the goal of significant reductions in energy use. I agree with the implementation strategies outlined thus far but it is clear that realistic and specific paths should be further detailed if success is expected. Two significant focus areas are building and transportation. -Many of the concerns we hear about growth relate to transportation, specifically auto traffic. Interestingly neither our planning goals or energy goals will be accomplished if we do not confront auto use and traffic head on. -We have a very inefficient land use pattern which generates significant traffic for the number of people here. It will be very challenging, long-term and tedious project to rectify this but the alternative is failure on 2 of our central goals. (energy & quality of life/community character, Wildlife will also greatly benefit from reduced auto traffic.)-The reduction of auto dependence mentioned above is part of the monumental task of retrofitting the Suburbs. This will be one of the more significant land use trends in the nation. We are primarily rural suburban thus face similar issues & are often further behind to begin with. -It is not too late to begin this process. The form of development and redevelopment will either add to or reduce our traffic generation and energy use. There is the potential for significant redevelopment in coming years. Thus I disagree with the belief that it is too late as most potential development is already platted.

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Thank you for for the alternative STAG meeting at the county chambers. I hope that town officials and the county commisioners now realize that what you have done to get the public's concerns about the comp plan up front again was the right way to go. I know you have a lot on your plate and can't please everybody. Do take into consideration the importance of how commercial developments should mitigate their impacts on the community 100% to prevent the type of growth the new comp plan is gearing up for if it is passed as is. The build out numbers need to be brought back to the original numbers that the current zoning laws allow. As we need more affordable housing and after infill in the Town of Jackson is complete then and only then should South Park and other nodes be looked at for future affordable homes. I think Gregory Griffth's comments got it right. We are so concerned about negatively impacting our neighbors outside of the valley that we overlook the negative impacts of exporting Teton Village, Snow King and other resort impacts (employee housing, traffic, services, etc) to South Park. If we let this happen the transporatation chapter of the new comp plan will be a joke. You can't expect future workers living in the South Park Node to bike and walk to their jobs in town and in the village. The resorts, other medium and large commercial projects need to house their employees where they work. Period! I know it sounds impossible but looking at all the money that is being poored into the village golf course and knowing that I won't be able to step foot onto it or even afford to, I would think that other future endeavors if they really want to build to take advantage of the scenery and wildlife Jackson Hole offers, they should be required to house all of their employees on site and help to mitigate other negative impacts their projects will generate. I commend the JHCA Report: The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources (June 23, 2009). South Park needs the wildlife and open space preservation theme put back as the number one concern. The NW corner of South Park build out numbers in the new comp plan need to be brought back to the original numbers. We should complete the wildlife and habitat research so we can have a clear picture of what negative impacts future development in South Park will have on the valley's economy and wildlife. Our economy relies on the preservation of wildlife and open spaces. You can't have one with out the other! I would like to add to the [above] letter by recommending all density bonus tools be removed and get back to the base numbers. That would actually bring South Parks numbers down even more from 370 to less than 300 units allowed. If we already house 65% of our workforce let's not complicate the issue by subsidizing developers while we pay the ultimate price; losing the values that brought us to Jackson Hole to begin with.
6/29/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for your continued work on the planning process underway. As we stated in our May 15, 2009, correspondence, the Conservation Alliance has major concerns with the new draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, released on April 13, 2009. In written form, we would like to reiterate our gratitude for the message sent and action taken by commissioners Larry Hamilton, Tony Wall and Forrest McCarthy on June 11, 2009. We also appreciate your commitment to continued discussions on a future motion, with specific recommendations for planning staff, scheduled for this Monday, June 29, 2009. As we have stated in recent hearings, the significant departure from the original objective of the process – to improve the current Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan – and therefore the difference in outcome (the new draft), is a key issue. We recognize that the complexity of this planning process has been compounded given that the new draft represents a total overhaul/complete rewrite of the existing plan. Because of the extent of the change, and a departure from the initial objectives of this process, the review process should include necessary adjustments in its timeline. We would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for coordinating the public workshop on June 23, 2009. The Conservation Alliance recognizes the importance of public review as a critical component of the process that must occur in the future in order for this process to result in a workable, effective plan for our community. However, we do not see anything wrong with taking a pause, and sending the draft back to staff for initial revisions to ensure that the workshop and hearing process will be more effective in the long run. At this point, the new draft does not represent an improvement of the 1994 Plan in fundamental ways. We value the position that this document should be in a more near-complete form and more representative of community will prior to entering another round of public review. We also believe much of the foundation, vision, policies, and strategies that could help get the most recent draft back on track are already outlined in our existing 1994 Plan. Thank you again for your leadership, and all your work on behalf of our community to protect the values of Jackson Hole that make it world renowned – its wildlife, open spaces, scenery, recreational opportunities and small mountain town character. Please contact us with any questions.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Remove all exemptions to the wildlife friendly fencing ordinances and develop penalties for failure to remove existing unfriendly fencing throughout the county.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Provide a list of Potential Transportation Network Projects including:a) West Broadway 5-Way Main Street Project: roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, a complete street projectb) WY-22 and West Broadway Pathwayc) New START Transit Centerd) Sidewalks in Town and mixed use villagese) Hoback-Jackson South Project (Complete Street - highway, pathway, wildlife mitigation, river recreation access, and transit needs)f)Wildlife highway crossings.

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Set a growth rate cap or a growth management quota system for commercial and residential development and define what historic growth rates have been.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Make Theme 1 the guiding and primary theme in ALL town and county districts. Even areas outside the NRO have wildlife and natural resource value.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Mandate use of renewable energy sources for all public projects. a)This would include both active and passive solar, geothermal, and purchasing regional wind and hydroelectric power.b)The transition to renewable energy sources and alternative transportation shall minimize conflict with wildlife conservation.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Develop a viable active transportation, ride share, and regional mass-transportation system.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Require that ALL future construction (residential and commercial) meet the green building standards of LEED certified, GYF, or equivalent third party certification, by writing those standards into our building codes.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Add an 8th Theme titled "Energy Conservation" that addresses the community's desire to be climate responsible and that will assure the ability of local utilities to service future development.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Quantify and identify appropriate locations for Public/ Semi-Public community infrastructure and amenities throughout the county for schools, START bus facilities, public parks (including dedicated dog parks) and a landfill site to accommodate the trash generated by this community and currently shipped out of Teton County. The construction of a landfill within Teton County would be consistent with the goals outlined in the Community Vision and Energy Conservation chapters of this Comprehensive Plan.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Provide for permanent solid waste recycling sites throughout the county.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Develop more site specific wildlife and natural resource objectives.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Include consideration of a paid parking program in Town to both encourage the use of mass-transit and to provide funding for START and Pathways.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Change the name of the "Teton County Planning and Development Department" to the "Teton County Planning and Conservation Department" and the name of the "Teton County Planning Commission" to the "Teton County Planning and Conservation Commission"; and staff and fill the newly focused department and commission appropriately.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that will accomplish our mode shift goals and represents a master summary of the transportation components of the improvement programs developed by each Town and County agency and department. Pages 8-8 - 8-47 are a good source for the framework of the TIP. Establish dedicated funding sources (Strategy 6.1) with the intent of implementing the TIP.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Work with regional organizations, other communities, National Parks and National Forests to develop regional mass-transportation options that will service commuters, visitors, and recreationists, focusing on:a) participation in the Yellowstone Business Partnership's regional transportation cooperative and b) ensuring public transportation from the airport.

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Legislate predictability by removing all incentive-based development mechanisms except for those that encourage conservation easements as discussed in directive 11)a). Workforce housing will not be used to justify zoning changes other than those areas needed to address existing shortages as discussed in Directive 17.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Include the language of Section 3010.B of the Land Development Regulations replacing "Land Development Regulations" with "Comprehensive Plan".
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Encourage a sustainable economy not dependant on growth.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Place more emphasis on Principle 4.3 and the idea of developing a portfolio of methods for meeting our housing needs that includes rentals, shared equity loans and tax incentives for self imposed housing deed restrictions.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Determine the amount of workforce housing necessary to mitigate for the development that has already been approved but not built, and the projected loss of workforce housing as people retire, to meet the desired goal of housing the to be determined percentage of the workforce locally. Then, indentify and zone enough specific locations to provide the needed housing and consider funding the construction of that housing through a SPET and real estate transfer tax (Strategy 4.1) so that projects do not need to be subsidized by density up-zones for free market homes.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	More narrowly define "workforce housing".
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Require that all future development, commercial and residential, be mitigated for employee generation (EGU) to the extent necessary to maintain the goal of housing an as yet to be determined % of our workforce locally - and that it must be produced on site. This workforce housing mitigation shall not increase the build-out number - rather it must be provided for within existing base property rights.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Include a Transportation Impact Statement based on projected growth.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Rewrite the "Statement of Ideal" for Theme 2 to read: "Manage buildout and the rate of growth based on preservation of the community values of character, wildlife protection and quality of life".
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Reduce the total potential build-out allowed by the 2009 Plan to the total build-out under the 1994 Regulations without any density bonuses:a) Beyond that base build-out consider: (for the purpose of encouraging conservation easements)i) Limiting the PRD to a maximum bonus of 3 units per 35 acres with these conditions:1) that should the IRS remove the deduction for conservation easements the maximum density will revert to 1/352) that there be 85% easement-dedicated open space with a 3X bonus; andii) Investigating the possibility of enacting a Transfer of Development Rights program aimed at mandating and facilitating the shift of development potential from rural lands to appropriate locations within the town and county. A possible program would mandate clustering at a 1/35 gross density for on-site development and encourage transfer of development rights into appropriate locations by providing a multiplier allowing the conversion of one development right in the Rural zone to 2 or 3 TDR's in a receiving area. Use of these multipliers would be an exception to the capping of buildout at the base densities allowed by the 1994 Regulations.b) Remove all "nodes" from the draft plan. Large areas should not be generally described as appropriate for increased development potential. Areas for increased development potential should be more site specific, but can be located next to existing services and infrastructure if it respects the existing development character of the area.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Remove all increases in commercial development rights (from the 1994 regulations) and prohibit any and all expansion of the resort zones and the establishment of any new resorts.

Date	Name	Comment
6/29/2009	Degro, Theresa Interested Public	I am Theresa Degro, and for those of you who don't know me, I was part of the planning team that developed the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations. And I want to thank you for all the time that you've spent so far on this effort. It's obvious that you spent a lot of time and effort thinking through a lot of very complex issues. I think I'll echo Town Councilman ?? about...I was kind of surprised at the move that you made in at the very beginning of a planning process and the public hearing process to, you know, send the draft back before, you know, it was after the first public hearing, which I didn't get a chance to go to. So, I haven't even had a chance to let you know what I think about the document that you have before you. I think a lot of your comments are great, and the direction is great. Some of them I don't agree with, and so I really do hope I am going to get an opportunity to make comments on where you're going from here. And so I would echo Commissioner Duncker in that, please, do get together with the Town Planning Commission, go through that process with them, you know, present your ideas or directives of how you would like to see this changed so far, but take public comment on it. Give us an opportunity, as the public, to tell you what we think about the document, what we think about the direction you are going with that document, have a discussion with the Town Council members or Town Planning Commission members, and move forward as a unit. Because we did it before, and we can do it. It's challenging. And it takes time. But you're obviously perfectly willing to put in that time and dedication, and I really wish you success with that, and hear us out from the public.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Exchange the fairgrounds property (District 19) in town for property in S. Park (District 12) in an area separated from residential development and with its own egress/ingress from hwy 89. Move the Fairgrounds, Rodeo, and START to this property in District 12, with the intent of building workforce housing in District 19 that will mitigate for the employees generated by already approved non-residential development in Town.
6/28/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	So, why are you expanding the lodging overlay in the TofJ? Indications are that the most agreed upon item in Jackson is that the people want to be a community first and a resort second, a distant second. The Town is not a resort zone. Town as Heart? Good luck with the traffic that you will generate and the County is going to dump on you. Why do you guys ignore the Bernstein studies? Explain to the public why Bernstein is nuts and your traffic plan is so great. Who benefits from the expanded lodging overlay?How about transferring density from the County into Town? That is how you lost the DRD. Trying to claim density in lieu of sprawl and the public quickly realized that they were in store for the worst of both worlds. Why not an honest meeting with the County and transfer density and have Town as Heart. Are you squabbling with the County over sales tax money?
6/28/2009	Goralski, Jim and Linda Interested Public	This is a short note to first of all thank the Planning Commissioners for their courageous decision to recommend that the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan be sent back to the Planners for MAJOR revisions. As we've previously commented at meetings and in letters, we strongly feel the current draft does not represent the input gathered from the community here in Jackson Hole nor does it represent the spirit of the Plan currently in place. The 'band-aid' approach of tweeking is not an acceptable resolution for this document in its current form. It requires a total overhaul. We think Commissioner McCarthy said it best when he said that....urban planning models suitable for cities such as Portland are not compatible with the needs of those living in rural WY. Second, we want to reiterate our comments that the community's desired preservation of wildlife and open space should be the priority of the Plan (THIS INCLUDES SOUTH PARK) and not excessive growth of commercial and residential development. The growth discussed in the draft exacerbates the problems we are currently struggling with and downgrades the quality of 'human needs' for residents currently living here. We wholeheartedly support the Alliance's motto of 'Grow slow, Grow smart'.
6/28/2009	Bain, Rhett Interested Public	WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES, VALUES THIS COMMUNITY HAS CHERISHED FOR DECADES, WILL BE REINSTATED AS THE COMMUNITY'S TOP PRIORITY AND BECOME THE ORGANIZING THEME OF THE ENTIRE PLAN Any new development in South Park should only occur after infill has been exhausted in the town of Jackson. The wording "Develop South Park North To South" should be eliminated from the Future Land Use Plan for South Park (District 12). Reduce the number of proposed future units from 1500 units in South Park back to the 370 units that are already allowed under present zoning. Any new development in South Park and the Tribal Trails connector Road should not be even be considered until a new road connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road in South Park is completed first to alleviate the traffic on High School Road. If any new development occurs in South Park there should be open space from the High School to South Park Loop Road between the new development and High School Road.
6/28/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	The sewer pipe north of Town is a vector for development that people do not want. State School Lands near Mormon Row can access this pipe. And there is a fair amount of private property along hwy 189 that can go for PRSDs with the sewer pipe because they can build near the highway, access the sewer pipe, and not have to build expensive access roads to their property.And the airport? Is this a deal to accomodate the airport, enabled by the Park?

Date	Name	Comment
6/28/2009	Heilesen, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We would like to thank you again for your recommendation that the Plan be revised to reflect the wishes of the public. As residents of South Park, it is clear to us that the Plan as now written ignores the contribution of South Park to the character and grandeur of the Valley as a whole, in particular: South Park's status as the scenic southern gateway to Jackson; its provision of wildlife habitat and migration corridors; and its rural, agricultural aspect, which still defines the overall character of the area. It has certainly never been a "node" (defined by our edition of Webster's New World Dictionary as "a point of concentration; central point"). A particular threat to South Park is the potential for density transfers, a zoning maneuver that allows developers to receive approval for density in one (presumably favored) location, and then transfer that density to another target location, piling even more density on the "less worthy" area. Another concern (extending beyond South Park) is the concept of density bonuses for affordable or "workforce" housing. Developers should be required to provide sufficient affordable housing to provide for the need generated by their own projects; otherwise, the affordable housing problem is never solved, but is just compounded infinitely into the future. Specifically, we respectfully request that the following be included in your directives to staff to incorporate into the Plan revisions: --Recognize the importance of South Park as a scenic gateway to Jackson, as wildlife corridor and habitat, and as a contributor to the still agricultural, rural character of the Valley. --Remove the designation of South Park as a node. --Retain the Natural Resource Overlay designation in South Park. --Retain the existing density of South Park, codified by the existing zoning of 1 unit per 35 acres. Restrict any increases in density to north of High School Road. --Expressly adopt a restriction to prohibit any density transfers from one project to another. --Eliminate the use of density bonuses for the provision of any housing categories. Thank you for your consideration.
6/27/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES, VALUES THIS COMMUNITY HAS CHERISHED FOR DECADES, WILL BE REINSTATED AS THE COMMUNITY'S TOP PRIORITY AND BECOME THE ORGANIZING THEME OF THE ENTIRE PLAN Any new development in South Park should only occur after infill has been exhausted in the town of Jackson. The wording "Develop South Park North To South" should be eliminated from the Future Land Use Plan for South Park (District 12). Reduce the number of proposed future units from 1500 units in South Park back to the 370 units that are already allowed under present zoning. Any new development in South Park and the Tribal Trails connector Road should not be even be considered until a new road connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road in South Park is completed first to alleviate the traffic on High School Road. If any new development occurs in South Park there should be open space from the High School to South Park Loop Road between the new development and High School Road. I hope a thank you is proper and adequate. I am glad elected officials are listening. BUT I am cynical enough to feel we are waiting for the other shoe to drop. I am afraid there will be some loophole that will allow this to go through just because of the vote to remand. I sincerely hope not and want everyone to listen to the public. Please make the plan much more detailed and SAVE the WILDLIFE HABITAT that is left.
6/27/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	Dear Official or Manager, We in the public are grateful for the opportunity to provide input to the ongoing Comp Plan update/rewrite process. Attached as "Comp Plan Remedies" please find a 2-page table of brief comments that recommend specific changes to the proposed plan and process. The third page in the attachment is a revised Table of Contents that would make for a more user-friendly Plan. These comments are my personal input. As you may be aware, early in the planning process Save Historic Jackson Hole commissioned a scientific voter poll that provided unbiased planning input. This input is now attached to insure it becomes a part of the official record. This is valuable data as those in the public service sector/profession need to understand their customer, the good folks that live in Jackson Hole. Respectfully, Louis Wang {referenced table is available hard copy at the County Planning Department}

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Harger, Cindy Interested Public	I write to you today, not in my capacity as an employee of a local nonprofit, but as a private citizen who has called Jackson Hole home for the majority of my life. I have worked to find a way to afford to remain in Jackson Hole because -- even though I have traveled a lot and tried living elsewhere -- I find this to be one of the most unique places in this entire country. No where have I found another place with a similar sense of neighborliness, proximity to nature and vibrancy of community that we share here. As a result, you will find me to be both a supporter of affordable housing AND wildlife and the environment. I firmly believe that the two are not incompatible. However, I believe that this comp plan process is heading down a dangerous road that takes us away from all of the reasons people say they like living here (a "tragedy of the commons," if you will). In doing so, there are components that could actually make the housing situation worse, and there are components that completely ignore the unique experience of being able to live in a community with wildlife. I am lucky to own a house in Rafter J, where I rent rooms to help pay my mortgage. When Rafter J was first built, I and others thought it seemed like a crazy design -- very suburban for rural Jackson... I mean, what was with all of those confusing winding streets and strange layout of housing? Today, a lifetime later of learning about planning issues and wildlife habitat, I see the design for some of the genius it included: corridors along the creek, wetlands and willow stands preserved, and open spaces between the clustered housing. As a result of that forward-thinking planning there and elsewhere in the valley, I frequently enjoy moose cow-calf pairs in my backyard in the winter, nesting ducks in the wetlands along the creek in the spring, the sound of coyote howls on summer evenings, and generous bird life in my trees and bushes. Last winter, I had a deer nest under my pine tree for a couple of snowy nights before it moved on. I cherish these moments, and whenever someone visits me from out of town and experiences this for themselves, they are awestruck and envious of life in Jackson Hole. That's why I was actually kind of flabbergasted when I read the draft Comp Plan and saw the extensive departure from the '94 plan regarding South Park, not to mention other areas, such as the plans for in-town development -- where I, as well as many others in this community also share a stake, even though we may have an address outside of town limits. For now, I will limit my comments to the South Park area. The new plan appears to call for a significant shift in what South Park would look and feel like by throwing mass amounts of development and traffic into South Park as a sacrificial zone... as opposed to working out problems holistically and in a way that would keep us from having the same problems -- and even creating new problems -- in the future. According to the new plan, here's what's in print and in store for South Park: ...“the provision of housing and light industrial opportunities” and to “Develop South Park from north to south as an extension of the town development pattern to provide for community needs.” (New Comp Plan, Page 110.) I strongly urge you to please return to the '94 Comp Plan values for South Park, where this area was among those that “should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve the rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community’s character.” (Comp Plan, Chapter 1: Community Vision, Page 4; October, 2002.) The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's recently released study of wildlife and open space values in South Park lays out a well-documented framework to support a return to the community's prior vision for South Park. I also ask you to heed the 2 to 1 vote of the public not that long ago regarding the Porter Estate annexation. There was not then, nor is there now, the public support to put such high levels of density in the hayfields south of town limits as this new plan would support. As importantly, I believe we especially should not allow such high upzones of residential density when it is not balanced with the high amounts of commercial development proposed in this plan, particularly in town. Following simple rules of supply and demand, we will NEVER have enough residential development in the price ranges we need -- no matter how densely we grow -- if we don't balance commercial growth (which leads to more need for residential), and if we don't balance the types of housing. Just ask New York City, where housing costs are as sky high as their buildings. We can build skyscrapers like they do, and just like they do, not have any affordable housing unless we structure it in through affordable housing programs that serve our greatest community need. As Aspen, Vail and New York City have learned, free market solutions don't work very well in an area with unlimited demand and limited supply. I believe there is much support to return to the values of the '94 plan and to ensure that they are included in any revision. The '94 planning process incorporated significant amounts of public dialog. I personally attended many of those meetings, beginning with the Successful Communities process that Luther Propst came out here to conduct. And I watched the town and county share about \$1 million in costs, if I remember correctly, to hire a world-renowned planning firm -- Lane Kendig and Associates -- to build a plan that, while it didn't completely please anybody or everybody, provided a balance and a framework to build on the diverse community interests that had come out of the extensive public process. Because of that, the '94 plan has had a reasonable amount of buy-in from the public over the years (though we all acknowledged there was room for adjustments). It's no wonder that there's so much community consternation over an entirely new plan that was developed in a significantly shorter amount of time, with seemingly little integration of public input. Instead of improving on the old plan and on well-established visions for the community [as the relatively teeny comp plan "update" budget was designed to do] a whole new document has been created without paying attention to the values this community embodies. What seems remarkably clear to me is that those same values that were expressed back in the '94 process

Date

Name

Comment

have been reaffirmed multiple times over the last several years in community sentiment on major planning issues that have arisen (such as the Porter Estate annexation, Downtown Redevelopment District, Teton Village expansion and Teton Meadows, to name a few). Even though it feels like there are more and more new neighbors moving to this valley who would like to live here for its beauty but also want to bring the big city with them, I was greatly heartened to see the same historic community values come out in such strong force in both the scientific and non-scientific polling that was done just prior to rewriting the comp plan this go-around. Those values I am speaking of put preserving our one-of-a-kind wildlife ecosystem first, they preserve a rural, western character, and they balance residential and commercial growth in a way that it happens in a healthy fashion for this community, not in a way that inadvertently destroys the best things about this community. I know you all have an incredibly hard job. I thank you for putting your hearts and souls into it. Please keep those hearts and souls open to what you are hearing from this community. Thank you for your time and consideration of my thoughts.

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Teton County Planning Commission – even to me who tracks the process closely - the current situation is clear as mud. I can say from the volume of phone calls, conversations and emails to me this week that the public: -has lost trust in the comp plan process -does not feel the plan reflects their well communicated vision for the future of our County -believes that this time-out in the process, and the County planning commission's actions, were very welcomed and one of the few times they have felt truly "listened to" Also the public now expects that JOINTLY, in some manner, the two planning commissions will give staff further direction to revise the plan BEFORE the public continues to consider participating in the process further. Process changes are also very welcomed but should come after the revision. I assume that on Monday evening the County planning commission will develop a list of specific directions to staff – although I believe staff already is well aware of what needs to be changed in the plan anyway. I am unclear how Monday's meeting along with the July 6 JIM and July 9 joint planning commission meetings will all play out – I don't think anyone does. So representing a broad and consistently engaged neighborhood group of citizens – I would be remiss if I did not suggest a few points to consider for staff direction with a focus on the South Park region and the excellent and detailed June 23 analysis by the JH Alliance on "The greater South Park region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources." Suggestions for the County planning commission to consider in their recommendation to staff for the revision with excerpts from the Alliance report: 1. "Because of the extent to which the new draft represents a rewrite, rather than an update of the 1994 Plan, the new draft has the potential to dramatically change future land use planning for the greater South Park region in particular. The new draft shifts away from the preservation of rural character, away from the importance of scenic preservation, and away from adequately recognizing wildlife resources in "interior districts," or nodes, in addition to outlying areas." a. Reinstate substantive language from our currently binding 1994 comp plan about the scenic, rural and wildlife values inherent in the South Park region. 2. "Specific to South Park, the Conservation Alliance questions the low prioritization of "wildlife and natural resources" in District 12: South Park, and in general is very concerned with the devaluation of scenic resources in the new draft. The study area, like much of the public and private land in this valley, provides critical migration routes and yearlong and seasonal habitat for a wide variety of native species. Based on the information available, the maximum density proposed in the new draft and a low prioritization of wildlife and scenic resources in South Park are inappropriate and should not be promoted. To rank what is the community's overall top priority so low on the list for South Park is to do a disservice to the area, its residents (both human and wildlife alike) and to the community as a whole." a. Either spit the South Park district 12 into two districts or perhaps better yet – redraw most of the district from ½ mile south of High School road (not ¾ mile as this was never polled for) to be included with the East Bank district 5. The prioritizing of themes and uses in district 5 better parallel the bulk of the South Park district 12. 3. "Overall, while some residential development is appropriate in the northwest corner of District 12, the new draft should not recommend significant intensification of development in the greater South Park region (or any district) given the community's goals to limit overall growth and protect wildlife. And, as development occurs, significant portions of adjacent lands, within South Park, should be permanently protected to balance development and conservation goals in the area." a. Reduce from ¾ to no more than ¼ to ½ mile (approximately 200 acres in the proposed node in the NW corner of the Porter Estate). Also reduce from 1,500 to no more than 400 the number of potential units which would be a doubling of current entitlements/zoning and use of the PRD tool (correct Appendix I to reflect entitled zoning including Suburban and PRD use is 210 units and not 370 units as stated for the initial 400 acre node as proposed – staff has acknowledged this error). b. Link any development in a now recommended smaller footprint and less intense remaining NW South Park node be tied not only to achieve workforce housing objectives but equally achieving permanent open space within district 12 and/or district 5. c. Recommend that this new reduced node, as well as any others still proposed in the plan - be withheld for consideration until all infill opportunities are exhausted. In summary the community has been crystal clear that they want a plan that presents the "least growth" approach to future land use planning significantly reducing both future residential and commercial development while respecting existing property rights. This is especially important given the plan has completely abandoned any analysis of its potential impacts on wildlife, transportation, workforce housing, schools, infrastructure and fiscal costs. Thank you for your continued leadership. Although I believe the plan should absolutely move forward as a joint process in some manner – no more public hearings should be held until planning staff has revised the document to better reflect the unified, clear and overwhelming public input to date. If this critical step does not take place – the public has made it clear to me that they will likely completely disengage from the process.

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Dear County Planning Commisioners, Thanks for all the work you did on the recommendations and taking our comments about the plan into consideration. I am worried however about moving the Start facilities, rodeo grounds and fairgrounds near High School Road. I think it will only trade one group of problems for another. I don't think that West Jackson should be dealt that kind of either or scenario and be made to look like we don't want to sacrifice anything. We have already with 6 schools, the public school transit system, heavy industrial, a sewage transfer station, a supermarket that services the whole valley and roads that are unsafe for school children and pedestrians. How will South Park deal with the added traffic, light, noise, air pollution and industrial runoff from the new facilities that would include oil, gas, antifreeze etc. How will the traffic in the summertime be mitigated and not just put up with? Will the town's plowed snow be transported to South Park also on to the new fairgrounds only to melt off into Flat Creek down here instead of in town? We can't just move the problems around. We have to solve the environmental and neighborhood unfriendly problems these needed facilities continually generate. Will LEEDS type regs be applied to these new facilities such as nonpolluting and quiet engines for the new start busses before the complex is moved. Will there be park and ride to the rodeo and fairgrounds from within town? Will town find somewhere else to dump their snow or use it in the summertime by implementing a gray water cistern system? How do we deal with the garbage that is produced from these public facilities, especially the fairgrounds and rodeo? Can we somehow tie into the composting facility located at the county dump site to accept compostable beer cups, plates, etc. and reduce the amount of garbage being thrown out? How close will the rodeo and fairgrounds be to the High School in relationship to the beer that will be sold; will it be too close to school grounds? Will there be sound and light mitigating measures like heavy landscaping with large Cottonwoods and low shrubs? The most important question is if South Park gets all these public facilities what's to prevent South Park from attracting more commercial in back of the High School and still pack the homes into the NW corner of South Park Loop Rd and High School Road if your other recommendations of reduced build out and dumping the density bonus tools aren't included in the final comp plan. It seems that history will repeat itself on High School Road. Haven't we learned a lesson with all the problems that condensing all the schools on HSR generated? Kelly accepted my invite for coffee and a walk around Cottonwood to show him what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. We met one morning a couple of weeks ago. He loved Range View Park and would like to continue something like it across High School Road. Do we now lose the open space incentive idea along HSR? I respect Kelly's family's right to make money off of South Park but at what price to their neighbors in Cottonwood Park and the surrounding neighborhoods? The transfer of these facilities to South Park I believe will embolden the South Park owners to continue with more commercial behind the high school. This only galvanizes Kelly's belief that this is what the community wants there (The 2008 community survey doesn't support that belief). Although, at the end of our conversation he did say that he personally doesn't want to see commercial by the high school. He would rather see a community college campus. Will the numbers in The NW corner of South Park be brought back down to the original 200 residential units allowed under present zoning without the bonus density tools? Or will that be negotiated from a higher rate. Kelly seems to think that between 600 and 800 residential units in the NW corner is fine. I animatedly but respectfully disagreed with him. These are Cottonwood Park concerns as well as my own. I have to admit I can't speak for the rest of Cottonwood when it comes to the transfer of the public facilities to South Park. But I can guess the initial response will be no. Personally, I don't want them in South Park. Although I am trying to keep an open mind about it. We would like to work with everybody to create a plan that is beneficial to everyone, but we are not willing to be dumped on again and then forgotten about to deal with the consequences. It would be nice if the hardworking people of West Jackson could escape to a quiet home in the evening and not have to deal with the tourists they deal with during the day. Thanks again for all the hard work you are doing to make this plan resemble what the community is speaking up about.

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Fuchs, Tim Wyoming Game and Fis	Thank you for keeping us apprised of the developments and revisions in the proposed Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Over the past two years, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department staff has been involved in the planning process and appreciate the efforts the County has made in emphasizing stewardship of wildlife and natural resources and managing growth responsibly. General comments: We support the concept of moving toward a plan that is more predictable in determining the extent and location of development within the County. We also support the nodal concept within Districts. Both concepts are consistent with the Plan's intent to paint a picture or provide a vision of the community with Plan implementation. However, we are concerned that the Plan deviates from the vision and conceptual intent by providing specifics relative to nodal density, design and location within Districts. We would recommend maintaining the overall visionary concept relative to all aspects of the plan, then in concert developing specific build out levels for the nodes/districts while updating the NRO and other pertinent regulatory mechanisms. . This would allow for an accurate assessment of potential impacts, appropriate mitigation measures, and identification of possible alternatives while meeting the vision and top priority, "stewardship and protection of natural resources", of the Plan. Specific Comments: 1. Natural Resource Overlay (NRO) We understand the County has utilized information from the updated wildlife GIS layers obtained from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Teton County, National Elk Refuge, Teton Science Schools, Wildlife Conservation Society, Grand Teton National Park, B-T National Forest, and the Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation in developing the revised plan. As stated above, we are concerned that the boundaries and potential build-out levels for districts and in particular nodes were developed without the formal inclusion of much of the updated information. This information would have been helpful prior to the selection of node locations and development of the range of potential build outs. The Plan is generally a visionary guiding document, but does propose specifics with respect to district location and development levels. Developing all of the regulatory mechanisms simultaneously may more accurately identify and quantify wildlife impacts, and clarified opportunities for improved district design and mitigation measures. Our experience evaluating proposed developments in Teton County over the past year has highlighted the importance of using the most current wildlife data and the NRO to evaluate projects. 2. Species of Special Concern The Plan identifies the need to expand the wildlife species identified as "species of special concern" (pg 18). We support the expansion of the list since it currently does not encompass bear conflict areas, sage grouse, nesting raptors, amphibians, wetlands and other potential areas of concern. Our State Wildlife Action Plan identifies Species of Greatest Conservation Need, which could be helpful for developing additional recommendations for this list. The Department would like to be included in future discussions relating to this matter. Moreover, these additions will be key for updating the existing NRO and providing a more accurate picture of important wildlife areas in the County. The plan should identify a time frame when the list will be developed and how this information can be incorporated into the regulatory phase of the plan. Analyses based on this expanded list could stimulate proposals for modifications of some objectives currently proposed for the different districts. 3. Indicators and Monitoring for Ecosystem Health The Department supports the Plan's strategy of the development of a list of wildlife species to be

used as indicators to monitor ecosystem health. In addition to focal species, a suite of species found within the individual districts could be identified. The species list, migration routes and seasonal range maps could be used to help identify areas where development restrictions could help mitigate impacts.

4. Inclusion of Important Habitat Types

The Department recognizes that the existing plan identifies and prioritizes important vegetative cover types (NRO, Section 3211) including: 1) mesic cover types (deciduous forest, mixed species forest, coniferous forest and other types), 2) nonmesic cover types (deciduous forest, coniferous forest, shrub-grassland and scrub, and grassland) 3) wetlands, and 4) agricultural meadow. The plan also provides standards for protecting water bodies, floodplains, and wetlands (NRO, Section 3220). We recommend that habitat/vegetative cover types be included and how they are prioritized be reviewed when updating the NRO. The WGFD Strategic Habitat Plan, 2009 could be helpful in this regard as it identifies and stratifies certain vegetation community types as important wildlife habitat. Examples are aspen, mixed mountain shrub, sagebrush, grassland, riparian and wetland habitats, prairie stream systems and cutthroat trout streams. Much of Teton County has been habitat type mapped by the surrounding agencies. We recommend the County strive to complete a current vegetation map and utilize it to identify important wildlife habitat types in need of conservation. The WGFD Strategic Habitat Plan identifies several strategies that encourage the WGFD to engage in habitat inventories and assist local governments and private landowners with management. Including important habitats in the Plan would help to identify areas where future regulatory mechanisms could minimize impacts of development on wildlife.

5. Environmental Commission

The Plan (pg 25,) recommends the establishment of an Environmental Commission to make wildlife and habitat recommendations as well as address cumulative impacts. We support this concept and the County's commitment to look at the cumulative impacts of development on wildlife. We also encourage this Commission to coordinate closely with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department as they consider wildlife related issues.

6. Buffer Areas between Nodes and adjacent NRO Designation.

It is well documented in scientific literature that wildlife is disturbed by human activity. The zone of disturbance varies by species, habitat type, and type of disturbance. An array of activities will be associated with high-density developments resulting in considerable wildlife disturbance. Thus, we recommend that the regulatory phase of the plan include an opportunity to create buffer zones around high density developments that are adjacent to the updated NRO. Buffer zone widths may vary dependent upon the primary wildlife species and habitat type(s) involved. This buffer zone should entail a gradual reduction in development density as one approaches the NRO boundary.

7. Build Out

Although the Future Land Use Plan is not regulatory, we have concerns regarding the picture of how the community could look if development themes in the Plan are fully implemented. Wildlife in Teton County depends upon access to seasonal habitats that are often separated by developments, subdivisions, and roads. While the Comprehensive Plan does provide guidance regarding appropriate locations for open space and developments, the plan should acknowledge that moose, deer, elk, bears and other wildlife will be negatively impacted as maximum build out is approached. Permeability is crucial and in areas like the Aspens Node along Highway 390 and the Wilson Node, wildlife must be able to move through areas proposed for increased development. Given the level of wildlife conflicts we currently experience, careful planning will be needed to ensure wildlife will be able to move daily and seasonally through these areas. Other

areas of the county where permeability will likely be an issue in the future can be identified through the wildlife mortality database and the updated NRO.

The draft plan could incorporate more specific language, data, and mechanisms to provide the degree of stewardship identified in the introduction of the Comprehensive Plan as the community's primary values. Identifying certain districts where wildlife and open space have high priority is very important but it does not preclude the importance of other districts for wildlife. Many wildlife species can be found even in higher density areas, and how remaining development is directed, and the level and type of development allowed, will determine if wildlife can still use and move through such areas. WGFD would like to coordinate closely with the county to identify these areas where the maintenance of wildlife movements will be important to allow wildlife access to important resources in the future.

8. Maintain Viable Populations

While we agree that it is important to maintain viable wildlife populations in the County, the term itself is open to broad interpretation. The scale at which a population is evaluated can make a dramatic difference in defining viability. Even though development on the local level will negatively impact and result in loss of individual animals, populations on a broader geographic scale may remain viable. The Environmental Commission and county officials will need to work with more specific objectives when making developmental decisions in the future. We suggest replacing "viable populations" with "populations commensurate with State and Federal wildlife plans". Examples of such plans are the Wyoming Game and Fish Department's Herd Unit population objectives for various wildlife species and the WGFD State Wildlife Action Plan, which addresses many non game species and is currently undergoing revision. The US Forest Service also maintains and monitors a sensitive wildlife species list. This will allow a quantifiable measure to determine if populations of wildlife are at desired levels.

9. Dispersed Recreation

The Comprehensive Plan addresses dispersed recreation in Policy 1.7.b. and states that "Recreational access to public lands should be planned and provided for in a manner that is consistent with stewardship and conservation of natural resources. Local government and private interests will coordinate with state and federal agencies regarding the creation and maintenance of access points to state and federal lands and rivers and creeks" (pg. 25). Levels of build-out in both the current Comprehensive Plan and the proposed Plan could result in an increased human population in Teton County, which translates to an increase in dispersed recreation. Historically, the B-T National Forest, National Elk Refuge, Grand Teton National Park and WGFD have implemented seasonal human use restrictions as a mitigation measure to minimize the cumulative impacts of dispersed recreation. The cumulative effects of an expanding human population may well require an expansion of human use restrictions temporally and spatially. It is critical that agencies cooperate in the identification of appropriate sites and types of dispersed recreation if habitat integrity and effectiveness are to be maintained.

10. Wildlife Vehicle Collisions

The Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation and the Wyoming Department of Transportation coordinate efforts to document wildlife vehicle collisions. The average yearly wildlife/vehicle mortality rate for 1990-1996 and 2000-2006 were 159 and 236 respectively. Average daily traffic volume on routes west and south of Jackson increased 129% from 1990-2000. There is a direct positive correlation between increases in traffic volume and wildlife/vehicle collisions. Therefore, we predict a significant increase in wildlife/vehicle collisions with an increase in human population and traffic volume. The Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation and WDOT have identified numerous areas where such wildlife/vehicle collisions occur. We recommend close collaboration among Teton County, City of Jackson, WDOT, JH Wildlife Foundation and the

Date	Name	Comment
		WGFD to address traffic flow and encourage highway planning to mitigate wildlife/vehicle collisions. 11. Nuisance Wildlife Calls The WGFD currently answers a substantial number of nuisance wildlife calls, especially for big and trophy game animals. . We have recently added a temporary position to assist with nuisance bear issues and have collaborated with Teton County and the Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation to foster a successful “Bear Wise” program. However, current staffing is not adequate to address additional wildlife nuisance requests that may occur as a result of the proposed increase in human population. If we can provide you with any additional information, please contact the Jackson Regional Office. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
6/26/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	I fully support the Planning Commissioners' rejection of the current Comp Plan Draft and ask that you send it back to the planning department for a major natural values overhaul. I have attended a number of meetings, beginning last summer, and have been frustrated by the planners' callow understanding of our wildlife assets – they appear to view them as just another mitigating factor on their planning chart. In public comment, over and over, residents (not special interest growth groups) have appealed to you and planners to protect our natural environment/wildlife corridors. This week, the JH Conservation Alliance presented you with a compilation of studies that have been done in South Park. The list of mammals, birds, fish and amphibians that have been observed is impressive. I have personally seen dozens of other species as well, particularly on the Snake. This spring there are large numbers of pelicans that can be viewed discretely; if South Park is "red-lined" for development as the current draft allows, such sightings will soon enough be just a fond memory. Attached is a photo taken at the gate of South Park Elk Feed Grounds. The message on the white sign reads: "Important Bird Area: This site is part of a global network of places recognized for their outstanding value to bird conservation - Audubon." It's ironic that the Audubon Society understands South Park's global significance, while local planners consider it an expendable "node". If Jackson Hole is to remain a healthy and viable ecosystem, we cannot pick and choose our parts. Please protect our treasure. {referenced photo is available hard copy in the County planning department}
6/26/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	South Park’s rural character, scenic beauty and natural resources are being shunned in the new draft of the comp. plan. Please help us. We can stand in the face of the planning staff and they all bob their heads. What we say either goes over their heads or is stored in a vacuum box never to be retrieved. We know that development in the northwest corner of South Park is appropriate. Our community agreed on that. The development of South Park starting north to south is way out of line. We need to preserve the wildlife and resources that we have. We have the Nat’l Elk refuge, for God’s sake. Town density in the northwest corner is ridiculous. Please take time to read the data that is being presented. Know that the people of the valley think you have big shoulders and are counting on you.
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Unlimited employee housing? You have to be kidding. How does this factor into a buildout cap? Those guys have gotten too many free lunches already.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	THANK YOU for wrestling the Comp Plan back some steps. It was a brave move and you know by now that you have a strong base of support for it. Having just read the Conservation Alliance piece assembling three decades' worth of information on wildlife and scenic values in South Park, I am writing to encourage (urge) your mindfulness of these findings in upcoming direction to Planning Staff. My takeaways: - No longer can we just toss away this part of the region as inconsequential to wildlife and scenic resources. - The impacts of any decisions we make are remarkably interdependent and cumulative. - Without habitat connectivity we won't have the animals. - The scenery establishes who we are. The report makes all these points vividly (some relevant excerpts are included at the bottom of this message). In your direction regarding Plan revisions, please consider including the following: 1. Restore important passages concerning South Park wildlife and scenic values (from the 1994 Plan). 2. Move most of District 12 (South Park) into District 5 (Eastbank), except for the NW corner and the light industry segments along Highway 89. 3. Reduce the footprint and scale of development in all identified nodes, including the NW corner of South Park. Many thanks for your leadership. Excerpts from the JHCA Report: The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources (June 23, 2009) The region is consequential to the valley's wildlife. "Elk, mule deer and moose use the area for annual migrations, daily movements, and minimal foraging. Raptors use the open agricultural fields for foraging, and the cottonwood and aspen stands for resting. Songbirds and migratory birds use the region, particularly the wetlands and riparian areas, for feeding and resting. Waterfowl, amphibians and reptiles utilize the wetlands, rivers and riparian habitats....Some of the spring creeks also serve as spawning grounds for the Snake River Cutthroat Trout. Cumulatively, these habitats contribute to the overall ecological health of the larger Snake River ecosystem." (pp 7-8 of 49) The report makes vivid how interdependent and cumulative our decisions are. For example: - "the establishment of one easement or protected habitat accentuates the value of the surrounding easements or protected habitats....while the 3.5 acre Teton Science School easement adjacent to the Indian Springs Ranch easement may itself not contribute greatly to habitat connectivity, taken together with the surrounding acres of protected land, its individual value to both wildlife and the preservation of scenic vistas is exponentially increased." (p 8 of 49, last paragraph) - "the increased presence of roads [more roads, wider roads] necessarily increases the impacts of each [one] of the roads....roads have long been recognized as features that break up habitat connectivity for many wildlife species. According to Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation data...most large mammals residing in Teton County must cross roads in order to access habitat and meet their daily, seasonal, and life needs. Roads in the study area [South Park and the area around the proposed Tribal Trails connector] represent some of the highest fatality rates for large ungulates in Teton County....[These areas] have been considered appropriate areas to construct wildlife overpasses." (p 8 of 49, 2nd & 4th paragraphs) Without habitat connectivity we won't have the animals. Both North-South and East-West Connectivity through the study area are needed, providing corridors "through which animals can pass or use to leave developed areas when they wander in. To allow access to the slopes or...to the river bottom, [a] corridor should be there." (p 9, 2nd & 3rd paragraphs) Scenery establishes who we are. "The true gateway from the south to both Town and resort facilities, South Park [is defined by] prominent valley viewscapes, connecting vistas of buttes to the more distant Teton mountain range....[likewise] the Tribal Trails area, as a gateway from the west, accentuates and further defines the rural and agricultural character of the Town and County." (p 9, last 2 paragraphs; top of p 10)
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	1. End PUMD, PMDs, PRDs, AHPUD, etc. They are administrative nightmares and favor those who grovel best to the high command. 2. Simple is good. Write the plan so that 'by right' development is the standard. 3. Nothing wrong with the old plan except for the alphabet soup exceptions itemized in the first comment above.
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Sustainable housing, please. That means no more deed restricted sales. Build nicer rental housing for core infrastructure employees only. When they quit teaching to sell real estate, they have to move out. No dogs is the definition of too dense. Build up START so others can live in Alpine or Victor and own property like real Americans, they get to participate in the growth of this great country. Stated differently, affordable housing is the road to serfdom.
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	I do not favor caps on growth. This is an egregious barrier to put between a man and the enjoyment of his property. How do you administer this system, who gets the building permit"1. Those who grovel before the high command2. Lottery winners3. High bidders in a auctions for building permits. None of these programs work, cannot be administered, are magnets for lawsuits, etc. Just have simple 'by right' development rules and stick to them without regular exceptions
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	One per 35, please. This 9/35 is a bag job. Do not count on tax deductions for conservation easements continuuing. Plan for good living. If y ou are an elk or moose on a minus 25 day in JH, you do not see rich people or poor people, clusterd people or 1/35 people, you only see people, and cars. Cars everywhere, slaughtering your friends and relatives as they try to cross the roads. Fewer people is better. Nodes are enticing, but not without 1/35.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Just stay the hell out of here. We do fine without any 'good' ideas from the high command.
6/24/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	It can't get much clearer, the Comp Plan process and product are both broken. The editorial pasted in below, Jackson Hole News and Guide, June 24, 2009, sums it up pretty well. The question is, do you have the honesty and courage to do what's right? You need a fresh start, not lipstick on the pig. Louis Wang {referenced newspaper editorial available hard copy at the County Planning Dept}
6/24/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	1. Mr. Resor talked about 'nodes' protecting adjacent land. Ironical that the 'node' of Teton Village did not protect SRA land. 2. Beware of what can happen in school sections. 3. Gail Jensen's suggestion that the tax deduction for conservation easements is unlikely to endure makes a great case to go to one unit on 35 acres and not give the store away trying to accommodate the Land Trust or large developers. 4. Gene B's suggestion that wildlife has tremendous commercial value distinguishing us from other high end ski resorts is on target. Why do the commercial operators take wildlife for granted? 5. Housing is unsustainable. No way can we house 65% of the work force, even using the base entitlements today. Also, our affordable housing program is unsustainable. What do we do for worker housing when current affordable housing owners retire? Greg Griffith researched the origin of the 65% guideline and it seems flimsy at best and merits more study. Beware of cures that are worse than the disease. 6. End the PRD and PMUDs and freeze resort zones. 7. Include worker housing in resort zones in the buildout numbers, which means you have to define how much you will allow. 8. SHJH submitted a traffic study to the high command and we believe the planners have ignored it. This is based on a discussion I had with Bill Collins where he attacked the credibility of the guy who did the traffic study. Our traffic guy has a PhD from Northwestern and did the very credible traffic study on Teton Meadows Ranch. 9. Ramp up START. 10. Many of my friends and neighbors have two children and three jobs and cannot attend these meetings, they can only sign petitions. On specifics of this email, I cannot vouch for them, but as to the vision of Jackson Hole, I know that they generally agree with the recent actions of the Planning Commission and are disappointed by the First Draft of the Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	My name's Louis Wang and I live in Town. I want to thank you for providing this opportunity. I also want to say that I have a background in planning from a corporate standpoint, different perspective. But for a number of years I had a couple of million dollars a year to spend on plans. This Plan is not a Plan. One of the things when we have draft reviews, we tell people take your ego out, if you contributed to this, just put it down on the chair beside you, cause you don't want to deal with that. You have to be honest. This is a vision statement labeled in this Plan and it has some pretty concrete beginnings for more entitlements. That's the essence of this document. It's internally inconsistent. I'll just deal a little bit beginning with the executive summary. The executive summary starts by...it repeats the term community vision eight times that I could count, maybe more, and it begins by saying the Plan delineates a community vision. In the next sentence that a community vision becomes the community vision, but it's not the community vision of the community. From the old Plan the community vision is the sustainable community not dependent on growth. And the exact quote is "promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth." That's from the old Plan. Page 1 of the executive summary repeats the community vision again and it says that it's established in 1994, but by the time you get to page 2, they're going over to sustainability based on a 1987 Run the Land Commission report on sustainability. A report that comes out in '87 is probably based on data that's two, three years old at that point in time, so it's 25-year-old data this report is based on. Then when you go google this specific report and it has the exact same quote.....that's in the executive summary. It defines sustainable development as development that meets needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The very next sentence on Google about this report says, the ?? Land Report was primarily concerned with securing a global equity, redistributing resources towards poorer nations. This report was commissioned by the United Nations. So, here we have the United Nations report dealing with how you help out undeveloped areas 25 years ago. And it becomes the key statement in here on sustainability. We are the richest nation in the world and we're arguably the richest community. The statement according to the IRS is we are often rank number one in terms of income tax as the richest county. And this statement about sustainability gets in here, and it's not about sustainable community anymore. I'm only into this thing a page and a half, and it switched from sustainable community to sustainable development. This Plan is about sustainable development, it's not about sustainable community. Having been trained as an engineer and dealt with science and technology engineers who do science in order to get something developed technically and make product, I've seen a number of bad Plans based on junk science. I know people put in a lot of hours and worked hard, but this is a bad Plan based on junk planning. That's just the flat truth. You've got a community that wants a sustainable community not dependent on growth, and you've got a Plan that says, we're going after sustainable development. Page 4 talks about how it's essential to realize the goal of sustainable development. You end up on page 6 with the community's vision for sustainable growth. We want sustainable community, not sustainable growth. Sustainable growth is an oxymoron—eventually you use it up, you run out. This vision has all of these various...the themes are feel-good fluff. That's really what they are, feel-good fluff. You can find a lot of stuff to feel good about. You can't do all the stuff but you can feel real good. So, you've got the beginning here, goes through about 87 pages of fluff, then you get to the districts and there's about 50 pages on districts and you've got plus-ups and entitlements. This is the hard part of the Plan, these maps with plus-ups and entitlements. This is not the community's Plan at all. A real Plan looks at the future and it says, I can see good out there a year, maybe two years, three years, so I put some hard stuff down, two or three years out, this is what we're going to do, community. Then as I go further and further out, I can't see so well, can't predict the future. So, we do a little airy-fairy stuff then. This has the hard data out here 50 or more years. This is really, it's really a way to do redevelopment of Jackson Hole. This is the DRD on a countywide basis. Every time the voters get a chance, they vote against big growth. You've got the DRD that was voted down by referendum. You've got the Porter Estate annexation voted down by referendum. You've got the ?? over here for a so-called Justice Center because we need a few more jail cells, fifty-three million dollars, and that wasn't the whole bill. The whole bill is probably sixty million dollars. These things lose by two to one or more. This is a junk Plan. I'd rather be honest than be nice. So, if I've hurt anybody's feelings, I apologize, but as I said in the beginning, if you want a good Plan, you lift your ego out, put it down on the chair beside you, and do a real good analysis. Is this a good Plan? It's a very poor Plan. You need to junk it and start over. And when you start over, you ought to do 10, 15, 20 pages that people can read and understand, rather than this motherhood fluff in the beginning. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Okay, I'll take a spot. I don't know where to start. I'll try to be constructive here. I'd like to answer Tony's question to Mrs. Walker. That 65 percentage came from a passage in the Housing Needs Assessment, which stated that Pier Mountain Resort research seems to suggest—that's the quote—seems to suggest if you go under the 60 percent rate, you tend to lose volunteers, ??, that's where that came from. That's just basically what I wanted Mr. Wall to know, ?? observation or research or analysis beyond that point. Around the table, everyone had great ideas, but the cumulative funding to implement a few of these strategies is incredible. There's a lot of credence given to the transportation strategies, but the appendices state emphatically that we're at about a 1 percent for local for START Bus, we're at about 6 percent in the middle of July for bicycle and pathway usage, and most of that is for recreation. I'm the biggest fan of Pathways and START Bus, as Mike knows. But we can't realistically base development patterns on the pipe dream that people in this climate at this altitude and at this latitude are going to use transport in a mass fashion. In other words, facilitate development based on that alone. We already subsidized our own demise when we, you know, roll in sewer projects, etc., and then the development and the land works come in, well, sewer and water are there so let's go to town. One suggestion—this is a great, this is a great forum, this is the best meeting I've attended and I've attended nearly all of them—but what I would suggest is to record this meeting. Record this meeting and hire someone...oh, you are recording it? And transcript, a transcript, get a transcriptionist and go let the public be able to see it, and individuals without good memories like myself can go back and look at it. Now, to get into some specifics, I strongly feel wildlife and open space need to be Policy 1 and 1.A. All decisions need to be made for the prism of preservation first in all areas. If you have a density bonus in the Town Square—I've been asked this question all the time—yes, that does mean if the Environmental Commission determines and the agencies of record determine that there are no specific wildlife values, say, in the Town Square. We know they're everywhere else. Even in the CBD. We've had, you know, black bears above us. Everybody knows ?? Meadows foxes, etc. But we need to immediately go to Policy 1.A., and that's to obtain an equitable exchange of permanently protected open space. We're all kidding ourselves if we think we're going to manage growth by any other method that'll lock in development ?? It's not going to happen. There will never be the political will. If you create a node 20 years down the line, they'll come back and create another node. We're doing that in, you know, all over the Valley now. The Plan was originally designed and public comment was centered around density neutrality. We don't have that now. We have 3000 units of discretionary density bonuses built into the highest number that the public commented on going into this draft. If there is any density bonuses allocated, we need a unit-to-unit exchange. We can't cram nine units per acre in five acres, 45 units, and then get five acres and a hayfield or a cow pasture somewhere, or a golf course, or in rich people's foreground ?? It needs to be biologically valued. It needs to be a demonstrable community benefit for that open space. We need to explore incentivizing clustering of base entitlements, especially in northern South Park. And if possible all open space should be adjoining, adjacent, and accessible to those who are suffering the negative impacts of said density. You're going to have a real battle on your hands if you give a district density and then pump their open space over to Alta or to Buffalo Valley. The Environmental Commission is a great idea. I think, you know, I'd have a problem if it was formulated around the categories of the STAG Committee. But I would suggest that all decisions go through the Environmental Commission prior to even going to the Planning Commission. That we have some kind of base analysis, some base research on the issue at hand before anyone goes to the Planning Commission studies as a recommendation to the Planning Commission, and then have another shot with the Environmental Commission prior to the final vote of the BCC. The last thing I'd like to touch on is...actually, two more things. I would suggest delineated hierarchy of LDRs. We can't...you'll get to the other end of this process and say, well, what do we do now. We need a hierarchy of LDRs which state that the issues which could potentially affect us negatively to the largest degree are addressed first. And that will be obviously wildlife and land use issues. The last concept is regionalism that I like out of this particular Plan, one of only two. And basically that states we will not export our negative impacts to surrounding communities like ?? or ??. I like that so well that I'd like to propose that we adopt micro-regionalism where we don't allow the Town and the Village to export their net negative impacts to Aspens, Wilson and northern South Park.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Ferguson, Jean Interested Public	I'm Jean Ferguson. I live in the County and we have property in Town, too. And I would like to second those statements about growth. I think we've got to do some hard, hard things to limit growth. And people tell me that percentage growth caps aren't going to work. And so if density bonus...if striking the density bonuses would work, that's great. We've got to do something about the Plan's growth. I think the concept of nodes, in response to you, is a great idea, but it's very impractical. You cannot, in my estimate, have post offices without delivery that people have to drive to every day, have six and eight trips to take kids places from people's homes. Those are counter to a self-sustaining node. A self-sustaining node with a bunch of commercial things so everybody will stay right in their neighborhood is not going to work. The concept of building density instead of sprawl is a great idea, but how do you do that in our structured Town? With spread-out schools, nobody hardly can walk to a school. People spread out. The fact that we have to go to a post office in this day and age, where there's no delivery in the whole rest of the United States, and we have fight to have things sent so they finally end up at our post office instead of sitting...I mean, the whole thing is ridiculous. The structure of this Town is not going to fit nodes. People are not going to stay home. They're going to get in their cars. They're not going to ride their bicycles in 20 below zero. At 70 years old, I'm not going to ride my bicycle. Let's face it. So, what I want you to understand is the only answer for the wildlife and the sustainability is to limit the growth. And that's what I believe. Thank you.
6/23/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Yes, <<inaudible>>. The technical details of overpass/underpass there from where I looked at it, it's pretty challenging. I really don't think you're going to be able to get an overpass or underpass to work right there. I don't know, Steve, you have a lot more expertise than me, you know, but because of the steep bank coming down the hill and then going out into ... {Mr. McCarthy: So this is site specific, just for Broadway?} Yeah, for that, but certainly in other places. I think you're going to need to look at that. You're going to need to evaluate each one I think separately. But there are, as Tim said, I think some other opportunities there and I think that's the most important thing is just because if we say, well, we should put an overpass in and WYDOT says, well, we don't like an overpass there. We shouldn't just say, well, we can't do anything. You know, we should look at whether there are other alternatives. You know, in that case, maybe the best we can do is to increase lighting and maybe, you know, the visibility so that the deer have a better chance of getting across. But in other places where we can do more, then that's what we should do. And I think that needs to be part of what we're doing is looking at more detail, you know, as we go forward. That should be in the Plan identifying some areas like that that we need to look at and come up with a real hard Plan, rather than just keep talking about, well, we've got to do something, we gotta do something, and not think it's best.
6/23/2009	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Well, potentially on West Broadway, we know it's a hotspot for deer mortality, wildlife vehicle collisions, a pretty hot spot for the loss of deer there, and it's a very dark little section of the highway. If there's enhancements to provide a combination where people walk and ride their bikes there, including downcast lighting that's appropriately scaled but that would provide vehicles a better visual clue that there's deer jumping off the bank, I better start slowing down, instead of waiting till they're right there on the hood. If you get a hundred feet of notice, you can stop. And that might be a way that, in that situation, there could be collaboration and could help pay for some of those improvements that would actually serve a couple of purposes.
6/23/2009	Kilpatrick, Steve Wyoming Game and Fis	I just had another snap. [Laughter] Maybe if we took a habitat approach. I know it's pretty good...and I didn't mention that in our comments but they are in our written comments. If we could quantify the acres of important habitat types, aspens, cottonwoods, ??, willow ??, those sorts of things, if we could quantify that now, we can always go back and measure that later and say, are we maintaining it, did we expand it, are we losing it at a faster rate than we wanted to? So, that may be one way to quantify how well we do. Yeah, and end up collaborating with Grand Teton National Park and Kiki Forest because they both have good veg overlays, or a good place to start. And I think we could find that pretty quickly for the small amount of private land there is, we could find it. So, that might be one way to help us out.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	Thank you, sir. I'm Pete Jorgensen and I'm not going to mention wildlife any longer, because everything I do mention will have a beneficial affect on <<inaudible>>. The Game & Fish Commission works very hard to take care of those issues <<inaudible>>. But we are in Wyoming, but we're in a different part of Wyoming. When you go to Cheyenne, we're weird. And it's true in a lot of ways. Part of it is our fault; part of it is their fault. The reason we're weird is because we're different and we ought to be proud of that. And let me go to the bottom line—the only way...we've heard talk last week with process, and this is not due process or whatever, the only way...the question is that everyone I assume has spoken to is put to the test, is that your board gives the County Commissioners a clear statement about whether this place is worth overdeveloping or not. And test whether they have the political will to vote for something that will utilize their zoning powers and authorities. If not, everything you've done is a waste. I've been here over 50 years. I've participated in every planning process, the local chair of the ?? in the early '80s, and we fought through this. And the public has said this time after time, and I believe, well, I know in my experience, from running for ?? three times, four times, whatever it is, I could spout off endlessly on this issue and get elected. I think this County is rather unique. The fact that only 3 percent of it is private land, over 15,000 acres of that private land is a conservation easement, that says something. It says that those lands are protected from being spoiled. And human needs, that's a bunch of baloney. Human needs can go anywhere and survive. In fact, a lot of them are in places where they shouldn't be and there's not enough water and all those kinds of things. That's not our problem. We'd love to dam our water to serve their human needs. But this is a special place. And I notice you're always in danger of being called elitist. And I really don't think it's that, but if that's what it is, that's what it is. I've been a land developer here on Skyline in the '70s or '60s. It was the first conservation easement in the state of Wyoming, to the major conservancy, two thirds of the property permanently protected. This County's been terrific in planning and has good planning staffs. But this sense that we have to grow, we even have to talk about a rate of growth, that just says, let it happen, because it will happen. There's an irresistible force constantly to develop it and to make more money. And there's not a piece of property in this County that doesn't have an intrinsic value and a monetary value in any market that shouldn't be sufficient for whatever happens to it on our land. Some lands are in the path of what we might consider logical development. And I would say that's probably a very small area south of High School Road. Anything else would be fine under, not just the '94 Plan, but the Plan before that. Where we got in trouble, I believe, was in PUDs and bonuses. Whatever we thought we were doing, we've had rampant development. Fortunately, the market now has cooled again but the implications are here. And the reason five-lane roads are proposed is because WYDOT looks back at the projections and the growth in the County and projects what's going to happen. They know what's going to happen unless we do something serious. And I would suggest—just skip all the other things I was going to say—we don't need any nodes. The only density node that we need is adjacent to and hopefully incorporated into Town. What happens now is we have two agencies, the Town and the County, and developers pick their side and utilize the side that works for their development. We shouldn't be so foolish, but we are. So, what we ought to do, or can do, in the County, and that's where you folks are, is say, you can do what you want in Town, subject to convincing your population (and I don't think they can do it), but in the County, this is what we're going to do. You talk almost...as often mentioned as wildlife is affordable housing. Affordable housing in this County beyond what can be done by the Housing Trust and the Authority is going to require subsidies. And the kind of folks who live here, many of whom are well to do, they don't like to pay taxes. And we're seeing that; we're seeing it statewide. There's...I don't know how much of the, I think it's a regulation, that 65 percent or 40 percent or whatever of our workforce should be living in this County. That's parochial. And we're paranoid about it to the point that it's destroying the values that are here and ?? So, I would urge you to give the County Commissioners a test. They're the ones who run for election. Give them a Plan that says what people have indicated that they'd like to see and see what they do with it. There's no sense in fooling around with anything else. Thank you very much. The current Plan, if I understand it, and I don't pretend to, has densities based on the location of the property and the type, whether it's land, whether it's ??, or whether it's steep. And I think living with those, with no bonus provision, with no PUD provisions, is probably the best ?? we're going to get. The base density is fine, okay, as far as I am concerned. I think at some point you've got to say that. Otherwise, the desire to develop and make more money is going to drive...I don't care what rate of growth you've got. There's going to be a new set of Commissioners. Somebody's going to have an advantage. Something's going to happen. You can't go back. We're so fortunate to have 97 percent of the land, plus the 15,000 protected by someone...my God, suppose it was the state of Wyoming protecting it? There'd be oil wells all over it.
6/23/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Gail Jensen. You know, a lot of the public not on the panel stood up and basically said the same thing. You know, if you went back and just said, hey, now let's just do this exercise with the Staff. Let's cut the number down to the base entitlements and see what the Plan looks like. And do that one exercise that encompasses the Plan. Keep the nodes in place in that, but you move things around a bit in that. What happens with public comment? I think that would dramatically change. And I think if you just worked on that one thing and directed them, what can you do with keeping the number the same, keeping the growth the same, and you put some of the tools, maybe try to move a few things around, if that's possible, with keeping the numbers the same. Is that possible? Could we do that exercise? Because that's what everybody's complaining about is the growth of the numbers.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Well, excuse me, it's an issue that we have struggled with also. First of all, we would start out with the goal of having conservation and that's the big one. And it goes in with the whole thing that we've been talking about, a number of us about appointing open space and understanding that more people means more impact, particularly impact of things that we would put into our character bucket—wildlife, and scenery, and so forth. So, when you look at those combinations and things, we would agree I think pretty much with what Bill is saying that we need the options. We need as many options as we can, whether it's TDR, whether it's a density bonus. The conversations we've had in the community is that probably three is about as high as it needs to go to create that incentive. Like I say, we're still debating the exact number on that, or in some ways, we're probably even debating whether we want to go there. But I think that's one of the tools that will give us conservation. And that's one of our biggest, biggest goals in this whole thing. So, I think we have to make it clear that there has to be a nexus. We have to have things that will allow the movement of that bonus, that value into a node, and predictability. But I don't think we want it as high as nine, because that really does start losing the idea of a build out or, you know, cap, population cap, predictability.
6/23/2009	Kilpatrick, Steve Wyoming Game and Fis	{if we are to apply wildlife and natural resources to, you know, every district, or node, or however we end up moving forward, what would be the best way to really approach that? Anybody that has any insight into that, I would be all ears. Steve?} I think you, you know, you might develop a suite of species for a district or a cluster of districts might be a good start, and get the specialists together to do that. You know, if you don't want a grizzly bear in Cottonwood district, you know, state that. But it might be okay to have one further north toward the ski resort or something. But anyway I think that would be helpful and saying that...and getting, you know, experts' opinion on what critters use the area and how that area is imperative to the continuation of that small population that maybe people want to see. You know, we particularly don't want a lot of moose in Town and in people's yards because they just call us. I mean, constantly. It's like I can't get in my car. Well...you have to go address that, you know, and there's a moose eating my bush. We don't address too many of those. There's a moose stuck under my bridge; we address that. <<inaudible>> from my living-room window; I don't like the scene. And it goes on and on. So there may be some areas where we don't want critters to be honest. I think that might be one way to approach it is by district and by, you know, the list of <<inaudible>>. In some ways, it would be nice to have moose because we need the permeability and ?? could maybe help out, but the 390 north, we need moose to get back and forth across that to the Snake River ?? zone. So, it would be a higher priority there. I don't want to see a blanket for the entire County apply. Here's the important species that we want to view in every district. I don't think that's going to cut it. I think we can do better. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Walker, Christine Teton County Housing	I'm thinking about this. So, you're asking how do we measure the impacts of what amount of housing we have for the development that has been platted and hasn't been built? So, you're talking Final Development Plan? And in relation to a goal of housing 65 percent of the workforce? So, currently, and especially with the downturn in the economy and the loss of a number of jobs, we're well above that housing 65 percent of our workforce here locally. The other thing is that we have quite a bit of development that has been platted, and we can definitely work closely with the Town Planning Department. Our organization also tracks current development proposals and the amount of housing that's provided within it. The other thing is we've got quite a bit of backlog of required developments that are being built out in the County that will help to also house some of the workers that were generated in the development. And so I'm thinking Jackson Hole Golf & Tennis is an example that that will be built out 22 units there. We also have some developments in Town that we're partnering also with the Housing Trust, and they're also building housing that will help meet some of that backlog, or to meet the demands that are placed on the community from the development that's platted. The other thing is that a lot of it will be absorbed in the community through existing rental units and opportunities, because we're housing more than 65 percent of the workforce here right now. And within those developments they're required to provide housing. So all the key pieces put together. And we find that businesses tend to also house a large percentage of their workers. I think that you provided some housing for your workers at Anthony's when you had a business? {Mr. Wall: Yeah, exactly, because we have numbers in Appendix I that show us what's here, what could be here under the '94 Plan, and then of course we have a brand new Plan. But it's that link between those and setting a goal, 65 percent, which is what I'm curious about. And then, well, another point was how can we define workforce housing? Ordinarily, you've already said that you're looking at that. But really the question about 65 percent that I have is how can we...if we acknowledge that we're at that point and that's our goal, we don't need to gain, we just need to maintain. But how can we maintain that with the current rates we have, particularly for commercial? Can we?} I think that we can. Part of it is that we're at a 65-percent level and we've had a 15-percent mitigation rate for years that we know we have had in affordable housing, the problem in our community. We've upped those mitigation rates to 25 percent in both the Town and County for commercial and for residential. Those two things overlapping will probably house, and this is where we start...we have to do more analysis of numbers, depending on how much commercial you get and how much residential you get, we will probably house around 40 percent of the workers that are generated from those two types of development. Then focusing our attention on providing...on preserving existing housing stock so that we're not losing that stock in creating opportunities for more housing, the rental product in our community is a great way for the private sector to provide housing. Working with businesses in our community to enable them to build housing more to buy existing housing stocks to house their workforce. And then also we have great housing organizations in this community that are also providing housing. And so instead of a development that has 25 percent of it as workforce housing, we're hoping that we're able to get those closer to 100 percent. We're really fortunate in this community that we really have solid foundations set up in order help us achieve a goal of housing 65 percent of our workforce. That's what I, I mean, that is really preliminary and not based on hard data. Again, it's going to depend on what balance or mix you have of commercial versus residential. {Mr. Wall: But if that were true, it would obviously indicate a need to raise the rate if we want to get the 65?} I don't think it necessarily means that. It could mean...it could mean that. But it would also mean that we just have to, if we're balancing kind of how we're providing housing for our community, it could mean that we have a greater emphasis on preserving existing housing stock, or providing rental product, or enabling the housing organizations to get a higher level. It's always going to be kind of a balancing act in trying to make sure that we're getting really pieces from different segments of the community. And it depends on what the other goals are of the elected officials. {Mr. Wall: Thanks...Just one more and I'll get my feet down. The other question I have, because it keeps coming up and it's one that I always had when I was on the Housing Trust board, is the issue of affordable rental housing. I mean, all three housing entities are, not primarily, but exclusively, building ownership affordable housing. And there seems to be a bit of an issue because the last Housing Needs Assessment Study didn't recognize that as a need. And yet everybody who lives here, with the exception of the recent economic downturn, it has appeared that we had a shortage of that.} Well, I think it ebbs and flows as far as the need for rental housing. And I would clarify is that the Housing Authority has built several rental products and, through our regulatory tools, we have about 225 deed-restricted units through commercial mitigation. The Housing Authority has partnered with Pioneer Homestead to build 24 senior, low-income housing units. We've also pioneered with the...partnered with the low-income housing...tax credit housing developer to build Snow King apartments, which is 24 low-income rental units. We've also worked with the owners of the Days Inn property, and they have been very generous and are working on a new model to provide 91 units of rentals for our community, converting lodging into rentals. So there is an emphasis on providing rental product through our organization. It is not a goal of the Housing Trust or Habitat for Humanity. However, we recognize that we need to balance and that also enabling or zoning for the private sector to build apartments, that is an amazing tool to provide a rental product in our community. And it is...rental product tends to be more related to incomes that are current in a community as opposed to an ownership product, which there are demands for ownership product from the world for housing. So it really raises the prices. So just providing rental product provides workforce housing opportunities and they tend to

Date

Name

Comment

stay more affordable. I had another point on the rental product. The other piece I think is really important from a planning perspective is that what has made this community really successful in maintaining a rental pool for our workforce is the lodging overlay. And the fact that short-term rentals are not allowed outside of the lodging overlay. It allows for long-term rentals in our community, which is very uncommon in other resort communities. So that is really an effective tool to provide workforce housing in our community, is limiting that lodging overlay.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Forrest, and everybody, my name's Bill Resor and I was a Planning Commission member for about eight years. And I went off just after we passed the last Plan on to the County Commissioners. I also was a past member, board member of the County schools, as Patti mentioned, and I was involved with the Land Trust from the conception and on the board for many years. Over the last 30 years, I've been involved in, and still am involved in, land management, land conservation, and land development in all of Jackson Hole. Really, just three major areas I want to address, but before that I want to say that compared to what we did leading up to the '94 Plan, you guys did a much better job. And your Staff's doing a much better job. The work that's being done by the County on this Plan is done mainly by County Staff or former County Staff, and because of that it is tailored to Jackson Hole. Now, we've all got complaints with it. But the last time around, we were starting with the first draft out of Chicago, and it discussed, you know, how to preserve apple orchards and stuff. It was a mess. [Laughter] And it took a long time just to get people, you know, the consultants, to even listen. So, I'm not saying that your job is easy. It's very hard, but I think you're doing a good job already. The problem with the last Plan is it started out ignoring the realities of Wyoming land-use laws. And there's no point trying to do things that you legally can't do. And in '94, that was the initial idea was one house per two-hundred acre zoning in the rural area, and by the time it got adopted, it was one house per thirty-five because that's what the state lets you do. Anyway, with that said, the three areas I want to talk about, and I won't do them all right now, one is why you have to plan for growth and why I think the nodes are a very positive addition to the Plan, not the particulars of them but just the idea of nodes. The second is how...is the part of the Plan that deals with creating more permanent, well-connected open space, which I really think is if we're trying to get somewhere is to where there's more land that's permanently protected and how are those protected areas connected. So that, to me, is, frankly, the area of the Plan I'm most interested in. And the third, which plays to that, is state trust plans. What I'd like to do is quickly go through the first point and then get to the others as they come up during conversation time. But basically why do we need the Plan for growth? Well, the thing is you can't say...you can't just say no; you don't have the right to. The County does not have full control of land use. First of all, as I said, the most restricted zoning is one per thirty-five, which does not create large chunks of open space. But more importantly, much development is not regulated by the County. The school board is not regulated by the County. WYDOT is not regulated by the County. Basically, they do what they want, but they will look to the County for advice. If you have plans that say where the things should go, they're going to look towards it; if you don't, they won't. When the County itself needs something new, like a new weed and pest building, if you don't have a plan where it goes, it just goes opportunistically without thinking it through. So you need to, you know, think of all that kind of stuff in the Plan so that people will abide by it. Also, a big part of why we need a good Plan is the Board of County Commissioners, they make bad decisions. And you need an enforceable Plan so they can be sued and brought into line. [Laughter] I'm not naming names here. Also, such areas as Rafter J and Teton Village can and may incorporate. So you want to have a Plan that encourages that...tries to make that less likely to happen. We're dealing with...we've got two entities now. If we end up with five or six entities, like Freemont County, it gets harder. Why do nodes help with all this? Basically, I'd like to compliment your Staff for having the guts to draw lines on maps. They've gotten shot full of arrows for doing it, but that was very brave of them to do it. I disagree with every single node in one way or another, okay, but I'm very much...I won't even go into my details on nodes. I'm very much in favor of having nodes. The basic reason is it protects everything that is not in the node. In the 1970 Plan, I think it was '70, under when Ralph Gill was mayor, I mean a County Commissioner, it was about eight pages long, the Plan and the Regs. Under that Plan, it said all new commercial had to be adjacent to existing commercial. The Board of County Commissioners approved two developments, one that's now part of the ?? Ranch, ?? subdivision, ??, and one that's an easement northeast of the Village. It was the ?? project. They got sued. The lawsuits went to the Supreme Court a couple of times, in the County laws and the developer laws. So, even an eight-page Plan, because it had something very definable, the County Commissioners had to stick to it. The '76 Plan had a Town-expansion area. Most of the growth happened within that. The school development happened within that. So that was, you know, that was helpful. And in that Plan there was a node proposed under the Wilson benches, you know, ?? Ranch and that area. Everybody went ballistic. The node was taken out. But the idea of having a Town expansion was very helpful. You know, there were areas expanding outside of Town but that really did help to have something identified. The '94 Plan failed to have a Town-expansion area. It failed to define nodes. And because of that, what happened? Stuff popped up randomly. The affordable housing PUD could go anywhere. Any neighborhood could all of a sudden have high-density nodes. We need affordable housing; it's a good thing. But we need to as a community to decide where it's going to go on a community-wide basis. You know, I think the one in the ?? project on Village Road, it's a good project. I think it's a, you know, B-, maybe C- location. It could have been in a better location. But it was discussed as a project, not as a County-wide issue. So that's why you need the Plan. WYDOT's new maintenance site, it went where, you know, there was nothing in the Plan telling them what to do. New High School, which I think might be a very good location, but it wasn't because the County said this is where it should go. So I think the more you actually draw lines, you protect all those areas that are not in the nodes. And then when a future Board of County Commissioners goes and approves, you know, take Seherr-Thoss, it was brought up twice, once by the County Planning Staff, once by a private developer. There was no node for it to be in or out of, so it was a bloody fight for years both times. If you had a node, it would have been clear from day one, like it would in this Plan, that Seherr-Thoss is not in the node, it cannot get an up zone. So I'll end it there on that but I think that's a major thing. People are looking at the nodes,

Date	Name	Comment
		saying I don't like that node. Fine. Fight with the node. But agree on where they are and mainly agree on everything that is not in the node, because that will be legally defensible and it takes a two-step process in the future to put something there. You've got to change the Plan and then you have to approve the development, which is substantially harder and substantially less likely. I'd like to talk about open space as a state-wide issue, but why don't I wait and soon get right back to that.
6/23/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	I just wanted to dovetail on what Kathy said in terms of the Commission, because my notes, some on those little sticky notes, was that the Commission was to be made up of scientists. And that sort of discounts a lot of people in this room who have been observing wildlife for 40 or 50 years and wildlife patterns. And it seems to me that those...that input is just as significant, or maybe not as significant, but it would an important indicator in the need to mapping, and what Steve was talking about is one way to do it. But in the past the need to mapping has not been a tool; it's just been those of us who've seen critters for a long time. So, keep that in mind when you establish this commission.
6/23/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, and thank you very much for doing this. I'm Kathy Tompkins; I'm from Cottonwood Park and, Forrest, I have to disagree with you about the wildlife. I think that you had mentioned something about that there might not be much value other than the small critters or something like that in Cottonwood. I live on Range View and Range View opens up on each end on the south side to High School Road on the north, west side over to South Park Loop Road, ?? Road, the ?? area. During the wintertime we always have deer and elk and fox, coyote come through that park. And, you know, nibble away at everything and usually when I see the animals, and especially in the evening, I see flashbulbs, flashes going off on all the houses cause all the kids are in the windows taking pictures of the animals and everything. And I have a question for you. Do you have a ??, Steve, from Cottonwood, as far as nuisance animals? Right, okay, because I heard you saying...thank you for clarifying that, yeah, cause over on Range View where we live on the Park, and it is open ended on both sides, we do get the wildlife in there. And talking with my neighbors and going around the circle there, we like it, we like them coming through. And if anyone's charging rent to this one moose, he's staying there quite awhile. But getting back to the permeability...leading up to the permeability with that and the development in South Park, I'm just hoping that I know there was like an easement along South Park Loop Road, you know, for wildlife for the view and everything like that. I would like to see that come around and some kind of park or something across the road, instead of pushing houses or whatever right up to the road and blocking off the wildlife permeability through-Range View Park, and then having them actually bottlenecked in there and then disbursing through the neighborhoods. That could be worse. And I'm just hoping that South Park and Cottonwood, and I say Cottonwood because Cottonwood is right next to South Park, you know, District 13 is a lot of neighborhoods, not just one neighborhood, but Cottonwood would be most affected by a new neighborhood on the south side. And we just feel as though we don't want to be gobbled up by this new neighborhood with the up zoning and take away from the community character that we love so much with all the different types of neighborhoods within this District 13—the affordables, the apartments, and the single-family homes. What we worry about is becoming a dead zone like the area around the new post office has become. That used to be in the old neighborhood, the border of Jackson, and then Cottonwood took over. My opinion is I see those houses around the post office and how disjointed they are now and how they're all rentals and not really single-family homes anymore. There might be a few in there. What we're afraid of is that spreading out to Cottonwood as these new neighborhoods in South Park are built. And then becoming rentals, you know, landlords would get more money because they could pile a lot more people into that one house, raise the rent up, and because they're sharing, you know, they'll agree to pay that rent. Those are the different kind of things that I think we need to...I know I'm going from wildlife permeability to the community character of Cottonwood, but I think it's all interconnected. And we just have to be careful that, you know, this up zoning in South Park, what will it do to the neighbors that are already there and how...I would like to see it brought back to the original number and I think it was 370 or 400 platted for South Park, the northwest corner. Does anybody know the number on that? Three seventy? Yeah, and then work from there and get all your studies in and get everything done, you know, before you start throwing numbers out there and before it's too late and then you see another neighborhood going down the drain, you know, just to make way for a new neighborhood. And again we like the animals in our Cottonwood Park. Right, and that goes back to actually to interviewing people like me and people who are there and live there and see, you know, talking to them about what they see. Range View Park is there; you have to deal with it and the animals do come in there. You just don't want to start building across the road without taking that into consideration and continuing that permeability across the road, you know, and things like that. And that's another thing with this Commission, you know, the Wildlife Commission is have them interview, you know, people from the neighborhoods there, cause they're the eyes on the ground there, you know, they know what goes through those areas. So that might be a good idea. So, that's all I have to say.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Hi, I'm Franz Camenzind with Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I'm a property owner. I've lived here in Jackson since 1970. First of all, I'd like to say thank you for this opportunity tonight. I think this is a good restart on this process. From what I heard yesterday and what was explained tonight by Chairman Hamilton, I think we are in a position now to have some good input and hopefully good results out of this process. We thought from the beginning that this is going to be a correction of the '94 Plan, and quite a few months into it we thought that. And I think the community did. And all of a sudden we've come up with a brand new Plan. And we debated long and hard as an organization, and I'm not sure that we know exactly for sure what we're going to do, but right now, we're looking at sticking with this draft Plan, working off of it, making our comments off of this, primarily because we respect the time that everyone in this community and all of you and the Planning Staff have put into this current document. But we really debated about taking the '94 Plan and trying to correct it like we thought we were going to do. Now, having said that, if during these deliberations you all decide, or whoever decides that you would like to go back to the '94 Plan, because quite frankly, I think would be easier to correct than it would be to correct this one, we would certainly go along with that. Like I say, out of respect for invested time and resources into this one, we're going to try to work with it. And a very general overview, and some of you heard this already, but we're very concerned that some major elements here are missing. The '94 Plan had many, many pages talking about the character and the value of character in this community. And clearly I heard discussions that a character-based Plan is very difficult to instigate, you know, to manage. A character-based Plan can work if you define what the characters are. As an example, if you define a neighborhood in Jackson and say this is a single-family neighborhood, that's the character and that should be maintained. Then you all can write, the Planning Staff can write LDRs that will do that. So, just to say things that character doesn't work, I think is misleading. Character works if you become objective with it. Right now, this is so subject that character doesn't fit in and consequently it's not even mentioned very much in here. And we do believe that character is a large part of this community. I think all the surveys have shown that. The character is small town, rural. Again, this draft Plan seems to have abandoned that language completely. And I'm not sure the community has. And I would like to see this brought back into the discussion. And I think there is a lot in the '94 Plan that could be pulled out, inserted here and then corrected. Also lost in here is any discussion of SRO of our scenic valleys in this community. I would like to see more attention put back into the SRO. I don't know why it fell out. I don't know where that direction came from, or if it was an oversight. NRO is somewhat the same. It is talked about. It gets quite a few pages in here and I like a lot of what it says, but it doesn't weave through the rest of the Plan. It doesn't show up. It's not the first filter that a lot of these districts go through. It's not the first filter that these chapters go through. And we, our organization, is environmentally...it is a wildlife-driven organization. And we believe sincerely that those values are also the values that drive the economic engine in Teton County today and I think will be our best investment in the future. So I think that the NRO should not be relegated to just a tool, but it should be brought up, the value should be brought up into every chapter in this theme. Never just scrapped. And right now we feel they're gone. Analysis, there's just a whole ream of missing analyses, if you will. Numbers do count. We need to know where we are, or where we're planning to go. That's the only way we can start doing impact analysis—transportation, school, fire, you can go down the list, recycling, everything. We need to have some idea of where we're going to go with this. And then with those numbers we could start doing an economic analysis, an impact analysis. Those connections are missing in this Plan. For the average person that wants to read this and get a picture of the future, this picture is extremely blurry and extremely wide with very little definition to it. I could go on but I think we'd be better off proceeding with more of a dialog than just to have me sit here and go over things. Needless to say, we want this to be a Plan that works. We should also remember that this is a Plan that will be in existence for ten or fifteen years. That doesn't mean that it won't be changed again. It'll be a new generation. It will be a new time with people making that decision. But we will be responsible for what happens between now and ten, particularly development study ?? will not be taken away. Places that are protected will be protected for the future, either through conservation easements, which are right now talked about, but there's no nexus between keeping the open space and conservation easements. The nodes, virtually all wildlife values are missing in the nodes. The rural areas, they're fairly well represented. In the Town wildlife valleys are almost gone. They're put down four, five, six, and seven on the tier list of importance, and clearly wildlife does have importance. And, Planning Commission, I just handed out tonight a copy of our publication that came out today on an analysis of the reports from the last 30 years from South Park, because South Park is a focus area for development. And what we did is simply a literacy search. It's not trying to make a whole lot of long-term projections out of this. But clearly this literacy search is showing that these studies over the past 30 years, there's an immense wildlife, there's an immense environmental value in South Park. And to ignore that I think is to ignore the best data that we have, which is hopefully in front of you now, and I think the will of this community. So I would urge you to take a look at that, and what it does show is that there certainly are gaps and we would hope that these gaps would be filled through the charge of the Environment Commission that I think will be set up. And I hope that Environment Commission has clear direction, not only as to what to do but the timeline to get it done, to start doing some analysis in this community, and particularly South Park. And I'll just cut it off there.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Overholser, Heather JH Community Recyclin	My name is Heather Overholser. I'm executive director of Jackson Community Recycling. I've been in Jackson since 1994. I've worked with Franz at the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance for nine years. I've been at JCR since 2003. Since 1990, Jackson Community Recycling has been providing recycling and household hazardous waste disposal services to the Town of Jackson and to Teton County, both residences and commercial entities. A major change in the organizational structure will take place on July 1st. Our organization, which is currently a joint...has a joint power board, will become a County department. It will be known as Integrated Solid Waste Recycling and will be a division under ?? We will still have a board; it will be an advisory board. And our duties will include not only managing recycling operations in the hazardous waste collection facility, but also in the trash transfer station and a composting facility and all the waste diversion that goes on at the trash transfer station. So, I'm very excited about this. It's a big undertaking but it's I think for our community, for the environment and for the solid waste programs, it's the best move we can make to have it all under one entity. We'll be able to prioritize better, make better decisions regarding solid waste, and also we will be able to divert more waste from a landfill, which is our goal. And also to make it very convenient for the public to recycle. So, in regards to the Comprehensive Plan, in looking through it, I did not really see anything about recycling in there. Even in the lists of public infrastructure and utilities, I didn't see recycling mentioned. But the most important piece for us that I see fitting into the Comprehensive Plan is providing adequate space for recycling in new developments, in existing neighborhoods, and most important is to provide a permanent community recycling site in the identified neighborhoods. As you may know, we have seven community recycling sites located throughout the Valley. These sites are very heavily used. They make recycling more convenient for the public, and they also limit the number of hardships down to our facility at Adams Canyon, which is definitely not centrally located for most residents in this community. So the community sites are important. All but two of our sites, the Teton Village site and the Wilson site, are not permanent, meaning the land owner generously allows us to use that property for our site and they can kick us off at any time. So we are very grateful to them, but we really would like to have some permanent sites where we will not risk losing the site at a moment's notice. Right now, in Wilson, I have a perfect example, they are constructing new development next to Wilson Gas and at the permanent site, the Commissioners put a recycling easement on that site, so they will have a site in perpetuity in Wilson. But for the next ten to twelve months during construction we have not been able to locate a temporary site. And so every day I can't tell you how many calls I get from the Wilson community complaining that there is no site for recycling. They show up there and they're car loaded and there's no where to put the stuff. Yes, the Village now has a site at the new parking lot in the maintenance area, which will be there in perpetuity as well. So, sites in the Town of Jackson, outside the Town of Jackson, in the County are really important. With this integrated solid waste recycling system you're creating an integrated solid waste Plan and hope to implement curbside recycling, food waste collection, yard waste collection. These are all dreams of mine for the future. They are not implemented yet, of course, but if we do move to a system of more widespread curbside collection, these sites still will be very practical and make a lot of sense, especially in the County, because curbside collection only makes economic sense in densely populated areas. Once you get out into more rural zones, curbside collection is not an easier way to collect recyclables. So, even if we did move in that direction, permanent community recycling sites would make sense. So that's really it. I would just love to see the mention of recycling besides just the general facility in the Comprehensive Plan. It's an important piece for the sustainability of our community, for our environment, and people really appreciate it. Thank you.
6/23/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	So, I'm Carol Waters. Well, I have a number of things I want to comment on. One of them is that I'm in agreement with the present people who said they think this is way too much growth, way, way, way too much. And the other thing that...and way too much growth in both ways—residential and commercial. I'm concerned that there seems to be a very cavalier attitude about the question of rate of growth. It is sort of mentioned and it is said, well, we will monitor it, but we're only going to monitor it after the fact; we're not going to set an intention about what we would like the rate of growth to be. I think that's foolish. And I guess the other thing that I wanted to talk about is the wildlife. I mean, I think the permeability issue is huge. I don't understand how you can expect wildlife to get to where it needs to get for its winter habitat if there isn't permeability allowed for and protected. And the last thing I want to say is I really like the idea that this event is taking place. I would like very much to be assured that the input that you've gotten tonight will not just stay with you, that it will go to the other people that are responsible in this arena for evaluating the draft Plan and coming up with a way to alter it. And I don't know if there's anybody who's thought about the way to have this kind of thing go on. And it seems to me that the STAG group has been—I don't know if I can say this in public but I am going to—the STAG group has been biased in the way it's set up. It looks skewed in a certain direction. And I think that in and of itself has caused a lot of suspicion and unhappiness on the part of the general public, because they don't feel as if their voices have been heard, and they look at the makeup of the STAG group and they say, obviously. So, I would hope that if there's any way you can suggest that these kind of voices that you've heard tonight get heard by the other two and three entities, I think that would be terrific.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Taylor, Nancy Interested Public	My name is Nancy Taylor and I'm a resident of the County. I just want to address the whole issue of sustainability, because the word is used rather, you know, loosely in this document. And if we're going to have a truly sustainable community, I think it takes on different meanings in terms of sustaining the wildlife population and also in terms of sustainability on a global basis. So, in terms of emissions that Tim was talking about and our human carbon footprint in Teton County, it's a different kind of sustainability. And I'd like to see the Plan address that differently from the sustainability of our wildlife population and permeability of how that wildlife travels through our County. The Plan mentions on page—excuse me, I dropped my glasses—page 26 under the indicators that we will monitor...we will look at the following indicators, and Indicator 6 is building related carbon emissions, and it states that we will be carbon neutral by the year 2030. And that's the last time it's mentioned and it's not addressed as to how this would be implemented. So, I'd like also, and I've been put off many times by different people saying, oh, if you're going to address green building, that will be in the LDRs so don't worry about it now. I'm not convinced that we can achieve this goal of being climate neutral by 2030 if it's not addressed significantly in the Plan as well. And if it's addressed in the Plan, then it can be implemented through the LDRs, but the Plan needs to give the LDRs direction. So, whether we have some kind of mandated green standards where all further commercial building in Teton County will meet, for example, LEED silver, and that there will be green building mandates for residential building. And I'm not suggesting that right now, or that that has to be written in the Plan, but I think that's something that we have to think about, because buildings contribute more significantly to our carbon footprint than does transportation. About 48 percent of all carbon emissions are coming from our buildings. So, if we're building, you know, log houses that are not...that have no insulation except for the thickness of the logs, we're continuing to create quite a big carbon footprint. So, anyway, the whole issue of sustainability needs to be I think broken down more specifically and address our carbon footprint as well as our animals. Thank you. Yes, I think it just has to be different from the wildlife portion, and right here it's lumped together, the stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. And in the building, rebate of carbon emissions is put in there. So, I'd suggest a separate one, because if the ?? Plan is going to go forward and we're going to become some kind of pioneer community—and I said this to you guys the other night—then...and we are going to be carbon neutral, there has to be some kind of teeth, not only in the LDRs, but in the Plan itself that's going to help us, you know, take those steps to get there. And, believe me, it's not easy to be carbon neutral. It's not even easy to build a carbon-neutral home. So, we have a ways to go on this, and if it's going to be in here and not be a joke, we have to do the homework that's necessary to back that up. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Let me go...first shot at it. It's an extremely important issue and you have to first look at the legal basis. But you can do the zone stuff to one per 35. Anything you want to get beyond that is going to take some kind of incentives. So what I would...and you can't legally require someone to do a conservation easement. You can have it as an option, it's attractive, and they can end up doing it. In setting up incentives, the best thing to look at is what happened with the '94 Plan. I think that's one of the most successful parts of the '94 Plan. The '94 Plan resulted in a lot of permanent protection of wildlife habitat and open lands. Alex Norton's analysis, you know, shows this. The density bonus is the rural zone resulted in over 3000 acres of permanent conservation easements while creating only 184 additional units. That was, you know, that's from '94 until now or until I think about six months ago. That's an incredible result. If you look at buying those easements, you're talking millions and millions of dollars. So that really worked well. And my sort of basic point on that is that's something that's worked. That's like Tim saying, hey, don't miss this part of the old Plan; it worked. Make sure you don't throw out the stuff that has worked; fix the stuff that needs fixing. So, I would keep in two kinds of incentives, and so far the Plan has kept those in. One is if you're in the rural zone, you should have some kind of bonus opportunity for clustering. If you look at the three times per 35, how that's been used, that was really, from '94 till now, it's averaged about 2x, just the actual PRDs that's come in under the 3x have been effectively averaging about 2x. And they, you know, really have worked well. The thing that you don't recognize in that is by having that...by allowing that multiplier in there, my estimate, just from personal knowledge of various conservation easements, is at least a thousand acres of conservation easements that were given because that zoning really didn't change from the '76 Plan to the '94 Plan. Roughly, keeping about three units per 35 acres is sort of seen as sort of baseline. If you look at the old Plan, it's one per three, one per six, one per ten, one per twenty, depending on slope and stuff. So, because that didn't get taken down, people kept getting conservation easements. I think if you were to drop that, you would see way fewer, you know, pure conservation easements given. People would just be waiting. You wouldn't be willing to make a decision at this time. The other bonuses in the Plan today, one of the things that's unpredictable in the Plan, is you can go to the 9x bonus anywhere. What I think is good about the new Plan, it's saying, okay, we'll give some kind of bonus in the rural zone, but if you want to go to a higher level of bonus, you've got to move it into a node. So that does two things. It makes it if you're out of a rural area, you know that, let's say, they kept 3x, the worst case is one house per ten acres and that requires significant clustering. If you are in a node, you've got a couple of options to get more density there. One is you print money. You just up zone it. Okay, that does, you know, that doesn't do the County...it helps the County's predictability. The County gets nothing for that zoning. The other is you say you can get a higher zoning if you do more affordable housing. That's a very good tool. That's in this proposed Plan. And another one is you can get higher density if you move it into the rural zone. The best example to look at '94 till now on that is Rocks Spring Canyon. That was I think about 280 acres. It's steep high ground but, you know, I'll promise you somebody would have built a road to it and put a house up there sooner or later. It would have happened. The Ski Corp, ??, took all the density off of that and moved it to Stilson. And, you know, people don't realize that when they ski through there. They're skiing through permanent private open spaces that was created through a density movement. If you get only two or three of those in the next ten years, maybe from, you know, density in Buffalo Valley or out of the south end of South Park and move it to the north end, even if that happens only one, or two or three times, each time is a really good protection. And the other way of getting that density is printing the money <<inaudible>>. So, I think you've got to look at that very carefully, listen to the Land Trust on what really what they see is really working. But I think you're getting pretty darn good predictability when you get rid of the high-density bonuses in the rural zone and keep the low end of them, you still get most of the conservation. {Mr. McCarthy: Do you have any, brought any insider thoughts on what type of multiplier is needed to still create the incentives?} Yeah, I've analyzed this and actually thought of this a lot. The one...the existing rules basically work well, the 3x. In other words, it's one per 35, but its base density is not the whole site. You remove certain things like rights-of-way and ponds and stuff. So, in reality...and then just, you know, nothing ever quite works right in the real world. You know, you're always ending up with rounding and you round down and all. So, in reality, the 3x, three units per 35, if you leave 70 percent open, ends up being about two units per 35, depending on which group you're looking at. There's a unit and a quarter per 35. I think what you need to do is come up with better objectives on that design, but to leave it loose enough so there's an incentive for people to come in. What you don't want happening is what happened at Bar-B-Bar, sorry, Bar-B-C, where they basically chopped it up into large lots and then came in and ???. In other words, you want people to come in with more than 35 ideally, 70 acres, larger, and plat it and get better clustering. Or you want them to move it into a node. And I think if you leave that three times multiplier for internal bonuses, it's somewhere in the range of the six to nine, that's harder to predict. And it depends on other options into the nodes where you take it all off and move it to the node. I think those will, you know, they will happen. The interesting thing is you don't...you can't look at it purely economically. Almost every time that this has been done, it's been the desire on the part of the land owner to do something like that. You know, the ?? family wanted to protect, you know, Rocks Creek Canyon. So they were willing to do that. My family has done, you know, years ago did that under the old Plan with Granite Ridge. You've got to have that desire to say, okay, I want to keep this open, but you don't say, well, would this work better; you say, would this work. So you've got options there. I think you'll see people moving density into the nodes, or people leaving more stuff open and doing better design, better covenants. And the big difference that I see in land that's...where

Date	Name	Comment
		there's an easement on it or there isn't is there's been more thought in it, there's more care about fences and stuff like that. So, having someone go to the Land Trust, or go to the County PRD, you end up with a significantly better land-use result, from a wildlife point of view, from a scenic point of view, from everything.
6/23/2009	Ferguson, Dick Interested Public	Richard Ferguson. I live in the County. This Plan was designed to confuse and get what they wanted done. I feel that from the get-go. And when you have something like that, like you have a car that's a piece of junk and you try to fix each part, it's time consuming and wasteful. I think you ought to take this Plan, take the covers off, keep the covers, trash the rest, go with the summaries of the '94 Plan. Cause you guys know what we want, and I think you want what we want. And you're going to be...each time you look at each item, you're going to have to figure out where they were trying to go and what we could do to fix it. You know better. You've got the sense to do it. Junk it.
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	There's two questions there. One is predictability. Right now in the rural zone it's very unpredictable. You can go from one to 35 up to nine to 35, or it can go to an affordable housing PUD. So, it's extremely unpredictable. What I'm saying is they've already made the decision to say the affordable housing PUD would not happen. So that removes the most unpredictable thing. And by having nodes, there won't be other ?? So, we're now down to just bonuses. So, I think the rural zone, within the rural zone, staying in the rural zone, if you drop it down to three times 35, the worst case is three units per 35 acres. So that's your predictable maximum. I think you can realistically plan, based on what has happened from '94 till now, you could do your road counts and all that. You could Plan at 2x and probably you'll come out high, because if you look at '94 from now all of the rural zone land that changed from undetermined to determined, in other words, raw land to conservation easement, or raw land to subdivision. There's a few odd-ball things you have to take out that were rezonings. The land that stays within the rural zone, the land that changed, it's closer to about, when you put in all-over conservation easements, the potential build out that's been created is about 1.2 to 1.5 units per 35. In other words, even with all the flexibility you've got now, that ?? really isn't enough. So I think you do have predictability if you make it, if you, within the rural zone, you have one...three units per 35 is the maximum, okay. The second one is incentives. The incentive to do a conservation easement is primarily the desire to protect the land. If you're giving a conservation easement, you're effectively selling the land for 35 cents on the dollar. It's more complex than that, but that's the basic incentive is you want to do it. Now, that being said, you know, financially, the more beneficial it is, the easier it is to do and the more that gets done. I can't, you know, every single conservation easement that I've known and looked at the finances behind has been different. So, you can't really say if you change a rule, it will have this effect or that effect. A conservation easement on a large piece of land, let's say, 400 acres, where you take all the density off, the appraisal really doesn't even go into the multiplier. The one house per 35 is financially the highest and best use. So, you don't really need that bonus to get...for large conservation easements. It's more for when the guy only owns 35 and he wants to...he's trying to get some of his cost back of the land by saying, I could do three, but I'm only going to do one. He then gets, frankly, gets money back from the IRS. But you get the conservation easement. So, basically, we're all in here discussing who's going to get what done in Teton County. The IRS is not in the room. So, if you set up rules where the IRS ends up paying for that open space, that's good for the community. So, I don't want to get into details of this, and Tony and I can go through them later. It's very complex as to why the 3x were significantly better, let's say, than 2x. But I'd be glad to go over it with you, you know, later. Yeah, all it takes for the really large pieces is the desire to protect the land. You get a deduction. If you remove all the density, you know, if you go from a potential one per 35 on <<inaudible>>, you know, you're giving away a lot of the value. And then you get to deduct, if you've got the income, you know, 30 percent of that, you know, in most cases. {Mr. Wall: I'm just trying to picture, and I get the theory on the smaller, the 35-acre pieces, but how many 35-, you know, acre pieces, 35-, 40-, 50-acre pieces are leaps and bounds that are still out there that could even qualify? They haven't been platted or something, I mean. } I'd say hundreds. I mean, it's more than you think. I mean, just think of the state land as 5000, I think that, you know, some, correct me on this, I think it's on the order of another 15,000 land in the core of Jackson Hole, not counting Buffalo Valley or ?? of large pieces that are undetermined.
6/23/2009	Wackerly, Michael START	Mr. Wall: I have one just real quickly for Michael. About how much land would be required for the new START facility? Mr. Wackerly: Just in rough terms, six acres, something like that; six acres approximately in round numbers.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hi, Gail Jensen. I'm not going to repeat; I think I sent around, though the public doesn't have it, maybe in tomorrow's paper, but my comments about the Plan were to fix, oh, six different kind of more global major points. But the one thing that I wanted to talk about was the numbers, and I'm talking not just a build-out number, but we don't have baseline studies for most of the things that are supposed to be monitored in this Plan. There are no numbers to start with, so how are you going to monitor something that you don't start with a number at? I don't understand. How can you do that? And we don't have numbers on wildlife really. We don't have current studies on our transportation, I mean, they're old. We have no numbers. How are we going to do it? This is no plan really. Yet, in order to plan, you have to have numbers to start with. And from the get-go there was a real desire, we-don't-plan-by-the-numbers attitude when they started the draft of the Plan. And I think that's very, very wrong, because how many people up on the panel said it's the number of humans that create the impacts and that we need to plan for and the wildlife. It's the number of humans versus wildlife, and if you don't start with the numbers that we're talking about and avoid them, you know, stop avoiding the numbers. Let's get to the real numbers. What is the true base density that is in this Plan? That's the true base without incentives. And I think that was stated in January of '08 by Clarion. They came up with the number. Well, the number in Appendix I is another 30 percent higher than that because the incentives have been added to the base zoning to create those starting numbers. And I'd like to see us get back to that original number and of the entitled property rights. Stick with that number; that's what we were promised at the original hearings last early summer, last year. And somehow the numbers have gotten juiced up. And then they've gotten juiced up again by more incentives over and above those juiced-up numbers. So, that's why a lot of the community is having a problem with the growth. Let's get back to the real numbers. Let's get some good studies so that we can really plan our future. You know, I'm just having a real hard time with this, because we can't...we don't have numbers on our infrastructure, on the cost of what the infrastructure's going to be, I mean, there are a lot of big pieces missing. And I just don't see where we're...how we can get there with what is in this draft Plan. So, please, start with the numbers. Thanks. Well, my feeling is I would stick to, and I know this isn't keeping with Bill or with Franz, but I would stick with the one per 35 and I would forget the multiplier. I think that the federal government is going to eliminate the tax incentives for conservation easements. I think that's coming down in the next couple of years, so there are going to be no tax advantages. So, what's the point of the multipliers? Myself. So, anyway. That's what I feel about it. Thanks.
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Thanks, Larry. There are over 5000 acres of state trust lands in Teton County. And the draft Plan correctly maps those as agricultural rural. It doesn't put them in like state land, because they eventually can get developed. You may think of these as public lands but they're not. They're trust lands. Sooner or later the state's got to get the money to <<inaudible>> around the state. That being said, the State Land Board, as trustees, you know, they may be the single largest owner of unprotected land in the Valley, but they want to work with the County. They're politicians, they want to have win/wins. The kind of uses on those lands are regulated and you can regulate that. Frankly, lately, Teton County has done a poor job of that, even little minor leases the County has overlooked. In the past, the County I think did a better job of that. The Plan should...our Plan should directly address how the County will move forward cooperatively with the State Land Office. A good example of past cooperation is the ?? School section, you know, what's down in Indian Springs. That was put up for sale by the state to be auctioned off, and they appraised it and set the auction date. The County Commissioners went to the State Land Board and said, if you require that the developer go through a PUD is that they not just divide into thirty or how many tracts. The State Land Board talked to persons willing to make the opening bid, the ?? family, and they said, we'll make the same opening bid whether the restrictions are there or not. So, the state put the restriction on. So, when that was sold, it was bought. The state got the money out of it, they were happy getting. And then that had to go through a PUD process; it couldn't just be divided up. So, another really good example is the small state piece adjoining the National Park in the Snake River next to the ??. There the Land Trust went to the state and just bought a conservation easement on a 20-acre ??, literally amongst the park and amongst the river. The state still owns it, <<inaudible>> horses, but it's public land but can never be developed. So, there are a lot of solutions here. I think you need to actively work with the State Land Office to have a Plan, you know, deal...and you've got to look at each piece differently. Some are in the Park, some are, you know, surrounded by private land, some are on the border of National Forest and private land. So, I think if you really look at that, you can come up with a specific Plan on how to maximize, how to make sure you let them get their money out eventually, but still protect public resources.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	, Conservation Alliance	To: Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions, Teton County Board of County Commissioners, Town of Jackson Town Council, Jackson and Teton County Planning Departments. Dear appointed commissioners, elected officials and planning team, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for your attention to the following report and for the opportunity to submit preliminary research on the wildlife and scenic values in the South Park area as part of the Comprehensive Plan update process. The Conservation Alliance believes that planning decisions for our county's dwindling undeveloped private lands should be based on the best available information, research and science. As we determine the growth patterns and the community's priorities in the different districts of Jackson and Teton County, it is important to base our decisions on the best available information. Additionally, when this information is outdated or incomplete, which is not uncommon, we believe planning should err on the side of caution, particularly given the community's top priority – to protect wildlife and promote stewardship of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. This report focuses on South Park because it is slated for the most potential residential development of any district in the draft Comprehensive Plan, released 04/13/09, and because the new draft plan places very low priority on the protection of wildlife and scenic values in the area. This low prioritization represents a significant departure from our community's existing 1994 Plan. Due to the drastically proposed changes in land use in the district, we believe it is first critical to take into account the area's documented and under-studied wildlife and scenic resources before the community considers a plan that stands to eliminate those resources and values. The enclosed report is simply a first step. It is a summary of readily accessible environmental reports, studies and documentation from the past 30 years that refer to the wildlife and scenic resources in South Park and along the proposed Tribal Trails connector road. While it demonstrates that much of the available data is old or incomplete, and that more complete data collection and comprehensive analysis is warranted, this summary also reveals that the area includes high wildlife and scenic values. Also, given the historical importance of the South Park area for scenic preservation, this study (which includes a review of the 1994 Plan) reveals how differently the new plan addresses scenic resources. This shift is a broad concern, but it is strongly demonstrated in the new draft plan's proposed South Park district. In general, this report intends to initiate discussion on the directions for future growth outlined in the draft plan and to what extent these proposed directions were guided by the best available information. Please see the enclosed report for more detailed information, and feel free to contact us with any questions. {referenced report, The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources, available hard copy in the County Planning Department}
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	I would concur with that completely. I think you add that to the NRO information we have now and I do think you would have a reasonable means of measuring over time. So, if you're saving a habitat and if you're still having the animals connectivity through there. When we submitted the NRO information to the Planning Department over a year ago, one of the first things that we saw that was a need for habitat mapping on the private land. And we're trying to get funding to do that and contract that out also, again, working with Game & Fish. I think habitat is something that everyone can see, can measure, and it is what the critters need, first of all and most of all. Well, again, we're trying to get the funding to put that kind of study together so that it can be turned over. Quite honestly, also, that needs to be incorporated into the Plan.
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Forrest, but if you looked at it as a crossing, the Town and County said this is a major crossing, I mean, just forget about the expense, the engineering per se. If you're coming to Jackson in 20 years and you hit there a 500, 800-foot-wide, you know, concrete structure that still had four lanes under it, and a bike lane, a sidewalk on both sides, where it came off the hill flat and then dropped into the park, I mean, that would be an incredible symbolic entrance to Jackson that we cared enough about wildlife to build a crossing right in the middle of Town. And Franz is absolutely right, mitigating that without an overpass, I think you're only, you know, you're working on the edges. I think the goal to have an overpass there I think is technically, if you look at stuff that's been done in Europe or in Canada, it's technically feasible and financially feasible if you start planning now for 20 years out.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri with Save Historic Jackson Hole. I guess I've lived here since 1996. Like most people, I value wildlife and it shows in some of the things that I do. I'm on the board of directors for the ?? Federation and I volunteer to remove barbed-wire fence in Teton County with the Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation. I also I don't neglect people, so I also tutor adults and children through the Teton Literacy Program. Do you just want that, or do you want me to go into some....? Okay, well, I guess a couple of key things is obviously wildlife, that's been a big issue. People have said I think one of the things that we could do maybe to improve on things is, even in areas in Town where maybe it doesn't have as high a wildlife value, there are still specific areas within those sub-areas I think that have wildlife value and that would be ?? Meadow, you know, recognizing the value of that. Or it could be through other parts of Town where wildlife need to move through. So that would be one raw comment. The other is I think, you know, from the ?? study and the UW surveys, there certainly was a strong support for some kind of rate of growth mechanism. And I think it would be easier to implement it now and work on adjusting what that threshold should be than it would be if we waited until we thought we were at a point where we needed to take action. And I guess the point along that would be, in terms of just the indicators that were talked about, that if we didn't get the data that we thought because people got too busy, that would be evidence that we're growing too fast regardless of whatever the target rate was. I think generally, I didn't get a chance to send you, Forrest, but I sent to Staff a copy of the Freemont County, Idaho, which is Highland Park, their Comprehensive Plan. And I think we could maybe learn something from that because it's a very tight, dense I think, without a doubt, supporting document. The supporting documents are all separate so that the core document, which is the 2-page vision statement, 15 pages that contain all the principles, are I think a lot less imposing to people. So that would be I think a good example. Let's see, and then also on the indicators, that's I think an area for improvement. I think we can...I've detailed this in suggestions for that that have been submitted on what we can do. And I think, you know, one of the things is we're trying to increase allowable densities to provide a sense of redevelopment. And I'm not sure that the community really wants that kind of redevelopment. That I think is part of our controversy. That's kind of what we have, overview.
6/23/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	I guess the other thing is, and I think Forrest brought this question up, is it {node} is an urban tool. Is it appropriate? Are we that urban now? But I guess the real thing is—I think that was touched on earlier—is the question is I think the concept is probably admirable. The question is it the appropriate year?. The other thing is, as noted earlier, is which one, you know, what do you make a node and then how much do you put there. And I think that was really that's a real big issue I think when you start looking at some of these nodes that were identified. When you start talking about increase in the density, you know, in terms of dwelling units per acre, just as an example, Wilson, which is now like point nine dwelling units per acre, could go under the '94 Plan to like double that, one point eight. And under the proposal going to a node it's going to go...it could go to three point six. Well, that's over three point six, that's a four times increase. That's a tremendous change in the character of a place. So then you have to really ask is is that node then killing the character. I think that's an important question that we have to ask. Maybe it is admirable for a bunch of other reasons, but if it kills the character of that community, then you really have to ask whether there is a benefit, or I would ask whether there's a benefit. But as a relative comparison, that's the point there is. I acknowledge, it's like I go there, but in the terms of...it's a tool to try and understand what's going on and what's being proposed. And so you can compare apples to apples, because under the one Plan, it could go to a maximum of, you know, double what it is now; under the other Plan, it could go to a maximum of four times what it is now. That's a big change from what's currently allowed. So, in regards to where it actually ends up, I think that the important fact that you have to take away is it's a tremendous change to that community. And there are other ones that are proposed as nodes that are similar. I think when you start looking at that much change in density, it's a big change to the character. I guess the question is do we need all that, is one of the questions. You know, given that the data shows in the existing, we've got like a 50-year supply already. You know, ??, that's what we say for housing anyway. We've got...certainly, even in Town, if we did nothing, I'm not saying that we don't change anything, but the question is I guess is whether we need to at least especially if we're saying we've got a 10, 15-year Plan, do we need to...we've already got a 50-year supply, how much more do we need to increase that.
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Part of this growth, too, if I might jump in here, we have to be careful that if we do assign potential growth to a node, any node, that it's really performance based, not just discretionary, just growth for growth's sake. Performance based meaning does it supply housing, does it earmark percentage for housing, does a percentage of it have to come off of rural land. You know, we can make those things, we can make those value statements. And then getting right to the basic question, or the point that Armond made, do we need that much to begin with. So, you know, I think our organization would look at a little growth in those nodes, particularly if it's performance based. It really solves the problems. It's connected to other results that we want.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Barash, Jean Interested Public	Jean ?? of Wilson and I, of course, have a zillion things to say, but I don't know where I want to say them, except, I guess, I would start out by adding on to what Nancy Taylor was saying about sustainability. And that is I was struck by what Steve read in his report about, you know, viable populations. And what struck me was that we have spent I don't know how many hours, days, months, years, the planners have spent, working on this Plan, and I know it was very hard and there's been a whole lot of comment on it from the public. And what struck me was that in just about every other area, whether it is a transportation plan, or affordable housing or, you know, whatever else, that term hasn't been used. We're going to have viable, just viable. And so it struck me as so outrageous that that term was used over and over again in this Plan. And this is where I'm going to sound really, really hokey, okay. But, we are different. This Valley is different than any other place. There are lots of places that have five-star hotels. There are a lot of places that you can ski. There are a lot of places that have fabulous shops. There is no other place like Jackson Hole and Teton County. And for us not to have wildlife and use the sustainability of our wildlife populations as the filter through which we compare and contrast the plans that we are following, to me, is really, really unfortunate. I've said this before, I know what lie means. I came here in 1948 and I never forgot it. I came back; I came back with my children. I now have my grandchildren. And this is priceless. You know, I don't care if people don't even, I mean, maybe there are people here who don't care about wildlife. I know that everybody does care that's in this room and I know the planners care. But even from just a commercial standpoint, it is wildlife and the natural, staggering beauty of this place that has people coming back and bringing their children and their grandchildren. So, I think, you know, I've learned a lot of things tonight. And I was really interested in it all, you know, from recycling and dog parks and so forth. But it's like building a house, for example. If you don't say to your architect, we want a house that's 4800 square feet, or 2500 square feet, and we have ex amount of money, you just don't know what you're going to end up with. And none of us would do that. So, I am urging that before this Plan can possibly be adopted, that the Planning Commission and then the County Commissioners, really put wildlife, not just the easy thing which is, oh, everybody likes wildlife, but, you know, we need information. Game & Fish needs information. I don't know how they do what they do. And so, you know, I urge the Planning Commissioners to (a) reduce the growth that's proposed, (b) somehow or other insist that the studies be conducted so that we don't end up with the draft Plan as it is now, which is very vague, but has very specific maps. So, I don't know how we can have specific maps when we have just a vague wish list of things. And that, again, it sounds so hokey—remember why we came here and preserve it—not just grow it, preserve it. I'm so tired of listening or reading—I shouldn't say listening—but over and over again, human needs, human needs, human needs. You know, I think they can work together, you know, but we can't. you know, what...I think overpasses and underpasses are fabulous, but what difference does it make if we have underpasses and overpasses if we have 20,000 more people and ex-thousand more cars, and we don't even have the animals to use the overpasses or the underpasses? I mean, I think that we just, those of us who have lived here for awhile, just come to, in a way, take it for granted. And so we think it's going to be here always. And then I know that there's some thought that because we have national parks here, that it doesn't matter if we have it in our yards anymore. But we can go to the park. And I don't think that's what the population wants. I really don't. And I think that's why many of us were disappointed in the Plan because I think there are people...I think many of us who have made the sacrifices that we need to make in order to preserve our wildlife population. I do, I believe that we are willing to do that. And I know people say sarcastically, well, how many people have you, you know, how many came to this meeting tonight in your car. And, yes, of course, we did come in our cars, because, no, there isn't a START bus from Wilson. But, honestly, you know, I don't think that our wildlife populations, for example, can stand widening highways. And yet the Plan doesn't address things like that, you know. If we go ahead and allow these kind of commercial buildings, for example, what happens to our highways? Anyway....
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Well, first of all, I agree on the way I address the value, you know, that incentive value that Bill is talking about. I just don't have that expertise. In fact, those are the questions that we're asking in trying to figure out where we should go. Predictability is very important. It's rather ironic that we...I don't mean to be countering you, Mr. Wall, but this whole document has very little predictability in it. And this would be one place where we would have some predictability, as Bill said, maximum predictability. And, you know, if there are a hundred units out there in the 35-acre range, that's either a hundred units of 35-acre pieces. That would be either a hundred units, or if we went into a three or a two, that would be two to three hundred. And those are real numbers—don't get me wrong; I'm not trying to downplay them—but when you look at the range of unpredictability that's in some of these other parts of this chapter, it's fairly small. So, we have a lot of predictable work to do here

Date	Name	Comment
6/22/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	Hopefully your P&Z Commission will be tasked with giving guidance to planners to re-write the plan. Here are some comments and suggestions: 1. The plan is not a plan. It's a vision statement packaged with lots of motherhood and feel-good fluff. It begins the entitlement process and guarantees an unlimited annual rate-of-growth. It's dangerous! The format of the current plan is better than the one proposed. 2. By increasing allowable densities it incentivises redevelopment that the community doesn't want. Redevelopment incentives are community destruction incentives. 3. A real plan states hard objectives in the near term and gets less definitive in the out years. Measurable indicators found in the draft plan may be an end-run substitute for hard near-term objectives; many of them are fluff and nonsense. They're dangerous. 4. Given that we've grown fast for two decades, and folks don't like it, a real plan might protect the citizens by limiting annual growth to the national average. 5. Lodging and commercial are the real growth engines of JH. They need to be measured, limited, and managed properly. I'd suggest a limit of 1/2% annually as an interim measure until a management program can be developed and installed. Other comments are included in the attachment, which you may have already received. It's only 1-page, and I've included it because you folks probably get a ton of official mail and may have missed it.
6/22/2009	Heilesen, Marv Interested Public	I wish to thank the Planning Commission for its courageous and timely action on June 11 in recommending that the Comprehensive Plan be sent back to staff to take into consideration the wishes of the public. This was the second time I'm aware of in the entire CompPlan process that someone in authority has spoken up for the interests of the great majority of the residents of Jackson Hole. The subsequent criticism of your action is unwarranted. The Planning Director's comment that he did not know whether he was being directed to incorporate comments for or against the Plan is disingenuous at best, and just plain sad at best. It was patently evident from the speakers at the meeting, as well as the petitions submitted, and letters to the newspapers, that the public at large does not support the proposed Plan, with its emphasis on more growth and density. Likewise, the comments made by some County Commissioners that you should have spoken up sooner are unfair. When the general area maps for the Plan were presented last summer, and concerns were expressed at your meetings about the apparent density and growth patterns, the staff said that people should wait for the final draft. As late as several weeks ago, they were saying to wait till the indicators and benchmarks are worked out. The citizens have been raising these issues from the start; and finally someone in county administration has acted on the concerns. The first time someone in authority spoke up for the interests of the public was during the community meeting in Rafter J last summer, when the Planning staff announced that the public would not be allowed to speak, but only to leave "sticky notes" and written comments directed at specific themes of the Plan. The people were outraged, and Leland Christensen stood up and took control of the meeting, insisting that some members of the public be allowed to talk. Memorably, he said, "This is the community's Plan." The Planning Commission's action offers the hope that it could still become the community's Plan.
6/22/2009	Davenport, Mark and B Interested Public	Planning & Zoning commission, Thank you for voting against the current Comp Plan. We believe it is ill conceived and not in the best interest of the community. We have even less confidence in the Planning departments ability than before for supporting this plan. Please do not give in to a plan that is bought and does not benefit our community for the long term. The reality is not everyone can live here or it will be like Los Angeles. Please only approve a plan that perpetuates the wildlife habitat and character of the town as it exists.
6/22/2009	Mortensen, Sue Interested Public	i support the recommendation of the planning commission. clearly there is a sizable number of folks in our valley who feel that the planners went forward without listening and considering and dialoging about wildlife and open space needs. it is a mistake in jackson to disenfranchise large groups. if we need affordable housing then let's use our own model for how this has been done in the past in low key, absorbable ways.

Date	Name	Comment
6/22/2009	Woods, Becky Interested Public	The large price tag and huge amount of time spent on the ongoing comprehensive plan rewrite are strong indicators that an annual review of the comp plan and associated land development regulations is fiscally, politically and administratively untenable. If this is the “meat” of the comp plan rewrite, the proposed plan is a turkey. Analyzing fiscal, environmental and traffic impacts of a considered course of action forestalls nightmarish problems: it is, after all, hard to unring a bell. Yet Teton County Planning Department’s blueprint for our future contains zero impact analysis. Zero. It wants us to believe it will effectively identify and address developing problems in “real time” to keep the valley’s character and qualities intact. Performance to date gives me little confidence this will happen. Equally disturbing as the rewrite’s backwards planning approach is the growing community dissatisfaction with the process. The depth of this widespread frustration is reflected in a petition drive reminding our elected officials that wildlife and controlled growth are top priorities. Love it or hate it, the petition is emblematic of serious disaffection. I doubt a drive would have been initiated if the public at large sensed planners were listening to—and addressing—valid concerns and comments. In January 2008, Mr. Daugherty discounted the results of community polling, saying they were based on “special interests.” Since then, planning staff has variously characterized public input as “artificially engineered,” “cherry-picking” and “people only concerned with density in their own backyards.” Planners didn’t want to hear verbal comments at neighborhood meetings and confined written comments of their lengthy presentation to Post-It notes. The department refused to release a Word document to neighborhood groups, the county planning commission, and the Alliance for line-by-line analysis until a county commissioner stepped in and told them to get it done. Such remarks and actions by staff are unprofessional, dismissive and condescending towards citizens and groups who care enough about the valley to weigh in. With respect, members of the planning staff are not—as Ms. Froedge perhaps unintentionally asserts in a recent Jackson Hole News and Guide article—community leaders. They are county employees hired to serve the citizens who pay their salaries. I remain optimistic that the appointed town and county planning commissions and you, our elected officials, will critically analyze the comp plan rewrite and LISTEN to divergent voices. I applaud the courage it took Planning Commissioners Forrest McCarthy, Tony Wall and Larry Hamilton to recommend sending this back to planning staff for further work. It is both unworkable and clearly not in-line with the results of consistent community surveying.
6/21/2009	Sinclair, Benj Interested Public	I would like to add my voice to those hundreds (or thousands) of county residents who have written or commented on the faults of the existing Comp Plan. The plan must be re-worked to accommodate this community's wishes. It will fail without community support. I fully support the recommendations of the P & Z staff in this process.
6/20/2009	Callahan, Mary Lynn Interested Public	I'm writing to give my support to the Teton County Planning Commission in their motion to return the Comp Plan as submitted, back to the Planning Staff. I believe the Draft Comp Plan should be a document that is acceptable to a majority of the people in the community. The submitted Draft Comp Plan is contrary to our community character and values. Please support the commission and return the plan back to staff!!!
6/20/2009	Kolsky, Eddie Interested Public	I am writing to you to express my support for the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation with respect to the draft of the new Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is way off base and should have community support before it continues forward.
6/20/2009	Legras, Tita Interested Public	I support the County Planning and Zoning Commission's vote to recommend that the Comp Plan be rewritten to better reflect the community's values. The plan must have community support before it moves forward.
6/19/2009	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	By declaring the draft Plan unfit for review, the County Planning Commission has done Jackson Hole a great service. Getting the Plan “back on track” is political doublespeak. The Plan never represented the community. That’s obvious, just read the community comments and public surveys. The plan got off on the wrong foot. It’s built on an unfortunate format that’s prone to misunderstandings and manipulation. It’s not repairable. Save Historic Jackson Hole submitted the Fremont County, ID Comp Plan to staff for consideration as a new planning format. It is more user friendly and less confusing. We thank Forrest, Larry, and Tony for having the courage to tell the truth. As in the “Emperors New Clothes,” these 3 brave souls had the courage to point out the farce. They should be commended instead of condemned. Save Historic Jackson Hole asks that you accept the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission and allow them to meet and add more guidance to their comments so staff has a clear direction for the rewrite. Getting it done right is more important than adhering to a schedule.

Date	Name	Comment
6/19/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	I am writing in hope you will consider the following Monday when discussing how to proceed with the comp plan. I feel the action taken by the County Planning Commissioners last Thursday was the right and only way to proceed. The plan's driving principles do not represent the sentiments nor do they reflect the public comment of the overwhelming majority of our County neighbors. Please send the plan back to the planning staff to first correct and address the following "big issues". Only then can we review and incorporate the many proposed new components and ideas of the plan. 1. The "numbers" are of utmost importance to wildlife, infrastructure, community character, quality of life and the future of Teton County. The refusal to plan based on the current base zoning entitlement numbers (without incentives and density bonuses) has enraged our community. We need to get back to the honest and real numbers as presented in January 2008. The claims that the plan is one that allows no additional growth beyond current base zoning, is far from the truth and insults the intelligence of all of us. The resistance to plan by the numbers is an attempt to disguise the massive growth this plan allows. Residential and Commercial development numbers and their combined effects must be honestly calculated and analyzed. We should embrace these numbers as this is true planning. 2. The public comments were very clear, wildlife and open space protection must be considered as the number one priority. While recognizing private property rights, all themes, mapping and future development must put first the consideration of impacts on wildlife and open space . This is not the case in the draft plan. 3. The plan must spell out the what, how, when and where with regards to infrastructure needs and improvements and who pays for these. This is missing and is critical to planning. Again, I urge you to send the draft back to planning staff with a clear message to correct the major flaws and adjust the plan to reflect the communities desires.

Date	Name	Comment
6/19/2009	Colligan, Chris Greater Yellowstone Co	Dear County Planners: On behalf of the Greater Yellowstone Coalition (GYC), I would like to thank you for your work on the Draft Teton County Comprehensive Plan and for the opportunity to provide comment. We recognize that the Comprehensive Plan is a visionary document to guide future growth in the County and that there will be future opportunities to comment on land development regulations, which will define how this vision is implemented. The County should be commended for the exhaustive public input opportunity used in defining the vision for future development. However, we do have concerns that this vision may not have been fully implemented in the planning process on specific nodes and in regards to the Natural Resource Overlay (NRO). We are also very supportive of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance and their efforts to analyze this plan for impacts to the wildlife, scenic, and rural values of this community. While growth is inevitable, wildlife values continue to be of foremost concern to Jackson residents. We would like to remind the planning effort that the community's top value continues to be "Promoting Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources." We feel it is important for the comprehensive plan to balance residential and commercial growth, with workforce housing and the wildlife, scenic and rural values that we all regard. GYC commends Teton County for using tools such as the NRO to determine appropriate levels of development in specific areas. The County should seek to update the current 1994 NRO before proceeding with the next step of Land Development Regulations. Current research is available on wildlife use that has not been incorporated into this map for this planning process. Additionally, indicator species have not been specified, and we feel the county should consult with State and Federal agencies to identify species and habitat types that are sensitive to the proposed growth. Using biological data to map development suitability is a critical step in reaching the community's goal of preserving wildlife and their habitats. Successfully utilizing the NRO largely comes down to consistently working with partner agencies and organizations to assemble the appropriate data needed to make informed decisions regarding density, design and other important factors. GYC supports the county's goal of increasing the amount of permanently protected private land within the NRO boundary. The Draft Comprehensive Plan directs the county to regularly update the NRO. GYC recommends expanding the NRO to cover critical private lands within County Rural Districts 2, 3, 4, and 6. Specifically, GYC is concerned about private inholdings within GTNP and their future potential for development. These inholdings within the National Park System not only provide key habitat for many wildlife species, but they also provide important scenic and open space values that contribute to the overall health and sustainability of the park. The county should work with GTNP staff biologists to obtain the necessary data and information that will facilitate the expansion of the NRO to include park inholdings and adjacent private lands within the aforementioned Rural Districts. Clearly, the private lands located within and adjacent to the national park are some of the most important in all of Teton County. As the NRO boundary is expanded to include these lands, the county should develop standards that provide adequate protection and, in some cases, a plan for permanent protection through conservation easement or acquisition. . We also would like to voice our concern that strategies outlined in the Draft Comprehensive plan which promote increase residential development in the Westbank district may fail to meet the priority of promoting stewardship of wildlife and natural resources in this district to the degree of the principles of Theme 1. Protection of wildlife and open space has consistently been identified as the highest priority of the citizens of this community and to GYC. Our primary concern is that increase in growth of the Wilson node will put undue pressures upon our current

Date

Name

Comment

transportation system and increase pressures on Grand Teton National Park (GTNP). These strategies would likely result in an increase of traffic volume along the sensitive Moose-Wilson Rd, and a decrease in park visitor experience in southern GTNP, specifically at the Lawrence S. Rockefeller preserve. The planned redesign of HWY 390, will only lead to increase in disturbance to sensitive habitat and unnecessary pressure on an already less than perfect road system. We feel that the redesign and improvement of HWY 390 would likely result in a perceived need to "improve" the Moose-Wilson Rd. We are opposed to improvements of the Moose-Wilson road within the park that would include widening, paving, straightening, or would otherwise increase traffic volume, creating a myriad of impacts to sensitive wildlife habitat. This area has important scenic and wildlife values and lies in a crucial migration corridor and wetland that is used by wildlife.

GYC believes the County should incorporate the future expansion of the mass transit system between the GTNP and the Town of Jackson and Teton Village, within the "Potential Transportation Network Projects." A partnership between GTNP and the Southern Teton Area Rapid Transit (START) could benefit both entities. We encourage the County to consult with GTNP and START to explore what a partnership could look like in this plan. Reducing single occupancy vehicle trips by Park visitors and Park staff with the option of START buses between the nodes of the Town of Jackson via HWY 26/89/191 and Wilson/Teton Village via Moose Wilson Rd should be detailed in the transportation and modeling plan. Reducing these vehicles can help the County achieve its goals of reducing negative impacts on the rural character, conservation of wildlife and natural resources, and limiting energy consumption in the Valley. Our comments are focused primarily upon the real and potential impacts to GTNP that the Draft Comprehensive Plan may create. We encourage the County to continue to work collaboratively with the Park in creating this visionary document. We hope to continue to engage in the development of the regulatory framework that will define this vision. Off final note, the valley of Jackson Hole and the surrounding public lands are a national treasure and vital to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. The decisions you make in planning future growth and development have consequence for not only the wildlife and residents that make this place home, but to the millions of visitors that choose to recreate and visit Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Park's. We hope that Teton County can find a balance in sustainable growth and promoting the values of wildlife and natural resources.

Thank you for considering these comments,
Respectfully,
Chris Colligan

6/19/2009 Ress, Sandy
Interested Public

I'm writing to support your vote and say I think you did the right thing in sending the Plan back to the planners (not because I oppose the Plan, which I mostly do) but because it is not your job to rewrite the Plan.

6/18/2009 Jorgensen, Jean
Interested Public

Here is why I support the Planning and Zoning Recommendation and hope that you are listening: the people do not support the Plan as it is being presented. Not long ago I re-visited an area of Switzerland that I had been to nearly 50 years ago and was pleased and frankly surprised to find that it looked much the same as it had then: beautiful open farm land and small villages. The people there had resisted "growth for the sake of growth" and the special flavor of their region was still alive and well. I ask you to be bold and act to save and protect what we love about this valley. If you're not convinced, please take an hour from your busy lives, go to the National Museum of Wildlife Art, and read every word in the LORAX display. Then maybe you will understand. Our children and grandchildren and the visitors of the future will thank you for having the vision to step up to protect what is special about this place.

Date	Name	Comment
6/18/2009	Bowers, David Interested Public	Please allow this attempt of another comp plan to go back to the planning stage. The process is practically a joke whereby the county commissioners have only heard, but not listened to, the overwhelming public input. Consider writing into your plan that town councilmen and county commissioners do not retain ultimate power to grant exceptions and variances to every developer that asks for special privileges. The past twenty years have proven that these plans have little to no real value and no substance or backbone when it comes to the power of financial persuasion (what some refer to as "economic vitality" and various other catchphrases). We have a plan in place with intent to help preserve Jackson Hole and curtail some growth; it has rarely been adhered to.
6/18/2009	Barash, Jean Interested Public	Dear Forrest: Thanks for listening to the public and its concerns regarding the proposed Comp Plan draft. We were out of town last week, attending our grandson's high school graduation, and couldn't attend the Joint Planning Staff meeting. Had we been there, our comments would have echoed the concerns of most of the attendees. Thank you for your vote - recommending that this draft be sent back to the planning staff. I think the entire Plan should be scrapped. Using 15 year old NRO maps flawed its credibility from the outset. The Community repeatedly said that preserving wildlife and open spaces was its top priority. The Planning Department's marginalization of using the most current maps made it clear (from the very beginning), that the Planning Department had a very different list of priorities than those stated by the Community. Their willingness to use out of date information also indicates a lack of professionalism that I found disturbing and disappointing. Jackson Hole deserves better. I'm in the process of writing a letter to the Commissioners supporting the Planning Commission vote. Thanks, again, for all your time and effort on behalf of our Valley.
6/17/2009	Whitcomb, Michael Interested Public	Thanks for stepping up to the plate for your community. The Planning Commission's role is to refine the Draft once it is largely supported by the community. Since that support is lacking and a substantial re-write is necessary, Planning Staff should be required to re-write the document so that it reflects public sentiment. Once we have met that criteria, then it will be your turn.
6/17/2009	Elser, Ray Interested Public	I hadn't come here tonight with the intent to speak, but I will feel inclined to chime in, especially when....I guess I'd ask the question of all of you up here, at any point in time, did you have any conversations with the Planning Commission from Teton County, in terms of their action? Because you need to recall one thing. They ain't driving the bus here, and I think...and what you're hearing tonight...and I don't say this out of being divisive and not working in concert with them, but you have work you could be doing within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Town that I think you would be doing a disservice to say, let's just kick it to the curb and not do anything until Staff comes back. I think there's a lot of work you can be doing. I think it would be a disservice...it doesn't mean that you can't bring your timelines back together later on for overall approval, but I don't think you're doing anybody any service kicking it to the curb, waiting for them to do whatever they want to do. And this has always been, historically, you know, having been in your seat, when we've had these joint...you have joint Planning Commission meetings and instead of saying, oh, well, you're all sitting up here, and then, oh, you can't vote on this portion, they get to vote on that, and then you get to vote and you try, as you're sending something up, let's remember, you're recommending body to the electeds. But I've got to tell you, this discussion tonight bothers me that people think that you should somehow be subservient to whatever the County board did. I might be more open to that if there had been something done in concert where you had met with your cohorts at the County and said, we're uncomfortable with these things, we think we need to go back and talk to Staff about how we want to go forward. And I really think you all were done a disservice by them by doing what they did, because you all have done a lot of hard work, and I think getting put in this position, is rather unfortunate. Thank you.
6/17/2009	, Interested Public	We the undersigned, as citizens of Teton County, expect that the comprehensive plan will be revised to reflect the following: wildlife and open spaces, values this community has cherished for decades, will be reinstated as the Community's top priority and become the organizing theme of the entire plan. To preserve these values and our Small Town Character we will not support any plan which doubles residential and commercial development. {submitted as a petition, signed by many; hard copy available at Teton County Planning Department}

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Whitcomb, Michael Interested Public	I applaud the Planning Commission's vote to reject the Draft. It was a tough decision to take, but the correct one. Let me explain. All of you have been exposed to the public's reaction to the Draft through open meetings, letters or one-on-ones. While some may want to dismiss the input for various reasons, resistance to the Draft as written will not go away until major revisions are made. The Draft has been sold as an "update" to the 1994 Plan. It is not. Fundamental changes to our Community Vision were made and Theme 1 was demoted in many districts to provide for 'human needs'. Discussion of build out population by district is deliberately discouraged and the consequences of growth not assessed. Lacking any assessment of outcomes (traffic, tax burden etc) what we have is a forecast, not a plan. Please read the ad run by Planning Staff in the News and Guide on Wednesday, October 15, 2008. In that ad Staff implies they heard what the public said and would be responding. They may have heard us, but they did not heed us. Given the magnitude of the re-write it is appropriate to send the task back to Planning Staff. Ask them to re-read what they published on October 15, 2008 and set an expectation that it is their job to gain public support for the Draft. Once the public is behind the Draft, it will be ready for the Planning Commission's scrutiny.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, JH Community Housing	Community Vision The Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust supports the delicate balance articulated by the Vision Statement of the proposed Comprehensive Plan: Preserve and protect the area’s ecosystem and natural resources and meet the community’s human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner. We recommend adding a theme to the Comprehensive Plan that speaks directly to, and is supportive of the second half of the Vision Statement: Ensure the Health, Safety and Welfare Needs of the Community are Fulfilled. With this addition, Theme 1, with a new Theme 2, can better provide the community with clear guidance to work through the complex and interrelated challenges facing our community. These two themes should be awarded equal importance in the umbrella Vision Chapter of the proposed Comprehensive Plan. The current themes Two (Manage Growth Responsibly) through Seven (Provide Quality Community Services, Infrastructure and Facilities) should be reorganized as sub-themes of the new proposed theme Two. The prioritization of each of the eight themes would be noted in each of the districts in the Future Land Use Map according to the natural resource values found in each district. In addition, we support the concept of Regionalism that has been introduced into the proposed Comprehensive Plan. Theme 4 Statement of Ideal The proposed wording of the Statement of Ideal seems to unnecessarily pit community against one of the primary economic engines in our community. We support the essence of the Statement of Ideal for Theme 4, though we believe it would benefit from some clarification: “Remain a Community by ensuring that at least 65% of the people working in Teton County, Wyoming live in Teton County, Wyoming”. 65% Workforce Housing Goal We agree that it will help our community maintain social diversity and economic stability by striving to ensure 65% of our workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming. A 65% goal will provide a tool to measure the ability of our working community to access housing. This goal acknowledges the fact that some in our workforce will always choose to live in certain areas based on lifestyle preference. A More Inclusive Term: Community Housing JHCHT recommends the Comp Plan embrace a new term: Community Housing. Community Housing would include all housing occupied by people working in Teton County, Wyoming regardless of whether the unit is restricted or not. Community Housing would include free market housing, permanently restricted ownership housing, employment-based housing as well as rental housing. It includes subsidized and non-subsidized housing. It includes full-time persons and seasonal persons earning their living in Teton County, Wyoming. Community Housing would include retirees, people with special needs, stay-at-home parents, and caregivers who are not paid employees but nonetheless make a significant and meaningful contribution to our community. This number is inclusive of all primary residents of our community. Note: The Plan should address our community’s need to address inadequate and substandard housing. Theme 4 Introduction: Why is this theme addressed? We believe it would help promote understanding of Community Housing if a brief paragraph could summarize the current housing landscape including the primary programs that have enabled our community to create affordable housing to date and the percent of our workforce currently living in Teton County, Wyoming. It is our understanding that the combination of programs and policies in place to date have effectively resulted in 65% of people working in Teton County living in Teton County. Principle 4.1: Housing for Diverse Population Policy 4.1.a: Policy 4.1.a titled “House all members of the community” fits nicely with the term Community Housing. It includes and accounts for every primary resident of Teton County, Wyoming irrespective of their employment status. Policy 4.1.b: This Policy, titled “Set strategic targets for restricted housing opportunities” is the appropriate place to define Workforce Housing. In addition, Habitat for Humanity should be included as an entity that will work with TCHA and JHCHT to provide elected officials with valuable information to

establish strategic targets (categories and criteria) for permanently restricted housing opportunities.

Policy 4.1.d: This Policy should identify the full spectrum of housing:

- Non-subsidy (free market) and subsidized housing (permanent, restricted ownership housing and rental housing which generally responds to seasonal demand); and
- Single family detached, duplex, townhomes, condominiums, and multi-family.

Policy 4.1.e: JHCHT agrees with this statement. In addition, we believe there is an overriding responsibility to minimize impacts on our neighboring national parks.

Principle 4.2: Requirements for Workforce Housing

Policy 4.2.a: This policy would benefit by clarifying the partners that will work with the Town and County: TCHA, JHCHT, and HFH. All will work together to update requirements for restricted workforce housing in residential developments (and non-residential developments where appropriate). To ensure the policy's objective: ensure the program is fair and understandable, JHCHT recommends adding an action item to Strategy 4.3: Create a task force to support the efforts of the Town, County, TCHA, JHCHT and HFH to update the requirements for workforce housing. The taskforce should include the lending and development community as well as major landowners. This task force would help expand understanding of and appreciation for the challenges inherent in meeting the community's housing needs. We recommend that this task force review and update the requirements every five years.

Policy 4.2b: We believe annual monitoring of indicators noted at the end of Theme 4 will help our community measure the extent to which rental housing is lost through redevelopment. It may be most appropriate to refine the policy goal for 4.2.b: Results generated from the careful monitoring of redevelopment and residential turnover should be used to guide the creation of requirements and incentives designed to minimize the net loss of workforce housing.

Principle 4.3: Preservation of Workforce Housing

Policies 4.3.a and 4.3.b that support Principle 4.3 are based on the premise that it is most efficient to restrict existing market units (vs. build new restricted units). This is a strong and general statement that does not take into consideration the financial expense of this initiative nor does it account for the liability that could accrue to Town and County governments (tax payers). While we support language that encourages cautious pursuit of this strategy, we do not believe it should be given the weight it is given in the Comp Plan. We believe it would be most appropriate to eliminate Principle 4.3 and Policies 4.3.a and 4.3.b and relocate the concept as a strategy to be explored under Strategy 4.2. In addition, this strategy should flag that while the concept has potential to be a community sensitive strategy, the benefits of the strategy must be thoughtfully and cautiously considered and balanced against the potential cost and long term liability to the tax payers.

Principle 4.4: Construction of Workforce Housing

We recommend the introduction to this principle be simplified to read: The community will continue to provide incentives for the construction of restricted workforce housing. Given the evolving definition of Workforce Housing, the Comprehensive Plan should clarify that density allowances should be considered in exchange for permanently resale restricted housing.

Strategies

Strategy 4.1: Establish a dedicated funding source for workforce housing

Strategy 4.1 should be as inclusive and broad reaching as possible. Specifically, strategy 4.1 should clarify that a dedicated funding source would allow local housing organizations to meet our community's housing needs. The second bullet should acknowledge that a statewide legislative strategy will be necessary to secure approval of a real estate transfer tax. The third bullet should recommend broad financial support of the work of THCA, JHCHT and HFH to meet our community's housing needs.

Strategy 4.2: Establish a Workforce Housing Action Plan

JHCHT strongly supports the idea of inviting a broad range of community voices to help THCA, JHCHT and HFH draft a comprehensive, coordinated 10-year Action plan to house 65% of our working community (Blue

Ribbon Panel). The goals and objectives of the Blue Ribbon Panel should be elaborated in Strategy 4.2.

Specifically, the Panel should:

- o Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of existing programs;
- o Review and assess the capacities as well the limiting factors facing program providers;
- o Work to understand the full spectrum of challenges and opportunities that could be an obstacle/resource as we work collaboratively to meet our community's housing needs;
- o Identify opportunities to enable public/private partnerships and pro-actively identify short and longterm funding sources;
- o Prioritize methods to meet our community's housing needs.

The Action Plan should be reevaluated every two years so it is accountable to changing economic conditions and demographics.

The first bullet should be amended to read: explore the costs and benefits of a program that would restrict existing workforce housing.

Strategy 4.3: Update LDR's and the Zoning Maps

TCHA, HFH, JHCHT and a Blue Ribbon Panel of developers, contractors, lenders etc. should participate in revising LDRs, Workforce Housing criteria, guidelines and methodology.

In addition, non-profit housing organizations that have been incorporated for a minimum two year period, whose charitable mission is to develop affordable housing, should be recognized as qualified, exempt providers of permanently restricted housing in the Comprehensive Plan and the LDRs. JHCHT, TCHA, and HFH's programs and tools, including selection and pricing policies, bring a variety of permanently restricted housing opportunities to members of our community. Each organization strives to serve a broad range of household income levels and offer a variety of housing options.

While we support the shift in the proposed Comprehensive Plan away from strict definitions toward a broader definition of Community and/or Workforce Housing, we should not lose sight of parameters that make housing affordable (i.e. permanent resale restrictions). The revision of the LDR's creates a unique opportunity to update policies and definitions so that the existing housing programs can better respond to the changing and evolving needs of our community. This will enable local housing organizations to serve a diverse range of household incomes in Teton County that cannot be met through the free market.

The LDRs should be updated to streamline and simplify the review process to enable affordable housing providers to build the highest quality units for the lowest possible price.

The Blue Ribbon Panel should consider moving away from HUD statistics (typically used to determine income eligibility) toward a set of income information that is more reflective of the reality of employees/households in Teton County, Wyoming.

Strategy 4.4: Increase Outreach and Educational Opportunities

Develop a strategy to communicate annually the results of measuring and monitoring the number of houses lost from the workforce, the number of permanently restricted units created, and the percentage of our workforce housed locally.

Future Land Use Map

Many districts in the FLUP have multiple land use classifications in one district. In districts where there are two distinctly different land use types, it would help to reduce future conflict to be very explicit in the theme prioritization section of each district.

For example: District 15, East Jackson, identifies Responsible Growth as the most important theme. To mitigate future conflict, the first bullet and second bullet should be expanded as noted by the italics below:

- o Continue to support the stable low density residential pattern of development in the Single Family Low zone.
- o Consider additional activities and incentives to enhance characteristics of a mixed-use neighborhood, including local convenience retail and workforce housing in the Single Family Mixed zone.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	May, Mike Interested Public	As the commission and staff grind thru the comp plan process I thought this interesting. Sent from a friend and good to know that other communities are going thru similar things. http://planwithus.blogspot.com/ I found the approach to review in the 5th paragraph interesting. Seems like it might help? Please pass along to the powers that be.
6/17/2009	Jorgensen, Arne Interested Public	First I would like to offer a couple of apologies: -I had hoped to get a more detailed note off before I left town. -I had tried to send an email earlier yesterday morning but did not get an indication that it went through. If the earlier email was successful, I am sorry to be sending a similar repeated note. As I know you are, I am quite concerned with the action of the County Planning Commission last week. As with any difficult planning effort, a successful process is built on trust – I feel strongly that this trust has been violated. The current draft document has been available for public comment based on a published schedule that included a range of opportunities for input. The schedule indicated a series of public hearings; these hearings, and the comment opportunities they provide, are certainly equally important to the written comments that have been received to date. Yet with the action last week, significant comments now may not be able to be weighed. From my standpoint, it appears that the well orchestrated efforts of a few to generate a large amount of written comment may have unduly limited the opportunity of others to weigh in on the current Comp Plan document. There will obviously be delays in a complicated Comp Plan process. While I have been somewhat skeptical of the scheduled goal, I have been supportive of the notion to move forward. Any considerations of the challenges and decisions about impacts on the schedule should take place at strategic points that allow for comment opportunities. This has not been the case with this action. I am not smart enough to suggest a way forward, but I trust that you will be able find a way to continue this process in a manner that allows for the timely consideration of the Comp Plan by both the Town and County that is somewhat similar to the past expectations. On a separate but related note, I am most concerned with the rather harsh, sometimes insulting and demeaning language that seems to be driving much of the community discussion around the Comp Plan. Hopefully I am not adding to that as I would expect more from this community. Thank you so much for the work that you do for our community.
6/17/2009	Bruner, Kristy Interested Public	Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment, and thanks for your work on this document. I know it's going to require a little...we are going to be presenting a number of specific suggestions in the future, for future discussions interview, but tonight I just want to focus on one larger picture issue which, in our minds, is directly linked to the intro and the vision as a joint process. We want to preface that we respect the hard work of the planners and the challenges placed upon them to balance a number of community goals, objectives and input. We recognize it's not an easy, black and white process for anyone. We also respect that a public review process is part of Planning Commission hearings as a critical component to move forward with but, that said, we don't see anything wrong with taking a pause to ensure that this hearing process is more effective in the long run. As a result of that, we appreciate the message and the action taken by Commissioners Wall, McCarthy, and Hamilton to enable some reworking prior to entering an aggressive timeline for public review. And as we have discussed suggestions for how best to move forward, we really think it's important, and I want to encourage you to keep into perspective why the need for that action, possibly why it occurred. We think that the complexity of this process has been compounded by the fact that this draft truly does represent a total overhaul and total rewrite of the existing Plan. And because of the extent of this change, and the departure from the initial objectives of this process, which truly was to update the '94 Plan, we see that this process has necessarily shifted and that we need to respond accordingly. We respect the County Planning Commissioners for what was likely a very difficult decision on them to recognize that a hearing-based review of this draft was not yet workable or feasible. We didn't view this action as trying to stop the process, but simply sending the message that a planning document of this level of importance should be at a more near-complete form before it goes through Planning Commission hearings and it should be more representative of community will. So, with that, just the request that, given the County Commissioners' vote to remand this draft to Staff, we recommend that the Town Planning Commission have a discussion on that same motion and consider taking the same action. We feel that this would uphold the joint process and increase the potential for the best possible outcome, which is a public review process. They'll ultimately be more effective, and ultimately a Plan that truly represents the citizens of Jackson Hole. Thanks....Kristy Bruner. Just one other comment, just specific to theme II. As someone who voted in the surveys...I'm speaking, I guess, as an individual...I would give a lot of thought for how differently managing growth responsibly that concept has changed throughout this process. If you look at the objectives and the meaning of managing growth responsibly and what it meant when people voted on it as the second highest priority, it means something very, very different than it means now, and that is of major concern, particularly given that it's a leading priority in 13 of 25 of our districts. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Ewing, Patty and Frank Interested Public	The vote to reject the draft comprehensive plan was a surprise to everyone. The draft does not provide any assessment of the impact of the commercial and residential numbers it proposes on the community's resources. When the first conversations of revisiting the 1994 plan were being held, it seemed a prudent path to take, considering the changes that have already taken place in the valley. It would be a chance to reassess the priorities of the community, which it turns out, based on all the surveys, public meetings, comments simply reaffirmed the recognition that wildlife and open space remains the overriding community vision, and set Jackson Hole apart from other communities and resorts. Considering the draft as proposed, this primary public concern was in large part ignored. It is clear the "growth nodes" effectively double the densities, both commercially and residentially, thus creating the need for more workforce housing; solutions to already existing traffic problems; impact on utilities such as water and sewer; more schools, teachers and staff; law enforcement; and all social services. All result in higher taxes and a reduction in our quality of life. Therefore, thank you for the decision to reject the draft comprehensive plan.
6/17/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armand Acri representing Saving Historic Jackson Hole. Observations primarily on the vision. Obviously, a lot of controversy here. Trying to understand that. I've been doing a little research and looking. And Fremont County, Idaho, just completed their Comprehensive Plan. They've been on about the same schedule as us. They've gone through...this is their third one, I think, and this is our third one, depending on who you count. They've been about two years ahead of us all along. And one of the things I found interesting is that's the Fremont County, Idaho, Comprehensive Plan; that's our Comprehensive Plan. Their vision statement's two pages long; our vision statement is around 16 pages. Their future land- use plan map is one page. It's pretty much at the landscape level; ours is much more detailed, pretty much looks at it not quite parcel by parcel, but pretty close. And I guess I ask myself why the big difference there? You know, because we actually share, if you read their Comprehensive Plan, some common issues. They have a large amount of public land. Granted, not as much as us, but still a significant portion. The majority of it is public land. Rural sprawl is a concern for them just as it is for us. Wildlife and open spaces is a concern and, not coincidentally, affordable housing is also an issue there. So, we share some common concerns with them. So I started asking myself why is that big difference there? Are our issues that much more complex? And I think the conclusion that I come to is the Fremont County Plan documents the vision of the citizens, and this Plan really has a lot of stuff in there in an attempt to sell a vision to the citizens. And that's where I think a lot of the controversy comes from, is that it still doesn't represent accurately the vision of the citizens. So, I think what we need is a simpler document that more accurately reflects what's going on, and then we don't need all this other additional stuff to sell things. It should be a simple statement. And I think if we try and boil this down, it's going to take a long time. We're all willing to do that, but we need to recognize that going through and trying to simplify this down rather than...I recognize the attempt was to try and make things more predictable and, I think, correct the problem from before, but I think what we've done now is complicated it so much it causes problems of its own. So, that would be our recommendation, is that we take as long as it takes to get it down simpler. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	Steve Harrington, I live on Hanson Street. As I sat last week at the meeting and listened to all the comments and what I've read in the paper and so forth from the public, the major concern seems to be wildlife. And you set that out as one of the top priorities in terms of the governing of the entire plan. And as I understand the Plan, in the future, once the Plan is adopted and yourselves or the elected officials are asked to vote on some project, they have to somehow filter that project through a wildlife tool, and I don't see how, at this point, at least, you have anything in the Plan or the prospect of making decisions regarding nodes or population areas or roads or anything else, that when you make that decision that you have any ability to determine whether it will have an effect on wildlife or not. And to me, if...and maybe it can't be done. I'm not saying you have to do it. But I think somewhere along the way, before you start making decisions about, you know, a thousand more houses here, or 500 more houses there, or wherever, you have to get some advice from experts in wildlife, whether it's the Game & Fish or Fish & Wildlife Service, or whomever it might be, to tell you what the practicality is of having anything in any place in the County and what effect it will have on wildlife. I mean, you may eliminate a whole node, for example, because it's impossible to maintain whatever wildlife situation is there now, if you are going to add X number of houses. And as part of that, I would hope that if you put together a committee...I hate committees but, nevertheless, you know, they have their place...if you did that, that you would not only invite some experts on wildlife in the community...and I think we've had a long knowledge of wildlife from a professional standpoint...but you would also put on that committee the most vocal citizens who are advocates for wildlife. Because if at some point in time it becomes obvious that wildlife can't be the most important thing in that area, or you can't do what you want to do because of the wildlife situation, then somebody besides a government-appointed group making that decision...you know, there's always the conspiracy theory out there that you guys are...you know, whatever's happening...so you have to have some really concerned citizens in that group. Because I don't know, you know, to me, you will hear comments, well, the deer are grazing in my backyard, well, they eat my flowers on Hanson Street. But that doesn't mean in the wintertime...that's because they have no place else to go. And the problem is when you make a decision about growth in any particular area, it may be five years before you know what effect it had on wildlife, and then the cow's out of the barn. So, somehow or other I think that before you get too far down this trail, that you put together some expert opinion about these various areas of the County that you want to have the potential for development or additional growth, and filter that through that wildlife filter, because I think that would be very helpful, and I think it would calm a lot of the public sentiment that's out there where people are getting really exercised about this whole wildlife matter. And the Plan is just going down this trail, you know, without really taking the time to consider the effects of what happens, especially in that wildlife component of the Plan. So, anyway, thank you very much.
6/17/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	I'm not going to say much...Gregory Griffith. I liked to echo Commissioner Duncker's assertion, and also Kristy Bruner's. I'd really like to see you take a vote, take a stand one way or the other. I think that would be helpful for the community. In closing, I'd like to say both Planning Directors shouldn't have to sell us our own plan. That's hard. I mean, you know, we shouldn't have to be sold our own plan. So, thanks.
6/17/2009	Kummer, Larry Interested Public	I don't know why any of you are surprised or upset with the motion made by your County Planning Commission. It is a necessary part of the process (debate and vetting) in the creation of this most important document. There nothing mysterious or difficult to understand about this recommendation. Tony, Forrest and Larry are paying attention. They have listened to the public's comments; they have read their e-mail; they have seen the surveys. If there's any mystery involved here, it is this: They seem to be alone, amongst our town and county's elected officials, their planning commissions, or their staffs, who are paying attention to this mass of public opinion and input . . . or this fact: The majority of residents in Jackson Hole . . . those who don't stand to benefit directly, economically . . . they don't want this level of growth. I urge you all to read, and reread, Forrest McCarthy's interview and comments in today's News & Guide, along with the writer's (Cara Froedge) description of the numbers the draft plan allows for Wilson, the Aspens, South Park and the Town of Jackson. It's all there in black and white. It's horrifying. Forrest is right on: this is a plan suited to urbanization and promotes continued growth – which is diametrically opposed to open space, scenic and wildlife values.
6/17/2009	Callahan, Mary Lynn Interested Public	I'm Mary Lynn Callahan. I'm a Town resident and also a business owner in Town, and you've already received my e-mail comments and comments at the last County meeting last week, but there's two other things I wanted to state, and one being in Town these wildlife corridors, like, for instance, Karns Meadow, which I live right next to, that it really needs to be left as it is. A lot of animals use that corridor, and I'm hoping that they need that area to move across the Valley instead of just north and south in this Valley. And then the last thing I want to do is just encourage this Planning Commission to support the County's Planning Commission in their motion that they made last week, because I agree with it and would hope that you would support them. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Halpin, Pete Interested Public	Thank you. My name is Pete Halpen, and my wife and I and adult children have property at 565 Trails End in Indian Trails and we also have property in Teton County. So, we have both property in the Town and in the County. And I believe my comments are reasonably connected to the themes. So, it's a hard act to follow, the specificity, of the previous speaker, but I did speak at the previous County meeting, and I appreciated the opportunity to do so at that time. I am opposed to the Tribal Trails Connector. So this is a completely single-issue discussion, and I spoke against it at the previous meeting last week. Just a little bit of background, again speaking from my knowledge of the Connector and its antecedents, there was a time when it was a great idea to have bypasses around towns, and a lot of towns in America have them, and the State planned for that. There was a bypass planned, which would run up the Gulch, and over time, of course, that's morphed. And there was a time also when, theoretically, and on the County Plan there could be up to 1250 units of housing between the two hills north of Wells Hill, up to the Wilson Road and through the Indian Springs development. Of course, that evaporated, but the Connector stayed on the Plan. And I didn't like the Connector back then and I still don't like it. And obviously being in my front yard or back yard, I like it less than most. In terms of...if I could just go through a couple points, and then I'll follow up later with a letter or more appropriate means of communication, but in terms of the alternatives, which is really what this is about, since the Connector has been in the Staff documents, it's been identified as a solution to Y-intersection traffic. I think that's a very relative thing. I think that one of the beauties of the County in preserving the nature of the community and habitat and for planning purposes have been the fact we've been able to channel traffic as much as we have into as few arterials as we do. And putting a parallel, high-speed—it's all relative again, high speed to us and certainly in our neighborhood through that area—is going to be, of course, permanently disruptive. And just to go through a laundry list of some of those damages, which I think would be quite severe to the neighborhood, obviously disruption to the neighborhood and wildlife, safety hazards, permanent noise, speeding traffic, reduction of property values and also damaging valuable view corridor that homes in Indian Trails have westward across the current Tribal Trails Road. And I certainly recommend to you that there are any number of standard conventional engineering solutions to the Y- intersection, and that the kind of money that would be contemplated being spent on the Connector could easily be appropriated in a different direction, including going to the State and getting that kind of support. And I might also add that the additional cost on road modification includes a major change in the Indian Springs access that was contemplated in the original zoning for Indian Springs. But if you talk to people...and I was in a meeting maybe a year or so ago...I heard some language, oh, it's going to cost a couple hundred thousand dollars to move that road. I would argue that the actual cost of moving that access over to connect down in what are wetlands may be more than the entire cost of improving the Y- intersection. That's before you spend money on the Connector. So these are very real things to the neighborhood and to people in Indian Springs on both sides of the creek. It's pretty obvious that the Connector is going to cut across major open space, which connects the mountains, and anyone who lives in that area sees the wildlife moving through there all the time. And of course there's significant current agriculture use there, traditional agricultural use, that would be disrupted. So, in terms of looking at the impacts, I would argue that the Connector should be removed and that instead you should appropriate the money and other planning resources toward the Y-intersection improvements, and I think that'd be a good investment. And it's much more consistent with the overall long-term values of the County and the Town to do that. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Woods, Becky Interested Public	I know it's a lot of time, and you guys are going to be in the political hot seat. Ultimately, we all want what we feel is best for the community. There may be some disagreement in that, but I wanted to thank you for your time. I also wanted you, if you continue this meeting, which I think you're going to, to also allow public comment and a continuance. I think perhaps there's a lot of people not from the County here because there was such uncertainty with what was happening in the process. So, I would ask you to please keep the opportunity for public comment on these particular themes and policies in the continuance, and not just discussion amongst yourselves because of that uncertainty. Okay, jumping right in, Policy 1.1(c), conserve large, contiguous and connected open spaces. It specifically states in the draft that that is necessary for habitat protection. It's valuable for wildlife and connectivity between crucial areas. My problem with that, one of the largest open spaces is South Park. The way the draft is currently written, it's basically develop it north to south with no preservation of open spaces. That defeats one of the main themes and priorities that our community values, which is both wildlife habitat and the scenic character of Jackson Hole. So, South Park as really...that language and visioning is not in line with that theme and policy. If you want to protect wildlife and conserve open spaces, the language of north/south development of South Park has got to be addressed, or you're going to defeat that purpose under Policy 1.1(c). So very important. Same thing under Policy 1.6(a), conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County. Again, that comes down to our scenic character, our Western historic character, and also allowing the opportunity for Land Trust to come in and permanently conserve large tracts of land. South Park is not mentioned. That is one of the largest tracts of land. You go into Alta, Buffalo Valley, and Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and South Fall Park Road. It was one of the first areas mentioned in the vision of the 1994 Comp Plan. I don't know why it disappeared in this draft. It's got to go back in, under Policy 1.6(a), again, for our scenic values, for our historic value of our community, and for wildlife. It's a mystery to me as to why that just disappeared. It doesn't seem to be in line with any of the surveys that have come out and what the community sees for its vision. Under Strategies, page 25, Strategy 1.1, it says, establish an environmental Commission, and they said it will be appointed by a volunteer committee of scientists. I urge the Planning Commissions to expand that to interested community leaders and neighborhood leaders, who have been working triple time on this, who have analyzed this line by line, who may have a different take on just someone with a strictly scientific background. I think that needs to be broader-based. It's simply too important to our community. Same thing under Strategy 1.2 when it says, the mapping would be with the Wyoming Game & Fish data. I think there's also very valuable citizen data that has been collected from people who actually live in our various communities that needs to be addressed. So, I would expand that to beyond just Wyoming Game & Fish, but to use all available credible data to do the mapping of our wildlife, etcetera. And last, just kind of a general comment that really does fit in with these themes and policies, and it's going to come up again and again. South Park is not a node. South Park is an area. It's over 2500 acres and it's the only node that has not been defined. If you're going to identify South Park as a node, that needs a hard edge, whatever it's going to be, a quarter-mile pass, the South Park Road or whatever. It can't be this amorphous South Park. Every other area has very specific boundaries identified with it. I don't know why South Park doesn't have it. I really recommend that that be addressed by the Planning Commission so these other themes and policies have a ghost of a chance of becoming reality. Thanks for your time...I'm still Becky Woods, and this is directly related to the themes and policies, actually. One of the problems I'm really having when I go through this draft and see the different themes and policies, which takes precedent? What's our overall community vision? It seems to me we're parsing off the Valley and saying, well, this is the area that gets the housing and this is the area that gets the wildlife, and this is the area that gets to have a nice view. And that's not how any of us feel who live here. We are all integrated, and we're one. And what I have a real problem with these themes and policies is there's no one integrating vision. And in think without one integrating vision, we stand the very real risk of destroying the Valley we love. I just have a problem with themes and policies. What I'm looking for in a Comprehensive Plan is a vision. I think we had it in 1994. I don't think we have it in the draft of 2009.
6/17/2009	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	Paul Duncker, a resident of Wilson, Wyoming. The way I understood this whole process and how the interrelationship of the Town Planning Commission and the County Planning Commission were going to work...because I asked this exact question to my County Commissioners at a meeting that I was present at. I said, well, how's it going to work when one board with 12 members and another board with five members have to come up with a joint recommendation? And it was explained to me that the Town Planning Commission has one vote on a particular motion; the County Planning Commission has one vote on a particular motion and, in order for that recommendation to get past forward to the County Commissioners, each board would have to vote in favor of doing that. So, if there wasn't a unanimous agreement between the two halves of the Joint Planning Commission, a resolution would not be made to the County Commissioners. That's my understanding of how this works. So, I've got a request to make. I would request that this board vote on the same issue that the County Planning Commission voted on at the last meeting, which is rejecting this Plan and sending back to Staff for a do-over. You can vote, obviously, however you like on this. But if this board did not pass forward the same recommendation to send this Plan back to Staff for a do-over, as far as I understand the process, that resolution would never get made to the County Commissioners. If both boards are not unanimously in agreement, then that doesn't go forward and both boards are then still reviewing the same Plan that's on the table in front of us. So, that's all I have to say. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Good evening. My name is Kathy Tompkins. I'm from Cottonwood Park. I agree with Becky that South Park needs more definition and not to just throw it away, defining it as a node. It sounds like something you'd find in your armpit. And I just have some observations that I made the other day and today, and it has to do with Policy 1.1(b) and, first of all, I want to make sure...this is unclear to me. When it says here, local state and federal governments must work with local biologists to create and keep current a baseline inventory of habitat wildlife and climate. And I am relating this to South Park. There is no inventory right now, as I'm understanding it. So, before anything is done, there has to be some kind of impact study done to clarify what we have in South Park, which South Park's neighbors can pretty much tell you. And then the other thing that this, I think, relates to is the up-zoning of up to 1500 units in South Park along High School Road and down to...I don't know if you've been along South Park Loop Road down to the nursery. I think that's about three-quarters of a mile down. It used to be a half a mile; they kind of stuck that quarter mile in there...extra quarter mile. With the up-zoning with up to that many units and that much upkeep of that many units and the land that goes with these units, walking around my neighborhood and observing landscape companies coming around with their machines to spray lawns, to spray trees, to spread fertilizer, and especially these last few weeks with all the runoff we've had from the rain. And I was standing out there this morning with my cup of coffee and watching the water run down the street and empty into wherever else, and usually it's into those ditches and the wet areas in South Park so, you know, down along High School Road. We know pretty much where that goes, but do we know where the runoff from the up-zoning of 1500 units in the northwest corner crammed into that northwest corner, what will happen to Fall Creek and the wetland areas around there? When you have commercial fertilizing, pesticides, herbicide programs going on, private and public, and you know that private aren't always so good at reading directions, and a lot people do it on their own because they can't afford the companies to do it for them. So, I'm wondering if anybody is going to look into this and see where all this stuff is going to wind up. I have a pretty clear idea where it's going to wind up, and this is one of the many things that happens when you create a whole new neighborhood where there is no infrastructure, there's no studies done or anything like that. And just to remind you that from Cottonwood all the way down to the tip of South Park, there's about 1500 homes, give or take a hundred or so. And then to put 1500 units in that little northwest corner, that's a lot of concentration of chemicals and what we don't know that's going to wind up in the system. So, just a little food for thought.
6/16/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	At last Thursday's meeting on the Comprehensive Plan draft I was heartened to hear so many eloquent statements in support of the most important values in Jackson Hole: wildlife and scenic resources. Almost unanimously, the people who spoke share my opinion of the draft plan—that it's deeply flawed and does not reflect the clearly stated priorities of the public, as expressed in public meetings, letters, emails, a petition, phone and internet surveys, comments on the County's website, and letters to the editor. Although various attempts have been made to dismiss and discredit the genuine concerns of a large portion of people who have commented on the plan, we are not some group of flaky outliers who just don't get it. We've read the plan, tried to make sense of the maps, and participated in the process in good faith. Many of us have lived in Jackson Hole for decades, and have worked over the years to protect this place we love. We don't understand why the draft Comprehensive Plan, supposedly written with public comments and concerns in mind, is so far from what the community asked for. It's a plan for the destruction of Jackson Hole, a plan for diminished wildlife and fragmented habitat, a plan to turn Jackson into yet another frenetic, overcrowded, overbuilt mess like many other American towns. Have you read the comments on the County's website? Have you listened to the public comments at the meetings? Have you read the letters to the editor? People hate this plan, fear the future it will create, and resent the refusal of the planners to listen to public concerns. On Thursday evening, three planning commissioners demonstrated that they were listening, that they have been paying attention to this process, and that they take seriously their job of planning for the future of our valley. Tony Wall, Forrest McCarthy, and Larry Hamilton deserve kudos for their action Thursday night, recommending to the County Commission that this draft be sent back to the planning staff for serious revision. It's the right thing to do, and it took courage to step up and try to redirect such a seriously misguided plan. If any of you genuinely care about the future of Jackson Hole, then please follow this recommendation. We'll be a lot better off a year from now, a decade from now, thirty years from now, if we get it right, both in terms of process and substance—and both process and substance are deeply flawed right now. Please don't insist on ramming this plan through just because it's what the staff wrote and you have a schedule. This is too important to rush, and community discontent is too strong to ignore. If you think it's more important to stick to your schedule than to make sure the plan is sound, all of us will regret it down the road.

Date	Name	Comment
6/16/2009	Jorgensen Associates, P Interested Public	Dear Jeff, We are writing in support of your concerns regarding the June 11, 2009 County Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners that the draft Comprehensive Plan be remanded back to Planning Staff. The action of the Planning Commission did not fulfill their responsibility to provide specific recommendations on issues under their consideration; disallowed comment by members of the community who may have planned to attend meetings on the issue scheduled through July; and nullified the Town-County joint review process. There has been a great deal of public comment on the update to the Jackson -Teton County Comprehensive Plan. It is the job of the County Planning Commission to work jointly with the Town of Jackson to distill those comments, to weigh their validity, and make appropriate recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding modifications to the plan based on their understanding of the will of the public - as well as on good planning practice. Further, we strongly believe that there is urgency to completing the Comprehensive Plan update. An extended process will significantly increase expenditure of public time and funds, and will subject the community to additional extensions to the development moratorium.
6/16/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	Thank you for taking the courageous position you have taken, rejecting the current draft. I completely agree that the draft as written needs substantial rewriting before it can obtain the degree of public support necessary for successful implementation. I applaud what you done and hope this will lead to an outcome more compatible with the expressed wishes of the community.
6/16/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Congratulations on your courageous stand on the terrible first draft of the Comprehensive Master Plan. Please keep up the good work. Thank you, Tony, Larry, and Forrest.
6/15/2009	Hamilton, Larry Interested Public	1. The draft plan needs to be rewritten to incorporate the concerns and data that are a part of the public record. I do not believe that the Teton County Planning Commission has the expertise or the capability to rewrite or redraft the plan. What the Planning Commission does have the capability to do is identify what needs to be added to the plan, what needs to be deleted, what needs to be revised and what needs to be jointly considered by the town and county planning COMMISSIONS. 2. The joint meeting schedule with the town was not the preference of the County Planning Commission, yet it was scheduled anyway. 3. The County Planning Commission is concerned that the present process will neutralize or negate any input that is not approved by both commissions. The possibility of having two revised drafts (one from the town and one from the county) should be considered as an option. 4. The goal of the County Planning Commission is to have a draft plan that the community can support and embrace to begin a discussion of what is truly feasible and possible to implement in the next few years. The public comments and suggestions need to be incorporated into a new draft. 5. To reconsider "the motion to remand the plan back to the Teton County Planning Department for further revision" is probably not an option. The motion was made and approved by a 3 to 1 vote. I do not think that vote will change.
6/15/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Bravo! It takes a savvy, committed, intelligent group to realize that we do not live in anywhere USA and the livelihood of this valley is based upon the natural beauty that encompasses it. Thank you! The staff planners have been influenced and taught that bigger is better. Hopefully they will take this challenge to heart and realize that they possess the ability to do the right thing and be a model to other communities who are standing in the face of destroying what it took nature so long to build. Again thank you for taking the time to really get a handle on this problem.

Date	Name	Comment
6/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to thank the town and county planners and the town and county planning commissioners for the time consuming and sometimes thankless work all of you do. I know we don't agree on certain issues but I appreciate the time and effort all of you put in. I don't agree with Hank Phibbs that Thursday evening was a circus. It was an evening of concerned citizens who care about the future of Jackson. Thanks again. See you Wednesday for another round!
6/14/2009	Tank, Garry Interested Public	Thank you for reconsidering the comp plan and sending it back to reflect the views of the people.
6/14/2009	Coon, Dave Interested Public	Commissioners, I urge you to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and remand the comprehensive draft plan back to the planning staff for a rewrite. As a blueprint to guide the long term growth and development in Teton County, the draft plan in its current form does not meet the vision goals of the community because it allows considerably more residential and commercial build out than permitted in the 94 plan. Nix this extra growth and put "protecting wildlife" as the top theme in each district and you will have a plan worth reviewing.
6/13/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	Board of County Commissioners: It is my understanding that you have recommended that this Draft Comprehensive Plan be sent back to Planning Staff with the direction to rewrite it to better reflect public input. You have now given us a wonderful opportunity to get it right: listen to the citizens of this County and provide for less build-out, less commercial square footage, and considerations of open space and wildlife as the top priority in ALL themes! We hope it works!! Thank you all, once again!
6/13/2009	Lang, Peter Interested Public	Please see my specific comments on the inadequacy of Appendix K: Transportation. That Appendix should support the Potential Projects listing and discussion on page 64, but since it fails to do so, I find that projects section inadequate.
6/12/2009	Vajda, Tom and Julie M Interested Public	I can't tell you how much we appreciate your vote last night. Thank you for having the good sense and courage to go against this draft plan. Maybe now they will listen to the real stakeholders who only wish to be responsible stewards of this great place!
6/12/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	Dear County Planning Commission members, I very much appreciate your honest and straightforward action last night at the Comp Plan meeting. It's tempting to continue the pretense that the planning is going well and only a "fringe" of JH residents are unhappy. As the Mayor might say, just comments from the usual people. Folks have been "dismissed" for too long on this issue. They don't want an "urban" planning solution! Your telling the truth serves the people in a very constructive manner, something no one else has been willing to do. We've got the adult version of the Emperors New Clothes with this Comp Plan; it takes courage and honesty to blurt out the truth. You did it!

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Heilesen, Marv Interested Public	My name is Marv Heilesen and I live in the County in South Park. And my wife and I have written to the Commissions and to the other bodies here and I won't repeat that. But I just want to remark from the very outset of this, I've lived here for about four years. Born in Rexburg. Grandfather born in Freedom. Practiced law for 40 years in California. And represent developers. So, if I represent developers, I would like a lot of developers. I was a Planning Commissioner for seven years in a wonderful little city that drew the line and said we're going to be semi-rural, Lafayette, California. And you take real courage on the part of a body like yours to draw lines and say we're going to preserve what we have here. And low and behold all of the developers have now flocked to live in this little city, between Walnut Creek and Birchwood in that area in East Bay of San Francisco. So, really, you just really have to have a lot of courage sitting behind that desk to do the right thing. The thing that I think disturbed me most when I first got involved in seeing what was happening here is the euphemism being employed in this document by the Planning Staff. I'm not against planners. My wife has a master's in urban planning, and urban planner most of her life. But the big euphemism is node. Now, what the hell is a node? South Park is not a node. South Park is the same distance, one house per 35 acres, some development down there, a lot of wildlife, talk to the moose and ?? that live in my back yard during the winter. You know, you go wrong when you use terms like node as just an excuse for saying we're going to have high density in a given area. The same thing with managed growth. That seems to have gone to let's have growth. It's lost it's connotation, managing growth. I think we need to restrict growth along the lines a lot of the speakers have indicated today. And the last comment I really want to make before I run out of time is I've noticed a great difference between this year and last year in terms of employee needs. People are crying for employees, you know, two years ago and whatever and they couldn't get 'em and, you know, they had classified ads and <<inaudible>>. Now, when a lot of people, even in my neighborhood, have lost their jobs, put their houses on the market, it's radically different. So you've got to take that into account. I mean, we don't have the workforce it needs today, and then certainly if you can limit your commercial property development, we won't need that much in the future. But take that into account. Thank you very much.
6/11/2009	Porter, Thomas Interested Public	My name's Thomas Porter. I've been here for this is the year 43, on and off. I came here first in 1966/67. Coming over Teton Pass was awesome. You stand in front of the Virginian Lodge, you know, there's nothing south of the Virginian Lodge but fields, okay. So, now, I want to know now how many of you right here at these tables actually believe this Comp Plan is the real deal? And admit to it, and tell us that you admit to it. Cause I don't believe it for a second. It feels like you're forcing it down our throat. We have 3 percent available virgin dirt left in Jackson Hole. It's being pushed out. The first thing that happened was the sign on top of Teton Pass—welcome...howdy partner, welcome to Jackson, yonder is Jackson Hole. Some two-day wonder thought it would be great to take it down, let's change the sign. Then you guys put an ad in the paper saying we lost our character. Well, it's obvious that when we see buildings that go up like the trashcans on Snow King Drive, or the ones that are out on the Village Road. You call it affordable housing. Out in Wilson, you call it affordable housing. Well, okay, let's go to the next point. Vail Associates come in here and you talk about trust. Vail Associates comes in here. Where's our affordable housing for Vail Associates? How many years ago was that? They said they were going to start doing something about it. Okay, what about when everybody complained in South Park about Roger Seherr-Thoss' gravel pit and being a beautiful thing. So, what do you guys do? How many people in this room realize that the County gave Roger Seherr-Thoss a chunk of money to buy him out and then backed out of the deal and then he got stuck in his hand with \$250,000 worth of taxpayers money? Does anybody in this room realize that? We have 3 percent available virgin dirt. We need to look at this whole Comp Plan and revise it for what we want, the people in this room. It's not your deal; it's our deal. We live here. We're the taxpayers paying your jobs. That's all I have to say.
6/11/2009	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	Okay, I'm number three, Craig Schwender. I live in the County and I don't represent any group. We've been property owners since 1978. Paid off our 30-year mortgage last summer and hoorah. We feel the Comp Plan has faults but I'm going to cover briefly just one, that's the growth rate. Many times over the years the people of the Valley have said in various forms and studies that we don't want fast growth. We want slow growth and thoughtful growth. The planners in their meetings told us they listened and they understand it, but it doesn't seem to show up in the Plan. They've assumed growth rates that are far beyond what is really reasonable. Certainly growth is inevitable. Property owners have rights that we have to respect. And we will. But to, for example, triple the size of Wilson is not reasonable. To increase the potential build-out of the Aspens from the present ten to three hundred more units is a thirty-fold increase and, to be charitable, that's absurd. To allow these nodes with such high density essentially subsidizes developers of properties by having us house their workforce. I see no fairness in subsidizing developers, not those who put up a new restaurant in Town nor those who put up a new hotel in the Village. We expect our Commissioners to vote in the interest of today's residents, today's voters, not some kid in California who wants to come out in a few years and ski bum for awhile. And to finalize real quickly, I thank you all for your public service. It's thankless and if you don't think it's thankless, just ??.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Taylor, Nancy Conservation Alliance	I'm number fourteen for those who are following. Thank you for having this meeting, for all your public service and for allowing public comment. I think it's really important and an integral part of this process. I'm speaking as an individual in the County. My name's Nancy Taylor. This Plan is disconnected without a holistic point of view. There are good values expressed in the introduction and I think they're values that we all support. But there isn't adequate follow-through to those values when you get into it, especially the nodes in the specific districts. If you, the Planning Commissions, are going to be able to implement this Plan, you must have a document that gives you clear criteria based on scientific evidence. The NRO, maps that Franz mentioned and the overriding value of community character, which was what the '94 Plan was about. The FLUP does not provide you with those tools. The ranges of possible build out within each node will not help you to clearly approve or deny future development. There are no clear-cut standards for how monitoring will be done. And lastly, if Jackson is seriously considering being a kinder community that will teach the rest of the country and the world to be a carbon-neutral community by the year 2030 or the year 2050, and this is under consideration right now quite seriously by members in our community, elected officials as well as community members, making Jackson a pioneer community be carbon neutral, we cannot double our population. We cannot build 9880 new residential dwellings and achieve the goal of carbon neutrality. And I just want to mention that if the maps in this current Plan show that development in Wilson could be a possible nine units per acre. And I remember when the first original Plan was written in 1978 that the designation, because it was in a hundred-year flip Plan, was one house per three acres. So but that destination has changed greatly, and I think that needs to be addressed. So, we have an amazing opportunity as a gateway community to demonstrate to the millions of visitors who come here that we value community character, wildlife and open spaces. Wall Street taught us a recent lesson that fueling greed and growth ends in tragedy. Let's rewrite the story with new players and a long-term vision that's truly sustainable. We owe it to our grandchildren and to the wildlife that sustains our souls, not our bank accounts. So, if you can't implement this Plan the way it reads now, all of you, I implore you to create a Plan that works. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Marsiglio, Pete Interested Public	I just want to say from what I can see the Plan is a very pro-growth Plan and at the cost of subsidy, of regulation and incentives. I do encourage some growth and from what I've heard natural growth is more of a term that I would like to apply to it. But I'm very against regulation subsidy and incentives for the fact that it encourages growth that's maybe unnecessary. And when you take natural growth into account, you could have someone who's going to, say, build a hotel and are worried about not having workers, and this comes back down to the affordable housing subsidy, if that developer is worried that they're not going to have enough workers, that's a natural, self-regulating type of growth where they say, well, maybe I shouldn't build this hotel because I'm not going to have the workers. But for a community to just say, well, we're going to spend money and, you know, the cost to the taxpayers giving that subsidy to help give housing, it gives more incentive for that person to build that hotel. So, it seems like it's a very forced Plan where we're trying to force more growth unnecessarily when we can naturally regulate. And then the other big thing is when you look at the current stand of economic affairs in countrywide, you know, in America today, I just look around Town and I see empty lots that were once a development. I see a lot of empty retail space. You know, obviously, it's every man for himself. It's an American tradition to want to build something. You think you can sell it, you think you can fill it, you think you can make money on it. That's great, that's the American way. So, in a way, you know, I'm...I encourage that, but I also going against my beliefs saying that up zoning and trying to create more space in other places when we already have it. Condensed growth is good, but the sprawl is not very effective when we have stuff that already needs to be filled. And then a lot of this stuff started happening a little more rampantly when the 2008 fall money basically from the federal government was just starting to be handed out to just about anybody. Well, all that can do is create inflation, which down the road is going to create more people not traveling, more people not taking part in what I should say excess, which in turn will create more empty buildings and more spaces that will be available, and which in turn will affect an economy down further which can lead to more things. So, natural, I think a natural-growth-type Plan is a little bit more effective than forced growth. And I see it being a little too forced.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Halpin, Pete Interested Public	Good evening. My name's Pete Halpin and I have property both in the Town of Jackson, as does my wife and two adult children who are residents, and property in the County. And I'm here to speak solely on behalf of my own family in opposition to the tribal trails connector. And I do intend to submit other written opposition to this connector along with either by myself or with others who share my convictions about this connector. Let me just say I have two principal things to say in regards to the connector, one which I have to say with a little bit of a grain of salt, which is that I applaud the concentration of traffic in the major arterials in Jackson Hole. And I think that one of the principal factors that enabled us to control environmental impacts and lead to a higher quality of life is that we have so few roads. So, my basic thrust is let's throw the money at the WY intersection and not run a second major arterial down the center of Jackson Hole, because that is exactly what it's going to become. Let me say that I'm in my 46th year in Jackson and in the Valley and if you want sprawl, build a connector because that's exactly what it's going to lead to. And I'm not going to spend the rest of my short time I have allotted this evening to speak to all those more technical reasons why I think this is a bad idea, but it's certainly going to be a nightmare for our neighborhood. And I might say a lot of people on both Indian Trails and Indian Springs actually believe that this connector is never going to happen. And as somebody who's spent a lifetime in transportation planning, I can tell you that it could happen. And I think it's a bad idea. And let me just say a little bit about the history as I recollect. This bypass, this connector started as a ill-fated Town of Jackson bypass. And a long time ago that was a great idea. Because planners thought that if you had a small growing town, you needed a bypass. And you can find those bypasses in many small towns around America. And fortunately we didn't choose to have a bypass. And when Indian Springs was developed, I remember one of the principal factors that were involved—it's not the only factor—some people in the County who were looking ahead for this very kind of meeting to happen, many decades in the future. It's been many years since then. But the reason why was because, well, the state of Wyoming wants it. And I remember that because I was in the state of Wyoming. It's on the plan; you've got to have it because in the state of Wyoming in Cheyenne it's hard to get those things off the plans. That's a fact; that's a fact. So, I leave you with some of those thoughts. How does a bad idea get embedded in a Plan?
6/11/2009	Harrington, Steve Interested Public	By the way, I'm number twelve, if anybody wants to be thirteen. My name is Steve Harrington. I live in East Jackson. I've lived here for 40 years. I think if you...the way the Plan is set up currently with the two most important factors being wildlife and scenic corridors and whatnot, then we know the problem is, and the enemy of those two things is, people. And it doesn't matter whether they're rich people, poor people, tourist people, or whoever they are. But wildlife and people are at odds. You can't...they can't co-exist if there are too many people that move the wildlife off...out of their habitat. So, if you are...if we are truly wanting to look at that circumstance as the number one priority, as Jean said, you don't to be...we don't want to be ?? The public that we're looking at it but we really know we can't do anything about it. If that's the case, then we ought to be up front about that because...but if you really are truly looking at that, then the only way to deal with that is somehow to limit the number of people that are in this Valley. Coincidental with that, the one thing that I have never seen in my time here is we have always had a population, a resident population. We say the census says there's 20,000 people that live here. That's not really true because that never counts every motel, every condo, every other rental property that has transient visitors. There's a huge difference between the number of residents and the number of people who can be here on any given day. And that is what drives a lot of what happens in the community in terms of public services. Why do we have as many police officers and sheriff's deputies as we have? It isn't because of the 20,000 people that live here; it's for the 50,000 or 60,000 that can be here on any given summer day. With that in mind, I also think that you should be looking at somehow some sort of a way to work backwards to actually look at what the impacts are going to be from any number of additional homes that we put out there. If you say we're going to put...pick a number, 5000 new homes, what does that really mean in terms of people? And if you tell me that, then I can work backwards. I can tell you you need to have five lanes of roads on, you know, going out to Wilson. I can tell you how big the sewer plant has to get. I can tell you all of these things. Those are the kinds of scenarios I think you need to work through before you decide on what the final number is going to be. And somehow I think that is where you have to look more. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Brooks, Clark Interested Public	Yeah...actually, my number is number two but because I never sat in the front of a classroom, I took number two, but unfortunately no one took number one either. My name is Clark Brooks. I live in the County on Thistle Road. I want to, as the meetings come up and since it's a major driver, is focus your attention on theme #4, which is the housing. And in there it's stated that we want to provide 65 percent of our employees in the County with housing. And I'm...since this is a major driver, I'm going to reach out and grab the third rail here. There are two issues that I'd like to bring up. One is philosophical. Like most people who have moved to the Valley, I spent a lifetime commuting, and I spent over 30 years commuting to various cities as did a lot of my friends in Chicago, New York and LA and San Francisco. And so the idea of there is some sort of inalienable right we have to subsidize housing that's approximate to your point of employment, really, I wonder why we have to do this. The second point I want to make is one that's economic. In this Valley today, you can hardly buy a footprint for a house for less than a half a million dollars. Let's say that you could buy one for two hundred thousand dollars—there is none available like that but let's assume you could—if you put a hundred...if you put a thousand-square-foot house on this, then at \$200 a square foot, you're talking \$200,000. So, that's talking, for affordable housing, that's talking...the reality is \$400,000. If you need, under this Plan, let's say, pick a small number at the housing, employee housing, then you're talking four hundred million dollars. Now, in the paper I don't know if these numbers are right, but if you're talking 2000 employee housing, you're talking eight hundred million dollars. So, I think someone has to look at this and say is this 65 percent number realistic. And I would strongly suggest you ought to start looking at perhaps we provide employee housing on the other side of the Canyon, south of Town, or over the hill.
6/11/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	My name's Justin Adams. I'm envious of people who have lived here 35 and 40 years; I've only gotten to live here about 15 years. I'm a resident of the County and I own property in the Town. What I'm hearing tonight is people want Jackson Hole to be a community and not a resort. So why are we expanding the lodging overlay in Town? What's our obligation to house employees of five-star resorts? The density increase which is necessary for this housing is a very subtle tax on everyone's quality of life. Should taxpayers subsidize vacations of the wealthiest people in the world by building this housing? Let's house poor infrastructure employees. That's where the housing focus needs to go—teachers and nurses. Subject to traffic, the Save Historic Jackson Hole presented to the planners and the elected officials a study by a guy named Bernstein. It's highly critical of the traffic planning in this new Comprehensive Plan and we just wonder if anybody's read it. I think that this Plan is a vain attempt to solve a development problem with more development. I urge you to dismiss this Plan outright and start over. I attended earlier meetings on the Plan and the Planners must have heard different comments than I heard. Let's show that we're not an ?? and radically downsize the Plan out of respect for the people who live here. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	My name is Barry Sibson and I live in Polo Ranches. I'm here tonight to plead with both boards to reject this draft Plan out of hand. The basic problem, my belief is that if you plan and have regulations that allow development, that development will come. When I see that this Plan could allow another six to eight million square feet of commercial space, I'm outraged. It's totally a possibility to achieve the vision, which I agree with strongly. But this Plan has too much development. It's totally out of line. To me, commercial development should be under new commercial development. It would be under two million square feet. New housing should be under 5000. If we have anything more than that, even if it takes 40 years or 50 years, we have set, those of us here now, have set the destruction of Jackson Hole. And I don't want to be a part of that. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Callahan, Mary Lynn Interested Public	Okay. Mary Lynn Callahan. I'm a Town resident and a downtown business owner. I've already submitted an e-mail comment, so I just want to hit on a few more items. One of them being that the new Plan it seems like it's encompassing some old ?? items that were voted down by referendum in this Town, such as four-story buildings, up zoning, and I would like to say please don't include those. Secondly, the ?? Meadow. I think I read somewhere about that it didn't have much wildlife value. I really disagree with that. I think it has great wildlife value. I live on the edge of it. There's deer that need a place to come through our Town, fox, there's all kinds of wildlife through there. So, I would like to see not much human development in that area. The next thing I would like to say is claiming wildlife is important in not only certain districts, but all districts. They all have to be compared to each other and included with each other. Also, checks and balances in that growth process. Like what happens if it does start growing too fast, you know, are we going to look at it at certain periods of time? Next, specifically, defining what human needs are in the Plan. I noticed those words used often in that language and I'd really like to see that language more specific. What does human needs really, really mean to us today or five or ten years down the line? I just want to thank everybody for all their volunteer work and their service. I know it's huge. And the other thing I'd like to recommend is if you need some committees and what to have some extra people helping you out, just ask. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	Gregory Griffith, West Banker. I'm here to present a petition, a loosely organized yet ?? by eight or nine neighborhood groups. Intended to circulate internally, word spread quickly, interest was high, so it naturally expanded in scope. Momentum in both signatures and sentiment continued. Petition states wildlife and open spaces—values the community has cherished for decades—will be reinstated as the community's top priority and will become the organizing theme of the entire Plan. Some may be surprised to learn that wildlife is the top priority in only 8 of our 25 districts. At a cost of 25 districts, the average value of our precious wildlife is only 4.2 out of 7 categories and as the County knows, wildlife is a paltry 5.5 ???. This is completely and utterly unacceptable. How many times do we have to say it? How many forms of communication must we use? We've attended meetings and we have commented, we have faxed, e-mailed, phoned, keypad, internet, questionnaire, polled, surveyed and face to face. All with the same overwhelmingly consistent result—wildlife is to be number one. This petition is not meant to be the full volume of public comment. It's not meant to be a sentence of public comment. This petition is meant to be the exclamation point to this phase of public comment. It is acknowledged and except for referendum we do not govern by petition. Even though our former government arguably began in what was essentially a petition. A relatively brief document body followed by 56 signatures—the Declaration of Independence. In this sacred document, Jefferson penned a statement which remains amazingly apropos today. I quote. We have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Yet our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. This is precisely how a large segment of our community feels. The Comp Plan as presented bears no resemblance to our well-documented community will. Therefore, we petition you, as appointeds, to send forth to the electives a mandate to reinstate our irreplaceable wildlife to their rightful position to the top of each of our 25 districts. This does not mean that if a member of our rapidly dwindling moose population was once spotted in the vicinity, that all development is off. This does mean that the conversation starts with conservation. That the direct and cumulative impacts to our wildlife and natural resources be addressed first as priority number one. And that an equitable exchange of biologically valuable permanently protected open space be priority number 1. A prior to discussing any density bonus anywhere. In closing, there is an undeniable symbiotic relationship between our incomparable ecological wealth and our economic health. This is not a coincidence. Our greatest legacy will not be what we build, but what we refuse to destroy in the process. Thanks. [see petition document]
6/11/2009	Morris, Bob Interested Public	Bob Morris, Teton Village, and these are my opinions only. We should not be encouraging commercial growth, including lodging. And we should not be encouraging free-market homes. The clustering along High School Road should be accomplished not by up zoning but in accordance with the Plan of '94 so that the sum of 85 percent of all that land is dedicated to perpetual open space. And lastly I recommend that you call on one-minute speakers first

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Good evening, Commissioners. Franz Camenzind, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I guess I can say I'm a 39-year resident and a short-timer at that. I really do want to thank you for the time you have put in and I don't envy the time you will put in. This is going to be a daunting task for you. We've looked at this Comprehensive Plan, this draft, very, very thoroughly for a long time and we're sad to say that we feel it's fundamentally off track. We started out with the idea about two years ago that this is going to be a tweaking, a correction of the '94 Plan, and somewhere unexpectedly it's turned into a brand new Plan, a Plan that I think has lost its way. Gone is the strong endorsement of the small-town character, the western character. Instead we have, I think, a mixed bag of disconnected tools. Absent is a road map that would bring us to a clear vision for Jackson Hole that I think so many of us share. And I think it was expressed many times in the polls in the early part of this process. We want predictability. You want predictability. We're going through a Supreme Court nomination right now and there's this discussion about having activist judges. I believe the community doesn't really want activist planning commissioners. I think we want people who are trained to interpret to make sure that developments fit the rules. And those rules, if they're clear, I think will give us the picture of the future that we want. Having said that, not everything, excuse me, in this draft Plan is bad. I think the idea of using districts, I think that's a good way to go. But the way they're presented, they seem to be existing in vacuums. We really don't see how one district fits into the next. We don't see that big map. The discussions aren't that way and certainly the analyses are absent. We think Chapter 2, which describes vision, has some good points. I think it's a very clear vision, but again it seems to hang there and really not present itself through the rest of the chapters. The question is will a Comp Plan guide the formation of new LDRs, and I don't think this Comp Plan can do that. I don't think it gives you the direction to give good, precise LDRs. And that's what this is supposed to do. There's a lot of ambiguity in what we see here. There are a lot of variations in the numbers that we see. One thing that's missing, this community has expressed for decades—and you've heard it tonight again and I'm sure you'll hear it more—our value, how we value wildlife in our environments. The NRO is absent in this Plan. It's discussed a little bit but it doesn't come back in the district maps. It doesn't form the basis for how districts are determined to be used and how they should be planned. I think that's a fundamental flaw in this process and I think it's something that has to be brought front and center is this whole NRO...plan our own mapping....Thank you for allowing me a second opportunity. I'll try to keep this shorter. There's one point that I'd really like to make here and one of the favorite things that we've ever done as a community is deal with resort district master plans. And right now we have 5 designated resort districts in the County. When I look at these districts, the 25 future land-use districts, 9 of them, 9 of those 25 districts have a mixed-use, visitor-orientation category. That's the category that allows resort development. So we have openings in 9 districts right now for an Applicant to come in and ask for something that will resemble a resort district. I think this community and certainly our organization would straight out like to see no more new resort district designation, and I think this language has to be cleaned up so that no one can make an application into an existing zone that would allow that debate to go out. I don't think you want to see me up here arguing against resort districts and I don't think you want to have to go through that process anymore and I don't think this community wants anymore resort districts. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	Brook Bullinger; I'm a resident of Teton County for 35 years. And I want to start by saying I know a lot of people have put a lot of time and effort into this Plan and it's not the final version. But I do think there's been some mixed signals arising in the Plan that I'm going to kind of go over here so maybe you can understand why the public is frustrated. This was originally touted as our Plan, so we the public filled out forms, answered telephone surveys, attended and spoke at meetings, wrote letters and e-mails. There's never been any question whatsoever that the top priority for the public are the protection of wildlife and open space. This is indisputable and it has never been contested. Then the Plan is released and wildlife is downgraded. The initial statement may say wildlife is first but that's not in the nuts and bolts of the Plan. When apart from the rural areas like Kelly and Buffalo Valley, wildlife is actually now rated fifth or sixth out of seven themes in 17 of 25 districts. Somewhere there is a disconnect. People are discouraged. How many times do they need to say the same thing over and over, attend another meeting in the midst of a busy summer? Now we're told the Plan will not be directed by referendum or survey but by STAG experts and some electives. Why is our future being decided by input to which we are not privy? Where are the minutes from the STAG meetings? Who are these experts? We're always told don't worry, we've got it covered. We'll have annual reviews. Reviews by who? Paid for how? How do you undo damage that's already done? So, again, I feel it's just mixed signals. It's our Plan. Or is it not our Plan? Is wildlife first or is growth first? But I want to end on a positive note. I want to say I'm really, really proud to be a member of this community. I think people in this County are more intelligent, more engaged, more participatory and passionate than anywhere else. We realize this is the single most important thing that will determine our quality of life in the future and we're not going to go away.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Kolsky, Eddie Interested Public	My name is Eddie Kolsky. I'm currently an active resident of Teton County and basically almost every speaker has said what I feel, so I'm not going to say much new except that this is our Plan. It doesn't feel like our Plan. It doesn't reflect what our community has expressed or at least stated. I agree with Armond Acri, Gail Jensen, Elizabeth Kingwell, Nancy Hoffman, Nancy Taylor—very well stated, Nancy Taylor, by everybody—??, ??, Bob Morris, the woman from South Park, the second speaker, the fourth woman from Wilson, the fifth woman with respect to the '94 Plan, I think it was a draft or step backward with respect to development especially. I agree with her on having a cap on growth as well. Jean Ferguson, and after Jean Ferguson, Mike Cunningham speaking for the Aspens homeowners, Franz, Gail, and that's about it. Thank you very much for all your work.
6/11/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Hello, Gail Jensen. I've lived here since 1980 and most recently we're trying to get very involved in community affairs in my old age, over 50. I would first like to thank...I would like to first say thank you to all of the Town and County Planning Commissioners for holding this open public forum. I know that many share my frustrations with the Comp Plan process that has gotten us to the current draft Plan. At present this is not the people's Plan. I have attended countless meetings on the Plan witnessing lobbying efforts to direct the Plan by special interests in one way or another. It is obvious that much of the lobbying efforts from some have quite an influence in the direction of this Plan. From the outset of this process some of the first comments from the Planning Staff were we are not and will not plan by public referendum. Listening to this repeated statement at numerous meetings has sent the wrong message to the citizens of our County. What we want does not matter and will not define the Plan. That is the take that I have from those numerous comments. I now ask that you please listen to what citizens say via surveys, letters, comments and follow the will of the people. Here are a few of my concerns. Protecting wildlife and open space should be the number one thing throughout the Town and County in every district. Limit growth to current build out with base zoning. What is the current build out of the County without zoning incentives? The current build-out number used in Appendix I has grown from the planner's interpretation of build out, which is a non-consistent formula using a percentage of possible incentives that could be used developing or, excuse me, could be used, depending on the developer's proposal. Because of this manipulated interpretation, the numbers as presented in January of 2008 have dramatically changed. The real number is very important to us. We have asked repeatedly, please give us and plan for the real accurate number. Numbers of people with all of our impasse, the buildings, roads and our community is what will shape Jackson Hole's future. We need to plan for the real current build-out number and as it relates to that total population. Theme seven, provide quality community facility services and infrastructure, should be a sub-category of managed growth. Any growth whether entitled or not should not occur unless the infrastructure is in place. The notion of regionalization should be embraced, not avoided. We will never build enough workforce housing within our County to counter the proposed growth of the residential and commercial development even to meet the 65 percent with this Plan....Hi, Gail Jensen. I just have a couple more quick things that I didn't have time to finish here. I really feel that there are huge tax increases necessary in most of this Plan. I am not supportive of this. Growth should pay its own way. I'm glad to see the monitoring requirements of this Plan; however, there are few if any current baseline numbers to measure performance. There are a few if any triggering solutions stated to implement if goals are not met. Where are these studies? The node concept has some promise but only at densities that still respect the number-one theme and as part of the overall theme of staying within the current build-out numbers. I hope to attend as many of the future meetings as possible so I can comment on more specific concerns. Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts.
6/11/2009	Kingwill, Elizabeth Interested Public	Hello, I'm Elizabeth Kingwill. I've lived here for about 30 years, lately in the County, having changed to Town, with residences at both. Planning the long history in this community and this day has been very short, too short in coming. This Plan is about build out, something that is pretty scary in my ???. In any ecological community, there are living factors and land ?? That real limit. We have come to that point in the County and Town where people in the natural world are ever clear of competition. And I do agree with Mr. Harrington. The real limiting factors here tonight in the foreseeable future must be you folks and the electives. There are hard choices coming for you all, for us all, from vulnerable populations, wildlife in the natural world, and young people and workers who make our Valley function. This Plan has evidences as build out, commerce and urbanization and I object to that. This Plan is misleading in the sense that more housing is a red herring. It will not be affordable for workers or families and it will be at the expense of wildlife, scenic values, and community character, whatever there is left of that. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, I'm Kathy Tompkins. I represent a group of concerned neighbors in Cottonwood, in West Jackson. I'd like to read a statement here. I believe the rewrite of the Comp Plan emphasizes too much residential and unmitigated commercial growth. Instead of solving and managing the consequences of past growth here in Jackson Hole, we need to solve these problems like protecting the wildlife we have left, exploiting our ?? To County, putting more sidewalks in, building more paths, putting in place a Plan to green up the homes that are already here, beef up the transit system, keep up the work on bringing up our public vehicles, educate people and incentivize zeroscaping, water conservation, and eliminate contaminated runoff into the wetlands and waterways, and continue directing employee housing in Town and the Village where the largest number of jobs are generated. We cannot learn and be successful at doing these things I just mentioned until we get a handle on limiting growth. Solving these problems is a daunting job on its own. Major up zoning in South Park and the other nodes mentioned in the Comp Plan and the increased unmitigated commercial growth proposed will make it impossible to change attitudes and life styles for people already here. Let us limit growth and solve the problems we have and then we won't have to rely on growth to solve the consequences of past growth. And I also have a local petition from the Cottonwood area that will be ongoing, but I'd like to submit the first part of it tonight. Thanks.....Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood. And I'd like to say I've lived here 10 years and I do, too, want to thank everybody for putting in their time and effort, and hopefully we can come out with something really good. And my invitation to all of you—I think I sent you all e-mails for coffee at my place and a little tour of Cottonwood—is still open. And I could show you the area and show you what a nice single-family neighborhood is and hopefully we can preserve the single-family neighborhood. And I think that is what really keeps this Town together. Okay, thank you.
6/11/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	For the record, number fifteen, Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I'm also a citizen of the Town of Jackson. I would like to start off by recognizing that the 1994 Plan was not perfect. It set some goals but it didn't measure things and it wasn't always clear. And I think there are some definite improvements in this Plan, one being the tend to use measurements. That is a big improvement. But we have a pretty big concern about that. A lot of the indicators, you know, some of them are set up to fail and that's in my written comments, so I'm not going to bore you with doing that again. But we do need I think to take action not just to monitor them. A lot of these indicators there's talk about, just monitoring but not necessarily taking action. And I think that really the time to talk about the action is now in the impartial, I mean, it's emotional right now as we know from having gone through all these developments and proposals and things, that it's even harder to have a coherent discussion. So, I really think that it is important because we would like to see this Plan succeed. We offer that as a strong suggestion. We do need to have that debate now. Also, we'd also like to point out that no reporting of the indicators that are promised us would be in our mind evidence that we are going too fast regardless of the growth rate. I think that's an important concept, so I will repeat that even though that was in my written comments. We also believe that it's important to look at not just growth rate and not just per capita, we think we have to look at both in concert with each other. We recognize the current process is inefficient and causes splits in the community as is mentioned. We definitely need a more predictable process and the time to do that is now. Again, the less charged environment of 30,000 ?? Rather than the immediate ?? Projects. As opposed to Steve Harrington, I just want to confirm...agree with him on defining visitors versus residents. That's a really important concept here, is that we need to recognize what is our population. That's one thing that's not addressed here we think needs to be done. And again there's no clear vision of what's going to happen ten years out or at build out in terms of what's going to be needed to support the amount of growth. We really feel that that's something that needs to be done. Proposed NC changes in the targeted growth areas and it's greatly changed, the fields, many of the neighborhoods they're targeted for growth, we think there's sufficient capacity in the Town of Jackson for this period. And lastly I think there's a need for consensus on numbers and would suggest ?? Or someone else get together to validate and propose numbers that the community would then support and be able to evaluate the proposal. Thank you.... I just would like to add one more thought as we go through all this and that is to express at least a concern. I think the schedule that has been laid out is very commendable, it's very ambitious, but I'm concerned not only for you guys' well being but also for the public. I mean, if you guys have got to hold two meetings a month on top of all these other meetings, then certainly I think we can go forward and try this, but I hope you guys are at least agreeable to that. We don't want you guys to burn out and we certainly don't want the public do that. Somewhere we need to have some balance between getting the input and not being something that grinds everybody down, including you guys. So, I would ask you to consider that as you go forward.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Donovan, Ted Interested Public	Thank you. I'm Ted Donovan. I've lived in the Valley about 30 years. I'm not a newcomer, so I've seen an awful lot that's happened here and many of you I know. I'm concerned about the economics as it affects the individual taxpayer. We saw what happened a few years ago. We've had to improve, expand, the County buildings. So, this Plan they're planning now you're going to have to tear those down and I don't know where you're going to put new buildings. You're not going to be able to domicile what's going to be needed. The cost to the taxpayer is going to go up exponentially. I mean thousands and thousands of dollars. Look at some of those communities out west that have gone up \$25,000 for individuals homes. You know, it's awfully nice to say we need more newer housing for workers but how many workers are we going to need? How many people can we accommodate? Do we want to accommodate? What kind of a community do we want in five years? I've seen what's happened here in 30 years. It's astounding. I hate to see the character change. I realize change is needed but how much do you need to change? I think you people got to seriously look at it. Thank you very much.
6/11/2009	Berkstein, Todd Interested Public	My name's Todd Berkstein and I'm a resident of the Town. I won't be redundant and repeat anything that other people have said, but first will appreciate and thank all of you, both Staff, paid and unpaid, for of your efforts. You have a task that I wouldn't want to endure. You asked for specifics at the beginning and this may be getting a little bit ahead of the game. But there are three things that have come up many times amongst many of us that have spoken that need to be addressed probably as part of the LDRs, so excuse me if this is too soon for it. But two things that need to stop and/or change. The ability for developers to come to Town or County and go on for one, two, three years continually coming back asking for variances. It's got to stop. Many of the local working people feel that if you have enough money, you're going to end up getting what you want in the end. Part of that that also comes into play is height variances. It seems like more times than not heights are allowed to exceed what is already in code. Employee housing, it seems to be almost a joke for any new development, commercial development, when I read that they have to provide housing for 1.7 employees. Why isn't this more along the lines of housing 25 percent, 50 percent of your employees, which will take away a lot of the need for further development that a lot of it needs to be employee housing? I think that's really all. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Hayse, Bruce Interested Public	Yeah. I'm Bruce Hayse and I have the fortunate having Frank Ewing as my neighbor. I came in a little late so I couldn't really hear what he was saying. But I can guarantee what he said is exactly the truth. [Laughter] I really don't need to say a whole lot more except that what Frank said is absolutely correct. I've never heard a false word come out of his mouth. So, and I totally agree with what he says about this Plan, the potential for it to destroy the character of this Valley. I think it's just abhorrent. And I say that even though I make my living from taking care of sick people, and it has been shown that the less contact people have with the natural world, the more sick they tend to become. [Laughter] So, obviously, it could be a boon to the medical profession. With this Plan in place, we're all going to see a lot less of the natural world out here in Jackson Hole. And, nevertheless, I think that for all of those of us that came to this Valley because of what's here, and honestly it reminds me of my childhood growing up in a place like this. It's no longer a place like this anymore, even though it's a small town in the west, it's gone a different direction, Jackson Hole, and I don't want to see Jackson Hole go in that direction. So, I think that we really need to just start over with a whole different type of approach. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Larsen, Mellissa Interested Public	My name is Melissa Larson. I've lived here 15 years in the Town of Jackson. And I'm terrified of public speaking, so please...I filled out the first few rounds of internet surveys that came along. And I was a little frustrated because I felt like I was being asked to make a choice between open spaces and affordable housing, and I'm very much obviously I hope to live here the rest of my life, but I'm a bartender. I might always be a bartender and I don't think I'll ever be able to afford to buy property here and I don't think that that is ever going to change. My only option to live here as I go forward is affordable housing. I'm not a nurse; I'm way down on the line. And I just want to make sure that in this whole fight for less growth that I represent a lot of people my age in this predicament that affordable housing doesn't get compromised. At the same time I'd also like to say that watching my friends try and start businesses in this Town, the employee housing rule is often the difference between them being able to start a business or not start a business because it's cost prohibitive for people who don't come to this Town with a lot of money but are just trying to get a foothold because they want to live here. And that's it.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	We the undersigned, residents of West Jackson, expect that the Comprehensive Plan will be revised to reflect the following: The wording "Develop South Park North To South" should be eliminated from the Future Land Use Plan for South Park (District 12). Reduce the number of proposed future units from 1500 units in South Park back to the 370 units that are already allowed under present zoning. Any new development in South Park should only occur after infill has been exhausted in the town of Jackson. Any new development in South Park and the Tribal Trails connector Road should not be even be considered until a new road connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road in South Park is completed first to alleviate the traffic on High School Road. If any new development occurs in South Park there should be open space from the High School to South Park Loop Road between the new development and High School Road. {signed by many, available in County Planning Department}
6/11/2009	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	Dear Teton County Commissioners: The First Filing Homeowners Association Board of Directors vehemently disagrees with and challenges hereby the District 10 Future Land Use Plan as proposed in the Teton County Comprehensive Plan and urges the County Commissioners in their entirety to vote against. Sincerely, First Filing Homeowners Association Board of Directors Secretary / Treasurer: Mike Cottingham President: Vice President: Member: Member: Delivery by hand Laurent Roux Sami Robinson Sara Brandenburg Malcolm Clinger
6/11/2009	Abbey, Lucinda Interested Public	Lucinda Abbey and <<inaudible>>, and I'd like to see wildlife put into the equation, protecting wildlife, making wildlife corridors and making sure that that remains a vital part of Jackson Hole.
6/11/2009	Cottingham, Mike Interested Public	My name's Mike Cottingham. I'm a 33-year resident of Teton County, 25-year resident of the Aspens. And I have submitted personal comments via the internet in the very limited space allocated to do so. I volunteered to hand deliver a very brief statement to the County Commission and to the Town and County Planners this evening from the Aspens Homeowners Association first filing. We represent 36 single-family residences in the Aspens. Dear Teton County Commissioners, the first filing homeowners association board of directors vehemently disagrees with and challenges hereby the District 10 future land-use plan as proposed in the Teton County Comprehensive Plan and urges the County Commissioners in their entirety to vote against it. And so I'm going to hand this to you folks and you can pass this on to the County Commissioners

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Ewing, Frank Interested Public	My name is Frank Ewing. I've lived in the County for 54 plus years and it's been the most important aspect of my life actually, no disrespect to my friends, my wife, to any of you, but I cherish this Valley as I first knew it. I, for a long time, was reluctant to speak out about telling people what they should or shouldn't, or could or couldn't, do with their land, because I thought the people, particularly in multigenerational people who've lived here, parents and grandparents, in some cases their great grandparents have lived here, I thought they should be allowed to capitalize to get some benefits out of their long time here. And by and large those people have been pretty responsible in what they were willing to have done with their land. Well, I think that time is up. I think there should be no more development. Responsible growth is an oxymoron. Growth is responsible but it's responsible for all the problems we have. And I'm not denying the fact that I make a living off of visitors that come here, as many other people do. But this never-ending drive to develop, to subdivide, to turn the whole County into a urban or a suburban place, and I'm sorry if it's...I don't direct it at anyone in particular, but we are too greedy. No is the word. If there's anything the Plan should address it's some way of helping people who live here, who are part of the workforce that live here. But as far as more growth is concerned, I don't care who you are and what you are, I don't care whether you get rich or starve to death, and it starts with me. It should end here. And growth is not good for us. We'll be just like everywhere else in the mountain west. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Moniker, Joe Interested Public	My name's Joe Moniker and thanks for having a public comment period. Largely I've seen public comment periods being sort of disregarded in the past. And so I don't know how, you know, what your goal is, but if the proposed Plan, as I read it, is your Plan, then it doesn't really make sense in the long run to add that sort of population density to the base of Teton Pass. If you look at the current infrastructure of Wilson, you'd have to make some serious changes to that to prevent a lot of backup on Highway 22 as currently, the population, or the density on that is pretty much maximum. So you're talking about adding stop lights to the base of Highway 22, which is, I mean, it's a safety issue primarily. And, you know, I saw a comment that said that we'd make Wilson a stronger community to go ahead and develop it further. And I really don't think that that's been quantified initially. I think that it's...there's going to be a lot of dollars necessary to upgrade ?? bypass. Schools, current schools are already at capacity. There is no library. There is no substation. There's very little police presence that's required now. That type of development would require a dramatic increase across the board in every area that I just mentioned. So, I think until you have the actual infrastructure in place to accommodate that sort of development, you really can't responsibly go further. And lastly, from my perspective, what you're talking about is financially motivated. And I think that, you know, in the long term that's probably not going to be of benefit for anybody who comes into this community with an intent to stay for long. Thank you.
6/11/2009	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Due to a conflict, I will not be able to attend today's meeting. My comments follow. Please maintain the commitment made in the current plan to conserve the scenic rural beauty and wildlife of South Park. Removal of this theme is arbitrary and unacceptable. Transferring development rights from rural areas (e.g. Buffalo Valley, Alta) where growth is not likely to occur to areas where growth is most likely to occur (South Park) does not conserve agricultural land. To the contrary, it makes development of such lands more likely. The community has expressed in several polls and in numerous public comments, it prefers slow, smart growth, that it does not want increased build-out. There are sufficient development rights to grow for many years. Up- zoning South Park would serve no community purpose. It would make a few individuals wealthy (or wealthier) and that's about it. The cost of the proposed scale of growth in terms of infrastructure and run-down of our natural capital are high.
6/11/2009	Harger, Don Interested Public	I'm Don Harger, excuse my voice, and ?? of Jackson Hole. And I'm not going to tell you anything new or do any repeating. My statement is the Plan ought to reflect the will of the people. Simple as that. I think we can discern what that is. It's for wildlife and open spaces ?? And the way to discern that I think is you can go to two votes that have happened in the city or the Town. First was about the year 2000 and the Town Council voted and that's all of South Park, you know, major development. In fact, the only Council member that voted against it...well, the public voted against it 67 percent as a result of a position in a referendum. ?? is the only one who stood up and said, we don't need this, the will of the people. And a couple of years ago they had a community downtown redevelopment district, another petition, another referendum, 62 percent said we don't want that. We have a large, large silent majority in the community that just don't go to meetings, and I can't tell you why. They...well, we can tell you why—they're raising children, they're creating jobs, they don't like to go to meetings. But it's easy to see why the majority of the community feels...as I talk to many of my friends in the County, I would say to each of the County <<inaudible>> in the County, you'd find 75, 80 percent said, let's stop, keep the traffic down, respect the wildlife and the open spaces. I think it's real easy to see and I think we need to reflect the will of the people. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	I'm probably not going to say anything new, but my name is Pattie Ewing. Frank and I have been a part of this community since the early '60s. Frank's been here since 1955. And so we have seen a lot of changes. And we've commented, come to the meetings, and we want to just reinforce that the draft Plan, which we thank the planners for putting in untold hours working on and you as members of the Planning Commissions, who are not paid, and I understand that very well, everything you're doing is volunteered, we appreciate your time. But this draft Comprehensive Plan has numbers in it that I know are changing. You know, they're not final for sure, but they are excessive. They are outrageous in terms of the amount of growth that could happen over a period of however many years. It doesn't even make any difference; the end result is the same. Our view is that other communities would love to have the wildlife open space that we have. And once that asset of wildlife and open space is gone, we become like every other community. Once it's gone, it's gone. And we just want to reinforce how very important it is to retain that wildlife open space as a priority. And I'm about to the draft Plan, I have looked at the numbers. We've looked at the nodes. We've looked at the priorities. And we both feel, Frank and I both feel that unless you keep that priority of wildlife, Jackson Hole will no longer be the Jackson Hole we all came here for and millions of visitors come for. And we need to retain that. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Rosenberg, Vicki L. Interested Public	I am Vickie Rosenberg and while I have only owned property in Teton County for not quite two years and have only lived here for a few months, I have visited the Valley several times over the past 27 years and have been stunned by the growth of Jackson Hole. I submitted a long comment stating the views my husband and I share regarding the Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan. I did not, however, delineate the suggested request which you guys have asked us to do. So I'm going to do that now. I'd like to reiterate my gratitude to the Comp Plan development group, who I think worked in good faith to craft a Plan that defines how our region needs to organize for the future. Build out, however, must be limited. Please consider renovation of existing or potential buildings that become vacant into affordable housing units. There are vacant buildings around here. They're probably owned by somebody who doesn't quite know what to do with them. I hope the Town or the County would consider buying those up and utilizing already-existing vacant space to create affordable housing. I do work for Teton County Public Health and I see an awful lot of people who could benefit from affordable housing. Also, instead of requiring any developer, any of the developers, commercial or otherwise, to provide housing for workers, require them to do so. That being said, I believe that a cap on growth is essential to the survival of living creatures in our region, including humans. This cap should not greatly exceed 1 percent per year and should be re-evaluated at least every decade. I think that's all I have to say.
6/11/2009	Lasley, Louise Conservation Alliance	Whoops...I'm Louise Lasley. I have been a resident of Jackson Hole for 25 years, ten years on Aspen Street and 10 years in Cottonwood. When I signed up I wasn't quite sure of what I wanted to say, but I knew I wanted to make my voice heard even though I have no comments. I definitely reflect a lot of the opinions that have been spoken here tonight, especially for wildlife. I think that does make our community unique and to not take that into account in every single district is a mistake. It's when that's gone, we are just like Aspen; we're just like Vail, and we're not. We have incredible resources those communities don't. And to continue the growth development rate that we are seeing or proposed would be detrimental. We can't support that with our workforce, which was 1.9 before this recession, and we can't support it and continue to have community buy housing 65 percent of the people who work here. When I heard all that and realized everybody said the same thing that I wanted to say, what popped out in my head was an earlier comment after a meeting, I think it was the first meeting in this room, when it was later determined that this was not a good demographic. And it is basically the same demographic that was at that first polling meeting that you can't discount us. The fact that we've lived here 30 or 40 years and that we're between 55 and 80 or whatever, does not discount our opinions. It, in my opinion, reinforce them. We have made a commitment to be here through all sorts of ups and downs economically, housing wise, whatever. And I think we have a valid say. We also recognize the value of housing those other members of our community, and we think that should be a priority rather than having commercial development that would exceed our ability to ?. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Durtschi, Grant Interested Public	Okay. My name is Grant Durtschi. I'm from Alta, Wyoming. I was born and raised in Alta. And I would just like to make a comment. I'm just listening. I've from over in Alta so I'm kind of the tail on the dog, but I'd like to comment to those that said humans and wildlife can't co-exist. I want to invite you over to my place in the evening and watch the deer show and ?? [Laughter] It seems like they like it. Anyhow, I'm a member of the Alta Advisory Board and my purpose today in speaking to you is to encourage limited commercial development in Alta. I was born in Alta, like I said, and we always did have commercial in Alta. And I make these comments. Ralph Williams had an excavation business. We had a chiropractic business. There were lots of businesses. We were trying to make ends meet. Right now we're at the end. We're in a recession over there. We don't have the tourism that you have in Jackson. Maybe that's good; maybe that's bad. But we're trying to make ends meet. And what I would like to encourage is that we pick a place in Alta and have it commercial and limit it to commercial. Okay? Instead of people showing up with a little business out back, and that's what they do, that's what they do and they don't, what do I say, <<inaudible>> because they don't have a commercial place to go in Alta. We used to say we don't need commercial in Alta, but five years ago, you know, we thought we'll never need commercial in Alta, Wyoming. We can always go to Drake's. And all of a sudden we had the opportunity to have a library and all of a sudden we were running for cover. Where can we put this library? Well, we're real grateful for the Episcopal Church. They gave us some space to put the library and we're going to have a library this fall. But we need a place. And what I'm encouraging and what I'm really wanting to encourage you to do is to give us a place for a small business, limit the size of the business and also limit the area it can go on. Have trees around it so people don't even know it's commercial and that people can go in and have their businesses in a local area and then come under the jurisdiction of the law. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Virginsil, Juanita Interested Public	Juanita Virgensil. I'm from Wilson, resident, and I'm with a group of residents from Wilson who have expressed concerns. I personally am against the Plan and just would hope for natural growth and let things just evolve. I feel we've already lost character and sustainability in Jackson and now most of us being faced with that issue. I do not feel any need to fill in the 1 percent. Somebody said 96 percent is left of the 1 percent available. I do not feel we need to push it to that point. I don't think that serves the Wilson people, or Jackson, the workers who cannot afford the affordable housing anyway, the taxpayers whose taxes are going to go up when they have a million-point-five house built next to theirs. And it doesn't serve the residents. What concerns me most is that with this Plan, and there was a previous plan, as Bob mentioned, in '94 that was supposed to be the Plan, and planning and zoning boards, or the drafters of the Plan, really may not be holding our interests, and if not our interests, then whose? Thank you.
6/11/2009	Sobey, Pegi Conservation Alliance	Thank you...whoops, got it...yeah, I think that's fine. Hi, I'm Peggy Sobey and I'm a Teton County resident. The number one guiding principle of the 1994 Plan called for protecting wildlife and scenic and natural resources. And I'm proud to say that this remains our community's highest priority. And it must be, it must be our Plan's central theme, because I'm disappointed that this priority has been downgraded in several of the themes as presented. All aspects of this draft must correlate to this priority. A truly Comprehensive Plan must establish an absolute cap on total residents. Tools to reach an agreed-upon goal must reflect what our Valley's natural systems and wildlife populations will bear, it must preserve our community character, and it must be reasonable for the developer and the taxpayer for financing that will be required for any infrastructure. A truly Comprehensive Plan must limit the number of new commercial facilities to a reasonable annual rate of growth and an ultimate agreed-upon cap. Effective monitoring requires benchmarks and appropriate and timely recourse. I strongly urge our elected officials to direct Staff to stick to the original directive, which is to take our 1994 Plan, leave in the supportive parts of this draft, and go from there. Thank you for the opportunity to comment this evening.
6/11/2009	Ferguson, Dick Interested Public	Hi, Richard Ferguson. We have the same properties, at least I did have. [Laughter] I have a question about the maps that are supposed to be the facts that inform us what will be built, where, over the next decade. I've tried to understand them. They remind me of the papers I receive from my students. The group of students that the finals snuck up on. They grabbed any data, any facts, they tried to put it together, true or not, to meet the deadline. There was other students that didn't understand the data and they wrote it as if it was what they wanted. The third group...actually it was a fourth group of really good students, but the third group were students who wanted me to believe what they wrote and they wrote intentionally confusing the facts with misleading codes, keys, words to get me to believe them. Give us the real data. If you don't have it, get it. We're making decisions that are extremely important and so are you. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Ferguson, Jean Interested Public	I'm Jean Ferguson. I live in the County and have property in the city. I agree with the comments about the growth rate and a cap on growth rate, and I believe it's the duty of the electives to manage this and monitor it and have benchmarks for monitoring it, not just trust us, we'll check it in two years or five years. I believe that we need to upgrade our data for wildlife and a Natural Resources Overlay. I understand from biologists that the Staff's is about 15 years old and this enormous growth of the '90s in our area has blocked wildlife and changed wildlife routes. And how can we make wildlife a priority without having the data to know where the wildlife are? And, of course, I'm reiterating that the number one priority is wildlife and it needs to be in all themes. Many of the public are not impressed by the shell game of moving wildlife ranges to Buffalo Valley, Alta and Hoback to increase density tremendously in the nodes, claiming that the total growth proposals are the same. We don't want urban sprawl but we also don't want to destroy neighborhoods, or Wilson, or Jackson itself. So, electives need to control this growth. And we suggest the revision of 1994 that was promised and not this whole new Plan. There have been two voting referendums against the Town Council views on growth. Again, people are feeling patronized, discounted and told to wait for the development regulations that will fix things. Trust us. These are just theoretical goals. Trust us. Put your opinions on little yellow stickies and trust us, and we'll monitor everything and it won't get out of control. We don't see an impact analysis planned to do that. In my business I have found that it is dangerous to reject emotional and logical input with patronizing statements and dismissive attitudes. It doesn't work in couples. It doesn't work in families. And it doesn't work in communities. People need to be heard and their many concerns need to be addressed. We can disagree, but let's listen so we know what we're disagreeing about. This is not an empty backlash. The most thoughtful community leaders have concerns and ideas that need to be addressed. So, slow down, listen, and address those needs. Thank you....I'm Jean Ferguson. And I just wanted to add that I was so intimidated by three minutes—I've never stopped at three minutes in my life—that I forgot to thank you folks for giving this time to do your job. It's just remarkable that you're willing to donate this. I also...one other point that I also forgot because of the three minutes and that was that I don't want in composing growth control, I do not want to limit or ignore small affordable housing projects that fit neighborhoods. And so as far as...I think our...your problem is going to be how do we control growth by what method do we do it? A percentage cap, or do we do what? And I think that maybe density bonuses for those small projects for affordable housing are worth it. I think density bonuses in general are not a good thing. Thank you.
6/11/2009	Jorgensen, Roy Interested Public	Yes, I don't mind, Roy Jorgensen, and I hadn't intended to speak at all. And there's a couple of things that I wanted to point to in the way of procedures. Number one, you're setting a parameter of procedures that are not conducive to getting to the will of the people, in my opinion. You cannot exclude the emotion and the feelings that the people have in the love for this County by looking at this as a process whereby we're talking about simply rules, regulations and so on. If you ignore the passion that has come out of this community, and I don't mean this in anyway towards you, as public servants, but you do so...the County does so at its peril. I can remember when our first Plan, when we had backhoes and trucks and dump trucks and so on, going around and around the courthouse because there was some regulation. We've come almost full circle. You will now see...now they may be around and around in Prius's, nevertheless, there's a lot of passion in this community. And it doesn't mean that they're wrong. It doesn't mean shut the door so no one else can come in. We have got to talk about quality of life. We all live here because of the spiritual value that is attached to why we live here. If you take that away from us, what have we left? Now, I live in Town. Town is becoming miserable. And I've lived here, for the most part, over 30 years, all of it in Town. And it's becoming uninhabitable. You cannot continue to put things into every alley in Town. You can't continue to take every lot and build higher and put more traffic and so on and expect to take care of those intrusions on ordinary life by pathways and wider sidewalks. We want a community back. You are one of two safeguards that exist for the change in the paradigm that has brought us here today where we're doing it the same old way. We can call it different things; we can go at it a different way. And I tell ya, I've worked with these County Planners and the Town Planners. They're wonderful. They're capable and so on, but it starts at the top. And we need a new paradigm and that paradigm is think about the people. Think about our needs as human beings. Animals are important and all the wildlife and so on, but so are people. And 65 percent of affordable housing in Town, when I was a County Commissioner, I don't recall that ever being adopted as a matter of set policy. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Hanlon, John Interested Public	John Hanlon, Teton County, 25 years here. Thank you, board members, for your work. As someone else said, I think it's far from over. I have long been an advocate of strong property rights here but that is changing. Our community is growing to the...it's busting at the seams. I've always held it analogous to somebody saying, well, I like the color of your wife's hair so she's got to keep it that way, or I don't like the color of her hair, so she's got to change it. I feel that telling somebody else what to do with their land has been wrong. But that's changing. And this community has changed, and we're busting at the seams and hair's falling out. I've got the proof. Our proposed Plan seems to lack balance. The growth in commercial can't be supported in housing and housing can't be supported with parking. And the added cars can't be moved on our crowded roads. Last night—not the peak of the tourist season, kind of, you know, we're rolling into it—I waited through eight traffic-light changes to get from the front of Virginian to clear Albertson's. That used to happen the first week in August. I don't know what it's going to be like the first week in August this year. Growth, if any, should be limited and in developed areas already. The Plan allows way too much growth. Our community is near its growth limits now. So, this isn't just the next Plan; this may really be the last Plan. So, let's get it right. Thank you.
6/10/2009	Siegel, Diane and Donal Interested Public	IF WE WERE ABLE TO ATTEND THE MEETING REGARDING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ON THIS THURSDAY, WE WOULD BE VOICING OUR CONCERNS AND OBJECTIONS TO ITS FAVORING OF DEVELOPMENT, GROWTH AND MASSIVE CHANGES. DO NOT LET OUR VALLEY BECOME WHAT CALIFORNIA HAS BECOME....A ONCE BEAUTIFUL LAND NOW DESECRATED,OVER-DEVELOPED AND IN DEBT. WE DO NOT NEED HOUSING FOR ALL EMPLOYEES...LET THE BUSINESS OWNERS PROVIDE HOUSING IF NEED BE.... WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO SELF-RELIANCE ? WE ARE NOT IN FAVOR OF THE PLAN AND DO NOT APPROVE OF HOW YOU COMMISSIONERS SEEM TO BE RAILROADING THIS THROUGH. YOU WON'T GET OUR VOTE IF YOU VOTE IN FAVOR OF IT.

Phase: Staff Draft Presentation

11/5/2009	Stearns, Clarence, "Stea Interested Public	With regard to Wilson planning: Having lived in Wilson for 60 years, owning Hungry Jacks, the post office and sometimes called the honorary Mayor, I think I have a pretty good idea of how most of the population feels. The village of Wilson is treasured as a small settlement. Most residents moved here because of the slow pace, friendliness, and lack of density. Thus they are positively against density. In the Plan the importance of preserving the environment and wildlife is stressed. Nothing mentioned of preserving the village for the people. We frequently have been warned about a major earthquake. Did you take this into account when planning high density for Wilson? What if the Jackson Lake Dam breaks? Wilson is 6' lower than the Snake River so you know where all the flood water will go. When the Gros Ventre Dam gave way, Wilson was under water. The post office Dept. says that because of the dikes I don't need flood insurance but that I must have earthquake. The insurance people say I better have both. Even in a big snow year with a late, fast runoff, Fish Creek overflows its banks and the water runs behind the post office. I give the Planning Dept. a lot of credit for doing their best in the problems they face and how they settle them. Thanks for listening – good luck and best to you.
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Yeah, one thing that I think is a really important point that Steve brought up and Franz brought up is permeability in connecting different parts of open space in wildlife habitats. That's something that should be in the Plan, because if you start mapping now where you're trying to get significant wildlife crossings and plights, then you could start building ???. Let's take Highway 390, which where moose getting hit is a significant problem. It's going to be hard to do overpasses/underpasses there, pretty much impossible, because there's no terrain. But what part of the goal is you should slow down traffic. You know, and part of... when WYDOT comes to redesign 390, we need to have you working with them for a number of years. In order to get more wildlife across there, the only thing we see is slowing it down. Work with them but state that in this Plan, that you need crossing on southern 390 for large ???. The other one would be on highway, sorry, yeah, Highway 390, and Highway 22 really start planning now. Where do you want underpasses or overpasses? You could make the new Wilson Bridge and a replacement of the existing Wilson Bridge start them back a quarter of a mile farther on either side with a crossway. And so you are going over the river bottom instead of just filling it. And, you know, you, there's a lot of good examples of that around the country. And then the wildlife will go under that. You know, in other places there might be overpasses. But if you don't start...if the County doesn't lay this out ahead of time, you can't really blame WYDOT for not, you know, for having to be forced sort of to come in later. {Mr. McCarthy: So, a helpful thing in this process really, right now, identifying the hot spots or the best spots for some of the wildlife?} I think that really actually helps WYDOT. It forewarns them and gives them, you know, the ability to start thinking about it.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Well, potentially on West Broadway, we know it's a hotspot for deer mortality, wildlife vehicle collisions, a pretty hot spot for the loss of deer there, and it's a very dark little section of the highway. If there's enhancements to provide a combination where people walk and ride their bikes there, including downcast lighting that's appropriately scaled but that would provide vehicles a better visual clue that there's deer jumping off the bank, I better start slowing down, instead of waiting till they're right there on the hood. If you get a hundred feet of notice, you can stop. And that might be a way that, in that situation, there could be collaboration and could help pay for some of those improvements that would actually serve a couple of purposes. If I could build on that just briefly. That might be a perfect place to propose a speed reduction, which gets to Steve's point that a little better lighting at nighttime, a speed reduction. Maybe the speed...I don't know if it's all day or if it's at those critical hours, but if you combine better visibility with a lower speed, I think you could greatly improve that particular location, which we know is a problem.
6/23/2009	Kilpatrick, Steve Wyoming Game and Fis	If I can...I don't want to give the appearance of it turning into a debate here, but activity on Broadway is an obstacle and not just the fact that a deer gets hit by a car, but they get set back off the road a couple of times. There's an energy drain every time an animal, particularly in winter, has to adjust its behavior, there is an energy drain. And for these animals that can be very serious. So, I would caution us to be putting more into traffic in that area and that starts with vehicles and ??, but it also starts and includes human traffic. That is not a good place if you want to maintain permeability, because the more people we have going through, whether they're in cars, trucks, buses, bikes or on foot, they're going to cause more impact to wildlife. I just want to throw that out.
6/23/2009	Kilpatrick, Steve Wyoming Game and Fis	I don't know how to monitor it to quantify whether we're being successful or not. I've struggled hard with that for the last few months to figure out what type of monitoring protocol we say, okay, districts one, two and three want to see, you know, they want these species of wildlife there and some presence of them. Who the heck is going to monitor that? Well, that may be one tool and, you know, I'm just trying to think of...and I don't think you need to decide that in this Plan. We're getting the cart ahead of the horse here. I agree that the Environmental Commission can ponder on that. But in order to say whether you're successful, you have to do some monitoring and you have to have some objectives that you're either reaching, or quantifiable ones. <<inaudible>>.
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	I think one of the things that you could use to address this is again this Environmental Commission. Ask them, or the way that is put together, and I would certainly urge the representative of Game & Fish to be on that, have them work that out. I don't think the details, you know, no offense meant, but I don't think that's where you folks need to go. But I think you do need to do some kind of parameter and maybe what Steve is recommending or suggesting is a way to go—certain districts, certain species. But on the viability thing, and Steve talked about that earlier, where he referred to my use cause I've had a hard time with that phrase, I would like to see not only the viability but more than that, as Steve explained it, somewhat the same kind of habitat use that's going on now. In other words, the same kind of distribution that's going on now. Because we could have even 12,000 elk, even if we paved over South Park probably. And none of us want to do that. So, I would not only like to see the numbers remain, you know, at Game & Fish type levels that they're going to suggest, and I'd also like to see the distribution and part of that is permeability. And I think that's a factor that has to be put in here.
6/23/2009	Walker, Christine Teton County Housing	I'm guessing what you're asking is how did we come up with the number of housing 65 percent of workforce locally? Is that....? I think it...there is probably an opportunity to quantify it more; however, I'm pretty comfortable with how that I guess rational nexus and legal nexus is what you're looking for, more quantifiable. However, I guess we've looked at several other resort communities and that they have measured when, and we're very fortunate in this community that we're still housing more than 65 percent of our workforce. So we haven't gotten to a tipping point where we lose that sense of community. So we've looked at other resort communities and have been able to analyze at what level, again, this is where it becomes a little more touchy/feely is that when they lost the sense of community, it was at about 60 percent. When they were housing 60 percent of their workforce, they started feeling that sense of community being lost. But there were some things that are quantifiable as far as local businesses started to disappear, so your local hardware store didn't exist in the Town anymore. The theater, local theater, moved out. So there were some local businesses that left the community when less than 60 percent of the workforce was housed locally. So, coming up with the 65-percent number was kind of the tipping point, and it was very consistent in several resort communities, was that 60-percent number. And so being just above that seemed like a reasonable number that wasn't too aggressive to keep a sense of community here. Is that what you're asking, or...? {Mr. Wall: Well, it is except I was thinking that there might be some higher degree of definition for it, because it's easy to measure, or not even that easy to measure the percentage of the workforce, but it must be really hard to measure sense of community on some sort of a, you know, scale. But it's just...it's a pretty subjective idea, isn't it, to measure at what point you lose your sense of community?} Mmhm, kind of like community character. Same thing, subjective.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Resor, Bill Interested Public	Forest, I think that would be really valuable. It is quantifiable. And it's also something that developers can mitigate. In other words, if you quantify the amount of aspen, cottonwood, then what are you losing? Well, what do you really need to replace? Instead of having a landscape, you know, just so many units, you can be saying in this area we want more cottonwoods, or in this area we want more willows. You can tailor it and that's something that a developer can do relatively easily. So, I think that would be a much better goal. Personally, I mean, throw out the NRO; it does more harm than good. You know, it's basically enshrining old out-of-date data. I would just require people to use the best up-to-date data that's available and do good, specific site analysis that relates to an overall Plan. But there's really no area in the County where wildlife is not an issue. You may not want to attract it somewhere but wildlife ranges are everywhere. So there should be an environmental...if there isn't an environmental analysis in a project, all the NRO does is make false, you know, information on what is most important versus what isn't. You know, it's not the best data.
6/23/2009	Walker, Christine Teton County Housing	Chairman Hamilton, Commissioners, Christine Walker with the Teton County Housing Authority. I wanted to thank you for this opportunity and I've just been impressed with all the comments that have been made to this point, because I'm definitely hearing a lot of things that I haven't heard in the past and learning a lot. And I'm sure you guys are taking all this into consideration. And I do want to thank the planning staffs of both the County and the Town for all the hard work that they've put into getting this Plan to the point where it is today. I know that there's been a lot of criticism of this Plan; however, I think that the Planning Staff has done an amazing job of balancing a lot of the different goals within this community and giving us a real starting point to provide feedback and make comment and make this a better Plan for our community. My comments are based on a letter from our board to this board and to the Town Council, which I'm sure you all got a copy of, and it was based on meeting with about 30 different members of our community and gathering feedback on chapter, or theme four, which is the housing chapter, meeting with our board as a group, and then coming up with consolidated comments. And I'll just briefly go over kind of the main topics of that. The first is is that our board fully supports the concept of setting a goal of housing 65 percent of our workforce locally. That allows us to be accountable as an organization and as a community, too, which I think Patti summed up perfectly, was creating a sustainable community and economy. That really is the basis of housing our workforce here locally. The second piece of it is through the principles and policies of really establishing a what we call a three-legged-stool approach to providing housing for our workforce. In the past, we've really relied heavily on the regulatory side and new development. And what we're looking at here is a more balanced approach of regulations, incentives, and preserving existing housing stock. There is a strong recommendation on our board that currently a large portion of our housing stock serves as workforce housing. And we see that with the changing demographics in our community that a large portion of housing that...houses our workforce will be converted to either second homes or not available for our workforce. So we're really emphasizing a program in order to use the existing housing stock to reach that goal of housing 65 percent of our workforce. The node concept is something that also is supported by our organization. We're not going into details about what should be in the nodes, what should not be in the nodes, but identifying locations where it is appropriate to house our workforce really helps our organization but also I think provides predictability to the community. And I think Bill put it very good was the affordable housing PUD and the ?? development. I don't think that would get a probably a C grade for location. However, it's an amazing development and it does house a large portion of our workforce and the families are very happy to be there. But in the future we want to know where this community wants to house the workforce and we will work within those parameters. There are a couple of pieces that are missing in this current version of the Plan that we're in the other Plan, and we want to make sure that those pieces aren't lost. There's two things. One is we've moved to a term of workforce and our board is very comfortable going in that direction. We think there needs to be a little bit more clarification on the definition. That's the primary feedback that we've heard. And that we do not lose sight of the affordability aspect. And that that really is a key piece to having families be successful in this community is that their housing costs aren't more than 30 percent of their income. So keeping that affordable aspect. The other is addressing inadequate housing in our community, which is completely lost in this new Plan and was a primary component of establishing a housing program in the previous Comprehensive Plan, in our current Comprehensive Plan. And then finally, so I'm not going on forever, is that we want to be cautious...there appears to be a shift to housing higher-income workers in our community. And we just want to make sure that we're not getting away from the lower-income residents in our community, or workers in our community. And that really when we look at the demographics of the makeup of our workforce, it's really heavily weighted towards the lower-income ranges. And we just want to make sure we're not losing site of that. But, again, I just want to thank you for this opportunity, and I want to thank the work of the Planning Staff. I know how difficult it is, and I do not envy your position of weeding through all these comments and trying to make a better Plan for this community. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Forrest, thank you. And Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I'm Tim Young, I'm the executive director of Friends of Pathways here in Jackson. I also serve on the board of the ??, America's oldest and largest ??. And I serve on the board of the Yellowstone Teton Clean Energy Coalition, which works on alternative, transportation and alternative fuels. I was on the Teton County Staff in 1994 when the Comp Plan was developed and was very involved through three years of development of Chapter 8, the transportation chapter. And that's what I'm going to principally focus my comments on. And I would note I'm really pleased for the opportunity to be here, especially because there's been such limited planning time and public discussion, from my perspective, on the transportation topic. Land-use conversations have dominated, and clearly land use is a crucial element. But the history of the Comp Plan shows there's a direct relationship between land use and transportation. And solving transportation issues is then neither easy nor without controversy. So I think there's some merit to taking some...adding some focus in your work as you move forward to make sure that that component along with land use is appropriately considered. I guess as I look through this, I would summarize my thoughts and my comments, which I've submitted at least round-one comments to you folks, as I go through this document, theme six principally, as it's related to in other chapters, I find it to be less specific, less measurable, less hopeful, missing some critical elements, and essentially taking some steps backwards in goals from what we previously set. And I'll go through a couple of these topics, I guess, to kind of illustrate this a little bit. One would be in terms of the why is this ??, and that's a good reason. What's the problem? If you're going to come up with solutions, you know, let's see what we're addressing. I would say that theme six is missing some environmental effects of transportation and I would include climate change, air and water and noise pollution, wildlife vehicle pollutions. Those are environmental effects of transportation that should be recognized. The energy issues are really quite under recognized. We should be a leader, as a community, in terms of alternative energy and conservation energy, including goals to reduce the use of fossil fuel and promoting alternative fuels would be appropriate in this Plan. Public health impacts on power-centric transportation are well documented. We see diabetes, cardiovascular disease are related to our autocentric development in America. And this Plan could chart a course for Jackson Hole that would benefit our entire community in public health improvements. And I think the economics impacts to Jackson Hole, the changing world, where the cost of oil will continue to rise, suggest that we should be looking at alternative transportation systems more wholeheartedly than this Plan currently takes on. For example, the ?? goals in this Plan, in my view, should be increased and yet this Plan actually decreases them. It says on page 59-60 that it would require an additional 10 percent of trips along the major corridors to shift out of single-occupancy vehicles into another travel mode. Well, the current Plan actually has 14 percent. So we're taking our goal and knocking it down 4 percent. It has, you know, ride share, walking, bicycling, and transit and sets specific targets for those. And this has no specific targets. It's really going to be a very difficult, too generic of a goal, and it's been reduced from what we previously had in the current Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan. There's a list of things that need to be developed in a transportation element or transportation chapter. It's not just a pathway system but it's also pedestrian walkways and those are not just in the Town but in the nodes—Wilson, Teton Village, the Aspens, Hoback Junction. If we're going to have nodes where people live and work, they're also going to walk. And that's a good thing. But we need to plan ahead if those are properly accommodated. Every street needs to be a complete street that serves all the users. We have complete streets in here, but in terms of really calling that policy out, this is not yet quite there. We need to greatly expand the STAR system, which it talks about but it could do more. It's also missing—and I think some of the other panelists touched on this—the County doesn't control the universe. We need to work very carefully with WYDOT, Greater Teton and Grand Teton National Park, in particular, three agencies that have jurisdictional authority over much of our transportation system. They're also, fortunately for us, could provide some of the resources we need to better accomplish the goals that we should be citing for our community. So, working with them in setting up some parameters for how that might take place are really important I think. And I think alternative fuel technology and trying to minimize the carbon footprint in Jackson Hole is a forward-looking vision that needs to be more prominent in the document. I think that instead of shifting 10 percent, we should be talking about 50 percent of all our trips would be by some sort of alternative modes by 2030, or pick a date, if you want to look out, I'm just thinking, say, it takes you another year to get this done, look out 20 years from then to 2030. Why couldn't we set a goal of 50 percent? It would be, say, 10 percent bike, 10 percent walk, 10 percent transit, 10 percent should be from just reducing like to rideshare and transportation demand management programs. A very reasonable goal, let me say. And add those up and you get 50 percent. Now that's the type of goal and more specific and more measurable that I think this Plan would benefit by tackling and including in this. The Plan talks about policy 6.1.c., research regional transportation authority by the ??. That falls far short of what you need to be doing, in my opinion, in this Plan. There's a tremendous effort underway right now in regional transportation planning. The Idaho Transportation Department over the hill is funded through the Americans Recovery and Reinvestment Act well over half a million dollars. The contract was just let for the very first time, hiring a full-time project manager, looking at a pilot study and developing regional transportation COLA, a new concept that's gaining traction and has tremendous funding. And it isn't Idaho is funding this, but it actually includes northwest Wyoming and the Greater Yellowstone Region. This document should consider that and I would suggest it's appropriate for the Plan to embrace regional transportation planning, regional transit systems, and integrate them into a multimobile system. That's where everybody that's successful in our country and the world, other communities in other countries, are being successful. And we have...we're

blessed with...we're in the right time and the right place to put this in here and actually get the financial assistance, work with our partners, and implement something that really could make a difference in terms of how people get around in our community, in our national parks and this great region we live in. There's some important elements that are in the current Chapter 8 that are just missing from this, and one is and the Town and County has substantially failed to follow through with this. It isn't that they've done a good job with it, <<inaudible>>. We've actually done a bad job as a community and now we're just kind of forgetting about it. And one of these is the development of a transportation improvement program. It's kind of a capital improvements list; it's common terminology in transportation planning and it needs to be ramped up. You should revisit what's in here and see how that could be fit into this new Comprehensive Plan. And I think it really needs to fess up and talk about the transportation network projects. What's in there now is really just a list of highway projects. If we're going to talk about alternative transportation and how important that is, we need to talk about a transit facility for START. That's really woefully under addressed in here. We need to talk about the highway down to Hoback Junction and maybe draw a line in the sand about how we're going to build highways and accommodate wildlife and scenic values, address our needs for mobility, and it doesn't do that yet. And there's other projects that are in my comments but I just want to point out that that is a woefully inadequate list of projects. This Chapter 8 has much more information. Maybe it's too specific, but I think there's value in tackling that in the Comprehensive Plan. How are we looking at these major, multimillion-dollar projects? What are the big ones that are important to us as a community? And those strategies in there again are less specific and potentially less hopeful than what we already have. We need to be able to measure the details and see if we're getting where we're going. We need to work better with WYDOT and federal agencies because in the transportation world, that's where the money flows from. And right now is a great opportunity. If we knew what we wanted, Congress is working on the next reauthorization of a big transportation funding bill, we could be written in. Senator ?? serves on the committee that's going to write the legislation. A very good time to know what we want and ask for it as a community. I think we would be rewarded if we did. That's really a brief summary of kind of my view of this. I'm not saying this is wrong, but I'm saying it's still less specific, less measurable and currently less helpful than what we have. So, I think the transportation element truly needs some work. And I appreciate the Planning Commission tackling that along with the land-use issues. I think they go hand in hand, and it would be helpful.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Kilpatrick, Steve Wyoming Game and Fis	Okay, I'm Steve Kilpatrick. I'm with Wyoming Game & Fish Department and I am representing them, so the comments that I'll paraphrase are being sent to you, and I'll sort of adlib on a bit, are from Game & Fish, not anyone's personal comments, so keep that in mind. And I've been here since 1985 personally. I'm a habitat biologist. And we had about six people collaborate on our comments. And we will give you a signed copy, probably not tonight because in redoing this, I found a couple of errors. So, we'll correct the errors and get the correct signatures and get them to you within the next couple of days. Thanks again for the opportunity to be here. And I said that back in 1994 when I worked with that Plan, so I have a little bit of experience with that and I think it was a pretty good Plan. I think that this Plan does tear off a bit of it in a lot of respects. I'm going to paraphrase some of our comments so I'll start with that. We do support the concept of moving toward a Plan that is more predictable in determining the extent and location of development with the County. We're also excited that the Plan states and emphasizes that wildlife and natural resources are a priority. So, while we're excited about that, that also probably puts us to work a little more than we expected. Some of our points that we made in our comments are...will be started with the Natural Resource Overlay. And we provided information a couple of years ago along with Teton County, the National Park, ?? Refuge, Teton Science School, Wildlife Conservation Society, Grand Teton National Park, BT Forest, and Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation, for some updated overlays. And we know the County used them to some extent; however, we wish maybe they could have been appropriated a little bit more in this Plan. And the Plan is generally...we view it as a visionary guiding document but does propose specifics with respect to node location, design and development levels. And updating the NRO prior to providing such specifics will attempt to, even districts as well as nodes, may have more accurately identified and quantified wildlife impacts. And potentially offered some opportunities for improved design and mitigation measures. So that was kind of our main concern, the one that was glittering through most of all of us that read the Plan. We're excited that the Plan still identifies species and special concerns and the Plan does mention expanding that. We're very supportive of that, because we do have better conflict areas, we have sagebrush issues, we have nesting rafters, we have amphibians, we have wetlands and other areas of potential wildlife, important and concern areas. We think the addition of more species of concern is very important by updating the existing NRO and also provide a more accurate picture of important wildlife areas in the Town. The Plan mentions indicators and monitoring for eco system health. We do support that. This is a great strategy, and we'd like to help develop a list of wildlife species to be used as indicators and assist with the monitoring of the future. And maybe we can get a list of indicator species by district as all the districts can be and some are quite different than others. So just a blanket species list probably would not be appropriate. The old Plan included important habitat types, and we would like to see that continued. The new Plan mentions it. However, we have a Game & Fish Strategic Habitat Plan if you would like to utilize it in cooperation with the County to try to identify additional important habitat types, such as aspen, mixed mountain shrub, some sagebrush communities, ?? areas, and some wetland habitat. So, if we could expand...and that might also be woven into the NRO. The old NRO mentions species as kind of the driving factor behind the NRO boundaries. It does mention habitat but I couldn't really find where habitat was actually woven into the fabric of the old NRO. We'd like to see that done in the new one. The new Plan mentions an Environmental Commission. We strongly support that and we'd like to be a player in that Environmental Commission. One thought that we had relative to high-density development areas that are being proposed and their close proximity to either the existing NRO or what we perceive to be the new NRO boundary. We'd like you to explore the concept of some type of a buffer zone to have a simply and infinitely small line in the sand, and on one side of it you have high density, high-rise development, whatever it may be, and the other side is the NRO. And having those adjacent to each other is definitely not the best idea for wildlife. The width of these buffer zones would be variable and depend on the primary species impacted and the habitat types that are there. Some habitat types, for example, might require additional screening while others may not. Some wildlife species may be very sensitive to human disturbance while others may not. So it's a case-by-case situation. And we will certainly help out with that. One category we just called build out. We have concerns regarding the picture of how the community would really look at full build out or planning implementation. And that isn't with respect to necessarily the new Plan but the build out expectations or allowances in the old Plan also apply. We just know as there are more people, there are more impacts to wildlife. In that category, we also threw in permeability as an issue. It's critical in areas like the Aspens, the Aspen node, and along Highway 390 and the proposed Wilson node. And we need to allow for permeability; not just allowing wildlife to move through there. Careful planning will be needed to ensure that wildlife will be able to make daily as well as seasonal moves. And also identifying certain districts as where wildlife and open spaces are a high priority is important, but the districts where it's not identified as a high priority may have some pretty important wildlife values, and we'd like to further discuss those. It's kind of a minor thing, I know, to the average citizen, but the term viable populations. As biologists, we stumble over that. A viable population means just enough breathing individuals to keep the population alive. And, you know, that necessarily isn't what we hope you folks mean as viable population. So, a viable population of elk might be 300 elk. And I hope we want more than that around. A viable population <<inaudible>>. So, we'd like to maybe have you change that terminology to collaborating with Game & Fish on our population objectives for various species. And we have various planning documents and ?? plans and so forth for an array of species, not quite all of them by any means, but we think they'll be more appropriate. For example, the former Plan says we'll work with Game & Fish to maintain current or proposed population objectives, instead of just viable populations. Viable populations is applicable to something that's about extinct or threatened,

something like that. So, not a big deal but just to us cone-headed biologists, we appreciate your patience on that. [Laughter] Disperse recreation, we continually deal with that in cooperation with the federal land mandate and private land owners. But we don't own much land in Teton County, that being Game & Fish doesn't own much land, but we own the wildlife and we're always working with individuals and entities to protect and maintain the integrity of wildlife habitat and not fragment it or minimize it anymore than possible. And so with increased human populations, we really hope you emphasize collaboration with the Forest, with us, with the Park, whomever it may be, to figure out where to funnel these people. There are some places that would be less of an impact to wildlife than others. I'd like to discuss those further. Just with increased population, as the old Plan and the new Plan proposes, we're going to have more wildlife via populations. The Jackson Wildlife Foundation cooperates with the Wyoming Public Transportation to document some of this. That's been very helpful. From 1990 to '96, for example, there were 159 documented road kills. We don't know how many more get a broken leg and wondered off into the bushes and die or get ?? or whatever. It could be quite a bit more than that. So, basically, 160 from 1990 to '96, and then from 2000 to 2006 basically killed 240, so it should be mentioned. We all know travel routes have increased vehicle traffic on them, you know, so from 1990 to 2000 it increased 129 percent. So, we'll simply have more wildlife on our highways. Increasing lanes doesn't seem to help. Slowing traffic does. That's been proven through science over and over again. But adding more lanes means more to cross at the same 55 mile an hour, 45 mile an hour, whatever it may be. So, help us with that. Underpasses and overpasses, I think there are viable solutions to that. They're very costly, but I hope we're not so rich we can't afford some things that are going to benefit wildlife. One thing that we're chronically hit with are nuisance wildlife calls, and those numbers just continue to increase as the population of the County increases. And we don't increase our Staff at the same level. We did add on one temporary position to deal with black bears and with bears, for example. And we've got a great bear-wise program going with Teton County and the Jackson Wildlife Foundation. That's only one aspect of it. But we are currently understaffed for the level of nuisance calls we get now. We'll undoubtedly get a lot more, which I'm not sure what we're going to do at this point. And that's about the summary of our comments. I'd just like to thank you for the opportunity to come and express some words for a constituency that seems to be the primary objective of the Plan in the community, so we asked our constituency, our free and feathered animals that don't get to come here and speak their turn or pass their opinion. So, we try to articulate what we think they need, but we're not always going to be exact. And our comments, please don't take them out on us. We're simply hired to articulate what we think those critters want. And it's not necessarily what we want either. <<inaudible>> . So, thanks for the opportunity and we'll get this signed and out to you shortly.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Romaine, Amy PAWS	Hi, Amy Romaine, PAWS of Jackson Hole, and I'm here to specifically comment on theme one, policy 1.7.a, which is stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. There's a section in there that says in order to avoid excessive pressure on nearby public lands, recreational opportunities such as dog parks, trails, parks and pathways will be provided and developed in developing areas. So I wanted to comment specifically on that. For many years, PAWS of Jackson Hole has worked with the Town and County in promoting an ethical responsible pet ownership, and we've been pretty successful in educating people on the importance of everything from spaying and neutering to picking up poop and maintaining control of your dog and training and all that kind of thing. Currently, Jackson is home to over 10,000 dogs, all of which require exercise and socialization. According to the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce yesterday, we get about two and a half million visitors per year on an average. Seventy to 80 percent of those come through in the summertime. So, we can say that we're pretty much confident that a large percentage of those visitors do travel with pets. So, we're seeing an extra few thousand dogs come through in summertime. So, that's in addition to our 10,000 that are already residing here. The number one question PAWS of Jackson Hole gets from these visitors is is there a dog park and where can I exercise my dog. Although there are many public parks in Town, none allows dogs on the premises as it stands today. What we see happening is a huge population of people coming in here. The first thing they want to do is let their dog out of their car. And, as it stands today, we really don't have a place for them to do that in an off-leash area. To make matters worse, if anyone is actually spotted allowing their dog to roam into one of our public parks, they could be faced with a citation by one of our animal control officers. This could be a simple warning. It could be a \$50 citation. But for repeat offenders that could be \$750. So, it really is frowned upon to let your dog roam onto one of our public parks. So we are thrilled to see that dog parks have been considered as part of this draft in the Comprehensive Plan. We do agree with its placement under stewardship of wildlife. Because none of the public parks allows dogs, most dog owners and visitors do take advantage of the fantastic trails and pathways that we do have. However, because of the sheer numbers of dogs out there, we're seeing a lot of congestion and sometimes there is conflict with wildlife. So we do get complaints mostly in the winter when the wildlife is traveling through. We believe that a dog park would help alleviate some of this congestion that currently exists and it would help to reduce conflicts with wildlife to get these dogs off of the trails and pathways. That's not the only benefit we see, however. We believe that the benefits to the community go much farther than protection of wildlife. As a resort or visitor-oriented community, in the planning process, we should consider both the full-time residents and our part-time residents and visitors. Having a dog park would bring Jackson Hole up to par with every other resort town in our vicinity. Towns like Park City, Vale, Breckenridge, Aspen, Sun Valley and Big Sky have all seen the benefits of dog parks. They've all installed at least one in their communities and they've all been proud to offer this recreational opportunity to their visitors. It is our belief that a dog park is part of a wide array of offerings that would contribute to the vitality of this growing community. Additionally, Jackson Hole has many workers that commute in from other communities. A lot of these people leave their dogs in their cars all day, which is not ideal for the dog. This would give them an opportunity to get their dog out during lunch and before and after work. And it would be in Town. Additionally, people who just come into Town for a few hours would have a place to take their dog and would not be hit with any kind of citation. Other benefits include the fact that dog parks do promote an ethical responsible pet ownership. They provide vital public spaces for people to socialize and form bonds of community and friendship. Dog parks offer designated off-leash spaces which reduce the amount of time that law enforcement has to spend enforcing the leash laws. They significantly reduce the amount of dog waste that is deposited on public and private land. And lastly a dog park would provide a centralized location for us to facilitate a dialog about responsible pet ownership. PAWS is well aware that having a community dog park is something that would require oversight and administration. We are prepared to take on that role. We would be willing to fund and facilitate property maintenance, fencing, water, sitting areas, governance of the park and any liability issues and insurance. We are also prepared to help finance the needs of the park well into the future. What we do need is for the Planning Commission to consider designating some space for this purpose. PAWS of Jackson Hole for many years has tried to get the approval to install a public dog park. Because land is so expensive, it is well beyond the scope of our budget. But we would ask that you would consider either changing the existing rules in one of the parks in Town, or consider designating some space for this purpose. Ideally, the space would be one acre or larger. In our research, we found that the average size of a U.S. dog park is an acre to an acre and a half. That's fifty to 75,000 square feet. There are smaller dog parks in cities around the U.S., but those typically just service the neighborhood in which they're located. They're not meant to service a whole community. So we would be looking for approximately an acre to an acre and a half. That's about it. Thank you for allowing us this opportunity to share our vision for a very small part of the future of this community. We believe that most people do consider Jackson to be dog friendly. A community dog park is the next logical extension of the notion that dogs are a vital part of the character of this community. And we believe that dogs bring people together and provide a social outlet for members of our community and for our visitors. So, please make every effort to include the needs of the dog-owning public in the next draft of the Plan. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Wackerly, Michael START	My name is Michael Wackerly and I'm director of START Bus. And I wanted to thank the Planning Commission for the opportunity to and for the willingness to hear the point of view of the START Bus and the START Bus board when they're doing their deliberation on the Comp Plan. A couple of things I wanted to point out. In one of the earlier versions, we were gratified to see that 61 percent of the community prioritized increased transit service over building new roads. And we certainly agree with that position. Seventy-seven percent of the community agreed that the Town and County should promote walking by signaling transit and carpooling as alternative to widening roads. And, again, we agree with that wholeheartedly. The principal six states that the most viable way to achieve a significant shift in travel to alternative modes is an increase in transit mode share and also acknowledges the contribution of the other modes. We certainly feel that there's a significant potential for cutting into a greater share of that travel in the community by public transit, if a much more expanded and comprehensive public transit service was provided. However, we recognize...and the other thing I'll say, and again sort of echoing what Christine said, I worked pretty closely with the Town and County Planning Departments in reviewing this. And so I feel like a lot of our comments were already included. And the two big ones were the fact that we have to identify a funding source that until we do that, and it's going to be in combination of some of the things that Tim mentioned, WYDOT and the federal funds and a larger local commitment of dedicated transit money. And until that happens, you're really not going to provide the kind of system that is going to take a much larger share of the travel away from the private auto. And the other major factor, and I think it's alluded to in the report, maybe could be strengthened but that the new facility...we're, the START Bus, continues to operate out of the Public Works garage, storing the buses outside, maintaining the buses in that garage and sharing that maintenance space with all other Town and County fleets. And we don't necessarily think that there should be a separate facility, maintenance facility. We think there is some economy of scale and some efficiency in maintaining all public fleets in the same facility, but the existing facility is woefully inadequate to do that. So before START can really consider any significant expansions, we have to address that new facility, how we're going to fund it, where we're going to put it, and get that project moving. I've been here almost seven years and I've been working on trying to get that project off the ground for a good, well, off and on for all those seven years and feel like we still are not that much further than we were seven years ago. So, we are working with the Town and County, and I think they recognize the priority of that and I think we are going to make some progress pretty quickly on that. But it definitely needs to be strongly emphasized in this Comprehensive Plan. The other thing I would mention, a couple of things I guess, the node and land-use pattern, we certainly support that. I think that would be a very...would allow you to provide efficient public transit if you could use the node. And again we're not here to say where the node should be or what all should be included, but using the node pattern, concentrating developments in specific areas of land uses in specific areas, provides a little greater density which is much more easily served by public transit. And we would like to work with the Planning Departments with input from Pathways and other representatives of alternative modes to help plan the transportation in the nodes, both in the nodes and between the nodes. I mean, I could see within the node, you know, a really effective sidewalk system and pathway system and but maybe connecting the nodes would be the public transit's role. So we would certainly support that. And the only other thing I'll mention, as Steve, I'm sorry, as Tim mentioned, there is an effort going on for regional, looking at regional transportation and the coop program, and Tim and I are both on the task force that is working on that. So, I certainly agree with Tim's sentiment that that should be something that is included in the Comprehensive Plan. That's all I have. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	My name is Patti Ewing and, along with my husband, Frank, have been in business in Jackson Hole, in the river business in Jackson Hole, since 1962, so it's quite a few years. But during that period of time, we've also been I think pretty involved in the community. And let me just briefly provide you some of those things. I taught school in the high school for 20 years and that was briefly interrupted by a 14-, 15-year hiatus of being alone up here; on the school board for 14 years. I was on the science school board from its inception from the time that ?? had the dream of the science school up until or through its first major fund raiser 20 years ago, and Bill Resor was a part of that. And I no longer fund raise, let me tell you that for sure. I've been on a number of other community boards, including the earth board, parks and rec board in its infancy. I was on the chamber of commerce board, probably not a very good member, but I was on the board. Because my love is for kids and I love horses, I helped to establish the Jackson Hole Pony Club, which my children were involved in, and then went on to help with the therapeutic riding. In brief, I guess most of my involvement has been with young people and, of course, rivers. Just as an aside, probably the most important thing Frank and I've done is raise our two daughters. Frank has also been involved in the community. Most recently, he was involved in helping establish the Snake River Fund. And he was a part of the Sea Fish, the organization which promoted the inclusion of the Snake River and it's headwaters and wild and scenic system, which we believe has had and will have an enormous impact on the future of Jackson Hole. So I'm saying this just because we want you to see that we are committed to the community. We love this community and we have for a long time. Now then, most recently I've been active in organizing Miss Jackson, the neighborhood, so that's my latest organizational kind of thing. And so through that I've been involved. We've attended all the meetings dealing with the Comp Plan since revisiting the Comp Plan has been done. Now, do you want me to go through the eight points directly that I think...Is that all right? I won't spend a lot of time on them. I'll try and be brief and then if you have any other questions, I'll try to answer them. First of all and first and foremost, I believe that the vision statement should be rewritten. It needs to restore the preservation of wildlife, open space and natural resources as the community's number one priority in all districts in the Town and County. And you say why, what happens in...why all districts, including downtown? And I suggest that anything that happens anywhere in this County or Town affects the rest of the County. I think that the quote meeting human needs portion that we find in this vision statement should be eliminated and it should be removed and subjugated to the challenge of meeting human needs through themes two and seven, and if you prefer to name those eleven to thirteen, those themes are outlined. Two, I believe we ought to set the build-out maximum for residential units based upon underlining entitlements without any incentive bonuses. That is by right. And I'm not going to go through those numbers right now. I think, three, we need to eliminate incentive bonuses' tools because they are not predictable. And as they are applied today, they have in fact increased our workforce housing burden. For example, since the inception of the Town's PMG tool, the Town's PMG tool has housed only 11 percent of the full-time employees those projects have created up through 2008. And that percentage, by the way, comes from the Town and Planning Department's own numbers. Four, adopt a policy which states that the County will not export its housing needs to Town and the Town will not export its housing needs to the County. And I was concerned about the policy 2.5.d. on page 35 that states...talks about the annexation possibilities. Five, workforce housing is inadequately linked to growth in this Plan. And I've gone through Appendix I in the big fat book, and I think we should require the workforce housing demand for the 65 percent goal should be continuously assessed by our Housing Authority people. And that means an inventory of the housing units, what categories they are, who's occupying them. And based on that, we set a mitigation rate and a linkage policy between commercial growth and housing. Six, the Plan should assess the consequences and cost of growth in terms of taxes and quality of life. And that elusive quality of life is a very real thing for all of us, because I think every one of us has come here to live because of the quality of life that we all enjoy. And I can go on with examples; practically, we all know what the problems are. The cost of the infrastructure, schools, crowded schools, needing more schools. What is that? I suggest it might be like a ponzi scheme. Well, maybe that's not a good analysis. Seven, we want a sustainable community and economy, not as described in the Plan as sustainable development. I think chasing tax revenues through growth incentives doesn't work. Growth is not green, I don't think; it's not really sustainable. And I suggest we work to improve the quality of life within a caring capacity of Jackson Hole. And all you have to do is look around the country and see all the problems in other communities, big and small, that are dealing with rampant population, cost of infrastructure, cost of providing those needs, the human needs. And eight, the community character, which Franz was talking about, needs to be stated very clearly and needs to be very high on priorities. And I suggest to you the 1994 Plan made a fairly good attempt at talking about community character. And it's one of those nebulous things, but we all see something we like and we know that that is a part of Jackson Hole. And I know that downtown Jackson Hole sometimes is described as, well, that's not really western, but it is in fact...creates an ambience which visitors like. And I submit to you that most of us are...this is a visitor-oriented community and I'm meaning to keep it that way because for obvious reasons. In closing, let me just say that we've had a lot of repeat clients over the years, many of whom are probably coming here to live, and I think we could all...we all know that, because it's such a marvelous place to live. But people who come currently will look around Town and see what's happened to Town, what's happened to this wonderful place that we call Jackson Hole, the mountain resort, which used to be truly a mountain resort, is becoming more and more urbanized as is Town. And I suggest to you that we all came here for the very same reason. And that is our services are certainly based upon the appeal in the Town and the County of wildlife, open space and our natural resources. I think we all cherish those; let's not lose them.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	Group discussed balance of additional local convenience commercial with need to complete Hwy 390 infrastructure improvements before additional development.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that a better definition of "local convenience commercial" was needed in light of possible Tribal Trails construction and desire not to attract trips to this area.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The majority of the group felt that Wilson should remain a node because it has the components of a node today. However, a more realistic development potential should be developed based on Fish Creek, wetlands, existing CC&Rs, community character, and Highway 22. The Future Land Use Map should be revised to incorporate this additional level of detail.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended that the Tribal Trails Connector be included in a more comprehensive traffic system study of all of West Jackson (Hwy 22, the "Y", High School Rd. South Park Loop). General discussion occurred regarding the local vs. collector character of Tribal Trails and the original intent of the road.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt strongly that wildlife movement from East Gros Ventre Butte to Karns Meadow needs to be addressed immediately in this district through overpass, or funneling to a wildlife crossing, or other method.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended a statement about connectivity of pathways and roadways to existing and future neighborhoods. Consensus was reached about highlighting future north-south and east-west thoroughfares in the north half of the district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was that this was an appropriate place for expansion of the town development pattern, but was no consensus was reached on how much development should occur. Some in the group felt that the increase in density should be similar to the Cottonwood Park area. Some members of the group believed that the whole district should be planned comprehensively. Some believed the district should be broken into a node district (north) and a rural district (south).
6/17/2009	, STAG	The majority of the group felt that Aspens should remain a node because it has the components of a node today. However, additional development potential should not be allowed until Hwy 390 is redesigned and the transportation impacts of additional development are understood. The Future Land Use Map should be revised to address this change.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that the Tribal Trail connector should not increase traffic congestion on High School Road. The group also discussed the appropriateness of traffic calming to reduce traffic impacts on local residents.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended including a definition of Complete Streets that would consider sidewalks, traffic calming, reduce neighborhood speed limits and other applicable multi-modal encouragements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Another recommendation was that the Wildlife Theme should move up in the priority order since the district provides connectivity from Karns Meadow.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group suggested inserting a statement about redevelopment of the Public Works Facility if should be relocated in the future. The future land use should be designated as residential.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended including a stronger statement about the importance of the hospital campus and accommodating future expansion of their facilities and supporting uses in the area. In addition Community Facilities due to the location of the hospital should be moved up the Theme prioritization due to health, safety, and general welfare concerns of the community.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	Some of the group felt that wildlife permeability needed more emphasis in this district. Others stated that the wildlife access was strategically designed to discourage wildlife permeability in residential neighborhoods and to direct wildlife to around the built environment (i.e. Elk Refuge fencing).
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that workforce housing was not appropriate in the Town Square Overlay. Language should be revised to reflect this sentiment.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Parking should be provided as a public common amenity to give pedestrian orientation to the district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Group discussed design standards versus guidelines trying to get to predictability, but understanding differences in style.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that building height should be limited to two-stories as recommended in the plan.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of group was to modify the language in the Plan to be more positive by encouraging two to three story mixed use buildings rather than discouraging single story, single use buildings..
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt document was weak on details of "Y" intersection redesign especially the multi-modal issue and suggested pedestrian overpasses.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that Single Family Mixed north of Broadway should be changed to Single Family Low.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed the feasibility of lodging due to the two story limit, but didn't want to preclude lodging necessarily.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The 1994 Plan recognized the importance of agriculture in the community. This Theme should better acknowledge ag preservation and ag preservation should be enhanced as a strategy in this theme by promoting meaningful incentives for conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group was supportive of all proposed expansions to the lodging overlay.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended including language about bulk and scale for nonresidential buildings to maintain community character.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	Consensus of the group was that incentives should not be discretionary. They should be performance based. Incentives that are currently discretionary that were specifically discussed were the PMUD, PRD, and AH-PUD development options. There was further discussion of eliminating the PMUD all together or at least amending the tool to reflect the FLUP.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was to leave in incentives/density bonuses for open space and workforce housing where appropriate if they are directly tied to those community benefits; however, there was no agreement on who should pay for this.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed the viability, practicality, and necessity of a growth rate cap or overall growth cap. Some members of the group felt the market will control the rate of growth and the current rate is manageable. Others felt that triggers, overall caps, 5 year caps, infrastructure triggers, or rate caps are necessary for managing growth. However concern regarding implementation and a lack of successful examples in other communities were identified in the discussion. The greater concern is the total number of persons that could be housed in the valley at the expense of diminishing the quality of life. Annual monitoring of the indicators does a good job of providing benchmarks for the community to evaluate.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Policy 1.3.c needs to acknowledge the regional, national, and international factors involved in achieving the goal of reducing greenhouse gases associated with buildings and the possible unintended consequences of future regulation.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Members of the group recommended inserting an indicator about the planning process and whether the length of the application process is effective and efficient.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group thought more emphasis should be placed on obtaining conservation easements to protect natural resources and open space by inserting it as its own principle.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group suggested that more clarity should be given to the definition of community character as it pertains to town and felt that tightening the language in Principle 3.5, Recognize the importance of civic spaces and social functions as a part of maintaining a sense of community, would achieve that goal.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Another area of discussion was the concept of regionalism. The group agreed that while not exporting impacts is important it has to be balanced with the reality that the community cannot meet all its needs locally. The group acknowledged that regionalism is a broad concept that does affect all themes in the Plan. The definition of regionalism should be well articulated and more clearly defined.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that stronger definitions were needed for terms such as natural resources, workforce housing, etc.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was that Vision should not rank Themes 3-7 in priority order. Rather, these Themes compose the human element of the Plan that collectively should be balanced with Theme 1 (Wildlife and Natural Resources). Some believe that it is this human element that is the responsibility of government and that an overarching "Human Needs" Theme is needed that focuses on the health, safety, and welfare of the community. Graphically, this recommended balance could be illustrated more fully with a teeter-totter image. Theme 2 (Managing Growth Responsibly) would function as the balancing point with Theme 1 to the left and Themes 3-7 to the right. Theme 2 is the toolbox for balancing wildlife priorities with the human elements of the community.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Some in the group recommended developing an economic development initiative or task force to develop a strategy to address strengths and weaknesses in our local economy. Others felt that function was adequately performed by the Chamber of Commerce.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group stated that the Plan should recognize that while we talk about being a "community first and a resort second" that we are, in fact, a resort community.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that both economic and environmental factors should be considered when making findings to approve development applications.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that connectivity of open space is important. Open space preservation does not necessarily equate to preserving wildlife migration corridors. Further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated in this theme. To accomplish this, future regulation should maintain enough residential density to allow for clustering in appropriate areas while providing essential conservation easements in identified crucial habitat areas or migration corridors. The group agreed that the indicator on conservation easements obtained needs to focus on analyzing open space connectivity and that while it can be compiled every year trends will only be seen in a 5-year period.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed the realistic implementation and prioritization of Principle 4.3 regarding preserving the existing housing stock due to the high acquisition costs and resale requirements on homeowners.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The general consensus of the group was that diversifying our economy is difficult, but should not be discouraged. The local economy is resort and tourist based and we are not trying to transform economy.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Some of the group suggested that the language in this theme should strive for economic stability, while others thought that growth is sustainable. Some felt the plan should encourage full employment, while others were not comfortable with that as a goal, and felt employment should only be used as an indicator of economic health. The group suggested adding the unemployment rate as an indicator
6/17/2009	, STAG	Generally, the group felt that economic development efforts should focus on fostering non-consumptive industries; however, the term "non-consumptive" needs to be better defined.
6/17/2009	, STAG	There was agreement in the group that the 1994 Plan encouraged us to further our status as a resort community. Recognizing the importance of tourism to our local economy, the Comp Plan should better emphasize the value in promoting our community as a tourist destination to maintain economic vitality.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed a strategy of trying to become the first "green" resort community as a way to differentiate us from our peers and market ourselves. This idea could be defined by the community at a later date.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group did not feel that the policies of Principle 5.1 actually supported the principle of maintaining a strong and diverse economy.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Some of the group suggested that a policy be added in this theme that controlling growth is needed as a part of protecting wildlife, natural resources, and open space; however, others felt that the market would control the rate of growth and the current rate is manageable.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group was uncomfortable with the use of the term "all" in Policy 4.1.a in discussion of who the community is committed to housing.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was that Level of Service D and the current level of congestion will hurt the tourism economy. The group indicated that a the community should not aim for failing . The group felt that intersection improvements at the "Y" in addition to the Tribal Trails Connector could aid in traffic circulation for residents and visitors alike.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that the Plan should be clear that the 65% housing goal is not a recommended mitigation rate.
6/17/2009	, STAG	There was a strong consensus from the group that the Theme should have a much stronger emphasis on rental housing in order to achieve the 65% goal.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group wanted to know the current profile of the 65% of workers living locally in terms of free market, deed restricted, and rental units. The consensus of the group was that the Plan should not establish a goal of housing 65% of the workforce locally without a better understanding of the current condition. Further, the group felt that the definition of working in the community should be refined to clarify whether retired workforce and live/work is included in this percentage.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended including language about bulk and scale for nonresidential buildings to maintain community character.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Consensus of the group was that incentives should not be discretionary. They should be performance based. Incentives that are currently discretionary that were specifically discussed were the PMUD, PRD, and AH-PUD development options.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed possible mischief in the balance of private property rights and redevelopment opportunities with the historic preservation policies of Principle 3.6. It was suggested that there are few truly historical properties in the community and that redevelopment should not be deterred by individual views on what is historic.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt strongly about the inclusion of the relevance of Flat Creek in this theme as a community amenity.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group unanimously recommended elimination Policy 5.1.d and Strategy 5.2 regarding small business subsidies. The group was not supportive of non-residential rent control.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended looking closer at the buildout range due to the Wild and Scenic rivers designation.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that the Plan also needs a better explanation of the redevelopment expectations for Mixed Use Visitor Orientation classification, should existing uses cease.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Group was supportive of general pedestrian connection vision and specific use mix and bulk and scale proposed for this district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group supported classification of the neighborhood north of Rodeo Grounds as Single Family Mixed.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that in the rural districts agricultural operations should be given some flexibility in order to house their employees on site.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group's primary recommendation was designating enough land for future community facilities to remove some reliance on Idaho jurisdictions.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	A straw poll was taken on whether the rodeo grounds and public works facility should be moved out of town to make room for a public park and medium to high density residential. The majority of the group supported the relocation of these facilities.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group generally agreed that the lodging overlay should not be removed on East Broadway.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that local convenience commercial near Golf & Tennis within existing entitlements to reduce trips to town is appropriate.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed the impact of multi-family land use classification on wildlife in Karns Meadow, but no consensus was reached.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was to make improvements to Highway 390 before allowing additional development in this corridor. Further, the group recommended that more specific traffic solutions should be identified in this district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group acknowledged that without more local convenience commercial near the Aspens to reduce trips to town, traffic increases on Hwy 390 will cause additional congestion.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that "Complete Streets" and "Context Sensitive Solutions" need to be defined.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group suggested a stronger emphasis on Strategy 6.7 by replacing the word "Research" with "Establish" a Regional Transportation Authority.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group supported a three story max but had concerns about street wall, overall building height, sky plaining, and overall bulk and scale in this district. The group recommended including language about the maximum building size.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	The majority of the group agreed with to expanding the lodging overlay to include the south side of Pearl from Cache to Willow.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended adding the word "underpass" to wildlife crossing in Project #4 on the list of potential transportation network projects.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Regarding the Forest Service Property, several members suggested that residential uses should be preferred over non-residential. They felt this was a good location to locate workforce housing.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that the key issues of each district need to be more explicitly identified and discussed within each district page.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group also recommended stronger statements about the significance of the airport to the community and the impacts that it generates.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt strongly about the inclusion of the relevance of Flat Creek in this district by enhancing the creek corridor as a community benefit.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that a wildlife crossing strategy for West Broadway needs to be identified and called out in the Plan.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that while the multi-modal goals were important, bike safety and bike mobility issues should be specifically acknowledged and considered.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt strongly that maintaining expected levels of service in the community would strike a balance between human needs and protecting wildlife and preserving open space. Thus, they felt this theme should be given a very high priority. However, in the Intro Chapter the group agreed that Themes 3-7 should be grouped together under the heading of "human needs" and be balanced with wildlife and natural resource protection through growth management.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group suggested reprioritizing the services in Policy 7.1a. First priority should include Police/Fire/EMS, Schools, Utilities/Infrastructure, and Medical Care. The second priority would be Library, Parks & Recreation, Public Transportation, Weed Pest Management/ Arts/Culture, Human Services, and Child Care.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Some members of the group felt that it was important to identify the services that will be needed given the growth allowed by the Plan.
6/17/2009	, STAG	General discussion occurred about buildout numbers being overstated or understated based on a number of factors, however no consensus was reached as to the accuracy of the numbers.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group suggested a projection of the amount of square footage on Public/Quasi-Public Lands in the buildout analysis
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group generally felt that churches and other privately owned Public/Quasi-Public uses should be classified in other land use classification to provide guidance if the existing units were ever redeveloped.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group believes the Plan needs a better definition of the term "local convenience commercial." However, the group could not reach consensus on the traffic reduction achievable through implementation of the local convenience commercial concept.
6/11/2009	Burwen, David M Interested Public	I am the owner of 2221 Weatgrass located in the Aspens. I think that it makes sense for the county to have development nodes to protect open spaces, so I am not against this proposal in principal. However, I am concerned that the recommended density of 350 condo units next to the Aspens is much too high. Since it is much higher than the current density of the Aspen, it will not look good and will have a negative effect on the wildlife corridor that is along the creek next to our Weatgrass unit. For example we often have Moose browsing along this creek. Given this situation, I am asking that the density of the proposed condo rezoning on the west side of the Moose Wilson Road be the same as the overall density of the Aspens, and that the area on the east side of the Moose Wilson Road road have higher density in order to provide the total number of additional units that the county is trying to create. This will provide a more attractive node when looking at the Wilson faces and the mountains (from the Moose Wilson Road), protect the wildlife corridor through the Aspen that is near the Moose Wilson Road, while providing the additional units required. Thank you for considering this suggestion.
6/11/2009	Klomprens, Julie Interested Public	I feel strongly that the Comprehensive Plan does not reflect preservation of wildlife and open spaces as a top priority. I do not support a plan that doubles residential and commercial development.
6/11/2009	, Interested Public	We the undersigned, as citizens of Teton County, expect that the Comprehensive Plan will be revised to reflect the following: Wildlife and open spaces, values this community has cherished for decades, will be reinstated as the community's top priority and become the organizing theme of the entire plan. To preserve these values and our small town character we will not support any plan which doubles residential and commercial development. Thomas A. Wiita Kathryn C. Wiita Kathryn M. Wiita Elizabeth G. Wiita Kathryn P. Carpenter H. Cotton Carpenter

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	The Jackson Hole Chamber Commerce commends you for your extensive work developing the Jackson/Teton County comprehensive plan. Your commitment has greatly enhanced our community's ability to provide input and participate in the development of the comprehensive plan, thereby creating a greatly improved plan from 1994. We are pleased to submit our comments on the Comprehensive Plan as formal input and recommendations for strengthening the Comprehensive Plan. The attached comments are general to the plan and specific to the separate Themes. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce supports a plan that is based on planning, not politics, spin or headlines. We encourage a dialogue that helps the public understand that this is a 60+ year vision. Furthermore, we encourage a dialogue that informs the public with the fact that each and every development proposal will be individually reviewed by multiple levels of analysis--planning staff review, planning commission review and recorded votes by elected officials accountable to the voters. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan will be reviewed on an annual basis based on "Indicators" to assess the performance of the plan's implementation and to assure that we are achieving our community vision and statements of ideals. It is important to understand that the comprehensive plan is a vision document, not an entitlement. The public should be informed that these are not expotential developments scheduled imminently for next year. The potential build out numbers are used as a tool for planning, not a recommendation for what development should occur in the next 10 years. As such, the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce encourages dialogue among advocacy groups that is responsible. We hope that more effort is made to restrict and reduce fear-based threats that potentiall mislead or misinform the public and are counterproductive. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that planning cannot be based on arbitrary fear about the word "growth" any more than business can be based on unbridled commerce. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that 'growth' is not a bad word -- and that 'responsible growth' is a worthy, desired and needed community goal over the next 60+ years. The Comprehensive Plan is a tool to alleviate uncertainty at the policy level while providing guidance at the regulation level. The Future Land Use Plan, however controversial, has certainly provided greater predictability in response to the community's desire for such. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that we need to make sure that we plan to allow an economy that at least keeps up with the rate of inflation. We cannot codify the recession as part of the Comprehensive Plan with "no growth." The Comprehensive Plan must be able to counteracCeconomic downturns that trigger significant unemployment and sales tax crises. (Not only to protect our quality of life, but to help control the potential need in the future to raise local taxes to make up-revenue shortfalls, or to limit local services.) The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that the recovery period for this downturn is unknown, with some estimating up to 5 years for recovery to pre-downturn levels. If that is the case, 5 years would be half the life of the drafted Comprehensive Plan, meaning that vibrancy/responsible growth must be an active part of the planning. No growth during thjs recovery period would essentially prolong the downturn beyond projections. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce takes no position on the projections of growth in one node verses another. But we do encourage a vision that includes open space for wildlife and signature scenic vistas, as well as people space for vibrancy and quality of life for the community residents as well as seasonal visitors. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce wants our grown children to be able to live, work and raise their families locally. We need responsible growth to ensure that our future generations are able to remain in Jackson Hole. Thank you once again for your hard work developing a vision for our community's future. - We are in support of the following: 1. Balanced Economic Development with Stewardship of Wildlife, Scenery, and Natural Resources. The strength and stability of our economy is dependent upon the health and diversity of our wildlife, scenery, and natural resources. According to tourism industry surveys, wildlife and scenery are consistently the top two reasons why visitors come to Jackson Hole. Our tourism economy has significantly contributed to our real estate and construction economies, as well as the supporting financial institutions. Any development policies must take this into account and strive towards

GENERAL:

a balance of development with stewardship of wildlife, scenery, and natural resources. These natural resources include but are not limited to protection of land along current scenic byways (Highway 26/89/191) and protection and improvement of (removal of power lines) potential scenic byways, such as highways 22 and 390.

2. A Strong Annual Review Mechanism. The annual performance reviews of the Comprehensive Plan should be based on rigorous, valid, and comprehensive criteria found in the Indicators section at the end of each thematic chapter. In order to provide flexibility in strengthening the Comprehensive Plan between the five- and ten-year reviews, the annual reviews should enable adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan in response to dynamic economic, social, and environmental circumstances. The Comprehensive Plan should provide an up front, sufficient explanation of the nature and process of the Comprehensive Plan; i.e., that the Comprehensive Plan is providing a future land use plan for the near and long-term future, not just the next 10 years but the next 60 years and longer.

3. Rate of Growth. Concerns for growth should address and focus upon rates of growth, not solely build out numbers.

4. County Development Nodes. The nodal development concept as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan centralizes development in specific County nodes while preserving open space. Greater specific definition of nodal boundaries would facilitate public discussion and understanding of the nodal development concept. The integrity of nodal boundaries and the rural characteristics of the land outside of nodal boundaries should be ensured.

5. Resident and Visitor Transit. Ensure that all workforce housing and nodes be part of an interconnected, community-wide and regional, multi-modal transportation system with an increase in public and visitor transit. These should include the encouragement of carpooling and vanpooling.

6. A More Sustainable Teton Village. Provide enough square footage of commercial space for Teton Village in order to create a node that can sustain workforce/family housing and local convenience commercial space to ensure a vibrant local community and reduce traffic on Highway 390. The additional commercial space needed should be based on an analysis performed with the support of Teton Village Association and in concert with a transportation impact analysis for Highway 390.

7. At Least 65% of the Workforce Living in Teton County, Wyoming. To remain a community first and resort second, we must strive to ensure that at least 65% of the community workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming.

8. Incentives for Housing and Open Space. In addition to Town and County mandates for providing affordable housing, incentives should be provided for affordable housing in addition to that created by current mitigation percentages. Workforce housing definitions should include all forms of housing, including deed-restricted and free market, ownership and rental. In addition, incentives should be provided to landowners to keep their property as open space in order to help preserve the wildlife and scenic values of Jackson Hole for visitors and residents alike.

9. Workforce Rental Housing. The Comprehensive Plan needs to have very strong provisions for workforce rental housing. References to workforce housing should contain language promoting rental housing and an increase in rental housing.

10. Provisions for growth of current and new businesses. Our business community is dealing with a very dynamic economy as well as high cost of living. The Comprehensive Plan should contain provisions for maintenance and growth of a

healthy customer base and new local businesses.

II. Additional Analysis. Data and models should be developed to analyze and understand the impacts of commercial and residential development upon employment, workforce housing, transportation, and wildlife, scenic, and natural resources.

Draft Input to Theme 4: Meet Our Community's Housing Needs

Statement of Ideal: Remain a community first and resort second by ensuring that at least 65% of the community workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming.

Principles:

4.1 House a diverse population in a variety of housing types

4.2 Require that development and redevelopment mitigate the workforce housing impacts.

4.3 Prioritize the preservation of existing workforce housing stock.

4.4 Incentivize the creation of workforce housing.

Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Recommendations & Comments:

The JHCC strongly agrees with the goal of at least 65% of workforce housed locally.

Please provide a definition of how much of workforce housing would be deedrestricted and how much is free marketing rental and ownership housing.

The Comp Plan provides the following definition for "Workforce Housing": "all housing occupied by people working in the community regardless of whether the unit is deed restricted or not." Please provide a definition of what working in the community means, e.g., number of hours (weekly and/or annually, period of employment including seasonal).

Place greater emphasis on maintaining workforce rental housing and creating additional workforce rental housing. The availability of sufficient rental housing is critical for persons entering the workforce in our community. To this end, we recommend that all definitions and discussions of workforce housing include emphasis on rental housing.

NEW POLICY= Policy 4.4.b (change the current 4.4.b to 4.4.c): Provide Incentives for existing businesses to create workforce rental housing. Existing businesses can be provided incentives by the Town and County to develop, redevelop, convert, and lease space to create workforce rental housing. This workforce housing can be deed-restricted and free market rentals.

Revisions to Indicators (on page 51 of the Comp Plan):

- For "Percentage of workforce housed locally", change the Review Period from every 5 years to every year. With such an ideal and critical goal as 65% of workforce housed locally, this should be monitored annually.

- For "Number of Rental Units", change the goal from "monitor" to "increase."

Draft Input to Theme

5: Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy

Statement of Ideal: The community will remain a community first and resort second by balancing its commercial, resort, and housing growth.

Principles:

5.1 Maintain a strong and diverse economy

5.2 Balance economic development with workforce housing and community character

Policy 5.2.a Balance workforce housing, commercial development, resorts, and civic uses

Policy 5.2.b Limit commercial development consistent with the Future Land Use Plan

Policy 5.2.c Maintain a strong economic basis for a high level of services and amenities

Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Recommendations & Comments:

CHANGE PRINCIPLE 5.2 to 5.4 and associated policies from 5.2 to 5.4 also.

NEW PRINCIPLE = 5.2 Balance economic development with stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. The strength and stability of our economy is dependent upon the ---lealUland diversity of our wildlife and natural resources. According to tourism industry surveys, wildlife and scenery are consistently the top two reasons why visitors come here. Our tourism economy has been significant in the health of our real estate and construction economies as well as the'financial institutions that work with these economies. Any development policies must take this into account and strive towards a balance of development with stewardship of wildlife and natural resources.

NEW PRINCIPLE = 5.3 Orient economic development towards community self-reliance
As the community strives towards energy efficiency, the Town of Jackson becoming a "Pioneer City" and other means of economic self-reliance, commercial development should encourage the recruitment, formation, and growth of businesses that support our goals of self-reliance. Such "green" businesses would be consistent with our community's orientation towards balancing economic, social, and environmental interests and concerns and create "green collar" jobs for our community. Our community's tourism economy would be strengthened by the attraction of discriminating travelers who select Jackson Hole as their destination of choice because of our community's economic development orientation and progress towards energy efficiency and self-reliance.

- Policy 5.3.a Attract commercial development that supports community energy and sustainability goals and initiatives. Incentives should be provided to businesses that support community energy efficiency, recycling, and other sustainability goals and programs and demonstrate that their operations are consistent with these goals and programs. NEW POLICY= Policy 5.4.d Strengthen community orientation of tourism economy.

Jackson Hole and Teton County should appeal to a broad range economic demographic. A continued and new focus on middle class families should be integrated into our plan. Family visitation has been central to the success of our community's tourism economy. Left unattended, current economics are driving new commercial development towards high-end business that is unaffordable for many families. In order to continue to attract families, commercial development policy will support affordability for visiting families. The policy and tourism goal of providing a high level of services and amenities is not limited to highend development and high priced services.

Revisions to indicators (page 57 of the Comp Plan):

- For "Percentage of workforce by industry type", change this to read "Percentage and number of workforce by industry type"
- For "Lodging occupancy rates", change this to read "Lodging occupancy rates by district."
- Add the following indicators:

"Jackson Hole Airport enplanements" with "Maintain or increase" as the goal and a review period of 1 year.

"Unemployment rate" with "Decrease" as the goal and a review period of 1 year.

"Visitor Center visitation" with "Maintain or increase" as the goal and a review period of 1 year.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	, Grand Teton National P	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan (plan). Although the Plan does not directly pertain to the management and administration of Grand Teton National Park, indirectly some elements of the Plan have the potential to affect the resources and values for which the park was established. As a neighbor and adjacent landowner, our comments are offered in the spirit of partnership, and are intended to be constructive. Although we take great interest in all aspects of the Plan and applaud the hard work and effort that has gone into the current draft, our comments are limited to those elements that have the potential to affect park resources, visitors, and employees. The Plan's vision statement, "preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner, " sets the framework for the entire effort, and seems to capture the sentiment of the community. We think it also reinforces the community's context within the larger ecosystem, and specifically with Grand Teton National Park. Of the seven themes identified in the Plan, we think that themes 1,2,4, and 6 are critical in terms of the potential to affect the park. Guidance provided by the Plan on the location and density of future development have the greatest potential to affect wildlife habitat connectivity, healthy vegetation communities, and scenic viewsheds. The Natural Resource Overlay (NRO) is a valuable tool in managing development on lands that are particularly important as wildlife habitat or are otherwise important to the protection of the area's natural resource values. Maintaining connectivity between park lands and others, both public and private, are often crucial to sustaining bird, wildlife, and plant populations and associated values. We note that portions of the NRO are located within the park, and include some lands that are in private ownership. Inclusion of these private lands within the NRO would allow for development, yet would also help to ensure the continued protection of park resources. We would also offer our assistance should there be opportunities for collaboration regarding the identification and protection of additional focal species and habitats. We think that a broader spectrum of species and habitats should be included in a future refinement of the NRO so that all roles in the ecosystem are represented. In light of the fact that development actions outside of the park may have the potential to affect resources and values within the park, we encourage the planners to carefully consider the potential effects of their actions on the park. The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) is a key element in identifying how growth will occur throughout the area, and should be more clearly defined before the Comprehensive Plan is finalized. Accurate buildout forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors. The Moose-Wilson portion of the park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, as well as access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character and slow travel speeds along the Moose - Wilson Road are key to enjoyment of this portion of the park, and because of its character, the road is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Traffic volumes along Moose-Wilson Road within the park are approaching levels that could diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the

Date

Name

Comment

park and should be carefully considered. We respectfully request that transportation strategies and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. In light of the potential for increases in traffic volume on the Moose-Wilson Road, the town and county should coordinate with the National Park Service to ensure that, in addressing development and transportation issues on Wyoming 390, additional transportationrelated and other impacts are not created within the park.

Workforce housing is a central issue for all of us, and we encourage the planners to make every effort to meet the community's housing needs while upholding the other values expressed in the Plan. We are working diligently to address housing of the park's workforce within the park to the greatest extent possible in order to minimize impacts on the community. We welcome opportunities to work together collaboratively with the town, county, and other agencies.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide our input and comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to continued dialogue on the issues and challenges that face our community and the amazing landscape in which we live.

Should you have any questions on our comments, please contact Jennifer Carpenter, Park Planner, at 307-739-3465.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	I have 3-points to make. Number 1: The comp plan needs to reflect the public input. Public Service, in its many forms, is a very honorable profession. But you have to actually serve the public. Favoring the planning input of special interests or elected officials with their own agendas over the public input is hijacking of the public. And, of course, hijacking and serving are two very different things. The Town and County have held numerous public meetings to explain the plan and its benefits. The plan itself recounts its benefits. Sooner or later you must face the fact that the public doesn't want the plan you have compiled, and all the cajoling in the world isn't going to convince them. Will you please stop selling and defending the failed draft plan and start serving! That's the fundamental problem, the planning departments haven't been serving the public. Number 2: The plan calls for too much growth. The underlying mega-error in planning was made at the very start. Taking the 9-on-35 and 6-on-35 clustering out of the rural areas and redistributing the density in "nodes" is a ruse. Those clustering development options were adopted by a planning commission at the behest of a wealthy and very large land owning family. It was a bad idea. You should now simply remove the clustering options as if they had never existed. You need to work at decreasing the density at build out, not at redistributing the beans in the jar. You need a clean sheet of paper and a new start. A second ruse is that transportation deals almost exclusively with transportation alternates rather than vehicle traffic and roads. The lack of disclosure on roadways and congestion, issue that are at the top of the list for most residents, is deplorable. A planning document that hides such a major issue rather than addressing it is unfortunately lacking at best and shameful at worst. The plan envisions too much growth. The public wants the community they have now; they like the rural feel of what they've got. They want to preserve that kinda-funky not-too-polished "last of the old west" Jackson Hole they have now. Number 3: Commercial growth must be contained. It's the growth engine of Jackson Hole and it must be monitored, limited, and controlled. Excessive commercial growth is probably the major contributor to the large "phantom" commuter population we now have. It's destroying our community. Limit commercial growth to 1/2% per year as an interim measure until you can evaluate the situation and develop a comprehensive and workable mechanism to deal with this problem. Statements in the plan that we aren't growing too fast now so we don't need to do anything on growth-rate other than keep an eye on it are pure BS. Excessive growth, especially commercial growth, is at the heart of many community imbalances and you should stop pretending that it doesn't matter. 2 In conclusion: Serve the public! Take care of Number-1, then #2 and #3 will be much easier. Please see the attached News & Guide Guest Shot. If you ever want to sit down and talk about any of this, or if there is any way I can help you to better serve the public, please call me. {referenced newspaper article available in hard copy at the County Planning Department}
6/11/2009	Roush, Lou Anne Interested Public	As a resident of South Park I believe preservation of Wildlife and Natural Resources should be at the top of the list of priorities for our district not at the bottom. Also having students in the Middle and High School I am concerned about the amount of traffic already in this area. The increased amount of housing you propose next to the High School will only aggravate the problem and increase the potential for student related accidents.
6/10/2009	McIntosh, Doyen Interested Public	Hello, I strongly object to plans to develop Wilson. Who decided on 65% housing for working force?

Date	Name	Comment
6/9/2009	Newcomb, Anne Interested Public	Thanks for all your effort. How about this? Put in the basic plan right now, total protection (no development at all beyond maybe a trail) for all riparian areas. Enough room on either side of any water to allow wildlife to feel safe. (I don't know. Maybe the length of a football field. Ask Game and Fish) Get as much info as possible on regular migration routes and often used trails and mitigate every way possible. (Underpasses, lights, speed restrictions) People say -well the wildlife have 97% of Teton County -and that's true. But we have the bottom land they need for winter use. And we fill up the back country with bikes and people and out of control dogs. Houses don't kill wildlife -cars and dogs and fences and lack of food/ forage kill wildlife. So I'm all in favor of buildings several stories high. But in the urban/forest interface (eg. Wilson, Teton Village, Moran) there should be appropriate restrictions. Slow speed limits, strictly enforced; dogs on leash (and I'm a dog person); absolutely no fences except when necessary for horses or cows or other farm animals. No pesticides. Edible landscaping and no compensation when it gets eaten. Build the protections into the plan. AND PLEASE legislate that developers must provide housing for any employees plus pay in advance for the costs they bring the community - like roads, schools, police, health care, etc.) Yes, that might inhibit development. That's the point. We really don't need any more development in order to be the richest county in the United States. Thanks for reading this. Best of luck to you.
6/8/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	It should be clear to all by now, that those who have done a truly thorough analysis of the Draft Comprehensive Plan - mathematical and otherwise - have proved to all of us AND the Planning Commissions and Elected Officials, that this Draft Comprehensive Plan is definitely going to overload our Valley's carrying capacity. We must not ruin this pristine Valley for future generations - sustainability dictates that we plan responsibly so future generations will come to live here and not feel pressed for space, crowded by too many people living in a finite area, or with just too much traffic to be able to enjoy the qualities only Our Valley now offers - open space and wildlife . Our top priorities for the future of this Valley. Doubling the population of this Valley will never preserve it .. increasing so much commercial space will not only offer undue competition to our present businesses, but ALSO cause the need for ever-increasing workforce housing - making obtaining such housing an ever-increasing gamble for the workers of this Valley who keep our Town and County running!! A vicious cycle! We urge you to listen to and consult with those who have done the most work on analyzing the Draft Comprehensive Plan since it's release to the public - Rich Bloom of South Park Neighbors, Mike Whitcomb of East Jackson Neighbors, Armond Acri of Save Historic Jackson Hole and Kristy Bruner of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. Their findings should be given attention one-on-one with the Planners and the Elected Officials - and not just at arms length in written reports, e-mailed letters or comments at public meetings. I strongly urge the Planners and Elected Officials to listen closely to the comments of the citizens of this Valley, and revise drastically the present Draft Comprehensive Plan before it becomes law. Permanently preserving wildlife, open space and small community character must be our vision and our guiding principal in ALL districts and Themes! And, we must bear in mind that which we've stated many times, we are a Town and County first, and a resort destination second.
6/8/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	During the past two years, after attending multiple meetings on all levels, participating in the “community process”, and now reviewing the draft comprehensive plan and its potential build-out numbers, we are even more convinced of the following: All development, be it in the county or town, should be governed by the clear and overwhelmingly expressed priority of maintaining wildlife and open space. This priority must be maintained in all districts, even in the so called “growth nodes.” While structures may be confined to growth nodes, people are not. All development, be it residential or commercial should incur and fully mitigate all projected infrastructure costs and impacts to the community: schools, roads, water, sewer, law enforcement, hospital, social services, and parks. Given the impact of the recession on this community, one can safely conclude that a “build today and pay for it tomorrow” does not work.

Date	Name	Comment
6/8/2009	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	Dear Planning Officials, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Comp Plan. General Comments to Public Process. Your written comment period is too short in the context of such an aggressive, complex, and game changing Comp Plan. No public meeting was scheduled for the Aspens/Teton Pines area despite the huge proposed change to the character of this area. This oversight should be corrected by scheduling a local meeting with appropriate notice. I attended the Teton Village public hearing and was offended that staff prematurely cutoff public comment and failed to record any of the thoughtful comments. General Comments Regarding Substance of Comp Plan. The Camp Plan attempts to do too much too fast. By "rezoning" the County in a single document, much is lost from the traditional scrutiny of site specific review. The "ivory tower/laboratory" approach to planning our community fails to square with the existing "on the ground" character and land use conditions, ignores the reasonable expectations of our residents, and destroys investments premised upon thirty (30) years of land use regulations. The textbook principles establishing unodes" based on location, services, and infrastructure ignore existing legal restrictions, including private covenants and State laws, fail to protect the character of existing neighborhoods, and promote chaos, uncertainty, and unpredictability for the areas targeted for huge growth and density such as Wilson and the Aspens. Aspens/Raintree Area. Pam and I have lived on the Village Road since we purchased our first home in Nethercott in 1977. We have resided in the Raintree subdivision since 1986 so we are significantly affected by the proposed transformation of our neighborhood to node. The Raintree subdivision is a low key subdivision inhabited by local working residents often outnumbered by wildlife. The thought of adding a hundred or more homes at thirty (30) times existing density to our neighborhood is unthinkable. The Aspens/Raintree neighborhood represents a diverse and vital neighborhood comprised of longtime residents, local workers, visitors and second home owners; it is not a blighted community in need of redevelopment. The Raintree subdivision is currently zoned NCSF in recognition of its long established single family three (3) acre neighborhood. Existing land development regulations promote the stability of existing land uses and insure the protection of desired community character of each zoning district. Private restrictions and State law also protect our neighborhood character and values. The proposed Comp Plan targets the Raintree neighborhood for mixed use high density residential development which could increase housing density thirty (30) times. It is unclear whether these are poker faced negotiating tactics hoping for some lesser density or an honest planning effort. The planners have no "skin in the game." None of the existing stakeholder owners in the neighborhood were contacted for their input prior to the release of the draft Comp Plan. The proposed Aspens/Raintree rezoning destroys the reasonable expectations and investment of the neighborhood residents. It represents an overly intrusive impact to an existing single family neighborhood and ignores existing legal rights, restrictions, and covenants including an open space dedication, express deed restrictions, private covenants, and Wyoming law. Surgical site specific infill which encourages compatible growth in an existing neighborhood is the preferred course to broad brush rezoning with a blunt instrument such as proposed under the draft Comp Plan. Density for the Aspens/Raintree area should be reduced to mirror the existing platted single family neighborhood. Otherwise, our neighborhood character will be destroyed. There is no need to throw out the 1994 plan. What happened to the idea to update it? Thanks for your consideration

Date	Name	Comment
6/8/2009	Johnson, Joanna Interested Public	In January 2004 I wrote this letter to the Teton Co. Commissioners: As a native of Jackson Hole, I believe the Comprehensive Plan governing growth here has to be downsized. Many concerned citizens discussing growth at recent public meetings offered this conclusion: cut the amount of future growth allowed! Current information indicates the for-sale housing and rental units are pretty well in balance with available jobs. A referendum last December overturned a re-development plan for larger structures in downtown Jackson. Last year a referendum overturned a development plan for the J.H. Hereford Ranch. I believe the current structure of downtown should be maintained. I also believe every effort should be made to preserve the current use of J.H. Hereford ranchland. Only 3% of Teton County is privately owned, and of this, approximately two-thirds has already been developed (there may be as many as 2,500 lots platted, but not yet developed). The current population of Teton County is 18,000, so putting a cap on the population somewhere near 25,000, while implementing smaller and less development of the one third undeveloped land available would be responsible planning. Under the current plan the population could grow to (or exceed?!) 40,000. This valley cannot sustain that level without sacrificing our most valuable assets. Downsizing requires the courage and conviction to oppose unnecessary developments that waste valuable land, and/or adversely affect natural resources (such as water and wildlife). The impact overbuilding and overpopulation has on necessary services such as law enforcement, fire protection, health care, social services, schools, roads, water, sewer, etc. will be extreme! Jackson Hole is a most unique place. Our proximity to National Parks, National Forest, Wilderness areas, Federal Elk Refuge, State Refuges, and BLM land requires huge responsibility on our part to manage growth accordingly. This location is part of a large ecosystem that requires balance in order to survive. These natural resources are precious to residents, as well as to those who visit. We each have choices and bear responsibility for what happens here. We can't change the past, but we can change the future by making wiser choices now. Sincerely, Joanna Johnson Now, in 2009, more excessive developments are proposed and again the majority of residents are saying no! Recently I spoke with the Planners and was told that 70% of private land in Teton Co. has been developed; 30% undeveloped. Planners quoted me the same figures five years ago, yet major developments have taken place in wildlife corridors and along major waterways. The population of Teton Co. is not truly known, as a census has not been taken for nine years. Necessary services such as law enforcement, fire protection, health care, social services, water, sewer, etc. are stressed. We will soon need more schools. The roads are at full capacity. We are losing wildlife (example: moose population is down 44%). Ranching is disappearing and natural resources are being compromised. Mismanagement of our part of the large ecosystem we share affects the balance of the whole. Teton Co. has gone from a ranching and tourist economy to an economy based on consumption which is driven by greed. Those who benefit monetarily are willing to sacrifice our most valuable assets. Consumption can only last as long as there is something to consume! Then what?? Will there be anything left to base a sustainable economy on? As a native resident I ask you again to please stop promoting the selling of Jackson Hole to the highest bidder and direct your efforts toward preserving what's left, while seeking alternatives for the economy.
6/7/2009	Lang, Peter Interested Public	Appendix K: Transportation is outdated. A 1996 plan with some limited updating in 2001 is inadequate for the present Comp Plan. Too much growth has already happened, or has been approved and will in due course happen, for that old stuff to be relevant any more. I studied the "Transportation Analysis" presented by SRA's consultant prior to that project's approval extremely carefully. It was a cleverly constructed set of misrepresentations and deceptions which purported to "prove" that adding 525 living units at the end of what in the winter is a dead-end road does NOT increase the traffic on the Village Road. That's obvious nonsense. I concluded that either the Village Road has to become four lanes or a north crossing has to be built, if SRA were approved. It was approved and is starting to be built. No Transportation Chapter for the present Comp Plan makes sense if it doesn't address the effects of this and similar subsequent developments. Although SRA maintained that 390 needed no widening, when the new access road from the Village to 390 was built recently, they made it four lanes! What good would that possibly be if they didn't expect a similar widening of 390? In conclusion, the full adverse effects on our roads and on their traffic of the more recently approved growth as well as the further growth now outlined in the draft plan must be clearly shown in a revised/updated Transportation Appendix, to allow us all to make a fully informed judgment on the present Comp Plan revision.

Date	Name	Comment
6/5/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Pleeaassee! Give me a break. Did you see the front page News and Guide article inspired by our learned planners (planners that you and I are taxed to pay)? It compared to their "neighborhood power point "meetings. It was smooth and creamy but they actually said nothing. They wouldn't say sh-t if they had a mouth full; and they do. So look at this. The comp plan is on line. If you can't bare that, go to Staples (I know I can't bare that either). Do it for the greater good. Each theme of the comp plan has an indicator which will tell us if things are getting out of hand. That sounds like a good thing, but where is the control. This is all an experiment and they have no control data. So when the water in my well or the moose in my field or the oxygen in my air or the fish in Flat creek get to what point, who says it's time to shut it down? Well, they do. The new comp plan indicators will tell you to check to see if there is consistency with the FLUP (Future Land Use Plan) and they, the planners, made that up. Yup, the FLUP is the planner's baby, not the valley's. This whole thing is a flup. On a lighter note, I signed the petition. I understood it, I was not under duress. There was a time in my life when I was picking up one kid from ski practice and dropping one off at drum lessons, trying to fit the grocery store in before I headed home to fix dinner, do the laundry and help with homework. A petition was an easy way for me to say, "Ya, I get it, but right now I have two kids that have a report due, and I still need to mow the lawn. I vote, therefore I assume that my elected officials will do the right thing." I'm wiser now.
6/4/2009	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	It is unacceptable that the need to protect the scenic and wildlife attributes of this area, made clear in the existing plan, have been arbitrarily dropped from the rewrite. Past events, such as the TMR disaster, have made it clear the public wants protection of this area in the plan.
6/3/2009	Peck, Chris Interested Public	I am very much concerned with the new comp plan and the direction the planning process has taken. After attending numerous meetings and carefully listening to my friends and neighbors it is apparent that we had a goal of sustainable community through a controlled pattern of growth. The plan, and correct me if I am wrong, just about doubles the housing and commercial build out in Teton County. This is the " new bigger is better comp plan". I swear the planners were not listening at those meetings, the large majority of people were not into the amount of growth shown in the new bigger comp plan. Crazy thing was, they would never really tell us a build out number for a long time. I guess I could write on and on, but the final line is the growth strategy of the plan is way out of control. Please support a reduced build out number, increasing mitigation rates on new residential and commercial development to directly offset the impacts of workforce housing.
6/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am writing to invite you to come to Cottonwood and go for a walk around the neighborhood to let you see what works and doesn't work here to keep our great little neighborhood viable. We are not opposed to extending our neighborhood South Of High School Road into South Park when the time comes. We welcome a new neighborhood when needed to compliment what's already here. We just ask that you have an open mind to our concerns about the proposed over development in the NW corner of South Park and the negative effects it will have on our diverse neighborhoods here in West Jackson. Our main concerns are the failure of High School Road being the only collector between Rte 89 and South Park Loop Road. There are no assurances in the comp plan to promise a parallel collector in South Park to alleviate the traffic on High School Road before this development occurs and the Tribal Trails Connector Road goes in. The second is the lack of open space and parks in the NW corner of South Park. If you do the numbers there is no room for these ammenities in NW South Park. The plan states that West Jackson infrastucture such as parks, roads and schools can serve the proposed 1500 units in the 400 acres in the NW corner. There are about 1500 all toll, homes from Cottonwood down to the tail end of of South Park. Can you imagine that many jammed into the small amount of land and the pressures that these units will put on the schools, parks and roads here in West Jackson. Give me a call and come on over for a cup of coffee and a walk around a great diverse neighborhood and help us think of ways to keep it going and make it better with out abandoning it for newer pastures accross the road.

Date	Name	Comment
6/3/2009	Young, Tim Friends of Pathways	Subject: Comprehensive Plan Comment on Spring 2009 Draft Plan Dear Town of Jackson and Teton County Officials, On behalf of Friends of Pathways (FOP), I would like to submit the following comments on the spring 2009 Draft Jackson/Teton Comprehensive Plan (draft Plan). Friends of Pathways is a private non-profit with 1,200 members serving Teton County, the Town of Jackson and the greater Teton region. Friends of Pathways advocates the funding, construction, maintenance, and use of pathways, trails, and complete streets through advocacy, educational outreach, and public/private partnerships. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. In general, one FOP comment is there has been rather limited planning time and public meeting opportunities that have focused on the transportation topic. Land use discussions have been much more dominate. While certainly land use is important, the history of the Comp Plan shows there is a direct relationship between land use and transportation, and that solving transportation issues has been neither easy nor without controversy. There would be benefits to the community for the Town and County to devote more time and open up more community dialog on transportation issues as the Plan moves forward. Friends of Pathways comments start with the Community Vision on page 7, and then shift to the Transportation Theme 6 starting on page 59 (of the spring 2009 draft Plan). Quotes from the draft Plan are highlighted in italics with page numbers for reference. Page 13. Community Vision, Strategy Theme 6, Transportation "The most sustainable way to provide for the community mobility is through alternate modes of transportation such as transit, walking, carpooling, and bicycling. Part of enabling this change is by placing people in closer proximity to services and by providing travel choices—through a nodal development pattern and increased funding for transit and other travel modes. A larger part is changing way we think about transportation options." FOP generally supports this summary of the Theme 6 Multi-modal transportation. We recommend this section should be improved with adding that TDM, or Mobility Management, is another one of the list of key solutions, along with walking, bicycling, transit, and Ride Share (perhaps better term than carpooling). Also, the final sentence should simply state "...increased funding for the Active Transportation modes (or "alternative transportation modes"), not just "...for transit and other travel modes", which could be interpreted to mean wider roads. Page 59. Current Theme 6 - Statement of Ideal "Reduce resident and visitor reliance on single occupancy vehicles while still allowing safe, efficient, and economic travel" This statement could be one of several plan goals, but it is nowhere near inclusive or measurable enough for a Statement of Ideal for the entire transportation system. Friends of Pathways would like to suggest the following alternative statement. This is based on a significant effort by the Sustaining Jackson Hole project that worked on the transportation issue for 3 years. It incorporates the input and support of over a dozen transportation, planning, and energy professionals and experts familiar with our community and its challenges. Statement of Ideal – Friends of Pathways - Suggested Alternative: "Town of Jackson/Teton County residents and visitors will be able to safely, efficiently, and economically move into, within, and out of the county by a variety of transportation choices that comprise an interconnected, multi-modal system based on conservation of energy, enhancement of public health, and fuels that are clean and renewable. The transportation system will allow for viable populations of all native species, the preservation of natural scenic vistas, and the safe, unimpeded movement of wildlife." Comment Theme 6 - Why is this theme addressed: Include more key Issues The opening section would be improved with a better statement of the problems, thus better providing the answer to the question, "Why is this theme addressed?" The draft Theme 6 primarily mentions the problem of roadway widening. There are significant additional reasons why this theme is addressed that should be developed in the Plan, these are: • Environmental impacts of transportation (climate change, air/water/noise pollution) • Energy issues, including goals to reduce use of fossil fuel and promoting alternative fuels • Public health impacts of auto-centric transportation (obesity, diabetes, cardio vascular disease) • Economic impacts to JH of a changing world, where the cost of oil will continue to rise. Comment – Mode Shift goals should be increased, not decreased

On page 59-60, the draft Plan states a substantially reduced goal for shifting trips – Why?

Draft Plan Page 59-60

“This will require that an additional 10% of all trips along these major corridors be shifted out of single occupancy vehicles into another travel mode. Transit offers the most viable alternative to vehicular travel, however, roadway designs that use the “complete streets” principle will help ensure that roads safely accommodate all modes of travel.” This is a significant reduction from the current Comprehensive Plan. Today’s Plan includes goals adopted by the Town of Jackson and Teton County in 2000 that are to increase “ride share 1%, walking 4%, bicycling 4%, and transit 5%”, which add up to a combined 14% mode shift goal by 2020 under current policy. [Page 8-22 of Chapter 8 – Transportation, Third Printing, October 2002] The draft Plan therefore represents nearly a one third reduction of the current community goal for mode shift!

Friends of Pathways does not support any reduction in the modal shift goals for the new Plan. It would be a step backwards from current policy, incompatible with the vision chapter of this draft Plan, and runs counter to the public opinion received in the Comprehensive Plan process. All Plan surveys clearly showed the public overwhelmingly supports multi-modal transportation, including pathways, bicycle, walking, and transit. Residents also support public investments to

construct needed facilities and operate these alternative transportation systems safely and efficiently. In fact, public support for Pathways was typically higher than any other mode of travel in surveys as well as the recent SPET election.

This Plan should deliver on the public’s will for a real multi-modal system that is among the best in the country. Such a system would go the farthest in minimizing environmental impacts of motor vehicle travel, and would overall be the best for wildlife and all natural resources. This means:

1. Completing the pathways system.
2. Greatly improving the pedestrian walkways in Jackson and all the mixed use villages
3. Making every street a complete street that serves all the users.
4. Expanding the START system, making it viable for more of the community and adding new routes to Wilson, the Airport, National Parks, and connecting to the region.
5. Working collaboratively on transportation projects with WYDOT, Bridger-Teton NF, and Grand Teton National Park.
6. Use the best of alternative fuel technology to minimize the carbon footprint of Jackson Hole’s transportation system..
7. Developing a high level of expertise in successful participation in federal funding for transportation projects - through the STIP and a wide range of federal grant opportunities in SAFETEA-LU the federal transportation bill, and other federal programs.

It also means leadership-level participation in the regional transportation system now underway and being formed with support from the ARRA Stimulus funds, Idaho Transportation Department, and Yellowstone Business Partnership. START should and can be inter-connected with the entire regional transportation system now being developed.

Imagine full access to our region including the parks with one simple ticket connecting us to our neighboring communities and beyond. This regional transit system is underway, and the Plan should specifically include recognition and policy support. FOP believes it is important to broaden the Plan’s view of our region to include mention of future transit connections the next step beyond Teton Valley and Alpine to connect Jackson to the main greater Yellowstone gateway cities like Idaho Falls, Bozeman and others. This is needed to support the future of travel in our region, including sustainable access for tourism, as gas prices will continue to climb over the next few decades.

Forward thinking goals should be a hallmark of this Plan, and taking steps backwards in mode shift would be the wrong way to go. Instead, the Plan should be revised to set higher goals and take much more advantage of the synergy of a comprehensive transportation strategy and action plan. This is possible - Many progressive local governments in America are achieving mode shift changes that exceed these levels, and most European nations are well above this - the

Netherlands has bike mode share of 30% nationwide. Jackson Hole must as well. Goals such as the following should be considered:

Mode Share of all transportation trips* - Proposed by Friends of Pathways:

- 10% Bicycle
- 10% Walking
- 10% Transit
- 10% TDM Reduction of motor vehicle trips
- 10% Ride Share reduction of motor vehicle trips
- 50% Total Alternative Mode share of all Jackson Hole trips by 2030.

*(Note “one trip” is travel of one block or more, for any purpose)

Comment: The Plan must rely on a combination of all active transportation solutions.

One important example of how the draft Plan language could be significantly improved is this statement on page 60, which is repeated in the draft Plan in multiple locations:

Page 60.

“Transit offers the most viable alternative to vehicular travel...”

This statement should be revised to more accurately reflect the reality that a combination of strategies will be required for Jackson’s transportation future. Each alternative transportation mode – Walk, Bike, Transit - has advantages, and works well in some, but typically not all, circumstances.

Therefore the statement should be expanded to properly support the key additional alternative modes and key programs. Modern transportation research is clear – successful communities are using a combined, multi-modal approach, which is what the draft Plan claims to embrace. Thus, the language changes proposed are consistent with the intent of the Plan.

For the new Plan to succeed it must proposed more specific, comprehensive, and integrated solutions. A proposed improved statement would be:

FOP Suggested change:

Transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes (including the pathways system) offer alternatives to private motor vehicle travel for many trips. These “Active Transportation” modes have the lowest environmental impacts and carbon footprint, and will be encouraged. (Note: there is a national shift in word usage to change from “alternative transportation” to “Active Transportation” and this Plan should consider changing to that newer term).

In additional to embracing all the “Active Transportation” modes of Walk/Bike/Transit, the Plan needs to include a more robust Mobility Management strategy (or Transportation Demand Management). This must also play a key role in shifting private motor vehicle trips to less impact modes and methods.

Each mode has its benefits and challenges, and the Plan needs to embrace all the alternative modes to fully develop a multi-modal system. Bicycle and walking are great for short to medium trip lengths, and since research shows 40% of all trips are 2 miles or less, there is substantial potential to increase these trips. Transit works well on fixed routes, including in-Town, Teton Village routes, and commuter routes from Teton Valley and Alpine. Today’s START system can be expanded in service frequency and with enhanced buses, which will increase use. The Plan should endorse potential transit extensions to the Airport and Grand Teton National Park, additional routes like Wilson and South Park, and better service to mixed use village nodes.

Bike, walk modes can also be combined well with Transit, leveraging more use.

Page 61.

“Principles and Policies 6.1 - Increase the share of trips made by alternative modes, especially transit”

Same comment, this must be revised to be more inclusive. There is no magic bullet in transit,

which in fact it is very expensive and the Plan even acknowledges on p. 60 it does not serve all the dispersed sections of our community. The other modes frequently are more cost effective, serve most of Jackson Hole, are better for public health goals, and are the clear environmental winners. The best modes from an environmental sustainability standpoint are clearly the active modes of bicycling and walking – nothing else comes close. Transit is important and is more efficient than single passenger vehicles, FOP supports it, but Transit is only one of the viable options that should be prioritized.

Page 61.

“Policies 6.1.a: Establish a permanent funding source for transit”

Friends of Pathways strongly recommends this Permanent Funding Source policy be expanded to include pathway, pedestrian and bicycle systems needs in any new funding source. For example, pedestrian facilities are one of the most important and challenging areas that need investment. The Town of Jackson and all Teton County villages have seriously deficient walkway systems, long capital needs lists, and limited funding sources. Pathways maintenance is equally very important to preserve the investments, encourage use, and provide high quality service. But funds for pathway maintenance have been severely cut in 2009 and would also benefit from a permanent funding source.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.1.c: Research Regional Transportation Authority Viability” This Policy section should be expanded to reflect the significant Regional Transportation

Planning that is currently underway in our Teton/Yellowstone Region. The Plan should reference the Regional Transportation Concept Plan recently completed by the Idaho Transportation Department and the Yellowstone Business Partnership, which has recommended a Transportation Co-Op be formed. The Co-Op concept has received over \$535,000 in ARRA Transit Stimulus funding from ITD, in June 2009 next plans to hire a full time staff and launch a regional transit pilot program.

The Regional Transportation Concept Plan recognized START as the most successful Transit System in the region. This regional transit planning offers Jackson a tremendous opportunity to connect regionally. The opportunity to expand on the somewhat limited Regional Transportation language in the draft Plan is significant. The Plan should be revised to establish a local vision for how Jackson will fit into a future regional transportation network of not only transit, but also pathways and complete streets.

Leveraging the means and resources of our Greater Yellowstone region, including Idaho and Montana communities and the two National Parks is a significant opportunity. The Plan touches on the topic, but should be more specific, clear, measureable, and inclusive.

Please revise the Plan to include policy support and commitment to participate in the regional transportation planning underway. This is important not only for our local transportation, but also to support the future of travel and tourism in the Greater Yellowstone. Simply relying on motor vehicles for regional access will not be adequate to achieve our goals in the future. For more information please see: <http://yellowstonebusiness.org/transportation/>

Page 62.

“Policies 6.1.d: Interconnect all modes...”

This 6.1.d is mostly a Transit statement; it should be expanded for all the modes.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.2 Reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicle travel”

The Principle 6.2 needs to be specific, “single occupancy [add] MOTOR vehicle travel”. One reason, a bicycle is defined as a vehicle by Wyoming statute. So the Plan should call out motor vehicle where that is intended.

Also, perhaps in this section, there should be a basic policy statement on the primary “active transportation” modes. Add a bicycle section, pedestrian section, pathway section, and transit. In addition, this may be the place to add significant policy statement on adding a “Mobility Management (or TDM)” section with measureable goals.

One of the world’s leading TDM experts Todd Litman has lectured in Jackson Hole on two recent occasions. Litman states that aggressive TDM programs can shift up to 20% of trips from high impact to lower impact via a mix of ride-share, employer, and neighborhood programs. See: <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/> Jackson could easily seek 10% TDM type motor vehicle reductions using off the shelf, proven programs.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.2.c Require Development to promote alternative modes...”

Should be expanded to require easements of developments to provide for sidewalk, pathways and transit needs. While a rational nexus must be met, that starts with good and specific policy support in comprehensive planning documents like this. Please add mention of this topic in the appropriate locations. This will help with future LDR revisions as well.

Page 62.

“Policies 6.2.d: Discourage single occupancy vehicles”

See comments above, this may be the place to add a “Mobility Management” or TDM policy.

Page 63.

“Principle 6.3—Maintain a safe, efficient, interconnected, multi-modal transportation system”

“Principle 6.3.b Coordinate network decisions...”

This should be substantially enhanced to spell out, in simple measureable ways, how all of Jackson’s Transportation Improvement Programs are developed, coordinated, and updated. State TIPs are federal requirements of States (STIP), and the current Comp Plan requires that an annual local TIP for Jackson Hole be developed.

The reality is, the Town and County have substantially failed to follow through with this critical aspect of transportation planning. There is no on-going TIP as required by the current Comp Plan, which states:

2002 Comp Plan Page 8-47: “The Town and County will develop a Transportation Improvement Program that represents a master summary of the transportation components of the improvement programs developed by each agency and department.

Principle 6.3.c Review land use proposals...

This should also mention the concept of requiring reasonable easements for pathways, sidewalks, and/or transit needs.

Page 64: Potential Transportation Network Projects:

This section of the draft Plan only contains highway projects, and thus is a highly limited list.

A list of highway projects is appropriate in the Plan and should be included. However, it is equally critical a much broader list of improvements be included as well, and that the highway projects are being considered as meeting Complete Streets and Context Sensitive principles. The list should include all known major Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian projects. As a starting point, this would need to include: West Broadway 5-Way Main Street Project: roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, a complete street project.

- WY-22 and West Broadway Pathway
- New START Transit Center
- Sidewalks in Town and mixed use villages
- Hoback-Jackson South Project (Complete Street - highway, pathway, wildlife mitigation, river recreation access, and transit needs)

Draft Plan Page 65 - Strategies:

In general, the Theme 6 Strategies section is less specific and potentially less helpful than the current Transportation Chapter 8. It lacks measurable details and guidance on what is recommended, what agency is responsible for what actions, and does not adequately discuss how this plan is to be integrated with the WYDOT and Federal agencies STIP (State/National level).

Strategy 6.1: Establish a dedicated funding source for alternate modes of travel

Dedicate a seventh cent sales tax, additional mil property tax, or other funding source to the provision of infrastructure for alternate transportation modes with transit as the priority.

Comment: Strike Transit as priority. Transit should be one priority, but sidewalks and pathways are equally important and must also be in the eligible list for funding.

Strategy 6.3: Create a behavioral shift program to increase travel by alternate modes

Educate the community on alternative mode travel options and benefits.

Pursue home mail delivery.

Encourage or require students in all grades to take alternate modes of transportation to school rather than driving or being driven.

Pursue transit service between Jackson and the airport.

Establish a trip reduction coordinator to work with employers to reduce trips and facilitate carpooling.

Comment: As noted above in the policy section, this strategy needs to be better called out in the policies. This strategy is a good start, but would benefit by selecting a name – is it to be a TDM or Mobility Management Program? Those seem more descriptive than “behavioral shift”. Also, transit service to the Airport is a new transit route, not behavioral shift, this should be shifted to a revised Strategy 6.2 for a more comprehensive transit strategy section, which could also include Regional Transportation Co-OP and Regional Transportation Authority strategies.

Strategy 6.4: Update road design standards

Include “Complete Streets” and “Context Sensitive Solutions” policies in road design regulations.

Include wildlife crossing and other wildlife mitigation standards in road design regulations.

Comment: The new Plan should go farther and formally adopt a strong Policy Statement on Complete Streets. This strategy can then be expanded then to show how the policy will be

implemented. It should be more specific that it will apply to Town, County, and WYDOT. FOP would like to note it is very likely the U.S. Congress will include a new federally required Complete Streets policy in the big Transportation Reauthorization bill currently underway and expected to be completed next year.

Strategy 6.5: Update land use review standards

Concurrently review development projects for transportation impacts that can be mitigated.

Track incremental impacts and periodically evaluate their cumulative effect.

Institute a countywide transportation demand management program.

Adopt design standards to promote alternate modes of travel.

Reevaluate parking standards and other regulations that may promote the single occupancy vehicle.

Comment: Here, this should discuss how land use review could help TDM goals. The program itself should be covered above under behavioral shift, or TDM section. Additional mention of the need to secure easements for sidewalks, pathways, and transit should be noted.

Strategy 6.6: Cooperatively create, maintain, fund, implement, and monitor a joint town/county Transportation Capital Improvement Plan
Prioritize projects within the plan across all modes to implement this theme.
Establish permanent traffic counters for all modes of travel on specific corridors in order to monitor the effectiveness of crucial segments of the transportation system.
Comment: Cooperative planning for the TIP is an important topic, but at stated this is substantially incomplete and hard to track progress. It should spell out who is responsible to do it, and should be expanded to include WYDOT and the federal agencies, BTNF, GRTE, YELL, NER. It is worth reviewing the current Chapter 8, which has a much more specific process.
The unfortunate reality is the Town and County have not followed the adopted policy in Chapter 8 in recent years. However, this is not a reason to take key details out of the plan; rather, this should be an opportunity to redouble efforts on critical components like the development of the multi-modal local TIP. This is crucial for the success of any multi-modal system.

Strategy 6.7: Research a Regional Transportation Authority
Discuss with neighboring jurisdictions and state and federal officials the costs and benefits of a Regional Transportation Authority.
Discuss with neighboring jurisdictions improvements that can be made to the regional transportation system.
See Earlier Comment: Teton County and Town should engage in the Regional Transportation Planning efforts underway, and should explore the potential benefits of joining the Pilot Transportation Co-Op being launched with ARRA Stimulus transit funding. RTAs are one possible option, and should be explored. However, there is substantial opportunity to fund much the START system's needs through participation in the Regional System. This should be embraced fully in the Plan.

Page 66: Indicators:
The draft Plan Indicators are incomplete, far to general, and missing important items. The indicators should specifically set goals and track transit, bicycle and pedestrian mode share along with single and multi passenger motor vehicles. See FOP's proposed Mode-Shift goals earlier in this comment letter. The current Plan has good, measureable and specific goals - those should be expanded on, not reduced.
The Plan should also require an update of the Teton/Jackson Travel Study. This key study should be updated every 5 years as is called for in the current plan. Travel Studies are considered essential tools by noted transportation experts such as Dr. John Pucher, and are frequently used in leading communities.
(see: <http://www.tetonwyo.org/plan/docs/SpecialReports/TetonCountyTravelStudy2001.pdf>)
In conclusion: This is our first comment letter on the draft Plan. These comments will likely be added to as the discussion continues and revisions are made to the Plan. Please contact me if you have questions or wish more information on any of the points and issues raised.
On behalf of the Friends of Pathways Board of Trustees and our members we thank you again for your consideration of these comments.

Date	Name	Comment
6/2/2009	Faraday, Michael Interested Public	I am taking this opportunity to comment on the current draft of the revised Comprehensive Plan. Like many others, I am very concerned that though protection of wildlife has been acknowledged as the community's primary focus there are few specific and stringent mechanisms to do so in this version. Following are some areas that I believe need more attention: "Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)" · Page 17, 3rd bullet: "A large majority of the community agrees with establishing a funding source to acquire open space..." However, no where in the strategies section is such a program even mentioned, much less defined. Without this definition, it is not likely to happen; and, if it does, it will be well after the fact. · Page 25, Strategy 1.1, 1st bullet: "The Environment Commission will be an appointed volunteer committee of scientists..." This is too limiting. I would argue that there are many residents who are not degreed "scientists" who have important practical knowledge of and experience in Jackson Hole that must not be ignored. "Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2)" · Policy 2.2.c: "Update the Future Use Plan every five years..." I suggest that this is too long to wait, for a number of important reasons, including: 1) in 5 years, the variances granted by the wide authority of the LDR's will have become the new norm; the clock can never be rolled back. 2) even assuming that 5 years is appropriate, it will surely take a year or more to gather the information, then write and approve new rules. In effect, this will mean review only every 6 or seven years. In my view, this should be not less than every 3 years. I believe the cost to the community of waiting longer will be far greater than the \$\$\$ cost of more aggressive review. I cite the current process and issues as witness. · Policy 2.2.d: "...if monitoring indicates that growth rate management is needed." Growth Rate Management must be required from the outset! If it is not, who will decide if it is needed? And, when? And, of course, by then it will likely be too late. The only way to know if a plan is working is to monitor it at frequent intervals and measure its progress against specific goals. As a sidebar, below is the response I sent to Jonathan Schechter re his column of May 20: I am, for want of a better phrase, a "slow growther," for a couple of reasons: 1) Jackson Hole's economy is unusual (though not unique) in that it relies so heavily on a) tourism, and b) income earned outside the valley. For that reason, I cannot agree with your assessment that it's "grow or die." Jackson is a destination unto itself and if we can protect our most valuable assets – wildlife, natural resources for the enjoyment of all, etc. – I would argue that growth is the last thing we actually "need." 2) Reference No.1, above, our economy is almost entirely internal; i.e., it serves to support itself and produces little for consumption by the outside world. The tourists come to visit. Eventually, a few stay or return more permanently. But, they are here for our natural product. Our major export may in fact be t-shirts. Therefore, whom do we need to attract? Without a base of manufacturing, either physical or intellectual, we really need only to fulfill our own extant requirements. I would argue that, while we are not an island, we are an ecosystem (ecological and economic). Such systems grow organically and do not need outside stimuli if left to their own devices. Ergo, we should protect what we have, and not put in place government sponsored plans/LDRs that encourage growth for its own sake. That is not to say, "no growth." But, in my view, it does say, "severely restricted growth with strong measurement tools" to make sure the community is getting where it wants to go. As an aside, I've always struggled with the concept of grow or die. It seems to me that if the family is supported, the kids can go to college, vacations can be taken and retirement planned for, why do we always seem to need more. If we're happy with \$X, why is it important to attain \$Y? I think I understand the human drive to look over the next hill, etc. But, it strikes me that when that becomes the goal rather than the point of interest, we have lost something important: the enjoyment of the journey.

Date	Name	Comment
6/2/2009	Springet, Jeff Interested Public	If we have identified living with wildlife as one of our highest values, we don't want density shuffled around and increased. We want it restricted. Wildlife corridors and natural resource overlays can be created but the fact is a vast majority of wildlife depend on the riparian lands along the river corridors which is exactly where our roads and highways are. You can't fill the valley up with cars and then say you're protecting wildlife. Fall Creek Road is a perfect example. As soon as the road was improved for cars the Great Horned Owl mortality rate from traffic collisions drastically increased. My work for the last 2 years took me from Wilson to just this side of Hoback Junction. The roadkill was often horrific, especially on South Highway 89. A tractor trailer coming into town at 50 or 60 m.p.h. doesn't even put on the brakes if there's wildlife in the road, it just mows them down. Given the amount of wildlife in the valley we should be working with WyDOT to lower the speed limit 10 m.p.h. between dawn and dusk when 70% of road kill occurs. This master plan is a chance to step up to the challenge of protecting the valleys wildlife not only for ourselves but for the world's heritage. I have lived in Alaska and have also spent alot of time in British Colombia. Jackson Hole is truly unique. There is no other populated valley in North America with such diverse and abundant wildlife. If we put another 20-30,000 people in this valley plus the additional commuter traffic I would like to see a discussion of projected impacts this increase would in areas such as: 1: roads traffic and wildlife 2: air quality, light pollution 3: airport traffic 4: infra-structure needs a: schools b:landfill, garbage c:gravel extraction d: social services 5: local demands on public land a: river usage b: snowmobiling c:Teton pass d: park & forest service facilities 6: property taxes I know the planning department has worked hard and has come up with a good textbook plan. However, we need a unique plan that truly protects the valley's heritage. Filling it up with people cars and pollution is not the answer.
6/2/2009	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	I respectfully submit this letter to address my concerns about the proposed new comprehensive plan. I find it disturbingly more pro-growth than the plan in place now and I feel that the public has adequately spoken that they do not want such increased growth. Why not build out what is currently zoned for and see where we are-- this would also serve to alleviate the that is sure to arise with the new plan as it is now written. Also, since there is no funding in place for any of the infrastructure that this growth would require and with the economy still in question it might be prudent not to push ahead with this. In addition, it is unfair to the old timers (illegible) of the backbone of our community who are not necessarily rich at all having bought their property a long time ago when prices were more reasonable to increase property taxes forcing some to move away--all this to pay for infrastructure for people not yet here. My main problem with the proposed nodes is that there seems to be some faulty logic at play. To say that the Aspens is a good place for a node because it has a START bus stop is purely rationalization. 1% of the population rides the bus and the ridership is flat, not growing. And yes there is a bike path that 5 or 6% of people use-in the summer-for recreation. None of the facilities that are now present at the Aspens are enough to service the additional trips to town that would be generated by a large increase in population. Teton Village and the Aspens are on a dead end road for 6 months of the year. Wilson, also because of its unique character and wildlife, whilst sitting at the bottom of a steep pass, is not a good place for a node. Further consider, the above 3 nodes have to use the Snake River bridge--which in view of any catastrophic event and a possible evacuation this has to be considered. Teton Village road is already overtrafficked. How you can think of adding thousands more car trips a day to the road when there are no plans to widen it until 2018 or later is, in my view, downright impossible. Finally, we are failing in our providing workforce housing--we need more class 1 and 2s, not 3,4 and 5s. We need to take care of those already here not those not yet here. We keep adding resorts and commercial developments that add to the problem and we will never catch up. I urge that this plan not be adopted as proposed without major changes more in line with the public's directive. Most sincerely, Brooke Bullinger
6/2/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	While it is great that you acknowledge "this area is a primary migration corridor for mule deer and other animals traveling from the Saddle Butte southern hillsides to Karns Meadow" and that "specific roadway and site design features will need to be incorporated into future highway improvements to address wildlife concerns and crossings," there are some things missing from the district description. First, Flat Creek must be identified as what it is - a hugely valuable asset to the community in terms of ecosystem health, downstream conditions, and connectivity for both aquatic and terrestrial species. Second, setbacks from the river MUST be established and respected. Third, animals continue on from Saddle Butte to Karns Meadow to the southern part of Snow King and beyond. They do not always stop in the meadow, so road improvements need to extend on both sides of Karns Meadow. Lastly, the highway improvements should be REQUIRED with any new developments/housing projects to go into the area, not only when the roads are improved on whatever time scale they are on. This needs to be addressed AS SOON AS the connectivity is threatened/limited.

Date	Name	Comment
6/1/2009	Jankowsky, Dorothy Interested Public	Please consider the following points as you work to fix the second draft of the Comp Plan: • When this process started, the community was told it would be an update, not a rewrite, of the essentially sound 1994 Comp Plan. But the current draft has dropped critical language from the 1994 plan that specifically protected Jackson Hole’s rural character and scenic views. This language should be reinstated. The new Comp Plan is supposed to improve, not lessen, the protections of the 1994 plan. • The draft Comp Plan proposes too much growth overall in Jackson Hole – up to 9,880 new residential units and 8.8 million new square feet of commercial development – and fails to evaluate what impacts that growth would have. According to the figures from Pages I-4 and I-5 of the current draft’s “Appendix I: Future Growth and Development,” the new draft plan would allow more than double the amount of development that Jackson Hole already has on the ground. Despite planners’ recent assertions to the contrary, community surveys conducted last year all showed strong support for limiting overall growth in the valley to protect the wildlife and other attributes that make this place unique. • The draft plan needs to take into account the drivers of demand for more growth. For example, it fails to acknowledge that the amount of commercial development it proposes will worsen, not relieve, Jackson Hole’s workforce housing shortage. Despite the plan’s stated aspirations, its likely effect will be an increased, not decreased, reliance on workers commuting from outside the valley. Here’s some simple math to illustrate the point: $(9,880 \text{ additional housing units}) \times (\text{between } 1.74 \text{ and } 2.37 \text{ people per unit}^*) = \text{between } 17,191 \text{ and } 23,415 \text{ more residents than the } 20,000\text{-plus Teton County has now}$ $(8.807 \text{ million sq. ft. of new commercial}) \times (1 \text{ job per } 240 \text{ sq. ft.}^{**}) = 36,695 \text{ jobs}$ $(36,695 \text{ jobs}) \div (1.26 \text{ jobs per worker}^{**}) = \text{demand for } 29,123 \text{ more workers}$ $(29,123 \text{ workers}) \div (\text{between } 1.74 \text{ and } 2.37 \text{ people per housing unit}^*) = \text{demand for anywhere between } 16,737 \text{ and } 12,288 \text{ more housing units}$ Interestingly, according to the draft plan’s own multipliers, the amount of additional commercial development allowed by the draft plan will generate a demand for much more housing than what the plan proposes. (*2.37 is the standard multiplier; planners sometimes use 1.74 to adjust for part-time residents) (**Jobs per sq. ft. and jobs per worker estimates are from the current draft’s Appendix C, Page 16) • We don’t even know what effect Jackson Hole’s present development is already having on the valley’s irreplaceable wildlife and other natural resources, not to mention the quality of life and experience for everyone who lives, works and visits here. But only last week, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department released statistics showing that Wyoming’s moose populations are 44.3 percent under objective, and mule deer populations are 18.3 percent under objective. If we don’t have enough information about the impacts of growth to make informed decisions, we should err on the side of caution until we do get that information. Conservative buildout numbers and caps on Jackson Hole’s rate of growth would allow us to see what toll growth is taking before it’s too late. At the very least, overall buildout numbers should not exceed what’s allowed under current base zoning. • The new Comp Plan needs to include an empirical basis for evaluating the impacts of development on Jackson Hole’s wildlife, aquifers and open spaces, and on quality of life issues, such as taxes, traffic and school class sizes. Without data, any plan is just shooting craps with this valley’s future. • The new plan also needs to go back to the definition of “managing growth responsibly” that was included in Comp Plan revision handouts and survey materials from Fall of 2007 to Winter of 2008, such as: “Establish and define the ‘end state’ for development of the town and county and implement it through regulatory and programmatic approaches”; “Establish techniques and policies to maintain density neutrality as future changes are made”; and “Fully address the cost of growth... Future growth will pay for itself and avoid increasing the tax burden on the community.” Inexplicably, the new draft’s responsible growth statement of ideal now reads: “Meet the human needs of the community in locations identified for development.” Huh? • The draft plan focuses too much on just the location of future growth and not enough on the rate, scale and community costs of the growth it proposes. • Allowing more development potential in the Town of Jackson and in northern South Park, Teton Village, Wilson and the Aspens will not result in permanent protection in the rest of Teton County unless there is a specific mechanism (growth boundaries, transfers of development rights, strict zoning, etc.) in place to guarantee it. The draft plan fails to address this, apparently relying instead on wishful thinking. • The Jackson Hole community said – and the draft plan acknowledges – that protecting wildlife is its number one priority. Yet the draft plan ranks wildlife last or next to last as a priority in 12 of the 25 districts. Again, huh? • This quote from “Balancing Nature and Commerce in Gateway Communities” by Jim Howe, Ed McMahon and Luther Propst sums it up: “Gateway communities seeking to develop a vital local economy must ensure that growth and economic development don’t come at the expense of their unique identity, quality of life, economic diversity, and fiscal well-being.... Without well-designed and publicly supported strategies to preserve their character and surroundings, gateway communities risk undermining the very assets responsible for their economic vitality and future potential.” Thank you very much for your consideration of these comments.

Date	Name	Comment
6/1/2009	Viau, Carol Interested Public	I would like to comment on the part of the plan regarding the idea to continue "light industrial uses on the bench above Melody Ranch". Currently, those of us living below the bench are sleep deprived 3/4 of the year. Spring, summer and fall, Fish Creek Excavation starts up their equipment and operations early. The sound reverberates over the Melody Ranch neighborhood, due to it's location. The Steak Pub/south side pizza pub, has a history of music (and is continuing it) on the back deck until late, then we are kept awake by the loud revelers still hanging out back there. The noise distributes so well, that entire conversations can be heard from our bedroom window, which is open due to the summer heat. Two summers ago I became very familiar with the night shift at the sheriff's office due to all these late night antics. I would call them every night with noise complaints. The same sound problem emits from the apartments next to the Pub. For those of us that work odd hours (two to three jobs, 15 hour days, weekends) this is absolute torture. However, to continue living in my affordable home, this type of work schedule is necessary as services jobs are low paying. If you want to keep the working force here, you must consider this problem in future development of the Melody Ranch Bench. I strongly encourage you to consider "QUIET" type of industrial uses here.
6/1/2009	Christopher, Frank Interested Public	I am a resident of the City Of Jackson, as well as owning several other properties in the Valley and having spent time in Jackson since the early 70's. We are blessed with a lot of intelligent people who live, work and play in our community. Many have made their voices heard, through public forums, and have articulated well intended positions concerning the intended direction of the new proposed General Plan. I would like to add my voice of support to those opponents of the plan who feel it assumes, and thereby condones a magnitude of growth which many of us are not comfortable with and do not feel is sustainable, if we are to keep the flavor of our community as it currently exist. One statement of truth my past residency has illustrated is, that if you have a desirable place to live people will come, and with it negative impact on quality of life issues. I am uniquely positioned to comment on this topic as I have formally lived in Pitkin County, City Of Aspen for over 11 years, during its struggles with these issues, and was an unsuccessful voice, as early as the late 70's, for our city to address these issues. Subsequently, a decade later moving to Sun Valley and watching history repeat itself. Aspen learned the hard way that there are no simple answers, and a lot of hard choices need to be made that no one in government or in the general population was ready to make, at the time they needed to be made. The end result was a patchwork of remedies, which developed over time, as the issues forced government and the public to recognize the realities that faced them. These in turn forced difficult decisions to be made, in many instances after the fact. Sun Valley specifically paid and employed experts from Aspen to address their rapidly approaching problems, yet choose to ignore them for the most part, and did not make the hard choices necessary, resulting in a society and current condition which will take more than another decade to resolve if at all. As painful as it is for many long time locals, our community needs to embrace and fully get behind affordable housing. Many of us can agree this is a good idea but most say "not in my back yard". There are a host of ideas and ways to approach this issue, at this point all should be "on the table" and all ideas considered. One ideal of the new proposed General Plan that I believe is a fair and a balanced approach to growth, is having higher density "Pods" of development in (4) key areas of the Valley. This I my opinion makes good sense, and does not unfairly put the burden of any unintended consequences of growth on a particular area or population base within our community. What the proposed draft does not address, to the extent many of us think it should, is curbing growth in our community and the burden and responsibilities, especially commercial developments, put on all our services, roads and infrastructure. To that end, there can only be one answer, the needs of the few or the one can not out way the needs of the many or the community. To do so would leave us with most of the same issues now faced in the two towns I formally lived and conducted business in. The lack of finding solutions to these issues is what drove me, and many others, away from them in the first place. We have to make hard choices now, put the limits on growth in place today, so our future quality of life is not so adversely effected that we loose the qualities that attracted all of us to this special corner of our country in the fists place. I am confident in the good intentions of our public leaders and our community activist, and we do have some blueprints to follow, so as not to let history repeat itself in Jackson. If we have to adopt quotes, as Aspen has, what is wrong with that. Sure some property owners will be effected and some money will be left on the table, but most of the same people this might effect are also part of our community, and have a vested interest in preserving what they value and drew them to Jackson in the first place. It has been said, "with great wealth comes great responsibility" one only has to look to one family, the Rockefellers, to realize this and understand that without their past philanthropy Jackson and the Teton Valley would not look as it does today. Rather than fostering an adversarial exchange, and maybe it is naive of me to think this, lets all come together from that place that recognizes none of the parties involved want to loose that most precious commodity, our quality of life and the very special place we have chosen to live in.

Date	Name	Comment
6/1/2009	Scott, Russell Interested Public	Commissoners, Thank you for your genuine concern & work for the good of Jackson Hole. I moved to JH in 1966 at ten years of age. I graduated from high school & have lived, worked & been a business owner in JH continously since my arrival. I have always enjoyed working with people. That especially includes tourists. I derive pleasure & satisfaction from educating our visitors about the human & natural history of this special place. I will leave the technical discussion of our plan to those more knowledgeable than I. The main question is; How much are we WILLING to allow JH to grow? I'd love for many generations of people to come visit JH & marvel at its natural beauty. Then I want them to GO HOME! Further "economic development" will not enhance the tourist's visit nor the resident's life. The way we live in JH now is not sustainable,so why would more be better? I want a communtiy that is diverse in its types of people, not in their economic status! Do the right thing; write & implement a plan which DISENGOURAGES growth! Put specific caps on all types of growth. Spell out specific ways in which commercial & residential growth will be managed. The character of JH and our life, as well as the integrity of our national parks, forests,and wildlife are at stake.
6/1/2009	Wang, Louis Save Historic JH	Dear Elected Officials, • Telephone: 307-733-4392 The draft Comp Plan took an unfortunate turn in late 2008. Many in the community feel their input has been disregarded and are disappointed, some are angry. Lincoln, in his Gettysburg Address, noted the importance of "government of the people, by the people, for the people" The draft Plan falls short of Lincoln's vision, and the community requests you intercede on their behalf. The comments below are a partial synopsis of concerns. Thanks for listening. Wildlife, though it's listed as "Theme I" in the Plan, is actually treated as # I in chronology only, not in importance. Combining it as "Wildlife and atural Resources" further degrades its standing. Wildlife is the #1 most important value to residents and it should be treated that way. Open Space. the 2"" most important value to residents. is ignored. It needs to be addressed. Entitlement of future development is the real focus of the Plan. The people of JH don't share the Plan's vision - they rejected the "node" approach in favor of a "Wildlife/Conservation" and limited growth focus IAlliance lener, 4/20/09.1- The Plan is hostile to the residents who are paying for it. Growth is treated superficially. We've been growing too fast, especially commercial growth that has spawned our large commuter 'shadow' population. We need to limit our growth rate to no more than the national average; we've been growing at a rate over twice that fast for too long. Town, with its huge addition of lodging and dense tall buildings, will become a resort in itself while residents are relegated to their nodes for shopping and services. This destruction of our community was rejected 2: I in the DRO vote. Vibrant means healthy, not constant big growth. Transportation focuses on alternates, ignoring the bigger issue. What about vehicle traffic; will congestion be relieved? Where are the roads; how big will they be; how bad are the traffic jams? Measurable Indicators are cited throughout the Plan so we can grade how well it's working. But they are often misguided or superficial so they will simply give false indications of success. Recession, the worst in 60-years, is ignored. Business failures, declining land values, foreclosures, etc. are ongoing. Unemployment is increasing: we haven't hit bottom. Until recovery is underway, we need a safety-net focus. Approval of a costly big-growth Plan now may be inappropriate. Tax Increases will be needed; the new infrastructure will cost local residents \$-millions. Voters just said 'no' to the \$53-million-plus Justice Center and panned the \$5-million Visitor Center. We're in bad financial times and folks are hurting. We don't think voters will approve new taxes. Management of the Plan by special interests input and planners reporting to politicians has been a failure. Input by ordinary residents has been disregarded. We need a team of citizens that embody the values and concerns of the community to help guide and manage a new process and a new Plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/31/2009	Zelazo, Barbara and Mi Interested Public	I am writing to express my thoughts about the current plan to dramatically expand housing in the Aspens and Wilson. I think the proposals offered are terrible ideas which will not help with work force housing. They will create more demand for services and they will increase traffic enormously on the Village Road. We want to reduce sprawl yes but the densities being proposed belong in town. This is where it belongs, this is where the community wants it. Everything about this plan seems too much too fast. Wilson is a small hamlet, you will overwhelm it with the growth being proposed. Some increased density there would be acceptable, but your plan goes to the extreme. The same can be said for the Aspens. Because some of us answered that density would be OK here, did not mean that doubling its size would be acceptable. The Cheney Lane area is also very low density and should stay that way. How this area could be designated for high density when it is by far over the ¼ mile necessary for walkable reange from the Aspen's minimal seervices is a mystery. It also presents a safety hazard if many folks start walking the village road in winter, as the pathway is only usable about 6 months per year. This seems to have been just included because the Housing Trust purchased land there, when they had no business doing so, and not because it is in the community's best interest. Between Teton Village and its growth, the Aspens and Millward there is already heavy use on the Village Road. There are minimal services for these existing "nodes" and you cannot guarantee that appropriate services will follow. Groceries, gas, and basic needs will have to be gotten in Jackson or possibly Wilson and will more often than not require a car ride. These facts will require expanding the road sooner rather than later, and the community is strongly against that. Listen to all the citizens and you will hear overwhelming dismay at what is being proposed. Scale this back, put high density development in town, where the jobs, stores and services are already located. The village deli is not a supermarket where any of us buy the majority of our food. It's great to have here but it's where you go when you forgot something at Albertsons or Smiths. Don't pretend people are not going to go into town, we do now and we will continue to have to. The more people housed on the Village Road, the worse the traffic will get, the greater the impact on wildlife and the less desirable it will be for all of us.
5/29/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Save Historic Jackson Hole submits the attached comments on the Transportation Theme of the Comprehensive Plan. They were performed by Robert Bernstein P.E., a traffic consultant hired by Save Historic Jackson Hole to evaluate the Comprehensive Plan. In his comments, Mr. Bernstein has 4 conclusions. We feel these conclusions must be addressed if the Revised Comprehensive Plan is to be successful. Mr. Bernstein is available to answer any questions on his comments. These comments have not been entered into the website. I have prepared an evaluation of the Draft Jackson-Teton County Comprehensive Plan, per your request. Primary conclusions of this evaluation are: • The Multimodal Strategy described in the Draft Comprehensive Plan (Theme 6) states goals and identifies principles, but omits analysis of conditions and specification of how its goals are to be met, and as a consequence, there is no way to determine whether or not the Comp Plan is reasonable and viable. • The Draft Comp Plan does not provide needed updates of the Functional Classification Plan, street design standards, Level of Service (LOS) definitions, and traffic volume standards. • The Draft Comp Plan does not provide necessary complete traffic forecasts and full traffic/transportation analysis of the Plan's preferred land use scenario. • The Draft Comp Plan does not specify the new roadways and capacity improvements needed to meet the LOS and volume standards under the traffic loadings generated by the growth and development envisioned by the Plan. A complete set of conclusions and a discussion of those conclusions is attached. The conclusions are based on a review and evaluation of related background information (including the Draft Comprehensive Plan and its Appendices) and discussions with Town staff, County Planning and Public Works staff, the County's transportation planning consultant, and Wyoming Department of Transportation (WYDOT) district staff and headquarters analysts. If you have any questions or if you need additional information, please contact me. {Full conclusions and discussions referenced in the above cover letter available in hard copy at the County Planning Department}

Date	Name	Comment
5/29/2009	Wilmot, Jason Interested Public	I own a home at 45 Stormy Circle in East Jackson. I write to comment specifically on the comprehensive plan components relevant to our neighborhood. Here is some background: My property is adjacent to a lot that is in turn adjacent to East Broadway. In the last year, I have educated myself on details regarding the zoning of the property adjacent to ours to the north (between us and East Broadway). This adjacent property (550 East Broadway at the intersection of Stormy Circle and East Broadway) was recently sold. As part of this sale, it was originally offered up under the premise that the entire parcel was zoned Office Professional. This premise of zoning was not congruent with my understanding of the zoning of this parcel. Upon further investigation and communication with the Jackson Planning and Building Department, it was revealed that the map available on the Teton County website was not accurate, and in fact, the south half of 550 East Broadway is still zoned Neighborhood Conservation-Single Family (NC-SF). The sale of this property was completed under new terms given this zoning fact. This zoning status has been verified, in writing, from the Planning and Building Department. This fact has been a large, temporary, relief to me and my family, as we are VERY concerned about the quality of our home and neighborhood if the south half of 550 East Broadway would be rezoned into Office Professional. With this background in mind: I have reviewed the draft Comprehensive Plan for District 15: East Jackson, and see that the south portion of this parcel, 550 East Broadway, is intended to be zoned as "Mixed-Use Office Orientation". I fear that this zoning change is premised upon the ownership boundaries of the parcels, rather than being congruent with a zoning delineation that is in line with your stated priority for East Jackson. If the zoning is changed on the south half of this parcel, this block of new zoning would be a peninsular intrusion into the single-family mixed-type zoning. The draft Comprehensive Plan states, "Redevelopment should generally be neutral and maintain and preserve existing character." The existing character of our neighborhood will be directly compromised if the south half of the parcel at 550 East Broadway is rezoned to allow Office development. We already have significant parking congestion and busy traffic on our street. I am concerned about my children's safety and the quality of the neighborhood if even more congestion and traffic is allowed under a new zoning configuration. I am very anxious over the following potential scenario. 1) The south half of 550 East Broadway becomes rezoned to become Mixed-Use Office Orientation. 2) The current owner of 550 East Broadway also owns the lot immediately adjacent lot to the west. I presume this owner will want to consolidate these parcels to achieve the minimum square foot lot size to qualify for a Planned Mixed-Use Development Bonus. (Even though the draft plan states that the 'town strongly discourages consolidation of multiple lots to create longer home sites not consistent with community character'. I recommend this principle also be applied to consolidation of lots for office professional development, especially in areas that should be single family homes). Depending upon how the Planned Mixed-Use Development Tool is applied to "Mixed-Use office Orientation", it is possible that the landscape surface ration for the combined lot would be reduced to only 5%. Also, and I admit I don't quite understand how the PMD would be applied to the new Mixed-Use Office Orientation, it is possible that a height bonus would be granted to a developer. What this would result in is effectively an urban character, very little landscaping, higher volumes of street traffic, congestion, a multi-story mixed-use building overshadowing my home and blocking any sort of view, and a loss of what East Jackson is all about. This scenario, to me, is directly counter to maintaining the quality of our neighborhood. These multiple and domino-effect changes would effectively be the opposite of your goal of "maintaining and preserving existing character". This scenario is not neutral, and the draft plan states that redevelopment should be neutral. Therefore, my strong request, recommendation, and comment is that you NOT rezone the south half of 550 East Broadway, but instead keep it the same zoning intended to maintain the character of an area intended for single family homes. Changing the zoning to Mixed-Use Office Orientation is a disservice to our neighborhood and, to me, would not be consistent with sound neighborhood stewardship.
5/29/2009	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	I have commented earlier, specifically on the Aspens, section 10. After much more reading and discussion, I find that I must also add my thoughts on the entire plan, not specifically per section. I do not understand that if you went to the trouble of surveying the residents, why did you not incorporate their priorities in there order of importance in the plan? If this plan is supposed to be an update, why are you re-writing sections and changing goals? Also, why is this happening so quickly? Please take the time to do this right. The plan does not seem to represent the voice of the majority residents. Please take the time and get input to try to build consensus. This is a draft plan, please be open to modification.

Date	Name	Comment
5/28/2009	Robertson, Lisa Interested Public	Dear Jackson "Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem" Representatives: Wildlife and Open Spaces, values this community has cherished for decades, should be reinstated as the Community's top priority and become the organizing theme of the entire Plan. Do I need to say more than these simple words? There appears to be an "uprising of the soul" in this community. We are ready for the change we are seeking. It's the time and the place in history to reverse our worrisome path towards destroying the most valued wildness in our country, and all the good that it shares with us. We must continue to protect this wild habitat and its wild creatures, and place this goal as a priority above our own agenda for individual profit. Let's begin thinking about "restoring" our habitat, not chopping away at it. We Can Do It. Warm thanks for your effort to protect our human values to preserve all things wild. Please take time to read the following poem. WHY WE ARE HERE Because the world we had imagined, the one we had always counted on is disappearing. Because the sun has become cancerous and the planet is getting hotter. Because children are starving in the shadows of yachts and economic summits. Because there are already too many planes in the sky. This is the manufactured world you have come here to codify and expedite. We have come to tell you there is something else we want to buy. What we want, money no longer recognizes like the vitality of nature, the integrity of work. We don't want cheaper wood, we want living trees. We don't want engineered fruit, we want to see and smell the food growing in our own neighborhoods. We are here because a voice inside us, a memory in our blood, tells us you are not just a trade body, you are the blind tip of a dark wave which has forgotten its source. We are here to defend and honor what is real, natural, human and basic against this rising tide of greed. We are here by the insistence of spirit and by the authority of nature. If you doubt for one minute the power of truth or the primacy of nature try not breathing for that length of time. Now you know the pressure of our desire. We are not here to tinker with your laws. We are here to change you from the inside out. This is not a political protest. It is an uprising of the soul.-Robert Arthur Lewis for the World Trade Organization Ministerial Summit, Seattle 1999"Let us begin. Let us restore the Earth. Let the mountains talk, and the rivers run."David Brower Note: Please read David Brower's book: Let the Mountains Talk, Let the Rivers Run,,,,,and you will forever be changed.....
5/28/2009	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	The allowable numbers of new housing units in northwest South Park are double what they should be. The balance of the area in South Park should be limited to 1 unit per 3 acres, but in clusters, so that 50% open space can be required of any development. That open space should provide for a contiguous north/south corridor of open space.
5/28/2009	Ladd, Berthe K. Interested Public	Having read a portion of the document, and many of the thoughtful comments in the JH News and Guide letters to the Editor, as well as the e-mail sent by the JH Conservation Alliance concerning the draft Comprehensive Plan, I would like to ask that the Teton County Planning Department listen to the citizens, ponder on the discrepancy between the understanding of the the citizenry going in to the process, and its understanding of the newly published draft Plan now, and rethink and redefine the processes and goals of the current draft Plan. There was obviously a misunderstanding between the citizens of Teton County and the staff of the Planning Department at the time that the work plan was undertaken. Further effort must be made to create a Plan that both the county and its communities can live with. I would like to underline my agreement with Walter Thulin's letter to the Editors that makes the distinction between Teton County as one distinct place, and the virtual and more encompassing area that has become our larger community. The finite area of Teton County cannot fulfill all of the planning goals set out at the outset of the planning process. The priorities were quite clearly outlined by a majority of the participating citizenry and those priorities should be given priority planning status.
5/28/2009	Bertincely, Juanita Interested Public	I am against the Comprehensive Plan as designated. I believe we (as a resident of Wilson) are already at max with units of growth. The need for "work housing" is an erroneous concept, I feel being used as an excuse to develop. We are already at "balanced max" of environment and growth limits. We do not need 550 units to achieve balance.

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2009	Watson, Andrew P. Interested Public	Can the nodes proposed for the Aspens and Wilson, district 10 and 11 in the Comprehensive plan, work? For Teton County the answer is no. Community planning that incorporates “sustainable” nodes along high speed transit routes can achieve a viable alternative to car use and promote walking communities. But the key to success relies completely on a fast efficient transit system that moves a high number of residents to one location for the majority of their work and entertainment. Since we do not have, and probably never will have, a transit system that does not rely on roads, the idea of setting up numerous nodes around the county only makes matters worse. People won’t leave their cars for something less fast and less convenient. The plan for nodes in Wilson and The Aspens does not create sustainable communities. It creates little “bedroom communities” with few jobs within the community itself, and little or no community amenities -- movies, music, live theater, libraries, restaurants, bars, drugstores or supermarkets. With the planned housing density, it will create thousands of car/truck trips to town where most of our amenities, already exist. Sure, some people will ride the bus, and some will bike to jobs when weather permits, but density in the nodes will only increase highway traffic. It is incredibly difficult to get people out of their cars. The Plan’s Vision Statement contains a commitment to preserving and protecting the area’s eco-system and natural resources, as well as meeting the community’s human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner. Is there one bedroom community in our country where bus transportation has significantly reduced automobile traffic? It is impossible to see how these nodes advance the vision. Traffic will destroy the vision. There are only two sites in Teton county where a majority of residents work and play: the town of Jackson and Teton Village. Jackson is really the heart of our community, and the services most important to residents are found there. So, why not put the people where the services are and create a walking city? By creating housing in Jackson, residents, clustered there, can take public transportation to Teton Village for employment or walk to work in town. Take a look at Portland, Oregon, considered one of the best-managed cities in the nation. It is a walking city, with housing, services and entertainment, all accessible without a car. And it has public transportation to some outlying areas.

Date	Name	Comment
5/26/2009	Welch, Diana Teton County Housing	Dear Board of County Commissioners and Town Council, On behalf of the Teton County Housing Authority Board of Directors, I am pleased to offer some comments on the 2009 Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. These comments are based on our mission to enable diverse opportunities for essential housing throughout the County. We have also met with several informal community leaders to hear their feedback on the plan and Theme 4 in particular. Overall, I am happy that the plan complements the Housing Authority's mission to enable housing for our local workforce. The board recognizes the importance of how the 2009 comprehensive plan incorporates a goal to house 65 percent of the workforce locally. The vitality of the valley depends on a strong local workforce, and the 2007 Teton County Housing Needs Assessment reports that other mountain resorts have suffered when the workforce migrates away because there are fewer locals supporting the businesses, the level of service to guests diminishes, and they become less desirable places to visit and live. It also notes that most peer mountain resort communities find that when approximately 60 percent of the workforce commutes, the sense of community diminishes. While the 1994 comprehensive plan identified a clear need for affordable housing, it did not articulate a goal. The 65 percent goal gives our valley a concrete tool to gauge our progress and success and allows us to respond to growth, rather than drive growth. The comprehensive plan also does a great job at outlining a diverse approach to creating workforce housing. Principles 4.2 through 4.4 explain how we will use requirements, existing homes, and incentives in a "three-legged stool" approach to house the workforce. Keeping the approach diverse will help us be successful in the long run. It may be helpful to be more explicit that those three principles are the ways in which we will accomplish our housing goal in a balanced manner. The land-use maps are great because they help the community identify where housing should be. Having housing in specific areas helps preserve our other community values of preserving wildlife and natural resources. It also responds to transportation goals and Town as Heart. We wanted to note that there is a major shift from the 1994 comprehensive plan in that the terminology affordable housing is now workforce housing. The Board likes this direction as it acknowledges that our workforce encompasses many economic sectors and lives in many types of homes, including market, affordable, employment-based, or rental housing. However, if we make the switch from affordable to workforce, we want to make sure that we don't abandon the affordability aspect. Affordability, where housing costs are no more than 30 percent of the occupants' total monthly income, is what makes deed-restricted rental and ownership housing successful. For example, employment-based housing works because homes are generally priced to be affordable for families making just above median income. We should not lose sight of the goal to house families affordably. Our nationwide economy and housing market are in bad shape because families had incentives to buy more than they could afford when it came to housing, putting them at risk of foreclosure. We don't want to see that happening locally with the investment this community has made in housing our workforce. Another shift has to do with addressing inadequate housing. Because our County is one of the nation's wealthiest, it is hard to understand the level of substandard housing that exists here today. There has been no economic incentive for rental property owners to keep their properties in good condition, as they have always been able to find tenants as rental supply has been low. The 1994 plan addressed substandard housing in Teton County, and the Housing Authority Board would like to see today's comprehensive plan mention it as well. Adding more rental supply and incentivizing redevelopment are both tools that help address this issue. We have also noticed that this comprehensive plan targets upper-middle income earners instead of targeting middle income earners as the 1994 plan did. This shift is a nation-wide trend, as communities have been struggling to build housing for their workforce as land and construction costs have increased. The majority of our workforce is in the lowermiddle income range, and we should provide a mix of ownership and rental products that target the make-up of our workforce. Without a doubt, the affordable housing program is complex. We would like to see the 2009 comprehensive plan carry forward some definitions from the 1994 plan such as affordable, attainable, and employee housing to eliminate some confusion and to communicate effectively. This language should be consistent throughout the document. We may want to consider changing the word workforce to community, but with whatever term we choose, it should have a clear definition. I am attaching a list that defines the housing programs that are pertinent to the comprehensive plan, a worksheet that suggests some changes that will help clarify the intent of each principle and policy in Theme 4, and a redlined version of Theme 4. Sincerely, Diana Welch Board President Teton County Housing Authority

{reference Housing Programs table; available in hard copy in the County Planning

Department)

Specific Recommendations for Theme 4

Theme 4 - Why is this theme addressed?

This chapter makes it sound like we're starting from scratch when addressing our community's housing needs when in fact we have a successful, well-established program with several successful providers. This introduction should recognize the programs that are in place today and the providers in the community that produce workforce housing. It should also be clearer about our approach going forward on how to house our workforce; specifically the balanced "three-legged stool" approach of requirements, incentives, and preserving existing housing stock. We would also like to see this section address the shift from affordable to workforce housing, convey where the 65 percent goal originated and include some language that ensures that affordability is still a goal. To be consistent with the 1994 comprehensive plan, we also request that it addresses inadequate/substandard housing. We have received feedback that it would be helpful to show where we are today with meeting our workforce housing goal. It may be helpful to replace the pie chart that shows the 65/35 split with a chart that shows how 33 percent of the workforce commutes, 67 percent lives locally, and of the 67 percent, x percent rents, y percent owns market housing, and z percent owns restricted product.

Principle 4.1

The text implies that we want to provide housing for everyone, including homeowners who earn their income outside of Teton County. Since the market already provides this ownership opportunity, the text should state that the focus should be to house a diverse workforce in a variety of housing types.

Policy 4.1.a.

We think that the intent of this policy is to express that we're not going to target one industry; we want to house a comprehensive workforce across many industries. Also, we think it's trying to say that we want to be socially responsible and house retirees and persons unable to work. (Those populations are not included in the 65 percent.)

Policy 4.1.b.

This policy makes it sound like we want to raise the target market. Rather, we recommend that we target housing to correspond with the make-up of our workforce. If families earn their income locally, then their housing options are limited. Our target should be consistent with the make-up of our workforce and address both higher-income earners and lower-income earners. Elected officials should make public policy decisions based on feedback from staff (Teton County Housing Authority) and public input (including the Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust, Habitat for Humanity, and the general public). We have also noticed that the words deed-restricted and restricted appear throughout the document, and it would be more consistent to choose a consistent term.

Policy 4.1.c.

Any place that market housing exists is an appropriate location for a restricted home to exist. However, density bonuses for workforce housing shall occur in nodes.

Policy 4.1.d.

In order to keep a diverse community, we need diverse housing options. Some families prefer to live in town in small units, others prefer to have units with large amounts of acreage. We want a variety of product types to give choices to our workforce, which encourages workers to remain in this community. This text includes a lot of assumptions about homeowners' desires, and the Housing Authority has seen these desires evolve over time, dependant on market conditions. Printing these trends dates this document. Instead, this paragraph should define the various housing types (condos, apartments, single-family detached, town homes). This policy should also allow for multi-family zoning to provide rental opportunities for the public and private sector.

Policy 4.1.e.

By housing 65 percent of our workforce locally, we are still importing 35 percent of our workforce from neighboring communities. We should recognize that those that we're importing will have needs for roads, buses, and daycare facilities. There will also be impacts on wildlife corridors and increased traffic from this policy, both within Teton County and in surrounding counties.

Principle 4.2

This method is one of three methods to provide housing in our community. It functions well, while principle 4.3 is not a well-established program and principle 4.4 is based on market conditions and landowner objectives, and outcomes are uncertain. Also, principle 4.2 allows us to keep up with new development. but it doesn't help us catch up with our existing backlog of needed workforce housing, so there are unique characteristics of each of the principles. We would like to see a clearer introduction of these three principles, showing that together they're a balanced approach (or three-legged

stool) to enable workforce housing. It may be difficult to work within the existing structure of the comprehensive plan, but it will be easier to follow if we can link these three principles more strongly. Some community members have interpreted this principle to mean that developers will be required to mitigate 100% of the housing for their workforce or at least 65 percent. However, we recognize that it cannot be the burden of new development to make up for existing needs in the community, so we recommend softening the language.

Policy 4.2.a.

The language in this policy is unclear. It reads as though we are moving away from inclusionary zoning for residential development and are going to transition to linkage requirements. If our perception is accurate, then elected officials should discuss this policy because it would be a major shift. We are comfortable with the direction, but it means that there would be a conflict between our current regulations and guiding documents. We recommend separating residential development and commercial development requirements into two policies to clarify the difference between them. Additionally, take out "and partners" since it's not clear who the partners are. It may also be beneficial to convey that to incentivize or de-incentivize certain forms of development, there may be different mitigation rates in the Town and the County.

Policy 4.2.b.

The current version of this policy implies that redevelopment is a bad thing. In fact, redevelopment may help change some of the substandard living conditions in Jackson, fits in with comprehensive plan goals to have infill development. and could provide more housing opportunities via incentives. The policy should reflect a balance of our goal to redevelop and our goal to preserve workforce housing. One way to minimize workforce housing loss through redevelopment is not counting existing workforce housing as a credit. It may make sense to split up the workforce housing loss through redevelopment and workforce housing loss through conversion into two separate policies

Policy 4.2.e.

We also recommend adding a policy that encourages flexibility in meeting requirements. It could be:

Policy 4.2.e: Provide flexibility in meeting requirements

Allow rental units instead of ownership units to meet residential requirements in mixed-use developments.

Allow use of existing housing stock to meet residential and commercial requirements.

Principle 4.3

The Housing Authority Board is pleased to see this idea because it will help us preserve our community character, and the language in this principle gives us the directive to start this new program. We would like to include how preserving existing housing stock helps preserve community character. We would also like to soften the first sentence, because it puts pressure on Principle 4.2 to have high mitigation rates.

Policy 4.3.a.

Out of the three principles of obtaining workforce housing (requirements, incentives, and preserving existing housing stock), it appears by reading this policy that preserving existing housing stock is the preferred approach. In actuality, we are looking for a balanced approach. To date, development requirements have been the most successful tool in attaining workforce housing. They're institutionalized and developers are comfortable with them. At this time, we need to prioritize preserving existing housing stock as a method for providing workforce housing. We recommend the following language: "Establish a program to preserve existing housing stock." We would also like to acknowledge that while this program will help us meet environmental and sustainability goals, the subsidies per home may be expensive.

Policy 4.3.b.

This policy includes property tax relief, reverse mortgages, shared appreciation mortgages and other financial incentives to fund policy 4.3.a.

Principle 4.4

This section should clarify the intent of the incentives. Should they provide additional restricted housing or incentivize market housing? Base zoning should be low enough so that there is a real financial incentive to take advantage of a density bonus. We can incentivize, but can't make someone take advantage of an incentive. We recommend adding language that has staff working with developers to help them understand incentive tools for workforce housing and what it means to their long-term business success. We also recommend adding a policy that allows for incentives other than density bonuses to create deed-restricted workforce housing. Finally, we recommend separating Policy 4.4.b into two separate policies-one that addresses public/private partnerships; the other that addresses providing

Date	Name	Comment
		technical assistance to the business community. Strategies We recommend changing the numbering of the strategies to reflect a sequential order. In sequence, the first strategy is setting a workforce housing plan, the second is updating the LDRs and zoning maps, and the third is funding the workforce housing plan. We also request that the workforce housing plan incorporate the Blue Ribbon Panel. We have made some edits in the red lined version of Theme 4. Indicators Some of the feedback we have received questions the feasibility of these indicators. We recommend taking out the greater than symbol in indicator #1 because our goal is to have 65 percent of our workforce living locally, not 65 percent or more of the workforce living locally. {reference Redlined version of Theme 4; available in hard copy at the County Planning Department}
5/26/2009	Jones, Richard A. Interested Public	Gentlemen: By _- The April 3, 2009, draft of a new Comprehensive Plan (the "Plan") is surely a disappointment to the majority of those who have made Teton County their permanent home. It lays out an elaborate scheme to manipulate and even promote development, but fails to limit growth or retard its pace. The proposed Plan's overarching commitment to ever more work force housing-and especially the ambitious quota of 65%-envision an extensive period of boundless growth. This devotion to the construction of new work force housing overrides concerns for the preservation of wildlife, natural resources and community character. In this defining respect, the Plan contravenes the hopes and desires expressed by a substantial majority of the citizens of Teton County. In establishing the paramount priority of more work force housing, the Plan fails to distinguish among temporary, seasonal, resort workers and permanent, critical service personnel such as policemen, teachers, and medical staff. Even more subtle distinctions might have been considered-such as the differences between those who settle in the valley permanently, and those who intend to live here for a year or two and then move on. But the arbitrary 65% quota lumps all of these different needs together as the core of a single, compulsive imperative for more development of all kinds. The pernicious effect of the drive for more work force housing is most clearly demonstrated by the planned transformation of Wilson-to become a contemporary caricature of the company towns of a century ago. It is easy to see why the residents of the Wilson "node" seem so opposed to the Plan. In completing a new comprehensive plan for Teton County, its citizens, through their elected representatives, will make the inescapable choice between the preservation of wildlife and community values and the pursuit of excessive growth-including growth aggressively promoted for work force housing. Respectfully submitted,
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	Wildlife habitat should be the primary concern in this area, as it is winter range for deer, elk, and moose. Working with WYDOT consider a 45-mph speed limit from Horse Creek bridge to where the 40 MPH begins near Hoback Jct. Recognize that the lower Hoback River and the Snake River south of Hoback Junction are now national Recreational Rivers with standards that apply to federal lands. Private land development in these areas should be compatible with the purposes for which the rivers were designated by Congress.
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	This area has much potential as a scenic and welcoming gateway. Enhancing the pedestrian environment should be a high priority; the recent sidewalk to the visitor center is a great improvement although traffic noise and volume remain an unavoidable impact. Contrasting high-density commercial/lodging on the west side of N Cache with the relative open/public space on the east could be further enhanced with more public oriented wildlife viewing, interpretive paths etc. on the east. Flat Creek/Cache Creek wetlands between the elk refuge and Kudars could be made more available to the public and would offer distance and relative quiet from the N Cache traffic. In order for this scheme to be effective strict oversight of architectural materials and designs would have to be in place. Most of the current newer structures, including the planned building at the home ranch, are not traditional JH 'old west' structures and look out of place in both design and size.

Date	Name	Comment
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	As a resident of this area, I have seen much change in the past 20+ years. What is planned for this area makes sense as presented, but zoning waivers granted in the past have reduced the ability of the area to meet the hoped-for character. Increased rentals and through-streets have created much more traffic that has not been mitigated. Speed bumps would be helpful. I would suggest the following to be included in the plan: 'Office overlay' should refer to allowing a homeowner to have a low-impact business in the existing building, such as those across Willow St from the county admin bldg -- not to purchase several lots, raze the houses, and construct a larger, more impactful business. Willow Street, as the primary access road, needs sidewalks on both sides all the way through to Snow King Ave. This has been on the plate for years but never completed. Sensitivity to partly-buried Cache Creek should be explained. In my mind this would include allowing Cache Creek to emerge into the llight, where it would serve as a central focus and linear park for the area, though I am sure that's not quite what is envisioned due to cost. Finally, street lights. They are not consistent or where needed for pedestrians at night. Also, none are shaded, so the lights shine in people's houses, not onto the street/walk below. This would be an easy fix and should apply to all town streetlights to reduce unwanted light 'pollution' as well as to work better for their intended purpose. Thank you. Another item: as town builds out there is more need for some kind of noise abatement. We live close enough to the county admin building that the fans etc. on top make enough noise to prevent sleep in the summer when it would be nice to be able to have a window open. State of the art mechanical works and noise screening (as was done at the Senior Center) would be very helpful in reducing the ambient noise.
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	The theme and plan for this area makes sense. In order to achieve the goals stated, there needs to be some limit on rentals and the number of people per rental unit (already in the zoning but apparently not consistently enforced) and some teeth in the plan that would prevent more of the larger, out-of-scale structures that are popping up. East Hansen has become a speedway; perhaps removable (for snowplowing) speed bumps would help. Thank you.
5/22/2009	Coburn, Broughton Interested Public	Dear Planners, I am a Wilson homeowner, and am not in favor of what appears to be an increased density concentration proposed for Wilson. The statement, "The priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities..." is questionable at the outset, considering the small number of jobs and low level of business and industry in Wilson, to begin with. Who would expanded Wilson housing be providing jobs for? For future (uncertain) expansion of businesses and services? Or for people who will live in Wilson and work elsewhere? I feel that, at the least, the timing for this "upzoning" (if it can be referred to that way) is off, considering the state of the economy. Fish Creek Interiors is now vacant, and it doesn't appear that other businesses here are enjoying a great degree of sales. Wouldn't it be prudent to wait and get a better feeling for how and when growth and development are going to naturally and economically expand, before offering concessions to levels of growth that there may not really be that much demand for?
5/21/2009	Falcey, Missy Interested Public	After attending the meeting at the Center for the Arts, I have been mulling over the plan. My position now is to revisit the '94 plan for adjustments but to have the political will to enforce it. I am truly concerned the the growth the 'new' plan proposes will destroy the character of JH and push wildlife to the fringes of the valley. Karen Langenberg wrote a letter to the JHN&G editor that appeared in today's paper (5/20, page 5A). I fully endorse her position. I don't know who Karen is, but she presents an intelligent and informed point of view. Perhaps she could be included in some future work?
5/20/2009	Platt, Doris Interested Public	Back in 1962, Stanley Resor said, "With future improvements Wilson would be the most beautiful little western town in the United States." There are many of us today who feel that Wilson, Wyoming is just that. Unique. Special. In July 1995 Wilson celebrated its 100th anniversary of its settlement. The Jackson Hole News wrote an editorial in commemoration. I've kept it displayed in my little log cabin. Here is the last paragraph. The piece was entitled "Thank God for a quirky small town" "Wilson is what Jackson Hole used to be -- a low-key, funky community where you know your neighbors and help them out when times get tough. Tuesday's celebration at Own Burcher Park across from the old red schoolhouse showed that spirit is still alive. Thank God for Wilson -- and may it retain its independence and spunk for another century." JHN 7/5/95 Drive around Wilson and see that it is truly a lovely little town. Sure, it can grow. But -- "density bonuses", "mixed use redevelopment of the commercial core" and all the services required for another 500 or more homes! Spare us! Let us not become "Anywhere, USA". Surely the fault line which runs under Wilson must be shuddering at the image of fast food places, possible three or four-story magni-bulidings, apartment houses and other possible terrors all crammed around our funky beautiful little town.

Date	Name	Comment
5/20/2009	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	We have seen many upzoning proposals over the years, calling for even more development in various "nodes" - particularly the Town of Jackson, with the DRD and annexation proposals. These proposals were supposed to protect open space and wildlife elsewhere by clustering development in the Town "node". Yet to many of us, that was an empty promise. No protection of other areas was offered as part of those proposed upzonings. That is also a very fundamental flaw in the current Comprehensive Plan revisions proposed by the Planning Staff. It may be that a Transferable Development Right (TDR) framework makes sense, where any commercial or residential density added to a "node" receiving zone must derive from permanent protection of acreage elsewhere - in critical open space habitat areas - through new protection by permanent dedicated conservation easements. That would be a fundamental requirement for any future residential or commercial upzonings in the nodes designated, other than carefully controlled affordable housing projects. This mechanism could also benefit large h:ndowners by creating a good mechanism for compensation where critical open space/habitat is permanently protected on their land. Of course the potential additional upzoning density in receiving zones should be far less than the Staff proposal. As a matter of fairness. Otherwise some would complain about getting the shaft in lieu of distant gold. A very prudent, cautious approach to this TDR framework may make sense. I realize that we are very early on, with a process where the Jackson Hole community may be subjected to the throes of intense controversy for many months. There will always be disagreements on something as fundamentally important to our community: but I believe there are some very effective ways to reduce the controversy right up front. a. Basic Approach. All of you have served this Jackson Hole community in different ways for many years. All of you know this community very well, not just through recent polls but as part of your own experience. All should know that the current proposals run counter to the most basic and nearly universal desires of this community - -limiting the potential urbanization of Jackson Hole. Not just for people in the areas most directly impacted (Wilson, South Park, Aspens, etc.), but in all other areas-as well. Some people in good faith believe that we and our friends, our progeny, are all entitled to live in Jackson Hole. As a result, we would have to aggressively grow, grow, grow to meet that never-ending goal. That attitude could destroy everything we love about our community. These Staff proposals give little if any real protection for the wildlife and open. space values cherished by this community. Indeed they encourage high density residential and commercial development which will have major long-term adverse impacts on those same values. Most important of all, to me, is the protection of the wonderful small town community character of Jackson Hole. These proposals place a large Bulls' Eye on numerous areas, inviting developers to develop and to urbanize this Valley. b. Suggestjns. I am not criticizing the Planning Staff people who came up with these proposals. They have their own perspectives, which in some cases are very pro-development perspectives. But they are not elected officials directly accountable to our community. You are. I would suggest that you either (a) hire an independent planner who really knows this community-- someone like Bill Collins or Dan Cowee, or (b) appoint a Blue Ribbon Panel to come up with basic suggestions as a starting point, with an emphasis on Panel members who have been great stewards of this Valley. You have many of them to chose from. Some of you may want to set up a "good cop/bad cop" negotiation framework of sorts, starting with very bad initial proposals. But that approach does not serve our community well. The starting point should be something reasonable and in the middle, genuinely looking for our common ground. With this economy, growth pressures are vastly reduced, and we clearly have a "time out" of sorts with the ability to plan with real vision and protectiveness, not just responses to immediate pressing needs where long•term vision always suffers.

Date	Name	Comment
5/19/2009	Jones, Alison Interested Public	In spite of recent rapid growth, Jackson Hole has until now been spared the worst consequences of urbanization – congestion, pollution, traffic gridlock, and lives distanced from nature. The 2009 Comprehensive Plan, ignoring such undesirable consequences, promotes rather than limits greatly increased development. I oppose the plan as written. Substantial revisions need to be made to meet its own and community stated goals of preserving the character of Jackson Hole – its abundant wildlife, open spaces, rural quality, and scenic beauty – by limiting growth. The 2009 plan, will more than double potential residential and commercial build out. Impacts on schools and other infrastructure, property taxes, traffic flow, and wildlife must be carefully assessed and presented to the public for consideration. Policies which reduce or eliminate these impacts must be added to the plan. Setting policies which will encourage workforce housing, increased population density, businesses and services to be located in the town of Jackson, and 4 other “nodes” must be accompanied by policies restricting development outside of these “nodes” in order to maintain open space and preserve wildlife habitat. Borders of these “nodes” must be clearly defined in the plan. Any future annexation of adjacent lands should be restricted to necessary services, and should not be a means to expand future residential or commercial development. Policies must be included to avoid encroachment upon wetlands, river corridors, and scenic vistas. While the goal of including as much workforce housing as possible is commendable, the proposition that 65% of the workforce be concentrated within Teton County is the biggest stumbling block to this Plan. The argument put forth that Teton County ought not to burden nearby communities in Idaho and Lincoln County by exporting overflow population is ill considered. Doing so could be a boon to these communities. A 30 minute to 1 hour commute is acceptable and common practice all over the U.S. Beyond Teton County, WY, there is not a commensurate need to protect wildlife habitat. Finally, it allows people a less expensive alternative which offers the advantage of freedom from restricted housing, as well as more space. I submit that efforts can and should be made to curb rampant and rapid development. We as residents of this valley must realize that it is our special responsibility to preserve and protect the valuable assets of this unique and special place.
5/19/2009	Johnson, Susan Energy Efficiency Advis	Add Policy 4.1.f: Promote energy efficiency in workforce housing - Community housing that is energy efficient passes those savings on to the homeowner and lowers the County's per capita energy consumption. Energy efficiency should be increased in existing housing that is restricted to serve as workforce housing. The life-cycle cost associated with housing shall be considered, including analysis of the up-front cost associated with constructing more energy efficient housing, and the long term gains. Policy 4.3.a: add: All restricted existing housing should account for the deferred maintenance costs associated with older homes, so the burden of a roof replacement, cracked foundations, etc. is not placed on the homeowner. Strategy 4.4: Add bullet: Require all affordable housing construction to be energy efficient.
5/19/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	I applaud your efforts to solve our affordable housing problems. However, I think it's very important to do as much as can be done to reduce the pressure for more affordable housing by slowing the rate and the amount of growth down to a much lower level than proposed in this plan.
5/19/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	This section correctly takes note of the potential for sharply increased infrastructure costs. However, it seems to leave the solution possibilities far to vague with the only stated goal as monitoring. and only " will consider updating the system of fees and requirements". I believe the plan should state that " the system of fees and requirements WILL be updated to insure that developers pay their fair share. After all, they get the profits and usually the tax payers bear the lion's share of the costs. We need to make sure that isn't the case here.
5/19/2009	Johnson, Susan Energy Efficiency Advis	Policy 1.3.a: "requiring and funding the conservation of energy..."Policy 1.3.c: Add: The life-cycle cost associated with buildings shall be considered, including analysis of the up-front cost associated with constructing more energy efficient buildings, and the long term gains.Strategy 1.4 3rd bullet: "provide incentives, adopt mechanisms to provide appropriate funding, ..."Add # 9: Indicator- Energy consumption Goal- Decrease per capita energy consumption Review period-5 yr
5/19/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	Is there a way to help encourage a lower community carbon footprint by establishing an incentive to buy hybrid/electric/fuel cell vehicles? It would be terrific if you could come up with something along those lines. You do mention that increased traffic will inevitably cause an increased number of wildlife vehicle conflicts. Already the Teton Village Road has a very large number of such conflicts with the present level of traffic. The planned increase in development will obviously cause greatly increased traffic and thus, of course, game deaths. However, there is no specific strategy to decrease this eventuality. You do propose wildlife over pass on highway 22. You should also plan for some on Highway 390 in addition to whatever redesign is done. I maintain that the most important way to control highway game deaths would be to reduce the amount of development planned. After all the community did come out in favor of preservation of wildlife migration corridors over widening the roads.

Date	Name	Comment
5/19/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	I do not believe that we should be encouraging more commercial growth. Some growth is inevitable, but to base our vision for the community on increasing growth will destroy our community character, strain our housing needs, and severely impact wildlife and other resources in the valley.
5/19/2009	Johnson, Susan Energy Efficiency Advis	Pg. 28 Add bullet: Reduction of energy consumption and reduction of the production of global climate change elements Principle 2.4: "...congestion, energy use, environmental degradation,..." Policy 2.4.b: "A hierarchy of protection shall be established preserving National Parks and Wildlife refuges first and foremost, followed by other appropriate Federal Lands, and State Wildlife areas and then neighboring private lands." Add # 5: Indicator - Rate of growth coupled with energy consumption Goal - Decrease per capita energy consumption Review Period - 5 yr
5/19/2009	Johnson, Susan Energy Efficiency Advis	Policy 6.1.d: Add: In addition, to truly interconnect ALL modes of transportation providing public transit to the Jackson Hole Airport and Moose should be considered.
5/19/2009	Johnson, Susan Energy Efficiency Advis	Pg. 8 Add checkmark: The energy being consumed locally has broader global impacts that extend beyond the greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Or: Local land development activities and prosperity contribute disproportionately to global carbon emissions, which should encourage new sustainability initiatives that involve the development and funding of better energy efficiency standards.
5/18/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	The community has repeatedly said that we cannot sustain our wildlife and open spaces, and our quality of life with the densities and buildout being proposed in this plan. We compromise the present as well as the future if our buildout population is not less than the 1994 Comp Plan. Any development must be entirely predictable by identifying exactly what the community can expect on all properties. "Smart Growth" is an oxymoron, considering the impacts of growth on our quality of life. Growth results in higher taxes, the need for more schools, more roads, more utility needs such as sewer, water, electricity, more congestion. According to the Key Expectations published by the Town and County Staff last fall, the community said in its public comment over that past year that a "growth rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts of development to natural resources and community infrastructure." This theme does NOT reflect that input.
5/18/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	Principles and Policies Principle 1.1 Establishment of focal species and protecting and monitoring them is an excellent idea. Who decides on the focal species? You say that until these new protections are put in place crucial winter habitat for moose, deer, elk, etc. will continue to be protected. But there is crucial winter moose habitat in Wilson (as indicated by the most recent Game and Fish evaluation) that will not be protected if the density increase contemplated in this Plan is adopted. I ask that ALL winter habitat be protected until the new protections, based on updated NROs (and expanded to include the current notable gaps) are in place. Policy 1.1.b. and Policy 1.1.d. Here I feel that all development decisions should be based on solid science. In places where we do not yet have sufficient information, nothing should be developed. There are acknowledged notable gaps in the data that we do have. These gaps are in Wilson, Teton Village Road, Snake River area. Exactly where you have designated development nodes and sharp increases in density. Decisions on such density increases should wait till we have adequate science to guide us and assure us that we will not destroy or degrade crucial habitat. Policy 1.1.g. I feel that in all areas, INCLUDING the county nodes, development should be designed to accommodate wildlife movement and support wildlife migration. Principle 1.4 You state that development in floodplains and other hazardous areas should be minimal or avoided. The Aspens and Wilson are both in 100 year floodplains. Clearly, that makes them an inappropriate place to promote such a drastic increase in density. What are you thinking? Policy 1.5 Here the town and county should require compliance with dark skies policy for existing and new development rather than rely on incentivizing.
5/18/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Commercial development drives job creation which in turn drives the need for workforce housing. Impacts will be felt on existing local businesses and residents.
5/18/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Theme 1 is ignored, and devalued in most of the development nodes as well as most of the town districts. The impacts of development which disrupts migration patterns, destroys habitat in wetland and riparian zones, diminishes open space, causes an increase in roads, traffic, congestion, pollution, need for services, infrastructure, all have a negative impact on wildlife. Also extremely important is the negative impact on the quality of life for our community. The protect wildlife theme must be placed as the number one priority!

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	There seems to be a basic premise here.....that growth is desirable. I seriously question that assumption. I would maintain that balance and equilibrium are what we should be striving for. You cited sustainability as a guiding concept but there is no definition of the term. We should have one. Also, the term "human needs" is repeatedly used, again, with no definition. A definition is needed. Actually the community should be involved in determining these human needs. Regarding growth: The community was never asked about a 'no growth' option. What we did say clearly is that we wanted a "limited growth" plan. This is NOT a limited growth plan. Basically, there is far too much growth, both residential and non-residential. However, I do believe that the nodal concept is a good one, IF handled with restraint. But the proposed level of growth is too extreme and will make it impossible to achieve our stated top priority, Theme I. In addition, to concentrate so much growth in the swath of Wilson, The Aspens and Teton Village also makes it impossible for this plan to succeed in its stated priority to "promote stewardship of wildlife and natural resources in 10.06 District 6: Westbank." pg. 98 since these three nodes are in the middle of the Westbank District. To develop on the scale and in the manner proposed will result in permanent fragmentation of crucial (recent Game and Fish evaluation) winter moose habitat as well as the serious compromising of movement patterns. Permeability should be protected in the entire Westbank district. To double the size of the Aspens and quadruple the size of Wilson is far too much growth. The total amount of residential units proposed could result in a doubling of the current population. That is too much. I would like to see a total increase of not more than 25% of the present number of residences in the town and county. The proposed amount of non-residential or commercial, at 8.8 million sq. ft. seems beyond belief. Why would that amount ever be desirable or necessary? That level of increase would generate about 35,000 new jobs, about 27,000 new employees and thus a severe need for additional housing. We will only be digging the hole ever deeper if we expand the commercial any where near that amount. Let's cut that down to 25% of 8.8 or 2.2 million sq. ft. I am very concerned that there is NO attempt to determine the carrying capacity of the valley. It seems to be only common sense to do so before proposing any growth plan. I ask that this be done immediately, before continuing. That's all I'm able to comment on at present. I'll will follow up with further comments within the near future.

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	I am dismayed, to say the least, at the proposed new comprehensive plan. I know that, after the investment in expensive consultants and staff time spent producing this document, there will be considerable resistance to changing course--but PLEASE listen to the many, many citizens of Jackson Hole who care deeply about what makes this valley special. Please put the brakes on the rushed and confusing process we are now in, and reconsider what you are doing. This plan does NOT improve on the 1994 Comprehensive Plan; in fact it's a giant step in the wrong direction, toward the destruction of the very qualities that make Jackson Hole such a remarkable place. It isn't easy to figure out what exactly the plan proposes. Is this vagueness intentional? Why aren't "buildout" numbers and other crucial information presented in the sections on each district? Citizens shouldn't have to wade through voluminous appendices to figure out what's proposed. For example, when I opened the Wilson chapter, I expected to find detailed numbers, maps, standards, descriptions--in other words, I expected to find out what, exactly, is planned for Wilson. Instead, I found one page of vague text, and one "conceptual" map with a disclaimer at the bottom saying that this is only to be used as a starting point for more specific future planning. In other words, after reading the Wilson section, I know essentially nothing, except that the planners have decided (over the strongly expressed objections of the Wilson community at several public meetings) that Wilson is an appropriate place for "town-level" densities, and that there will be "increased residential development potential above 2009 zoning levels." It was from the newspaper, not the plan's chapter on Wilson, that I learned that 520 new units are proposed. Naturally when I discovered that Wilson is designated as a development node I wondered whether my home there is destined to be surrounded by duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, multi-story apartment buildings? Will what are now single-family lots be designated as appropriate sites for density bonuses for workforce housing? What density will those bonuses allow? Will setbacks be decreased, will height limits change? The plan doesn't say. Is it unreasonable to expect a comprehensive plan to lay out something more specific than "contextually-sensitive development that provides for community needs"? Anyway, in my opinion, adding 520 new units to a town of 170 units will destroy Wilson's character and is not exactly "contextually sensitive development"! "Community needs" or "human needs," something the plan repeatedly refers to, are undefinable and potentially infinite, and can be used to justify any amount of development. I think it's unfair to ask citizens to give their support to vague conceptual maps, with assurances that more concrete planning for zoning and development in the nodes will come later. Separating approval for the concept of dense development from the process of defining development regulations makes it impossible for us to know what we're actually approving. Objections we make now are countered with the statement that we shouldn't worry because we'll have a chance to influence regulations and zoning later. Later, when we're presented with upzoning and dense development, we will be told that it's too late to change because the comprehensive plan approved those concepts. In other words, this "plan", despite its stunning lack of concrete detail, will quite likely make sensible, fine-scale planning later difficult or impossible if it conflicts with the broad-brush "conceptual" maps we are now being asked to support. I don't think it's fair to the citizens first to ignore their input, and then to cloak the plan's true impacts in vague verbiage. Phrases like "Increasing the vibrancy of Wilson as a town-style node" are essentially meaningless. What is increased "vibrancy"--more traffic? More buildings? More commercial development? More noise? Less open space? Less wildlife? All of the above? "Managing growth responsibly" apparently means approving far more growth than the 1994 plan anticipated. While concentrating growth in the town of Jackson and immediate surroundings would make sense, this plan encourages much more growth in the "nodes" than ever before but seems to lack any real means of slowing or limiting growth in the County as a whole. Finally, some of the plan's assumptions (e.g. "Ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs") are highly questionable or flat-out wrong. If we really care about ecosystem preservation, it will take more than lip service and wishful statements about how we can have it all. We cannot maintain the current abundance, diversity, and health of Jackson Hole's wildlife species while steadily encroaching on their habitat--we just can't. It will come down to a choice--more people, houses, cars, pets, roads, and all their associated impacts will fragment remaining habitat, stress wildlife on their winter ranges, disrupt their migration routes, and diminish their numbers. The existing comprehensive plan is at least based on an attempt to delineate important wildlife habitat and scenic resources and to direct development away from those areas. The new plan needs to focus on this as well, and build in some scientific reality. If you give your approval to this plan's 9,880 new residential units and 8.8 million new square feet of commercial development, more than doubling the human footprint in this valley, there is no way we will have anything like the wildlife we have today. In short, I think this plan is deeply flawed, and I think it's moving way too fast, with too little understanding of its impacts and too little acknowledgement of the expressed wishes of the community's priorities. Please put on the brakes and reconsider what legacy you want to leave for future generations of wild and human occupants of Jackson Hole.

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2009	Pratt, Holly Interested Public	The following statement in the transportation strategy chapter is COMPLETELY unsubstantiated, unfounded, and altogether incorrect. This statement should be removed. The other corridors were NOT analyzed as a part of this study. The plan currently stated: "Other projects were analyzed as well, but were determined to have minimal system benefit. A north crossing of the Snake River and the paving of Spring Gulch Road would decrease traffic at one congestion point, but increase traffic a similar amount at another congestion point. In the case of the north crossing, traffic would decrease at the "Y" but increase at Town Square. Paving of Spring Gulch Road would decrease traffic in Town but increase traffic at the "Y". Both of these projects have land use, wildlife, and natural and scenic resource impacts that are greater than the transportation benefits they provide. Neither is recommended at this time." If these corridors were studied- I want to know when, where, and by whom? How were the corridors modeled? What were the daily and hourly volumes used? Or was this simply a discussion between the contributors? This is wrong to promote this statement in the way it is currently phrased. I think the plan should state the truth not something fabricated (intentionally or not). Transportation deserves more attention than a subchapter promoting transit, carpools and bike lanes. This is a planning document, and should be handled as such. There are corridors to study and they should be fully explored and analyzed for future development. I agree with the short-term strategies (public transit, bikes, and carpools) however these are the no-brainers. The plan should study the impacts and promote a system that is well integrated and forward thinking. The statement from the plan (above) is short-sighted and naive to the changes that we may witness in the lifetime of the plan. It's a chicken and the egg thing.... which came first- appropriate land uses or logical transportation patterns? I am very displeased that Transportation is not being more fully addressed in this document. Separating the two issues diminishes the impact that one has on the other and the significance of their innate and intrinsic connection.
5/18/2009	Healey, Bill Interested Public	Please slow down, take a deep breath & realize how much negative effect this proposed plan will result in for the future of the County----Jackson is such a special place---in my opinion this plan needs a Major rewrite
5/18/2009	Crowley, James Interested Public	Tyler, Thank you for your time last week to discuss the potential impact of the proposed District 20, Future Land Use Map, on the Business Conservation (B.C.) zone. As a housekeeping matter, I would first of all suggest that the language in the paragraph describing the uses in the Multi-family classification which overlays the B.C. zone include a reference to Offices, since they are an existing and allowed use in the B.C. zone (albeit with some restrictions). Additionally, based on our conversation it seems that some qualifying language like that included in the District 24, Future Land Use Map, would be appropriate. I would propose something along the lines of: In all cases, it will remain important to balance the impacts of any proposed new higher-density residential uses with the existing single-family and office uses in the area. Planning within the district will need to be cooperatively addressed by current and future property owners to ensure a desirable solution for all parties. In the interest of brevity I have left out an exhaustive recitation of the reasoning behind this proposal because we have already discussed it at length. Let it suffice to say that this addition to the District 20 language will serve as a placemark to allow us to address the unique challenges and opportunities that the B.C. zone presents, and is consistent with Themes 3, 4, and 5 of the proposed Comprehensive Plan.
5/18/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	The concept of sustainability should be defined. I'd want to see this plan use the "carbon neutral concept" in determining how we grow. Requirements should be put in place to make sure all new construction is carbon neutral in regard to materials and processes used during building and energy consumed during the life of the building. We should certainly be aiming in this direction. I believe that preservation of wildlife, natural resources and our small town nature should be the top priority in ALL districts, including Teton Village, the Aspens, Wilson and South Park. These areas all have significant wildlife. Why should wildlife in some areas be more worthy of preservation than in others? You have acknowledged the community's wish to have preservation of wildlife and open space as the top priority by designating it as Theme I. However in several of the presentations, it has been given equal status with Theme II. The draft plan seems to assume that the community wants more growth and that growth is desirable.....both highly questionable assumptions. Although the plan states that the community recognizes that ecosystem protection does not preclude growth, I'm puzzled as to how that conclusion was arrived at. I participated in all three surveys and was never asked that question. I feel strongly that growth should be limited in order to protect wildlife and open spaces. I also feel that Theme I should remain as THE top priority and not be demoted to equal status with Theme II.
5/18/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Where this theme fails is in the details. In town, for example, there is no link between the potential commercial development from 3,678,00-5420,00 sq ft, the potential creation of 9,193-13,550 new jobs and the proposed new residential units of 2,770-3790.

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2009	Bennett, Petie Interested Public	I find it difficult to put into words the bewilderment and dismay that I feel about the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan, which fly in the face of the wishes of the people who live in this community. Why must we provide housing for another 15 or 20 thousand people who would move here only because of another 9 million square feet of commercial space. I think it's appropriate to provide for the ability to house the work force that we now have, but why invite more jobs, congestion, stress on the infrastructure and, most importantly, stress on the wildlife which are already being pushed to their limits. How can we blame the coyotes for eating our cats and dogs when we have left them so little of their natural hunting areas? And now we are warned that bears are becoming a problem in residential areas. That, of course, will inevitably result in the elimination of "problem bears", and so on. Please recognize that endless growth, like cancer, ends in destroying the host.
5/18/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	The Vision Statement must be fixed! "preserve and protect the area's ecosystem." PERIODDelete the 2nd part of the statement. Including the above with the second part of the vision statement on Page 7 is NOT what the public said at any of the meetings I attended, and with one exception, I attended all of the input meetings.
5/18/2009	Whissel, Fred Interested Public	You have printed a large number of letters to the editor and news stories recently regarding proposed Comprehensive Plan revisions. In reading those, I have drawn the following conclusions: 1) Most of the letter writers, and apparently most Teton County residents, oppose the directional thrust of the changes that have been proposed by our government growth planners – after those planners sought and received input from mercenary consultants who do not live here and couldn't care less about our immediate housing problems, near-term growth problems, and potential future problems. Such consultants are experts mainly in receiving money to make recommendations that almost no one but government growth planners will pay any attention to. 2) There is a great and growing concern that our government growth planners have almost completely failed to hear what most property owners were saying in those surveys that were taken specifically to get their feedback. On the other hand, our decision makers could have gotten the gist of those opinions but have simply decided to ignore any public recommendations that they do not agree with. 3) As proposed, the revised Comprehensive Plan would not stop or even slow the growth of Teton County, but would actually encourage it. Since the problems that we are trying to solve today were caused by growth, allowing further growth would simply exacerbate today's problems and make things even worse tomorrow than they are today. 4) Our government growth planners have demonstrated very little interest in protecting two of Teton County's greatest assets: our fascinating and revered wildlife, and our critical wildlife habitat. 5) Our government growth planners have completely failed to grasp a very simple concept: growth -- without imposed and enforced limitations -- is self-perpetuating ("If you build it, they will come"). Facilitating the construction of, say, 500 more homes in Wilson will require the provision of that much more goods and services -- underfunded and overcrowded schools, fast food markets, vehicle repair centers, gasoline stations, etc. -- to meet the needs of those 1,500 or so new residents. That would create more jobs, certainly -- which would attract more people. In turn, there would be a need for more housing to accommodate those additional service providers. More housing would also create more construction jobs. And more construction jobs would call for more housing, more goods, and more services. The "more, more, more" cycle is endless. And vicious. 6) Unless a reasonable and enforced cap on growth is imposed in Teton County, no Comprehensive Plan revisions will ever adequately meet our perceived needs and respond to the fears about lost quality of life of the majority of property owners in this county. 7) Any Comprehensive Plan revisions which are designed to minimize vehicular traffic congestion, impose a minimum construction requirement for low-income housing, or respond to any other impacts of projected growth will fail, auspiciously, because it is not the feces of this growth process but growth itself that is the prime problem. 8) We have met the enemy, and he is us. Ask Walt Kelly.

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2009	Elletson, Roger Interested Public	The community response to the proposed Comprehensive Plan [CP] has been uniformly one of disbelief and outrage, reactions that are well grounded as the CP has not been advanced in good faith. What should be a document of transparent communication has become, instead, one of co-opted equivocation. Behind the verbiage that “We listened to you”, the reality of the draft CP is that it has become a case study in co-option by the undisclosed but indispensable parties of those who feed off the “growth for the sake of growth” machine and the mammonic power structure that finances them under the jurisprudential mandates of compounding usury. It has been deliberately formulated to ignore all the major concerns of the community such as minimizing future “growth”, development, and commercialization, preserving scenic vistas and the ecology, and protecting wildlife habitat and migration corridors. And development in “nodes” rather than in more “open spaces”, does not remedy these concerns, it exacerbates them. Furthermore, by advancing this agenda, the Planning Department [PD] that should provide a protective voice for the community has now become complicit in this co-option and a hostile witness. The relationship between the community, the PD, and the commissioners, is thus no longer communicative and responsive, but adversarial, and can only be remedied through the adoption of “Community Impact Analyses” [CIAs] as an integral part of both the CP and the Land Development Regulations [LDRs]. What is a CIA? It can best be viewed as a “Community ‘Bill of Rights’” against the conduct of vested interests and local government determined to advance development agendas that clearly contravene the community’s intent. A CIA provides the community a formal place at the table of development applications and the creation of development plans by requiring that: 1) An arm of the PD formally represents the community’s interests in one of the steps in the planning and application processes that currently focus only on the imperatives of the “growth machine.” 2) The PD’s representation includes, but is not limited to, the identification and quantification of all cost and other externalities associated with any development plan or application. 3) The PD ensures that those costs and other impacts are formally internalized and capitalized into development costs rather than being surreptitiously foisted onto the community as a whole through self-serving proposals, unchallenged analyses, and rising costs and taxes. 4) Public concerns and comments are made part of a written public record requiring formal response rather than just being an abbreviated audio recording that is boxed away and ignored. In the same way that no legitimacy can attach to any adversarial legal proceeding that only recognizes the prosecution’s evidence and permits no formal defense, the absence of a CIA in the development application and comprehensive planning processes similarly deprives these procedures of legitimacy. The CP must thus be recognized for it is — a co-opted framework to advance the undisclosed agendas of the development machine and the dictates of mammon and compounding usury that impel them. The CP, for example, supposedly embraces the concept of “Accountability” which is covered by an “Annual Review” of the Plan to elected officials only and a “report directly to the public” only “every 5 years”. It does not even contemplate accountability for the impacts and externalities of individual applications on the community as a whole. On its face, therefore, the CP’s gesture of “accountability” is presumptively disingenuous as it implicitly speaks to an accountability to the “growth machine” itself rather than the extent to which the planning process has protected and advanced community interests and intent. And the same can be said of the CP’s equivocal use of the concept of sustainability” that needs to be supplanted with the idea of “regeneration”. In other words, the language in the CP has intentionally side-stepped the community’s protective intent in order to maintain the prerogatives for unbridled “growth”. The initial draft of the Comprehensive Plan has also embraced the notion of a “Statement of Ideal” to describe a particular planning Theme”. An “ideal”, however, connotes some aspiration that is both elevated and worthy, but that is typically unattainable. In other words, an “ideal” is not a yardstick amenable to accountability, a concept grounded in reality and subject to verification. Adopting “Statements of Ideal” thus only serves to attenuate any meaningful community accountability on the part of the PD and commissioners, to wit: 1) It provides no basis for verifying the PD’s and commissioners’ compliance with community intent; 2) It provides a cover for developers and others feeding off the “growth machine” against community criticism and accountability and serves to conceal the continuing advancement of undisclosed development and mammonic agendas. 3) And instead of requiring compliance with the CP, it uses equivocal language and contradictory assertions to allow the PD and elected officials to “Continuously improve upon the policies of the Comprehensive Plan” and thus effectively ignore the Plan at will. “Statements of Ideal” need to be replaced with “Statements of Community Accountability” that specifically delineate those elements and externalities of any theme, proposal or plan to which the community can hold the PD and commissioners accountable. In summary, as the CP recognizes, “it is essential that the community remains invested in the successful implementation of this Plan.” And to make this community investment possible, CIAs need to become integral parts of the planning and development processes and included in both the CP and in the LDRs.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Vajda, Tom Interested Public	After much public comment, oral, written, and surveys conducted, it's clear that the vast majority of residents want to emphasize the protection of our valley's most precious resource: rural scenery and viable wildlife corridors as our number one objective. Additionally: Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan. Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'north to south starting at High School Road.' Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes (including NW South Park) or targeted Town growth areas. Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan. Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley. The reduced NW South Park node to have a 1/8 mile pull-back from both High School and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop. The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability. The design of any East-West connector road to not encourage further sprawl towards Rafter J in the future. The design of the reduced NW node to not add traffic volumes onto High School Road. No annexation of the new reduced node until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards. The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the 'Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.
5/17/2009	Jesse, Dennis Interested Public	Thank you for accepting my comments. I am a resident of Cottonwood Park Neighborhood. I came to Jackson from my home state of Colorado in 1977 with every intention of returning. I was on a summer climbing trip and had a job at a local summer camp. I ended up with a complete life here. I think the reason I stayed was people here had a sense of what was valuable, not in terms of dollars, but in quality of life. I hope that my suggestions are helpful. I know that I am part of Jackson's overall growth too. First of all, developing of land as an economy is flawed. Second, importing labor is a sign that business is flawed. Maintain an economy for the citizens. Jackson in the 1970's supported itself with a tourist based industry. Granted, there weren't huge profits but the community was very happy. Is there any chance we could return to just hosting visitors and showing off our beautiful county? The plan seems to be designed for expansion of town as if this type of growth is necessary for our survival. I think we're more unique. Specific to my concern: We work a huge amount of hours to come home and enjoy our nice, quiet neighborhood in Cottonwood Park. We are, for the third time, threatened with a super high density development right next door. This "node" has been kicked around the county and again landed on our doorstep. Nobody that I know wants the Porter Estate to be a city. I would welcome a mirrored image of Cottonwood Park in density (1/3 of proposed) and character to provide opportunity to our next generation of "in community" citizens on that land. Bear in mind that Cottonwood Park originally did not attract the buyer that would get a Sotheby's broker very excited but it did provide Jackson's current citizens a quality home. We have one of the most diverse neighborhoods in the County. We want to continue to maintain our "neighborhood character" as all of the other Town of Jackson subdivisions have claimed when a large development was proposed in their backyard. Please don't use the area for density trade, bonus, credit, whatever, for somebody's profit elsewhere. I suggest we take that off the table completely. Any trade for open space belongs in South Park. This property can be put on the market in a form attractive to the community, not to the outside opportunist. Also, it's not free enterprise if we pack it full of subsidized housing. Please adjust colors on the District 12 map to reflect the open space buffer zone along High School Road discussed with Cottonwood Park residents or schedule another meeting with the residents to confirm and clarify this proposed buffer zone. We would like to see this buffer zone be 1/4 of a mile (not 1 1/2 city blocks). If this buffer zone has been discarded please advise us. I think that an access corridor would be appropriate along Flat Creek, rather than allow it to be privately held. Maybe the District 12 map should suggest this, in color. Roads, in particular the "East-West connector", parks, water, sewer, should precede coloring of the map. Draw some lines and dimensions even if it's just preliminary, we'd get a better feel for what you are thinking. Wildlife, Scenery: Our moose and deer like the view of the Snake River Range as much as John Dodge moose enjoy the Teton view. Also note, and I'm sure you have, that quite a few old time citizens have moved to other areas e.g. Star Valley to have more space for horses, etc. and still work in Jackson. This is their choice and there is no reason to add more workers to replace them. They are still here, working.
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	Wildlife is our number one priority in TC, this includes South Park and other "nodes". South Park is an important rural area, it has fine scenic vistas and a slower pace. Next to the Snake, it is one of the most interesting areas for water fowl viewing and is critical for nesting. It is also our southern gate. I am very concerned about the odd, new, and vague language regarding protections in South Park. We do not want housing expansion, we seek to protect wildlife. Restore the language of the "94 Plan, eliminate the very strange wording that states South Park will be built out from 'north to south starting at High School Road.' Accidental? In-fill in town should be exhausted before considering expansion into outer areas. Do not use the NW South Park area as a dumping ground for problems generated by other areas of the county. Preserve the rural scenic nature of South Park Loop and High School Road. Any development in So. Park should allow wildlife permeability. No commercial development. No redlining.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Faraday, Michael Interested Public	Page 17, 3rd bullet: "A large majority of the community agrees with establishing a funding source to acquire open space..." However, no where in the Strategies section is such a program even mentioned, much less defined; without this definition, it will not happen. Page 25, Strategy 1.1, 1st bullet: "The Environment Commission will be an appointed volunteer committee of scientists..." This is too limiting. I would argue that there are many residents who are not degreed "scientists" who have important practical knowledge of and experience in Jackson Hole that must not be ignored.
5/17/2009	Baldwin, Huntley and Jo Interested Public	It seems peculiar, if not suspicious, to invite public input on the creation of a comprehensive plan, set up community-agreed upon objectives, and then propose a plan that turns its back on them. What happened to the number one goal of protecting wildlife? What happened to the commitment to manage growth responsibly? What happened to the desire to preserve our open spaces and rural character? Nothing better illustrates the apparent disregard for community desires than the proposals for Wilson. There is no way that Wilson could support the 520 new homes the plan proposes without ruinous effect on wildlife, rural character and infrastructure. Obviously we can't hope to limit our population to that on Hungry Jack's nostalgic sign, but certainly we can do better than what is currently proposed. We urge you to take another hard look at the plan as it stands now, before we destroy the very aspects of the Valley that we all cherish.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Smith, Margaret E. Cree Interested Public	Here it is, the 11th hour, and I find myself wishing there was more time for comment. I appreciate the amount of effort that has gone into producing a plan that has made an attempt to address the diverse and complex needs of this incredible community that I live in. Unfortunately, I feel that in a number of areas, the plan has fallen short of what this community wants. Forgive me for rambling as I go along but at this point, it is the only way I will get my comments to you. For starters, I am baffled as to how the update of the 1994 plan can call for such an increase in growth. Who is asking for more growth, and not just some growth, but a massive increase in it over the next 1-20 years? Doubling the number of housing units?, more than doubling the amount of commercial space? I feel that the projected numbers or housing units and commercial space needs to be dramatically reduced. In my mind, all of this growth creates a ripple affect through out the entire valley of Jackson Hole that moves away from the concepts of sustainability that are touted in this new draft. (Speaking of which- I don't know who wrote the following: "the concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs." but in my mind, this needs to be completely rewritten so that it makes sense to the lay person. Was someone trying to impress the masses with their mastery of the English language? Captain Bob was right when he said in so many words, "Keep it simple!" I find that loading up on density on the NW corner of the Porter Estate, especially at the density specified, will do nothing but create more problems as the infrastructure of that area, roads in particular, are not designed for that kind of density. I don't know numbers but having 4 schools in close proximity to a massive density increase seems seriously flawed to me. And what about the wildlife? The movements of wildlife in the South Park area is increasingly diminished as more and more development occurs. Continuing to put density into South Park does not bode well for the wildlife. They don't know boundaries. And what about when chronic wasting disease finally comes to Jackson Hole and works its way into the elk herds that winter on the feed grounds in South Park and elsewhere? Won't that too interfere with their movement patterns and their behavioral histories? I would hope that in addressing any future issues on development in South Park, that this issue be looked at and that recommendations are in place from the Game and Fish and other wildlife authorities. Now that I'm on South Park, let me continue. This new plan eliminates any language calling for permanent open space protection of portions of South Park, and for protection of scenic and wildlife values in the South Park region. Why is it that South Park was eliminated from this draft plan when it was first on the list in the 1994 plan's section "Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources"? Wildlife and natural resources should be the priority for South Park. Language that states that South Park will be built out from "north to south starting at High School Road" needs to be deleted. Any development that does happen in the NW corner of the Porter Estate should have at least 1/8 mile pull- back from both High School Road and South Park Loop Road. Good that Flat Creek will get protection but it can not be looked at independently. Animals move to and from Flat Creek. It is not enough to just protect it's corridor. There needs to be inclusion in the plan for movement corridors for wildlife. A study should be done on animals other than large game using the agricultural meadows throughout Teton County (this includes the majority of South Park). The paradigm needs to change where value is giving to species other than those that draw income from hunting permits. The small rodents of this valley and the animals that subsist on them need to be recognized for the importance the play in the biodiversity of Jackson Hole and the GYE. I would like to see this addressed in this plan. Density incentives for NW South Park should be taken from permanent open space protection in South Park, not from elsewhere. Why not move the Rodeo Grounds to the NW portion of the Porter Estate and use that area for town infill? My feeling is that town infill should happen before any other areas are targeted, especially Wilson and South Park. (The increase in density in Wilson, both in residential units and commercial seems completely misguided. Yes, there is commercial, yes, there is housing but it is still only a 15 minute drive from the heart of town. Do you really think that people will do more of their shopping in Wilson if you increase the commercial there? The Center for the Arts is in town, Snow King Ice Arena is in town, Jackson Hole Youth Soccer is in town, all High School athletics are in town- the list goes on. How many trips are made a day from any one place in Teton County to get kids to some activity? Parents then do what they need to do when they get their kids into town. Spreading out density across the valley and increasing commercial in these "nodes" is not going to solve a whole lot of problems. Am I rambling, or what? Density should be in town, first and foremost. There is does the least amount of damage to any other part of Jackson Hole, including its wildlife which if I remember correctly, was the #1 priority of this community. Oh yes, open space too. I can't remember growth being a priority. Somehow, it became one in this draft. I sincerely hope that everyone is listening carefully to the people of this community and that you will consider serious rewrites of this draft plan. It still needs some work before it is a document that we can be proud of. I hope that you will extend the deadline for comments. I felt that it was entirely too short.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Ambler, Emily and Jim Interested Public	I couldn't say it any better than Joan and Huntley Baldwin so am forwarding their message. I am very concerned not only about the proposed size of growth throughout the country, the seemingly lack of concern for our wildlife and scenic places but also a total disregard for the character of Jackson and the Valley. Unlike the previous plan, this new Comp plan doesn't even address this. Some people involved with the Plan try to say they don't know what Character means.....we all know what we are referring to. We all know what we don't want the Jackson area to become and we all know that we would be negatively effected by a loss of character and scenic wildlife area when tourism stops bringing in the money that seems to be behind all in interest in development. We can do better than this!
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	Wilson teems with wildlife. Further development will be very harmful to migration and nesting/breeding.
5/17/2009	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	I was born in Teton County. I was fortunate enough to be of a family that arrived in the mid 50's and purchased over 300 acres in Wilson, not without looking from Astoria to Grand Teton National Park. I feel very strongly about this entire county, but due to the growth along with the popularity, I must choose an area that effects me most and that I have the energy to try to save. Teton County is my back yard, and I am getting exhausted and very frustrated. I have spent countless hours, and sent several comments to this planning commission, and I am speechless, I can hardly comment anymore, no one is listening. This is for many of us our second large battle against high density. I remember when the construction trades, real-estate agents and very large land owners were very in favor of the 94 plan. IS IT STILL ALL ABOUT THE DOLLAR?. I also distinctly and sadly remember the Hardeman expansion. We environmentalists after a long battle said, ok you want to put in 70 units ok, we don't like it, but ok, and then the county came back with 96, and the other 12 or whatever in Schwabacker property. My numbers are off, but the point is that the powers that be seem to want the biggest and most. Not everyone can live in Teton County and preserve what we barely have left. I never envisioned that you would come back to us with 100 times the density for the entire county. You can not fill this valley Butte to Butte. The 3 to 5% of vacant land is irreplaceable. I have never seen the elk migration march right up and down fish creek, due to no other avenues and stay as they have the past 3 years.. I live in the Wilson Node. The area that you want to add 520 units lies in direct conflict with migration of just about every wild animal that this area is famous for. Not to mention the disgusting amount of commercial space YOU THINK WE NEED. For the past two weeks, I have had every day, and I am not exaggerating moose, elk, bald eagles, osprey, fox's, deer, sand hill cranes, and coyotes IN MY BACK YARD. These animals pass thru my yard, which is at the south end of Ward Lane bordering the Rossiter property. These animals/birds do not abide by the fence or the road, they travel this area going in every direction to and from the Snake River, Fish Creek, Fall Creek. Please, Please Reconsider, update, and complete the NRO's for all of Teton County, prior to signing this ludicrous amount of density. You are the very group of people that we have all taken the time to voice our concerns for the past two plus years, why have you given us a plan that is so far removed from so many comments opposed to so much density and outrageous commercial space. DON'T BE REMEMBERED AS THE STAFF THAT PLACED THE DEATH NAIL IN TETON COUNTY. YOU HAVE GREAT POWER TO DO SO MUCH BETTER. PLEASE, PLEASE LISTEN TO THE CITIZENS OF THIS INCREDIBLE VALLEY.
5/17/2009	King, Karin Interested Public	Please, please do not consider the amount of growth in the new Comprehensive Plan. Jackson Hole needs to remain the wonderful place that it is now. Wildlife and natural resources should be the priority of the valley - how wonderful it is now - don't ruin it. We don't need to double the population which only feeds the developers and the tax revenue. If we do have to have development, please keep it in the town area, not the rural areas. Some development is okay in South Park, but certainly not 1,500 units which would encroach on the wildlife corridor, increase traffic and impact the infrastructure. Just a few points - but please consider the results of the survey. We put a lot of thought into it and hoped it would guide you all.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Fenn, Jon and Annie Interested Public	Thanks you for providing lots of opportunity for the local community to learn about the current draft of the new comp plan. Unfortunately, the more I have learned the more frustrated I have become with how the planning staff and their consultants could come up with a plan that differs so much from the priorities that the electorate outlined in various surveys and public meetings. The community made it clear what it desires from the new comp plan: wildlife habitat, open space, limits on growth, preserved wildlife corridors, stronger standards to protect natural resources, less overall development, more concentrated development in the town of Jackson, and some affordable housing which is subsidized by new developments. Given these priorities, it appears to me that the staff and their consultants decided to ignore the communities wishes and pursue their own progrowth agenda. This total lack of regard for clearly expressed community priorities makes me wonder how the draft could possibly have been written with the best interest of the community at heart. The Jackson Hole Community is well educated, vocal, politically active and will not standstill and let the biases of a few dictate what the community will become down the road. I urge everyone involved in drafting the plan to closely examine the drafting process, hiring of consultants, the process for collecting input from various sources, and the planning staffs personal beliefs to determine where the process broke down and how we ended up with a plan that is so out of synch with the input the community provided. I would suggest a "do-over" and starting fresh with a new draft since the current draft was not drafted with the communities' input and priorities as a top objective. Please carefully consider the implications of moving forward with the current draft, since it is so counter to the wishes of the electorate.
5/17/2009	Albright, Joe Interested Public	If the community is to accept the sacrifices that go along with growth, the Comprehensive Plan must be founded on rock-solid numbers rather than fuzzy math. Unfortunately, the numbers published in the draft Comp Plan are nowhere near as solid as they need to be. I'm writing to urge you to begin by subjecting the buildout numbers in the draft Comp Plan to peer review comparable to what would be required if the Comp Plan were going to be accepted for publication in a scientific journal. In my view, an independent review of the numbers must resolve and explain the obvious discrepancies in the numbers before any votes are taken on whether the Comp Plan draft should go forward. To wit:1.There still remains a large unexplained gap between the numbers in appendix I of the Comp Plan draft and the "snapshot" numbers generated last year by Clarion, Collins, Fehr & Peers, a well-respected consulting firm that the county hired to compile baseline numbers for both existing county residential units and commercial square feet. As an illustration of how far the two sets of numbers diverge, Clarion's 2008 report states (page 21): "Approximately 7,200 housing units . . . are in the unincorporated county today." A footnote in the Clarion report said these figures are based on "Housing Needs Assessment 2007." However, page I-4 of the Comp Plan draft states - without giving any sources or further explanation - that there are only 5,930 existing dwelling units in the unincorporated part of Teton County. This is an alarming discrepancy of 21 percent in the simplest category - counting the number of existing housing units. There are similar disturbing discrepancies in the number of square feet of commercial space and the number of housing units that are permitted under today's existing zoning. As part of your efforts to gain public acceptance of the Comp Plan, I advise you to issue a peer-reviewed set of accurate numbers before the community can be expected to think about the pluses and minuses of the Comp Plan for the future. If we base the plan on Junk Numbers, there is no way the community can achieve consensus on where we should be going.2.The column entitled "2009 LDR Potential Development" on page I-4 of the Comp Plan draft should be recalculated so that the Town and County figures are calculated on the same basis. As far as I can determine, the Town's figures in that column are based on what landowners are entitled to under the current base zoning, whereas the County's figures in the same column are not based on curent base zoning. Rather, the county's figures apparently contain an estimate of how much density bonus the landowners will get. It seems to me that a column should be inserted in the chart that shows "2009 LDR Potential Development" in both the Town and County under a common assumption -- and that assumption should be spelled out.3.There seems to be an inconsistency in the way workforce units are treated in the same chart. The county figures seem to include a 25 percent increase in units for workforce mitigation, whereas the Town's figures apparently don't include any increase for employee housing units. This makes the Town's figures seem too low. I realize the Town hasn't given final approval to the 25 percent, but this seems very likely to happen. Thus a footnote would be appropriate explaining the divergence in methodology.4.The Clarion "snapshot" numbers referred to in the first numbered paragraph above have been deleted without explanation from the internet version of his report that is now an appendix to the draft Comp Plan. At the least, the planners should put a note on the cover sheet of the Clarion report revealing that it is a revised document. In my opinion, you'd be better off to restore the deleted numbers so that the public could see the discrepancies in numbers cited above.Summing up: To gain the trust of the public, planners and elected officials need to make decisions that are based on the best available science.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Unfried, Amy and Steve Interested Public	I know you have a lot of these to read, so I'll keep this short. Wildlife is the number one value expressed by residents throughout the plan's long process. Wilson has, even for this amazing valley, above- average wildlife and habitat, as updated NRO data will prove. It makes no sense for the plan to place wildlife in Wilson at #5 out of 7 values, when we all want it to be #1. Nor does it make sense to project additional housing units and population of three times as many as currently exist after Wilson's rapid growth of the past decade or so. The same reasoning applies to the Aspens. Eventual buildout of the valley has long been a concern of many residents, and the draft plan's projected possible doubling of the permanent population is disturbing. Such an increase in population would mean that the months we now think of as the shoulder seasons -- slow times with few tourists, when it's possible to find a parking place in town -- would be as crowded as the peak months of summer now are. Then, peak seasons, with the tourists and summer residents added back in, would put even more enormous pressure on everything -- roads, public lands, the liveability of the valley. Even though a certain amount of growth is available by right to current landowners (though I don't think you need to live in such fear of takings suits as you seem to), let's not leap to the assumption that that is a minimum for the future. Limit growth and make it smart, so that future by-right development is pretty close to a maximum. Once the unique features of this valley are exploited for development, there's no getting them back. Thanks for all your hard work, and please listen to the community.
5/17/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Why is this theme addressed? I feel the wording should be changed to reflect a limited buildout which is consistent with the public comment: This Plan recognizes that the amount of growth allowed in this Plan will be limited to no more than existing base entitlements supported by 2009 zoning.Theme 7 should be included in this theme. There is no responsible growth management if you do not consider Theme 7.There is no mention of relating the amount of Commercial square footage currently entitled to the amount of workforce housing needed for the employees for the new business uses. Amounts of residential and non-residential development should be tied to each other.Page 28. The second to the last paragraph should be stricken as it represents the planners desires and not the community's public comment that insisted on buildout numbers and limited growth not to exceed what could be allowed in our current plan. This wording is not the community's plan. Who wrote this?What the community has said about this theme. Let us be clear what the community said: Public comment was clear that a maximum buildout be consistent or less than what could occur in our current plan without incentives. Who wrote this wording?Generally agree with Principle 2.1.Policy 2.1.a. This wording is confusing. The community is concerned with the overall buildout number for the entire county including Town. The charts shown in Appendix I do not support this statement. Yes if the incentive tools are eliminated then in the rural zones the rural buildout will be reduced. I am only aware of the Town of Jackson as "incorporated".Policy 2.1.c. Doesn't the land owner in a node have the right to say no to higher densities?Policy 2.1.d. I agree with this concept but only at densities that are predetermined and do not increase the overall county planned buildout.Policy 2.1.e. This would be important but how will the affordable housing residents in the nodes be able to shop at local convenience stores that are historically very expensive. Few can afford to shop at the Westside Store for their groceries.Policy 2.3.b.Use of density bonus incentives should not increase the buildout maximum for town or a specific node.Policy 2.4.c This whole idea is not based in reality. Communting has been a viable option for many working in Jackson for many years. We should embrace and develop strategies instead of thinking we can be completely independent of our regional neighbors.Strategy 2.1 Update zoning maps and development right regulations to be consistent with the overall buildout number that reflects the 2009 base development right.Eliminate the incentive tools and instead specify maximum densities in all nodes, town and districts.Indicators - What level triggers what action. Why monitor if nothing happens?
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	We need wildlife impact studies to be built in as we go along with planned development.
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	I feel this is becoming a very slippery slope. What is workforce housing and for whom? Is it one generational with an ever increasing shortage is the long run since land expansion is limited.Who determines these issues in fairness? How is the budget shortfall funded to pay for programs/subsidize land and services? Will this force property owners to move out of the valley due to huge prop tax burdens?This model is based on endless budget growth.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Generally: Numerous policies are stated that require some sort of measurement and monitoring yet no current studies exist that set baselines to allow a comparison. There is not enough mention of continued agricultural uses and not just as it relates to conservation easements. Protection of this long Wyoming industry and character enhancing value of Jackson is missing except for the mention in Principle 1.6. The 1994 Plan was much more supportive of ranching, 4H use, recreational horse ranches, etc.. The Plan should remove all development incentives in the NRO but should not limit the base entitlement rights of land owners. Numerous mention of incentives are mentioned - what kind of incentives? What are the costs of incentives and who pays?Page 16 Photo caption should be changed to indicate: Wildlife and natural resources protection is the priority theme of the Plan.Page 17 box. The first paragraph should state that most members of the community believe that wildlife and natural resource protection should be the organizing theme. Bullet 2 should not mention some believe workforce housing is equally important unless a percentage is stated and better yet eliminate this sentence.Bullet 3 should indicate the unwillingness or low level the community is supportive of funding. This bullet is misleading based on public comment.Policy 1.1.a. Is worded like there are not protections in place which is not the case. 1.1.d. Is this attempting to further limit the base entitlement rights in the rural zones? This is already very restrictive.Policy 1.1.e. What are programatic steps?Policy 1.1.g. This should not except development in the town or nodes. Agricultural use should be protected as in the 1994 Plan.Principle 1.4 and 1.5 make no mention of existing platted or approved development affected by new regulations.Strategy 1.2 last bullet should also set up approved sending areas for off sight vegetation mitigation.The indicator table on pg.26 shows timeframes that in most cases are too short to show any trend or come to a conclusion.
5/17/2009	Domsy, Marc Interested Public	First and foremost I have attached an article that I think should be read by all of those playing a role in the Update to the Comprehensive Plan. It was written by a Professor at the University of Washington and discusses the concept of Sustainable Growth. It is very apropos to the challenges we face as a community. I sent this once before but after reviewing the updates to the Comprehensive Plan I am not so sure it was read. Secondly, I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the direction of the update to the Comprehensive Plan. I have been to more than a couple meetings regarding the Comprehensive Plan and it was clear that the Community has ranked wildlife, scenic and natural resources, controlling growth and maintaining rural character as its highest priorities followed by preserving a diverse community. Again, I would strongly encourage you to read the attached article as it clearly demonstrates that sustainable growth is the path we should be following. I would request that all upzones be eliminated. [see comment for reference attachment]

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	Page 7. The first paragraph assumes that the vision of the plan should be to meet demands of the many people who want to live and visit here. This suggests a growth strategy and the use of the word sustainability as support for this growth. This Vision indicates a balanced/equal approach which is not what the public comment has chosen. Wildlife is number one priority and this is in contrast to a balance. The definition used for sustainability is not appropriate. This is one individual's definition. Please use the Webster's version which is the most recognized and appropriate for this vision. If one substitutes the word "maintaining or prolonging" for sustainability in all references within this Plan the meaning is very different. It is very important to be clear in this plan. If you substitute maintaining or prolonging in the last sentence on pg. 7 this meaning is contrary to public comment. There is no debate on what the community at large has chosen - Theme One is above all and please keep it this way. It is not to be a balanced approach with growth - the teeter totter concept and more balance as suggested in staff meetings is in direct contrast to public comment. The concept of regionalism and not exporting impacts to neighboring communities is overstated throughout the Vision. This plan assumes all want to live and work in Jackson Hole. This is not the case. The development of neighboring communities can be a positive for them. Non-residents have benefited from the available work opportunities non-existent at times in their own communities. The nodal development concept is good, however, it assumes that services for town densities already exist in these nodes. This is not true as in the Aspens and Teton Village the services are more tourist oriented. The Manage Growth responsibly Theme states that workforce housing is the most sustainable type of growth. This assumes that fulltime occupancy does not consume services, schools and impacts on infrastructure as much as second home ownership or tourist uses. Workforce housing creates a need for more housing. The net effects should be acknowledged and considered in this Plan. Theme 7 should be combined in Theme 2. One can not be separated from the other. Any growth contemplated must first consider Theme 7. Public comment has supported and acknowledged this. Theme 3 does not mention the presence of wildlife within town and its value. The picture used is actually a home that has an approximate value of 2 million dollars. Why not use a picture from one of the affordable developments? The workforce living in Jackson would be less likely to spend their dollars in Jackson as most if not all goods are more expensive in Jackson. Many travel to regional centers to shop where goods are less expensive or they shop on the internet. Theme 5. The picture caption is incomplete but appears that it is aiming at not prioritizing wildlife and natural resources as #1. The wording is indicating a balance not consistent with public comment. Theme 6 - How are wider roadways more dangerous for human traffic? This theme should state upfront that major highways will be widened and that if the community changes the way it travels that transportation infrastructure expansion may be limited. Transit should be the focused strategy. Bicycling and walking will not have a significant impact on our transportation needs due to our climate. Theme 7. This should be combined into Theme 2. The relationship of the #1 Priority - Theme 1 or the #2 priority in the specific districts should not change the public comment does not indicate tradeoffs.
5/17/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	The vision statement should only focus on preserving wildlife and open space. Do not include "predictable development" as a part of the vision. Promoting development is not compatible with the theme to "promote stewardship of wildlife and natural resources."
5/17/2009	McIntosh, Beth Interested Public	The current vision for Wilson as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan is unsustainable, unrealistic, and will prove devastating to any kind of life of value (or at all) in this magic valley. Please realize that there has to be a way to REPLACE SPRAWL with high-density nodes or the net effect of condensed living is worse than what we have now. During the next phase of planetary adjustment to resources, we need to be radical leaders in how to live WITH a landscape. Planning for conventional growth is not a way to do this. Smart decisions limiting car traffic, using local resources (and less of them), changing our habits to accommodate wild animals and paying attention to our health and education needs as a community are ways that we can improve this place and our lives. If we want to accommodate 3-4 times more people in Wilson, then we must house them in square footage that has already been constructed, and create sensible commerce around existing infrastructure. The proposed density increase lies within the highest priority grizzly bear conflict zone. With the radical die-off of whitebark pine and the de-listing of the grizzly, it is highly possible that there will be no grizzly bears left in Yellowstone/Teton in the next few years, DUE TO CONFLICTS WITH HUMANS. Increasing density will increase conflicts, and create unmanageable stress levels for the bears. This is a time when we need to look very carefully at what we have left and what we want to do about it. Please LISTEN TO THIS COMMUNITY.
5/17/2009	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	The purpose claims to be a rewrite/update of the 1994 plan, but clearly is not. During the 1970s, 1980s and the 1994 efforts the highest priority was and is to protect wildlife and open space. That priority is not reflected in this 2009 draft comprehensive plan

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Emrick, Madeleine Interested Public	I think the proposed increased density in the Aspen's is proposterous. Teton Village Rd is basically a dead end road. Enough growth in this area. Please. Lets re-direct the money that is being spent in shifting around denisties and spend it in studying "0% Growth". We know we ultimately have to get there so why don't we start now.
5/17/2009	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the plan proposal before hearings begin. An incredible amount of study and work has gone into planning efforts in this community for years and this effort may present the opportunity to simplify the issue and resolve it. My interest in land use and the pace of development goes back over 40 years when I was one of three local families who developed the Skyline Ranch development in the 1960's. This 600 acre development was accomplished on 200 of those acres with no bonus incentives. The remaining 400 acres constituted the first Wyoming Nature Conservancy easement, permanently protecting both the open meadow along Wyoming State Highway 22 and the entire riparian strip of land bordering the Snake River. Since that time I have served as an engineering, surveying and land planning consultant to other developments in the valley. In the early 1980's I served as local coordinator for the RUDAT Land Use Planning study for South Park, copies of which I believe are still existent. That intense three day planning effort brought together national planning professionals and involved the entire community of interests. The conclusions of that study and all subsequent studies, surveys, and elections when planning was involved, have supported the desire of the Teton County populace to limit build out growth and focus on "Town as Heart". With that in mind it seems the following scenario might satisfy Teton County's citizens desires: Modify those portions of the current plan which authorize PUD's, clusters, or higher densities beyond the base densities to restrict such additional density procedures throughout the county EXCEPT in new developments on lands adjacent to the existing Town of Jackson as that town boundary runs along High School Road from US Highway 89 westerly to the Spring Gulch Road. This would be a focused fix to the current plan while additional debate or study may continue. The southerly extent of that new development and affordable housing component within it could be worked out as a next step. This would have the immediate effect of removing higher densities from the majority of the county and concentrating it as a logical expansion, or node, within the Town of Jackson. Exactly what I understand "Town As Heart" to represent. This node would be within walking, biking and START system access to all necessary support services to such a density node. There does not seem to be any demonstrable need , except probably the inexorable development push, for any other such nodes in the county. The need for affordable housing seems to be a frequent justification for the proposed additional nodes throughout the county. The fact is that any affordable housing must be either privately or publically subsidized. The very granting of nodes away from the Town of Jackson places impact costs on Teton County ranging from transportation to schools and support businesses. If such additional subsidized housing is proposed, a funding estimate and source must be identified – otherwise the costs will by default fall to the citizens of Teton County in some way. The fact is that a quantity of affordable housing which may be desired beyond what could be accommodated in the area south of High School Road is clearly beyond the tolerance of the community for increased taxes, either directly or indirectly. The Housing Trust and Housing Authority have made and continue to make effective investments for some affordable housing and that should be encouraged. This unsatisfied demand, or need, will be satisfactorily addressed in our neighboring communities of Alpine, Star Valley, Victor and Driggs. This is more true this year than last with much more affordable land available within reasonable commuting distance of Jackson – all serviced by the START system and subsidized by the state and local governments. Not a bad arrangement. In the current economic downturn effecting the world, nation, state and local governments it is important for us in Northwest Wyoming to remember that tourism is the second largest industry in Wyoming. In consideration the state's extractive energy revenues appearing to revert to year 2003 levels it is desirable that locally we assure that our tourism attractions – natural values such as wildlife, scenic vistas, clean water and low congestion – are protected. These values differentiate Northwest Wyoming attractions from nearly all other such resort towns in the United States. My experience over the last 7 years in the Wyoming Legislature has convinced me that only in Teton County is there the possibility of finding the political will on the part of the County Commissioners (the entity with land use authority in counties) to identify and establish the regulations to assure that Northwest Wyoming remains the community able to live with, and benefit from a healthy, a truly sustainable economy based on the values on public lands while at the same time being careful not to become a parasite on those values for individual economic gain at the expense of those values. I admit to not being well acquainted with the time lines in the Teton County planning process. How long would such the above modification of the existing Comprehensive Plan take to accomplish, assuming both the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners found it desirable? Just an estimate of the time required is all I'm looking for.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Faraday, Michael Interested Public	Policy 2.2.c: "Update the Tuture Use Plan every five years" I suggest that this is too long to wait, for a number of important reasons, including:1. in 5 years, the variances granted by the wide authority of the LDR's will have become the new norm; the clock can never be rolled back.2. even assuming that 5 years is appropriate, it will surely take a year or more to gather the information, the write and approve new rules. In effect, this will mean review only every 6 or seven years.In my view, this should be not less than every 3 years. I believe the cost to the community of waiting longer will be far greater than the \$\$\$ cost of more aggressive review.Policy 2.2.d: "...if monitoring indicates that growth rate management is needed." Growth Rate Management must be required from the outset! If it is not, who will decided that it is needed? And, when? And, of course, by then it will likely be too late. The only way to know if a plan is working is to monitor it regularly, which is being established in the Plan, and compare it to SPECIFIC CRITERIA.
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	I am very disappointed in your conscious pro-growth stance. This is out of step with the core values of residents.It's been stated (Jeff Daugherty) that surveys are but one of many factors in deciding direction in the plan. Residents pay taxes and are most significant stakeholders. Why are they under-valued and under represented?It appears that pro-growth special interests are leading your charge.
5/16/2009	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	The purpose of the plan, just being a 10-15 year plan, can not also mean that it can be sustainable. Sustainable is a longer range concept. There is a conflict here. The word sustainable is over used throughout the plan. Because it is so over used it becomes meaningless. Sustainable should only be used in the context of protecting Jackson Hole's irreplaceable wildlife, scenery and community character.
5/16/2009	Jordan, Carl Interested Public	I apologize that my previous comment pertaining to Policy 1.5.d ("Maintain dark night skies") ventured well beyond the "community-vision" objective of the Comprehensive Plan, and into the forbidden land of "regulatory means." But to do otherwise is difficult when the best antidote to light pollution is simply less light - given that even reflected light from "dark-sky" compliant fixtures can contribute significantly. The Comprehensive Plan's acknowledgement of "dark and starry night skies" as worth maintaining is very positive, as is the policy statement's inclusion of limiting "nonessential lighting,"À (a reference to the double whammy of natural-resource depletion). Missing, however, is explicit reference to qualitative attributes of outdoor lighting that clearly affect its value, without directly impacting dark skies and natural resources.That omission occurs because the Plan's architecture fails to include a Community Value Theme that addresses the human interface of resource stewardship and responsible growth. Therefore, I suggest adding an additional Theme and thereby broadening the Plan's conception of "public goods," as follows.Theme: Provide for the community's public safety and quality of life.Therein would be a venue for outdoor lighting as follows:Principle: Promote effective outdoor lighting.Policies: 1. Limit glare. Glare is what blinds the eye's retina as it adapts to the brightest light source, meaning one's surroundings become darker and less visible. Even worse, the effects of glare become more disabling with age, which is why the elderly often are unable to drive at night. Typically, a light that causes glare is psychologically associated with good lighting, whereas it is just the opposite-glare reduces visibility, visual comfort, and the usefulness of light.2. Limit light intensity. The effects of excessive illumination are similar to glare: the retina is slow to adjust to a variety of light levels and, once adjusted, greater illumination levels may be no more enabling than lesser levels. And as illumination levels increase, adjacent areas appear darker and shadows more prominent, thereby impairing public safety.3. Limit light trespass and light pollution. This relates to the intrusive and devaluing effects of unwanted light upon private property and common spaces, and the responsibility to avert uncontained light from spilling upwards or outward across property boundaries.Strategy: Amend lighting ordinances and development standards so as to achieve a timely implementation of policies.

Date	Name	Comment
5/16/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	As I digest all that has been said by the community and in April's Comp Plan draft... it occurs to me that for now, we should stick with the 1994 Plan, which in many ways got it (and still gets it) right. It's instructive to revisit the plan update objectives (in their entirety), which don't seem to imply much more (http://jacksontetonplan.com/plan/plan-update-objectives/): 'Plan Update Objectives The plan update will accomplish four main objectives:1. Reconfirm/refine the 20-year vision for the valley that is realistic and achievable 2. Bring directions and policies of the County and Town into alignment with each other and with those of other coordinating agencies 3. Coordinate decision-making 4. Provide a greater level of predictability to landowners, businesses, and residents.' It's water under the bridge that so much time and money have been spent on what amounts to a plan REWRITE, not just an update. It obviously matters much more what happens to real life here in Jackson Hole. Let's maintain the community vision as captured and reflected in 1994. Keep that ironclad. At most, stick with the commercial and residential growth numbers as envisioned in 1994. Now...with our 2009 sensibility, go to work on 1994's policies surgically (only): – Strengthen permanent protections for wildlife, open space, and community character (if new taxes are considered, designate these to help pay for such protections). – Think about reducing residential (and especially commercial) growth BELOW 1994 projected buildout, and CAPPING annual growth rates at 1-2% per year. – Incorporate specific policies that will increase workhouse housing in the mix (and place much greater emphasis on affordable rentals). Prioritize redevelopment, infill, mitigation, and exactions for this purpose. New ground-breaking should be the last option, and then only in or directly adjacent to Town (avoiding Jackson single family neighborhoods), and falling within the annual growth cap. While we're on the subject of Town adjacency...wildlife doesn't notice if the land is called 'South Park' or any other name. What's special about this valley is what's special about this valley – everywhere. Wildlife, scenery, and open space protections should have the same priority (first) - everywhere. In South Park, apply the same reduced, capped growth framework and the same permanent protections (wildlife permeability, open space) as elsewhere. Exhaust infill in Town before considering expansion into ANY County area – including the northwest corner of South Park. It's inspiring to revisit the words of the 1994 plan, with its inclusive view of County lands (Chapter 1, p 4): 'In Teton County, [the first area of concern] is "open space." These are lands on which ranching should continue, wildlife habitat [is] preserved, and the visual qualities of scenic vistas protected. Examples include the hay meadows of South Park, the Spring Gulch scenic area, ranchlands along the Teton Village road, Buffalo Valley, and the western-most entrance to Teton County from Alta. These lands also include the Snake, Hoback, Gros Ventre, and Buffalo Fork river corridors and those hillsides and butte sides which are crucial winter range for ungulates. These areas should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community's character.' We need to keep all these things in. The 1994 plan got it right. The connectivity, scenic, and wildlife values are still there (including in South Park), and the community still cares about them in the same way. With all of these different (specific and clearly-stated) policies in place, we can then address the 2009 need for increased predictability, through their associated language in 2009-updated zoning regulations.
5/16/2009	Margolis, Fred Interested Public	I live north of the Aspens off the Village Road. Other than during the "off season", trying to make a right turn varies between being problematic to a nightmare; turning left, forget it. Permitting more growth at the Aspens and Teton Village will undermine quality of life, as reflected in only one measure---traffic---materially. I vote no.
5/16/2009	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	I WILL KEEP THIS SHORT. THIS ENTIRE PLAN FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY SUCKS I AM VERY DISCOURAGES WITH THE FACT THAT THE PLANNERS HAVE NOT HEARD A WORD ON LOW DENSISTY REQUESTS. FROM THE PAST 2 YEARS OF CONCERNED CITIZENS. IF THIS GOES THRU AS WRITTEN YOU THE WRITERS, AND YOU THE PASSERS WILL HAVE TO LIVE THE REST OF YOUR LIFE KNOWING YOU PUT THE FINAL KNIFE IN THE HEART OF JACKSON HOLE. DO NOT PASS THIS PROPOSAL AS WRITTEN, AND LISTEN TO THOSE OF US WHO VOTED YOU IN
5/16/2009	Thal, Laurie Interested Public	I have several concerns regarding the new draft of the Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 plan has a strong focus on stewardship of the land and protecting wildlife, & open space. This appears to be diluted in the new plan. Transportation will be a huge problem with the amount of additional residential & commercial development proposed by the new draft Comp Plan. Also, quality of life and neighborhoods, the reason we all like living here, will be compromised by that large of an increase. We need to set growth boundaries and implement sptrict zoning. Keep Wilson as it was described, a rural community. The majority in Wilson have already voiced strongly their opposition to becoming an "urban"area .The reasons were stated in the original plan, proximity to important wildlife habitat, traffic, impacts on school and community character. workforce housing will be a greater problem with the increased allowable commercial development. This kind of development must be held more responsible for finding solutions to relieve our workforce housing shortage. Thank you for taking your time to plan and help keep this valley the place we all want to continue to call home.

Date	Name	Comment
5/16/2009	Miller, Cate Interested Public	1.Updating of NRO mapping should be done prior to adoption of the plan so that decisions are being made on the basis of information that is as up to date and complete as possible.2.Permeability of development design for wildlife:current "wildlife friendly" fencing standards as currently written are very difficult to enforce as has been shown by numerous problem fences constructed in recent years.When the LDR's are written to implement this goal, please consider having some permit process for construction of fencing or some way for the Town and County to know IN ADVANCE that a fence is going to be constructed so that "wildlife permeability" can be reviewed before construction. Trying to correct a problem after construction is not working well at all. Many of the new buck and rail fences that have been constructed around individual parcels are simple too high.The agricultural exemption is a serious problem and should be reviewed. For example: *The construction in 2008 of a very high (48"-52"+ top rail) buck and rail fence along Spring Gulch Road to replace the old and long established 36-38" wire fence has resulted in a barrier to wildlife movement. *A 52" fence (2007) on a 120 acre parcel in the Zenith area is causing considerable impediment to elk movement (especially for younger/old animals) during the migration in Spring and Fall. *A 52" fence built around a conservation easement property (Kings Highway area) is yet another impediment to the "permeability" concept. If this Plan is genuinely dedicated to stewardship of wildlife and all that this implies then fencing regulations must be improved AND ENFORCED. At present fencing contractors interpret the ag exemption to mean that "we can build anything we want" regardless of consequences to wildlife.The Town of Jackson should also consider the implications of fencing in known wildlife movement areas. Given the movement of deer across the corridor from the butte to the Karns Meadow area, the construction of the fence along the north side of the old Sagebrush motel Property on Broadway should have had to meet wildlife friendly standards.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Density bonuses for Single Family Mixed is in conflict with statement that East Jackson is a Town Stable District
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	The Lodging Overlay should not be expanded to the other side of Broadway along Flat Creek. A wall of hotels on both sides of Broadway is very undesirable. -Buildings should be limited to 2 stories.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	"Encourage upgrades to this gateway district" is not clear. What upgrades are desired?
5/15/2009	Gill, Robert Interested Public	I have been reviewing the latest version on the Teton County Comp. Plan. I know that you are looking for some feed back, but all I have is questions. I see that the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch is targeted to receive the most density. What I do not understand (and I am not alone) is how it receives this increase. After talking with Jeff Daugherty anf Alex Norton it is confusing on how the commercail and higher density would be divided between the two owners of the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch? There are so many questions that need answered for me to be able to make comments. What is the base density? What are the PRD multipliers? Are there going to be PRD's? How do we get density from other porperty owners? Are the affordable housing and workforce housing purchased at a discount? With out these answers plus the LDR's it is difficult to make constructive comments.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Developing South Park from the North to the South is a logical pattern, but all of South Park should not be developed with a town development pattern. Appendix I shows that the 1500 units proposed for South Park are not needed to meet the community's needs for the duration of the Plan.- Any development at Town density should be to Town standards for streets, lights, and sidewalks. -There is no need for convenience commercial in northern South Park unless the downtown commercial is reduced by the same amount. Most convenience commercial will fail because residents will not pay more for inferior products. They will drive to Smiths for groceries, their favorite pub for a drink, or their favorite restaurant for a meal. It is an exercise in futility to attempt to control the free market. -Do not add traffic to High School Road. East west connector must be complete before development begins. This should be clearly stated in the Plan. Construction traffic on High School Road is unacceptable. -The view corridor on South Park Loop Road and High School road must be protected with a minimum set back of ¼ mile. This should either be shown on the map or clearly stated in this section. Berms are not an appropriate way to preserve the view corridor.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-Development in South Park must not create traffic problems for West Jackson. Access for new development should not connect to High School Road.-Any development in South Park should have a visual buffer from West Jackson.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Do not discourage single use and single story buildings. The market will decide what is needed for this district.-Three story buildings are not appropriate as a gateway treatment.-Future development of the USFS site should favor residential use over commercial
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Allowing two stories fronting the street but three stories to provide incentives for workforce housing is not predictable. Limit all buildings to 2 stories. -Proposed hi potential for development density is almost 2x what is currently allowed and is almost 3x what is currently built. This will not just change the character of this neighborhood; it will change the character of the entire Town. There is significant unused density potential. Do not add anymore until it is all built out.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	density bonuses for single Family Mixed is in conflict with statement that the Southern Hillside district is A Town Stable district.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-Agree that building heights should not exceed 2 stories.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Building height in this district should be limited to 2 stories.-This sub-area an almost double in density from what is currently built compared to what is currently allowed. It is already the densest sub-area in town. The proposed hi potential density is over 2.5x waht is currently built. This would have negative impacts on the character of this neighborhood and the entire Town. There is significant unused density potential. Do not add anymore until it is all built out.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	I believe that Town Square should be restricted to two stories and that regulatory relief should be granted for redevelopment/upgrade of propertiesin the Town square overlay. Particularly relief from housing requirements needs to be done. Two stories in the Town square do not lend themselves to affordable housing.
5/15/2009	Rohrstaff, Kate Interested Public	The Rodeo Grounds are one of the key componets to our "wild west" roots. That is one thing that I don't think should change.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Since 30% of all deer killed in Teton County are killed on this stretch of Broadway, it is obvious we need to address this problem. Although wildlife is not a high priority for this district, a safe wildlife crossing should be a high priority. If development in this area is not permeable to wildlife, it needs to provide safe travel corridors. These corridors need to be an integral part of any development patterns. Surrounding Karns Meadows with high density development will severely reduce its value to wildlife. The goal should be to identify a solution for a wildlife crossing before any development is approved. If we wait until after development is approved, it will be too late. -This area is a critical link for wildlife between the North side of Snow King and the South facing buttes on West Broadway. -The proposed hi potential density is over 2x what is currently allowed. This proposed density is higher than the current density in any sub-area in Town.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Transportation Theme should include a Roundabout at the Y to reduce congestion. A density increase is not appropriate unless congestion problems are solved. -Disagree that the Y is an appropriate location for significant increase in workforce housing. As a gateway it should transition to town.-The proposed hi potential density is twice what is currently built. This is not appropriate for an intersection that already has significant traffic problems.
5/15/2009	Rohrstaff, Kate Interested Public	Honestly I don't think it matters. 2 or 3 stories? What is the difference really???

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Barrett, Dave Interested Public	The stated purpose of the proposed Draft Comp Plan of April 2009 is to "update" the 1994 Comp Plan so as to retain the values, intent, character and desires of the community. The community has spoken loud and clear in several surveys and in public meetings regarding desired values, priorities and outcomes. While the "proposed Draft Plan" speaks to the community desires, it falls far short of honoring what the community has said it wants in several aspects. The following issues and comments represent some of the more critical problems of this Plan:#1 WILDLIFE, which is the highest desired priority expressed by the community, is near the bottom of the priorities in 12 of the 25 districts. It should be #1 throughout the County. Wildlife influences our values, quality of life, and is an important economic driver. The proposed "Draft Plan" does not adequately consider Crucial Winter Habitats, riparian zones, connectivity and migration corridors. The proposed development in this "Draft Plan" could have serious negative impacts on critical species such as moose, elk, trumpeter swans, eagles, and , cutthroat trout, among others.PROPOSAL: I believe that BEFORE any Draft Plan is accepted, Planners should prepare new up to date NRO maps and designations reflecting the best available science and mapping, as available from sources such as the Teton Science School, Wy Game and Fish, or other agencies. For example, Wy G & F in 2005, prepared mapping of Crucial Moose Winter Habitat south of Wilson village, which in the Draft Plan actually extends INTO the proposed high density development proposed for Wilson, south of Rt 22. Moose are at risk in our valley. Crucial habitat maps and other such data should be included in the NRO zone to receive the highest level of wildlife protection. (The proposed "Plan of April 2009, is based on 1994 NRO maps and as such are out dated and incomplete.) Up to date data and mapping should be used in preparing new NRO maps and zones which should be strictly applied to all planning decisions so as to protect wildlife.#2 GROWTH: All the surveys said overall growth should be limited. Yet, the proposed " Draft Plan" calls for doubling residential growth, up to 9,000 new houses and an additional 20,000 residents, on top of the existing 20,000.The proposed "Draft Plan" calls for up to an additional 8.8 million square feet of commercial space. This is equivalent to 175 new Albertsons. Where, what, who? How many employees will this generate? Some projected analysis say 20,000 to 30,000. Where will they live? We are currently meeting our objective of 65% worker housing. How will we sustain this? Who will pay for this?What are the impacts of growth on wildlife, natural resources, quality of life, highways, schools, infrastructure, taxes? How much is this going to cost and who is to pay for it? What do we want for our future, our legacy, and, the sustainability of our wildlife and natural resources?PROPOSAL: I believe that BEFORE the proposed "Draft Plan" can be considered further, Planning needs to provide hard data as to outcomes, costs, and impacts, in all aspects. Now is the time to evaluate and plan, not after the fact of unintended consequences.#3 REGIONAL Planning: The presentations by the Planning Staff suggested that wildlife considerations should be viewed from a regional perspective.PROPOSAL: I believe that planning should take a regional view in all aspects, including wildlife, housing, transportation, schools, etc. For example, consider supply and demand on housing. Jackson has a need for housing while west and south there is a very large supply. Wouldn't make it sense to see how we can work together? How about making it easier to commute with enhanced START bus service? Planning should evaluate this scenario from all aspects as part of a "comprehensive" plan.I will address other issues at another time, soon.Thank you for your considerations.
5/15/2009	Wilmot, Kate Interested Public	I would like to comment on changes to the comp plan that effect a particular section of East Jackson - Broadway between No Name and Stormy Circle. I am a home owner that shares a boundary line with a large piece of property that has a zoning boundary in the middle of the parcel. The 92' south of Broadway is zoned OP and the 108' of property directly south of this is zoned NC-SF as stated in the 1994 comp plan. This is consitent with the sounthern extent of OP zoning along Broadway. In the new comp plan, it appears that this entire piece of property has been rezoned into a category that would allow a significant amount of Commercial development. The size of the parcel also allows it to be considered for a PMUD. This change is absolutely not taking into account the character of the neighborhood, but rather favoring the owner of this property by changing the potential development opportunites based on property ownership. This is not acceptable. The property directly west and north of me also shares a boundary with this particular property but it is not being considered for the same zoning change? Again, this shows that zoning changes are being made based on ownership - this is not how the Town of Jackson should be setting priorities.My strong suggestion is to keep the zoning boundary between OP and Single Family residential in the same location as was set in the 1994 comp plan.I look forward to hearing back from you with regard to how you have justified the proposed zoning change for this parcel.Thanks

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Matthews, Heather Interested Public	I am unable to make detailed comments on the Comp Plan on its website by the end of today, so I hope you will accept these summarized comments. I have lived in Teton County since 1997. I have worked at a dude ranch, in a restaurant, at a vet clinic, for an artist, for a plumbing and building contractor, and for two non-profits in that time. I am very lucky to be a homeowner, to enjoy recreating in this amazing valley, and to be a part of this community. I have come to love and respect what makes Jackson Hole so special- its wildlife, amazing views, clean streams and clean air, and the people. Jackson is so special is because of the balance between all of these things. The Comp Plan, as written right now, does not hold up this balance, and it does not protect those natural resources mentioned, or the community's character and values. This may be unintentional. I hope it is. But I have serious doubts because of a single phrase that I reread and reread in disbelief: "ecosystem preservation and protection does not preclude growth". "Human needs" is mentioned as being the priority. The community spoke its mind in surveys: we want to protect the wildlife and natural resources, manage growth, and provide affordable housing- in that order. I would say that means the ecosystem comes before growth. The Plan would allow an enormous amount of commercial development that would demand a number of employees that we don't have, and to get those employees we would need more affordable housing- I don't see the link in this plan. I also don't see the link of this need for employees to a projected population build-out to transportation needs for that amount of population growth or the affect that would all have on our natural resources. Why isn't a carrying capacity of the ecosystem determined and planned from? Why aren't there ways included in the plan to determine how development allowed by the plan would impact natural resources, housing needs, transportation, infrastructure, etc.? It seems that the Plan only allows for evaluation AFTER development has occurred. Why push the limits, which could cause irreversible damage, instead of erring on the side of caution? I don't see in the Plan how open space will be permanently protected if/when development rights are transferred into nodes. I also see a lack of wildlife protection within nodes- the Plan seems to think wildlife and natural resource values can be dismissed in nodes. The local economy gets attention in the Plan, but not like it did in the 1994 Plan. The 94 Plan recognized that our natural resources, recreational opportunities and our western, small town character are the basis for our local economy. This plan seems to say that our economy is based on growth and development. The 94 Plan showed vision for a sustainable future- for its residents and the ecosystem. I would like to add two specific comments on the Plan here: Hoback Junction- the lack of potable water in the area is not mentioned as a limiting factor in regards to additional housing and commercial development. Please include that. On page 25 you mention in ways to decrease the impact on public lands that we need dog parks. I have worked with PAWS on and off for 10 years, trying to get a dog park in Jackson. So far, we have had no or little support from the town or county, or potential neighbors, to do so. This makes me think there is very little chance of a dog park existing in the valley. And I do see dogs (which will increase in numbers along with an increasing population) as a huge impact on public lands, and on neighbors. Thank you for your consideration, and all of your time that has been dedicated to drafting this plan, to meetings and hearing, and to reading comments. I hope that we can get this plan right for the ecosystem, instead of for developers.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Taylor, Nancy Interested Public	I am writing in regard to the April 2009 draft of the Comprehensive Plan to urge you to go back to the drawing board and draft a plan that reflects the will of the people of Jackson Hole. There is a major disconnect between the language expressed in the introduction which pays lip service to wildlife values, sustainability, and ecosystem stewardship; and the current contents of the plan that outline a “growth oriented” scenario for the future of our valley. Because we sit at the gateway to two national parks, we are privileged to inhabit a very fragile ecosystem. This land and this community cannot be dealt with using traditional planning methods. We cannot simply take past growth patterns for both town and county and project them forward while calling this a planning exercise. What is lacking in this plan is a holistic vision of the future that takes into account the carrying capacity of both public and private land for the future protection and enhancement of the wildlife that we all love. The buildout figures for each “node” are beyond excessive. The figures do not limit growth as the public asked you to do, they do not link the numbers with the impacts to our already burdened infrastructure of highways, schools, water, and sewer coupled with the impacts of 3.5 million tourists. Sustainability is mentioned in the plan but if one were to take the buildout figures that you give us, it paints a picture that is truly unsustainable, from a wildlife standpoint, from an energy-use standpoint and from a quality of life standpoint that many of us know and treasure. 9,880 new housing units, increasing our population to roughly 40,000 people; 8.807 million possible new square feet of commercial space with its 29,000 new workers could push our population up to 70,000 people. This is insane. It is not what the community asked you to do and it does not serve or reflect the will of the people. We have been told that these “numbers” only reflect the “growth potential” for our valley and that the Land Development Regulations (LDRs) will limit what can happen. But lets be realistic, the LDRs will only be as strong as is mandated in the plan. Planning commissions are directed by the plan when they implement the LDRs and we have no way of knowing what kind of “teeth” you will put in the LDRs. Given what we have been handed as our new draft plan, I question the set of teeth the LDRs will have. It looks more like a bunch of cavities and sweets for the developers than a set of regulations that would truly support a sustainable community for future generations. It is mentioned in the plan that Jackson will be climate neutral by the Year 2030. This is an ambitious goal and if truly taken seriously will require the we slow growth down so that building regulations, transportation plans and the carrying capacity of the land can realistically adhere to this ambitious agenda while minimizing human impacts on this fragile environment. Please reconcile all aspects of the goals stated over and over again by the community with the numbers in this plan. There needs to be a reduction in numbers that reflects the community’s value of wildlife and open space; not just a “growth oriented trajectory” that favors a few at the expense of the whole community. I trust that we can house our workforce in green-affordable housing and still reduce your projected numbers. Once the wildlife is gone, it isn’t coming back and neither is the tourist-based economy that considers the Northwestern corner of Wyoming so special that they travel from all over the world to witness the last wild place in the lower ‘48. Pave it over and watch them run; no more elk, moose, bears and eagles means no more dollars that fuel the economy for those that live and work here. When planning is viewed holistically as an interrelated process, the development that threatens wildlife is linked to the economic costs to the community, not merely to the economic gains of those who stand to profit from unbridled development. We pay you, we elected you, please listen to the majority of those who have spoken and enter into a creative and future oriented dialogue that will preserve this place not ruin it! Please take the time to do natural resource overlay mapping that includes winter habitat, migration routes, animal fatality statistics and flood plains for all of the proposed growth areas. We can only make educated decisions once we have all of the information. Moose don’t show up at county commissioners meetings and talk about what it means to have your mother hit by a car when you are yearling twins. Give them a voice and give them a break in your next draft of the plan.
5/15/2009	Hughes, Robert Interested Public	It seems a political nightmare has been created in the process of taking one step forward, and several steps back in the current planning process. The one step forward is the current Draft Comprehensive Plan; the first of ten steps back is the loss or removal of the basic tenets of a perfectly good plan from 1994. That plan clearly incorporated the wishes of the community in the details of the plan. Other steps back include an amazingly naive, simple projection of growth in an environment that geographically limits its growth by the nature of its surroundings and by its population of wild animals and concerned citizens. Also, there is a lack of clear and detailed provision for the animals whose homes we have chosen to disrupt, by use of nature-mapping overlays. The only overlay I perceive is that of planners with vested interests in growth and little apparent perception of why they have been retained by the citizenry. As far as the general populace is concerned, the draft plan does not represent its wishes, aspirations, or even intent. As far as any other constituencies are concerned, the suspicions and rumors are in full sway, and as politicians, you must make some hard decisions. Letters from concerned citizens have politely made the fundamental deficiencies of the draft plan abundantly clear. There is also no lack of detailed criticism on all aspects of the draft plan from numerous sources, if you will only entertain their input.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	May, Mike Interested Public	To begin I want to acknowledge what a laborious process drafting this plan must have been and give my thanks for the countless hours staff, stake holders and the public have put in. We're close and with some refinement I think this can be a great tool. That said, I have some concern that the Comp plan as a whole seems to be promoting growth rather than planning for it. I'm a realist - heck I moved here from somewhere else too - so the last thing I am is anti-growth. However, the draft plan as it stands seems to be prioritizing build out. Will we get there some day? Most likely, but I don't think this community wants to race toward it. I also can't help but wonder about the way themes were prioritized throughout the districts in this document. Time and time again I heard that wildlife and scenic values were one of the top themes throughout the valley yet the plan as it stands does not reflect this sentiment. Sure, wildlife and scenic values can't be the top priority in all the districts but this discrepancy makes me wonder about the efficacy of gathering comments the way we did. Please know, I'm not insinuating that staff disregarded comment in any way or calling into question anyone's integrity but simply wondering whether something was lost in translation because of the methodology used. There must have been thousands of post-it notes from all the meetings and by and large the comments I saw and canvassed (which were many) don't add up to what I'm seeing in the prioritization of our community themes. We don't need growth for growth's sake and I think our community has spoken loud and clear on our priorities; smart - dare I say slow - growth and maintaining our wildlife and scenic values WHILE doing what we can to meet our human needs. A tough balance for sure but one that can be accomplished by not concentrating on final build out numbers but rather smart, focused planning. I don't know - maybe we need to be biting off smaller chunks? In short, and I understand that this is a forward thinking document, I'd urge the commissioners and our elected officials to proceed with a less is more mentality in regard to our comprehensive plan. Thanks for your time. I look forward to future discussion on the plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I am sorry to say that I have waited until now to write this letter, but I have been listening, reading and reviewing in hopes of understanding. However, I feel very strongly that what has been proposed will be very detrimental to Teton County. I'm sure it has been a thankless task to compile all of the information from all of the surveys and meetings, and I appreciate that your team has attempted to do this. But it isn't clear to me how you came up with the suggestions that you did, because I know that I heard very different voices at all of the meetings that I attended – and from people that I spoke with, particularly in Wilson and the Westbank , before this draft came out. Teton County continues to be a special place because of all the hard work that has gone into keeping it that way. I can attest to that first hand, from my 37 years of living In the valley. If this concept of nodes and intense growth is allowed to go forward, we will no longer have the environment that sets us apart. I thought the whole point of the Comprehensive Plan was to avoid going down the same path that Aspen, Vail and Sun Valley did. We are supposed to have learned from their mistakes. I think a question that was asked loud and clear, was “Why do we have to continue with the growth pattern from the 1994 Plan?” I think what we saw in the 1994 plan has begun to be built, and it is no longer just words on paper – it has taken on a dimension, and not one that people want to see built out to its maximum – let alone made larger. I understand that there are basic rights for the landowners, and removing that density would be considered a “taking”. But think of all of the landowners who have worked within that Plan and been able to preserve large acreage, and still been able to build what they want on their property. Sending all of the development to these “nodes” is so structured and unnatural! It's hideous to think about! Who will want to come here to see a series of dense, built-out communities? Who will want to live in these dense, built-out communities? I think we should continue to let the large landowners develop their properties according to their rights – not forcing them to transfer or sell their development rights to these nodes. We don't need the commercial and residential growth that has been proposed. Adding so much commercial just creates more work force, which means more services, more schools, more contractors to build the schools – and it's an endless cycle for more growth. Who says we need all of these people to live here? Who says that everyone is entitled to live here? I came here as a 22 year-old, and I took all sorts of jobs to make ends meet. I didn't look to the community to provide affordable housing for me and I didn't feel entitled to stay here. I don't feel that my 20 and 22 year-old daughters are entitled to have affordable housing provided for them. It wasn't easy to make ends meet back in 1972, and it's not easy now – but I think it's all relative. I have always believed that there should be affordable housing – but nothing like the amount which you have proposed. I especially don't think the affordable units need to be owned; I feel that as a community we would be much better off to offer more rentals. There are hundreds of people who want to come to work and play in this valley for a few years, without the commitment of ownership. Seasonal employees don't necessarily want ownership. We have gotten way ahead of ourselves on these numbers. You say that 65% of the work force should be housed in Teton County. I'm sure you have some calculation of how many are currently housed. Have you counted me in that number? I can tell you that I consider myself a fulltime worker, and a lot of people I know are in my position – but I don't think you've considered us as “work force”, which may skew your numbers. In addition, there is quite a bit of inventory in today's market that should be considered affordable – and interest rates are affordable. Let's not add hundreds of units in these nodes, We don't have the people to fill all of those units – so let's not encourage the growth that would be necessary to build and fill them! There are so many topics that I would like to address in this plan, but this one letter can't contain it all. I would like to say “ditto” to the insert from the Conservation Alliance, and from a letter written to you by Ernest Labelle, as well as many other Wilson/Westbank residents who are opposed to this enormous density and change of character that you have proposed. I realize how important it is for each of us to continue to go to meetings, talk to each other and talk to all of you – and I'll continue to do that. Thank you for listening!
5/15/2009	Thomas, Shirley & Dan Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft plan. While I commend you all for a great job, some items are still not represented. We need to ensure that the wildlife that we all want protected is protected. So, the plan needs additional tools to assess & evaluate the conditions & act upon those. The plan does not seem to acknowledge that all the growth will worsen the problems we already have- workforce housing, increased needs for roads, public utilities, schools, etc. So, by growing so large, we will then need more & more to sustain what we have- a vicious cycle. The use of building nodes is a great concept, but they are all too large at buildout. The plan must have language that assures the protection of the open space we all want & need. So, please listen to the community & limit the growth in these nodes. Think & then build carefully. We have only one chance & let's not spoil it. Thank you.
5/15/2009	Wagner, Lynne Interested Public	Thank you for all of the hard work you all have put into this plan... It is well done and I know you tried to include all the comments that were given to you. Thank you,

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	May, Mike Interested Public	Greetings and thank you for taking my comments,In regard to district 12 I feel this plan misses the mark of what the community is looking for. I attended many meetings and had many more discussions along the way where I heard that wildlife and scenic values lie at the core of what our community values most. I heard from planning staff in the last Rafter J informational meeting that wildlife and natural resources can't be the priority theme in every district and agree there is some merit in that statement. However to place those values second to last in south park is completely contrary to what I heard the public say.To manage growth responsibly is something that we should strive for and I think most of us agree that south park is a logical place for SOME growth. I also like starting at the north end (closest to town and public services) with the most density and moving south accordingly. That said, the plan as it stands calls for too much growth - it seems like we're actually striving for build out when we should be moving more slowly and more carefully. I also have some concern about some of the vague language in the plan. The difference between development a half mile from high school road, continuing south along south park loop and three-quarters of a mile from HS road moving south is enormous and that seemed to be brushed over in the Rafter J meeting. I'd suggest setting firm 1/2 mile parameters so there is no grey area - we'll inevitably be fighting over those questions in the future if we don't.
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hopefully if and when South Park does develop, that somehow preservation of the single family neighborhood is seriously enforced. What bothers me is the fact that 'growth' (theme #1) and work force housing (theme # 4) are higher priorities in West Jackson then (theme #7) "maintaining the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live for our local workforce" which is last in the draft FLUP for West Jackson. West Jackson is already built out except for a few small lots and I don't think you can squeeze anymore workers in West Jackson except over stuffing single family home rentals with 5, 6 and 7 unrelated people. It's a catch 22 for working people here in West Jackson who keep this valley going for the large homeowners on the outskirts. They get the protection for wildlife and scenic vistas and we get the overcrowded neighborhoods and streets for trying to do the right thing for the valley. That's some trade off. What really upsets a lot of people here in Cottonwood Park is that the planners couldn't even set up a presentation here for the draft plan. I was told it was a scheduling oversight because of Spring break. I would think that since we are on the frontline of major up zoning and traffic impacts that a meeting here would have been obvious. Theme # 5 'community facilities' states that we should "continue the district's role as home for most of the school district and parks and recreation facilities". With no promise of open space in NW South Park like a set back for a park (the depth of the high school property) on High School Road to South Park Loop Rd, West Jackson's neighborhood parks and open space will be overburdened. The plan does mention a 1/8 of a mile setback along South Park Loop Road across from Three Creek to preserve the scenic vistas of that area. That's another slap in the face to the hardworking people of West Jackson. What are we going to do when we want to walk down the South Park Loop path to see the vistas, use our periscopes to see over the ugly berms that will be on both sides of the road like a gigantic half pipe? Again it's scenic vistas for those who can afford it. We do have great parks here in Cottonwood Park but they will be maxed out especially since the Blair Apartments and the new affordable neighborhoods like Ellingwood have only the bare minimum of open space. Parking is already an issue here when families come from outside the neighborhood to use the Range View and Cottonwood Parks. How much more traffic can the "failed" High School Road take, especially if the Tribal Trails connector is built and the major up zoning of South Park occurs. Theme 3 'transportation' states that there needs to be a "balance of needs between the existing neighborhoods of District 12 and the entire community". Where's the balance when all you are doing is tipping the scale of traffic jams from the "y" to High School Road. The comp plan needs to promise that the East West collector road in Northern South Park has to be in place before any new development in South Park takes place and before the Tribal Trails connector is started. Any new neighborhood in South Park should empty on to the new East West collector and not High School Road. The scale of the NW build out should be drastically reduced also. The new draft plan is asking West Jackson to bear a lot of the burden for this plan. Maybe that is why the 'Balanced Community' Theme is dead last for West Jackson. You need to come to West Jackson and walk with us to find out what works and doesn't work here if you are going to use our West Jackson as a role model for "responsible growth". Christine Walker from The Housing Authority walked around the neighborhood with us to see and hear our concerns; perhaps officials and planners could take a field trip. I will supply the coffee and doughnuts. We have some great neighborhoods here in West Jackson and we deserve a lot better then what the present draft plan has to offer us which is basically zip right now.
5/15/2009	Koedt, Bonnie Kreps & I Interested Public	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Comp Plan.We have severe reservations about the current Plan.We think it is too focused on development, especially commercial development.We think there is not enough analysis of potential long-term results of the current Plan.We hope the planners will reconsider these issues and come up with a revised Planthat takes these fundamental issues more into account.We cannot fully support the Plan in its current form.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Barash, Jean Interested Public	Repeatedly during the Comp Plan process the Community stated that its top priority was/is PROTECTING WILDLIFE. Those results were seen in the Keypad poll, the Online survey and the U. of Wyoming phone survey. The Comp Plan, as drafted, does not reflect the sentiment of the community. Growth: The draft Comp Plan proposes too much development - up to 9,800 new residential units and 8.8 million new square feet of commercial development. Such growth goes against the stated desires of the Community. Additionally, the draft fails to analyze the implications and consequences of such massive development. Such massive commercial development can only make our workforce housing shortage worse. Nodes: The draft contends that allowing significantly increased development in designated nodes will result in more open space protection, without harming wildlife. As a resident of Wilson, I strongly disagree with that blanket statement. The proposed draft would allow up to 520 new homes in Wilson - 400 above the 120 currently allowed. As shown on Page 109 of the new draft, downtown Wilson could grow from a village of 170 units to almost 700. Fish Creek flows through the heart of Wilson. Wilson's riparian areas are home to moose, elk, fox, cutthroat trout, ducks, osprey, eagles, deer, otter, bears and an occasional mountain lion. The area immediately south of Highway 22, where we live, provides safe calving grounds for moose as well as crucial moose winter habitat. It is a complete contradiction of priorities for the Plan to say that the area's natural resources are its top priority when promoting density changes that would irrevocably degrade wildlife habitat in Wilson. Even more distressing than the proposal for such density nodes, is the fact that these nodes were designated using 15 year old Natural Resource Overlay mapping. To designate nodes, without using the newest maps - most of which have been available for over a year - is PUTTING THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE. It is also very unscientific. DATA: This draft does not give us enough specific information about the impacts of this Plan on our infrastructure - the impact of 20,000 more people on our schools, roads, taxes, water, recreational areas, our way of life. SUGGESTIONS: I urge the Planners, as well as our town and county elected officials, to keep zoning as it is under the 1994 Comp Plan. I urge our elected officials to immediately update the Natural Resource Overlay maps, using the most current scientific information - including data gathered by the Teton Science School, Wyoming Game and Fish and other sources. Would any of us rely on 15 year old information when buying a car, pricing a house, or choosing the best surgeon to do a knee replacement? I don't think so. In conclusion, I urge all involved to remember what the community has said it wants - in the order in which they said it: 1. Protect wildlife and open space. 2. Manage growth responsibly. Limit growth, if necessary to protect the above. 3. Provide affordable housing opportunities for most of our workforce - keeping in mind that we are currently at that 65% rate.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-Proposed density for this district is over 2x what is currently built. It will change the character of the area and is not appropriate.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Trauner, Gary Interested Public	I respect the work you have put into this Draft Plan. I truly want to comment and question from perhaps a bit of a higher level (we've got more time down the road for details).1) My most pressing question is where is the groundswell of support for the huge increase in nodal densities, overall density, and de-emphasis of wildlife, natural resources and limited growth? Where and from whom did the imperative for this radical departure from previous plans come from? I understand the desire for affordable housing. And this is not about NIMBY. But I don't think there is any dispute about what makes our community and valley unique: wildlife, natural resources & beauty, and rural feel/character. In my opinion, this plan emphasizes growth over those factors, and I believe the people of this county deserve to know - specifically - who pushed the change in emphasis.As the 1994 Plan stated, we can develop a sustainable economy that is not predicated on growth that alters the bedrock foundation of why we are here.We all know the free market has passed "affordable housing" by here in Jackson Hole. The only two ways to achieve true affordable housing are via government subsidy or increased density. We should strive to use those tools in a reasonable manner to keep our community vibrant and as diverse as possible WITHOUT DEPENDING ON GROWTH OR RUINING OUR VALLEY. As difficult as it may sound, no one (including myself or my children) has a "right" to live in Jackson Hole. We simply cannot accommodate everyone. However, if we think regionally, there are communities close by (Teton Valley and Alpine) with HUGE inventory (literally thousands) of affordable lots. Why not work with them to achieve our goals in a manner that improves their economy and sustains ours.Generally speaking, it has been proven that growth does not pay for itself. Putting town densities in places like Wilson and The Aspens, eventually doubling the permanent population of Jackson Hole and allowing for the eventual increase of the workforce by nearly 30,000 workers, frankly, is flat out crazy.To close, I want to repeat my main question and then make a suggestion. Question: Where is the groundswell of support for this Plan, and who specifically drove its precepts?My suggestion is simple: now that the Plan is out and has been publicized, how about another statistically valid poll/survey to determine public sentiments towards this Draft. The money will be money well spent, the feedback would serve as the basis for future decisions. There is no rush to get this right. I'd rather do nothing than make changes that can't be undone.Jeff Daugherty was quoted in the paper as saying, "The [community] surveys are not what the Comp Plan is based on...[They] were an important element but not the only element." We deserve to know who/what the other elements were, and the community deserves to be heard AND actually LISTENED TO.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Fustos, Gail A Interested Public	This is a growth-based plan. That is not acceptable. There are two primary barometers that I think should be used to figure out the best direction for Teton County 1) protection of wildlife and 2) using local traffic to measure the quality of life as stewards in a small Wyoming mountain-town within an enormous area of natural and spectacular public lands. Based on your 2008 surveys and my conversations with others, protection of this territory's wildlife is the number one priority and the reason most of us live here. According to regional statistics, wildlife road kill is increasing dramatically (as the local human population grows). More and more local people means bigger roads, more roads and more wildlife corridors being compromised or eliminated, resulting in the destruction of wildlife and their habitat. As stewards of this incredible area, it's criminal to allow this to continue. It reminds me of the history of the white man invading American Indian territories. Quality of life in Jackson in the last ten years has seen major deterioration. You may not know this unless you get out of your single-occupied motor vehicles and walk through town for about an hour on a regular basis. The metal containers most of us drive really do seal us from much of the noise and toxic fumes in town and on the county and state roads. If you have come here after living in or near a metropolitan area in the last ten years you may need to compare your walk through Jackson today with a present day hike up the Sleeping Indian to understand how loud, stinky, dirty and busy this town has become. Solution, if you want to live and/or work here you would need to present, for approval, a travel plan for you and your family that clearly shows you will only be contributing minimally (10%-20% of your local travels) to the Jackson area's traffic fiasco. Obviously, the plan would need to be monitored and enforced. My credentials on the subject of Jackson area traffic comes from twenty-two years of traveling to work and errands by walking, bicycling, carpooling and/or using Start Bus in and around Jackson and driving solo only as a LAST resort. You can see, feel and/or hear a lot more when you are outside the protection of a metal and glass container or are a passenger in a vehicle. From these many years of observing my fellow Jackson dweller/worker, I don't see most people being willing to make a sacrifice, for this special needs place, and not contribute to its ugliness (the single-occupant, multi-passenger motor vehicle traffic) most of their commutes. Consequently, with regard to a transportation strategy of simply encouraging alternative transportation it isn't going to work. Even with the huge influx of new residence to this area in the last decade, I see very few new faces on the streets commuting to their destinations using alternative transportation such as a bicycle or carpooling. Most Americans are addicted to using their vehicles and flitting around (alone) without a thought to any of the negative consequences. Solution some method of a \$3 a gallon gasoline tax on regional gasoline consumers. I would bet that there would be a big change in some ecologically incompatible behaviors. Some people might decide to leave the area. Okay. It may attract a few people to move here. Okay, as well. Other suggestions to add for a sound, comprehensive town/county plan: a) Require residence and businesses to recycle everything recyclable in this area. b) Enforce littering laws and create and/or enforce fines for overfilling garbage containers. c) NO MORE idling vehicles allowed - high cost fines. Five weeks was not nearly enough time to read, research and write our opinions regarding this massive, complicated draft comprehensive plan.
5/15/2009	Ambler, Emily Interested Public	Given the short time to respond, I want to mention a few key things. 1) There is no mention or concern for the "Community Character/County" or the quality of life. 2) The rate and size of planned growth seems very excessive which can lead to Sprawl in the County and over crowding and loss of character in Jackson. 3) Growth must be managed responsibly to include limiting growth so that there will be no harm to our wildlife and scenic places. Jackson Hole is dependent on tourism for its economy more than future growth and development. If we destroy all that has made Jackson the place it is, we will be killing the goose that laid the golden egg so to speak. It saddens me to see some of the new development in the area of Miller Park....we are beginning to look like Park City, UT which used to be a town of charm and character. Let's go really slow and keep Jackson the type of place we all will love and care for. Thank you for your consideration.
5/15/2009	Ream, Dick Interested Public	Please add my voice as a 30 year resident of Teton County and Wilson as opposing the newest version of the comp plan. It sucks on many levels. They call it a vision but it is truly a nightmare. It should not be adopted.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the April 2009 draft of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Given the limited timeframe of the first phase of the public comment period, and the extent to which the April 2009 draft represents a rewrite, rather than an update to our community's current 1994 plan, this initial correspondence will only include a brief, broad summary of our preliminary analysis. Prior to the beginning of planning commission hearings, the Conservation Alliance will submit additional, detailed comments specific to each chapter, theme, and future land use plan. The Conservation Alliance has major concerns with the draft released in April 2009 and believes that the draft, as currently written, is fundamentally off-track. Not only does the draft not represent the vision of the community in fundamental ways, but it also omits a number of important principles and policies that could positively direct long-term, strategic planning in Jackson Hole. In general, the plan has a number of vague and contradictory policies that raise more questions than they answer. There are also significant discrepancies between policy themes and the draft's planning tool – the “future land use plan” – particularly in light of the amount of development the maps propose and where. Our community has a long history of dedication and commitment to protecting the values of Jackson Hole that make it world renowned – its wildlife, open spaces, scenery, recreational opportunities and small mountain town character. Our community has long recognized that in order to protect these values we must take a unique approach to planning for development and conservation. As a result, a core objective of our current 1994 Plan is to protect rural character (low-density characteristics) throughout the valley. The 1994 Plan also emphasizes the importance of permanent protection of open space as development occurs. The new draft steps away from this underlying, basic foundation. The new draft identifies permanent protection of open space as a potential step, but doesn't provide substantial enough language to require it. Also, unlike the current plan, the new draft fails to address the range of community benefits that result from permanent protection, such as the elimination of anticipated transportation demand. If we move forward with the adoption of the draft that was put forward in April 2009, we could take a major step backwards in terms of promoting long-term stewardship of the rare assets that define Jackson Hole. While the plan includes some positive elements, including some of its concepts outlined in the vision chapter, the bulk of the document, including the future land use plan, falls far short. For example, we appreciate the new draft's intentions to shift development patterns into increasingly confined footprints. However, it misses the mark on other important aspects of planning and wildlife protection – such as the intensity, rate, and type of overall growth regardless of where it occurs. Overall growth potential in this plan should be reduced. The new draft lacks a systematic framework through which land use decisions can be approached in an integrated way. The original objective to increase cohesion among different themes was not achieved. Also, the new draft appears to lack a science-based understanding of the different community issues it seeks to address, ranging from habitat conservation to workforce housing. At a basic level, planning is a form of problem solving. Unfortunately, the draft doesn't bring forward comprehensive solution-oriented policies to address some of our community's most challenging and pressing issues. As an example, our community will not lessen our workforce housing shortage if we continue to facilitate the extent of commercial development called for and deemed reasonable in the new draft. These contradictory elements are unacceptable, particularly given the incredible extent to which the public will be called to support the achievement of other workforce housing policy objectives. As we move forward, we recognize the Comp Plan is an initial step in what will likely be a much longer process – the revision of our land development regulations. We recognize that the land development regulations will enable a more detailed discussion on some of the issues. However, given the role of the Comp Plan as a guiding vision document for the drafting of land development regulations, getting this first step right is critical. We have major concerns with the disconnect between the degree of geographic specificity (and development characterizations) outlined in the future land use plans and a lack of analysis of what is proposed. It is troubling that the new draft maps send the message that certain levels of development are appropriate without any accompanying analysis of impacts. In general, the manner in which the future land use plans are organized is not user-friendly or clear, leaving the door open to unpredictable future land use planning. Overall, this new draft does not simply encompass a “big picture” community vision and therefore should not be reviewed as such. We question the approach to prioritize themes in individual, isolated land use planning districts. This type of approach could lend to planning and decision-making that underemphasizes the importance of cumulative, valley-wide impacts. The new plan should include a more comprehensive framework to evaluate all land-use decisions. In July 2008, the Conservation Alliance submitted extensive comments outlining our concerns and recommended strategies for how the “updated” comp plan could be reworked to better uphold the will of the community. Many of these concerns and recommendations we brought forward still hold, and we will reiterate them again in future comments. And, as we have stated before, based on the community's consistently voiced top priority, theme one should be the foundation of this plan, rather than an isolated theme. In Teton County, strategic conservation of the county's unparalleled wildlife, open spaces, and scenery needs to be the organizing theme of land-use planning decisions. In closing, we will continue to voice, on behalf of documented community will and our irreplaceable wildlife, the new draft must be fundamentally changed so that it will effectively be able to protect the larger role that Jackson Hole plays in this ecosystem and for many around the world. The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, and our community, which places stewardship of the ecosystem as its top priority, deserves no less.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Bryan, Bomber Interested Public	The ceiling number of units currently proposed for the Aspens and downtown Wilson is far in excess of what these areas can absorb. The Wilson discussions since 2001 have been heavily weighed toward minimal increase in residential and commercial capacity. The latest Wilson Mixed Use numbers for residential were a +98 units and now we're looking at 500+! Regardless of the fact Wilson has already absorbed a lopsided (high) percentage of workforce housing, I know it's the wrong geographic location in our valley to put more density. Downtown Wilson is split in 1/2 by a major 2 lane road and WYDOT does not have current plans to improve and/or widen this stretch of hwy 22. They do not have it on their calendar. I know the density (population increase) won't happen over night or even next year, but I know it's the wrong decision to deem this high number a maximum cap. Other than major traffic to and from Teton Valley, Wilson has little traffic and impact, and that's why the wildlife frequent the area. There's NFS access and lots of water and this won't change. The wildlife will suffer with more congestion over the years and this wildlife concern is the community's #1 concern. Human Needs are also important and should be on an equal basis with wildlife, but Wilson is not the smart location for massive additional population. The character of the street-scape is vital to those who live and use Wilson as their 'home' and this should not change b/c special interest groups feel this geographic location needs to have a higher percentage of workforce housing. For those who know me, I'm an advocate of workforce housing, but Wilson proper is not the right place. The Aspens, west side of Hwy 390, would appear to be more appropriate, but still not the best choice. Additional workforce housing belongs near major grocery stores, the bulk of employment and four lane highways - Keep Town as Heart b/c this makes the retailer's businesses prosper. Packing in housing b/c a fifteen year old plan defined Wilson as a 'node' is ridiculous. Please listen to those who live and breath her now.
5/15/2009	Jorgensen Associates, P Interested Public	We are writing to express our strong support of the overall vision and goals set in the April 3, 2009 draft revision of the Jackson- Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We applaud your efforts to bring the Comprehensive Plan into conformance with the current state of the community it serves. We support the vision that recognizes the need for balance between environmental and wildlife protection and smart, responsible growth that is essential to maintaining a vibrant, sustainable community. While there are elements of the plan that need refinement, the basic concepts it puts forth are on target. Its adoption will put in place tools that will enhance predictability of future development. The definition of specific dense development nodes in both the town and county will protect natural resources and wildlife habitat, and provide the opportunity for much needed housing for the work force that is the foundation and soul of our community. The potential for change always elicits a strong emotional response from those who perceive that it may negatively impact them. It is important to be mindful that some interests that are in a position to spend significant resources (including time) on critiquing planning efforts do not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the community at large. We believe that the changes for which this plan will serve as guide will result in a healthier, stronger community, and are long overdue.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	This plan will guide the Valley's planning and development for the next 10-20 years. In the next step, it will guide us in amending land development regulations. Stakes are high, and outcomes permanent. We have to get this right. What follows is a summary assessment provided to my neighbors – major issues and changes needed. The current draft is not the community's plan – far from it. Yet! Thanks go to a number of South Park Neighbor economists, planning experts, developers, rural land owners, biologists, workforce homeowners, affordable homeowners, builders, educators and others that helped shape this assessment. We trust this collaborative work will assist you in reviewing the issues and addressing needed solutions. Comprehensive Plan Priorities – Major Issues, Changes Needed Overall: Community Vision vs. the New Plan Draft • Our plan, our responsibility, our legacy, is to guarantee that this valley, its wildlife, its vistas, its uniqueness, are preserved for all time. There are no bailouts if we fail. • We expect the plan to work to protect Jackson Hole's cherished wildlife and open spaces, while also addressing workforce housing needs in a measured way. • The new plan draft lacks the policy direction needed to accomplish these goals. • Although there are good things in the plan that respond to the community's desires (such as creation of an appointed, volunteer Environment Commission concerned with wildlife issues and human-caused impacts, or heightened emphasis on workforce housing), the foundation of the plan rests on a false assumption - that the community wants more growth. The existing (1994) plan says our community's vision is to 'promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth.' (p 5) The new (2009) plan says 'the concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that...ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs.' (p 8) Hunh? • The draft also fails the community's mandate to consider the implications of build-out, and evaluate the consequences of overall growth in the valley. • By heading for a potentially larger build-out, not having clear prioritized open space incentives (especially in greater South Park, where density incentives will be directed 100% to workforce housing, not at all to open space preservation), and recommending almost 9 million square feet of new job-creating commercial space, we assure that workforce housing shortages will only get worse, open space likely will not be protected, quality of life will diminish, and most importantly wildlife and natural resources will erode further. All in a failed attempt to focus the plan solely on pattern of growth – and not respond to the public's desire for a less-growth strategy. • 'We cannot grow our way out of growth-related problems.' – Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance • People and wildlife both lose in this plan. • The plan fails on all important points – quality of life, workforce housing, taxes, wildlife, open space, rural land owners. Wildlife, Natural Resources, Open Space • Wildlife and natural resources should be the top priority in all districts, without compromise • Draft Plan Principle 1.1: 'Maintain viable populations of all native species' Policy 1.1 g: Permeability of development for wildlife: 'In all areas, except those designated for mixed use or more intense development in the Town of Jackson or County nodes, development will be designed to accommodate wildlife movement.' We believe, to achieve Draft Plan Principle 1.1, the design of development in ALL nodes identified for growth must allow for wildlife movement permeability. • The existing (1994) plan includes an entire chapter on natural and scenic resources, defining them as distinct key assets of the community. The new draft de-emphasizes the importance of scenic resources. This is particularly evident for South Park. The existing (1994) plan (Chapter 1, p 4) identifies South Park as a key area for scenic resource protection. The Scenic Resources Overlay covers major sections of this district, including open space where 1) ranching should continue, 2) wildlife habitat should be preserved, and 3) the visual qualities of scenic vistas should be protected. The 1994 plan specifically identifies the hay meadows of South Park, the Spring Gulch scenic area, ranchlands along Teton Village Road, and Buffalo Valley as areas to be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible, to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat, and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, as well as to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of community character. The 1994 plan adds: 'where possible, the County should be flexible with its development regulations as an encouragement to land owners to permanently protect these wildlife, scenic, and agricultural areas' (p 5)

- The new draft plan does not contain a mechanism to permanently protect rural open space. Moreover, it specifically removes South Park from areas now recommended for preservation. (Policy 1.6a)

Growth

- Growth will occur. Current entitlements are huge (with much of it 'shovel-ready' but currently on hold, due to financing and/or feasibility issues): over 6,000 new homes and over 4M sq ft of additional commercial space. These entitlements include platted but unbuilt lots, base property rights, and significant remaining resort development, which together will take our community from a current population of 20,000 to over 30,000.
- At stake in current plan discussions is growth beyond existing entitlements - 'upzones.' Upzones will potentially add 2,100 more homes and 4.8M more commercial sq ft than where we were already headed (Appendix I).
- So it is not growth vs. no growth – it is how much additional growth.
- The draft plan foresees future growth as follows:
[see comment for reference tabular data]
- The number of housing units would more than double, from almost 10,000 existing right now to a total buildout of almost 20,000. Assuming approximately 2 residents per housing unit (Planner range is 1.74 -2.37), the housed population in Jackson and Teton County would also more than double, to almost 40,000 residents.
- Commercial space would more than double. Assuming approximately 4 new jobs created per thousand sq ft of commercial space (Planners estimate 1 job/240 sq ft, Appendix C, p 16), that means over 35,000 directly-created new jobs and (see above) an even greater housing deficit than we have today – far greater.
- All of these new residents and workers would create demands for additional workers in the form of new needed teachers, nurses, police, plow drivers, etc., further compounding the valley's already escalating housing shortage.
- About 20,000 people currently live in Jackson Hole, others commute here to work, and at peak times of the year, about 20,000 more tourists are visiting daily. With the tremendous demand for new workers, the increase in new residents, increasing tourist visitation, and even more commuting workers, the plan leads to a deeper workforce housing shortage, tremendous increase in commuters, and doubling of the resident population. Just to illustrate, today's peak summer driving and parking conditions become the everyday norm – or worse.
- 'Responsible Growth' should be deleted as a priority in the Comprehensive Plan. It isn't one (even if responsible).
- Overall buildout should be reduced
- Maximum build-out should be specifically defined, capped and permanent, with a slow, sustainable rate of growth over an extended time
- Job-creating commercial should be constrained.
- If a growth theme needs to be articulated in the plan, call it Reduced Build-Out/Growth Rate. Then consider 'managing the pattern of growth' as a critical sub-goal.

Workforce Housing / Community Diversity

- Workforce housing inducers need to be addressed as much as solutions.
- Non-growth solutions should be prioritized
- The community wants less growth while addressing workforce housing. This could be accomplished with minimal growth by:
Identifying a permanent funding source to purchase and redevelop existing housing.
Increasing housing mitigation rates on new residential and commercial development
- The plan will worsen workforce housing. Commercial and homes create new demands. Example: Rocky Mountain Bank, recently approved on Broadway, will create 65 jobs. Mitigation is set to provide just over 1 (one) workforce housing unit.
- The plan recommends new job-creating commercial that would require almost 12 projects of the size currently proposed for the NW corner of South Park, just to house all of the new workers (assuming 2 workers per home). Even with foreseen growth there won't be room for this many new residents, as the housing expansion won't keep up.
- Reduce the job-creating commercial in the plan, and require all development to fully offset direct impacts on workforce housing and infrastructure demands. Achieve this through adequate housing mitigation rates (requirements for developers to provide housing for most of their workers) and exactions (fees to cover impacts to parks, roads, sewer, and water).
- In-fill in town should be the first priority before considering expansion into targeted County nodes (including NW South Park) or Town "growth areas"
- The plan prioritizes needs of humans who may live here in the future over the needs of current residents. The needs of current residents should take priority.

Outcomes & Impacts

- The final plan must have clear and specific data to show outcomes and impacts on wildlife, traffic, roads, schools, environmental, taxes, and other

quality of life issues. • Costs of growth: Taxes will go up. Social services will get worse, not better, as demand increases and funding falls behind. Crime and traffic will go up. This is not wildlife vs. the people. All lose. In fact, people lose the most.

- Who benefits from growth? A few landowners will, while the majority of rural land owners will lose opportunities for economic return, even while they continue to support open space and wildlife.
 - When clarifying outcomes and impacts, the plan should also look at documented motorist conflict zones, and require wildlife-friendly solutions
- Plan Language
- New (2009) plan's vision statement: 'Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and natural resources and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner.' (p 7)
 - The plan needs to clearly define 'Human Needs'. These should be tied back to other priorities, recognizing that human needs will be best met when they do not depend on continued growth in a hopeless attempt to grow ourselves out of a growth-caused situation.
 - The terms 'Human Needs' and 'Community Benefit' are dangerously vague, taking us back to setting policy with three votes on Town Council or County Commission.
 - 'Sustainability' is a plan priority, yet growth limits are not defined, determined, or set in the plan.
 - Sustainable development ties together concern for the carrying capacity of natural systems with the social challenges facing humanity. As early as the 1970s, 'sustainability' was used to describe an economy 'in equilibrium with basic ecological support systems.' Ecologists have pointed to the 'limits of growth' and presented the alternative of a 'steady state economy' in order to address environmental concerns.*
 - In the new plan draft, sustainability is selectively defined so as to support growth. 'The concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that ...ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs.' (p 8)
 - Can we really have our cake and eat it too? Others say no, not really. 'The idea of sustainable development is sometimes viewed as an oxymoron because development inevitably depletes and degrades the environment.' **
 - We should replace the definition of 'sustainability' in the draft plan with the language of our current (1994) plan, where the overarching goal is to break our dependence on continued growth in order to achieve human needs. We want 'an economy not dependent on growth.'

* Meadows, Meadows, Randers, & Behrens, 1971. The Limits to Growth. New York: Universe Books.

** Redclift, M. (2005). Sustainable Development (1987-2005): an Oxymoron Comes of Age. Sustainable Development 13(4): 212-27.

South Park – Poster Child for Growth

Question: does South Park have any wildlife values or open space worth preserving? The following picture and caption ran in the Jackson Hole Daily May 1:

[see comment for referenced picture]

A bald eagle perches on a fence post while looking for a meal in a field Wednesday morning in South Park. Bradly J. Boner / JACKSON HOLE DAILY
In the new draft plan, language states or implies a future for South Park that qualitatively could also happen to other valley 'nodes' targeted for growth.

- Unwinding of protections for open space, and scenic and wildlife values (Policy 1.6a; Policy 2.3b)
- Dramatic upzoning, commercial and residential footholds established, without protection from future expansion (Appendix I, p 4; South Park District description p110; Policy 2.5b)
- Density incentives directed to workforce housing only (and not to open space protection) (Policy 2.3b)
- Removal of wildlife connectivity values (no requirement for wildlife permeability in development design standards) (Principle 1.1, p19)

Example:

The plan proposes eliminating all language calling for permanent open space protection for portions of South Park, and for protection of scenic and wildlife values in the South Park region: 2009 Plan, Policy 1.6a: 'Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County: The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land and to continue farming in Alta, Buffalo Valley, the Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and south Fall Creek Road.'

South Park was first on the list in this section of the 1994 Plan. The new language strips South Park of such protection, implying that the entirety of the South Park district does not deserve conservation and directly unwinding the protection in our existing plan. (1994 Comprehensive Plan, Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1) - pg. 24).

For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order:

Date	Name	Comment
		• Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district • Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan. • Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'north to south starting at High School Road.' • Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes (including NW South Park) or targeted Town growth areas. • Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan. • Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley. • At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing. • The reduced NW South Park node to have a 1/8 mile pull-back from both High School and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop. • The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability. • The design of any East-West connector road to not encourage further sprawl towards Rafter J in the future. • The design of the reduced NW node to not add traffic volumes onto High School Road. • No annexation of the new reduced node until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards. • The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the 'Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	We totally agree with the following statements: "Where government and other organizations are falling short in the implementation of this Plan, the community will hold them accountable and take additional action as needed." "The collective input from all non-profits will be helpful in monitoring community perception of and satisfaction with this Plan." P.140
5/15/2009	Goralski, Jim and Linda Interested Public	WE just want to join the many other comments that you have already heard, seen and read concerning displeasure, dismay, and disappointment regarding the direction of the 'new' Comp plan. We feel the new plan does not convey the spirit of the existing plan, nor represent the will or wishes of the current residents of Teton county. Given the loud, negative reactions by upset residents (and voters), you must realize that we look to you, the elected officials of Teton County, to do the right thing and reject this 'plan as it is currently proposed'. We have been at many meetings, written letters, and talked with our neighbors across this community and honestly do not know anyone who feels this plan represents them, or the values expressed by other residents of Teton County. It appears that 'future' potential residents are being given priority over the residents that already work here, pay taxes and are 'the community'. Unfortunately, the plan seems to focus first on growth (not a community priority) and then tries to force this growth into unrealistic, high-density 'nodes' in communities that have rejected the very idea of the 'node' concept. Aggressive commercial growth is being planned that will, realistically, provide low-paying service jobs for people that can't afford to live here, thereby exasperating the current issues of housing, service provision, transportation, etc. The Planners appear to have their own agenda regarding growth and don't listen to their ultimate employers, the taxpayers of Teton County. We're expecting more from all of you and will certainly look to your actions on this issue as a guide to ours in the voting booth.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	The only additional issue that will need to be addressed as part of the Tribal Trails connector is its impact on South Park Loop--which potentially could destroy what makes the loop interesting--all the alder and cottonwood trees. Achieving this themes goal will be the most difficult task at hand.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	What will we look like in 15 years? What changes will be needed in our road system. How many new START buses will be needed? What new facilities will be needed for the buses? What new schools will be needed? When do we anticipate a need to expand the Town sewer treatment facility?

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	RE: Waldron Property and Wilson Mixed Use Boundary The 15 acre Waldron Property and the properties located south on Fall Creek Road do not belong within the Wilson Mixed Use Boundary. The Planners inclusion of this piece within the boundary is arbitrary and is not consistent with public comment received in the Mixed Use Village Planning process or the current Comprehensive plan update. During the Wilson Mixed Use Village Planning process the citizens of Wilson made it abundantly clear that Wilson should only grow to the size currently allowed under today's zoning. Please reference Planner's notes from the October 4, 2007 Open House "All were opposed to additional density on the Waldron property." Throughout the Mixed Use Planning process the Waldron Property was shown in yellow or "single family low". Myself and many other citizens were upset when between open houses the 15 acre property changed from Yellow NC-SF which is the current zoning to MU-R or Mixed Use Residential. We were concerned that by including the Waldron Property within in the boundary would increase the likelihood that property could be slated for High Density Development. Repeatedly Alex Norton claimed that this was not the case. We realized our fears were well justified when the Comprehensive Plan Revision was released allowing for High Density Development on the Waldron Property. Furthermore the maps provided to the residents of Teton County by the planning staff during the during the Comprehensive Plan Update showed "South on Fall Creek Road" as a distinct area and the "Town of Wilson" as another. The demarcation point was Highway 22. The feedback that the residents of Teton County provided for "South on Fall Creek Road" was to preserve the rural character and not to allow any additional density. This only makes sense as the lots that are located south on Fall Creek Road are larger and adjacent to large conservation properties including the Rosseter property and the Fish Creek Ranch. The planners only justification for the inclusion of the Waldron property being located within the boundary was "walkability," while ignoring the many reasons why this special property is not the appropriate place to have high density housing. The Waldron Property is considered Critical Moose Habitat by Fish & Game. It is vital wildlife corridor for a host of animals and is adjacent to hundreds of acres under conservation easement. The property primarily consists of pristine wetlands which according to the Wilson Charette/Mixed Use Village meetings were to be preserved and enhanced. The views as you enter Wilson and look south down Fall Creek road are spectacular. The views are just one of the many special aspects of the "character" of Wilson. The citizens of Teton County have stated that wildlife is their number one priority. The possibility of high density housing on the Waldron Property flies in the face of the expressed vision of the citizens of Wilson and Teton County. Please remove the Waldron property from the boundary and extend the same protections that are provided in the plan for all the properties located south on Fall Creek Road.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	My appreciation to community members for asking that this theme be included in the Plan.
5/15/2009	Hawley, James Interested Public	We also need a comprehensive study to determine how the road system in Jackson will be negatively affected by a considerable increase in additional traffic. Given the proposed substantial increase in population, it is inevitable that roads will need to be widened since Jackson has a built-in bottleneck at the town square. If roads are not widened, we will be facing a major problem with gridlock.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	All development costs the community money. Finding a better balance to have ANY development, whether residential, commercial, industrial or otherwise, contribute it's fair share to community costs is essential. The exaction's now are insufficient to offset costs to the community.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, III Interested Public	Longmont CO "One percent of Capital Improvement Projects of more than \$50,000 is allocated for the Art in Public Places" This is an example of one of 300+ public art ordinances across the US, allocating public funds for Capital Improvement Projects for public art. The first 1% for Art program began in 1959, and has inspired countless others. Principle 7.3: The Town of Jackson and Teton County must consider a '1% for Art' program to deliver quality public art experiences within the town and county nodes. Public art generates community spirit and enhances the quality of life for everyone.
5/15/2009	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	While looking at the community infrastructure, I would recommend the county consider imposing a fee for new commercial developers to fund public art to be placed at the gateways to our community. Many times, the first thing people see when arriving to our valley is industrial/commercial development. To beautify the landscape and to compliment our natural beauty, it would be nice to see an icon such as the elk antler arches in the town square for people to remember and mentally refer to Jackson Hole.
5/15/2009	Larkin, Amy Interested Public	Please add language to the Comprehensive Plan that endorses the arts in Jackson Hole. Supporting and funding the arts and local artists is vital to our community. Public art invigorates residential and commercial zones, developing new places of beauty and interest. It provides an intangible but real extra dimension to daily life. Public art has the capacity to reveal insights about our natural surroundings, cultural history and community connections. It can encourage private investment in civic space. thank you

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	To discourage vehicle use, Level D will be an acceptable LOS. This has not worked in any other community. Why do we think it will work here? -Other communities have struggled to reduce single vehicle trips by 1-2 percent. Why is our Plan based on reducing trips by 10 percent? -Policy 6.3.e seems to be in conflict with 6.2.d. Maximizing interconnection and redundancy will not discourage single vehicle use. -In complete agreement with 6.3.d. We need to provide wildlife crossings. The first step is to identify key areas and start evaluating options. -If we cannot reach transportation goals, development should be slowed down until we reach them. Our current traffic growth rate of 2 % is unacceptable. -Per capita miles traveled are not a good metric. Better to examine total vehicle miles driven, since it is the driver for wider roads and the need for redundant roads.
5/15/2009	Steinberg, Ethan Interested Public	i've been a resident of Wilson for about 10 years. i feel strongly that the planned/zoned growth for Wilson should be much less than what the plan looks like. I recognize there are many interests at work here but believe the vision of a majority people is not consistent with the plan. As planners/public servants i feel you're accomodating developers and people who 'have yet to move to Wilson' with this plan. That is not your constituency and come election time I expect to work hard to make sure my representation better reflects what i and what i believe the community actually wants. please don't increase the potential density in Wilson anywhere near the degree as is proposed right now. Thanks for your hard work.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	I'm very enthusiastic about some of the proposals in this section, probably because they seem like tangible solutions that can have a measurable impact, and they require not only creativity, planning and coordination by agencies, but a demonstrated commitment on the part of all residents.
5/15/2009	Hawley, James Interested Public	Predictability is a term that was brought up repeatedly in the Comp. Plan presentation, but it is absent from the written plan even though it is a significant part of any future plan. In order to establish predictability, the Comp Plan needs to demand uniformity in zoning to ensure predictability of how neighborhoods will be developed. We need to eliminate spot zoning so that all parcels on the same street in the same area have the same zoning. We also need to eliminate rezoning developments so that we avoid unacceptable density levels in subdivisions and in town such as the Teton Meadows' project that requested a variance in zoning so they could build 500 houses/condos on a property zoned for 50. Such an increase in density should be prohibited, so it isn't even considered by the Town Council or the County Commissioners.
5/15/2009	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	The transportation section is so idealistic and absolutely impossible to achieve. We live in a rural area which is 6 months under snow. I think the bike paths are a wonderful addition to our community but certainly not an option or alternative to car transportation. If any future development is planned and achieved in the "nodes", the development should not be approved until the road system can handle the additional number of people using that road. To consider allowing dense development without having a reasonable road plan involved is very irresponsible planning.
5/15/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	It is great to acknowledge that road widening is not what the community wants, and not what is the best for the wildlife and natural resources. But, the solutions that are offered are essentially to keep the LOS on roads low, increase bus rider ship from the nodes (yet there is no analysis of realistic rider ship expectations), and get people onto their bikes and into their walking shoes. Changing the habits of valley residents is a lofty yet honorable goal, but cannot be the only thing that is relied upon to reduce traffic and limit the need for road expansions. In January, when you live in the Aspens and need something from the hardware store, or to pick up your mail, or to go to work, your first thought would be to get into your car and drive to town. Right now, there are busses from the Aspens to Town. If you add any number of people to that Aspens community, perhaps your bus rider ship will increase (due to the net increase of people living there), but so will the number of people getting into their cars. The only way to reduce congestion on the roads is to reduce the number of people living out there that need to use the roads. This sort of analysis of the impacts of the amount and rate growth in the nodes on all of the themes/chapters is critically important, and noticeably absent. An example of the interconnectedness that the Plan needs to acknowledge: Busses, on cold winter nights, idle all night, outside. Building a START bus storage facility, as is one of the strategies in this chapter, would also help to alleviate our resource use and fossil fuel emissions, as per Theme 1, particularly if the START system is slated to expand. This connection needs to be acknowledged.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	, Interested Public	Tourism is outlined in the plan as a "non-consumptive" industry. "Take only pictures, leave only footprints" is not just some cute saying. People fly in here, yes, or drive their RVs across the country to see Yellowstone. They eat food when they are here, they stay in hotels that require water to wash the sheets. But they are not taking a piece of this community with them. They are not extracting oil, or burning down forests, or necessarily detracting from the experiences of concurrent and future visitors. It is important to realize that language such as "non-consumptive" is critical to maintain in this Plan even if the activities in question are not entirely without consumption. Relatively speaking, tourism is less consumptive than many other industries. And, it is nice to have goals out there to strive toward. "A large majority of the community agrees with putting a cap on resort development," - and then the Plan goes on to say that exceptions to this growth cap are allowed, and also to identify Teton Village as a node, and say that the County Commissioners will accommodate changes to the Village Master Plan. Where did that come from?
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Resorts should be maintained at current levels. Any work force housing and convenience retail should come out of the current approved development. They were given tremendous upzones as part of their Resort Master Plans. -Skier days are not a good metric for community first unless you separate locals and tourists in the data. A better metric would be to maintain the ratio of full time residents to tourist by comparing dwelling units to APO. - Lodging occupancy as an indicator can be misleading. As we build more lodging the average occupancy will go down unless we increase the number of tourists. Increasing the number of tourists is not sustainable. This metric will also be confused by the trend to high end lodging which focuses on fewer guests who spend more.
5/15/2009	McCandless, Lyndsay Interested Public	Policy 5.1.d I think is very important to see expanded. This community is filled with creative forward thinking people, entrepreneurs. We want them to stay here and open businesses, but right now it costs so much to open and run a business that it seems like we might only be able to afford bigger chain stores. Affordable leases, live/work spaces will support and encourage a locally-oriented, strong and diverse economy.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	This section emphasizes resort-related, and construction-related businesses, with no mention of a growing "telecommuting" workforce. I honestly don't know how significant it is, but I'm aware of many "new" residents engaged in work that is not located in, or directly connected to, this area. What impacts do those businesses have on the economy of this community?
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	What is described in this section sounds reasonable--until you look at the projected non-residential growth in the appendix. Those projections seem at odds with this theme.Finding some way to support local businesses in the central part of Jackson will do more to maintain character than encouraging out-of-town businesses. Stabilizing rents is critical. The tourist economy of Jackson is truly only about 5 months--being able to survive the rest of the year is very tricky. When property values jump excessively, causing rents to rise, local businesses have a really tough time.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	This theme should be made number two behind wildlife. A government's prime responsibility is the health, safety and welfare of its citizens. See my initial comments
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Policy 6.2.d: This I feel is a totally unacceptable policy. As I have previously said, we are dependent on a resort economy and we must provide class A services for our visitors or they will simply choose somewhere else to go and we will have managed wound our economic driver.Our infrastructure is most important and should be considered before all other development occurs.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	Prin. 6.2:While terrific in lofty concept, we live in a rural community. In order to use the Start Bus, I would drive 8 miles to Stilson; wait for a bus to town; wait for a transfer bus in town, possibly; wait for a second or third transfer bus for additional errands requiring greater storage than a bike could handle, or assuming bad weather; reverse the process to go home. CRAZY! In a CITY, buses run every 10 minutes and have a web of patterns to choose from. We are not there. We are too rural. The only way to reduce single car use will be increased fuel prices. The county currently only provides two parking areas for car drops/start pick ups. Where are the rest going to be put?Potential Projects:Yes to TribalTrails Connection. Should have been done 15 years ago.Yes to upgrading Snow King Av.Yes to a redesign of Hwy 390, and at the least an additional stop light between the Westside Store and the Village to create a traffic flow.Yes to transit between Jackson and the Airport, with service using a town parking dropoff.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Since the first studies were done in the 1980s the area of the Porter ranch in South Park has been identified as the most appropriate area for high density development. Here planners have the opportunity to work with a clean slate in their efforts to create new housing opportunities. This is very different from the Aspens and the Town of Wilson. Here you have existing communities who have over the years built and enjoyed small subcommunities. It is very unsavory to have a group of planners descend on these communities and propose a significant change in the character of these communities. I believe that The Aspens and The Town of Wilson should be entirely removed from the consideration as nodes for increased development. 390 and 22 are already approaching capacity for comfortable and safe travel. With the additions to Teton Village and the increased density there, travel particularly on 390 is going to become unbearable. Those housing units slated for these two areas should simply disappear or be reallocated to the other nodes. Given wildlife, economic and infrastructure considerations they really should just disappear.
5/15/2009	Linn, Ellen Interested Public	My comments on the Proposed Comp Plan for Teton County/Jackson regarding development in Wilson are: We, as residents of Wilson/Westbank are being pushed and cajoled into something that a "developer" wants when he/she wants to maximize the density. Ninety plus new units in Wilson is TOO MUCH for the VILLAGE of Wilson. Too much commercial is also included in the plan. The existing commercial seems to be very adequate. Adding a cleaners and/or a pharmacy will not keep people from going to Jackson. Most people will be working in Jackson anyway and will make at least five round trips a week. Increased traffic trying to get on Route 22, (in either direction) is not very smart. It's dangerous, particularly right at the bottom of Teton Pass. There is currently un-rented office space in Wilson as well as bank and/or retail space. Regarding residential development - an additional 90 units is TOO MUCH. We cherish the wildlife and 90 new dogs will eliminate the wildlife. The habitat will be diminished by more houses. I feel that 20 to 30 residential units might be acceptable. A good design with open space would still allow for some habitat and feeling of being in the country instead of in a city. The development is slated for a dangerous place with regard to entering the highway at the bottom of the Pass. I thought it was known as "Tommy's Truck Stop" for a reason. I believe that the back of the property contains a lot of wetlands. The bottom line is the proposed plan provides for too much density. Please consider keeping wildlife and reducing, not increasing traffic. Please remember this is the VILLAGE of Wilson, not a NODE.
5/15/2009	Doyle, Doug Interested Public	Please reconsider the plan adding over 500 homes to the Wilson area the town can not take that increase. HWY22 crossing will not be safe, school will not be able to handle the increase #'s, character of the town will be changed for ever and wildlife impact will be too large. Thank you,
5/15/2009	Phillips, Brian Interested Public	Wilson is NOT a "node" that should have additional subsidized housing and 100,000 sq ft of commercial space.....there are plenty of houses available right now.....there is plenty of commercial space available....walking town....where Hwy 22 give me a break....We voted you into office and we can vote you out....just remember you work for the tax payer and from the looks of it from the attendance at Wilson Elementary last week.....NO ONE SINGLE PERSON was in favor of this proposal. It is appalling that this meeting was not on the public record....shame shame shame
5/15/2009	Rossetter, Birdie Interested Public	Is anyone listening? How many more meetings do we have to attend? How many more letters do we have to write? How many more emails do we have to send? Wilson does not like or want the Comp Plan as written. Eighty or more houses plus at least eighty dogs plus one hundred and 50 or more cars on the pasture land on South Fall Creek Road in Wilson equals Night Light Pollution, Noise Pollution and NO Wildlife. As to the redevelopment of downtown Wilson.- We already have a Hardware store, Catering service, 2 Restaurants, a Bagel shop, a Bank, a Ski and Bike shop, a Barber shop, a Post Office, a Medical facility, an Elementary school, a Community Center and Hungry Jack's for everything else. People will always drive to the ski area parking lot, the golf course, the Snake River, Teton Park and Jackson no matter how many so called amenities are added to Wilson. Bus service is not an adequate option when you have jobs, errands appointments etc. both North and South of the Y. Do we really want Wilson to become "Every Town USA" ?

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	This is a plan for the destruction of Wilson, and for Jackson Hole. Why did you hold all the public meetings if the wishes of the community were going to be absolutely disregarded? What a sham of a public process. I attended several of the meetings, and the residents of Wilson were very clear that we do not want our community destroyed by making it a focus for high-density development. The planners assured us that we had made our wishes clear and they understood that we do not want increased density in Wilson. I am horrified by what this new "plan" proposes for Wilson and for the rest of Jackson Hole. How many jobs does Wilson provide? The vast majority of people living in Wilson have to commute elsewhere to work. That won't change by adding hundreds of new units. What we will have is hundreds more cars on the road every day as the new residents commute to work. You also can't make a case that Wilson has little value as wildlife habitat and therefore is suitable for intensive human development. I have moose in my yard every winter, coyotes and foxes roaming around, trumpeter swans and geese and ducks on Fish Creek, elk in my yard this past winter, river otters using Fish Creek, and many other species of mammals and birds in all seasons. How many of them will persist with the intensity of development you are proposing? I am also dismayed at the lack of detail and vagueness of the "Plan". How is anyone supposed to be able to tell what's actually proposed? We need much more concrete detail in order to comment intelligently. Just saying things like "duplexes, triplexes, and four-plexes are appropriate" tells us nothing--where will they be? What areas will be upzoned? What amount of "worker housing" will entitle a landowner to upzoning? Which areas will be off-limits to increased density in order to protect wildlife? We need more time, we need more detail and less fluff. I, like many people I've talked to, am appalled by this pseudo-plan.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Last line of the test states "The Town of Jackson will remain the resort, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." Why is the Town the Resort center of the Region? This furthers the battle between Town and Teton Village for tourists.
5/15/2009	Cottingham, Mike Interested Public	I studied planning in graduate school and the presentation I saw at Teton Village was a textbook planning presentation. Jackson Hole is not a "textbook community". Our community is an extraordinarily unique place and requires an unconventional approach in order to protect its special features. I am outraged that this high density node concept is even being entertained. I am also outraged that certain developers appear to have had privileged access to this concept. Finally, I am extremely angered over the timing of this concept and the limited time for public comment. It could not have been planned more perfectly in order to minimize home owner opposition. Nobody is here now and you know that.
5/15/2009	Hlitschler, Lynn and Ton Interested Public	General Comments to Public Process: The Comment period is too short for adequate representation. Many of the owners of properties in the Aspens and surrounding areas are seasonal residents and will not have had the opportunity to even know of the potential changes you are suggesting for their residence areas. They do not receive the local newspapers at their other residence and there have been no mailings or emails sent to inform them of this planning process. No public meeting has been scheduled for the Aspens/Teton Pines areas despite the fact that the proposed housing increase here is 20% greater than proposed for Teton Village, which generates most of the traffic flowing from Jackson, Wilson areas to the Teton Village, not Aspens/Teton Pines. Specific Comments regarding the Aspens/Teton Pines Planning Comp Plan: The two lots identified in the Aspens "Future Single Family Mixed - Type" plan, i.e., dense housing category, have Deed Recorded zoning restrictions on them that prohibit such development. These restrictions PROHIBIT the single family residential subdivision PROPOSED IN THE COUNTY PLAN. These restrictions are State protected and zoning cannot override private restrictions. SHOULD SUCH A PRECEDENT BE SET THAT SUCH DEED RESTRICTIONS CAN BE OVERRIDDEN, THEN INDEED, ALL EASEMENT RESTRICTIONS AND DEED RESTRICTIONS THAT ARE THE BASIS OF JACKSON HOLE LAND PROTECTION EASEMENTS ARE AT RISK. THIS IS WHAT YOUR PLAN FOR THE ASPENS/TETON PINES PROPOSES. IN ADDITION, AT THIS SITE, IT PROPOSES OVER 300 DENSE HOUSING UNITS ADJACENT TO A HIGHWAY WHICH WILL ONLY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC. CONVERSELY, THE AREA OF TETON VILLAGE, WHICH REQUIRES A GREAT DEAL OF EMPLOYMENT FOR ITS ACTIVITIES, IS ONLY SLATED FOR SOME 200+ HOUSING UNITS. TETON VILLAGE INDEED IS THE AREA WHICH WILL GENERATE THE GREATEST GROWTH OF THE TWO AREAS. Might I also ask the obvious but highly unpopular question: Why have we not looked into a low rise building in Teton Village, which would be somewhat invisible against the mountain background and also consider the much needed bridge across the Snake River near the Teton Village location. Both of these suggestions, would provide significant changes to the thinking process to date. Thank you for your consideration.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	Aspens' growth: The density suggested for the Aspens is wrong. There is not the infrastructure in the commercial area to support more people, except as a commuter society. No post office; no gas station; limited banking facilities; limited food marketing; limited food choices in a range of price levels; limited space at the elementary school and all older students would be part of the mass transport problem. There are not enough jobs to support the workforce, so they will all be community to their employment. This flies in the face of everything you are preaching about limiting road use and creating 'Nodes' of communities. No more growth at the ASPENS!

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Heilesen, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We strongly object to the density proposed for South Park. The community clearly expressed its opposition to such density during the Teton Meadows application, and also the Comprehensive Plan public input process. South Park has never been a "node"; it is a semi-rural suburban outskirts area of Jackson, with open space, water meadows, and wildlife dependent on those resources. The effect of designating it a node, and allowing higher densities, will be to severely impact one of the Valley's key wildlife corridors. Moreover, it would simply move Jackson outward, creating both the need and the excuse for more high density further south.
5/15/2009	Webb, Deborah Interested Public	I am very opposed to the plan for both the Aspens and Wilson. My primary reason is that both of the "pods" on the Westbank are home to year round wildlife. Of course our biggest wildlife population concern in this valley is the decrease numbers of moose. This is not due to predation in this part of Jackson Hole, but due to human development and loss of habitat. Are you all familiar with Dr. Joel Berger's extensive study of our valley's moose population? Teton Village Road is has the highest moose mortality rate in Jackson Hole according to his study. Those of us who live along 390 and 22 are sick of seeing the moose carcasses along the side of those roads.And increase in traffic that has been profound and detrimental.I do see some good ideas and positive aspects to the proposed plan, but the overall number of humans proposed in these two nodes is excessive and the resulting stress on the highways and further degradation of the wildlife habitat is unacceptable.I also own property in Teton Village and vehemently opposed the scale of development that was approved there. Further development on highway 390 in light of what has already been approved is ludicrous.I don't support the high amount of growth set forward on the westbank in this plan draft. I believe we need to grow, modestly, first by redeveloping areas near elementary, middle, high schools as well as jobs in and near the existing "Heart of Jackson Hole". Just looking at the Gregory Lane region, many of those lots could be smartly redeveloped (and using green techniques) where children and adults can easily bus, walk and ride to their destinations.I fully support exploring the 'Hostel' housing idea for our many seasonal employees and would like to see the planners address this low cost alternative immediately.Thank you for your time.I expect to see large changes made to this first proposal. I believe this valley was never meant to house 'everyone' that might want to live here and this plan does not address smart, slow growth or our precious resources.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	The Buildout Calculations (Part 3) are the most confusing part of this document especially when combined with App. 1. The ranges create some unacceptable numbers--specifically the non-residential new floor area. Doubling the non-residential square foot imprint on this valley will create an unacceptable number of new employees--and the housing numbers do not reflect (as far as I can see) taking care of the employees and their families. Again--this issue seems to be driving the plan rather than balancing our future by paying attention to what the valley can support while saving habitat for wildlife--particularly winter habitat and migration routes. Coming to grips with a balance on growth potential will require a look at optimal numbers and not just "more of the same" as this plan proposes. If we don't start addressing this issue now we will certainly irreparably harm this valley's future. What happened to your ad: "Growth Rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts to development natural resources and community infrastructure." I don't see this as part of the plan.Putting in place a serious and on-going way of monitoring buildout as well as analyzing impacts -- before the fact-- is equally important. This plan doesn't accomplish this. Wildlife is a fragile part of the picture and the most vulnerable. Too many people will cause irreparable harm to this valley--we already have negatively impacted many habitats. Continuing to "mess with Mother Nature" without reigning ourselves in will destroy what we have. This plan should take these potential impacts into more serious consideration. Saying that growth will continue at its current rate and suggesting that shoving that growth into a few nodes will solve the problem is very short sighted. We can do betterWhere is the discussion to trade more intense development in town and nodes for maintaining less density in the county. It appears that the increase in development allowed in some locations is just an "add-on"--there are no resulting reductions somewhere else.Table 10-1 Land Use Classifications are confusing in that there is no reference to the existing zones that these will be replacing--particularly in town. Also, to find out what is going on in each of the Districts, you have to go back and forth to this table to figure out what applies. This information should be included where it applies in each district.The Mixed-Use visitor orientation classification includes existing resort districts AND other non-resort areas--will defacto resort district opportunities be available to these areas--as an example "Old West Cabins"Kelly is included in the Single Family Low classification which says that is should be served by sewer and water, but no mention of this is made in the Kelly District description. If sewer is added to Kelly this could have huge impacts--it could turn Kelly into another "node."
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	There should be no additional Resort Development beyond what is in the approved Resort Master Plan. Teton Village should take workforce housing out of approved development.-Additional commercial in Teton Village is in conflict with Town as Heart. Past experience has shown the public is not willing to pay higher costs for lower quality goods as a convenience.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	SR Sporting Club should take workforce housing out of approved development. There should be no expansion of the Resort or its uses. Additional restricted workforce housing is not appropriate at Snake River Sporting Club.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	There is no Resort in this district. Why is there mention of "no additional resort"?
5/15/2009	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	I do not think the current development guidelines for the Aspens and Wilson should be changed. The Aspens is currently a resort district and adding the possibiity of 300 + dwellings in a very small area will change the complexion and intent of this development. Currently, the commercial area benefits both visitors as well as full time residents and it accomplishes the goal set forth with the Aspens and Teton Pines developments. To state that any further commercial development has to be for the work force and not for the visitors is an unfair change to the current zoning. Wilson has always been a small village with some commercial development. Current density should stay in place.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-When do we need to expand sewer? This should be in Theme 7.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Agree expansion of JHGT is not appropriate.
5/15/2009	Durtschi, Grant Interested Public	I was raised here in Alta and my siblings (Dick, Dorothy, Ralph, Mark, Jim, Heidi, Mike, and Roger) and my mother, Marian Butler, all own property here. All through the years, there have been businesses in Alta. Farming, in many cases wasn't sufficient to sustain our families. For example, Arnold Grossnickle has a chiropractor clinic, Ralph Linseman had an excavation business. Fritz Kaufman had a lumber and fence business, Mark Wilson hadquite a few ideas, one of which was building furniture, Rex Christensen had a door and cabinet business and the list goes on. This was part of the Alta culture. It allowed economic diversity, which in my opinion was an asset to the entire community.Now Teton Valley is experiencing challenging times. People are leaving the area because there are no opportunities for employment. Our area is focused on real estate and associated services. Now that real estate is suffering, the entire area is suffering. It appears that this recession in the valley could last a long time. If our community had some small technology, manufacturing and associated businesses, that would soften the recession issues.There is the feeling that these businesses should be in Idaho. Teton County, Idaho is also having difficulties. From personal experience, finding a location to operate a business in Teton Valley, Idaho, has been difficult. Rent prices are high, locations to build are extremely hard to find and expensive. I note that since the recession, commercial property is easier to find.I am recommending an allowance for some limited commercial zoning. I am totally opposed to commercial activity like Wal-Mart or Target. I would like to see a small commercial area where small businesses could be located. For example, an accounting office 1400 squire feet or less, a hair salon, a marketing center 1400 square feet or less, a computer technology assembly plant of 2500 square feet, a light manufacturing facility 3000 squire feet or less, etc. All commercial activity would be located in a commercial area off the main road with a tree buffer. In this manner, the commercial area would not be seen from the road and therefore quality of life in the area would not be diminished.Land in the area could also be donated to the County for future County facilities such as a post office or recreational facility. Three years ago, it was never dreamed that Alta would need land for a library. The community is fortunate that the local church made land available for sale.In summary, a commercial area in Alta prevents commercial sprawl in the community, creates economic diversity, gives the community a place for future growth, and makes a space for current commerial to become "conforming". Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the draft comprehensive plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Durtschi, Beth Interested Public	I understand from reading the plan about Alta that you propose the vision to be our community as solely agricultural and residential. I find this very surprising since this doesn't reflect our current community and seems to put an unfair burden on our farmers. I'm surprised that this became "our" Alta vision since both my husband and myself were at the original input meeting and this doesn't represent our vision. Like most people, I love the scenery associated with farming but I can't fairly say that I expect our local farmers to provide this for me. In fact, Alta has no full-time farmers in our entire community. All the farmers/ranchers I know have other means to support themselves. Here is what I know about our local Alta farmers. Warren Kaufman has a Polaris shop, Liza Wilson has a kitchen cabinet business, Jim Wilson has a library database business, Leland and Anita Christiansen have other jobs. Steve Green works at Stock Lumber. Marian Butler is a retired nurse practitioner. Janice Wilson is a retired school paraprofessional. Rex and Marie Christiansen have other jobs. Jim Christensen is a retired college professor. Meredith Wilson has a bug-spraying business. Would it really be fair to continue to zone all their property as agricultural and expect them to continue to provide all the scenic, natural, and wildlife resources on their property? I don't think so. Adopting this plan that identifies this community as agricultural and residential leaves out much of the current community which surprises and disappoints me. In fact, it makes me completely opposed to this part of the comprehensive plan, the Alta portion. One of the themes of the proposed Teton County comprehensive plan which is in direct conflict with the Alta portion is "Theme 5: A diverse and balanced economy. Maintaining local ownership of businesses is a key element of sustaining a community." No kidding, you can't sustain Alta on only farming and residential. That would be forcing many people to move their livelihood to Driggs. We wouldn't dream of asking the farmers to do such. There is a lot of commercial activity in our community, that is, locally owned businesses. I'm afraid this new plan gives specific permission to pinch out these activities over time based on the sentence that says, "in non-agricultural areas, existing non-residential non-institutional uses should be redeveloped as residential." I know that you create regulations based on the comprehensive plan. I object most to this part of the plan. I don't believe it is realistic or sustainable. Your proposed plan must address the existing business operators. Your vague language puts their operations at risk. Let me describe our commercial activity in Alta. We have a 9 hole golf course. We have a restaurant, "Lost Horizons" My brother-in-law, Dick Durtschi, had a welding shop on Stateline Rd for 30 years. My husband, Grant, now occupies that spot with his construction business. We have local lodging and a restaurant at "The Teepee". Reed Dayton has a construction business based out of his home. Mel Hammond has a landscaping and building business based out of his home. Dave Green has a wood-working business based out of his home. There are other home businesses such as Wade Treasure's and even have a local farmer, Warren Kaufman who owns a snowmachine shop and works on snowmobiles in Alta. Janice Wilson has a bed and breakfast inn, Alta Lodging is also a bed and breakfast inn. I'm sure there are many others that I am not aware of. It isn't my vision to expect Alta to be a bedroom community for all except for a handful of part-time farmers. This isn't the current culture of Alta and I don't believe should be the long-term vision. Everyone else has to make a living elsewhere or only in a non-visible home office? The fact of the matter is that our community is composed of resourceful, motivated, and hard-working members that should be allowed to pursue their commercial activities in Alta. It actually feels quite discriminatory to limit commercial activity to farming only and forcing others to move their shops, restaurants, equipment, and lodging to Driggs. Likewise, it would be ridiculous to ask the farmers to move their equipment and non-residential activities to Driggs. And of course, we have Grand Targhee Resort, a major commercial activity that earns forgiveness in the new comprehensive plan. Of course, no one dares suggest we get rid of that commercial activity. But it is quite absurd to suggest that this ski resort is not part of our community and that we should as a matter of practice pretend it isn't there as we go about our agricultural and residential activities. I would like to talk a moment about our future Alta library which should be open for business this year. Your proposed plan stated that people did not want a heart of community. In fact, the proposed plan suggested having a "heart of community" is our very last priority. This library came about because people were indeed interested in some kind of heart of the community contrary to what your proposed comprehensive plan states. Your plan states that community facilities should come from Idaho and that there should be no development for the heart of our community. I believe that the process of creating our library from our community input goes directly against what you mistakenly perceived as our community desires. This alone should give you the idea that unfortunately your planning process didn't adequately represent the current culture of Alta or its proposed vision. I must state what I believe the vision and community character of Alta is. Our community is a combination of legacy farming, resort vacation living, legacy commercial, and bedroom community. We have legacy agricultural because no commercial farmer could move here, buy farm land and go into business. Land isn't available and if it were, it would be too expensive to make agricultural viable. Why make zoning and the comprehensive plan regulate economics? Let's change the plan to include everyone. My vision of Alta is indeed not limited to agricultural and residential. Heck, I live in a big non-modest house on a golf course, 7 miles from a ski resort. Making this community agricultural is something like trying to create Nebraska in the middle of Las Vegas. It isn't realistic or sustainable. Your plan states that homes in Alta should be limited to modest, rural character homes. That is insulting to many people in our community who have created comfortable, large homes in our resort like area. In fact, some of these people provide employment to hundreds of local citizens. So, I propose you drop the priority of agricultural and residential and let the culture and community develop based on current community input and desire. Isn't that democratic? Isn't that how we made a library happen in our neighborhood contrary to your proposed plan? This can be created through the Alta

Date	Name	Comment
		Advisory board and let the zoning and planning revert to what it was before. In no way, should current commercial activity be allowed to be pinched out and redeveloped as residential. I believe there should be some modest area that is allowed to have some commercial activity that supports "Theme 5: A diverse and balanced economy. Maintaining local ownership of businesses is a key element of sustaining a community." Commercial activity is going to continue to go on in a "non-conforming" manner, anyway. Recognizing it and making room for it reduces commercial sprawl and allows development to happen in a controlled and regulated manner.Thank you for allowing me to comment on your comprehensive plan.
5/15/2009	Hobbins, Richard Interested Public	The plan in general is well conceived and meets the principal concerns of the people in Teton County. The one problem I have is that the build out numbers are too high. Certainly, in Wilson, the method by which the upper bound of 520 additional homes was reached (assuming the density of West Street for all of Wilson) is unacceptable. I believe the build out numbers should be no greater than that which is possible under existing regulations.
5/15/2009	McCandless, Lyndsay Interested Public	While meeting housing needs, I think it is important to also address affordable commercial spaces. Locals find it very difficult to open a business due to the outrageous costs involved. If this is not addressed, soon we will find that it is only out-of-town, chain stores that could afford to come in. Affordable live/work spaces maybe. It is also difficult for business owners to pay their local staff enough money to afford to get into the housing market. More affordable commercial spaces might allow that money to be diverted to employees. I am surprised at some of the nodes that don't seem to have caps on increased density that are appropriate to their rural character...wilson, teton village, aspens.
5/15/2009	Cottingham, Helen Interested Public	I have been a resident of the Aspens for over 26 years. The wildlife, the neighborhood, the community atmosphere, to mention a few, have kept us here. This "node" idea is one of the most ill-planned, ill-conceived ideas I've ever encountered. Jackson Hole is not a "textbook" community. It is unique in every way and has unique needs. The guise of protecting wildlife by forming these "nodes" is ridiculous. They are already very stressed. This density would kill them. By the way, there are already "vultures" out here meeting with businesses to capitalize on this plan. The young work force does not want to live here. They want to be in town, where the action is. This whole plan needs revamping. It's Jackson Hole.
5/15/2009	Gunther, Linda Interested Public	WAY WAY WAY too much density! How did the Total Buildout jump so from prior plan and drafts?? Please PLEASE do not approve this plan as written, but allow additional time to get it right. I know we're all exhausted and rather fed-up with this whole process, BUT it matters enormously so don't give up and approve just to have it over with. Allow public input to mean more than that of the 'experts'; we, after all, should be the ones to decide where we want our elected officials to take us. PLEASE VOTE NO AND REWORK THE PLAN. Thank you.
5/15/2009	Resor, Avery Interested Public	The draft of the 'Comprehensive Plan' comes very close to addressing the importance of public art in our community. I would like to suggest that the plan explicitly state that public art is an intrinsic aspect of the Jackson Hole region. The iconic arches of the Town Square, appreciated by locals and tourists alike, exemplify the role of art in Jackson. The plan should help to encourage development of new public art thus complementing the values of wilderness, scenery, and community embodied by the 'Comprehensive Plan'.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	1)The Plan acknowledges that citizens consider wildlife and open space the most important priority overall, but none of the strategies or indicators deal with wildlife. The citizens of Teton County desire strong protection for wildlife and open spaces. Even within sub-areas that do not have a high priority for wildlife, there will be smaller areas that have high value for wildlife. They should be given a high priority. Deer habitat on both sides of Broadway near Karns Meadows is an example. 2)To effectively manage growth we need a rate of growth mechanism established now. This is supported by the keypad and UW surveys. We can adjust the target rate as we go. Failure to report responsible growth indicators to the community as detailed in the plan is evidence the growth rate is too high and must be addressed immediately. 3)Any plan to reduce density in rural areas and increase density in identified nodes must provide permanent protection.4)Resorts should be limited to their current plans. Any adjustment to provide workforce housing and convenience commercial should come out of existing approvals.5)PMD and PUD should not be amended. They should be eliminated. Residents strongly oppose 4 story buildings and many are opposed to 3 story buildings.This is supported by the keypad and UW surveys.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	Planning begets planning begets bureaucracy begets multiple layers of regulations begets more bureaucracy begets failure of bureaucrats to enforce the regulations on the books Complexity begets concessions to one, then another, so that the whole planning process becomes hobbled together by miscues and mistakes, all taken with perhaps the most noble intentions.I don't think there is anything wrong with the Plan and the zoning we have right now IF it would be adhered to by officials and not constantly bent to provide comfort from pressure. Citizens provide the only enforcement currently for many, many of the regulations not enforced. It is only through citizens' constant complaint of violations that the enforcement is sometimes provided. With greater regulations come greater ignorance and avoidance of the regs. Then it necessitates a citizen vigilante force to see that they are upheld. Let's not break what is not broken. Let's mend and enforce what we have.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	My comments here are only in response to the Executive Summary. I intend to read the other sections as soon as possible, and respond further by the May 29 deadline. I apologize if some concerns listed below are already addressed in other places in the document. The Vision Statement is positive and to the point. I also liked the mention in the Ex. Summary of a commitment to NOT EXPORTING the impacts of our decisions, growth, (and I might include "lifestyles") to surrounding communities. The themes seem sound to me. I have few specific comments:#1. The commitment to environmental stewardship is a profound responsibility. I sincerely hope that we have the collective wisdom, integrity and discipline to live up to our own goals in this regard. #2. As a sort of catchphrase, "Responsible Growth Management" sounds good. However I suspect that many of us might interpret that goal in different ways. For some it will mean "manage the location of inevitable growth". For others it will mean "limit growth as much as possible". I look forward to reading further details in that section of the Plan. #3. I support the idea of the town of Jackson being a central commercial and cultural hub, but it still needs to be a liveable environment. I am concerned that the proposed focus on infill and redevelopment doesn't adequately consider the importance of building and maintaining actual "neighborhoods" in town. #4. Worker housing is an important issue. However the focus seems to be on providing more worker housing, without also addressing the possibility of limiting the commercial activities that create the need for more housing.#5. I agree with the general theme that we should focus on "community first, resort second". But how do the sizeable number of second home-owners and part-time residents fit into those definitions? We are not only a community of full-time residents, nor a seasonal resort community. What does it mean to promote businesses that "serve local needs"? How do we decide what are truly "community needs", as opposed to the desires and expectations of a growing population of absentee homeowners. #6. Transportation is a key issue. I can certainly understand the benefits of nodal development in planning and executing public transit. #7. Health, safety and welfare are important duties of all communities, and I am generally proud of the way Jackson and Teton County meet these obligations. Again, I wonder how we will ever get a handle on what "appropriate" means for our community when we have socio-economic groups with very different (and changing) needs and expectations. I really don't understand the final sentence in the paragraph that says "Appropriate service levels will help the community better understand..." It's almost as if a word or phrase is missing. Perhaps "Defining...appropriate service levels." ?
5/15/2009	Hawley, James Interested Public	Though Appendix I states that "Buildout is not projected growth," the comprehensive plan projects a significant increase (doubling) the population in fifty to sixty years. What is missing from the Comprehensive Plan is a formal environmental impact study to determine how sewage treatment, the aquifer and power, and refuse disposal would be negatively affected. The Plan identifies what some of the usages are, but it does not provide research to determine what the potential negative effects or costs could be.WATERThe Plan states the Town of Jackson currently uses 7.3mg/d and has permitted water rights of 9.5 mg/d, but there has been no environmental impacts study to determine how much of the aquifer will be depleted as consumption increases. There is also no research to establish how this may affect ranches and farms that also rely on the aquifer. SEWAGEThe plan states that the Town of Jackson currently uses 2.5mg/d peak of its capacity of 5 mg/d, which could be increased by 1 mg/d. We need a research study to evaluate what the negative environmental impact will be with the increasing processing of sewage.POWERThere is no analysis of Lower Valley's capacity to meet an increasing use of power or how the increase in usage will affect the cost to customers. Increasing demand usually results in increased cost. There is also no research to determine how this increase will add to the "carbon footprint" of the county.REFUSE DISPOSALThere is no data on the capacity of Teton County Transfer Station, or its ability to meet the demands of an increasing population will necessitate an increase in trash disposal. SCHOOLSThe Comp Plan provides an analysis of the current enrollment 2,320 Students, it gives an overview of the School District's Enrollment Trends for 2000-2008, but it gives no projection of how an increasing population will necessitate the building and staffing of new schools or what the cost will be to the residents of Teton County. FIRE STATIONSThere is no analysis of how Fire and EMT services will need to be increased with the increasing population.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	The themes are well described as far as they go. Unfortunately the whole Scenic Resources element which is very important is totally lacking in this version of the plan. Who decided to leave it out and why?The beginning of this document describes how important wildlife values are, but it doesn't seem to be stressed or dealt with adequately in the actual District descriptions.Lacking also is any real vision of what is "sustainability"--what are the impacts of "growth as usual" which seems to be the direction of this "plan." The community meetings agreed that some growth will come, but at some point the island that is Jackson Hole and what makes it unique (it's wildlife and scenic values) will hit a tipping point. It was hoped that this plan would take a hard look at where this balance point might occur--BEFORE the habitat is destroyed, migration corridors cut-off, winter habitat filled in, views blocked. The compounding of too many people and all that we demand--roads, services, housing, cars needs to be addressed thoughtfully and limits placed so that we can PLAN for this and not destroy the goose that laid the golden egg. Saying we will have growth "as usual" is NO PLAN at all. (reference 10 Future Land Use Plan pg 75 Part 3 Buildout Calculations).
5/15/2009	Miller, Cate Interested Public	I attended the recent comp plan meeting in Wilson and was dismayed to hear the obvious disconnect between the stated emphasis on Theme 1 - Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources - and the direction of the plan towards the growth scenarios described. I wish to state in the strongest terms possible that the draft plan is going in the wrong direction, a direction which does not support the top priority of community values, the stewardship of wildlife and natural resources.It seems as though lip service is being paid to theme one but that the actual foundation assumptions are based on continued growth to a degree that is not supported by the residents of the community. You state that "This Plan balances and prioritizes the community's values using the concept of sustainability" I respectfully disagree: it simple pays lip service to the balance and prioritization.Furthermore, the definition of "sustainability" does not clearly include the top priority of the community values, rather it is focused on the " human needs".At times during the meeting, I actually felt as though it was an Alice in Wonderland experience in that what was being said about the priorities and values was simply not being supported in the document.This revision of the comp plan was initiated in a very different economic environment, I would like to suggest that there needs to be a "time out" for reflection given the current economic realities and the fact that things have changed quite drastically in a very short period of time. To continue on this path without consideration of the new realities is very short sighted. Jonathan Schechter recently suggested that Jackson Hole develop a vision to become a model green community. This is definitely worthy of community consideration. At its core, the current draft plan is out of synch with this concept. It is possible that development of such a vision to incorporate into the comprehensive plan could be the key to balancing and prioritizing the community's values and giving true priority to the most important and widely supported theme: Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	The overall concern seems to be the stewardship of wildlife and natural resources and 2. manage growth responsibly. These are laudable goals to achieve, but I do not believe that the plan then goes on to accurately address these goals. With regard to managing growth responsibly, it is my feeling that there are two important factors that are not given the consideration that is necessary. First priority would be the responsibility of the government to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the citizens. This means that water, roads, police, medical and schools should be the prime elements that would drive this plan. The second element that goes hand and glove with this goal would be the maintenance of a vibrant economy that recognizes that we are inextricably tied to the resort/tourist industry. It is the economy that allows us to live and enjoy this valley. When this plan talks about responsible growth it seems that the driving force is to ensure that we put an additional 27,000 people in this community without regard to the health safety and welfare of the citizens and the resort industry which drives this vibrant economy. It is impossible for me to imagine that a population of 50,000 people in this valley is not going to have a crushingly negative impact on the welfare of its citizens and their economy. The plan's answer to this seems to be to let every road in the county deteriorate to d class service so that its citizens will be forced in total frustration to ride the buses. Is this planning? It seems to me that a more balanced approach would be to look at our infrastructure and determine what level of housing units we can accommodate without overburdening our infrastructure and our economy which will hopefully generate the tax revenues that will be necessary to pay for all of the wants of our citizens. There is going to be a point where our visitors are not going to be comfortable sitting in a four hour traffic jam getting through town. Remember residents of cities have no choice but to sit in traffic jams. Our visitors do have a choice. They can elect to avoid us. I believe that there has to be a concerted effort to change the driving force of this plan which is housing under the guise of sustainability to one that emphasizes the economy and the associated infrastructure. Under the subtitle "This plan balances and prioritizes community values..." In this section is found the issues of regionalization i.e. not exporting our growth problems to other communities but taking them all on here. While this again is an interesting concept I do not believe that this what the community said. A far better way to approach to this would be to acknowledge that there are going to be people who want for any number of reasons to live in our outlying communities and to establish a means of dealing with that situation. Not to say that they all will be housed in Teton County. Once again the plan is being driven from a housing standpoint without regard to the real world of infrastructure and impacts on our economy. Finally, with regard to wildlife, it is very difficult for me to understand how the promotion of 9000 more housing units in Teton County is by any stretch of the imagination going to be promoting good stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. I just can't make those goals jibe.
5/15/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	This is a great vision statement, but it is important to remember that these sentiments need to be carried over into the rest of the document, as a guiding principle, not merely mentioned and then forgotten about. This ties into an analysis of the impacts of growth and development on all aspects of our community and ecosystem. Sustainability and sustainable development are also great goals to strive for. We need to understand that even if we are not growing all of our own food and generating all of our own electricity, there are productive steps that we can take in the right direction, and we should not write off "sustainability" as a goal for our community. With the geographic ranking (district by district), does priority #1 actually take precedence over the other stated top priorities? How can we be sure that it is actually a guiding principle for the entire plan?
5/15/2009	Jordan, Carl Interested Public	RE: Policy 1.5.d: Maintain dark night skies. This element is of critical importance to natural-resource protection as it impacts tourism, disturbs natural habitats and circadian rhythms, and devalues the dark sky as a source of human discovery and inspiration. The objective must be effective lighting without undue glare, trespass, or light pollution. Currently Jackson and Teton Cy have similar ordinances with good provisions for glare (90-degree cutoff with limited pole heights) and trespass (shielded from direct view at the perimeter). The maximum permitted illumination levels are reasonable, but should be restated in lumens/sq.ft., as incorporated in the current draft model-ordinance proposed by International Dark Sky Association and Illuminating Engineering Society; and these levels should be kept low due to substantial light reflected off winter snow-cover. But if the intent of Policy 1.5.d is only to maintain current ambient light levels, that is not good enough. The night sky around Jackson Hole is already light-polluted, and therefore must get darker in order to protect its values. And references to generalized national standards (e.g. IESNA) are likely to be too lenient to meet our demanding environmental objectives and winter-snow conditions. Therefore, further strengthening of local ordinances should include the following provisions: 1. Given the substantial light-pollution impact of outdoor lighting on tourism, habitat, and the adjacent National Parks, an amortization period for noncompliant fixtures is justified (as in Victor and Ketchum), at which time all grandfathered fixtures must comply. Meanwhile, hinged, adjustable floodlights should be re-directed downward (below 30-degrees above nadir) and away from roadways, and all outdoor lighting be brought into compliance as a complement to redevelopment or change of use. 2. Natural resources can be conserved and night-skies darkened by extinguishing nonresidential uses one hour after the close of business, except for demonstrated security needs. 3. Signs should also be regulated by requiring downward-directed sign lighting, and internally-lit signs (except for trademarked material) should be composed with dark backgrounds. 4. Given the extreme sensitivity of Jackson Hole to light pollution, I do not believe that upward (vertical) architectural lighting should be permitted, no matter how tightly it might be regulated.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Makley, Ann Interested Public	I feel strongly about the town as heart - build out should occur within town first. people should walk/bike to work and live close to services. Wildlife/openspace are number one priorities of folks in this valley. Should we consider a cap to growth? We can't have it all. Thanks for listening.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	How on earth could you publish this theme without a revised NRO map????? You've had the information for almost a year and there is no way you can gauge the impacts of the wildlife issues for the various districts without a revised map. This is the most inane thing that has happened with this plan. Wildlife is a driving force with this revision and not having the revised information as a part of the document is ridiculous.What is described as being important considerations in this theme are appropriate. Taking them seriously in the LDR's is yet to be seen.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	van Ee, Jeff Interested Public	My comments focus on the proposed changes in the draft comprehensive plan to the Aspens and Teton Village areas. Dramatic changes are projected for these areas in the future. Virtually all of the projected growth in the Teton Village area appears to have been planned and approved whereas the projected, proposed growth in the Aspens "node" is presumably subject to discussion and changes. I have resided in the Aspens since 1995. The general character of this area has changed little since I moved here. Some growth has occurred in the residential and commercial sectors. A bicycle path has been built. Wildlife abounds in the Aspens. Moose and deer are prevalent. A variety of smaller mammals are frequently observed. It is, today, a pleasant place to live. Unfortunately, traffic on Highway 390 has increased to the point where entry into, and exit from, the Aspens has become more difficult. Summertime, ski season, and "rush hour" are the most difficult times. As Teton Village grows, more traffic on Highway 390 can be expected. It is widely acknowledged today that traffic on highways 22 and 390 can be a problem. Wildlife collisions on Highway 390 are already a problem. Signs urging drivers to be cautious are present today. While I support the themes outlined in the draft comprehensive plan, I cannot support the proposed significant increase in commercial and residential units in the Aspens "node". Creating "town centers," or "nodes" in Wilson, Teton Village, or the Aspens seems to go against the theme of designating the town of Jackson as the heart of Jackson Hole. The present character of Wilson and the Aspens should be preserved. Public polling and my personal conversations with neighbors have not shown me support for the proposed growth in the Aspens "node." Teton Village has long been recognized as a village, or node, where high density development can be anticipated. That development alone will have serious consequences for the West Bank. Traffic on Highway 390 can only increase. Pressures on nearby Grand Teton National Park and the Moose-Wilson road will increase. Increased landscaping and sewage loads will likely increase contamination of the near-surface aquifer and likely increase nutrient loads to nearby Fish Creek. (Treated effluent from Teton Village is presently injected into the ground.) Wildlife on the West Bank will be affected through increased development of their habitat, increased collisions with motorists on the roads, and the increased population of dogs and cats that accompanies the increased human population. While I support efforts to increase "multi-modal" transportation in the valley to reduce traffic on our roads, I am not optimistic that increased growth and density on the West Bank can be mitigated by increased "multi-mode" transportation alternatives. It has been shown, time and again, that people are wed to their cars. If "multi-mode" transportation can be shown to be timely and cost-effective, more people will use it. However, as vehicular traffic on roadways is reduced by multi-modal transportation, more people are likely to resort to using their vehicles. In short, the increased development of commercial and residential properties on the West Bank will increase traffic on an already strained roadway. My recommendation would be to not advocate in this comprehensive plan the increased growth and densities projected for Wilson and the Aspens. Let us see what results with the already approved expansion of Teton Village and try to mitigate the impacts of that expansion. In particular, any projected growth in the Wilson and Aspen areas should be predicated on the ability of the existing transportation system and roadways to handle that growth. Present traffic on highways 22 and 390 would justify a go slow approach in increasing population and densities in the West Bank nodes. Furthermore, efforts should be made to protect the existing wildlife on the Westbank because it is noteworthy and significant. The draft comprehensive plan is flawed in reasoning that the core theme of protecting wildlife in Jackson Hole can best be met by directing more growth and density to areas like Wilson and the Aspens where, some might reason, there is relatively little wildlife and wildlife habitat. While I support the concept of providing services and work near where people live, there is no guarantee that people will follow the pattern. For example, a commercial establishment in the Aspens, such as a laundromat, may not be useful to Aspen residents because most of the residences and condominiums already possess washers and driers. The hypothetical laundromat may be more useful to residents of Teton Village and thus encourage more vehicular traffic on highway 390 for those who simply wish to do laundry. Furthermore, workers who reside in Teton Village may initially work in Teton Village, but may later change jobs to work elsewhere in the valley. I applaud the concept in the draft of having regular reviews of how the comprehensive plan is working, but I have to say again that I think the magnitude of the changes being proposed for areas such as Wilson and the Aspens are too big for starters. The comprehensive plan is supposed to be a long range plan. I am afraid that once the significant, proposed changes in the West Bank nodes are approved, it will be difficult to reverse those changes if the impacts of that growth are more significant than projected. The current economic climate will have long-lasting effects, and these impacts on the residential and commercial sectors of Jackson Hole should not be ignored. I am not convinced that, in the long run, the core values of Jackson Hole will be preserved with this draft comprehensive plan. This comprehensive plan envisions a more urbanized valley with not just one town center, i.e., the town of Jackson, but town centers at Wilson, the Aspens, Teton Village, and South Park. A key component of this comprehensive plan is expansion of the existing commercial sector. For each new hotel and motel room and for every increase in commercial space there will be an increase in workers. With people arguing that we do not have enough worker and affordable housing to meet our present needs,, are we going to get ahead of the curve by advocating further, dramatic increases in the commercial sector? And what kind of establishments are we talking about? Reducing growth in the commercial sector would be good, in my opinion. Incentives could be provided in reducing already permitted growth in the commercial sector by allowing certain growth in specific areas that might not be permitted. Jackson Hole has changed since I moved here ,and it will continue to change. The town of Jackson has always been, in my mind, the heart of the area. Wildlife is an

Date	Name	Comment
		important attribute that distinguishes this area from many other mountain, resort areas in the nation and in the world. Open spaces and viewsheds are an important component of the Jackson Hole experience. I am not alone in valuing these things. I can only hope that they will be preserved for those who follow me.
5/15/2009	Liebzeit, Ed Interested Public	Thank you for all of your efforts and thoughtfulness you have put into the planning process and presenting something you believed met the needs and the wants of the community. Jackson and Teton County residents have varied and strong opinions so getting a consensus is a very difficult thing. My personal feedback is that we need a plan for manageable growth, there will be people coming to Jackson and property owners have rights, all of which need to be considered. No growth is not realistic or consistent with what many of us believe is reasonable. Your efforts to be far reaching and look beyond the next ten years may have been overly ambitious. As a result that may have added confusion for some people who react quickly. I have had more people wanting to "bend my ear" on the proposal and meetings than any other subject for quite a while. The Wilson and Aspens plan (nodes) may be the ones raising the most passion, the residents I have heard from are troubled. The nodes themselves may be too specific. Although the intent of focusing growth is logical, it has resulted in people focusing on "their node" rather than thinking or considering the entire plan. There will be growth and large property owners deserve the right to consider options and have them evaluated in a fair and open manner. I suggest that openmindedness be maintained and the focus be on getting the plan about right but not hung up on getting every detail of everyone's priorities covered...if so, we will never get out of the planning stage (getting the last apple off the top of the tree is hard to do and sometimes even dangerous!).Getting a plan forward will require flexibility on everyone's part but we do need to move forward. Thanks again for all of your hard work thus far and thanks for allowing the public to provide input and feedback.
5/15/2009	Jay, Chris Interested Public	i support cathy tompkins views as her neighbor!
5/15/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	There is much in this draft of the Comp Plan that I can support. However, i do also have major concerns. There is so much that has been over looked, omitted, ignored or avoided, that I believe it would be best to start over again. Perhaps take the 1994 Plan and revise it rather than scraping it and writing a new plan.The major difficulty is that this proposal does not follow the repeatedly expressed community support for the permanent preservation of wildlife and open space as our top priority. To effectively protect and maintain our wildlife, we need to have solid, scientific information so that we can be assured that we will not destroy or degrade crucial habitat. We do not have current information ...The NROs are seriously out-dated and there are some notable gaps where we have very little solid science to guide us. Those gaps are the Snake River corridor and the Teton Village Rd. These are the very places where the draft proposes to increase density drastically.I feel strongly that we should not proceed with approving any increased density until we have the science to inform us as to exactly what the consequences, short and long term, will be.There is way too much growth, both residential and non-resenditail, allowed for and the rate of growth is not meaningfully dealt with. Rather only monitored.... to be dealt with apparently once there is a problem. And the stated goal is to be our historical rate of growth which if it is the last ten years would be too rapid a pace.
5/15/2009	Wauters, Carol Interested Public	At the two presentations of this plan that I went to, the impression was given that the two stated themes, I and II have been given equal status. That is not what this community has said it wants. Apparently, other sources were considered. The public should know who or what these source are.The oft repeated assurance that many concerns will be taken care of in the LDRs rings hollow considering the history of so many variances given, seemingly for the asking. More of the limits should be outlined in this Comp Plan so we will know what we will actually get.I would like to address some of the details in various parts of the plan and I will do so at a later date, but very soon.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Gillete, Claudia Interested Public	Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original ideal, principles and how those work within the districts. The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and causes a district to be unified. We love our neighborhood and how it, with the other neighborhoods in our district, make them a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district. The high density does leave something to be desired. Less density in our neighborhoods is important; please listen to the concerns and needs of many (older) citizen's, some of whom were born and raised in this valley, (scenic, wildlife, open space/migrant corridors; less crime, infrastructure needs, on and on!) When reading the written text pUblished in the draft plan we have the following comments: 1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as role models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open, available lots within the town makes more sense. 2) Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our district's character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed. 3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts needs to be first and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other schools that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems have to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation needs further consideration & forethought. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property. 4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if, in fact, the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home somewhere in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's. The proposed work on the high school ~stadium" is a bit much in dollars and ~improvements". 6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wildlife is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and fencing/berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great deterrent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice (~allowable trade offs for District 13" are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South. 7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we should not and need not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smith's plaza is physically close enough, for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Pollock, Gary Grand Teton National P	Mary asked me to send you some info regarding the airport EIS and our thoughts on the Comp Plan. Regarding the comp plan, I had asked Alex Norton several months ago to include some specific language regarding Moose - Wilson Road. Although I am not finished reviewing the current draft, I have not seen the language in the sections where it would make the most sense for it to be. We will be making the same request in our written comments that are due on May 15. The language I suggested is as follows: Transportation strategies will be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. In light of the sensitivity of the Moose - Wilson Road to increases in traffic volume, the Town and County will coordinate with the National Park service to ensure that in addressing transportation issues on Wyoming 390, additional transportation-related impacts are not created within the national park.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	French, Peter Habitat for Humanity	Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the draft of the Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We commend our elected officials and the Planning staff for recognizing the need for this Plan update and for creating many opportunities for public input. While our comments are on Theme 4: Meet Our Community's Housing Needs, we recognize and appreciate the interdependency of the themes and appreciate the inclusion of housing in many areas of the Plan. Although Habitat for Humanity's mission is clearly centered on housing, we look to carry out our work in a way that is consistent with community values. We recognize that providing workforce housing is one of several priorities in our community and we appreciate the current effort to find a sustainable balance among the priorities. Summary The key points of this letter are as follows: • We support Theme 4's Statement of Ideal • We support the concept of housing a diverse population of our workforce and the decision to not export our affordable housing and workforce to neighboring counties • We would like acknowledgment that the greatest need for housing exists at the lower income levels • The housing categories and criteria should be set by the Housing Authority • We would like acknowledgement of the existence of substandard housing in our community • We would like to see emphasized the importance of continuing to provide homeownership options (as opposed to solely rental) to Category 1 and 2 residents • Residential mitigation and incentives should continue to be focused on Categories 1 through 3 • We support the strategies in Theme 4 and would like the following included: - o Include "private housing agencies" as part of the solution (Strategy 4.2) - o Include language that affordable housing will continue to be provided for people below median income Statement of Ideal We strongly support the Theme 4's Statement of Ideal, "Remain a community first and a resort second by ensuring that at least 650/0 of the community workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming." This provides the housing programs with a publicly recognized goal to work towards and a way for the community to measure the success of the results. As 650/0 of a workforce living locally has often been referred to as the "tipping point" in other communities, the inclusion of the words "at least" establishes that 650/0 is the minimum target and an increase in that number, if achieved in balance with other community goals, is encouraged. Principle 4.1 We support the general concept of Principle 4.1, "House a diverse population in a variety of housing types," and specifically Policy 4.1.a, "House all members of the community." This formal recognition of the value of economic diversity among residents provides guidance to housing organizations and updates to the Land Development Regulations. In addition, we are strongly in favor of Policy 4.1.e.'s statement, "Exporting our affordable housing and workforce to neighboring counties is not the community's solution for addressing our housing affordability issues." While it is important to identify solutions to our housing issues, it is equally important to identify which solutions we will not pursue. We suggest two changes to Policy 4.1.b: 1. While the need for affordable housing spans a wide range of incomes, it is important to recognize that 660/0 of our households fall into Categories 1 and 2 according to the 2007 Teton County Housing Needs Assessment. Policy 4.1.b currently reads, "As the value of land in the county has continued to rise, it is no longer just the lower-middle income segments of our workforce that cannot afford housing. With the median house price at 1,800 of the median income, even the upper-middle income segment is unable to afford housing..." That is a powerful statement that we support. However, on its own it could be interpreted that our focus should be shifting towards higher categories of housing at the expense of lower categories. As the Comprehensive Plan is intended to inform the Land Development Regulations, it is important to identify that the greatest need is still at the lower income levels and to state that our housing programs should be designed to serve the needs proportionality. 2. We believe the housing categories and criteria should be established only by representatives of the public interest, namely the Housing Authority. However, should private entities be included in the category and criteria setting, we respectfully request that as a housing organization, Habitat for Humanity be granted a formal role in providing input on such decisions. General Issues to Address in Theme 4 In Theme 4 we would like to see acknowledgement of the substandard housing that many of our residents live in, possibly in the "Why is this theme addressed?" section. Through our family selection process, which includes visits to the homes of applicants, we are regular witnesses to homes with no heat, electrical problems, mold issues and lack of sufficient insulation. As a result of high rent prices for even these substandard units, overcrowding is also a widespread issue. Our experience is that many residents are unaware that these conditions exist in our community. By recognizing this fact in

Date	Name	Comment
		the Comprehensive Plan, it creates an opportunity to prioritize the needs of those living in substandard housing. In addition, we feel it is imperative to recognize in this section the importance of continuing to provide homeownership options to the lower category households. Due to the high subsidy required to make units affordable at that level, there is temptation to direct our efforts towards creating affordable rental units for Categories 1 and 2 and to serve only the higher level categories with ownership units. While we believe that our community is in need of decent, affordable rentals for our workforce, we know that communities with high homeownership rates flourish for a number of reasons. If we do not provide material homeownership options at the Category 1 and 2 levels, we will continue to experience high turnover in jobs and reinforce the trend of exporting our workforce to neighboring communities that we are explicitly trying to change. Policy 4.4.a specifically calls out "incentives for the construction of rental units instead of ownership units." We feel strongly that both rental and ownership should be encouraged and incentives should be provided for both. While we understand that the distinction of categories will be addressed in the Land Development Regulations, we request that language be included in the Comp Plan that would inform those LDRs that relate to residential mitigation and affordable housing incentives to prioritize Categories 1 through 3. We would also like to see the split between categories be reflective of the current needs of the community. Strategies • Strategy 4.1: Establish a dedicated funding source for workforce housing preservation and production. We appreciate the recognition of the need for a dedicated funding source for housing. Without such, fulfilling the Statement of Ideal will become increasingly challenging. • Strategy 4.2: Establish a workforce housing action plan. We request that "private housing agencies" be added to the third bullet that currently reads, "Seek opportunities to work cooperatively with governmental and quasi-governmental agencies, employers and developers to provide restricted workforce housing." Private housing agencies such as Habitat for Humanity provide viable solutions and have successfully partnered with the Housing Authority, employers and developers in the past. Ideally, the housing agencies would work together to establish a workforce housing action plan. • Strategy 4.3: Update Land Development Regulations and the zoning maps. We would like the third bullet, "Incentivize the preservation and creation of rental housing" to be modified to include homeownership housing. We would like to see the second bullet, which indicates that the limit for affordable housing will be increased to 200%, to include language that affordable housing will continue to be provided for people below median income in Teton County. • Strategy 4.4: Increase outreach and educational opportunities. We feel encouraging partnerships and improving public perception are important tactics to increase the supply of workforce housing. Updating this Plan and consolidating and incorporating public input is clearly an enormous job. We appreciate the thorough effort that has gone into this update thus far and look forward to reviewing the next iteration of the Plan.
5/15/2009	Dakis, Jamie Interested Public	Ms Dakis has asked me to convey the following message on her behalf. The following are direct quotes from her: The reason I am submitting this information is because there are over 30 Americans in Teton County with disabilities at present either unaware or unable to comment on the Comprehensive Plan. I come to represent their empty chairs. These documents have been submitted by Jamie Dakis who is a Board Member of the Wyoming Self Advocacy Advisory Group representing herself with her personal comments with regard to the Comprehensive Plan and other Disabled Americans in Teton County. Page one: This document represents a meeting that Jamie will attend this coming week with regard to what their needs are. Page two: This document represents the only mission in town and the rising need of services 2009 Housing Survey: Self explanatory

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Andrews, Laurie JH Land Trust	Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Our comments will focus on the wildlife/natural resources recommendations and the recommendations for growth management. Resource Protection We applaud the draft Plan's recognition that conservation of important wildlife and related 'habitat is this community's number one priority. Although the Plan mentions that about 20,000 acres of private land have been permanently protected (by conservation easements), it is amazing to us that no mention is made of conservation easements as an important strategy for future habitat or migration corridor protection. In the long run we know of no more effective way to accomplish this goal than. the use of conservation easements. The permanency provided by conservation easements, as opposed to zoning, is key to permanent protection of habitat and migration corridors. We offer the following recommendation with respect to habitat and migration corridor protection: Creation of a permanent funding mechanism, such as is proposed for affordable housing and transportation (both important but neither at the top of the list of goals for either the Plan or the community) for the purchase of conservation easements over critical wildlife habitat and migration corridors. The price of protecting such habitat has become prohibitive for private funding alone and contributions of conservation easements cannot be relied upon to protect critical properties. We believe that as the Plan's and the community's number one priority, meaningful funding of the protection of critical habitat is called for and should be a top priority. Growth Management The draft Plan calls for a substantial shift in residential density from the rural areas to the Town and County "nodes." However, the Plan does not specify exactly how this shift in potential development will be accomplished. We have two concerns with this aspect of the draft Plan. First, the proposed reduction in development potential in the rural areas may undermine the incentive for future contribution of conservation easements. Second, we are not convinced that density reduction through zoning alone is likely to accomplish the long-term protection of rural land. We know from experience that existing rural development potential is a major factor in the willingness of landowners to donate conservation easements. This development potential represents a value that many landowners do not choose to realize through development, but will extinguish permanently through the contribution of conservation easements Since 1994, when the County adopted the Planned Residential Development (PRD), over 10,000 acres of land have been protected by conservation easements held by the Jackson Hole Land Trust, compared with 5,000 acres during all the years prior to that. 'As opposed to down-zoning, the reduction in density resulting from conservation easements is permanent; therefore, elimination of development potential in rural areas through a zoning change that may reduce incentives for the contribution of conservation easements may be counterproductive to the protection of rural land. While we support the Plan's goal of protecting rural land, we are skeptical that in the long run mere zoning changes can accomplish more than a temporary deferral of rural development. Without the use of conservation easements, either through the current clustering provision or the non-contiguous transfer of density units, we fear that the Plan's goals for the rural areas of the County will fail and, worse than that, lay the foundation for increased density in the future. In light of these concerns we offer two recommendations:. 1. That rural development potential not be reduced. If it is, this will seriously undermine the existing incentives for the contribution of conservation easements. 2. That provisions for clustering and/or transfer of units be retained in the plan. These tools should be simple and easy to use. If open space and wildlife habitat 'are to be enhanced through conservation easements, it should not be discretionary and subject to political whims. Please let us know how we might assist you in your consideration of these recommendations.
5/15/2009	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	Don't make room for 1000's of more houses in the valley to solve your housing problem. That's really what this whole thing is about. You'll destroy the valley in the making. Regulate rent prices. Don't take the easy way out of the mess by just making room for more headaches. Regulate rent prices, FIRST please. Once you start your invasion of the South, things will only get worse ... forever ... and forever is a long time. And we'll have you to thank for it ... and Jackson Hole will be just another growing city with its growing list of problems.I don't have to spell the problems out. You have been told by hundreds of people. Sad thing is, why do hundreds of people have to tell you. Kinda scary ...
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Policy 3.6.a I am concerned that great mischief is going to be created by this.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	The Plan again mentions theme 1 and 2 as if the were on equal footing. Prioritize the community's top priority! "County Nodes are appropriate for some levels of development to serve community needs" but elsewhere you say that County Nodes are appropriate for town-level density. Which is it?In the Land Use Classifications Table (10.1), single family mixed type cold be manifested as single family home, duplex, tri-plex, or four-plex buildings. Even though the maps are not regulatory, what is to stop a developer from covering their land with four-plexes, even with some "community benefit" provided? What ground do elected officials have to stand on to say "no," to such developments?Under "Buildout calculations:" "The county rural districts contain almost all of the mapped critical wildlife habitat" There is an important distinction between "all" and "all mapped" critical habitats. Because it is impossible to make decisions based on data when the data does not exist, it is critically important to collect that data. We cannot contend that there are no wildlife values in particular areas in the valley when we KNOW that there are significant data gaps in terms of critical wildlife habitat. There are provisions in Theme 1 that suggest collecting more data, and updating old data. The Plan needs to consistently acknowledge this data gap and actively strive towards filling it, and not making decisions about location and amount of growth until we have a better sense of the impacts.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	Sounds very ambitious, but important.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	This theme is well written and supports many important issues. BUT, without some idea of what population growth is expected or planned for, it is almost impossible to determine what the 65% represents. Particularly stressful is the amount of new commercial projected in the plan and what this might represent in terms of workforce. The commerical projections--in MILLIONS of additional square feet (app. 1-3) has become the tail wagging the dog.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	The figure of 65% bworkforce housing has been thrown aroud in this chapter without much regard to the eventual consequences of this idea. Once again much mischief is possible with this concept. if i as a worker choose to retire and am no longer a member of the workforce, am i going to have to vacate my home for a worker or possibly make available another residence to keep the status quo of workforce housing. I realize this is an extreme thought the authorities could use this concept for rather bizarre outcomes.I believe this entire chapter needs to be reworked to protect the citizens from over reaching regulations
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Where is the data to support the claim that the community agrees that the Y is an appropriate location for dense development, or that 3 stories is the desired limit along major corridors? -The Lodging Overlay should not be adjusted. -Do not amend PMUD and PMD, eliminate them. They reduce predictability. -Proportion of population in town to the county and nodes might be a meaningful indicator for measuring "Town as Heart." Dwelling units and nonresidential square footage by district are not. If the Town is to be the retail center of the county, then measuring retail sales in Town vs. County is more appropriate.
5/15/2009	McCandless, Lyndsay Interested Public	As a social and cultural hub, the plan for Jackson to support public and local art should be stronger, more clearly defined and committed to. We need a diverse creative culture to attract tourism and retain locals. Retail and commercial development should also be geared to supporting our local community. What sorts of businesses do we want and need? How can we support local entrepreneurs to start small businesses and contribute to a diverse and thriving local economy.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	Prin. Prin. 3.2: Paramount to Jackson maintaining its retail hub is the ability to distinguish itself as a unique "Place". The town square overlay is absolutely key to this sense of place. Requiring a two-story height restriction will be one way to accomplish this. Another way to accomplish this is to ELIMINATE THE PMUD regulations that allow development bonuses and waivers from other requirements.Prin. 3.5: I think it is critical that Prin. 3.5 recognizes the function and important of public art to enhance community character and enhance pedestrian walkways, as well as provide a stronger sense of cultural community amenities. A funding mechanism for public art would be to allow developers the option of using public art and/or landscaping to achieve the "landscape" requirements. Landscape required is often only "pretty" for a few months out of the year. Public Art could be a 12-month draw and amenity. There would need to be a different criteria established to measure the requirement, so that people would just place "big" sculpturss to equal 20SF of landscape - big doesn't always mean better in public art.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	, Interested Public	I would like to see more public art in the valley. I would like to see a mural (or two) on the new parking garage! I would like to be involved in that project. I would like to see creative arts being offered to children with disabilities in a sustainable manner (I work with special populations). I would like our community to look out for what the people that live here want & need, not what developers and 2nd home owners want & need. I do not want our town to become a city. Let's be more creative together. Let's listen to what people are saying. We need a small but robust future encompassing all things (including art) that uplift the human experience.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	Generally sounds good, though it is hard to have specific suggestions without referencing the Future Land Use Plan.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Page 17. I would point out that the second bullet point under 2008 polling..says that a MAJORITY of the community supports preserving wildlife over more deed restricted housing. I think this has been totally ignored. I know the answer to that is that with the nodes there will be less impact; but with this plan there are still going to be 50,000 people in this valley and that cannot help but negatively impact our wildlife.
5/15/2009	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	The Comprehensive Plan should overtly acknowledge the economic and social benefits provided by public art and our cultural organizations. The Plan should acknowledge that it would be both desirable and beneficial to establish a fund to support art and arts events in public spaces. Arts and culture organizations in Teton County have a significant positive impact on our community. According to the Americans for the Arts 2005 survey of "The Economic Impact of Nonprofit Arts and Culture Organizations and Their Audiences" the economic impact of "Organizations and Audiences" in Teton County exceeded 2.5 million dollars in revenue for local government and over 3 million generated for state government. Arts and Culture events generate dollars and keep them circulating in our community. Art in public spaces expresses of the values and character of a community and provides economic benefits. There are several places in the Comprehensive Plan where Public Art should be included in the visionary document, I have included just a couple instances below. Principle 3.5: Recognize the importance of civic spaces and social functions as a part of maintaining a sense of community. Public Art completes public spaces, makes gateways memorable, enhances pedestrian experiences, and should be incorporated into parks, signage and amenities like walkways and water fountains. Public spaces without Public Art are not complete. Artists should be given the opportunity to participate in the design of public spaces. Public art should be considered as an alternative to landscaping requirements in downtown areas or heavily built environments where landscaping is not feasible. Policy 3.5.b: Make public investments in strategic locations. The community will continue to invest in public facilities including art in public spaces. The revised Comprehensive Plan should include language that supports (but is not limited to) the following strategies to develop a public art program: Public art provides social and economic benefits and is appropriate and congruous with the goals and ideals of the Comp Plan. The plan should acknowledge the substantial value that our arts and culture organizations add to the community. It should be stated that amending Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to include 1% of new commercial and municipal developments budgets to support a public art fund is desirable. A Cultural Steering Committee comprised of volunteers who represent the interests of Teton County's arts and culture stakeholders should be established to create a cultural plan that includes administering the public art fund.
5/15/2009	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	The Housing Trust should not be responsible for setting categories and criteria that will encompass the majority of workforce housing. As an independent non-profit they are not responsible to the community. Policy should be set by elected officials who answer to the public. -Incentives besides density bonuses should be considered to encourage work force housing. -Indicator 4 should change from "Number of houses" to "Number of units" to reflect the definition of workforce housing. -Measuring most indicators on a yearly basis will give misleading data because of the small number of projects that happen sporadically. Measuring a 3-5 year rolling average would result in better data. -Measuring the percentage of new units that are restricted ignores the impact of rental units. It will also set the plan up to fail in the long run since this number cannot increase forever.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	I am totally supportive of the concept of Town as heart. I think there should be a statement that says that redevelopment of commercial projects should be given regulatory relief in regards to impact fees and other considerations. The redevelopment of outdated and worn out structures would help to keep Jackson from looking old and worn and would improve the tax base. However height and FAR should be kept at a reasonable amount and not used as a trade off for housing. Two story structures should be mandatory in the Town square overlay. Where possible public art should be encouraged possibly as a trade off for landscaping requirements. Redevelopment should be encouraged in residential areas with economic (regulatory) relief where there is not an impact on established functioning neighborhoods.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, III Interested Public	I am writing to support the inclusion of public art in Theme 3 of the Comprehensive Plan, along with a strategy to implement a public art program. Public art can serve as an iconic and memorable feature of the valley. This is evident in the popularity and enduring quality of the Elk Antler Arches, which have delighted visitors of Jackson for over 50 years. Growth in Jackson must embrace public art as an asset, which creates value for developers, enhances the quality of life for residents and promotes Jackson as a cultural destination for tourists. Policy 3.1.b: "...future development should reinforce and create new vital neighborhoods within the town." Establishing a '1% for Art' funding mechanism that allocates a percentage of new development costs for public art will add value to new developments, while also creating distinct character and identity for new communities. Principle 3.2: Public art, as seen in the Elk Antler Arches, enhances the aesthetic appeal of the Town Square. Future development within the Town Square should consider the long-lasting impact of unique public art enhancements that will create new cultural artifacts for future generations to enjoy. Public art will also contribute to the emotional appeal of the Town as Heart concept, contributing to the economic viability of local businesses. Policy 3.5.a: Public art will create interesting, attractive and memorable public spaces. A '1% for Art' funding mechanism, which allocates a percentage of new developments to improve public spaces with public art, is a model embraced by 300+ cities and towns across the US. Policy 3.5.b: Public art is a strategic investment in cultural tourism, which should be noted as an important aspect of Jackson; home to 40+ art galleries, a National Museum, a 4 acre Center for the Arts, the Grand Teton Music Festival, and a myriad of other cultural activities and assets. Public art promotes the cultural status of a town with an outward embrace of creativity. Policy 3.5.c: Public art will provide the millions of guests that visit the Town of Jackson every year an interesting, memorable entrance to Jackson through creative and thoughtful gateways. Strategy: Develop a public art plan consisting of; a public art ordinance, administrative body, and potential sites and future developments to integrate public art.
5/15/2009	Mortensen, Sue Interested Public	I hope you will vote against the density proposed by the new plan. Density of this proportion undermines the kind of natural habitat that is necessary to support the amazing variety of wildlife that we enjoy living with. We live in a truly unique place. Please, support the open space that makes this uniqueness possible. We have more species sharing this ecosystem than anywhere in the lower 48. Please stand up for wildlife. It's what the majority wants. If we need affordable housing, then let's find a way to build that without extreme density. We should not be controlled by the greed of developers.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	If no reporting is done on the promised data, it is evidence that growth is out of control and must be brought under control regardless of the actual rate. -I am not convinced that plan reduces overall build out in the unincorporated county. -Plan does not implement a rate of growth mechanism until a problem is identified. It will be too late then. We need mechanism now and adjust threshold as we go. People were not happy with the growth rate of the 90s. We should keep below that rate. -Need to monitor what has been built, what is approved but not built, and 'budget or estimated under current zoning.' This should be done for dwelling units, commercial square footage and APO. -A simple LOS to monitor is the time to process building permits for citizens and average time for completion after a building permit is issued. When they start to go up, we are growing too fast. -The number of FLUP amendments is not meaningful data. -A useful metric for measuring and managing growth is comparing new work force dwelling units created to new jobs created. Jobs created could be estimated yearly from new commercial sq ft and adjusted with census data as it becomes available.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	I agree with the idea of clustered residential development within the county, including the possibility of "local convenience" businesses. However I do not agree that the county nodes need to be developed to the same density standards as the town of Jackson.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	We can manage growth responsibly only when we have an idea of what goal we are managing. This theme just talks about accommodating growth and monitoring growth--and when it's too much figure out what to do. I think the community felt in the meetings that WHAT is too much would be identified. It is not....and the ranges in appendix 1 are so confusing and flawed that it is impossible to figure out what is proposed. Some of the districts now have new names (particularly in town) so it is confusing to figure out what will actually be happening. It is a great idea to monitor growth--but that was supposed to happen with the 94 plan and it fell through the cracks. With budget crunches and staff shortages, it will be the first thing thing to be dropped UNLESS it is a required finding for the staff with EVERY application for development. But, this too has to be measured against some numerical goal and that is what is lacking in this whole theme.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	New regulations will protect a group of focal species, but they are not yet identified. There should be a target date for establishing the focal species. Evaluation of focal species should be done on a running 3 year average, not on a year to year basis. -Strongly disagree with policy 1.1g that Town development and county nodes will not be wildlife permeable. There is a need to provide safe passage for deer on West Broadway. That area needs to be developed with permeability or safe passage routes in mind. The same applies to South Park. -This theme promotes renewable resources and a reduction in greenhouse gases but ignores the obvious. Build less. If we build smaller buildings we have a reduced impact. A big house with LEED gold certification in the wrong location can use more energy and have a bigger impact on wildlife than a smaller house in the right location. -Policy 1.5.d has a goal to maintain views of vistas from public roads and parks, but does not mention from town. Citizens do not favor 4 story buildings. They block our view. We need to eliminate them. Living in town does not have to mean giving up a view.-Environmental Commission needs private citizens, not just scientists. The Commission should include at least 2 citizens who are concerned about wildlife. -The indicators do not mention wildlife. This is very discouraging for a theme that is supposed to be about wildlife. We need to define a LOS for people who value wildlife in Teton Co. If I have to drive to see animals I used to see in my neighborhood, my LOS has declined. -Conservation easements will taper off with time, using that an indicator of success will cause failure over time. -Indicator 4 should be monitored yearly to avoid the temptation to make Indicator 3 look good by dumping directly into Flat Creek to reduce the sediment in storm water treatment units. -Indicator 5, ratio of habitat mitigation to habitat disturbance is not meaningful. Need to quantify the value of the mitigation and disturbance, not just the measure the area affected. -In sub-areas that have a lower priority for wildlife, it is important to recognize that there may be areas within the sub-area where wildlife should be given higher priority. The best example is deer crossing West Broadway to reach Karns Meadow. Protecting a crossing through that spot is very important to keeping Snow King and the south facing slopes above Broadway connected. These areas should be identified in the Plan
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	Sounds great.
5/15/2009	Liebenthal, John L Interested Public	Because of the placement of this issue, it is focused on night skies, which is excellent and a valuable part of the Plan. Another aspect of outdoor lighting should also be addressed in the plan -- the effect of glare and light trespass on residents and visitors. These effects do affect the ability of residents and visitors to enjoy the night skies. They also affect the ambiance of the area, and they represent a health safety issue in two respects. First, evidence is accumulating that light-at-night (LAN) suppresses melatonin production, disrupting sleep and contributing to cancer risk. Second, glare makes driving and navigating at night more difficult and can be a contributor to accidents. This other aspect of outdoor lighting effects should be addressed at an appropriate place in the Plan.
5/15/2009	Moberg, Jill Interested Public	With your ambitious plans for excessive growth in Teton County, you have completely ignored the public's comments about the importance of preserving wildlife and natural resources.
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	This theme is described well, but in practice, this is not what has been happening. For some reason the visual (character) aspects of Jackson are beginning to look like every other mountain resort. Just preserving the few historic structures and sites that are left are not enough. Redevelopment adjacent to these sites have a huge impact--the historic sites are dwarfed and no care is taken for the transition between these elements. This will become even more critical as redevelopment moves away from the town square. Neighborhoods need to be maintained as described. This "heart" is critical to the well-being of Jackson.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	The proposed hi potential density for Wilson is 2.4x what is currently allowed and is 4x what is currently built. It would make Wilson significantly more dense than what the Town of Jackson is now and would be within the proposed density ranges for Town. Increasing the vibrancy of Wilson will not reduce traffic. It is in conflict with the Town as Heart and will change the character of Wilson. People chose to live There for its limited retail.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	I agree that the No. part of South Park is a logical place for residential growth outside the town of Jackson. I am encouraged by the possibility that such growth will include attention to Safe Streets designs, and effective public transit. I am relieved to see the map include a mix of density types suggested for the South Park area. I really cannot picture what the proposed buildout might actually look like on the ground. It all sounds like A LOT.
5/15/2009	Rohrstaff, Kate Interested Public	I think the conceptual land use is acceptable. I live in Rafter J and believe that building between High School Road and Melody is a good option. Not only will adding homes in this area give people who work in Jackson places to live, but it will also provide jobs to all of the people who will be needed to build the homes.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	The northwest end of South Park is a logical extension of town densities. This should be done by annexing in phases as development warrants. However, the text and the map have contradictions. The rest of South Park is very confusing. On the map, the area suggested for development seems to grow with each version of the map, the remainder being shown as Agriculture/Rural. But, while wildlife is significant during several times of year (particularly winter), Wildlife & Natural Resources are shown as next to last in terms of importance. Also, South Park is inexplicitly excluded from the list (Policy 1.6a) where conservation easements would be appropriate. Even though the importance of the Flat Creek corridor and view sheds are noted--there is no protection mechanism for these areas--much less wildlife migration/winter habitat protection. Density bonuses in the "node" of South Park are not clear--this node should be more of a transitional node to lower density housing. There needs to be more recognition of the importance of protected open space in South Park. It is not clear whether this node will be expanding dramatically in the future. On page 110 of the plan, in the first paragraph development of 1/4 to 1/2 mile in the NW part is described, then in the second paragraph "The northern 3/4 miles of South Park is appropriate for town-style development..." Is this all the way to Hwy 89 including the corner of High School Road? The language and the map related to South Park appear to be contradictory. Even 6 Pronghorns spent the summer in South Park as recently as 2006--to ignore wildlife in South Park is untenable. It is rich with birds and mammals.
5/15/2009	Obering, Julie T. Interested Public	Wilson, precariously situated at the base of Teton Pass, is not only presently strained with it's own local traffic but also with the traffic traveling to and from Idaho. To increase the residential units and extensive commercial space in Wilson so greatly is not responsible management, will be a hazard, and should not be recommended by the Comprehensive Plan. Living in Wilson, I drive, daily, on Highway #22, passing the Stagecoach, Fall Creek Road, West Street, Hungry Jacks & the Post Office, Nora's Fish Creek Inn, Ida Ward Lane, and Second Street. Between the Stagecoach, going east to Second Street there are 8 or more access roads or driveways onto Highway #22. Fall Creek Road on the south is the only access for all the residents off Fall Creek Road to Highway #22. West Street and Second Street are the two primary access roads for the residents from the north to Highway #22, from the town of Wilson and from along Fish Creek Road. Having a vision in the Comprehensive Plan of the possibility of increasing by up to 520 new residential units within a quarter mile of the existing commercial core is excessive and would be a danger, particularly to the area between Fall Creek Road and Second Street. Presently the traffic is often a problem. There are many cars and trucks, as well as pedestrians, bike riders, and even some horseback riders. The vision for additional residential and commercial units should be far less than presently proposed in the effort to honor the stated "Priority: Manage Growth Responsibility". I agree with the statement that "While Wilson is designated as a node to accommodate some community needs, such as housing, the Town of Jackson should remain the lodging, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." Because Jackson is intended to remain the "center" of the region, I believe that Jackson should have more of the commercial and residential units that are now envisioned for Wilson.
5/15/2009	Roman, T. Interested Public	As a resident of Wilson, I have seen many changes with the development of the area. Everytime a large area of land is dug up (SRA for an example) the animals of the area are misplaced. Once the ground was broken at SRA the coyotes moved south and started dining on many of the Wilson residents' pets since their prey moved upward on the mountains. A friend down the street came outside due to a ruckus by her door to find several coyotes ripping apart her small dog. Moose that frequented our street are found dead on the highway as their habitat continues to be consumed and many more vehicles are travelling on Teton Village Road. Travel surveys for Teton Village show almost a hundred vehicles entering the Village per half hour during the various seasons throughout the day and that's just entering not departing. Enough is enough, a ten percent growth each year will compound these problems with the New Comprehensive Plan. Less is more. Ten percent more people, ten percent more cars, ten percent more wildlife becoming carnegie to selfish people rushing to their destination. How many more moose or other animals have to die on the Village road before anyone cares about the traffic. In the last three days I have seen three moose crossing Teton Village Road during the day between 11am and 3pm. It currently takes almost ten minutes for me to get out onto the Village road from my street due to the present traffic flow. How can ten percent growth each year sustain what we already have, once it is gone it's gone. The current Comprehensive Plan screams sustainability for real estate companies and construction companies not wildlife or community.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Spackman, Jarad Interested Public	As a Wilson resident I am very concerned with the large development densities being planned for this node. I attended multiple meetings last year with concerned citizens and I do not see where the planners incorporated any of our feedback and viewpoints into this new plan. This plan looks like or is even worse than the Option B that everyone was so against from the start of this process. Were these meetings just an exercise in futility? A necessary hurdle towards getting what our county planners envision rather than what actual residents envision? I feel wronged that our voice was not listened too. Wilson has already gone through a massive amount of new development in the last ten years with Wilson Meadows, HHR, and Stilson. Let's think smart growth. Giving bonus development densities only begets more growth and creates more systemic housing problems. If the goal is to create more affordable housing than make sure that any density bonuses are zoned as "affordable housing" and not as standard residential development. Any new marketable lots/buildings created in such a desirable area like Wilson will not be affordable to the working class. The affordable housing problem is due to commerical developers not having to provide enough affordable housing. Why does the comp plan have to allow our community to double in the next twenty five years? Quality of life and protection of wildlife soley comes from keeping our population at a sustainable thresh hold. The first goal in this plan should be a census on what maximum population numbers we can sustain without damaging our values.
5/15/2009	Grossman, Steve Interested Public	Our family became members of the Wilson community following the last Comprehensive Plan, and while we certainly had some notion of what we were joining, it has turned out to be so much more than any of us expected. We are in awe and humbled by what we have become a part of, and a few of the many lessons we have learned in the process (and this includes our 14 and 10 year old children) are (1) respect for the physical, wildlife and human elements of the entire community, (2) recognition of our role as temporary inhabitants and in that role stewards for generations to come, and (3) acknowledgment of the vast reservoirs of wisdom that we can tap into by listening to both the vocal and more silent members (including our local wildlife) of the community.As background, we chose our location for many reasons - including the unique mix of connectedness and openness. We are a quarter mile from the commercial district on Hwy 22 and yet the orientation of our modest home on a little over an acre is toward Munger Mountain, with wide vistas provided by the adjacent combined 80 acres of conservation easement property. We take advantage of the proximity to walk or bike to the commercial district for much of our shopping and in so doing we have the privilege of sharing part of the commute with moose, fox and elk who either inhabit portions of our and adjacent lots, or who use them as part of their migratory pattern. It is just this ability to (1) connect to both the town of Wilson and the wildlife whose land we have taken over, at the same time as the ability to (2) immerse ourselves in the openness of physical beauty of all that touches and surrounds Wilson that inspires the strength of the emotional tie to the community that we love and imparts those life lessons.While on one level as a recent member of the Wilson community I applaud the overall vision and themes and their county-wide priority, at the same time I am deeply concerned about how that vision and those themes have been applied to Wilson. Moreover, my concern is even greater due to the apparent lack of adherence to my lesson # 3 - this effort does not evidence the willingness to listen to the voices previously communicated based on the earlier proposals for Wilson. I strongly urge that the application of the plan to Wilson more closely reflect both the priorities of stewardship of wildlife and responsible growth management without abandoning the effort to include Wilson as one of the county nodes for further development. Allowing for housing growth in areas such as the area bounded by Fall Creek Road, Highway 22 and Fish Creek based on the single family mixed use zoning ignores the impact on wildlife that is a significant element of that part of town. From my perspective the plan is doomed if it is not at least more internally consistent in prioritizing the themes. How can one be "contextually-sensitive" in addressing development without taking into context the adverse impact on the wildlife that such a change to that area would cause? While I did not participate in the earlier town meetings addressing the proposals for mixed use development in Wilson, I understood that similar views were effectively communicated. Also, it appears that my reaction and approach is consistent with the survey results. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I will provide more detailed suggestions in a future communication.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	"While Wilson is designated as a node to accommodate some community needs such as housing, the Town of Jackson should remain the lodging, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." comp planAgain, you are zoning for growth in areas that do not have adequate infrastructure to accommodate density. There is no mention of impact on the school system (already at maximum), just mention of more parks. What about more grocery stores? Places to eat? This will just be another population pimple that feeds off the Town, which means addtional traffic.Too much density!Limit Growth across the board. That is what the community is saying.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Harmon, Scott Interested Public	I would like the following comments regarding the new proposed comprehensive plan made official. It is against my better judgement wasting more of our time concerning uncontrolled development in Wilson, Wyoming. The county never listens anyway proof from the latest comprehensive plan that is completely contradictory against what the people living in Wilson stated they wanted to see for our community 6 months ago at a work shop meeting. This new plan could triple the size of Wilson! When is it going to end? Wilson grew at a rate of tenfold with the Hardeman development, doubled again with the old school house development and is currently being hit with more development. Enough is enough! Forget the discussions of road safety, wildlife, and community character. Those comments have always fallen on deaf ears. I have lived in Wilson for over 30 years and paid property taxes helping to support government officials. It is past time the county respects our wishes for controlled development regardless for thier whishes for continued affordable housing. Especially when this so called affordable housing invites developers into the project and the county offers them density bonuses as well. Those of us living here for so long need to also be considered into the equation. We have paid to live here and our opinion must be sreiously considered. I was at that town meeting and I heard 95% of the comments opposed to continued mass development and this is exactly what the new comprehensive plan calls for; 500 homes??? Give me a break, 100 homes is too much in downtown Wilson. Have you driven through town lately? Tried to cross highway 22 with all the speeding traffic? Mass development belongs south of Jackson where we have the infrastructure to support it. Wilson has already been hit with too much density and taken more than it's fair share. Few of us in Wilson want this plan and will fight to keep controlled development. One day I can only hope the county listens to the peoples voice and reconsiders the monetary side versus the human side and shows more respect to the long term citizens of this valley.
5/15/2009	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	I am writing as a resident of Wilson to tell you how disappointed I am with the Draft of the Comprehensive Plan revision. I have lived in Teton County, WY since October of 2000 and have been a resident of Wilson since January of 2007. We purchased a home in Wilson so that we could be a part of the character that makes Wilson such a special place to live. We wanted to live in an area of the County where we would be close to town, but far enough away so that we would be close to the wildlife that makes our valley so special. We became very involved in the Mixed Use Village planning process once we moved to Wilson. We joined with our neighbors to help shape what the future of Wilson. After countless hours of meetings, emails and phone calls, the planners provided Wilson residents with two options to be presented to the Planning Commission. Option A (density neutral) and Option B (increased density zoning.) Wilson chose Option A. We obviously made the wrong choice in the eyes of the Planning staff, because this was never presented to the Planning Commission. Option B was an increase of 98 units and now the planning staff is trying to increase our density by up to 400 additional units. Why did no one listen to Wilson? Why did we spend so much time planning in Wilson to have all of that work for nothing? How did we go from them recommending an additional 98 units to an additional 520? What happened to wildlife and preservation of wetlands being the #1 priority????As was stated by the great majority of attendees of the Wilson Mixed use village meetings, the Waldron 15 acre property in Wilson should be removed from the boundary that the Planners dreamed up. The Waldron property is NOT an appropriate place for increased density. The property is currently deeded for up to 5 residences and that is how it should remain. The Waldron property is a migration corridor for the wildlife that is so important in Wilson. It is adjacent to the Rossetter land which is adjacent to Fish Creek Ranch. Our property is adjacent to the Waldron property and we have wildlife viewings multiple times each week. The property seems to have a resident immature moose who lost his mother and twin brother due to traffic on our highways. The Waldron property is South on Fall Creek Road and should be put in the same zoning category as the rest of the properties South on Fall Creek. My husband and I attended all of the Comprehensive Plan meetings. It is very clear that our community said that protecting wildlife was the number one priority. It was not my intent nor do I believe it was the intent of the majority in attendance, that in order to protect wildlife in the county that the plan would cram high density in the places that most of us live! The Node concept is flawed!!! I think that the node concept should be removed entirely from the plan. Wilson is not a pedestrian friendly town, it is at the base a steep mountain pass! The plan does not take into account the infrastructure and services that will be necessary for all of the additional people it is planning for. Where will all of the children go to school? The Wilson elementary is already close to capacity. More vehicle trips will be created into town. We do not have an Albertsons and never will! I realize that the plan is planning for the future, but I do not believe that the planners planned for the future that the residents of Teton County envision. These are only a few of the issues I have with the draft plan and will continue to comment throughout this process. I hope that the Planning Commissioners will listen to the residents of our community and help create a plan that does reflect our vision.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Fales, Ellen and Randy Interested Public	We strongly urge you to scale back your density plans for Wilson. With the proposed density in the new plan, the character of Wilson will drastically change. Fragmenting Jackson Hole's population further by increasing the density of Wilson instead of within the city of Jackson, where it should be, is irresponsible planning - and certainly not "green". There is no reason other than to satisfy the greed of developers, to increase density in Wilson - and particularly NOT down Fall Creek road. What has happened to the vision to be a green community - to concentrate population around diverse commercial centers, reduce driving distances to community services and offer alternative transportation to the car? Increasing population density in Wilson only creates more long distance traffic; less efficient traveling for shopping and everyday life. Schools and other infrastructure will be impacted enormously necessitating further development. Teton County today does not offer adequately paying jobs to support a mortgage for many. Density with lower income housing in the mix, does not ultimately relieve the issue. Two years ago Teton County had too many jobs and not enough employees. This year we have too many employees and not enough jobs. Past and present residents of Wilson moved to Wilson for its unique and SMALL town character. At the very least IMPROVE Wilson's walk ability and community character. Do not screw it up. Uphold the design that the residents of Wilson spent hours compiling in the public charrettes. It does not resemble your proposal. You have an opportunity to preserve a wonderful community and area for wildlife. Please do it.
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order: -Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district- Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.-Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'North to South starting at High School Road.'-Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes, including NW South Park.-Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan.-Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley.-At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing.-The reduced NW South Park node to have a pull-back from both High School (for a park) and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop.-The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability.-The placement of an East-West connector road in South Park should precede any new development in the Northwest corner of South Park and placed close enough behind the high school to alleviate traffic on High School Rd.-The design of the reduced Northwest corner of South Park should not be connected directly to High School Road but to the new East-West connector road. -No annexation of the new reduced Northwest corner of South Park until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards.-The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the "Y" intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.
5/15/2009	Moberg, Jill Interested Public	You have slated far too much growth and development for the South Park area. We don't need that much housing in this areas. High School Road cannot support that degree of development. Wildlife migration will also be unforgivably adversely affected.The current economic situation has resulted in less demand for new housing in Teton County. You should re-evaluate all plans for growth, in all areas of the County, at this time, since your data and comments from the public advocating more housing are now outdated.
5/15/2009	Pilafian, Peter Interested Public	Please REMOVE Wilson from the list of "Nodes." The level and density of growth that you are describing is completely inappropriate, and would be the Kiss of Death for Wilson as we know it.Your 'Plan' seeks to turn Wilson into a bedroom community to support Jackson businesses, and to supply convenient workforce housing for other employers all around the county. Your plan for Wilson is inappropriate and unacceptable, and ignores the wishes of local residents. To the extent within which Wilson might possibly be called a Node, it is entirely built out now, and does not need any significant additional density. You do not even realistically (or imaginatively) address the problem of Highway 22, around which the whole Wilson question revolves. As you know, the charrette cross-section was a serious compromise, and has already been violated by WYDOT.Nobody is in favor of your Wilson plan, except those that stand to profit from it, or those that dont live here. Wilson should be changed to 'Rural' designation. Wildlife, ranchlands, scenic vistas, riparian lands - this is the character of Wilson.Please -- remove Wilson from the list of 'Nodes' before this plan is submitted to the county. Do it Now!

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Bigler, Greg Interested Public	While I can not claim residence in the valley for a long time (6yrs), I can add some thoughts on what I hope occurs to my home current and future in Cottonwood Park. My thoughts:1. Keep growth rural in South Park 2. Open space along the High School Rd. 3. New development south of HS road, will need another east/west rd, and keep commercial nil or minimal as there is enough traffic and light pollution as it is.4. NO upzoning in town kill pmd's, and strict adherence to the plan/zoning that is/will be in place5. Keep the plan and just as important, future legislation and or zoning and property development decisions, in line with what the survey states.6. I understand that this area makes sense for some town like density, but lets not dump everything here. All of the county areas need to be part os the solution. Including the west bank and east jackson , my self just like me owners in those areas do not want their vision of Jackson to be overrun by growth and development.7. Do not over grow the valley. Just because it can be bigger does not mean better.
5/15/2009	Baldauf, Jill Interested Public	Thank you for all the hard work you have done to complete the Comp Plan for the County. I am sure it is difficult to distill everything you hear into one clear, concise and strategic plan. I am afraid perhaps, you didn't clearly hear the residents of Wilson, Wyoming when the shared their concern for low/lowgrowth and protection of the wildlife. The ideas you have proposed are directly contrary to the voices of Wilson residents. We are in a wildlife migration pattern and we love it. Everyday we see moose, elk, fox, deer wandering through our backyards. They come down the hill above Fall Creek Road, cross the road and head toward the Snake River. The retaining walls on Fall Creek have already forced them into a narrow path. Adding homes to the Waldron property would end the pattern. Adding home to the Waldron property will also endanger human beings. Visibility is terrible around the curve for the houses that already exist there. To add additional traffic would be extremely dangerous. Just the thought of children walking along the road to Nora's or Hungry Jack's is terrifying. We can't handle more traffic on Fall Creek. And speaking of traffic, have you notice we don't have a traffic light in Wilson and we like it that way. If you really plan to sextuple the population, you will have to add in a myriad of traffic mitigation features that we certainly don't want. Can you please try to listen just a little harder, read just a little more carefully and really understand how we Wilson residents feel. Our quality of life and that of the wildlife that we care for is in your hands. Please be kind to all of us.
5/15/2009	Dean, Gregg Interested Public	I really don't want to see 500 more houses in Wilson. It is too much growth too fast. There is not the job growth in Jackson Hole to support a doubling or tripling of the number of houses in Wilson. Not to mention that it will significantly impact the small town feel of Wilson. Please slow down with this planned growth business.
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	I do not believe that this area should contain high density development. Use of the park area would be damaging if the west end of the area had large numbers of houses/families, dogs. The area should be reserved for needs that will not negatively impact the current status of the meadow as the last large remaining wildlife friendly part of town and a means of crossing town for wildlife. The site of the current RV park would work for multifamily housing, the remaining area identified for that use should be more of a buffer or be for uses that do not bring large numbers of people into that area.
5/14/2009	Chamberland, Betty Interested Public	Under the new plan, developers would have ask for an amendment to the comprehensive if they want a property's zoning to change. To secure the amendment, an applicant would hve to garner the votes of at least three of five county commissioners. Only after the reclassivication is approved could a development be proposed. i read this in the may 13th guide interview with alex norton my problem with this is what's different we have the same situation now stay with the old plan is what i think alex either misspoke to me or the paper got it wrong he told me after the village meeting that to change the approved new plan, if approved, it would require the town and county approval i felt that it was a better solution but now find there are a lot of same old politics going on and we are being told and not listened to sorry to say i find it disheartning
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	Hwy 390: the draft plan contemplates the redesign of Hwy 390. At our neighborhood meeting on May 5th, Jeff Daugherty suggested that new development along 390 would have to be found to have a neutral impact on 390. This needs to be stated specifically within the comp plan. There is no guidance on how traffic impacts on congested roads are to be measured or judged, especially if such roads are slated for "redesign". When would the "redesign" be contemplated in a development approval, and when would it not?We need a Start Bus system that is free. It could be paid for via a gas tax in Teton County. We need free or low cost Start Bus access from the airport to town and to Teton Village. Most advanced societies in the rest of the world have attractive public transportation from city centres to their airports. The cost of cab fare for a family from the airport to Teton Village virtually guarantees they will rent a car. The experience of being a passenger in a local cab ensures that a family will rent a car on their next trip. There is no safe way to walk in many parts of our community during the winter. If a friend or neighbor sees you attempting to walk in many parts of the community in the winter, they are likely to think you are crazy and offer a ride. We need sidewalks/bikepaths that are clear of snow for pedestrian access throughout our community.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	The biggest incremental impact in this plan is on the Aspens where there is currently little to no allowable incremental residential development under current zoning, and where the new draft comp plan anticipates the potential for an aggregate 85% increase in residential units. When did the Aspens become designated as a node for increased density? There is no mention of the Aspens as a node for increased density in the prior Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan only cites limited commercial growth potential at the Aspens. As discussed in Appendix B - 1994 Plan Analysis, "the 390 corridor is not called out in the 1994 Plan as a location for Affordable Housing" The community survey used to compile the current plan asked participants a rather innocuous question of whether there should be "additional residential development within 1/4 mile of the Aspens." While the results were not overwhelmingly positive, I doubt the community response would have been positive in the least to a question of doubling the size of the Aspens - as has been proposed in the draft plan. This is such a meaningful break with the past contract with the community, it should not take place. Defining Cheney Lane as part of the "Aspens Node": According to the document, development of this node should be within 1/4 of a mile of the Aspens. (The industry standard for walkability is 1/4 mile). The start of Cheney Lane is 1/3 of a mile from the Westside Store. It is 3/4 of a mile from the end of Cheney Lane to the Westside Store. There is no place to safely walk on or near Hwy 390 in the wintertime. In fact it is downright dangerous. There is no way that the comp plan can mandate that private property owners provide access to others across their land to mitigate access to the commercial areas of the Aspens. To quote the draft comprehensive plan on page 74 - Incremental, site-specific decisions, which are emotionally, politically, and largely tied to a particular application, are not an effective way to implement this plan. Following on - If the Housing Authority didn't own the two parcels at the end of Cheney Lane, would this section be included in the "Aspens Node" at all? Cheney Lane has no place for inclusion in the Aspens node as defined.
5/14/2009	Nabors, Libby Interested Public	Re' Reprehensive Plan I have finished reading the draft of the Comprehensive Plan. It appears on the surface to be a good plan, but once I looked deeper, I found that it doesn't have any real teeth. Coming from a family that has lived here a very long time, I can tell you my grandmother and my father would strongly oppose this plan, were they still on this earth, because it does little to protect the wonder and beauty of Jackson's Hole.
5/14/2009	Ednie, Marilyn Interested Public	I am a resident in Cottonwood-Rangeview. I have lived in my home for 18 years and I have seen a lot of changes to the area. I know it is inevitable that the Porter Estate is to be developed. What I would like to be better informed on is the "planned" traffic routes (High School Road, South Park Loop & Hwy). I would like to be assured that in the plans; the "planned" routes will not encourage traffic to come through the Cottonwood-Rangeview streets during traffic jams. I know that I would hop skip through this area if I was delay in traffic, so what's in the plans?
5/14/2009	Cook, John and Cynthia Interested Public	My husband and I bought a tiny place here in 1979. The whole reason for buying was the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. We were able to move here permanently a little over three and a half years ago. We were shocked at the extra development, but you expect some changes in such a time. However, your plan will ruin everything we moved here for: the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. You will destroy everything nearly everyone here cherishes. The whole Hole will be destroyed. Please change the plan. Wilson too will be utterly ruined and lose its charming character. With the long winter here the planned extra growth will put too much strain on everything: traffic, air quality, quietness, wildlife, low crime, and on and on. It will become an ugly Piccadilly Circus. Yes, I am an ex-Londoner so I treasure this place more than people from the country. I can't imagine either how all of us will pay for all of the changes.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	In general, the draft plan takes too much of a growth approach. The plan itself could be paraphrased as "let's just double". Our community can choose to give much less. Many of the parameters in the document are overly general and would be subject to moving targets. What does it specifically mean to manage growth in a responsible and sustainable manner?My biggest issue with the draft plan is the nodal development thesis. While the nodal plan makes sense in spirit, it is not consistent with reality. If the intention is to increase density at the "nodes," beyond current zoning levels for "workforce" housing, the thesis of a node falls apart. It would be in the economic interest of all of those living in workforce housing to travel to town for literally every gallon of milk they purchase. The potential inhabitants of the workforce housing in the Aspens are not likely to go to dinner at Mizu Sushi, pay \$3.00 for a latte, golf at the Pines, or buy their groceries at the Westside Store. They are also not going to pay bus fare to town to buy groceries and carry them back on the bus.The Comprehensive Plan cannot mandate how much is charged for commercial rents nor dictate commercial tenants or their pricing. The same analogy could be made for Teton Village, the Aspens and Wilson.What was the data used to develop the "nodal strategy"? Did anyone interview the residents at Millward or Wilson Meadows to determine where they purchase their goods and services? WYDOT's traffic demand model was used, although the veracity of WYDOT's model was not questioned nor supported with data.The workforce in Teton County is much more likely to use public transportation to commute to and from work than they are to use public transportation for their personal needs.If we are going to change the current agreement with the community for zoning densities, it should be done in a least impactful way for the environment and the entire community. The community would be far better off locating "workforce housing" closer to "workforce shopping" and "workforce activities".11% of the new residential buildout is proposed for highly dense nodes on the Westbank, where there are no appreciable community services for our "workforce". The result will be impermeable barriers for wildlife on both Hwy 390 and Hwy 22.The planning staff report for the Osprey Creek development proposal on Hwy 390, suggested that each dwelling would make 11 vehicular trips/day. It is fairly likely that each incremental dwelling at each of the new designated rural nodes is likely to make a similar number of trips, largely to town and back.The community was asked innocuous questions in the survey of whether it would support "additional development" in certain areas. If the question had been whether the community would support doubling or tripling the current densities in what are now proposed to be "nodes", I doubt the response to the question would have been favorable. The draft plan stuffs 30-50 years of forecasted residential development and density bonuses in areas that are newly deemed to be nodes in this plan. Why should the community be giving 30-50 years of density bonuses at once - especially when we don't even know if the "nodal concept" is a valid one?The only way to effectively mitigate impacts on our transportation system and the environmental is to shift more development toward town. The nodal system sounds wonderful in spirit, but is likely to compound our challenges in practice.
5/14/2009	Nolan, Ellen Interested Public	In my opinion, one of the biggest flaws of the failed attempt to develop the Porter Estate was the commercial development slated for the frontage of High School Road. That plan was noxious in terms of density, undue increased traffic on High School Road, and the significant loss of green space to predictably intrusive commercial buildings.At our neighborhood meeting at the Cottonwood Park community center early this winter (prior to the May meeting), we discussed these concerns with the planners, with an emphasis on the imperative of open space on High School Road. The planners indicated their understanding and agreement of the usefulness of this point. This new plan has no green space on High School Road, nor do I see any green space down toward Rafter J except for what I assume is the Lockhart property.I would like to see a significant buffer of green space, the same depth as the high school property, running all the way from the high school to South Park Road. Why does the plan specify the preservation of the scenic character of South Park Rd. but not High School Road? I agree it is a beautiful road to drive or bike down. However, the mostly part-time residents of Three Creek can't see the road over the berms, while Cottonwood residents enjoy the scenic vista of the Porter Estate from High School Road and the view is of enormous value.Better yet why not extend the green space to protect the scenic value of South Park Rd as well and simply centralize the development and extend it south to make up for lost space?The other imperative is for one (or two) new east/west road(s) connecting the proposed mixed use parcel to Hwy 89 and preferably no entrance or exit on High School Road at all. If and when Hwy 22 is connected to South Park Rd. there should also be appropriate redirection of traffic flow to mitigate new traffic on High School Road coming from Hwy 22.The plan indicates the east/west road would be created as development occurs, but I think it should come first. If not, there is no way to avoid the huge trucks and other new construction traffic on High School Rd. during the lengthy development phase.Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	Mange growth responsibly does not equate with encourage growth. The plan allows for growth that is detrimental to the existing community and our resources. We should acknowledge that this area can not sustain a growing population without sacrificing our wildlife. While focusing development in Jackson and the nodes is better than growth throughout the county, the amount of growth this plan proposes is too much. There needs to be much better cooperation and coordination between the town and county on all the themes in this document.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Carlson, Benjamin Interested Public	As I read Policy 3.5a: Maintain and improve public spaces, I couldn't help but think of Memorial work done by Maya Lin, the Vietnam Memorial and the Civil Rights memorial that she did. These kinds of public art memorials for instance achieve the goals of this policy. They are interesting memorable and I would add educational fixtures. In adding the words "public art" to this policy, I believe that the town has great potential to use art to continue to activate public spaces and strengthen our community, via education and intrigue. By giving local artists or nationally or internationally recognized artists space and resources to construct art we can create truly unique spaces to engage the community and attract people from all over the world. Works could include for instance an outdoor amphitheater for outdoor plays and music, or educational installations or gateways teaching people about our flora and fauna, or even an interesting sculpture for a diversity of people to come together and play on and around. These kinds of projects have great potential to be created via collaborations between artists and architects artists and biologists artists and local historians etc. I believe artists have a special way to activate our culture and community and therefore I would love to see the words "public art" written into this or another appropriate policy.Thank you for your encouraging locals to share their ideas.
5/14/2009	Byrne, Sally Interested Public	The arts in Jackson are a unique resource and rich benefit to the community that warrant strong verbal as well as financial endorsement in the plan.
5/14/2009	French, Peter Interested Public	Our family lives in Wilson, inside the single family area of "District 11". Our primary concern with this plan is that the Mixed Use Orientation will allow dense redevelopment of the commercial core of our town, destroying the character of this small town gem. We absolutely oppose 3 story structures in the core and are much more comfortable with the scale of the PS Bagel/ Wilson Backcountry building. Please take into consideration the character issue.It cannot be recreated and even in the long term our county does not need an abundance of 2 and 3 story condo projects.Finally there seems to be an argument that adding rooftops will lead to more retail which will reduce traffic. I fundamentally disagree. More people=more traffic.Thank you for your consideration of residents!
5/14/2009	Flanagan, Caryn Interested Public	Please add language to the Plan that endorses the arts in Jackson Hole!
5/14/2009	French, Peter Interested Public	I am a property owner in both district 15 and 19. I support your plans throughout those districts.As you finalize the plan and begin to work on the LDR's I would encourage you to allow lot splits/PUD's on single parcels in the appropriately dense areas. The current 3 parcel minimum discourages redevelopment to denser uses.The 6,000+ square foot lot certainly can support 2 or more very attractive units which would be more affordable for sale products. It would be more fair to the small property owners who are the majority of owners in those areas.Thank you for your consideration of this comment
5/14/2009	Robinson, Roxanne DeV Interested Public	As a private citizen of the County , I am in support of the BHAG (Big Hairy Audacious Goal) of being Carbon Netrual by 2030. Please keep that statement in the Comp Plan. Thank you!
5/14/2009	Round, Phil Interested Public	This appears to be "deja vu all over again." There is no way to maintain wildlife and community character while allowing for growth. These things are mutually exclusive. Coupled with the fact that growth never pays it's way, this is a very depressing conclusion to have come to (again!).I've watched these plans since the first attempt at a Comp plan decades ago. These plans end up being driven by the "players." Who are the players? The entities that are at every meeting and are paid (either directly or indirectly) to be there. Those are almost entirely development interests. They are NOT the general, working public who largely make up this community and cannot be at all the meetings. These are the folks that frustrate planners and commissioners time and again because they aren't up to speed and end up wasting time at meetings going over already covered ground and making unspecific comments about wildlife values and small town character. But this is what the majority of residents want. The specifics have to relate back to these general principles. The public has always wanted these concepts to guide the plan.The future is going to be a very different place from the past. The economy won't be so consumer oriented. Old modes of doing business (including planning) will prove to be devastating both financially and ecologically. We need to find sustainable ways to maintain this community as a viable place and I would argue that that means contraction as opposed to growth. I say no more commercial space, or reconfigure what is already allowed. The scale of everything will be smaller and more localized in the future. It will have to be.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Green, Clint Interested Public	As a community member and an individual interested the arts i believe it is imperative that principles concerning the inclusion of public art be placed under the theme "Heart of the Region" I have served many roles over the last 5 years of my residency in Jackson Hole and all have brought me into direct contact with locals and visitors alike. A common ground is the amazing scenery that surrounds our town. When individuals speak about our town they many times mention interesting land marks that make jackson unique in character. Interestingly these are most often man made creations concerning a certain element of artistic design, the most notable being our "antler arches" or "neon cowboy". With so many new projects being discussed it seems a disservice to not include some stipulation to include a designated amount for the inclusion of public art. Both permanent and temporary installation would encourage discussion and enhance the experience of our visitors. It is amazing to me that such a rich and diverse arts community currently exists in Jackson. Being so removed from any major metropolitan area artists are able to draw positive energies from our surroundings to create amazing art both representational and abstract in content. I have had the pleasure of working with both local and visiting artists on large scale installations. Patrons where continually drawn to the work site and often would play some role in the creative process. I am an artist as i am an every man. Traveling has given me the opportunity to experience our countries communities at face value. The memories that stand out the most involve some form of visual interactions with my surroundings. It is for that reason and those listed above that i strongly advocate for our town to continue support to make Jackson a cultural destination as it is a scenic one. Please designate some Principle to civic funding and support of public art. Thank you for your time.
5/14/2009	, Interested Public	The Rodeo Grounds: The current zoning and planned furute zoning all fit the existing neighborhoob. However, the actual Rodeo Arena should not be moved or relocated. This property serves the town very well, as a venue for a multitude of events. It's location within the town makes it unique and brings helps to keep our downtown vibrant. Additionally, the Rodeo ground serves as significant open space, if rezone to multi-housing, this open space will be significantly diminished.
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	While there is mention of the importance of wildlife corridors, there is no attempt to define wildlife corridors, nor is there any guidance on how important wildlife corridors would be identified. Once we make a mistake and allow development impacts in critical wildlife corridors, it will be too late. As stewardship of wildlife and natural resources is the most important theme of the community, this appears to be a critical omission. While there are general steps to protect wildlife, the plan does not permanently protect wildlife in any way. What are the specific litmus tests? Environmental commission: While the concept of an environmental commission is an admirable one, there is no mention of how the commission would be chosen by elected officials. As real estate development and tourism are key elements of our local economy, we need more specificity on the avoidance of conflicts of interest and the depth of qualifications expected for such a commission. How will the commission measure impacts? When is an impact deemed great enough for action?
5/14/2009	Propst, Bonnie B. Interested Public	I have family living in Jackson and have been following the new comprehensive plan. I have found the land use map to be shocking. Everything seems to be geared toward growth and development at the expense of the wildlife and uniqueness of the area. I hope that this is just a poorly misguided preliminary plan and that the end plan will reflect a drastic reduction in the density numbers. As it now reads, it seems to be a mockery of the public meetings and comments that were to direct this plan. Thank you for taking these comments into consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	When I went to one of the meeting about the plan, my first question was why do we think they will listen to us now? Obviously, they didn't pay attention to the survey results. I was assured everyone involved is trying to do a good job and was listening. Please don't let the community down. I think there already too many people in this valley. We should not be making grandiose plans for growth. Growth will occur naturally and is already planned in lots of areas. We need to protect wildlife and their habitat HERE, not just over in Alta or miles away from town. Many of these areas are restricted or on private access that would not be of any benefit to me. The reason people want to come as tourists is the wildlife and the scenery. If we continue to grow, take away wildlife habitat, and obstruct the view, there won't be a reason for growth, there won't be any tourists. Any plan for expansion should first consider and have in place, streets, parks, open areas, and necessary services. To plan 1500 homes on 450 acres means less than a quarter acre per home without taking out land for those necessities. That is too congested for the area. There are no plans to allow traffic access to highways. Poor High School Road will not be able to handle it. There are already too many stop gap, band aid measures because of poor planning. This valley cannot afford to grow itself right out of its livelihood. In the part of the plan about West Jackson it says that area will not be affected by this plan. In the part about South Park there are many plans and changes. How can Cottonwood be a part of both areas? And would the area be affected or not affected? We need permanently restricted areas for wildlife and their corridors of migration. These should not be an afterthought. We need to know how this plan will play out year to year. It would also be wise to look at the previous plan and see how it worked out year by year. Was this aspect monitored? Did the previous plan apply, was it implemented? When I moved here four years ago I thought this was an environmentally concerned area. Now I'm afraid it's being run by an obsession for money. Soon there won't be a scenic corridor of entry because our motto will be "Pave Paradise and Put in a Parking Lot".
5/14/2009	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	I write to share my feedback and raise concerns about the recently released draft of the proposed update to the Town of Jackson/Teton Comprehensive Plan. The draft plan fails to properly protect Jackson's unique wildlife, open spaces, and community character. Once you have allowed growth to occur in an irresponsible manner (as proposed in this draft plan), it will not be possible to ever recreate the beauty of this valley or bring back wildlife destroyed by this proposed growth.I do not understand the reason why you have ignored what the public has asked for and diluted the clear, strong language of the 1994 Plan that supports the stewardship of the ecosystem. The public clearly stated it did not want more growth but rather appropriate limitation of growth. The public also shared through community surveys that it wanted to preserve open spaces, such as South Park, and to protect Jackson Hole's wildlife and natural resources as the number one priority. The new draft proposes significant growth that is not desired by the public and then allows for a substantial increase in the number of buildings and private developments. I cannot tell whose voices were heard and addressed. The draft plan reads as if you listened to the voice of developers rather than the rest of the public.I remain opposed to a number of aspects of the draft plan. It improperly de-emphasizes the importance of scenic resources and does not contain a mechanism to permanently protect rural open space areas. It contemplates more than doubling the number of residences and commercial space. Rather than directly address and reduce the severe shortfall in affordable workforce housing, this draft plan worsens the problem. New workers will create additional demands for affordable housing, and compound the existing shortage.In my view, the draft plan should make infill in the town the first priority before considering expansion into other nodes in the County. Please reduce the recommended overall build-out of the town and county and define maximum build-out so that only a slow sustainable rate of growth will be encouraged.I live in South Park and remain seriously concerned that the Plan proposes elimination of language from the prior Plan that called for permanent open space protections of South Park and for protecting the scenic and wildlife values in South Park. I have looked out of my window and seen red fox and moose living in and crossing this part of the valley. Eagles regularly rest on nearby trees. This area contains irreplaceable wildlife and, if you do not protect it, that wildlife will be lost forever. Please revise the comprehensive plan to accurately reflect the will of the community and its residents and fulfill your responsibility to preserve this spectacular place we live in.
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	The increased pressure on our wildlife and natural resources from development will only get worse and needs to be addressed in a more proactive way. Research by WGF and others is limited and should be a driver for what needs to be done. If there is no data in an area, either there should be an effort to obtain that information or any decisions for that area should be made with the knowledge that each remaining acre in Teton County is becoming more and more critical for habitat. To assume that no data means that everything is OK is irresponsible. There is a great need to look at cumulative impacts we are having on the land and resources. We may be beyond the tipping point for being able to maintain our wildlife. Unfortunately, the identified nodes are also wildlife habitat and the plan should address development that impacts those species. Additional species should be included in your focal group such as bears, birds of prey, pronghorn, and others as determined by WGF and other researchers. The "crucial" and "migration" corridor definitions should be refined or eliminated from the LDRs. We should declare that all wildlife use of lands in Teton County are essential to the viability of these animals.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	There has been talk over the years of moving the rodeo grounds south of town. If we are in fact wanting to address town as heart and transportation issues, we should keep the facility where it is. The location actually helps maintain the character of town that we endorse...the wild west.
5/14/2009	Ferguson, Jean and Dick Interested Public	We are very concerned about the new Comprehensive Plan, which we feel is seriously flawed. It needs complete revision. 1. Its growth rates are excessive and omit the costs of and solutions to expanded schools, utilities, fire and police protection , streets, and highways, etc, etc. We need a plan for slow growth by implementing caps, restrictions and other possibilities. 2. It includes no plans to preserve the unique character of Wilson and Jackson while promoting massive growth and massive urban style. Just limiting growth around the Square does not preserve the character the citizens desire. 3. Wildlife, the number 1 value to the people, was totally devalued by this plan. Wildlife corridors, winter range, prime habitat, wetlands, and scenery decisions from the 1994 plan were omitted and current science based data is needed to protect wildlife. 4. Questions to be answered: Why won't the planners release the data with which they are supposedly making decisions. Isn't it public information? Who is pushing our employees in the planning department to propose such an extreme pro-growth plan? Or are the planners just totally out of touch with Jackson. 5. What possible "human needs" could drive 9 million square feet more of commercial growth? Growth has been shown to cost more than it generates; it is a vicious cycle. Affordable housing should not be an excuse for growth. 6. The 2 story limit around the Square is a very good idea. Besides allowing views of scenery, it will help the sun keep the winter ice on the streets to a minimum. In fact it is a good idea for all of Jackson and Wilson. 7. Greed locally and nationally has hurt so many people and continues to displace values in its rush for money. To purposely degrade the wildlife and the western character & hospitality of Jackson Hole for financial self-interest by developers, realtors and other groups surprises us. Some of them understand that preserving the Hole's uniqueness will make them more money in the long run and their life living here more enjoyable. 8. The planners seem to think limits on growth in one area must be provided somewhere else. It doesn't. Unlimited growth is not inevitable. It should be obvious to the electeds that the people want limited slow growth. And the electeds should instruct the planners to provide such a plan.
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	Modeling and conclusions based upon the past 10 years of real estate demand, growth, and prices are flawed. The past decade of real estate activity was fueled by leverage in our financial system that will not be replicated again in our lifetimes. As the recent dramatic increase in available rental housing shows, this is not the crisis that some would have us believe. There is also an explicit assumption in the draft plan that housing prices will only increase. As shown more rapidly in other areas of the country, housing prices driven by speculative activity can be highly volatile. The assumption that the "development potential" captured in this draft plan will be used up in 30-50 years may easily be too aggressive. Why are we potentially making allowances for massive zoning density changes for growth that is likely to be decades in the future? Aren't we putting the cart way ahead of the horse? What is the purpose of conferring 30-50 years worth of density bonuses in one fell swoop?As the growth rate of real estate development slows down, especially large resort development, we are also likely to find that the size of the workforce needed in Jackson shrinks dramatically. There is a very loose definition of "workforce housing" in the draft plan. Workforce housing is defined as "all housing occupied by people working in the community regardless of whether the unit is deed restricted or not." This would suggest that anyone other than a second homeowner is part of the "workforce." This would also suggest that development bonuses would be available for any project aimed for full time residents. How does "workforce housing" relate to deed-restricted housing? How can the comp plan mandate that a unit cannot be owned by a second homeowner? These are critical omissions and assumptions. This loose definition for workforce housing has the potential to allow density bonuses for all types of housing. Given the very loose definition of the workforce, it is also likely that the community already houses far more than 65% of its "workforce" deemed desirable in the document. Workers who choose to commute:If workers in the community choose to buy a larger house elsewhere and commute, this is their choice and not one that can be changed by decree. The best the community can do is to provide an attractive public transportation alternative.
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	The projected growth rates on page 86 are again based off of recent growth rates, which are likely to prove extremely aggressive. Growth rates over the past decade were fueled by leverage that will not be replicated again in our lifetimes. Use of the historic non-residential growth rate from 2000 to 2008 is extremely erroneous as it would include the 4 Seasons hotel, which was completed in 2005. While it might make some sense to plan ahead for excessive growth, it also puts pressure on the community to make decisions in a hasty fashion that might otherwise be made more thoughtfully over time.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	Administration:More detail needs to be provided on the frequency of amendments. The public cannot keep up with amendments that occur on a haphazard basis. Amendments should be reviewed on an annual basis. To repair the problem of haphazard and discretionary review of projects and amendments in the past, amendments should require a 4/5 vote of the appropriate jurisdictional body. This would keep amendments from eating a hole in the document. There should be a provision for public comment on amendments to occur at a time that is regular, convenient for the public, and disclosed to the public suitably in advance.
5/14/2009	Whitcomb, Michael Interested Public	1) Human needs must be removed from the new vision statement. By including human needs you are re-writing the 1994 Comp Plan, not updating it as you claim. For decades this community has been consistent about its desire to preserve what makes this valley so precious. Your new vision statement opens the door to priority conflicts in which wildlife and open spaces and our sense of community must compete with opportunistic definitions of human need. Our primary mission, and therefore our vision, is to preserve what makes this community and valley special. Your new vision statement will fail to do so.2) Theme 1 must be our number one priority in ALL areas of the county. Remember, it is our prime directive to protect why we live here. In all districts regardless of whether they are a growth node or stable. Why do you think Wilson is fighting more development even though they have been designated a density node? A good example is the Karns meadow district in town. Wildlife and open spaces is number four, behind town as heart etc. This is flat wrong. Karns is a precious open space in town which provides wildlife habitat and migration. Deer-auto impacts on Broadway near Karns are all to common. While we do need to consider more development in the Karns district, it must be guided by our number one priority: Theme 1. Not by our desire to keep town competitive with Teton Village. One more point. Just because you confine building density to nodes does not mean those people stay in the nodes. Far from it, they spread out into the boundary areas and to impact our wildlife, our quality of life.3) The connection between Theme 4 and Theme 2 with regard to job creation and workforce housing is too weak. Theme 4 will fail unless commercial growth (driving job creation) has a hard policy connection with residential development (quantity, type and location). Without that link, this is not a plan.4) You have avoided the inherent conflict between discretionary density tools and predictability. Your claims of improving predictability with this plan have no substance as long as huge density bonuses are on the table. You need stronger language specific to PMD/PUD and the limits imposed on their use.5) The fundamental structure of this plan fails to reflect community sentiment. The plan does not use buildout numbers to establish outcomes or guide policy development. That is what the public asked for and you chose to ignore that guidance. This is a fundamental failure of the draft which needs to be rectified. Is this the community's plan or your plan?6) Entitled by-right residential buildout has been calculated differently between town and county (Appendix I). The 2009 potential columns need to be restated for the county rural areas without guessing the extent of PRD use. The public should be given actual minimum buy right numbers as a baseline from which we can discuss the need for density bonuses.7) Expanding the lodging overlay along Broadway to Flat Creek will erode services available to residents near the downtown area. The justification given, a gateway into downtown, fails to outweigh the value of retail services which would be lost to lodging re-development. Whose idea was this anyway? Was it in the public surveys?8) Downtown re-development needs stronger guidelines to assure that a sense of community is restored for residents. We should zone for workforce housing (not relying on weak linkage/mitigation rates) with a goal to house downtown workers in the same district. Provide them with necessary amenities so they do not have to go to the "Y" for services. Make downtown a place where people live, not just visit for work or a quick meal.
5/14/2009	Greger, Art Interested Public	I am writing to express my opposition to and disapproval of the Comprehensive Plan as it is being presented.To say that public input has been ignored or misrepresented is obvious. Having attended some of the planning meetings, one fact seemed clear to me, and that is that a low-growth formula was seen by almost all participants as the preferred alternative to achieve the outcomes desired, be it wildlife preservation or maintaining the character of Jackson. In the first round of discussions, compact centers and housing received the lowest favorability rating. How did this now become the plans centerpiece? All meetings I attended mirrored this response.If the sticky notes pasted at the meetings have not been filed in the trashcan, please review them. Ask yourself if the Plan as written takes into account the publics wishes. The recent outcry over growth in Wilson should help answer this question. If the answer is still not clear, review the annexation vote of the Porter estate from years ago. If you think things have changed since then, please learn from the publics outcry over the Teton Meadows proposal.The changes I would like to see are as follows:1)Reduce growth drastically.2)Reduce commercial growth even more drastically.3)Protect South Park. It is one of the most beautiful parts of the county.4)Put desired (by the community) growth in town, preferably as redevelopment, consistent with the desires of town residents.Thank you,

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Olson, Greg Interested Public	I am a resident of Rafter J subdivision.1. We must have green space from Cottonwood Park extending fro the Highschool Rd. to South Park Rd, extending 1000 ft. to the south. This can be used as a park of future school property. The 2 parks in Cottonwood are used by everyone in the area and overused.2. NO commercial use. The Smith's plaza is enough. More light pollution is not needed.3. Future development must have at least one east-west connection to Hwy 89. Highschool Rd. MUST NOT be used as a main artery. IT SHOULD REMAIN A SCHOOL ROAD ONLY. 4. GROWTH RATE OF 1.5% per year.5. Planners are not following the survey. You have altered the results!a. Wildlife: #1 NOT 6b. Growth: #2 not 1c. Town as heart: #3 not 7d. Housing needs: #4 not 2e. Economy: #5 not 3f. Transportation: #6 not 4g. Services: #7 not 5
5/14/2009	Mattson, Ann Interested Public	I am a resident of Cottonwood Park. We moved to Jackson 6 1/2 years ago from Salt Lake City, UT to enjoy the open space, wildlife, and small mountain town atmosphere. The proposed comprehensive plan would destroy many of the values that we hold dear.Growing up, I lived in Durango, CO. I watched minimally-regulated growth completely change the character of that town over the course of 30 years. Also, as a resident of Salt Lake City, I watched as rampant growth took over the Park City valley. What was once a mountain town became overrun by dense housing developments.To preserve Jackson, we must learn from the demise of other mountain communities. Please listen to the results of the public survey, and consider the consequences of the current proposal.1. Residents ranked what they saw as the valley's priorities. The planners are not using those findings as a guideline. a. Wildlife #1 b. Growth #2 c. Town as Heart #3 d. Housing needs #4 e. Economy #5 f. Transportation #6 g. Services #7.2. Open space must be preserved along the western portion of High School Road, south of the artery! With the current housing, schools and light industry in the area, the road cannot handle more traffic and the area needs more park space.3. NO commercial or light industry use. The eastern end of High School Road is densely developed, and additional light pollution would further deteriorate our night skies.4. Future development south of High School Road MUST have at least one east-west connector to Highway 89/189/191. High School Road is for SCHOOL traffic only and is already very congested.5. The valley growth rate must be limited to 1.5% per year. Even at these levels the town will grow quickly!Please review these comments and consider them in the course of developing a new comprehensive plan! This plan will guide our communities development for many years to come, and we need to take action now to avoid the pitfalls of other mountain communities.
5/14/2009	, Interested Public	Do you really think swapping the development rights for land that is practically unbuildable because it's so steep with grades that require variances is an ethical way to "protect" the valley's natural resources?The county already makes it difficult to build on these sites. Swapping development rights should be limited to land that is able to be easily built upon.I oppose the current draft of the comprehensive plan. It doesn't protect our land from overdevelopment and it doesn't protect our natural resources, which are the reason this valley is so loved and treasured.Don't kill the golden goose. Change the plan to protect natural resources and securely limit growth.
5/14/2009	Karns, Pete Interested Public	For many years there has not been any apartments built in Jackson Hole. The only apartments that have been built were ones that were built first as apartments but to later be converted to condominiums. The reason that no true apartments have been built is that the Plan doesn't contain a zone where apartments can be built without having to compete against condos for the same land. The only zones that allow high density residential development allows both apartments and condos. Apartments and condos are lumped together and compete for the same land. The economical reality is that condos will be built every time because the land under a condo is worth considerably more than the land under an apartment. The solution is to create a new zone in the plan that would be exclusively for apartments or rental housing. The rules in this zone are fairly straight forward:1. It must allow for high density multifamily housing. 20-30 units per acre or even higher would make this workable.2. It can never be subdivided. This is necessary to prevent conversion later to condominiums.If this type of housing were built, I would predict that nearly all of it would be occupied by people who are in the workforce in Jackson Hole. This would be far better than the 15-25 percent workforce housing that is the current goal. The idea would be to create a new zone in the Plan that would become a tool for creating future workforce housing. It could be called Rental or Workforce Housing Zone. For example, if the north end of Southpark gets developed, a portion of that project could be zoned for Rental Housing. Do not make the mistake of downzoning land within the town of Jackson to force the building on apartments. This will not work. It can only work where land is upzoned (e.g. Rural Zone to Apartment Zone). Land within the town of Jackson that is currently zoned AR can be subdivided now and can provide ownership opportunities for workforce housing. This is an important part of the housing mix. To take away the opportunity to subdivide in AR would probably result in less workforce housing, not more. In addition, taking away the right to subdivide in AR would cause a huge devaluation of the land. That would be unfair to the landowner.Rental housing is an important part of Jackson Hole's future. It can be achieved if the correct tools are in the Plan. My suggestion is to create a new zoning tool that will be there when new development proposals are brought before Jackson Hole for consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Pyle, Owen Interested Public	I have recently reviewed the 2009 Plan. This plan is way off the mark in its growth components and will hopefully will be significantly modified by the planning commissioners before being submitted the Town and County Commissions. My concern is why such an aggressive growth plan is submitted in the first place, given all the surveys and public upset over the recent Teton Meadows Ranch scheme. It is not remotely realistic that the Teton residents would approve this plan. Jeff Daugherty's and Alex Norton's comments in the April 29th JHN&G suggests that special interests are at work here and hopefully they are not electeds. Since the County Commissioners hire these men,the taxpayers are paying their salaries and the cost of this plan, I am asking each of you what is going here. Maybe we have the wrong planners working for us. Thank you for considering my comments.
5/14/2009	Stoffelmayr, Amy Interested Public	I have written a comment in the comment area for South Park, but I have a general and longer comment I would like to make. I do experience Jackson as a community (or communities) and in looking over the planning "themes," I do not see maintenance of "community" and human resources addressed in comprehensive and specific ways. Perhaps "community" does not get addressed at this level of plan, but I do think it is an overarching concern of any community. I live in Indian Trails and would not like to see Boyle's Hill Rd. and Rt.22 connected. But I know that this is a concern that I have a vested interest in and is essentially a selfish concern. If there is no other option for a connector road, I can accept it in my neighborhood. My worry is that many Jackson people have only essentially selfish concerns and not community-minded ones. And people here complain about and object to anything that means change, without fully realizing that things are changing anyway and local character can become caricature. I am a proponent of community, as it is and as it can develop. Everyone is the recipient of the "goodies" of living in a functioning community, whether they realize it or not. What's not to love about living with wildlife? But is wildlife really more important than people? People take for granted their services infrastructure, e.g. Police, etc., etc. and don't even consider the community aspects of Jackson, which keep all of us relatively safe and happy, e.g.people watch out for each other and are generally considerate of each other. The residential nodes sound great but I think that places for people to meet (on foot or on bike) which are integral to them is what helps build and maintain community-- such as playgrounds, corner stores, cafes, pubs, post offices, benches, sledding hills, warming huts, groomed paths and trails. I'm sure there are many more in the research. Anything that can be developed anywhere in Jackson or the county, where people can met on foot or bike is good for the community, especially the old and the young. What about a Green House Project elder house built as a part of a planful residential node. Jackson has a diverse community and ways to help everyone integrate are important now that it has grown and diversified. I think people are generally kind of selfish but they also want to do what's good and right. Local government and planning can foster and support community members thinking beyond themselves and being more altruistic. I think that this could be named and addressed more specifically (and not just economically) than it now is. Well, I could go on but I'm sure we all have other things we need to do. My best and thanks for all the good and hard work you do for our community.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Springer, Kim Interested Public	I'd like to comment on the new Draft of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long time (almost one year) since we saw the first draft and there are far too many substantive changes to expect the public to have such a tiny window to comment. This is far too important a Plan to rush through. Please extend the comment period. My greatest concerns are listed below: The Community has placed the protection of wildlife and open space as our highest priority yet this plan does not protect Jackson Hole's irreplaceable wildlife and scenery. There are no tools in place to measure the impacts of the huge potential developments. We need planning tools to ensure that protecting wildlife is the highest priority. What happened to protecting our "Community Character?" As anyone involved in the 1994 plan knows, the community character was paramount in the Plan yet it has been omitted from this Draft. Please include verbiage from the 1994 plan regarding the protection of our rural character. The "Single Family Mixed-Type" classification is too vague. I'm told the need for the new plan is to provide "accountability, predictability, and measurability." The Single Family Mixed Type would allow single family, duplexes, tri-plexes, four-plexes and "convenience retail." What is predictable about a neighborhood with this classification? Sounds like anything goes in a neighborhood With this designation. In east Jackson the 1994 plan would allow an additional 140 new dwellings and the new draft will allow 270 new places including "convenience retail." With a total of less that 1000 existing dwellings in East Jackson now, this is an increase of over 25%, yet the plan calls east Jackson "Town Stable." What does stable mean? It is clearly misleading. The new Draft could more than double the residential and commercial development in the Valley. This would only exacerbate the need for workforce housing. The infrastructure costs are lacking in this Plan. Nodes will drive commercial growth and increase urban sprawl. Zoning should remain as is on the entire West Bank. Animals will not realistically adhere to our zoning boundaries; we are witnessing this with many species such as the bland and grizzly bears. Whose plan is this? I'm told this plan is a synthesis of all the public's input but I have yet to talk to anyone in favor of this plan or find evidence of its support. Realtors, general contractors, students, business owners, etc. are in opposition to the Plan. There are clearly some who will benefit financially from this kind of growth but not many of us. I ask you to slow down, read all the fine print and please listen to the people who care so passionately about this wonderful Valley.
5/14/2009	, Interested Public	I do not believe this draft version of the Comprehensive Plan reflects the desires of the people who live in this community. We spoke when we filled out your survey and our concerns are not adequately addressed. This plan belongs to the community and not to any other interests. Please amend the plan to control and limit growth in a way that is tangible and detailed. Allow values identified as most important to people who live here to prevail over those slated as less important. Most important value: Protect wildlife and our outdoor natural open spaces. It's the reason tourists visit here and the reason most of us continue to live here. It's the reason this valley has weathered our worldwide economic collapse as well as it has, so far. If this plan weakens our wildlife values, it will weaken our economy. If nothing else persuades you, I hope this reasoning does.
5/14/2009	Stoffelmayr, Amy Interested Public	I live in Indian Trails and have a vested interest in maintaining our quiet, low-keyed neighborhood. I would not like to see Tribal Trail and Rt. 22 connected. The Conservation Easement on the land between Boyle's Hill Rd. and Rt. 22 is a particularly beautiful part of the Hole with the Tetons viewed to the west, encompassing Boyle's Hill and bordered by High School Butte and a small ranch to the east. It includes a wetland being rehabilitated, a horse farm, cattle (in the past.) It is a small wonderland, filled with birds and mammals, appreciated by many, not only the residents but also users of the bike path as a flat, natural area, from which to view spectacular scenery. Indian Trails is an area filled with families with young children. If there is another route which a connector road to take, it would save this little jewel in its beautiful setting.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	, Cultural Council of JH	The Cultural Council of Jackson Hole is a 50 1(c)(3) non-profit corporation registered in the State of Wyoming and was formed to serve as a "clearing house" of applications for funding directed towards both the Town of Jackson and Teton County. The targeted applications are those submitted by organizations and individuals in regards to cultural and artistic endeavors. The Cultural Council has established a fair and impartial process by which all applications are considered and appropriately funded utilizing, in large part, Town and County subsidy. It is in this role that the board members and various committee personnel of the Cultural Council have had the better part of 15 years to become intimately familiar with the artistic and cultural activities throughout our community. We have observed strengths and volatility, trends and growth; we've seen children graduate in to leaders and local grass roots arts organizations that initiate global impact. We've seen international dignitaries from dance companies, prominent authors and musicians, to the Secretary General of the United Nations take part in seminars and deliver keynote addresses, all as a result of the resourcefulness of the cultural arts organizations in Jackson Hole. To say that the arts are thriving here and to derive that Jackson Hole has become, and will continue to grow as an "Arts and Cultural Destination" is clearly evident. In a community with less than 20,000 residents there is an 80,000 square foot Center For The Arts with more than a dozen full time organizations complete with staff and outreach programming. The Grand Teton Music Festival attracts artists worldwide and enjoys global recognition with significant local impact. Another crown jewel is our local art museum, to which the Federal Government has granted the official and elite designation as "National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States." With these examples, and dozens more, there are abundant and inspiring opportunities for visitors and residents to both experience and contribute to the arts that celebrate our culture. The economic impact of the local arts industry is substantial with recurring evidence of positive net returns and continual reinvestment. Our figures, along with other estimates show more than 50,000 individuals are affected annually by cultural and arts spending in Teton County. With the utmost respect, The Cultural Council of Jackson Hole, as appointed arbiter and eyewitness to the cultural and artistic phenomena of the region, recommends in the strongest possible manner that the joint Town and County Comprehensive Plan include language encouraging continued support and growth of the Arts in Jackson Hole, in addition to the concept of Jackson Hole as an "Arts and Cultural Destination." In doing so, those authorities having jurisdiction will see clearly the hearts, desires and intent among those framing the culture of our community. Signed on this day, May 14, 2009 by those board members as noted below and submitted to the Jackson Hole Comprehensive Plan process. Emy DiGrappa Don Kushner Bronwyn Minton Sarra Mossoff Macey Molt Erin Roy Lisa Samford Dimmie Zeigler
5/14/2009	Jorgensen, Jean Interested Public	Comments on the draft of the County Comprehensive Plan My intention had been to comment on the various sections of the draft but the more I think about the whole process the more I feel that the timing for this planning effort is just plain wrong: As the economic base of this community is tourism and real estate, and there is huge economic uncertainty at all levels, local, state, national and international, no one knows what impact this uncertain climate will have on this community, and for what period of time. Also, the town and county are making the push to "Go Green" and to become leaders in this movement, to set examples for other communities on how to lower carbon footprints. Isn't it backward to adopt the Comprehensive Plan before having the Green initiatives in place? Although I support efforts to "protect wildlife and open spaces, manage growth responsibly, and provide workforce housing," I feel that the numbers proposed for the "nodes" are excessive. I know that currently there is frequent "gridlock," on the roads (knowing how long it sometimes takes me to get out of my subdivision, Skyline Ranch, onto Highway 22). The idea of adding those hundreds more cars sounds like a recipe for disaster, and certainly doesn't fit with reducing the carbon footprint. I am aware that this draft of the Comprehensive Plan fails to evaluate the impacts this amount of development will have on many parts of the community. As a former Teton County School Board member, it makes me shudder to think of the numbers of new schools that would have to be built, not to mention all of the other requirements for human services, law enforcement, and so on, that would be needed should the numbers suggested materialize. This at a time when cutbacks are being required in these areas due to loss of revenue in the state. What happened to "Community Character," that has been so important to the people of this valley for so long? I could go on, but I know that you're hearing from plenty of people who are alarmed at the potential for the destruction of what most hold dear about this place. Be careful. There is a real potential for "Killing the Goose that Laid the Golden Egg."

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Pfeifer, David Interested Public	Your plan in Wilson is out of control. You should rethink the number of houses you want to approve and cut it to zero. No growth in Wilson, and I don't even live there!
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	I commend the effort that went into the draft of the Comprehensive Plan. It is always easier to find the flaws in a piece of work than it is to actually sit down and draft such a large and comprehensive body of work. I largely agree with it in spirit. I especially support the strategic desire to increase predictability and reduce discretionary review. The move away from a focus on resort activities towards the community is to be applauded. We need to stop being a community where the profits are privatized and the costs are borne by the community. In this spirit, the gross community impacts of the potential commercial development proposed by this plan should be analyzed in advance of completion of the plan. It is only by doing such an analysis that we will know whether the assumptions proposed by this draft plan are reasonable or not. In the same vein, the draft plan should address the potential impact of the residential buildout on public facilities. The plan simply contemplates that the quality of services should remain the same. Where are the impacts contemplated to be the greatest? I believe there are additional meaningful flaws and omissions in the plan, which are worthy of consideration. In general, there is a lack of specificity to the plan in several areas.
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	I agree with the seven themes and the ranking you have given them, but do not agree that the stewardship of wildlife and natural resources will automatically occur without active management. The balancing of human and resource needs requires five additional components for the human side of the equation, but assumes that wildlife will do just fine without more specific actions.
5/13/2009	Field, Wendell Interested Public	I would like to see affordable land in the heart of town available to low income members of the community. In addition to this I would like "alternative" structures allowed, mainly yurts. I am a low income resident of Jackson. My income comes to me as an artist a teacher and worker in the nonprofit sector. My work is important in many ways to our community. I have lived in and visited many yurts. They are a durable, affordable, and charming structure to live in. They can have plumbing available and be easily off the grid. This would serve to inspire simple living to the world outside of Jackson Hole and provide a balance to much of what Jackson Hole has become, (a very unsustainable way of living by many of the large, second homes owners in Teton county, as well as provide housing to a sector of our community in need. I would also like to see public art projects expand. Art in public places is what gives a town it's soul. Murals and sculptures around town would be an addition that would benefit Jackson culturally and in turn economically for many years to come. During time in Santa Fe I often hear how Jackson is becoming more and more an arts destination. Public art would solidify that notion and add much to our town. Thanks for your good work and consideration of my comments.
5/13/2009	Richman, Gordy Interested Public	Cottonwood park was the first neighborhood development for the "service industry" and working class of Jackson. For over twenty years our community has been trying to catch up to the housing demands. I realize development will happen. District 12 has Dover apartment, Blair place, and 3 creek employee units. Flat creek business center, Gregory lane industrial park, and Smiths plaza. 1) prior to any future development. please give us "open/green space" on the south side of cottonwood park. the "hole" strip from middle school road to southpark loop. it should extend far enough south to maintain the visual aesthetics of Munger mountain region, green knoll, and mesquite creek. minimum of 2500 ft. 2) The proximity (sp) of professional services and retail to our district is the highest per capita of all the districts in Teton county. there is no need for future commercial growth. This proposal has negative effects for the goal of town (lets start saying community at heart, how about region at heart). You asked our opinion. your plan DOES NOT SUCCEED IN ACCOMPLISHING ANY OF THE SURVEY RESULTS. TO ACHIEVE REGION AT HEART WE MUST WORK TOGETHER. YOUR ACTIONS DO NOT REPRESENT ANY OF THE HEART. The high school has all windows on the north side. the shop is on the creek and visible from the gateway (poor water quality/ visually bad). the year round soccer field where designed to have people kicking balls at cars not nets. these are just a few example of poor planning in our district. You dont need a phd to design an industrial park the can handle semi's. "s" turns on Gregory lane????????p.s. build out should not block lines of sight of pedestrians or vehicles. less angst + more trust + town/county/region at heart. I may not type well, or spell well. please dont make obvious mistakes. slow down.
5/13/2009	Johnson, Judy Interested Public	Please ease off on the developement... Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	Development in the NW corner of South Park should be mitigated so it has no impact on High School Road. I strongly feel there should be a buffer between development and HS road. Growth should be limited as much as possible. I generally agree with comments that were developed by Kathy Tompkins and Rich Bloom., see below. Cottonwood Park District 13 Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original Ideal, principals and how those work with in the districts. The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and cause a district to be unified. We love our neighborhood and how it with the other neighborhoods in our district makes a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district. When reading the written text published in the draft plan we have the following comments: 1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as roll models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open available lots with in the town makes more sense. 2) Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our districts character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed. 3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts need to be fist and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other school that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems need to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation is a big mistake. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property. 4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if in fact the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home some where in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's. 6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wild life is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and irrelevant berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great determent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice ("allowable trade offs for District 13," are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South. 7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we can not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smiths plaza is physically close enough and for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Three times now, I have typed a lengthy letter and lost it because of my unfamiliarity with a Spanish keyboard. So this is very short. The Comprehensive Master Plan revision is a disaster and ignores so many representations made to the community on the front end of this project. You are trying to develop your way out of a development problem. Are you playing the same game that your wealthy developer friends play so well in your public forum, ask for the moon, make concessions and claim that you have listened to the public.... Sewer pipe, Wilson, Teton Village, traffic study, buildout populaton, all early representations have fallen by the wayside. Time to start over.
5/13/2009	, Interested Public	I strongly disagree with the direction of the proposed comp. plan. I have lived in Wilson for 19 years and previously lived in California. To see the result of rampant growth which destroys a place, one only needs to go to Southern California. Our assets her are the open spaces, wildlife and clean air. Read the guest shot in last weeks paper by Kristine&Paul O'Brien and then re-read it. Protecting our "environmental capital" is the only way to ensure that Jackson doesn't become just another ruined destination. Where is it written that everyone who wants to live here,should live here? Why do we need a total build-out? Let's rethink the idea of living within our means-what our environment can sustain.
5/13/2009	Poole, Steven Interested Public	Density as proposed is far to high. Limit any growth to wilson workforce only. Do not increase commuter traffic by promoting people who work in other areas to live in Wilson. This plan is not about its stated goals, appears to be a rubber stamp for unpresidented growth that is not benefit to anyone but developers. Waldron property off Fall creek rd should recieve highest protection as wildlife corridor not as increased housing. Animals coming off pass are forced into narrow hillside area by fall creek retaining walls and a high fenced pasture at base of Heck of a Hill. This corridor is used daily by multiple animal species. Property provides key link to Rossitter open space, Fish creek waterway and protected Hardeman lands beyond. Plan must address current highway 22 traffic and speeding issues before any other growth priority. Include all comment recieved at recent Wilson charettes in planning documents. Listen to community before planners and developers.
5/13/2009	Hocking, Scott Interested Public	What is the number of residents going to be in this comp plan?When I moved here,and invested in this county,the proposed build out was 20,000.Let all know what the new number will be-don't hide that number.Please do not punish the residents of Wilson with the increased housing that we all know should be built at Teton Village.
5/13/2009	Pilafian, Peter Interested Public	Planning is almost always a good thing. And the current version of our comp plan revision is a lovely piece of work, written in a very literary way with lots of nice graphics. The long hours and hard work on this project are greatly appreciated. However, it is not only off the mark, it is full of contradictions as well. In seeking to provide answers, what it primarily does is raise more questions. A big one that comes to mind is: what happens after the much-touted "Build-out limit" is reached? Does everything come to a creeching halt? I don't think so. That's not human nature. So 'buildout' is just a conceptual smokescreen. And what really is a "Node?" When you describe Wilson as a designated 'node' of the future, you are not only giving today's Wilson the kiss of death, you are contradicting the concept when you say it will be used for housing development only, thereby maintaining 'town as heart' (i.e. keep the retail business in Jackson). In other words, you want Wilson to become a Bedroom community, with triple or quadruple the population! Shame on you, planners! A comprehensive plan should get specific about recommended new platting for public spaces like parks and pedestrian areas, and new layouts for communityoriented street and transportation systems. This one does not. And why do we NOT see the phrase 'Community Character' peppered throughout the document? Well, apparently it is because the planners in their infinite wisdom decided that Community Character could not be given a precise, black and white definition, so they would just leave it out! Go figure! The authors show a further lack of connection with this community when they say that the existing Wilson services, school and small businesses need "increased viability and sustainability" (their words.) Ridiculous! Every service and business in Wilson is the very Definition of Sustainability! And in fact, they are pretty much running at desired capacity most of the time. The big exception, of course, is that brand new two-story office building which sits empty on highway 22, but we tried to tell the developer it was not needed before it even got built. And now your plan talks about putting more "offices" in Wilson. I have one specific request: please take Wilson off of the list of "Nodes." Wilson can grow slowly, in its own "Rural" way. And maybe we can do without your "daytime vibrancy" – whatever that means.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	, Conservation Alliance	Wadda ya mean, 'There goes the rope?': Sometimes, even the best laid plans go awry [published pamphlit, see actual pamphlit for content, headings below] Please help, It takes a community to find community solutions What's a Comp Plan? And why should you care? Take a second look: Analysis of the new draft Comp Plan reveials major flaws. Community's top priority: protecting wildlife. Whose plan is this, anyhow? Why are so many of the things people asked for missing from the new draft? What does "managing growth responsibly" mean? Depends on when you asked. One step forward, two steps back? New dradt loses key protections of the plan it was meant to improve. Numbers Matter. Will "future land use plan" maps will get us where we want to go? Not if Wilson's any example... Iffy foundation? Now, how can we fix it? Solutions won't happen without your help. What can you do? Help creat a plan that works. Make your comments count.
5/13/2009	Smith, Barbara Interested Public	I have lived in East Jackson for nearly 37 years. Already when I walk past the recently built tall buildings I can't see the familiar landscape and they are built right to the side walk. I feel like I'm walking down a city street anywhere. I don't recognize where I am. I agree that density belongs in already developed areas. Lets do it consciously and not build to capacities just because we can. Thank you for the enormous amount of time and energy that has been put forth by the elected stewards of our community thus far. I support redirection of the comprehensive plan regarding these points:1) Town has 4,251,000 square feet (sf) of existing commercial floor area. The Draft forecasts an increase of 3,678,000 to 5,420,000 sf, depending upon incentives. Up to 3,466,000 sf of this growth will occur within the Downtown and Snow King districts. These two districts alone will employ 8,665 new workers (using a very conservative 2.5 jobs/1000sf). Total employment growth for Town would be 13,550. This represents a level of urbanization for our town that could destroy it's character and quality of life for those already living here.a) Where will these workers be housed? How many deed restricted or rental units will be needed and what is the funding plan? What policies link the creation of new jobs to housing supply? Under the Draft, there are only a few Town districts where increased residential density is planned. Do these districts have the capacity to house 13,550 workers and their families? b) Is this Plan affordable? What increases in taxes and fees are planned to fund the required schools, justice center, roads, bus system, parking structures, etc.? Schools are roughly \$25 million each, how many are needed to support the growth allowed under this Plan? The financial burden of higher taxes will fall hardest on the very people our affordable housing programs are designed to help. Is this Plan sustainable? 2) Downtown Jackson = growing resort district. The Lodging Overlay is to be expanded west to Flat Creek. Important community retail services (ex. Staples, Hoback Sports, Ace Hardware, Bubba's) could be replaced by hotels. Why doesn't the Draft seek to restore a sense of Community in this district? Rather than more hotels, let's zone for more workforce housing and amenities which will attract residents.2. East Jackson, "District 15"The East Jackson portion of the Draft hints at the possibility of important policy shifts. EJ is designated as a "stable" district where development is "neutral and preserves existing character." Development is expected to be sensitive to wildlife permeability, especially in areas bordering open space. While these are encouraging words, there is one change which must become codified in the LDRs if these words are to affect what happens on the ground: ***** PLEASE Restrict affordable housing density bonuses under the Planned Unit Development tool (PUD) to lots already zoned for higher density (AR/NC-2). We must ensure that this restriction becomes part of our land use regulations, significantly improving land use predictability while providing proper EJ locations for workforce housing.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Wilbrecht, Erich Interested Public	In light of a tight deadline for comment by Friday the 15th I will address my overall reaction to the plan as explained and set forth at the Wilson School meeting last Friday. First, thanks for all of your hard work. Second, I don't think this draft plan focuses on the feedback and desires of the majority of residents in Teton County. My overall reaction to the proposed buildout numbers is shock and disgust. I agree with the majority of residents that the first priority should be the preservation of open space and wildlife. This plan needs to nurture a sustainable community. By doubling our valley's current size we will outgrow all of our current infrastructure (schools, hospital etc), create an ugly mess of traffic, grow government which will lead to spiraling tax increases, etc, etc. Enough is enough. I would support a plan that allows future growth only on those lots already platted and vested with development rights. Beyond this, the only new growth I support is to address the needs of employee housing of critical county and town employees. All new employee and deed restricted housing should be built either in Teton Village, to fulfill the needs of employers in Teton Village, or in Town, where current commercial and commuter infrastructure exists to accommodate their needs. The concept of tripling the size of Wilson is absurd. Most of Wilson lies in the wetland corridor of Fish Creek, (and several feet below the level of the Snake River). It is surrounded by land under easement with the Land Trust. The only housing needs I would support in Wilson are for teacher housing for the Wilson School, or for affordable housing for businesses that currently exist, or could be built under existing development rights. Regarding the "node" in the Aspens; again, the only housing I would support there would be for employees of businesses located at or near the Aspens/Pines/Westside store. I would support deed restricted housing for critical workers in Teton County; ie; teachers, emergency workers, health care providers, firemen, police) near the new High School, along the High School road, near commercial centers and public transportation. We do not need to double the size of Jackson Hole. We have no obligation to feed the lion of progress. Many other civilized cities and towns throughout the world thrive without rampant growth. They remain sustainable, desirable, and liveable. Let's not hang ourselves on the cross of affordable housing, nor the misguided concept that we can create affordability through more density. I appreciate your efforts and I look forward to the recrafting of the draft comp plan.
5/13/2009	Callahan, Mary Lynn Interested Public	1. Page 8 states " the concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that...ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs." I completely disagree with this statement and believe that in all the meetings and polls everyone or the majority of voters stated that the Plan was to protect and preserve our cherished wildlife and open spaces despite growth and human needs !! 2. Wildlife and natural resources must be the top priority in all districts WITHOUT compromise. I want to see permanently protect rural open space within the plan and not specifically removing South Park from areas now recommended for preservation. 3. Growth will occur. What I don't agree with is the growth beyond existing entitlements & upzones. (see appendix 1) The new plan doesn't address the growth problems today and just adds additional growth and future problems. So a.) Overall buildout should be reduced b.) Job creating commercial should be constrained c.) Maximum build out should be specifically defined, capped and permanent, with a slow sustainable rate of growth over an extended time. 4. Increase housing mitigation rates on new residential and commercial development. Reduce the job creating commercial in the plan and require all development to fully offset direct impacts on workforce housing and infrastructure demands. 5. The needs of current residents should take priority not future residents. We want to live equally with wildlife and our natural resources! The plan must have clear and specific data to show outcomes and impacts on wildlife, traffic, roads, schools, environment, taxes, and other quality of life issues. 6. Vision Statement: "Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and natural resources and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner." a.) you must define "human needs" b.) These terms of human needs and community benefit are way too vague, policy should not be set by 3 votes on Town Council or County Commission. c.) Sustainability is a plan priority, yet growth limits are not defined, determined, or set in the plan. 7. I want a community and economy that is NOT DEPENDENT on growth. 8. 2009 Plan, Policy 1.6a. Make sure South Park is included in this section. thank you for all of your work Please consider each and every comment submitted and be fearless in changing your opinion and listen to the residents of Jackson!!!
5/13/2009	McNutt, Jim Interested Public	Further comment: I am and have been a supporter of the JH Historical Society, so my comments are not intended negatively towards their good work; I just want to see some balance that includes the broader arts and cultural activity that is prominent in the town.
5/13/2009	McNutt, Jim Interested Public	I am struck that historic preservation gets prominent attention in this draft, including mention by name of the JH Historical Society, but that the arts, including the Center for the Arts, gets short shrift, even though there are significant economic generators associated with art galleries and performances and the Town of Jackson has invested directly in some of these in the past. If the vision of the town hews so closely to historical/western themes and ignores the dynamic and changing face of the arts in the town and county, what are the implications for future development (both public and retail) and the potential of the arts to become a destination-generating activity and source of good for the community?

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Mortensen, John and P Interested Public	We wish to express our observations on the proposed plan for Wilson. • Although protection of wildlife is expressed as the number one consideration for the county, it is only number five for Wilson. Wildlife populations in Wilson are already challenged. Moose populations in Teton County are down over 50% from ten years ago, attributed to loss of habitat. Are we willing to forsake these precious resources for yet to be identified new residents. • Growth and workforce housing are the driving elements of the plan, when Wilson already a higher percentage of subsidized affordable housing and homes for “workforce” residents than any other sector in Teton County. • And, it’s hard to say who is the real beneficiary of subsidized affordable housing. Is it the occupant? Is it their employer who can continue to pay a less than adequate amount for employees to afford home ownership? Is it not contributing to otherwise un-sustainable commercial development? What is the real benefit to the community? • Recent re-development of West Street has been sited as a model for this plan. Yet few “workforce” residents could afford the resultant new homes, all exceeding \$1,5000,000 in value. This re-development has resulted in property tax increases in our case of over 60% and even higher for others. Continued development of this kind could well drive current working residents to leave their homes in Wilson, no longer being able to afford increased costs of living. • While stating future development will be designed to protect Fish Creek, simply enforcing the current 50 foot set back will go a long way in achieving this goal without any changes or unclear plans. • There is not sufficient infrastructure to accommodate such dramatic growth in Wilson. Not the schools, roads, sewer capacity, water resources or commercial development. Why are planners so willing to forsake our present rural character for, future unknown residents? Wilson more than doubled its size with the development of Wilson Meadows just over a decade ago. Wilson and Jackson have always been very special parts of the west, created by rugged individuals. If this plan is so beneficial for all of us tripling Wilson’s current population, why stop there. Maybe ten or twenty times would better serve the needs of our future unknown populations. It is apparently not for long time residents to say, having consistently expressed our views of slow, low density growth.
5/13/2009	Cadenhead, Sophie Interested Public	My name is Sophie Cadenhead, and I am an 8th grade student at Jackson Hole Middle school. I ride horses, play volleyball, show dogs, and play guitar. I love living in Jackson Hole because of its smallness and beautiful mountains. It wouldn’t be the same here if there weren’t wide-open fields that frame the surrounding mountains. It makes Jackson special there is a good amount of houses spread throughout the valley. My biggest concern is that my unique town is going to be eaten up by houses in the huge fields that make up Jackson. As of right now I can look out my back door and see at least three miles of open field with cattle and horses grazing. It is the best feeling to know I don’t live in the city, and that I’m lucky enough to live in a small town, but if we let the land go how will this affect us? Letting our land become nothing more than a place to put houses will in my opinion change Jackson. The land value will go down while energy bills will go up. The sights will change in contrast to the houses affecting tourism, and that is how Jackson makes all its money. I know I wouldn’t stay here if that happened I would probably move. Also, with all these new houses how will that affect the animals, or the environment? Really do the benefits of these houses over rule the down side? I don’t think so. What do you think?
5/12/2009	Pfeifer, David Interested Public	I am a resident of Cottonwood Park1. We must have Green space from cottonwood park extending from the High school to South Park road, extending 1000 feet to the South. This can be used as a park or future school property. Our two parks in cottonwood are used by everyone in the area and overused.2. NO commercial use, we have Smiths and other stores 1/2 mile away!!!! We Do not need any more light pollution. !!!!3. Future development MUST have at Least one east-west connector to Highway 189. High School Road MUST not be used as a main artery. IT IS A SCHOOL ROAD ONLY!!!!!!!!!!!!4. Growth rate of 1.5% / year.5. Planners are not following the Survey. Look at what the people said, you have altered the results.a. Wildlife, #1 not 6b. Growth, #2 not 1c. Town as heart, #3 not 7d. Housing needs,#4 not 2e. Ecomomy, #5 not 3f. transportation, #6 not 4g. Services #7 not 5
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Tripling development in Wilson does not seem feasible given the current nature of the region and lack of public transportation to the area. I think tripling the size would have a very negative impact on the character and wildlife in the area.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I agree with town as heart and don't mind the rodeo grounds being in town but the grounds need a serious facelift. This area, along with the public works area and START bus parking are a true eyesore. I loved the addition of trees on SK Ave. but much more needs to be done to make this a useable and visually appealing space.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I think we should focus on re-developing existing structures for housing needs before new units are met. I like the idea of attempting to house 65% or more of our workforce in the valley and I am not opposed to dorm or hostel-like housing for seasonal employees as long as it is done thoughtfully and with character. For example, the Blair apartments serve a great need but they could have been done in a much more appealing way.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Reilly, Jamie Interested Public	The creative expression of this community and its members is as valuable a natural resource as the wildlife and landscape. I would like to see specific language about the creation of opportunities for public art installations addressed throughout Theme 3. Policy 3.1.b refers to the creation of "new and vital neighborhoods."Policy 3.5a refers to maintaining and improving public spaces that are "interesting, memorable, and reinforce our sense of community," as well as "creating attractive gateways." Policy 3.5.b refers to investment in "arts and cultural facilities" to make the town a "cultural hub"Policy 3.5.c refers to specifically enhancing the 3 major gateways into our community.Opportunities for public art will help ensure the aims of these policies are realized.Similarly, I would like to see specific mention of public art under theme 7. Policy 7.2.a refers to "fee structures and requirements that assess the cost of public facilities" and I would like to see public art factored specifically into those assessments.
5/12/2009	White, Marylee Interested Public	Residents of Jackson Hole experience a cultural life far richer than others living in communities the size of ours. President Obama recently pointed out the arts play an important role in the economic health of a community. Public arts and public art programs, encourage vibrant thought and community interaction.
5/12/2009	Dunstan, Mark Interested Public	Public space should be created with the enhancement not only of the public's basic needs in mind, but also that of the public's experience of those spaces. A percentage of the cost of new development should be dedicated to providing the public with an cohesive and relevant sense of cultural space. It is critical that we provide both visitors and residents with a clear and public view of the arts and culture, past and present of the valley.
5/12/2009	Shattow, Eric Interested Public	I enjoy seeing art in the public space. The best first impression on visitors can be made by supporting Policy 3.5c to enhance jackson gateways. This is inline with art in the public space for both locals and tourism. I support Policy 3.5a to maintain and improve public spaces, and comment that I would like most art in the public space to be temporary, or to gain sufficient funding and support to change with the seasons.
5/12/2009	Kushner, Don Interested Public	The concept of public art enhancing the visual and visceral experience can play a major role in the strategies detailed in 3.1.b, 3.5.a and 3.6.a&c.Please include language that supports public arts concepts.Thank you!
5/12/2009	Joy, Diana Interested Public	What a great opportunity we have before us to integrate PUBLIC ART into our community!!
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	We MUST encourage fewer vehicle trips and provide safe and well designed corridors for pedestrians and bikers. The bus routes need to make sense for users and serve more areas. Neighborhoods within developed areas must have sidewalks or safe areas for kids and adults to walk and bike.
5/12/2009	Dunstan, Mark Interested Public	The preservation and enhancement of our local and regional character/charm requires that with any development, there is a proportional increase in the amount of visible culture. Making allowances for public art within that development would tap directly into a regionally relevant source of culture.
5/12/2009	Kelly, Cara Interested Public	In response to Principle 3.5 Inflated costs for events should be addressed as large portions of the community are excluded. Practice spaces, concert tickets, etc should be more accessible for more members of the community--especially younger members. I think that this would help to create a community with all ages represented and involved.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Caldwell, Cat Interested Public	We are at an important junction in our developmental history. The public art possibilities are endless and must be presented to the community as viable. This should be done in a sustainable and eco-friendly manner using recycled goods and volunteers. After this evening's conversations, I think that entering the conversation at the developer's drawing table is probably the best option. However, artists (and locals who may not yet be comfortable defining themselves as artists) ought to be encouraged and invited to the table for entertaining ideas. At present, it is unclear whether or not the town/county has recognized the potential for incorporating public art in a more official manner. Please consider clarifying how "the lofty ideas of the community" ought to be presented to the government/developers in a way that the public may become aware. One thing that I do not feel has been considered is public performance and performance art. Jackson Hole is home to a variety of talented outdoors and adventuring enthusiasts who could authentically share their stories, songs, rants and raves in a professional manner that would entertain the tourists and provide a creative outlet for the locals. (If you are curious about my ideas of being a local, then see who buys groceries:) Housing seems to be our number one thing, after conservation and, again, coming up with a way for the community to artistically express their joys and frustrations of living here would be an exceptional use of addressing public art. Finally, the thing about art in public is not only unexpected appreciation, but also communal participation in ways that make history! Just a thought at this "Public Art Meeting" of the virtual minds. Thank you for providing a space to share our thoughts, feelings and finds:)
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	A diverse and balanced economy is essential. Local business owners need to feel supported and not pushed out. It is important that we do not allow Jackson to become Anytown, USA.
5/12/2009	G., Matthew Interested Public	Utilizing Public Art would be an excellent way to enhance civic spaces and could also be a way to visually document Jackson's history. Artists could be commissioned to create a visual narrative that accentuates historic spaces and highlight local traditions in our town. Investment in Public Art is an investment in the future of our community.
5/12/2009	Leslie, Craig Interested Public	I have further studied the Draft Comprehensive Plan, and want to strongly voice my concerns as follows;1) I do not believe it reflects the overwhelming desire of our community to protect wildlife and the environment. It talks about "responsible growth", but does not assess the impact of so many extra people, houses and motor vehicles.2) It seeks to "sacrifice" Wilson & South Park, against the wishes of these communities. Why do we need commercial growth, which will then require new workers and new housing? Vicious cycle.3) Jeff Daugherty is not acting in the interests of the community and the values they cherish; we want land protection, and not deed restricted housing that is only required if we build additional commercial space.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I am a fan of this concept but I don't want to see town "overdeveloped". The amount of dwellings and residents in town must be sustainable for town and the surrounding national forest and national parks. Any development must also be offset by open and green spaces and parks within town for all to enjoy. It would be soooooo nice if we encouraged a small grocery store to be located within 2-4 blocks of the town square. Without being able to buy basic needs close to town, everyone will continue to drive to one of the grocery stores often, no matter what alternative transportation options we offer them.
5/12/2009	Miller, Abbie Interested Public	The need for public art to address social, environmental, and local issues in Jackson and abroad are imminent. Public Art has the ability to instigate a community dialogue that can enhance and expand our visual and imaginative perceptions. Public art is on par with the visual considerations designers take with architecture, landscaping, and the preservations of our beautiful surroundings in Teton County, but can provide beauty and reflection that surpasses our urban layout. It is incredibly important that we as a community support the efforts of our local artists to engage the beauty and political climate we live in ways that expand our current visual landscape. Public art brings people into specific places and environments and asks them to consider and reflect on their surroundings. Such projects can also provide places of peace and democracy, and give access to art for all people.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Barney, Bodean Interested Public	I have the following concerns about the South Park Development:1.) 1/8 of a mile (660 ft.) set-backs from South Park Loop Rd. is inadequate. There should be set-backs of at least 1/4 mile from both this road and the High School Road. The only ditch that conveys water from the Leek Ditch over to the Dairy Subdivision (where there are water rights, appears to be the one along the South side of High School Road). Further, why do we care more about keeping this "gateway" (East of Flat Creek) open from development, while congesting the NW side of Flat Creek. Seems that we are giving preference to tourists visiting Jackson Hole at the expense of the folks that live and work here. Why not actually maintain open spaces and "scenic vistas" rather than giving that impression to passing travelers, who would find something very different if they drove just a mile to the West.2.) What about infrastructure? Will connector roads (East/ West) and other roads be in place before they determine how many units will be packed in to this area. What about open space? Rangeview seems to be very well planned and laid out, almost too well, as we get a lot of traffic from folks visiting Rangeview Park from all over town (but especially Blair Place and Ellingwood). As I understand it, the open space in Rangeview was determined by the # of residents (when you add all of the additional use and potentially even more from the other side of High School Road, this makes me feel like I live in the center of a housing project). I'm concerned that there will be a toilet bowl effect, with Rangeview Park at the center (especially when the Tribal Trails connector goes through). Thank you for your time and consideration.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Managing growth responsibly is very important and we must protect our character and resources. New development must take in to account open space and transportation issues and not compromise wildlife or natural resources.
5/12/2009	Pollak, Ernest LaBelle a Interested Public	We are writing as residents of the West Bank area of Teton County to express our concerns about the basic premise and specific content of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan update which proposes to embody a 10 to 15-year vision for our community's future. We respectfully believe the plan in its present form is seriously flawed in the following areas: The high density "nodes" proposed for the West Bank (Teton Pines) and Wilson communities will significantly compromise the quality of life for both human and wildlife inhabitants of those neighborhoods by greatly increasing traffic volumes on highways 390 and 22. The plan should not in any case be offered for adoption until an updated natural resources overlay can be applied to those areas. Otherwise it will fail to take into account wildlife corridors and wildlife winter range locations and will increase the probability of failing to provide for the use of existing and proven methods of facilitating the free movement of wildlife and reducing the levels of road kill on highways 390 and 22. The proposed system of "nodes" will contribute to an imposed and unrealistic separation of human and wildlife inhabitants as opposed to the encouragement and facilitation of the co-existence of those populations which is the basis for Jackson Hole's unique character and quality of life. To be truly wildlife-driven, our vision should be one of creating a porous environment in which wildlife can move about with relative safety and freedom both in and through populated and open space areas. Otherwise, the open areas become little more than viewing zoos and our communities become sterile segregated zones that are not as wildlife friendly as we want them to be. The plan as drafted does not seem to recognize that wildlife habitat is and should be everywhere and not just in so-called outlying areas. That is what differentiates the unique area of Jackson Hole from a Vail, Colorado, or Sun Valley, Idaho. There is no evidence that the planning authorities have asked themselves why Wilson and Teton Pines are already successful as wildlife-friendly communities with a high quality of life and then looked at how those characteristics can be maintained and improved upon, not how they can be changed into something it was never meant to be and that the existing population would abhor and reject. Communities can and do change, but they should be encouraged to change for the best, not the worst. The idea of becoming a "node" to accommodate some planner's idea of growth and progress does not have much appeal to us or to our neighbors. In conclusion, we believe that the comprehensive plan should be wildlife-driven, not growth-driven and that the entire process should be slowed down until these important questions can be more carefully addressed and understood.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I am thankful for the open space in this part of town and encourage planners to not develop too much around the meadow. Having open space in the densely populated areas of town is critical for a healthy community.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	diGrappa, Emy Interested Public	I am involved in the arts on many levels: board member for the JH Cultural Council, dance teacher of Dancers Workshop, and Marketing Consultant for Off Square Theatre Company - the arts impacts my life. It is important for the "heart" of the region to have a "soul" - arts and culture is the soul of the community. It is the pulse of the people on many different issues political, social, and personal self expression. People's throughout history have always expressed themselves through the arts - that is the reason it has a distinct heritage and legacy - as stated in Theme 3: Jackson as "Heart of the Region".For this reason, it is imperative that the arts play an important role in a comprehensive plan for the Teton County Community Vision.Each of the following areas in the plan should address the arts:"Heart of the Region" - the arts create the community character and play a vital role in preserving the heritage. legacy and character of Jackson Hole.Policy 3.5 - arts and cultural facilities - not just facilities but programming in those facilities makes the cultural hub. A building is a building with no life in it, ie: the arts programs in the Center for the Arts, for example make the CA an art facility not the sign outside that says "Center for the Arts".I respectfully submit my support for the consideration of arts as part of the comprehensive plan.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	If more development is to occur in this area, it must be sustainable with the traffic and public transportation. More open space and parks must be created.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	This area must be bike and pedestrian friendly. It would be so beneficial to encourage a small grocery store to be located in the area so that town residents have easy access to everyday needs. I am a big fan of closing the town square to traffic, much like the centers of Boulder and Burlington.
5/12/2009	White, Marylee Interested Public	I support policy 3.5.b; Make public investments in strategic locations. As the community continues to invest in public facilities, including arts and cultural facilities, it would be good for the community to consider a mechanism for the creation of public art; a fund that could support public art and a review committee that ensures that permanent installations fulfill the vision of the comprehensive plan.
5/12/2009	Springer, James Interested Public	The increase in the number of nits in the Pines area seems extreme. Highway 390 is already under stress in volume and yet the increased amount of traffic will only increase the problem. Although there are commercial businesses in the area none of them satisfy the day to day needs of residents in the area. The market is great for emergencies like running out of eggs but I have never seen anyone there with a more that a few convenience items in their basket. It is time to quit stating in planning documents that the proximity of a convenience store will reduce traffic to Jackson.Another point in the plan promotes the increased population as it will help justify more off season START bus service. Again and again the bus service is used to justify development. I live next to the Calico and no matter how much the START bus stop is heralded as a solution to traffic volume, the ridership is still very small. Increased density in the area benefits neither the wildlife nor already critical traffic problems. I would like to see the justification based on something other than the fact that there is already density in the area and more empty busses will be made available. Thank You
5/12/2009	Silberberg, Gary Interested Public	I am on the board of the Center of Wonder and have been involved in supporting the arts through different venues (e.g. offsquare, dancers workshop, center for the arts, NIPE funding of school programs). We are blessed to have a vibrant creative community and wonderful facilities. With these resources we can truly build a "town as heart" with art. To do this we should proactively encourage an true community of art (public art, family classroom programing, direct support of artists, etc.) Providence, RI set this as a goal in their plan a number of years ago and revitalized a mature urban environment. With the advantages Jackson has, the only obstacles is setting our expectations too low.
5/12/2009	Belk, Kathleen Interested Public	Without stewardship of wildlife and wild spaces, Jackson Hole might as well not exist.
5/12/2009	, Interested Public	Protecting and enhancing the character and charm of Jackson during periods of development requires enabling and supporting a proportional increase visible culture. While simply improving public space by conventional means is vital, attention should be payed to the relevance of these improvements to the character and culture of our town. By integrating relevant public works of art into both improvements and new development, we would be going directly to the source of this culture to amplify the character and charm of the valley.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I think promoting stewardship of wildlife is paramount. Development must be limited in many respects in order to acheive this goal. I don't believe that tripling the size of Wilson and allowing for 1000 more units in South Park are in harmony with this goal, nor is overdeveloping the Town of Jackson. I like the idea of town as heart and support more development in town but not to the extent that the number of people in the valley has a negative impact on wildlife and natural resources. A much larger poplulation in town would surely compromise the integrity of recreation areas such as Cache Creek and Snow King. The amount of allowable development must be in harmony with our environment.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Too many units are allowed in this area. It would cause great damage to the region and major traffic issues that are not addressed.
5/12/2009	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	The following are specific comments to the overall plan:1] Village concept, ie, Jackson, Wilson, etc., defining specific boundaries, preserving open space and transportation "spokes" between. Each village will provide necessary services; housing for all persons providing services, including: sewer, security, water, power, trash collection, health care, groceries, gas, etc..2] Define residency: Use Wyoming Game & Fish Dept."Residency Requirements", as published.3] Variance Requests: Must prove five or more years of "Residency", as defined above [#2], as a primary requirement before such request is submitted/considered. Persons with proof of "residency" of more than twenty years and, age sixty years or greater, requesting any reasonable variance to their primary residence/property, which they occupied for same period, with consideration of all zoning during same occupancy period, will be granted. All variance requests to be weighted by years of residency as follows: Five years = 10%; Ten years = 50%; Twenty years = 100%.4] Weight housing needs for "senior citizens" as equal or greater than "employee and affordable" housing needs. 5] Vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety: Discourage the planting of conifer trees on the south side of east-west streets, and encourage removal of same to reduce icing and promote traffic safety.Remove all trees and shrubbery from intersections which prevent fields of vision necessary for safe travel.Consider "Four-Way" Stop Signs & controls at all intersections in residential zones.6] Use clear and concice language in all writings.Say what you mean; mean what you say.Thank you for this opportunity to comment.
5/12/2009	Silberberg, Adam Interested Public	I think it is important to have more public art to inspire this community. People through history have accomplished this very goal. Look at Florence, Italy... Well maybe we don't have to build an entire city but we can sure help inspiration along.
5/12/2009	Davies, Alissa Interested Public	It is really important that within Theme 3 "Heart of the Region" that we recognize how allocations for public art could make this idea of heart even stronger. Keeping our community alive, engaged, diverse, and colorful through cultural happenings is necessary in order to maintain our wonderful way of life. Creating Jackson as an arts destination not only benefits people who live here, but all of the visitors who frequent the valley. Public art is not simply sculpture or even visual art; it incorporates the performing arts, music, the written word, and any other form of creativity. Having copy within the Comprehensive Plan that dictates the need for public art in all forms will allow us to move forward in how to execute that need. Please consider adding the need for Public Art in the Comprehensive Plan. Thank you!
5/12/2009	Roth, Ben Interested Public	I feel Theme 3 sounds good except for the lack of public art in it's verbiage. I feel that public art should be included in "cultural activities" and feel that a cultural hub cannot exist without it. Art is also an obvious component of "balanced mixed use". It will also enhance the town's gateways and should be an investment that is supported by public and private investment.
5/12/2009	White, Marylee Interested Public	I look forward to Wilson being better connected to Jackson with pathways and public transportation. Wilson is a node and always has been. I support that concept. Concentrating new development is good for shared transportation, good for wildlife and will improve diversity in Wilson.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Parks and sidewalks withing neighborhoods create more cohesive communities and must be included. Public gathering spaces and community centers are also very important.
5/12/2009	White, Marylee Interested Public	When enhancing Jackson gateways, do not limit the vision to signage and landscaping. Public works of art can be very effective in establishing a tone and atmosphere for our community.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Please be sure that any "enhancements" to the Y keep pedestrian and biker safety as top priorities. Navigating these areas as a walker or biker is exceedingly dangerous.
5/12/2009	Dakis, Jamie Interested Public	I am a constituent of Teton County and would hope that you will address the issue of growth that is all inclusive of all walks of life. I have been here three years and have noticed an increase of homelessness of male caucasians between the age of 28-52, and females to a smaller percentage. There is one domestic violence housing for women and children, however they must have been beaten or abused to be allowed housing. Additionally, there is only one mission in town which is extremely secular. Responsible growth to me means that this issue needs to be addressed by making sure that along side of this growth, we as a humanitarian community build additional homeless facilities that would be more helpful to the present economic situation that only promises to beget more homelessness.
5/11/2009	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	The people have said repeatedly that they want slow growth (or no growth-- to the extent it can be minimized) in the valley. These planners have proposed a plan with huge growth that will be devastating to the character of this special place. If the commissioners allow such in the face of public opinion, they are ending their political years. In fact a good case can be made for a requirement that all new growth must occur only within a half mile of the homes of our present commissioners.
5/11/2009	Wakeman, Polly Interested Public	I am distraught at the growth proposed in the comprehensive plan. I am concerned with your plans to double the population of Teton County, and specifically, as a resident of the town of Wilson, with your proposal to triple the number of homes in our village. Why is such drastic growth necessary? Can you prove that there are so called "human needs" sufficient to justify this enormous growth? Why do we need to succumb to the sprawl that has ruined other once charming mountain towns? Why do we need another 9 million square feet of commercial space? I agree we need more affordable housing, but not at the price of such character altering growth. For those of us living on the west bank, we have chosen to live in Wilson because we prefer to be away from the hustle and bustle of Jackson. If you were to proceed with your projected growth from 170 to nearly 700 homes in downtown Wilson - our one horse town will become just like its east bank neighbor. The quiet, charming Wilson we love would be changed for the worse. Traffic would triple; and where would all the new children go to school? The "new" Wilson School is already at capacity, so a significant school expansion would be necessary and with it probably a traffic light where HHR road intersects Highway 22 to deal with all the increased school traffic. Who is it exactly that wants to triple the size of Wilson, besides the developers, and the planners who do not live there? If you were to take a vote of Wilson residents, I am sure they would vote such a proposal down. And what about the wildlife that we profess to care about protecting? With the documented decrease in moose population over the past 20 years, it is unethical to further deplete their crucial habitat, thus continuing their decline until we no longer get to enjoy their presence on the west bank. The proposed density of 9 units/acre in critical moose winter range ignores your responsibility for protecting one of the things which makes Jackson Hole such a special place. Please don't ruin our village of Wilson or Teton County by moving ahead with a comprehensive plan which lacks proof of the necessity for such significant and rapid development, as well as the backing of its residents. It would be a tragedy to move so quickly and permanently damage the nature of the community of people and wildlife we love. Please slow down, we don't want such growth!
5/11/2009	Rambo, Jeff Interested Public	This is not a must do project in Wilson, there is no need for this many homes. This is just developers being developers. There are no jobs or businesses or buildings to put a business in Wilson and it will not change any time soon. The jobs are at the ski hill or in town so built there when it is necessary, we have enough traffic from Victor and Driggs every morning. This town has very low density and that is the attraction. This project is not needed in Jackson at this time, maybe once things turn around and then a project in the town of Jackson makes more sense.
5/11/2009	Zellmer, Theresa Interested Public	In regard to the Wilson Plan, I cannot support the housing density and feel the numbers are too high. I'm also concerned about wildlife conflict that high density housing may create, coupled with high traffic converging at the bottom of Teton Pass. Thank you,

Date	Name	Comment
5/11/2009	Rosenberg, Vicki L. Interested Public	I am submitting a full comment on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan in this District 11 (Wilson) section of the Feedback portion of this website. I am also submitting portions of my comment in other sections. It does not appear that any comments have been submitted as yet, which I find worrisome. My husband and I attended the community meeting on May 6, 2009 at the Wilson School. It would be extremely disappointing if the important questions raised and the many impassioned comments made at that meeting were not appropriately recorded. Although new Jackson-area residents, we've been coming to the region for winter vacations for more than 25 years. In fact, my first glimpse of the Rockies was looking at the Tetons as my plane landed in Jackson Hole in 1982. Every time we returned to the region, the build-up was shocking. Two years ago, we finally decided to buy, fearing that we would never be able to find a permanent home here if we waited any longer. Fate was with us when we made that decision, since my husband found a position here and we were able to move much sooner than expected. It was the character of the region that drew us here: the sheer, naked beauty of the mountains and the valley; the friendliness of the residents; the hominess of the town; the ubiquitous commitment of all who lived here to protecting the character of this unique region. We moved here to be a part of this community that so closely aligns with our own personal character. We live in Wilson; our home is less than ten miles from Hoback Junction. We are concerned about the inclusion of Wilson as one of the nodes slated for expansion by the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Plan, Wilson already has mixed-use facilities that have locally oriented non-residential uses, which provide local residents with basic services. The Plan states that the intensity of any development would be higher in town where the locally oriented uses serve the entire community and limit dependence on trips into town. In terms of building form and orientation, further development would include two- and three-storey buildings located fronting the street with mixed uses that provide for morning-through-evening vibrancy and where pedestrian corridors could be utilized while accommodating automobile transport. The Plan calls for the development of mixed-type residences that include single family, duplex, triplex, and fourplex construction, along with limited retail facilities in appropriate locations. According to the Plan, the building form and orientation of such structures will be compatible with neighborhood character. We respectfully ask where tri- and fourplex housing is compatible with the character of Wilson, or where additional retail facilities would be appropriate? Even though the Plan states that single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing, we are puzzled as to where such structures would fit in with Wilson as it has evolved over the past 150 years. According to the Plan's discussion of managing growth responsibly in District 11 (Wilson), the Wilson node comprises an area within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core that is deemed appropriate for town-level densities. The buildout calculations call for increasing nonresidential existing floor area from 51,000 to as much as 171,000 or greater. Buildout numbers also call for increasing residential development from 170 dwelling units to as many as 520 dwelling units, which would increase residential density from 0.94 to as much 3.08. Essentially, the Plan suggests that Wilson expand at least three-fold. How can such expansion possibly preserve the character of Wilson? The Comprehensive Plan states that "the priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities to benefit the community." Is this meant to benefit the Wilson community or the Jackson/Teton County community? Expansion of Wilson to provide for the housing needs of the broader community would exploit the educational, commercial, sewer, emergency, recreational, and transportation services of the immediate community. While it would appear on paper that the vibrancy and sustainability of Wilson would be enhanced, a three-fold residential expansion would certainly strain existing services beyond the breaking point. Furthermore, the Plan states that "all development in Wilson should be designed to protect riparian corridors." Any expansion within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core would involve riparian habitats. We are impressed with the detailed breadth and depth of the Comprehensive Plan. Certainly, the developers of the Plan have exercised due diligence in bringing to the community such a well-structured design for growth, development, and conservation within the region. Of grave concern to us, however, is that the Plan states that this design will be used to inform future zoning and land development. We understand that community members called for buildout projections and some means of gauging the process of growth. The Plan reports that the community supports more population in the Town of Jackson in order to preserve the agricultural and natural resources in the county. It also states that "a large majority of the community agrees to limit development in rural parts of Teton County while allowing more development and population growth in certain county nodes such as Aspen/Pines, Teton Village, Wilson, South Park, and Hoback." Nowhere in the plan does it explain how or why these areas were selected for expansion. Time and again, spokespersons for the Comprehensive Plan have emphasized that the Plan is only a plan, and does not define zoning maps or land development regulations. Yet, a strategy referred to repeatedly within the chapters of the Plan states that zoning maps and base development right regulations should be updated and amended to be consistent with the 10 Future Land Use Plan. The 10 Future Land Use Plan, or "FLUP," is an integral part of the Comprehensive Plan. The plans for residential and unit developments, for affordable housing developments, and for mixed use developments appear to already be in place under the guise of "just a plan." If adopted, will the Comprehensive Plan adhere to its stated principle that new development regulations will protect existing character and promote sustainability? Will it truly consider "how well a proposed development fits' into the setting in which it is to be located ?" When it states that "incentives that promote desired conservation and development are also needed" does it mean that administrators of the Plan will pay off residents

within county nodes and the Town of Jackson to expand housing and local convenience commercial? The Plan also states that annexations will be used for town expansion, and that criteria will be adopted to guide such seizure appropriately.

We wholly support the promotion of the Town of Jackson as the "heart" of the region. From a sustainable perspective, it is certainly desirable for at least 65% of the Town's workforce to reside in the immediate vicinity. The vast majority of workers are unable to afford a home valued at \$2 million, the current average. Perhaps employers should, indeed, take on a larger responsibility for housing their workers. Perhaps it will be necessary to develop multi-family housing. We agree with the majority of community members that the need for local workforce housing conflicts with other community values such as preservation of wildlife habitat and natural resources, reductions in traffic, and preferred development patterns. We believe that that provision of deed restricted workforce housing should take priority over additional commercial or resort development make room for the workforce before developing businesses that require more workers. This would uphold Theme 5, which calls for the community to remain a community first, and a resort second; to maintain a vibrant economy while preserving wildlife, natural resources, and community character. As the Plan reports, the community expressed concern that growth primarily oriented to serving visitors, has little community benefit and may compromise community character.

Theme 6 of the Comprehensive Plan addresses the transportation issue in Teton County, stating that ideally, any strategy adopted would reduce resident and visitor reliance on single-occupancy vehicles while still allowing safe, efficient, and economic travel. Repeatedly, the notion of bicycle and transit use in the Town of Jackson and in and between county nodes is suggested as a means to alleviate local traffic. We certainly agree that mass transit is desirable, but dependence on bicycle use anywhere outside of the Town itself is unrealistic. More importantly, we believe that Teton County planners should develop a working relationship with WYDOT to increase the viability of alternate modes of transportation within the Town of Jackson as well as in/among other county locales, not simply investigating internodal transit.

As new, but passionately involved members of the Wilson and Jackson/Teton County communities we wish to express our hope that planners, administrators, and elected officials read closely the Comprehensive Plan before adopting it as the absolute paradigm for future development in this region. The Plan is a work of art and its intricate detail is staggering. Unfortunately, it appears that a number of the Plan's expectations have not yet been met: updated mapping of wildlife habitats and migration corridors; updated zoning maps and amended base development right regulations; coordination between Jackson/Teton County planners and WYDOT; determination of congruence between stated plans and local character. Surging forward to adopt this Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan without careful consideration of these and other issues significant to the residents of the varied parts of this community can only be detrimental to all concerned in the long run.

In the Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan we read about the community vision adopted in 1994 and confirmed in 2008. We agree with every one of the points made: protection of scenic vistas and wildlife habitat for generations to come; maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; promotion of and support for a diverse social and economic population, including provisions for a resident work force; preservation of the traditions and character of the Rocky Mountain West and Wyoming; and assurance that development on private lands in Teton County was compatible with surrounding public land values and uses. We also understood that the community recognized that a new plan should map areas appropriate for certain land uses in order to give landowners, developers, neighbors, and elected officials a measure of predictability regarding land use decisions and actions, so that priorities of and relationship between community values would be addressed. We particularly appreciate that measurable indicators would be developed with any new plan that would hold everyone involved accountable for the cumulative impacts of decisions made.

We understand that the development of a new Comprehensive Plan particularly addresses the issue of sustainability within our region, so that development meets the needs of the present community without compromising the ability of communities that evolve in the future to meet their own needs. It is notable that the proposed Comprehensive Plan guarantees that decisions about development extend to the preservation and protection of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Specifically, the Plan states that, while recognizing that growth and development are necessary to meet the human needs of the community, the impact of local decisions must be understood in a regional context because of the ecological significance of our surroundings. To this end, two foremost priorities were developed that drive the focal community themes around which the Comprehensive Plan was formulated: 1) promotion of wildlife and natural resources stewardship, and 2) responsible management of growth.

In terms of the first priority, the Plan seeks to maintain viable populations of all native species and to preserve the natural, scenic, and agricultural resources that define Teton County's character. There's that term "character" again. In the chapter detailing this first community theme, the Plan once again addresses the need for updated mapping before any decisions about development or community change can be made. Many residents of Teton County are seriously concerned about the disruption of wildlife migration corridors, should any regional development plan be adopted before mapping is updated. Community residents apparently agreed with the limitation of development and population growth to county nodes, the "Y" and downtown Jackson. In no part of the Comprehensive Plan or its appendices is it recorded that community residents agreed where those county nodes would be located.

The second priority of the Plan details how growth in this region will be managed responsibly. We agree with the Plan's statement that future

Date	Name	Comment
		development, including redevelopment and infill, must occur in a measured, deliberate, and predictable way so it does not detract from the existing natural environment and community character. While the Plan does not define the carrying capacity of the region, it does describe a 10 Future Land Use Plan that will direct decisions related to growth in this community. In fact, those who developed the Comprehensive Plan have provided excellent maps and other visuals that depict how the Plan's themes, principles, and policies will be implemented in both the areas appropriate for conservation and those appropriate for development in such a way that community-wide priorities will be honored.
5/11/2009	Rosenberg, Vicki L. Interested Public	I have looked through every downloadable document on this site. I've also looked for comments on the various sections of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Draft Plan. Where is the feedback? Where are the comments?
5/11/2009	Schwartz, Bill & Cheryl Interested Public	As I have discussed with Jeff, my wife (Cheryl) and I own 10 and 20 East Simpson (Lots 1 and 2 of Block 7 of the Cache 2nd Addition). Our property is directly across the street from the Center for the Art's theatre. It appears from the map that only Lot 1 is currently included in the proposed mixed-use designation area. Jeff indicated that he thought that was an oversight, but suggested that I submit a comment as a reminder to fix it. Thus, for the record: Both Lots 1 & 2 should be included in any mixed use area. As you know, it could be difficult to accomplish any mixed-use development on only one lot. Further, it appears that the mixed-use area extends at least two lots east of Cache Street in all other locations on the South Cache corridor. There is no reason to discriminate against our property; in fact, given its proximity to the Center for the Arts, one could argue that our two lots are more suitable for the mixed-use designation than are any of the other properties located to the south of us on Cache Street. Additionally, it is unclear how many of Mr. Varley's lots across the street from us on Simpson are included in the proposed mixed-use area. (It appears that at least two and perhaps more are included.) I would think that properties across the street from each other in this area should be zoned in the same way. Thus, if the thought is that two lots east of Cache are appropriate for the mixed-use zone, then only 2 of Mr. Varley's lots should be included in the mixed-use zone. Otherwise, the Town would be potentially discriminating against the Hoffmans, who own the two lots east of us. As we consider it, we are not sure whether it is such a good idea to have the entire length of South Cache "upzoned" in this fashion. If the intent is to provide increased services for the Center, those services should be provided in very close proximity to the Center; it would not seem necessary to provide those services several blocks to the south of the Center. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.
5/11/2009	Parker, Jon Interested Public	I do not know why you bother to take public comments on a comprehensive plan for Teton County. The public has repeatedly said that their priorities are for wildlife preservation, open space, and affordable housing. Yet your actions seem directed at development to the detriment of all of these three factors. Perhaps, it lets you feel better to believe that you have taken public comments, but public desires have had no impact. In addition, the expense of a master plan seems to be wasted. Even with the prior comprehensive plan, it seems to have had no impact on your approval of developments. The plan called for 35 acre lots in rural overlays. However, if 350 acres were to be developed, first it was increased from 10 lots to 25 as bonus density for clustering and leaving open space. Then, it was increased to 50 if affordable housing was included. Finally, "we don't want affordable housing in our upscale project" so the dense housing was put in South Park. The final result was a project that instead of having 10 millionaire homes, we get 50 millionaire homes that probably put more strain on services and affordable housing than was solved. Either quit the charade or truly listen to the public. South Park is a major wildlife corridor, and currently has a rural character. We don't want it to become a solid, high density housing development.
5/11/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Let's not take time to smell the roses. We don't have that luxury. What we have is a team of educated planners (they might be eastern educated), a consulting group that wants to get their final installment, and a valley that is back to work come Memorial Day. We make hay when the sun shines. It really doesn't matter what your job is, during the summer months, life is busier. When I'm sitting on top of "Cream Puff" it is hard for me to fathom that we would destroy anything as beautiful as this valley. Teton Village is a place I hardly recognize. (The village was my mother's babysitter) I don't think there is anything we can do to save it. They have a tremendous amount of commercial space that has already been approved, just waiting for the money man to give the nod. This is commercial space that will create jobs that we don't have people for. If we would add up all of the jobs created by Teton Village (I don't have my tallies on me) I wonder if Teton Village houses 65% of its employees.-- Of course not, I'd bet 10% and that's an uneducated guess.. Now hold that thought and move the housing to the Aspens and Wilson. Bingo Bongo. Do you see what I see? Whoa, Mr. Green Jeans we have made a discovery. It doesn't take redneck genius here or a Bolshevik mentality to get the just of things. Money is money no matter how you fold it. If you don't know what in the hell I am talking about, call me or stop me on the street. After Memorial Day you might have to catch me on the trail. Don't let down your guard. Leave a message or send an e-mail to our government. We're about to get screwed in a big way. And they want us to smile about it.

Date	Name	Comment
5/11/2009	McCorquodale, Liz Interested Public	Please add language to the plan that endorses the Arts in Jackson Hole!!!!JH needs more public art _ I have lived here for 17 years and have always mourned the lack of it.More Public Art!More Public Art!More Public Art!thank you
5/11/2009	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	In the surveys taken last year, this was more than a theme-- it was a priority. When it conflicted with growth and development, this was to take "priority"-- that's what it means. The planners seem to have forgotten that, or as one said when denigrating the surveys, "we don't plan by referendum." The people will not put up with being insulted by the the planners and those encouraging them. Start over and do this right, it's just too important.
5/11/2009	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	Nodes? These are employee housing for developers in town and Teton Village. No justification has been presented to justify shifting the burden of development from those doing the building to us out in your new "nodes". We did not vote to become nodes. We bought in the Aspens (or in Wilson) because we chose not to buy in town. So the smart guys brought in for this bring the town to us. GREAT! Fire 'em.
5/11/2009	Dann, Erin Interested Public	With great respect for the work done to move the community forward with a land use plan to guide us into the future I'd like to share a few comments and concerns:- Where is the pressure coming from to grow to the degree this plan proposes when the predetermined priority for it was preservation of wildlife and conservation? - The Resor property development was a concern because our roads and transportation alternatives are so limited. Safety in the event of a natural disaster is compromised by the infrastructure of Westbank roads and the aging Snake River bridge. We know how slowly WYDOT works and adding enormous traffic loads to already busy highways seems irresponsible. Not to mention the impact on wildlife...the top priority of the new plan. -The risk of looking like "anywhere resort USA." Just because some of our resort counterparts have overdeveloped with limited road accessibility doesn't make it right. i.e. Sun Valley -Reconsider the importance of a "node.". They are not equal, as presented in the plan, and shouldn't be treated as such. Stop and go, bumper to bumper traffic on Hwy 22 during July and August are a reality we already live with. Let's not make it worse, please.
5/11/2009	Becker, John Interested Public	Thank you all for the presentation in Wilson. I now understand how you've reached your numbers. The numbers for Wilson are staggering to me. The conflict with the wildlife vision is the main stumbling block for me, combine that with the teton pass factor,traffic and daggies etc., I can't support the numbers the plan proposes. One thing that wasn't discussed at the meeting is Wilson's close proximity to some of the most important scenic easments. The Ordway Fish Creek Ranch, the Rossetter easment, the Wilson Wetland Trail and both Hardeman meadows. I worked on fourr of these projects with the JH Land Trust aand realize how incompatible the proposed density is. I was amazed to find out that the current zoning allows for 120 new units. That number also seems too high to me. Thanks to you all for the opportunity to comment.
5/11/2009	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	Let's see-- you want us to absorb a 30 fold increase in density over what is now allowed. Why? to help out those developers who are building in Teton Village and in town. Can't see a good reason to do that for them. These hot shot planners said they wanted to bring predictability to the process. What kind of predictability did they bring us? For the last 30 years the area near the Aspens was to be built one per 35 acres. Then in one quick thrust while everybody is out of town, surprise-- not 10 units, but 310 units. That's predictability!!!
5/11/2009	Dahl, Charles I Interested Public	I am opposed to the draft comprehensive plan. This plan should be more appropriately called the Real Estate Agents, Developers and Contractors Guaranteed Pension Plan. Only lip service has been given to the county's first two themes (Promote wildlife stewardship and natural resources and Manage growth responsibly). I would like to see limited and more closely managed growth not the drive to maximum "build out" that seems to be projected. Projected raises in sales tax to seven and eight cents, massive increases in property taxes and a real estate transfer tax to support needed infrastructure are not acceptable. We cannot grow our way out of growth related problems.
5/11/2009	Fuchs, Junie Interested Public	Teton County Staff and Commissioners have obviously put alot of time and effort into this plan and it shows. I believe it is a good basis for a plan and supports the communities interests as a whole.The idea of nodes which can contain the needs of certain parts of the valley shows some great vision.I would like to see more study and research in Teton Village to be sure it can support the 6000 to 8000 people that visit, live and work on any given day in the winter. I am not sure there is enough diversity or quantity in the commercial area to support the guests, workers and residents.Jackson as heart is a good theme as long as we don't create this MECCA that sends everyone in the valley on our roads to MECCA and contradicting Theme #1 our Natural Resources. There needs to be a good balance between having enough support in the nodes and not truly competing with Jackson as Heart.Thank You

Date	Name	Comment
5/11/2009	Hobbins, Karen W. Interested Public	Having attended the County Neighborhood meeting in Wilson on May 7th, it sounded as though the majority there were in agreement with with Theme One of the Community Vision which states: Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources. However at the meeting people seemed betrayed by the Plan's prioritization for Wilson of 1: Responsible Growth and 2; Workforce Housing, with 5; Wildlife and Natural Resources much lower on the priority list. Is this really the priority for Wilson given the input people gave in the pre-draft comment period?The people in attendance seemed further horrified at the suggested build-out numbers, allowing up to 520 new homes in this node. Basing build-out numbers on the density of West Street and allowing that density on all areas of the single family mixed type areas on the map for Wilson seems too dense. The recent economic downturn will likely diminish the growth rate, and therefore I would suggest a re-evaluation of build out numbers be contemplated. A diminished build-out number would perhaps accommodate people's wish to protect wildlife and natural resource, while still allowing the increases in density currently permitted under the existing zoning regulations.In general Wilson residents are not opposed to some growth, but fear that density allowances will damage the character of the town.. Specifically, classification of the properties south of Highway 22 and east of Fall Creek Road for town-level densities, allowing up to 9 units per acre of single family mixed type development seems inappropriate. Given the wildlife corridor there from hillside to Fish Creek and surrounding wetlands, it would be better to transition from town to rural and conservation lands with much lower density there.Thank you for all the work you have put in on the draft comp. plan, and for the opportunity to have input at this stage.
5/10/2009	Carpenter, Bryan Interested Public	I was born and raised in Jackson and have since moved to San Diego in the last couple of years. While living in San Diego I have noticed the city's commitment to public art. I think the public art really adds to the city's culture and benefits both the locals and people visiting. Over the last couple of years when I have come back to Jackson, I've noticed an increase in public art which I fully support. In the future I hope to continue seeing more public art. It will make visitors' experiences more memorable and add to the unique scenery that already naturally occurs in Jackson.
5/10/2009	Nice, Kristin Interested Public	I am in full support of the proposed growth plan in Wilson. I have always felt Wilson to be too exclusive & under utilized as an area for the future growth of Jackson. If development is executed with intention & a focus on maintaining the strong sense of community that exists in Wilson I strongly agree with the proposed growth projection. Thank You.
5/10/2009	, Interested Public	Increasing housing in Wilson will only increase traffic on Hwy 22 to and from Jackson. As stated in the plan (increasing housing in Wilson will decrease the need to drive into town for errands etc.) where do these numbers come from?? I would like to see a valid assessment. If my assumption is correct, a large portion of workers live in the town of Jackson, not Wilson, therefore wouldn't it be a better option towards creating workforce housing where a majority of residents work? This would be a more sustainable option. Not built below one of the most dangerous mountain passes in the U.S. Can anyone say "Tommy's Truck Stop" again??And more importantly, why has the largest proportion of workforce housing been developed in Wilson? Tripling or even doubling housing in Willson will only destroy the character and sustainability of the town. Places like Hungary Jacks or Westside Groceries will not be able to keep up with the demand. Will a new post office need to be created to supply mailboxes to new residents? Will a new school need to be built?? Where? How? What is the plan for an increase in traffic on Hwy 22?? I believe in "no growth" We should work with what we have. I would saw half of all the condos in the Aspens are empty during the year. There are places for people to live here in Jackson. I think the solution would be to place a Cap on rental fees etc. to make it affordable. Building more is not the answer.
5/10/2009	Gronberg, Don and Sue Interested Public	Increased density in Wilson and Aspens will create need for wider roads to accomodate for more vehicle traffic, further impacting already heavily affected wildlife. Any further density should be developed near services and jobs in TOJ. We should maintain the westbank as a more rural area of the county as currently zoned. We oppose the nodal concept as proposed in the draft plan.
5/10/2009	Randall, Joy & Edward Interested Public	We are opposed to the plan. We feel it doesn't have enough protection in it to maintain the current atmosphere/environment in the Aspens and Wilson. We oppose anything that would bring or encourage more traffic to the area.

Date	Name	Comment
5/10/2009	Zvegintzov, A. A. Interested Public	I own the 5 acres between Hardeman's Barn and Fish Creek. My house is virtually on the creek and is built up so I have an incredible view up and down the creek and across the meadows. I see swans and geese and ducks and teal, eagles osprey and countless song birds. There's a herd of 15-20 elk that move from just upstream of me all the way down the creek. Moose rub against my house at night and feed on the willow and in the creek - and get killed on the highway. This spring there are actually two fox families raising their families around the Hardeman buildings; about 13 kits. Some of them will perish on the highway also. Otters are making a comeback and so are beavers. I have endless wonderful wild life stories seen right from my kitchen window. But the creek is already being degraded by the unnaturally high water that continues so much of the year; the baetis hatch is nearly gone and the caddis hatch is sparse. The amount of growth proposed by the plan can only speed and increase the degradation of the whole area. Our natural treasures need more protection - as our Wilson community keeps telling you- than is proposed in the plan. Please be more sensitive to what the community is saying.
5/10/2009	Yeomans, Jessica Interested Public	According to the results from the community survey, it does not appear that the connection road from hwy 89 is a desired thing. If fact, it seems like the road is completely unwanted.
5/10/2009	Robinson, Steven Interested Public	I have lived in the Aspens subdivision since 1975. In 1976 I purchased a condo, in 1979 I built my first home here, and in 1988 I built my present home. The Aspens was designed and is still today a resort development with seasonal occupants in the units. This has allowed the subdivision to have a minimum impact on the environment and wildlife with very little full time use. The actual number of single family residencies is quite small with most lots well over 1/2 acre or larger. The clusters of multi-family units have limited parking with no garages, vacation type amenities and lots of open space for tourist to enjoy. Your idea to impact this area with full time densely populated full time residence will have a serious negative impact on the full time residents and more importantly, the wild life in the area. (a natural corridor between Fish Creek and the Snake River for the majority of wildlife in the Jackson area). We addressed this concern in detail with the Osprey Subdivision which fortunately was prevented from development. Now it appears you want to create a similar problem to the north in and around the Aspens. Your proposal to develop 50 by 150 size lots for single family homes is completely out of character with the current size homes and acreage in the area. There are no 50 by 150 lots in this area because of wild life concerns when the first comprehensive plan was developed and implemented. It limited growth in this area to protect wild life and the character of the current road. When Teton Pines Resort was developed, it was made quite clear under comprehensive plan that any development would be limited. At that time, the county commissioner even rejected a plan to hook the sewer from the Aspens and Teton Pines into a single line to town (which we agreed to pay for as well as a deposit to the town of \$1,500,000.00 for future development of the town sewer system) because the commissioner did not want dense development on Teton Village Road. Under the comprehensive plan, having a sewer line down the village road would lead to increased density and development. We put in our own system as a result. Years later, the county put in the very line down the village road that we had proposed. The commissioners were right to reject the proposed line because the very concern they address is being proposed today. Teton Village Road is a very unique corridor along the Tetons. Don't ruin it forever with the dense over developed plan that you now are proposing.
5/10/2009	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I have actively followed this comp plan since the beginning, attending meetings, and being hopeful of an outcome that protects wildlife and the people who have lived in this valley for years. The people have spoken in loud terms...WILDLIFE, WILDLIFE WILDLIFE...have you not heard it? Both Teton Meadows and Osprey Creek (huge density developments) cause an outcry among everyone who loves this valley...we do not want this kind of density. The village road has too much character to be lost with the numbers in which this plan proposes. This plan is out of character, much too dense, and the people of this valley do not want it.

Date	Name	Comment
5/10/2009	Woodfin, Blane Interested Public	I don't envy the task ahead of you, but you've just got to get this one right. No mulligans, no second chances, no Federal bailouts. The recently released draft for the new Comp Plan seems distinctly out of synch with the overwhelming sentiment in our community. First of all, further growth may be inevitable but full build-out need not be. Preservation of wildlife and scenic open spaces will, above all else, insure high quality of life for our citizens and highly valued experiences for our visitors. South Park serves as the southern gateway to Jackson Hole and simply must be put back at the top of the list of protected areas, as was so clearly stated in the 1994 plan that has served us well up to now. To refuse to restore this invaluable resource as a protected legacy would be incomprehensible. On the matter of work-force housing, I'm reminded of the adage about finding oneself in a deep hole and recognizing that the shovel in your hand is helping to dig it. STOP DIGGING! Let's take care of the people who already live and work here through innovative solutions that don't depend on increasing the development footprint that already scars so much of our precious land. Incentives for purchase and re-development or rehabilitation of existing neighborhoods, particularly those close to town with existing infrastructure and services, simply seems to be the obvious direction to take. Adding more commercial space and de novo projects is the equivalent of digging our collective hole even deeper. Forget about contrived growth strategies and focus solely on these two issues: Natural resources (wildlife, open space) and Work-force housing (existing families employed by existing businesses). Doing so will greatly improve the chances that the final outcome yielded by your actions will be one we can be proud of leaving for the next generation and beyond. If those two priorities drive all your decisions, our growth will take its proper course into the future. Do the right thing for all the right reasons that drew all of us to call this special place our home. Get this one right.
5/9/2009	Workman, Jim Interested Public	Planning I live in Cottonwood and the proposed 1500 homes is way to dense.1) Need a road first that parallel High School Road.2) Need another play ground for all the children that are in the Blair apartments as well as for dogs and people whom attend our cottonwood park.3) Need a large setback like they have in front of the high school.4) Need to develop the infrastructure first prior to the home plans.5) Do Not dump anymore traffic on High School Road it is dangerous enough.
5/9/2009	Hoffman, Nancy Interested Public	Our greatest asset in Teton County is not tourism, second homes or the construction industry, but the natural environment, wildlife and gorgeous geography. People come to Teton County because it is unique and one of the last frontiers remaining in our country. Our land use planning should first and foremost be designed to continue to protect and enhance these special assets. Adding additional growth potential when the current plan already allows for 20,000+- additional people is premature and ill-conceived. The commercial square footage proposed will continue to fuel a much greater deficit of workforce. Our basic premise for planning must be to DO NO HARM to what we have. Any increased development should enhance these precious values and not despoil them. I respectfully submit how I see our 2009 rewritten Comprehensive Plan should proceed. Much of what I am addressing is not being considered and in my opinion, as well as many others in the community, should be. a. The current draft must allow existing density (and remove the bonuses) for already platted residential and commercial zones to infill before adding more potential, worse case scenario density to the valley. There have been way too many conditional uses and bonuses given. These incentives to encourage developers are unnecessary. The market will take care of itself. b. Node boundaries must be mapped and fixed with remaining open space carefully assessed as to additional impacts the development will cause even if it means no further development there at all. Consider transfer of development rights to move to more suitable land especially if the areas are wetlands, or are in wildlife summer or winter range, i.e. Also Wilson and the Aspens should not be considered "nodes" c. The NRO and other natural resource mapping must dictate where any new development should not go and not be just a reference point as one of the many planning considerations. Wildlife corridors, winter and summer range, etc. must be respected and no development should occupy these areas without a complete assessment of the wildlife impacts new development will cause. This important tool does not appear to be taken at all seriously. Specialists such as Game and Fish, wildlife biologists etc. should determine these impacts based on currently accepted scientific practices. They should comment on any new or redevelopment. d. New development should also consider the quality of life of its future occupants with special attention to adjacent parks, bike paths, public services, schools and churches, clean water and air, setbacks allowing for landscaping and planting more trees, lighting impacts on the citizens as well as being able to see the night sky. e. The cost of growth determination is seriously missing in this draft plan. It must be the responsibility of the public officials to consider their constituencies and the future tax burden that will be placed upon them. Growth has never paid for itself. It is irresponsible to not understand what any growth will cost and make the information public and part of the discussion and analysis. f. Finally, all public and private input to the public officials should be made public to truly determine if the community wishes are being heard. Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
5/9/2009	Cushman, Verena and R Interested Public	We live in the Aspens since 1989. What attracted us to this valley was the fact that there are still more animals around than human beings. Your comprehensive plan is pushing numbers and development, which are in no way an enhancement to the delicate balance of Wildlife / Natural Resources and human interaction. I don't need to tell you that Jackson Hole is an environmentally marginal area that does NOT support a growth explosion as your plan is laying the groundwork for. Unless you want to destroy it all, we need to stress a low impact policy. We like your nodes/cluster approach, surrounded by open spaces / green belts, and we support healthy growth to benefit ALL, and not a few selected - as your proposal favors. Your plan proposes numbers that can not possibly be absorbed by the existing INFRA STRUCTURE. The "Aspens Node" is a necessary convenience center for the entire Westbank. We have plenty of workforce people renting timeshare condos, in fact we are a mixed community as it is, with visitors, short- and long- term tenants walking the neighborhood; allow this growth to flourish in moderation, but don't choke it with too much of one kind. It was dirty business when the Lake Creek Condominiums were built in -what we were told- were dedicated wetlands. The 100yr flood plain line was arbitrarily drawn and altered to allow business to happen! Your Plan is opening flood gates to the like business allowing densities that will move new people in affordable units in and others out!
5/9/2009	Chamberland, Ray Interested Public	Comp rewrite? By who? Who are these planners? Have they done a full comprehensive plan before or is this on the job training that the county will be stuck with? Triple build out and no mention of improved roads and bridges to handle traffic! What's the point of a rewrite when 5 people - county commissioners can amend it, when pressured by special interest groups. Point Teton Science School, built in middle of elk and deer migration route. This school was given over 100 variances! also Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis, overturned by 3 people and was taken from the original comp plan and changed to a resort status this whole re-write is an exercise in B.S.
5/9/2009	Phillips, Theresa Dowlin Interested Public	For the past 1 1/2 years, many locals have been participating in what the Planning Dept. called the "People's Plan." We spent countless hours attending meetings and readjusting our time to be in the valley for what we considered to be critical decision times. We were lead to believe that our input was forming the new Comp Plan. Now that the plan has been revealed, it is not what anybody asked for at all. The new Teton County Comprehensive Plan is a huge disappointment with tragic consequences. Comments will be directed to Wilson and the Waldron property. Too much growth Wilson - Not a "walkable" community Waldron property - "South on Fall Creek" boundary Moose habitat being ignored. In October 2007, the people clearly chose "Option A" with neutral density. Teton County's published hand-out called Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan WILSON DENSITY stated "Based on the public input received at the October 4, 2007 Open House, the vast majority of Wilson residents support Option A (density neutral) and are opposed to Option B (increased density)." Wilson has already doubled in size in the past decade with the addition of the Wilson Meadows sub-division. Most importantly, Wilson is not an appropriate place for high-density housing. Wilson is not the cute little isolated mountain town that the County tries to portray it to be! It is a town that was built at the base of a steep mountain pass, 10% grade, which serves as a major commuter highway for multiple communities in Idaho going to and from Jackson and Teton Village. WYDOT considers it to be one of the busiest and most dangerous highways in all of Wyoming. Traffic count figures for July and August 2008 average around 12,500 cars per day traveling through Wilson. Yet the County seems to believe that this is a great place for high-density housing! To propose a significant increase in high-density housing immediately at the base of this dangerous run-out is not only irresponsible but grossly negligent. In addition there has already been two affordable housing projects built with the additional project at the old Wilson School underway. The Waldron property should remain in the "South on Fall Creek" boundary which is rural in character. Alex Norton, on April 20, 2009, explained that high-density was going to be put where high-density already exists. This is not true for "South on Fall Creek" and the Waldron property, which has been platted for five parcels on 15 acres for decades. In addition, Teton County's "Comments from Wilson Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan Meeting--10/4/2007" states on the 3rd bullet point "Waldron Property - ALL were opposed to seeing increased density there." Critical moose habitat is being ignored. The Waldron property provides substantial wetlands for moose habitat and provides the necessary wildlife corridor to the Rossetter Land Trust and the Snake River. Please refer to the article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide dated March 25, 2009 - "Moose on the decline in Jackson Hole area." In conclusion, to propose high-density at the Waldron parcel, with deadly access at the base of Teton Pass, is not responsible planning.

Date	Name	Comment
5/9/2009	Doyle, Elizabeth Interested Public	I attended the meeting at the Wilson School on May 7th. There was obvious emotion and opposition to the proposed plan. The plan, in my opinion does not focus enough on the impact the increased traffic will have on these "nodes" but especially on Wilson. I feel that the three identified "Nodes" on the westbank are unfairly matched. Teton Village was solely developed to support the resort. The Aspen was developed for residential housing. Wilson is not and never has been a "development". Wilson is a town with a grocery store, bar, restaurant, park, community center & school. It is also the only "node" with a highway that splits the town in half. Increased traffic on Hwy22 would only divide our town in half even more and destroy the already threatened wildlife population. I have three children we live down Fish Creek rd. We ride our bikes to Hungry Jacks everyday in the summer and it is already scary enough to ride my kids down Main St. & West St. The thought of potentially doubling the amount of vehicle traffic on those, already narrow, roads is frightening. My children are unable to cross Hwy22 by themselves because it is too dangerous. It would be a shame to prevent them from even riding to school because it would be too dangerous. I am not opposed to growth. I want my children to be raised in a community that provides for them. However; the current proposed plan is not smart growth. I would strongly suggest that the commissioners treat Wilson very differently than the rest of the proposed "Nodes" because it is not at all a fair comparison. Thanks for your consideration of this matter,
5/8/2009	Kummer, Larry Interested Public	In reviewing the draft of the new Comp Plan it is obvious that its authors have caved in to the interests of those who stand to profit most, economically, by the continued growth and sell-off of Jackson Hole. This document fails to retard the same development path we have experienced the last few decades. Multiple surveys and neighborhood meetings notwithstanding, the concerned citizen with little or nothing to gain monetarily cannot begin to compete with the desires of those who control the land in Teton County – whether it be by inheritance, purchase or option. Landowners have effectively partnered with our real estate agencies, to advertise and invite the world to own a piece of our valley. As a result, tourism has been replaced by growth and development as the primary economic engine of the valley. Real estate, finance, (often our own banks), architects, attorneys, right down to our planning departments, planning commissions and often our elected representatives have been complicit. None of these interests enjoy the words “low growth” or “no growth” in their vocabularies. What started out as an effort to limit our growth in favor of wildlife and open space has failed. I was foolish to think I could help make some difference.

Date	Name	Comment
5/8/2009	Anderson, Richard Interested Public	My name is Richard Anderson. For 12 or more years I have been a close and interested observer of the arts community in Jackson Hole, mostly as a writer and editor for all of our various weekly newspapers, and, for the past 18 months, as marketing director for the Center for the Arts. I would like to comment on public art and the arts in general as they relate to the community of Jackson Hole and the Teton County Comprehensive Plan. As should be obvious to us all, our resources have limits. We do not have boundless land to develop; we do not have a bottomless labor pool nor an endless supply of housing; even the natural resources upon which our prosperity has depended for virtually all of modern Jackson Hole's history are not infinite. Social and economic conditions have stressed and continue to stress these resources, and while it often appears to me that we have not yet fully accepted the reality of these limited resources, conditions are bound to rub our faces in it sooner or later. There is one resource at our disposal, however, that I believe is unlimited: There is no end to our creativity and our imagination. I don't think Jackson Hole's citizenry is unique in that, but for various reasons - the inspiration of the natural world, the nurturing and tolerant attitude of a mountain town that has long thrived on individual gumption and initiative, contemporary liberal arts education - many people in Jackson Hole have embraced the creative life and some have even profited financially from it. I have no hard data with which to back this up, but my observations over the past dozen years suggest that more and more of our neighbors have taken the plunge and are making a part or all of their living off of artistic endeavors. I recall a conversation I had a decade or so ago with a musician friend of mine in which he said it was virtually impossible to make a living off of music in the Tetons, and yet today I personally know dozens of people who not only make ends meet but have been able to purchase homes with income from performing and teaching music. Certainly there are more art galleries in Jackson Hole today than there were in 1997. I can't even begin to count the number of published writers and professional photographers who live and work in our valley. And I'd warrant that there are many, many other talented and residents who for whatever reasons have not yet dared to take this supreme but rewarding challenge of living off the fruits of their creativity. This sector of our economy is by and large clean. It is compatible with many other uses, including residential. It dovetails with our tourism-based economy in that many visitors enjoy seek out something indigenous to the valley to take home as a souvenir of their vacation. And it has the potential to continue to boom, to be a true growth industry, without (as far as I can tell) causing any significant harm or stress to our overtaxed resources. There are other advantages to nurturing our creative resources. Creative people are known for thinking about problems and solving them in sometimes counter-intuitive ways. Their art often demands this of them. While no one can make any promises, I can easily imagine a community of artists and art appreciators that, having embraced and encouraged its native talent, engages in creative problem solving to address issues. At the risk of getting lost in some sort of utopian fantasy, I'd propose that such a community at the very least would produce interested and able students, would create artful and attractive streetscapes, and might even elevate the level of civic discourse. The Center for the Arts, of which, as I've already stated, I am a proud and honored employee, stands as a testament to our citizens' commitment to the arts. It could not have been built without the assistance and blessings of our Town and County, which says to me that our local elected officials already have a good, baseline understanding for the importance of the arts and the value of their contribution. Explicit recognition of this in our Comprehensive Plan would demonstrate a continued commitment, as would a clear and executable plan for the creation and installation of public art throughout the county. Like the Center for the Arts, public art would serve as a real and tangible sign of the entire valley's commitment to the arts, as well as a fun and interesting way to enhance our streets and parks, and to express our public personality. Also, perhaps it would be possible to encourage and reward the creation of artist-friendly development - affordable studio space, for example - in some appropriate downtown development soon to be entering the pipeline. Thanks for your time and attention, and thanks for including the arts in this discussion.
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	Theme 2 "Manage Growth Responsibly" should be revised to say "Limit Growth Responsibly". Revise the Theme 2 statement to define "responsibly" as growth that will be centered around workforce housing and social service needs. New commercial or free market residential upzones is not responsible. This is justifiable because the current base buildout provides plenty of new commercial and free market residential units. The community does not need more commercial buildings and more jobs that come along with it. I believe an increase in commercial development will only export our impacts to adjacent communities. The community needs should be listed and defined in this section.

Date	Name	Comment
5/8/2009	Wang, Louis Save Historic JH	Two weeks ago I hand delivered a letter asking for access to "all of the input" to the Comp Plan Update. It was an "official request made in the spirit of openness and full disclosure." So far there has been no response from either of you. This is disappointing as there is apparently much information available. Jeff was quoted in the April 29 News & Guide as saying "information gathered by the planning team... was received from a variety of sources" and that "it was important for us to talk to other experts." Fair enough, what was said and who said it? Because the draft Plan differs so drastically from the public surveys and comment, folks want to know, if you didn't follow the public's input then whose input did you follow? This letter is a renewal of our "official request" made two weeks ago. We are simply asking for access we are entitled to under the Wyoming Public Records Act. We look forward to regaining the transparency now missing from the Comp Plan Update process.
5/8/2009	Christel, Tammy Interested Public	Public art encourages environmental stewardship through curiosity and creating a sense of ownership, and by enhancing public space. It is a significant community tool that promotes tourism and regional appreciation. Public art is great marketing. We imagine myriad public art installations in and around the Town of Jackson. I take this opportunity to call upon our Town and County officials to spearhead a public arts installation program. In most urban areas, the quest to design for relevant public art is old hat. Public art installations define cities, and we are a small city. Our planning process needs to include space for public plazas, parks and sculpture. Seattle's Olympic Sculpture Park combines places to eat, shop and walk with nine acres overlooking Puget Sound. The project brings together the best of (the) city: art and recreation, sculptures take center stage, representing such artists as Louise Bourgeois, Alexander Calder, Richard Serra, and Ellsworth Kelly. Contemporary Seattle mixes traditional Inuit art with contemporary masters. Walkways and "paths" of connected galleries connect sites. We can conjure a similar urban art potion. I envision growth, but growth that incorporates landscaping, parks, arts, or "grace of space." Let's create space both sacred and fundamental. Without these provocative elements, we forfeit a higher level of urban vibrancy. Define the Town of Jackson as a business, educational, and cultural center. We are a great case study, and this is our opportunity. Public art and placemaking are, as I and others in the arts community have been saying, inextricable from contemporary, smart, even green, urban growth. Quality urban growth must include public urban spaces and public art. Preserving environment and quality of place, managing growth, and creating a viable, broad-based economy are Jackson's great challenges. Most crucial is ensuring we promote and protect our wildlife, its habitat and other environmentally sensitive areas. In our region, the arts are a keystone in preserving place. Although our Town Square's monument, various land art and myriad creative educational projects provide continual reminders of our inherent love for the arts, we've so far not included researching and moving towards making the arts a part of our "constitution," as it were. We can remind ourselves, and all visitors, of this history by including beautiful and lasting public place making in our Comprehensive Plan. Such planning aids in building tourism and strong market values. Think logo. Art captures the essence of the places dear to our hearts. Successful public art resonates on a national level. Our traditional themes may be translated traditionally; they may also be translated using contemporary aesthetics and materials. We must not only include the words. We must decide upon a logical process of implementation. Without implementation any plan is simply an exercise.
5/8/2009	Andreas, K'Lea Interested Public	Please add language to the Plan that endorses the arts in Jackson Hole. Thank you,
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	Policy 1.1.b: Monitor cumulative human impacts Data already exists that supports human impacts have had a negative effect on native species. We need to start this Policy by compiling and analyzing existing data. Policy 1.1.c: Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces Yes! This is a policy that could be the most effective in sustaining our wildlife populations, scenic values and tourist based economy. Policy 1.1.g: Permeability of development design for wildlife I strongly disagree with the statement that the Town and community nodes will not be included in this. Please change this statement to include all development. For example, Flat Creek running through Town provides for a tremendous amount of fish and wildlife movement. Policy 1.2.b: Require filtration of urban runoff This policy should include onsite and off sites detention and ideally, retention (through infiltration) of stormwater. Low Impact Development practices should be implemented by new development including municipal sidewalks and other projects. Indicators Add - Percent of surface water runoff being detained and infiltrated/treated before reaching our waterbodies.
5/8/2009	Chassard, Bryan Interested Public	I think the Wilson expansion is inevitable and a great idea. I am excited to hopefully purchase a home there one day. I have lived in the Jackson Hole area for 9 years off and on and have desired to own a home in the Wilson area. I am also a member of Cornerstone Church that meets at Wilson Elementary School and hope to make Wilson my permanent community. This new plan would do just that - it would make Wilson a more united and self-sufficient community that doesn't have to rely on driving into the town of Jackson constantly. Thanks for all you are doing!

Date	Name	Comment
5/8/2009	Jern, Ken Interested Public	I am a property owner living in the Raintree Development for the past 21 years; adjacent to property that may be rezoned from one home per 3 acres to a much higher density. I was previously a 12 year homeowner in the Aspens. Today I observed a deer, a fox, and a cow and calf moose; this is why I came to this valley 40 years ago. Have the designers of this Comprehensive Plan come out and made observations of the wild life or have they hired professionals to do a scientific count of the wildlife and their habits? Have the drafters counted the number of people who now live within walking distance to the West Side Market, a small local convenience grocery, who still drive to get their gallon of milk as compared to the people using no motorized means of travel? Can this small grocery even handle an increase in customers? Or will they need to expand, hire more workers, thus increasing the need for more housing to accommodate increased growth? Have you tried to turn left out of the Aspens during peak travel times? Why is the priority changed for the Aspens area? I think the Aspens area is just as important to the wild life and its scenic value as any other location in this valley. Maybe the Planners should get feedback from the moose. This new Comprehensive Plan isn't smart growth; there is no balance of wildlife and scenic values to human sustainability. The projected expansion of human growth will drastically decrease the wildlife numbers, that's science. The more dwellings created will not enhance the scenic character of his valley. More people, more crime, more traffic, isn't going to lead to a better quality of life. I am against this new plan!
5/8/2009	Rominger, Wendy Interested Public	Consistently considering Green alternatives to traditional methods of generating power, encouraging community gardens and compost, protecting large trees and planting new ones. Recognizing the amazing close proximity to wildlife and educating the community on existing together.
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	Again, this needs to read "Limit Growth Responsibly". Growth will happen, let's slow it down and limit it as much as we can. The use of "Town Level Development" should be eliminated completely. This is a vague term that could potentially be detrimental to the nodes. Town development almost crept in to northern SOuth Park. Please redefine and rename. POSSibly call it "Community Needs Level Development."
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	If the Rodeo Grounds is built as single family, the Town will need to find a new location for snow storage in Town. I would completely eliminate the language stating conversion to single family . Please consult the Town on the logistics and cost of hauling snow to a less central location.
5/8/2009	von Hagke, Thekla Interested Public	I think this plan is far too vague and open to special interest interpretation. I think the plan should err on the side of restriction, not leniency. I am dismayed that there wasn't even an attempt at citing build out numbers. If this is difficult to determine from land use, the road use should be a viable and reliable guide. Go to Sun Valley or Aspen and drive the commuter routes and stop and think if this is really the Jackson Hole you want for the future. By the nature of our valley's protected land, we will some day have to say no more. Discriminating as that may be, it is an inevitability. The only thing we have control over is what the valley will look like when that happens, and what quality of life it will afford. Is it possible to act with foresight and try to not repeat the mistakes of our peers? My personal feeling is that we need a steering board for this plan made up of octogenarians who have each lived in this valley for at least 40 years, a council of elders with the wisdom of perspective. Growth is not what our valley needs. Many of us moved here because of the lack of growth and development. Someday we will have to keep our economy going without construction revenues. Why not sooner with a high quality of life instead of too late later.
5/8/2009	Epstein, Steven Interested Public	In light of the current economic situation it seems to me that it would make much more sense to concentrate as much growth as possible to the greater Jackson area and the Teton Village area. This would eliminate the need for many of the services that will probably need to be added to the so called node areas, ie schools, transportation, law enforcement, fire safety etc. Since the plan seems flexible as conditions improve other areas could be added.
5/8/2009	Banks, Patrice Interested Public	I live in Cottonwood Park and am very concerned about adding more traffic to an already busy High School Road. We have 6 schools that create a lot of traffic (both auto and pedestrian). Cottonwood Park, Rangeview and Blair Apartments are very dense and adding 1000 or more homes would inundate High School Road. I firmly believe that there MUST be an East-West road connecting all these new homes/businesses to Route 89 as well as South Park Loop. I feel that this connector road should be worked out before any development whatsoever is started. Another concern is open space. With Blair Apartments having no playground of their own, they all come to the Rangeview Park. Please consider adding playground equipment/parks and more than 1/8 mile (660 ft) setback of open space. People love living in Cottonwood & Rangeview. It seems emulating our developments instead of cramming lots of homes in would make sense. Please help us keep High School Road safe and Cottonwood Park a great place to live. Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
5/8/2009	Davis, Eric Interested Public	I would like to comment briefly on the proposed Wilson expansion. Overall, I think the plan is very well thought out and a benefit for Wilson and west bank residents. My wife and I have lived on the west bank off and on over the past 8 years and have grown to love the area. One of the difficult things, especially during the summer, is making the trip into town for shopping and errands. In our opinion, Wilson and the west bank could use such a commercial expansion as you propose. Yes, we, like many residents love the quiet and peaceful aspect of the west bank. Growth and change can be scary, as I'm sure many have indicated to you. However, its contradictory for us to totally oppose growth, especially responsible growth as your plan proposes. We all contribute to the population here and therefore need to embrace responsible growth. Though many will likely fear this plan, I am confident that, if and when it is executed according to your responsible measures, residents will be surprised how well it works and subsequently embrace it. Growth and change are inevitable. They are a normal and positive part of life and community. One question I have for the planning committee is this: Does or will the committee include a lot-designation for the possibility of a future church in Wilson? This would add diversity and a positive community aspect to such growth for Wilson. Thank you for taking the time to read this. We heartily support the plan to responsibly add the several hundred home sites and commercial property as you propose. Thank you for all your hard work. Keep up the good work.
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	Change the priority to "Limit Growth Responsibly" A main theme priority in South Park should be preservation of scenic vistas and open space. May tourists drive into town and stop to take pictures of the area from the highway. This open space and scenic vista will contribute to sustaining our economy. The other theme should be limit all growth to the northwest corner adjacent to high school road. Delete all references and statements about developing from north to south. This is a dangerous topic and gives a green light for extensive development in South Park rather than preservation of open space. The use of the term "town development pattern" does not fall under the definition of responsible. Please change this to "Community Needs Development Pattern". I do not know of a single person who would like to see Town Development in South Park. The addition of a priority to create very large areas of infiltration wetlands (could be stormwater treatment wetlands for Town runoff) to lands that are converted from flood irrigation practices in South Park. This will ultimately provide groundwater recharge that Spring Creek (near 3 Creek Ranch) and other South Park wetlands need to be sustained. For example, portions of the Rafter J ponds stay ice free in the winter and provide crucial winter habitat for Trumpeter swans. Flat Creek needs a minimum 150' buffer from development. Development of South Park with town level development from north to south will completely degrade this waterbody. This should be seriously stated in this section.
5/8/2009	Spitzer, Horton Interested Public	The Wilson school was filled with concerned neighbors to hear the planners tell us what may be in store for our special community. The universal sentiment was that the unique character of Wilson will be destroyed forever by the concepts as presented, particularly the tripling of the population. No mention was made of preserving the CHARACTER and VIEWSHEDS we all hold as reasons to live here. These features were given emphasis in the previous plan. Why have they been totally eliminated in this new proposal for the entire valley? These words seem to have been buried by academic planning definitions. Also the proposed method of planning accountability with an annual review of decisions made by government officials during that year by the same officials who made the decisions is ludicrous. Such a review should include nongovernmental personnel, not those who instituted the decisions. Lastly, why weren't the many thoughtful Comments made by Wilsonites recorded and made a part of the public record. The rules not to record public comment were made by our government officials who work for us. We should require them to change this policy in the future. I feel insulted to have taken the time to participate in a public meeting and not have comments recorded. Is this an exercise in appeasing the public with little consideration to its input. More work and changes need to be done to address the heartfelt concerns of our community before the Plan, as proposed, can be considered acceptable.
5/7/2009	Danford, Susan Interested Public	As a north of town resident I am happy with the plan for this area. I would like to see the addition of a pathway to Kelly and around antelope flats as very many people both local and visitor bike this route and it is hazardous. Human powered travel could reduce car traffic which would be good for people and animals. I would also like the plan to specify no speed route from the airport to the village as there is too much wildlife habitat that would be destroyed. What is not mentioned in the plan can be interpreted as allowed.

Date	Name	Comment
5/7/2009	Salter, Andy Interested Public	The recently released draft of the proposed update to the Town of Jackson /Teton Comprehensive Plan fails to reflect the interests and concerns of the majority of the residents of our Town and County. The draft plan is based upon the false assumption that the community favors growth, and regrettably ignores the considerable public input you received identifying preservation of wildlife and open spaces, and favoring slow and controlled growth. I share these views; growth in our Town and County should proceed only slowly and carefully. Preservation of our open spaces and our wildlife should be highest priorities. Our County officials and our Town officials are responsible for protecting this valley, its wildlife, its scenic vistas, and its uniqueness for all time. The draft Plan speaks to encouraging growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs but there has been no demonstrated need for growth in our community. The public has told you just the opposite. Public input should provide the foundation and direction of the new Comprehensive Plan and should not be ignored, as you appear to have done. I am absolutely opposed to a number of aspects of the draft Plan. It de-emphasizes the importance of scenic resources and does not contain a mechanism to permanently protect rural open space areas. The draft plan contemplates more than doubling the housing population in Jackson and Teton County, and more than doubling commercial space. Rather than responsibly attempting to address and reduce the severe shortfall of workforce housing in the area, these proposals will make this serious problem far worse. New residents and new workers will create additional demands for affordable housing, further compounding the existing shortage. Infill within the Town should be the first priority before considering expansion into other nodes within the County. I strongly encourage you to reduce the recommended overall build-out of the Town and County and specifically define maximum build-out, so that only a slow, sustainable rate of growth would be encouraged. As a resident of South Park, I am extremely concerned that the Plan proposes eliminating language from the previous Comprehensive Plan that called for permanent open space protection for portions of South Park and for protecting the scenic and wildlife values in the South Park area. Wildlife and natural resources have been and should remain a first priority in South Park. South Park contains important and irreplaceable wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values. If we do not protect them, they will be gone forever. Residents of the Town and County dutifully attended you many meetings of residents and community groups and voiced a preference for slow growth. I am deeply troubled by the suggestion that input from individuals and interests you now refuse to publicly identify led to a conclusion that the public's mandate was for more growth. Please revise the Comprehensive Plan to accurately reflect the will of the community and its residents and to property plan to preserve this spectacular place in which we live. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.
5/7/2009	Harder, F. Interested Public	After attending the May 5, 2009 meeting at Nick Wilson's Cafe in Teton Village, I have the following comments. I am strongly opposed to the massive projected planning and development plan which was presented. It did not go unnoticed that some of the committee advisers are developers! Our wildlife migration corridors, infrastructure and ecosystem are demonstrating stress at the present level of expansion, and are in need of updating to sustain our current population. We desperately need a second bridge access to the West Bank. The current bridge is in dire need of repair and at our current population density is overstressed daily. Also, it is a safety issue in the event of a natural disaster. The majority of constituents want "limited" managed growth...the proposed plan being totally opposite to the community's preference and preservation. Affordable housing should be centered as much as possible in town which avoids further increasing congestion on road corridors in and out of Town; and insures easy accessibility to community facilities and services. If, Teton Village requires additional employee housing, it is their development and their responsibility; not the Town's, The Aspens, Wilson, South Park, etc. The ongoing development in Teton Village is "over the top". It has ruined the unique quaint quality it used to have. I would hope, when and if, future affordable housing is constructed that it blend in with the style of the area, rather than the "eye sore" units we are presently stuck with.

Date	Name	Comment
5/7/2009	McClelland, Porgy Interested Public	What have you done to get us all so stirred up? The planning department seems to have a radically different view of what this place should look like in the future. While attending planning meetings, we have heard that protecting wildlife, and preserving community character play the leading roles in plan development. We have also been told repeatedly that community input will be incorporated into the plan. I have never heard anybody beg the county for tripling the size of Wilson, and the draft plan County wide seems to have hit us with shock and awe when the cumulative impacts are pondered. Simply put, there is too much growth allowed to preserve what we have asked you to protect. The county Commissioners and others have stated that we have a crisis due to the lack of affordable housing and the planning department seems to have to have let this be their guiding light in drafting this plan. In 1979, I sold a small house and lot to Clarene Law who contacted me within hours of the for sale add appearing in the paper. On closing the deal, I asked Clarene why she was interested in this sort of property and her response was, "I can see a day when my help won't be able to find a place to live". My point: Clarene is a very smart woman who was able to address her business needs. When the next Sooting Star arrives, I doubt the developers would have the insight that Clarene did, but the county should be able to predict the number of slaves required and enforce the developers to build the required housing. The businesses that take care of their employees will flourish, and those businesses that rely on someone else to provide housing for their workers will have a harder time-just like in the free market. I am sure that the planning department cannot address affordable housing through the creation of nodes as increasing the supply side will only work in the short term and with much sacrifice to the values we cherish. I know the tremendous amount of time and energy that has gone into the plan to date and realize your desire to get it right. I hope you take the time to measure the impacts on "wildlife and character" before you allow densities that will destroy both.
5/7/2009	Smith, Patricia Interested Public	I am writing to oppose any more affordable housing being built in Jackson. Affordable housing destroys the real estate open market for everyone involved. The houses look cheap and are made cheaply. It's unfortunately, because what makes Jackson a special place is not everyone can live here. By making it easier for people to buy a home here, it automatically makes Jackson a less desirable place. And guess what? Life isn't fair! Not everyone can live here. So stop accommodating the poor and taking from the rich. This might as well be Communist Russia. If affordable housing was not in place, the real estate market would be a better place. With the large number of affordable housing, you have created an environment for the super wealthy and lower class. That leaves the hard working people who have saved money too wealthy for affordable housing but can only afford the bottom of the barrel in the open market. It is infuriating that a SKI-BUM is encouraged to buy into affordable housing, where a hard working middle-income person like myself has too much money for an affordable HOME and can only afford a 1 bedroom APARTMENT on the open market. Please stop affordable housing!
5/7/2009	Miller, Teresa Interested Public	Sounds like the Jackson Hole Community is speaking out against your growth plan. Are you listening? Kristne & Paul O'Brien say it best in their "Guest Shot" article in the weekly JHN&G (May6), bottom line is sustainable--continued with minimal long-term effect on the environment. The key word is "minimal", not massive. Please don't ruin the community we love with this plan. Please don't ruin Wilson. I do not like this plan.
5/7/2009	Ballard, Ken Interested Public	VERY BAD IDEA! The impact of The Plan will drastically impact the wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. In the long run, Jackson will become just another resort. That is not why people buy in The Aspens or the Jackson/Wilson area. The community is unique and totally in tune with the wildlife and natural resources. I want moose and elk walking by my home and the tress and open spaces for birds and other wildlife to inhabit. The growth plan for The Aspens and the Jackson/Wilson areas in general jeopardize the integrity of the community, in spite of The Plan's claims to "mitigate impacts to wildlife and should allow for wildlife movements and crossings,Äù. LOL what a bunch of bull!!!! To mitigate, means to cause to be less harsh or hostile. So who's going to determine what is less harsh or hostile? What is the metric? Anything less than the status quo is not acceptable! If The Plan cannot guarantee that future development will have "NO IMPACT" on the wildlife and natural resources, then it should have never been considered in the first place. WHAT ARE YOU THINKING???
5/7/2009	Tillemans, Lori Interested Public	The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up. We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must: • Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average • Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage. Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us: • Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat • Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations • Preservation of our rural way of life. I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl. I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.

Date	Name	Comment
5/7/2009	Pardo, Hernando Interested Public	I am writing to voice my opinion on the planned development of Wilson, WY. As a long time resident of Jackson (30 plus years) I am opposed to the high density planned for the town of Wilson. It will negatively affect many aspects of the small town. Wildlife will suffer, traffic will be too much for it as is and would need further development of reads and highways, which again, I oppose. DO NOT CHANGE WILSON TO A HIGHER DENSITY AREA.
5/7/2009	Vaughan, R H Interested Public	As a 17 year resident of Wilson I am totally opposed to proposed plan for the future development of Wilson as set forth in the May 6th edition of the JH News & Guide. The statement by Mr. Daugherty that Wilson's character "COULD" change by virtue of the plan is disingenuous at best. If that reflects his judgement he should seek a new line of work and try to sell bridges in New York.
5/7/2009	Harris, Suzanne Interested Public	I strongly oppose the addition of 500 possible new homes in the Wilson "node." Wilson and the Aspens should not be "nodes," as the additional traffic caused by so many new housing units would kill animals and make our roads and schools overcrowded. The residents of Wilson came out this evening in strong and emotional opposition to so much growth. It would ruin the good conditions which attract people to live here.
5/7/2009	Rizzotti, Ken Interested Public	Please listen to the citizens who attended the Draft Comp Plan Presentaton in Wilson on 5/07/09. The citizens desire no change to the already outstanding character which exists in Wilson. We are at a tipping point, where additional population and their associated impacts will adversely affect wildlife and scenery. Consider the fact that Hwy 22 runs through the center of Wilson, which is a dangerous mountain pass. Focus on making the community better for the citizens who live here. Where did all the results from the past charettes go. Density neutral was the consensus. This "node" is a beautiful place, and like many others in this community, I fear that the "density bonuses" and "afordable housing" are more important than the wildlife who has resided here longer than us. There is too much focus on balancing wildlife with growth. Soon enough, there wont be any wildlife, and we will be like any other western resort town. It is time where the County officials actually listen to the citizens that pay the taxes that make their paychecks. Manage growth so it is acceptable to the citizens of Wilson, meaning growth neutral. Work with WYDOT to improve Hwy 22. running through Wilson. Dont get caught up in the self perpetuating philosophy that we need to continue to grow to fuel the affordable housing programs. Wilson is a special place which can not sustain any more development without sacraficing the real character of this community.
5/7/2009	Day, Clint Interested Public	I realize the commercial zoning has been on the Hwy 22 corridor for awhile (I've been in town 19 years and it's been the same I believe). I understand and respect that any landowner has the right to maximize their property's potential, especially commercial, within the bounds of the law. I do wonder what other services a town like Wilson requires though. We have a gas station, P.O., awesome general store, hardware store, bar, bank, welding shop, Dr's offices, contractor, bike/ ski shop. To me the town is extremely viable and already meets you requirements allowing residents to avoid trips to town. For years, I've been able to NEVER cross the Snake to fulfill daily needs and then some. In fact, there have been months where I never had to leave "the Loop" (except to see friends) in order to be completely sufficient in today's world. I think a satellite Sheriff's office is just plain dumb. Enough said. It also seems from the orange area on the map that most of the property for future home development is currently held in private hands. I could be way off-base on this. So, in some ways, the future of Wilson's development potential lies in the hands of current owners not giving in to an upzone of their property and early retirement if they sold out. Our 2+ acres on the loop can be taken out of your calculations. Thanks
5/7/2009	Bar-or, Gal Interested Public	Simply stating over and over that you are attempting to "manage growth responsibly" does not make it so. The residents of Wilson, by which I mean the downtown Wilson area as well as the area in the Aspens, DO NOT WANT THE GROWTH YOU ARE PROPOSING FOR OUR COMMUNITY. You are proposing to change the character, the tone, the living quality and the structure of life in our town, and we feel you are doing so against our vehemently stated wishes. Finally, the "nodal" concept is flawed fundamentally, does not take any real efforts to directly address infrastructure (saying the developers will deal with it is NOT acceptable) and seems to be a rationalization for dumping development in our laps, again, against the wishes of the members of the community you are planning to ruin.

Date	Name	Comment
5/7/2009	Yurgalewicz, Jean Interested Public	It's dusk, I'm looking at a group of 4 mule deer plus a set of twins bedded down in the wildlife corridor tangent to my Aspens condo. Out my back door today, I viewed a cow moose and her yearling calf grazing on the shrubs, territorial red squirrels, pairs of chipmunks, and the lone female 2 yr. old moose wandered by-her mother was the one killed on the Village Rd. last Jan.'08 by a snowplow during the blizzard-...She keeps close to home here since her mother showed her all the great spots to browse here in the Aspens. A fox has been seen here of late, making his early dawn and dusk rounds, keeping the rodent population in check. These are just some of the wildlife that I experience daily from my condo here at #2111 Windflower, one of two condos that are west of the proposed future bldg.site of residential/commercial growth slated for the east side of the Aspens. It is my understanding that the private land owned by certain valley realtors along our buck rail fence line (our backyard) is scheduled to be developed into perhaps a police station, laundromat, shops, etc. If you head down Kennel Lane on your immediate left all the way down to the split in the road, there is a known wildlife corridor,(mentioned above), that shelters and is habitat to maybe 20-40 different species of wildlife at any given time year-round. Last nite I heard a Great Gray Owl calling. The stately Lodgepole Pine forest is home to a myriad number of bird and waterfowl species in the surrounding wetlands further along the creek there. Now, I ask you, Is this PROMOTING STEWARDSHIP OF WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCES as your proposed ideal THEME #1 states in The Comp. Plan??? Please, I invite you to come sit on my back deck, or take a walk along Kennel lane and just keep your eyes and ears open and take in all that will disappear if you consider high density commercial/residential growth here.
5/6/2009	Sundgren, Shelley Interested Public	I reside in Cottonwood Park. The following are some of my concerns regarding the proposed development in South Park.1. It is unclear whether all of District 12 will be developed (under this Plan) - from north to south - or if only the areas indicated on the map (400 acres in the northwest corner, Rafter J, Melody, and the industrial area east of Melody) - will have development beyond the rural classification. State specifically what areas will be other than rural. State that the areas shown as rural will be developed based on that designation and will NOT be developed to a greater density. What is meant by developing "north to south"? Either describe what is meant by that or delete it.2. 400 acres and 1500 residential units seems excessive. How about stating that development would be staged as demand supports, with an ultimate buildout not to exceed 400 acres and 1500 residential units? This way appropriate density can be achieved and services provided to a discrete area - not to all of the 400 acres immediately, i.e. avoid scattered development.3. In-fill should be stressed in Jackson (town as heart theme) prior to going wild with development in South Park.4. We had moose and deer moving through Cottonwood this winter. They will be back. Wildlife will be present in any South Park development. This has to be recognized. Wildlife corridors have to be designated and provided.5. Provide at least a 1,000 foot scenic buffer along the east side of South Park road. Do not allow anything other than access roads (perpendicular to South Park only - minimize road length in the buffer, also minimize the number of access roads crossing the buffer) in the buffer. Do not allow noise/view berms to be constructed in the buffer.6. Provide at least a 1,000 foot buffer along the south side of High School Road. 7. Perhaps the buffer area along High School Road could be developed as a town park - both for students and for the residents of the new development. Note that Range View Park gets lots of use by people outside of Range View and Cottonwood, since their developments do not have public parks (e.g. Indian Trails, Rafter J). Alternatively, require a public park to be included somewhere in the area to be developed in the northwest corner of South Park - and require it to be done at the start of development, not sometime in the dim future.7. Do not add any additional traffic capacity to High School Road. Keep it with a speed limit of 25 mph. Perhaps add a bike path/sidewalk south of and seperated from the road (similar to that on the west side of South Park Road).8. Cottonwood Park has only one exit from the subdivision and that is onto High School Road. That exit is too close to the Middle School Road intersection to allow a stop sign on High School Road for the Cottonwood intersection. High School Road (per its name) has several schools and lots of children walking along the road. No increase in traffic should be allowed on High School Road - both for safety and maintaining existing quality of life for existing residents. Traffic from the proposed development in northwest South Park should be directed onto the new connector from 89 to South Park Road. Require the construction of that connector before ANY development is allowed in northwest South Park. Note that the connector will have to cross Flat Creek in an environmentally responsible manner - which means it will be expensive. Require the development in the northwest corner of South Park to pay for this. 8. The development in the northwest corner of South Park should be required to pay for the expansion of town services (e.g. sewer and water) required for their development.9. Establish a buffer Flat Creek - especially the west side (if it is not already set). Show the buffer on the map.10. In general - stress the themes in the order of importance determined from public comment, i.e., wildlife protection is important, development is not. Development seems to be given more importance than wildlife.Thank-you for the opportunity to comment

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2009	Shore, Kenneth Interested Public	My comments begin generally on the draft Comprehensive Plan -- and perhaps with a comment that you really do not hear much, certainly as often as you should. Thank you. The staff and elected officials worked hard, and community-wide we should give it our general support. As with any comprehensive document, it is a work in progress and the feedback is very important -- but please don't let those loud voices who oppose this or that particular provision drown out the larger message that generally this is a positive and important document. You are headed in the right direction and have presented and good balance between protecting both our community of great people and this special place with wildlife. Your plan shows an increased protection of wildlife, reduction in development in rural areas and an emphasis on workforce housing. The nodes are smart planning. And it will be a given that they won't please everyone. But we all have to live as a larger community and accept front and backyards alike. It was interesting to hear the public presentations that indeed we are talking about a very, very, very small section overall of private land as a base. One tenth of 1 percent indeed is a small place for people habitat. I'm grateful for the recognition of the economy in this plan. Responsible growth is important. In fact, if you didn't include responsible growth -- as some of the opponents are asking -- it would be highly irresponsible of you as elected officials! This community is suffering with the rest of the nation from the downturn economically. I hope you remember this: The fact is the majority of our community goes to work every day. Payrolls and paychecks are the majority of us -- and some are too busy working to earn a living to comment or get involved in this. More than ever, we need to emphasize our economic health here in Teton County. Specifically in Teton Village, workforce housing is welcome, but I too hope you work with us in a positive dialogue to create the best Teton Village mix and plans. Only workforce housing -- without accompanying planning for interesting commercial and diversity -- will risk a man-camp in Teton Village. If only workforce housing allowed, you will drive up car trips in record numbers as people will need to travel to get economically better priced daily living services. The workforce is a vital and active part of our community. To deny the kinds of commercial interests that appeal to workers and visitors -- with pedestrian qualities -- is poor planning for Teton Village. The Village needs vibrancy. For quality of life, for good business and for positive tax revenues flowing to County and Town. Furthermore, keep in mind, Teton Village as an economic engine of the County is a green one. Recreation and fun. That should be encouraged via smart planning. In general, Teton Village must be a well-planned, positive place that is aesthetically pleasing with many options and choices for everyone. We look forward to an active dialogue with the County in the future to achieve that goal. But again, generally many of us give you our support of this draft plan overall.
5/6/2009	Sundgren, Shelley Interested Public	I have not seen anything discussing how the rate of growth will be monitored. How about adding something that indicates when approximately X% (e.g., 20%) of the planned development has occurred (preferably on a district by district basis), that the plan will be reviewed to see if it needs to be revised due to too rapid development. Remember that development was determined to NOT be a priority of the citizens. The plan needs to include a way to make sure that the development occurring under it is in line with what the citizens want.
5/6/2009	, Interested Public	The comprehensive plan for 10.11 District 11: Wilson, does not represent the cultural beliefs of the residents of Wilson. The plan states the increase in housing and commercial building will reduce the need for Wilson residents to take trips to Jackson, thus reducing traffic. This statement is false and cannot possibly hold true. The majority of Wilson residents work in Jackson and many use the Stillson parking lot to reduce traffic. Increasing housing by almost 3 times will only increase traffic, period! And ten years from now a new comprehensive plan will need to be created to try and figure out how to decrease traffic by expanding highway 22. Growth is not in the best interest of Wilson residents, we live in Wilson because we wish to get away from the chaos. I have lived in Wilson for over 25 years, born and raised and to be honest, I avoid Jackson like the plague and I do not need to go to Jackson because Wilson has a grocery store, a hardware store, post office, coffee shop, gear store, doctors, and two restaurants and a bar, plus all the close wonderful restaurants in the Aspens and the Village. So the statement that increasing housing to reduce traffic and trips to Jackson is absolutely ludicrous and a statement that is attempting to justify building MORE AND MORE AND MORE. Please stop.

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2009	Farrell, Nadia and Bob Interested Public	We have reviewed the April 3, 2009 Draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Our main interest and concern with the draft plan are focused on District 19: Rodeo Grounds. Concern 1: Inaccurate description of the area shown as Single Family Mixed-Type. In the Draft Plan this area is described as follows: "The area classified as Single Family Mixed-Type currently consists of single family homes with accessory residential units and multifamily residential structures located at the periphery. The land use pattern in this area will continue to be dominated by single family residences (with and without accessory units) with some multi-family projects at the edge of the area." This description implies that all residences include accessory residential units. In fact only a small percentage of homes in the proposed Single Family Mixed-Type area have accessory residential units. We believe there are less than six accessory residential units and of those only one is a stand-alone building (a partially converted detached garage). The reference to the multifamily residential structures would be correct and more informative by stating that a few multifamily residential structures are located at one corner of the area. As currently written, this description creates a false image of the make-up and character of this neighborhood. This false image seems to provide the basis for the proposed classification of this area as Single Family Mixed-Type. An area consisting of two residential units on each lot and with Multifamily units on the edges of the area could logically be classified as Multifamily with little or no change to the area. This is not the make-up of the proposed Single Family Mixed-Type area in District 19: Rodeo Grounds. Following is a suggested rewrite of the description of this area. "The area classified as Single Family Low Mixed Type currently consists primarily of single family homes, a few of which have with accessory residential units. and There are a limited number of multifamily residential structures located at one corner of the area the periphery. The land use pattern in this area will continue to be dominated by single family residences (some with and without previously developed accessory units) with a some multi-family projects at one corner the edge of the area." Concern 2: The classification of the Single Family area as Single Family Mixed-Type rather than Single Family Low. We agree that the Multi-Family classification for a portion of this District is appropriate considering its current uses, the District's status as a Town Targeted Growth District and the priority to Manage Growth Responsibly in this District. However, it does not seem appropriate to classify the Single Family area as Single Family Mixed-Type instead of Single Family Low. This neighborhood is primarily single family residences without accessory residential units (See Concern 1 above) and under the 1994 plan was identified as Neighborhood Conservation - Single Family. This neighborhood has been a stable and positive addition to the Town of Jackson for over 40 years. If all or most of the homes had accessory residential units, the properties were falling into disrepair or the neighborhood was in need of redevelopment we would be in favor of a classification of Single Family Mixed-Type. Perhaps in 10 or 15 years during a five year Plan review a finding for the need for redevelopment might occur. At that time an amendment to the Plan could classify the area as Single Family Mixed-Type. However, at the present time, our neighborhood is strong, viable, stable and at least equivalent in size, quality, viability and stability to neighborhoods classified as Single Family Low in other Town Targeted Growth Districts - for example, the proposed Single Family Low residential area at Scott Lane and Snow King Avenue in District 17: The "Y". That neighborhood, like ours, is relatively small (~37 lots vs. ~47 lots) and is adjacent to areas classified as Multifamily. Based on the above facts, we believe the Single Family area in District 19: Rodeo Grounds could and should be classified as Single Family Low. By doing so, the plan would preserve a viable, stable neighborhood while providing for additional managed growth in the larger Multifamily portion of the District. We appreciate your consideration of our comments and look forward to the finalization of the Plan and the development of Zoning and Land Development Regulations needed to implement the Plan.
5/6/2009	Sundgren, Shelley Interested Public	I have concerns regarding the proposed Tribal Road connection. Minimal effort should be put into planning that connection until AFTER all possible improvements have been made to the Y and the traffic has shown that it is required. Do NOT plan (or build) the Tribal Road connection until the traffic actually exists that requires it. Do NOT build it based on estimated (modeled, hypothetical) traffic. The construction of the Tribal Road connection would have negative impacts on the local communities along the currently dead end road, wildlife, and on the residents of Blair and Cottonwood Park. It would increase traffic on local roads - a decrease in the quality of life of the residents. It would increase traffic on High School Road, Middle School Road, as well as South Park Road - a big safety issue with all the students who walk to school.
5/6/2009	Barney, Bodean Interested Public	I have serious concerns about what the property owners intend to do with their water rights in T40N R116W Sections 6 and 7 (abandon, transfer?). Since the Adams Ditch head gate is in the SW1/4SE1/4 of section 6, will these appropriators have access to that head gate and what about ditch maintenance issues?

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2009	Hanlon, John Interested Public	While the overall concept of updating the plan is laudable it lacks at least 2 major thngs that I see.1. it doesn't really listen to the will and needs of the population.2.It doesn't listen to itself in a cohesive manner. For example, if we have 5 million sq. feet of new commercial built, do we have enough space to house the workers? No. And why are we expanding the lodging overlay? No one has complained publicly about a lack of hotels here and we haven't filled the space in the current overlay. Did someone get a favor?Scrap it and start over.Thanks for listening.
5/6/2009	Shore, Kenneth Interested Public	My comments begin generally on the draft Comprehensive Plan -- and perhaps with a comment that you really do not hear much, certainly as often as you should. Thank you. The staff and elected officials worked hard, and community-wide we should give it our general support. As with any comprehensive document, it is a work in progress and the feedback is very important -- but please don't let those loud voices who oppose this or that particular provision drown out the larger message that generally this is a positive and important document. You are headed in the right direction and have presented and good balance between protecting both our community of great people and this special place with wildlife.Your plan shows an increased protection of wildlife, reduction in development in rural areas and an emphasis on workforce housing. The nodes are smart planning. And it will be a given that they won't please everyone. But we all have to live as a larger community and accept front and backyards alike. It was interesting to hear the public presentations that indeed we are talking about a very, very, very small section overall of private land as a base. One tenth of 1 percent indeed is a small place for people habitat.I'm grateful for the recognition of the economy in this plan. Responsible growth is important. In fact, if you didn't include responsible growth -- as some of the opponents are asking -- it would be highly irresponsible of you as elected officials! This community is suffering with the rest of the nation from the downturn economically. I hope you remember this: The fact is the majority of our community goes to work every day. Payrolls and paychecks are the majority of us -- and some are too busy working to earn a living to comment or get involved in this. More than ever, we need to emphasize our economic health here in Teton County.Specifically in Teton Village, workforce housing is welcome, but I too hope you work with us in a positive dialogue to create the best Teton Village mix and plans. Only workforce housing -- without accompanying planning for interesting commercial and diversity -- will risk a man-camp in Teton Village. If only workforce housing allowed, you will drive up car trips in record numbers as people will need to travel to get economically better priced daily living services. The workforce is a vital and active part of our community. To deny the kinds of commercial interests that appeal to workers and visitors -- with pedestrian qualities -- is poor planning for Teton Village. The Village needs vibrancy. For quality of life, for good business and for positive tax revenues flowing to County and Town. Furthermore, keep in mind, Teton Village as an economic engine of the County is a green one. Recreation and fun. That should be encouraged via smart planning.In general, Teton Village must be a well-planned, positive place that is aesthetically pleasing with many options and choices for everyone. We look forward to an active dialogue with the County in the future to achieve that goal.But again, generally many of us give you our support of this draft plan overall.
5/5/2009	Foyster, Pam Interested Public	As part of the Transportation plan, there has been significant work done to promote safe, accessible, interconnected system. However, the community at large continues to stymie the plan's progress, and this will negatively impact any comprehensive plan.If the plan is to succeed in Teton County, one of the 3 following options MUST be adopted:1. Widen Hwy 3902. Build the north loop road to create alternative road access across the Snake River. This is important for safety as well as vehicle congestion in and through Jackson.3. Following the example of Sun Valley and Steamboat, create a free bus system for all riders. These progressive communities reached over 1 million riders 10 years ago, and are still going strong!Thank You.
5/5/2009	Foyster, Pam Interested Public	Thank you for the extensive report and information.I would like to correct one element of your Conceptual Future Land Use Map - the Aspens subdivision is mostly owner occupied, rented as long term workforce housing, or as second-home for owners. The Aspens is a very good model of what can be done as a focused area of development. However I hope you do not intend that this area should be increased in density to town-levels. The Town-As-Heart concept should be maintained, and not allowed to spread along highway corridors (ala Steamboat Springs).Thank you.
5/4/2009	Colglazier, Carol Interested Public	The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up. We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must: • Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average • Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage. Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us: • Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat • Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations • Preservation of our rural way of life. I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl. I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.Please do not approve any more 3 story buildings right downtown, within 3 blocks of the square. It is beginning to make us feel like we are living in a CITY instead of a town. Tourists come here because they like the small town atmosphere.

Date	Name	Comment
5/4/2009	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	I am a part-time resident of Jackson Hole living in the South Park area of town. I have read with interest the document referred to above and would like to offer my comments. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan was designed to guide community planning in such a way as to "promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth" While this was a worthy objective, that Plan did little to deter population growth due largely to Jackson's intrinsic qualities of scenic beauty and abundant wildlife, coupled with the proximity of skiing, hiking and outdoor activities, making it one of if not the most desirable small communities in the country. The current draft Plan seems unlikely to protect and preserve the qualities that make the Jackson Valley unique. Nowhere does the draft Plan recognize the kind of qualities that caused the Rockefeller family to aggregate land and place it in trust as parklands. The central premise of the draft Plan should recognize above all that the rate of growth the Valley has experienced over the past several decades cannot be sustained if we are to sustain the quality of life that Jackson residents and tourists alike cherish. Specifically, the draft Plan allows for population growth from the current 20,000 to around 40,000 and for designated housing units to increase from the current 10,000 to 20,000. Specific areas, such as South Park, allow large buildouts with density incentives to permit workforce housing, while the commercial buildout infers some nine million square feet of proposed commercial space. To call the draft Plan "responsible" growth is irresponsible and erroneous. It presumes the sort of upzoning that has ruined other communities seeking additional sources of income at the expense of the qualities that led to demand in the first place. Responsible growth would instead emphasize the upgrading and infilling of existing growths in areas that are already served by current infrastructure and services. Commercial projects should likewise largely be restricted to replacing and making more sustainable older existing projects rather than projects that extend workplace housing further from town since such housing will ultimately require additional infrastructure and services that constitute additional expenses for the host community. The draft Plan shows little in the way of acknowledgement that natural systems such as watersheds and wildlife corridors have a carrying capacity that planners exceed at their peril. Simply referring to "human needs" and "community benefits" does little to help evaluate the merits of proposed projects. Instead, planners need to work with wildlife biologists and other experts to produce indices that portend which are desirable and which will produce harm to these natural systems. I gather that the Jackson community have emphasized this vision of Jackson but their comments have largely gone unheard at staff levels. I am writing elected officials in the hopes that you recognize the the structural changes that have and are taking place in the economy that not only have fundamentally changed the way we do business but the danger of adopting a draft Plan based on future growth. The current recession has brought about a shift towards sustainability and yearning for ways of life that are not predicated on untrammelled growth. Where growth occurs it should be incremental and respectful. For Jackson to adhere to a growth model betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the evolving socioeconomic realities around us. Indeed, the fragility of the Jackson economy and the current recession offer planners and citizens a rare opportunity to plan for the future without the attendant pressures of earlier years. Attention to the replacement and modernization of existing infrastructure (Jackson Airport, the Y Intersection etc.) should be prioritized. Projects like the limited expansion and upgrading of Teton Village are good examples of responsible growth as it directly impacts the tourist economy. I am a real estate developer in California and can attest to the fact that recreational and resort developments are labor intensive and must be judged within the local economy on a long-term basis. To conclude, I am writing elected officials in Jackson to encourage you to use the "breathing room" that the current recession affords you to revise the draft Plan in ways that will insure Jackson's future as a "last great place." Failure to produce an appropriate Comprehensive Plan this time around, unlike 1994, will have dire and perhaps irreversible consequences. A Comprehensive Plan is a visionary document. Please demonstrate to current residents and future generations that you are indeed men and women who can match your wonderful mountains.
5/4/2009	Walker, Darrick Interested Public	As a local resident in Wilson I am concerned about adding higher densities in an area that serves as a natural wildlife corridor. The impact of more homes, business and more roadways ccan and will impair the natural movements of the wild animals. However an even bigger issue will be done during the construction period which could permanently change their natural habitat. From cement mixers, loud noise, diesel and gas emmissions, carbon dioxide, dust, trash debri, paint fumes etc, these aforementioned pollutants have no place in Wilson or in Jackson Hole.
5/4/2009	Wilson, Phil Interested Public	Classifying the Valley Springs Ranch as inappropriate for growth in the next 10-15 years, but possibly appropriate in the future makes sense and is something he agrees with. The existing road off of Hwy 89 that accesses the Valley Springs Park would be an appropriate connection from Hwy 89 to South Park Loop.
5/3/2009	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	I have owned a unit in the Aspens for several years. I did not spend \$800,000 to now be considered a place for more density and workforce housing. There are to many cars and trucks already on the road. Densities should be increased South of town where there is better and larger roads and access. I enjoy watching the Elk herd just outside the Aspens boundary.

Date	Name	Comment
5/3/2009	McQuillan, Karin Interested Public	The vision of the community is not accurate according to all the public input. The public has expressed quite clearly that we want limits on growth as a primary and necessary basic goal, in order to enable the public's commitment to protect our wildlife, scenery and small town way of life. Limited growth should be explicitly stated as a primary goal in itself, against which all other goals must be measured. All other wishes, such as employee housing, are only acceptable so far as they support limited growth. They must not be excuses for variances that undercut the PRIMARY GOAL OF LIMITED GROWTH. We don't have a shot in hell of protecting our valley, our wildlife, our small town life if growth is merely moved around, moved into taller buildings, etc.
5/2/2009	Balogh, Holly Interested Public	I have significant concerns about the way that this plan addresses protection of wildlife. This is one of the most important places in the country and the main reason we moved here. I am very disappointed that the plan does not limit growth nor consider current wildlife migration and sensitive areas when it identified up-zone areas. Allowing for more development in these areas DOES NOT PROTECT OUR WILDLIFE. Just drive down HWY 89 any morning in the winter and you can see for yourself what development in Melody, Rafter J and the construction of a 5 lane highway has done for our wildlife. The amount of dead carcasses on the road is unbelievable. I would appreciate your consideration on this subject - the number one subject identified by our valley residence - and re-work this plan so that it gives our much deserved wildlife a needed break.
5/2/2009	Fleming, Francine Interested Public	I have owned a condo in the Aspens since 2000 and recently bought another for my children. I bought here because it is so serene and shows to full advantage the Wyoming I have grown to love----living with nature with wonderful wild views and sightings of wildlife. I DO NOT wish to look at further commercial property or other homes in this wonderful wild area. Please do not make the Aspens like residential city blocks in Jackson. I bought here because of what it is like NOW and not to become a little city. Please note that I am adamantly opposed to additional building in this area.
5/1/2009	Zvegintzov, A. A. Interested Public	I don't think the planned Wilson node reflects what the locals have been saying. The plan includes too much growth. Our wonderful wildlife natural resource is not being adequately protected. And on and on. Keep it simple. Keep it small.
5/1/2009	Kroposki, Michael Interested Public	The Conceptual Land Use Map for Teton Village, Page 105 show green bands along Michael Drive and Rachel Way. The legend indicates these are "open space/parks". This designation makes no sense. The existing use is multifamily residence buildings. There is almost no open space. Most of the area not covered by buildings is paved parking lots. This needs correction or explanation.
5/1/2009	Ambler, Emily Interested Public	The Y is a congested area. We do not think there should be any high density construction approved, similar to what was recently discussed. In general the Comp Plan should assert that if an area is upgraded another area should be downgraded in regard to building/density. Without corresponding protection for scenic and wildlife habitat we will all too quickly lose what we value most in the area. We could end up with both sprawl in the county and congestion in town.
4/30/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	I have talked to people living on Gregory Lane....they call themselves the "forgotten ones" as they live on Gregory Lane and winter like summer there is heavy traffic on this little curvy road. A lot of times you have heavy trucks rolling down that road. No sidewalk or bike paths on Gregory Lane so people have to walk on the road with their kids...I heard it is especially dangerous in the winter with the high snow banks. People living there (hispanics, european students and many more) are our workforce... So how can there be a consideration of building 1500 homes in the South Park node....a lot of people use Gregory Lane...(which is totally unsafe) to go to the ballpark and the commercial stores and offices... more houses would mean more traffic...we have reached already our traffic capacity.... and more traffic means building new roads, widening them etc... all affects wildlife corridors and outbuild of town...of areas where is no space to add on.... We have existing buildings which are not occupied or could be rebuilt to more efficient housing...why not start there before adding on houses which may end up empty in this economy but looking at history of town affordable housing ended always up as not affordable (Rafter J , Melody Ranch) Thank you for all your hard work...this is such an extensive plan and really hard to understand everything, so I can only put down my thoughts and experiences I get with talking friends and coworkers.

Date	Name	Comment
4/30/2009	Hoffman, Darrel Interested Public	Please Forgive me for typographical errors as I am not the most accurate typist in the world. I have made specific comments separately within the plan by use stickies and high lighting In the Adobe Acrobat document that I downloaded from the Jackson/County web site. The following is a summary document with an outline with the following headings: Summary of the Land Use Plan, Summary of the Comprehensive Plan followed by Introduction, Jackson/Teton County Community Vision, headings for each of the seven Themes and General Comments. Summary of the Land Use Plan The numerical results of residential units and commercial sq. ft. is the most revealing part of the information provided for reviewing the proposed plan. I have therefore presented my comments on the Future Land Use Plan first. I have reviewed the Land Use Plan but plan to make only a few, but important, comments at this time. If the themes, policies and strategies change as a result of comments regarding the draft plan then the land use boundaries and other data will change substantially. In looking at the tables in Appendix I: page 1-2 and 1-3 the following growth is planned in residential areas and commercial areas: [see comment for referenced tabular data] The upper range of Future Maximums from the Appendix I, Tables have been used in the above Tables A and B. If there is a range in numbers for growth and development, experience shows, it will be the maximum number that will be used. Using the numbers from the Tables in Appendix I, indicates the Residential Units and Commercial Sq. Ft. will more Than double in 8 years for residential and 5 years for commercial. This probably means the population will also more than double in 8 years. What is the next step if this rate of growth does happen? I assume it would be time for another Comp. Plan to accommodate more residential and commercial growth by allowing more growth to Jackson, the nodes and the rural areas. Oh well, so what if we eliminate more wildlife habitat and open spaces that are now zoned rural. But wait, I thought preservation of wildlife and open space is supposed to be the number one goal for the proposed plan. The growth resulting from this plan seems to be paving the way “for the death of Jackson Hole by density.” It has taken from 1889 the year of the first family settlers to Jackson Hole to now for the population to reach 20,000 + or -. Data in Tables A and B above would indicate that the population could double in about 8 years to about 40,000 + or - if the current version of the Comprehensive Plan is approved. Summary of the Comprehensive Plan: I have summarized my comments on the proposed Comp. Plan and they will follow. I do not want this summary, that was requested by the planning department, to preempt my specific comments that are included within the Introduction, Jackson/County Community Vision and Themes 1 through 7 of the Plan. The latest version of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan took a long time to produce. It was released to the advisory groups on about April 3 and the public on April 13. I am diligently reviewing the plan but it has been difficult to meet the time table set out in an email that I received as a member of the Stakeholder Advisory Group. The time schedule is April 24 for comments and May 7 for Stakeholder recommendations. I think the public and other advisory groups should have the same amount of time to read, digest and make comments on current version draft plan that was taken to produce it. If more time is not allowed the public comment and other advisory group comments will have been set aside. I hope that Planners, Commissioners, Mayor and Councilors involved in this important document will give the advisory groups and the public more time to review, comment and make recommendations. Following is a summary of my comments: Introduction My comments are included within the draft version the proposed Comprehensive Plan and will not be included in this summary. Jackson/Teton County Community Vision 1. My only comment here is that it is a tall order to preserve the ecosystem and natural resources and meet human needs. Refer to my comments within the draft plan to see my specific comments and suggestions. Theme 1 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources 2. The Plan lacks adequate protection for wildlife (WL), natural resources (NS) and open spaces (OS). 3. Rural areas seem to be an inventory of land area reserved for the next planning process to happen in 5 to 15 Years, but not necessarily to accomplish this theme. Probably more like five years to an update or new plan with the extreme growth orientation of the current proposed plan. 4. No private land areas are set asides permanently for WL, NR and OS. The exception would be those private lands protected from development under conservation easements. Theme 2 Manage Growth Responsibly 1. The Plan is growth oriented. There needs to be a slow rate of growth for commercial sq. ft. and for residential units.

2. Commercial land use should be reduced and the Lodging Overlay should be reduced rather than expanded. These reductions should be for land area and building ht.

3. The plan provides for the use of numerous density bonuses by PUD's, PRD's, the PMUD, AHPUD and other methods that simply mean more density. Density bonuses should not be allowed.

Theme 3 Uphold Jackson as "Heart of the Region"

1. A heart can only take so much overuse and it dies. I do agree with Jackson being the primary commercial use area, but the plan is allowing for too much density both in land area and building ht.

2. The idea sounds good but as planned it is not what the people who live in Jackson have clearly said they want.

Theme 4 Meet Our Community's Housing Needs

1. The Plan is driven by affordable/work force housing at public expense.

2. What we really need is affordable housing for people such as; school teachers, fire men and women, police, and other first responders. These people will continue to move to Lincoln County or Idaho unless the affordable housing in Jackson Hole meets the same living conditions they can get in these two areas. What they want is space, with a decent sized lot and a typical medium sized 3 bedroom single family house.

3. Workforce housing should all be rentals. People that are part of the workforce are generally seasonal and many will not remain in Jackson for the long term. Development of rentals would mean not dividing all buildings into condominiums.

4. Development of affordable and workforce housing should only be developed within new subdivisions with no density bonuses.

Theme 5 Provide a Diverse and Balanced Economy

1. It is important to identify the purely economic uses that create growth in Jackson Hole. Some of them are:

- The plan is silent pertaining to the airport in terms of economic development and transportation needs. The airport is a factor in the development and use of large vacation homes. There is a sea of rental cars at the airport that generate much traffic.

- Lodging and short term rentals allows more people to stay in Jackson Hole. Lodging is not much different from other residential use except rooms are used by different people each night or for a series of nights and days and they usually eat in restaurants. Lodging and restaurants create a need for affordable housing, workforce housing, create much air and ground traffic.

- Area allowed for lodging need to be small in both land area and building ht.

- Commercial development creates a need for more housing of all types, more schools, more medical facilities, more utilities, more roads and increases traffic.

- Real estate subdivision and development in most cases is done for only economic interests and not for community need or with consideration for wildlife. The high end development of real estate requires intense and broad advertising to sell the product. This also creates growth of traffic and the need for workforce housing. The saying "build it and they will come" certainly applies to real estate development when sole purpose is for economic gain and not for actual housing needed for the community. The real estate market in Jackson Hole is at least nationwide or perhaps worldwide, but the bulk of development and marketing is not for local people.

- National Parks and National Forests create lots of visitors and traffic. Probably not much we can do about this, since they are public land.

2. Balancing the economy with wildlife, natural resources, open space and local community character is very important. The force of economic growth and the money it produces is more powerful than preserving wildlife, and local community character. Economic growth therefore, needs the most stringent regulations to keep it balanced with wildlife and community character.

Theme 6 Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy

1. I fully agree with an efficient system of mass transit. In order to have people to not use cars the mass transit system must be efficient and fast to move people from place to place. Providing for other types of transportation would have to be suppressed.

2. The Plan provides for simultaneous road expansion and mass transit. These are diametrically opposed components of a transportation strategy. If new roads are continually constructed and existing roads expanded people will probably continue to use cars instead of mass transit. We are a time oriented society and will use the fastest and most convenient way of moving around in Jackson Hole. If roads are allowed to become crowded and slower to get from place to place then mass transit then and only then will people choose mass transit.

3. The Plan is silent on a very big and significant part of transportation, which is the airport. There should be a separate policy and strategy to constrain airport expansion.

Theme 7 Provide Quality Community Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure

1. My comments and suggestions are minimal for this theme. The Statement of Ideal is covered in the policies and strategies.

2. One comment that is not in the plan but pertains to the proposed sewer line from Grand Teton Park to the Jackson sewage disposal plant. Increased density and growth follows sewer lines.

Date	Name	Comment
		3. Extension of sewer lines allow for higher densities for Jackson and the County. The first treatment plant for Jackson was at the Northwest corner of the Karns Hillside Subdivision. for service to East Jackson. The next extension was to a site near the intersection of Gregory Lane and High School Road to provide for more density and growth for West Jackson, along Highway 89 and Gregory Lane. The third sewage disposal site is the current site at the South end of South Park which allowed more dense development and growth in Rafter J, Melody Ranch, Cottonwood Park, Spring Creek Ranch, and to accommodate more growth and higher densities on the Wet side of the Snake River. 4. Higher densities and growth follows sewer lines therefore, one way to limit growth is not to allow more extensions. General Comments 1. The plan is long and cumbersome to read. It is broad non-specific and loaded with weasel words. It should be more concise, more specific and allow no weasel-words. The plan is full of non specific words and phrases that leaves it open to many different interpretations 2. The outline of the plan is satisfactory, but I urge the Jackson and Teton County officials to give the public and the advisory groups more time and then amend the plan to match more closely to what the public wants. 3. The boundaries of the nodes; Jackson, Teton Village, Aspens/Teton Pines, and Wilson should not be allowed to expand in land area. Building heights should remain at no more than two stories and floor area ratios should be no more than 1.00. 4. I submitted detailed comments on the Jackson Land Use Plan several months ago. I have high expectations that you will thoroughly review and consider my comments on the Jackson Land Use Plan. 5. We now have paid advocates to develop and present real estate development proposals to both Jackson and/or County Officials including Planning Offices, Planning Commissions, Councilors, and Commissioners. • Paid advocates are usually called lobbyists. These lobbyists start the process of seeking approval well in advance, perhaps even multiple years, of a proposal reaches public awareness. During this period when the lobbyists are free of public reaction and comment there are, in all probability, commitments made by the Jackson and County Officials. This is probably the group outside of the public that is influencing this plan. If so they seem to be getting more attention than the public at large
4/30/2009	Sharkey, Steve Interested Public	The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up. We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must: • Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average • Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage. Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us: • Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat • Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations • Preservation of our rural way of life. I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl. I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project. My biggest concern is with respect to the growth permitted in the "growth areas" in town and the four growth "nodes" in the county. I think the monitoring component of the plan is a big improvement from the previous plan. If you reduced the potential build-out in the "nodes" by 60% (e.g. the NW corner of South Park is reduced from a max of 1,500 to a max of 600), I would support the proposed plan.
4/30/2009	Hoyt, Clay Interested Public	People When we left the meetings last year I was under the impression that most everybody was in agreement that we donot want growth and the growth we will get here will be slow growth. now I hear we get 500 new houses in Wilson, did nobody hear what the people of Wilson said
4/30/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up. We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must: • Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average • Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage. Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us: • Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat • Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations • Preservation of our rural way of life. I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl. I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I just think that unless you solve the problems we have right now and use the laws we have on the books to reign in the renting of single family homes to 4, 5 and 6 people by landlords in supposedly single family neighborhoods, this trend will just spread South to any new neighborhood and history then repeats itself. People are going to find a way to cram as many into a house to save on rent. All at the expense of the live in owners who are trying to make ends meet and make their home a home not just a frat house. There is no regard for the speed limit and safety of the children playing. These single family homes are suppose to have no more then 3 unrelated people in them. I just went around the corner of my place to a house and asked them to get the cars off the lawn (what was left of it!)clean up the trash and the empty beer bottles. At that time I think they had 5 kids living in the house. They had a bar set up at the end of the garage and fire wood and skis here and there. Not pleasant to look at. Plan all you want but it will be for nothing if you can't preserve the single family neighborhood. It is indeed an admirable proposal to try to persuade people to use alternate modes of transportation such as biking, taking the bus, car pooling and last but not least your feet. The Teton County, Town of Jackson Comprehension Draft Plan is trying to do just that, with an overall reduction of single occupied vehicles (SOV's). The plans' success relies on the good graces and athletic capabilities of our future residents that would live in the proposed new South Park town hub. A reality check is needed when we grow bigger instead of better. Before I get to the realty check I just want to say I love the proposed programs about home mail delivery, encouraging and or requiring students to take the bus, walk or bike (don't forget skateboarding) to school and employee carpooling incentives. We should back them 100%. Although I think we should forget about encouraging students not to drive to school. Bribing works best with teenagers. Now, fantasy verses reality. Do you really think people in the future South Park town hub, living that far away from their jobs and services in Teton Village, Wilson and town are going to give up their car to take the bus, walk or bike? The only South Park residents that will possibly walk or take the bus are the employees at the South Park convenience stores selling four dollar a gallon not so fresh milk, overpriced beer and cigarettes. Now suppose they do hop on their bikes or walk to the stores or work. Don't you think they'll have trouble getting through those unplowed pathways in the winter? I know several people including a lot of kids that have that problem right now. There is also that highly visible but nobody wants to do anything about it problem of overcrowded non family occupied rental homes with five and six cars in the driveways, on the lawns and on the streets (snow plow drivers love the last one). I don't think that a new South Park town hub is going to solve it. The rent is not going to be any cheaper and if tenants can save a lot of money and landlords look the other way; South Park is going to end up having the same problems other single family neighborhoods are having right now. That brings me to the calculations on the build out number of up to 1500 units for South Park over the next 10 to 15 years. I know, I'm not supposed to worry, it's just a number. Instead of 3,000 more cars coming out of South Park it will probably be more like 4000 cars when the above rental trend spreads there. I keep hearing the plan is just guidelines. Well, let's guide it a little more. Why don't we just take a breather, listen to the majority of the constituents who want "limited" managed growth and scale this plan back. What's the rush? The economy is not heading anywhere fast, anytime soon. In the mean time we can work on solving the problems we have by building more affordable Category 1, 2 and 3 homes in town, closer to work and services so our future residents don't wear out so many shoes and bicycle tires. Clear the most used pathways in the winter or groom them all and break out the cross country skis! Give single families back their neighborhoods by creating on work site employee housing like seasonal hostels with a few more creature comforts for the singles that just need someplace to sleep, store their skis, bikes and kayaks. Nothing fancy they're up all night and day anyway either working or playing. That's why they came to Jackson Hole. Improve the bus system we have by doing two way loops so you don't have to go all the way around town to get to Smith's from Cottonwood! I like sightseeing but we should leave that for the tourists.
4/29/2009	Stahl, Zippora Interested Public	I have owned a condo in The Aspens since 1987 and wish to object to the further growth of multi family development in this area. I wanted to express my desire to not have the area around The Aspen rezoned to provide the buyers that option. Please consider this as my widh for this growth in theis area. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2009	, Conservation Alliance	In brief, below are some of the key, broad issues that the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance believes are important to address in the upcoming meeting. The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance will be submitting line-by-line, detailed comments on the new draft prior to the planning commission hearings. During future comments, we will provide detailed recommendations for changes in policy language and the structure of the plan. The current approach and key elements of the plan do not reflect the will of the community. On October 15, 2008, the Planning Team placed an ad to confirm recognition of top community concerns voiced during public comment. Unfortunately, the new draft falls short in addressing them. See ad text below: "The Comprehensive Plan Will Be Responding to Public Comment: What you said: • Wildlife and open space protection is the most important value in the community. • Buildout should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation. • Growth rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts of development to natural resources and community infrastructure. • Workforce housing should be provided in greater proportion by commercial development and include a mix of rental and ownership options. • Commercial development potential should be limited with sensitivity to building design, community character, and not exacerbate the workforce housing shortage. • South Park should only develop at town level density in the northern portion in order to address the workforce housing needs of the community. • Plan format should be more clear, concise, and user friendly. " The current draft doesn't give appropriate attention to all factors (direct, indirect and cumulative impacts) that affect our ability to protect wildlife; buildout was not clearly identified and did not provide guidance in policy creation; growth rate regulation is identified as a step to take only if future monitoring indicates the need to do so; weaker language (than in the '94 Plan) is used to describe the relationships among different community issues/themes, particularly commercial development and workforce housing shortages; strong policies to limit commercial development are absent; proposed ranges for development in South Park far exceed the geographic scope presented in surveys and policies indicate sprawling development (north to south) for future planning in this district; and the plan format is not clear or user friendly given the map layouts and a number of vague and contradictory policies. Other Key Issues: • Amount of proposed development potential- residential and commercial- should be reduced. • The impacts of commercial development are inadequately addressed in theme chapters. Drivers of growth-related impacts are underemphasized and inadequately described. • Theme chapters, and the structure of the Future Land Use Plans inadequately address that our community must face, and answer, tough questions about carrying capacity (amount of overall development). As we increase the potential for direct, indirect and cumulative effects associated with human-related development impacts, there is a strong potential for crossing thresholds (in terms of survival of local wildlife populations). • The meaning of Theme 2 "Managing Growth Responsibly" has changed significantly through this process. • Geographic prioritizations (and district boundaries) in many node districts are highly debatable. • The draft does not cohesively link different themes and policies. The Future Land Use Plans, as currently drafted, would not uphold the policies outlined in the draft. • The draft rests on a number of assumptions that are not backed up with analyses. The draft suggests that the extent of development proposed within the nodes would have minimal ecological impact; however, we disagree, particularly given indirect and cumulative impacts. • Permanent Conservation is a top priority of this community. We need to make sure that policies are in place to encourage permanent protection. • There are MAJOR policy shifts from the '94 Plan to this new draft. The new draft reflects much more than an "update" of the '94 Plan. Key issues include: the lowered emphasis on scenic resources and rural character (in the county and town), transportation policies, and fundamental assumptions on the need for continued growth. • Indicators need to be refined in all theme chapters.
4/29/2009	Winter, Richard Interested Public	I own a unit in the Aspens. What is the meaning of the Statement on Page 80, in the description of "Single Family Mixed -Type" that states "In the county, single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing." For example, does it only allow workforce housing? Or does it allow/require a mixture of workforce and full-price housing? Besides answering my specific question, Please clarify this critical definition in the final document. Thanks

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2009	Henley, Markida Interested Public	Thank you for the meeting in Alta. I came in late so I don't know who did the presentation, but the presentation was excellent, as was the speaker. As co-owner of Targhee Village Golf Course, my primary concern for our property would be to ensure that a future owner would be allowed to expand the golf course to 18 holes on either adjoining or neighboring property so that it can realize its potential. Our current 91 acres isn't enough land and I would hope the Mixed-Use Visitor Orientation land use classification would carry over to additional property, as opposed to perhaps being limited to our current acreage. Thank you very much!
4/29/2009	Magin, Barbara Interested Public	Preservation of wildlife, wildlife corridors and scenic areas should be our #1 priority!The End.
4/29/2009	Wang, Louis Interested Public	The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up. We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must: • Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average • Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage. Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us: • Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat • Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations • Preservation of our rural way of life. I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl. I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project. This Update was to be an open process. To have the respect of the community you should disclose all the inputs that went into this April, 3 draft Comp Plan Update.
4/28/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	Thank you for reading and considering the following letter. Most residents in Jackson feel the true values we have expressed were not prioritized in the Comp Plan. I look forward to discussions over the next few months. JACKSON'S HOLE Let's face it, if it were not for the unparalleled beauty of our Tetons, the abundance of open space, and the incredible wildlife outside our backdoors, how many of us would choose to move to Jackson? Without those qualities, this isolated town might as well be just a Hole. According to the most recent Comp Plan, we are about to lose two of those three qualities in the next several years, should this plan go unchallenged. With maximum growth as the Plan's priority, open space will be the exception and wildlife will be forced to retreat even further from our view. The South Park Neighborhoods are being targeted with attention to maximum build-out with minimal regard for our wildlife and scenic values. We, as a community, must be aware that this undeveloped area of town is our last chance to ensure that the qualities we value about Jackson will remain for future generations. There can be an incredible opportunity to create a better, 'green' community South of town, not just bigger, with careful planning. It is clear, the message our Planning Department has sent in favor of big development, is that Jackson Hole should be just a Hole. Survey after survey has shown overwhelming support for least or no growth options, protecting our wildlife, increasing transit over building new roads, and scenic values as the priorities for Jackson Hole residents. Our Comp Plan should not focus on build-out, but focus on build-in! Now is the time our Comp Plan should focus to improve our infrastructure: maintain least growth patterns though out Jackson, mandate all future construction be 50% green building materials, expand public transportation routes, redesign the Y intersection as a roundabout (solves traffic delays, saves fuel, reduces pollution) , expand recycling methods with curb pick up, require any new development must meet 1:1 minimum open space ratios, and promote and maintain all wildlife habitat/ migration routes. Let us look for solutions to make our town better, not bigger. Build-in strategies will keep us stronger for future generations, not weaken us through big build-out. Let's keep the name Jackson Hole much more than just a Hole.

Date	Name	Comment
4/28/2009	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Rightfully, sustainability is a key element of this Theme. However, I am concerned that the policies described to achieve this goal are either absent or in direct contradiction to it. An economy cannot be sustainable unless we ensure that all economic activity pays its own way, both socially and environmentally. A business that relies on the community to house its workers or widen roads for its customers is not paying its own way socially. A resort development that pollutes a river with fertilizers or chokes off a migration corridor is not paying its own way environmentally. A town that obliges its teachers, emergency response personnel and public service workers to live far away, or does not provide alternative methods of transportation, is not paying its own social or environmental costs. Fostering local business may at first glance appear helpful. However, consider that in so doing you are inviting other businesses to locate here- and if those businesses are not sustainable it will be at the cost of not attracting truly sustainable businesses. Using growth to solve social problems might seem like an easy fix because nobody pays, but that's only if the true cost of development (pollution, congestion, the need for more development, the need for more public service workers, crime ...) are not counted. If this growth occurs through a density bonus, it is even worse because there is the added cost of encouraging the construction and building industry- an industry, which clearly is not sustainable. As public officials, you can take the lead in changing our County's outdated philosophy towards development. The world has grown past the point where environmentalists should be considered a detriment to economic advancement; they should be an integral and influential part of economic policy decisions. This is particularly relevant in Teton County where our Natural Capital is our biggest asset. If we ignore or hide costs because it's easier not to look, we will decrease our own wealth. Furthermore, we will exacerbate the problems associated with growth, selfishly passing them down the line to future generations. A more positive way to view this is, that as the world grows, develops and pollutes at an increasingly greater pace, genuine environmental capital will become more and more valuable. Nurturing our environmental capital is an excellent investment opportunity.
4/28/2009	Lewis, Rod Interested Public	Comments from conversation at Center for the Arts meeting-unhappy that the Hoback commercial area is now "chipmunk habitat"-got screwed in 1994 when hotel use was prohibited in Hoback commercial area-a Wild and Scenic designation for the Snake will prohibit anything from happening in Hoback-sick and tired of 40 years of the County screwing him-County cares more about wildlife than people-County cannot put a boat ramp on their newly acquired property on the Hoback River-he is going to develop the ugliest thing possible to spite the County-Larry Huhn got so sick of the County that he built 3 crappy houses on Hoback commercial property-can't do anything because of the 150 foot river setback
4/28/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	After being on a lot of meetings regarding the comprehensive plan...I have a question regarding public transport. Living in South Park I have always wondered why is there no START buses coming down to Rafter J and Melody Ranch. I have lived here since 1998 and haven't seen any changes in this. Our traffic issues are growing and I am sure you are spending quite some time on this issue... I made a call to START bus a couple of weeks ago and asked if there is any talk about public transportation to South Park. They said no and it is not even on their agenda in near future? How can that be...!!!! They have done a great job on the transportation to Star Valley and over to Idaho ...and it works great... Everyday I drive my car from South Park to the hospital, where I work. 70% of the drivers drive way to fast into town and follow each other to close...and so on and on....most are probably running late and are not concentration on the traffic... So why cant we get more people of the road?...for this little town we have reached our traffic capacity already a while ago. I would love to drive the bus to work..save gas., less.stress...and less cars on the road.... I think enough people live in South Park (incl. Rafter J and Cottonwood) to make this service available. So the comp. plan talks about it but I don't see or hear any really solution about traffic. It is all nicely printed but in reality we are going another way.. We also need more walk and bike paths/walkways in town. I rode my bike for two years in the summer to work and know how you go from bike path to road a lot of times in town...that should be priority and not the bike path in Teton National Park for recreation. Priorities!!!! On the comp. plan meeting in South Park , Jeff Daugherty said we owe our workforce to be housed in Jackson....So the 1.500 homes , which could be build in the South Park node should solve our workforce housing problem... Hey in a lot of cities you have to commute to work...we cant build up town just because it is so great here and everyone wants to live here (at a point there is just so much you can build and accommodate) Again it comes back to traffic congestion, more services build out..... These are just some thoughts which I have been discussing with my friends...and even they don't always show up at the comprehensive plan meetings , they are also very concerned and hope that our county commissioners will represent the people of Jackson.... Thank you for your attention
4/28/2009	Moyer, Robin Interested Public	I am writing to oppose the whole notion of proposing such a massive upzone of the acreage around the Aspens . Furthermore, I can't believe we pay you planners to come up with such ludicrous ideas. 310 additional units? Do you honestly think it makes sense to burden the Teton Village Road with more traffic? Where are all the supposed workers going to work? In the town most likely, which will just create more congestion on the TV road and the SR bridge. I live off of Cheney Lane and have moose,fox, raccoons and sometimes elk reside on our property all winter long. Adding more traffic will surely jeopardize their survival, especially the moose where it has been shown that they are already hard hit by traffic accidents. I thought the community's goals were to preserve wildlife and open space in balancing future growth. You apparently didn't listen.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	why build all homes...just it makes more money for the developer... build some appartments in the south park node... use less open space to develop for 1500 homes a lot of people dont need houses and are perfect in appartments/condos...people move in and out of town a lot... how are 1500 homes justified...? It all comes down again, to maybe think about a population cap in this town. There are already high density neighbourhoods in South Park...and they were inteded to create workforce housing...what happened there and then. Its all in a dream/vision on paper but reality (money) brings it all down to...where quick big bucks can be made...wildlife, town of heart doesnt matter.....anymore.
4/27/2009	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	For the past 1 1/2 years, many locals have been participating in what the Planning Dept. called the "People's Plan." We spent countless hours attending meetings and readjusting our time to be in the valley for what we considered to be critical decision times. We were lead to believe that our input was forming the new Comp Plan. Now that the plan has been revealed, it is not what anybody asked for at all. The new Teton County Comprehensive Plan is a huge disappointment with tragic consequences. My comments will be directed to Wilson and the Waldron property. Too much growth Wilson - Not a "walkable" community Waldron property - "South on Fall Creek" boundary Moose habitat being ignored In October 2007, the people clearly chose "Option A" with neutral density. Teton County's published handout called Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan WILSON DENSITY stated "Based on the public input received at the October 4, 2007 Open House, the vast majority of Wilson residents support Option A (density neutral) and are opposed to Option B (increased density)." Wilson has already doubled in size in the past decade with the addition of the Wilson Meadows sub-division. Most importantly, Wilson is not an appropriate place for high-density housing. Wilson is not the cute little isolated mountain town that the County tries to portray it to be! It is a town that was built at the base of a steep mountain pass, 10% grade, which serves as a major commuter highway for multiple communities in Idaho going to and from Jackson and Teton Village. WYDOT considers it to be one of the busiest and most dangerous highways in all of Wyoming. Traffic count figures for July and August 2008 average around 12,500 cars per day traveling through Wilson. Yet the County seems to believe that this is a great place for high-density housing! To propose a significant increase in high-density housing immediately at the base of this dangerous run-out is not only irresponsible but grossly negligent. The Waldron property should remain in the "South on Fall Creek" boundary which is rural in character. Alex Norton, on April 20, 2009, explained that high-density was going to be put where high-density already exists. This is not true for "South on Fall Creek" and the Waldron property, which has been platted for five parcels on 15 acres for decades. In addition, Teton County's "Comments from Wilson Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan Meeting--10/4/2007" states on the 3rd bullet point "Waldron Property - ALL were opposed to seeing increased density there." Critical moose habitat is being ignored. The Waldron property provides substantial wetlands for moose habitat and provides the necessary wildlife corridor to the Rossetter Land Trust and the Snake River. Please refer to the article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide dated March 25, 2009 - "Moose on the decline in Jackson Hole area." In conclusion, to propose high-density at the Waldron parcel, with deadly access at the base of Teton Pass, is not responsible planning.
4/27/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	Read through the principles....I called Start Bus a couple of weeks ago and asked if the is in the near future a plan to get public buses to Rafter J and Melody Ranch to help decrease traffic coming into town...START officials said there is not even talk about this in the near future...How can this get implemented into the comp plan:we need to have public bus service to south of town asap...with the wording right now...everything seems like open and they probably wont be much done...Guess this is a comment for the county commissioners...Would just be nice to have the comp plan more direct in their language...direct solutions named...

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2009	Duke, Marva Interested Public	I have been reviewing the Comprehensive Plan with particular regards to Wilson as that has been my hometown for the last 33 years. I have learned that the property of most interest for development is the Waldron property located at the corner of Teton Pass and Fall Creek Road. I have major concerns if development is to occur on this property. I have seen many accidents involving semi trucks coming off Teton Pass in the years that I have lived just off the Pass road. One truck in particular hit a shed on the Waldron property (known as Tommy's Truck Stop for many years after the accident and the newly constructed building is Bill and Tom's New Truck Stop). God forbid that any person, least of all a child should be struck by a run-away truck while crossing Highway 22 to get to the Wilson School which is located on the north side of the road. There are hundreds of cars that use Teton Pass Road on a daily basis. I have waited at the head of my road for many minutes to get onto Teton Pass during the busy rush hour early in the morning and have worried about being rear-ended coming home at night and turning off of Teton Pass because of the traffic. In my opinion, putting dense development at the base of a very steep mountain pass road is a very poor idea and does not show responsible planning. Will there be a traffic light at the base of the pass so that those people living in that high-density area could get out of that development? Can you imagine how far up the pass cars would be backed up if that were the case? Putting more traffic onto a currently highly used road would only compound the problem. Another major concern of mine is for the wildlife that uses the Waldron property and adjacent properties to access Fish Creek. We have many moose on our land, especially during the winter. One very distinctive moose, plagued by ticks and mostly hairless from scratching himself, used that corridor this winter. He spent many afternoons in our yard, but then I would see him the next day down on the Waldron land. In the winter the animal tracks are numerous and obvious as the animals go from the bench above the Fall Creek Road down to the valley below. I would appreciate your consideration of my concerns as a local who has witnessed the activities and environment of this area over the last few decades!
4/27/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	We have a lot of protected lands...but to build out the last 3% to the total extend is not in the interest of many people living in Jackson. To be a responsible Steward for Wildlife and the Yellowstone greater area we probably should have a greater vision. Just looking into the next 10 years is maybe not extensive enough...maybe a look further than 10 yrs. into the future would be more responsible....Jackson, is a "small node" and cant be another Idaho Falls, Casper, etc...We dont have to accomodate everyone who would like to live here because it is so beautiful.....I see almost on a daily basis people who have come here to Jackson for work (summer or winter) and love to kajak, bike, hike..you can do it all here...but are really not interest in Stewardship for the wildlife...it is nice to see a moose and an elk but hey..I cant slow down because of them because I have places to go and need to be there "right now"... So there more population we have here in Jackson (densed in) the more conflicts there will be between wildlife and people. So I guess even in that little 3% node we need enough space for the wildlife to migrate through....open spaces... So please consider the open spaces in town and south and north of town.....the wildlife needs them, we need them..too.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	During the long, drawn out public comment period, Mr. Daugherty repeatedly stated one would have to "swerve to miss" participating in the Comp Plan process and letting the department know what the community envisioned for its future. It is clear Mr. Daugherty has "swerved to miss" the community's stated objection to growing our way out of growth-related problems; we know that will only fail. Our responsibility and legacy, is to guarantee that the attributes of this valley - its wildlife, its vistas, its people, its uniqueness - are preserved for all time. Residents have repeatedly identified wildlife and natural resources throughout the valley as their top priority, not shifting dubious, shadow growth that may never occur in outlying areas to nodes where constrained growth was favored - not dumping in the "excess" transferred from other areas. The final plan should acknowledge wildlife and natural resource attributes of ALL areas of the county and focus on least growth solutions to our varied community challenges, including workforce housing. Buildout must be reduced; job creating commercial growth needs to be significantly constrained. If we fail at this critical juncture, a decade from now we will have more traffic, more pollution, less wildlife and a larger workforce housing gap. It is folly to argue more growth will solve growth-related problems. Nothing will tie the hands of future leaders more than a comprehensive plan that does not curtail growth-related problems NOW. The draft plan includes no empirical basis for evaluating the impact of proposed, nodal development. A "comprehensive" plan should include clear and specific data outlining the outcomes and impacts on wildlife, traffic, roads, schools, workforce housing, taxes and other quality of life issues. Without it, it is nothing more than a "trust us" stab in the dark. Are the impacts and trade-offs of such a plan in line with the community's vision? How can this be evaluated without knowing what the projected impacts and consequences are in real terms? Intuitively, the draft falls far short of what we, as a community, seek. There are no bailouts if we fail. We have a lot of work to do. I remain committed to participating in now amending the plan, within the public process, so it can become the "Community's Plan". Many in the community have told me they are disillusioned and frankly burnt out on the process. Many others have told me the current draft should be rejected. This is far from being a done deal. The public needs to know that the plan is not in the control of the planning department anymore – it has moved on to the joint planning commissions and elected officials. That does not mean we should not continue to hold the process accountable – in fact it is more important than ever that we persevere. Hang in there and contact your County Commissioners, Town Council and joint planning commissions with your concerns. They ARE listening, open, and committed to maintaining the public's trust.
4/27/2009	Peterson, Ryan Interested Public	The amount and location of development allowed by the new Comp Plan is not aligned with our priority to promote stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. We must recognize the long-term value of open space in the valley floor, especially for wintering wildlife. We must ask ourselves the question, why do we need to develop more open space? We will never be able to meet the housing demands of all of the people that want to live here. We should focus on managing what we have better, the existing developed area in town and our affordable housing. If the existing affordable housing was managed properly, we would already have housing for the teachers, emergency personnel, and law enforcement that need it. Instead, I pass by affordable housing and I see expensive cars in the driveway and people with jobs that are not essential to the community in many cases. Of course more people want to live here now, and we will never build our way out of it, instead we will just destroy what makes the valley unique.
4/27/2009	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	It has been interesting reading the new Comprehensive Plan, and following the debate over it, from out here in Abu Dhabi. I've been struck by a link between the economies here and in Teton County: Both are dependent on a natural resource, and successful management of that resource is essential for good economic performance. But there also is an important difference. Once a barrel of oil is sold and shipped from here it's gone forever, and the oil supply eventually will run out. Teton County has a great advantage over this region; its natural resources can be enjoyed without depletion, and with proper care can last for, and benefit, many generations. That is why I am puzzled by why the Plan doesn't make a stronger effort to understand the scope and vulnerabilities of the Valley's natural capital. Preserving the natural environment is an important theme of the Plan, of course, but this is not accompanied by any serious attempt to measure the impact of development on the environmental capital of the valley, or to balance costs against benefits. That gap, in my opinion, undermines much of that the Plan wants to accomplish. You have a Plan that assumes growth will happen, and tries to channel it to where that growth will do the least damage. It takes a short-term view when it treats building homes and commercial space that will last for decades. This is not responsible stewardship of a unique, irreplaceable resource. The planning process made a strong effort to understand what the community wants. It did not make the same effort to take an inventory of our environment, and determine how to preserve it. That's a gap that can be fixed. The problems of our economy and financial system have just put a long moratorium on major development activity. There is no obstacle to extending the planning process to make a quantitative assessment of our natural capital, and how much development it can sustain. Your leadership can make a difference. Support the goals of the Plan, but instruct the planning staff to come up with real answers to hard questions: What is our environmental capital worth, in terms of jobs created and recreational benefits enjoyed? What further buildout is consistent with maintaining current environmental quality? Where do we want the population and development footprint in the Valley to be in 50 years or 100 years? There is time to ask these questions now, and if we miss this chance we may not have another one.

Date	Name	Comment
4/26/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Let's talk sustainable. What do you want to be sustainable in your lifetime? I'm a grandmother. I might not be around to fight the next fight. The last comprehensive plan in 1994 I was at my parent's house on the Village road watching my mother die and trying to help my father cope. My mother was 57. There are some things in life that when you let go you can't get them back. The entire community said that wildlife in our backyards, in our meadows, on our hillsides, drinking from our ponds, creeks and river banks was our most important community value. And in this new comprehensive plan draft (let's hope it's only a draft) the planners are flipping us off. Once we've been taken advantage of they'll keep coming back for more. I made my husband go to the South Park planner's meeting. My neighbors wouldn't go because, well, you know the saying "Fool me Once". What I heard at my Planner's neighbor meeting was, "Cindy we are going to take your most important community value and transfer it to Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island, and Kelly. Not to worry. The wildlife in your neighborhood will learn to use the cross walks and read the signs. If they do make it to Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island, or Kelly there will be "Affordable Wildlife Housing" to meet their needs." In exchange we will take the development rights from Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island and Kelly and move it to replace your wildlife's habitat. If the planners heard the valley say," slow the impacts of development" (News and Guide Oct 15, 08), by regulating growth", what dictionary are they using? In my dictionary, Daniel tells me that slow means to proceed at less than the usual speed. (It also means stupid or sluggish which is another can of worms.) Jeff Daugherty our county planning director and Alex Norton a county planner explained that this comprehensive plan would be a road map for citizens and elected officials as far as where development should be in the county and town. -----Who told Jeff and Alex? Who and where did their comprehensive plan data come from? It didn't come from "We the People". The Planner's power point slide show is just as smooth and creamy as your granny's fudge. But they don't say anything about where they bought the ingredients or what this comprehensive plan is going to do to our girlish figure.
4/26/2009	Rossetter, Birdie Interested Public	I always thought that I lived in the Village of Wilson. Do I now have to refer to it as the Node of Wilson or Wilson Node? I live on 38 acres 2/10 of a mile south of Wilson with both Fish Creek and Spring Creek running thru it. The first thing Tom and I did when we bought the property 20 years ago was to put a Conservation Easement on it. Almost every wild animal (including baby cougars last winter) and wild bird in this Valley either live on our Property or migrate thru it. Moose twins have been born on our land almost every year. Two years ago Moose twins were born on the Waldron Property. The proposed Comprehensive plan for high density development of lands south of Wilson-land immediately adjacent to my property, would seriously impact moose habitat and migration. Moose move back and forth from the Wilson bench to my land. They feed on my willows. They calve in the oxbow of Fish Creek which is also my land. I am sure other people will speak about the nightmare of having 100s of cars trying to get onto Rt. 22 at the base of a steep mountain pass. Several years ago Tom and I were having a conversation with Luna Leopold (Aldo's son) about rivers. In his wonderful deep voice he said "The best thing you can do for a river is "Leave it alone." The best thing you can do for Wilson is "LEAVE IT ALONE
4/25/2009	Kennedy, Lindsey N Interested Public	As an employee of the US Forest Service and volunteer for Wyoming K-9 Search and Rescue, I can not express enough the importance of affordable housing. I commend and appreciate the people who commit their time and energy to a crucial work of affordable housing.Thank You

Date	Name	Comment
4/25/2009	Melville, Chi Interested Public	I'm writing to you with my comments on the Teton County Wyoming Draft Comprehensive Plan, specifically for Alta, Wyoming. My main concerns are with the Transportation section. With your recent approval of the Grand Targhee Resort expansion, traffic through Alta has the potential to increase dramatically, so more mitigation of the traffic increase should be put in place. Pathways / Pedestrian / Cycling There are no pathways or bike lanes in Alta. People who want to go for a walk or run, especially in the winter and spring, have to do so on the roads. I often see people walking their dogs, parents pushing strollers, runners and cyclists mixing with the traffic on Ski Hill Road. Combine that with the tendency for skiers to speed through Alta to and from Targhee with sporadic law enforcement and you have a potentially dangerous situation. The road through Alta is wide enough to re-stripe it with narrower travel lanes and provide bike lanes on the side. Reducing the travel lanes to 10' would have a traffic calming effect plus additional traffic calming methods should be considered. There are bike lanes on the Idaho side of Ski Hill Road, but they stop at the State Line Road junction. Even the current shoulders in Alta are rarely swept which means that cyclists who don't want flat tires are riding in the traffic lanes - annual sweeping should be done. That said, there is probably enough right-of-way along the road to place a separated pathway through Alta. That should be pursued as the long term choice but as a temporary measure, simple re-stripping and signage for bike lanes would be easy and inexpensive to implement. Another road that has had increased traffic is Alta North Road. It's a narrow 20' wide road with no shoulders and short sight distances due to the frequent hills. Combine that with the fact that many people drive considerably faster than the posted 35mph and you have another potentially dangerous situation. This is a favorite place for people to walk their dogs, push strollers, run & cycle - school children often ride their bikes on it to the Alta school. It would probably be too expensive & impractical to widen the road so a separated pathway along Alta North Road should be pursued. Chip Sealing Policy / Designate Ski Hill Road as a Shared Use Road Ski Hill road from Alta to Grand Targhee currently gets high use by cyclists, runners, walkers and roller skiers during the dry months - that type of use will only increase as the population grows. The county commissioners approved a policy of not chip sealing mixed-use roads, but apparently it needs to be enforced, as since that approval, several roads in Jackson were indeed chip sealed. Protecting the road with a smooth treatment option, not chip seal, will allow these important non-motorized uses to continue on the road from Alta to Grand Targhee. The Ski Hill Road from Alta to Targhee should be designated and signed as a mixed use road. Paved Roads There are several gravel roads in Alta with considerable traffic that are currently being graded and treated with dust guard. While the treatment does make the roads better in the summer, they quickly fall apart during the mud seasons and when it rains. The treatment used for dust guard is magnesium chloride - a highly corrosive salt - it's even etched holes into my concrete parking apron as the muck drips from my car. While mechanics may love mag chloride as it causes premature replacement of under carriage parts, car owners don't - the county should consider stopping the use of mag chloride on county roads. A goal of gradually paving as many roads as possible over a period of time would eliminate much use of mag chloride. While a considerable amount of money has been spent on Alta roads over the past 5 years, almost all of that was spent to upgrade the section of State Line Road that Wyoming is responsible for - North of Ski Hill Road. This upgrade has cost about a million dollars and primarily is used by Idaho residents. I don't know who made that decision, but that amount of money could have instead been used to pave most of the Alta roads where Teton County Wyoming taxpayers actually live. Interestingly, Idaho has done almost nothing to upgrade the section they're responsible for. There has been considerable debate about finishing the upgrade of State Line Road all the way to South Leigh canyon. There are about a dozen vocal Teton County Wyoming residents who live up there and have been trying to get that road completed. I think completing that road would be a mistake and not the best appropriation of our tax dollars. It would require condemning property and paying for easements, constructing an expensive bridge, and building about a mile of new road - if it were built, on a benefit per tax payer basis, that could end up being the most expensive road in Teton County. Plus, there are more residents on the Idaho side of South & North Leigh canyons so again this would primarily serve Idaho residents. We need to have Alta road money spent where it's going to serve the most tax-paying Alta residents. There are two roads in Alta that are good candidates for pavement - Alta North Road and Targhee Towne. Alta North Road needs only 3/4 of a mile of pavement and would serve over three dozen homes housing over 50 residents. At least one subdivision at the end of that section would like to pave their subdivision road, but doing so makes little sense until that section of Alta North Road is paved. The road in Targhee Towne is longer but the density is even higher. These are the roads the county should prioritize for spending money on and paving in Alta, not the road that primarily serves Idaho. Teton County Wyoming offers its' residents many good and valuable amenities but for some reason, it seems that it has never prioritized its' roads, or at least not the somewhat rural roads. To me, the road infrastructure is part of basic services that should have a higher priority in the county. I've been told by county engineers that after the initial cost of paving, maintenance costs for pavement are about the same as those of gravel roads since the resurfacing of paved roads only gets done about 5-7 years. If the county were to gradually pave more roads each year, the number of miles of paved roads will increase, but maintenance costs would not - it just takes that initial investment. I've lived and paid taxes in Alta for over 20 years, have had no kids in the school system and rarely get over to Jackson to take advantage of county services where most of them are. I realize that the county has spent money recently in Alta for the new Library and the waste of money spent on upgrading State Line Road. But as the tax base has increased with recent construction of a number of multi-million dollar homes in Alta, I feel that services, namely good roads, should be increased as well. I've received few direct benefits for the tens of thousands of dollars

Date	Name	Comment
		I've paid the county in taxes over the years and few paved roads and pathways would go a long way to make me feel I'm getting some benefits from my tax dollars.
4/25/2009	Williams, Jodi Interested Public	I am a nurse and a longtime westbank resident. I was unhappy to hear that the aspens area was being considered as part of the future development plan. Firstly, the aspens is already congested if you ask any year round resident. People who choose to live on the westbank, choose NOT to have TOWN the heart of the area... Thats not what attracted me to jackson wyoming in the first place. The pace at which this town is expanding is very sad. Yes we need workforce housing, but not at the rate proposed nor in the locations suggested. Why not take over more old buildings that are tear downs etc.. Secondly workforce housing should be in town.. not in the aspens. What percentage of jackson residents work in teton village year round.. less than 3 percent?? I work at the hospital and even the hospital doesnt want to develop much out there because their employees want to be close to the hospital. The westbank store and surrounding shopping area is a danger to drive into during the summer due to increase in traffic. The condos areas practically face each other and I do not look forward to the increase in noise and traffic. The construction and cookie cutter housing would provide a decrease in the charm and serenity of the westbank. I already have replaced two windshields last summer due to the debris dropping off of trucks that were on their way to Shooting star ranch. In addition, shooting star has already mapped out affordable housing in that project which I feel in addition to the downtown Wilson development and the one by calico.. we have enough affordable housing. Not to mention the decrease in open land in the residential neighborhoods you are proposing. This is the reason people choose to live on the westbank and you are taking that away from people. I have already seen a dramatic decrease in wildlife since I have lived on the westbank. Basically I strongly oppose and will fight til the bitter end. thank you
4/24/2009	Poole, Carol Interested Public	The density for the region you have labeled 'single family mixed use" is too high. The entire town of Wilson is a wildlife corridor. Scale it down or our wildlife will suffer. Keep the density at current levels south of highway 22.
4/24/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	This task is very difficult. "I'm here and don't want 'low cost' housing (a paradox) anywhere near me" makes this a very contentious item. Imagine putting such a development in John Dodge or Indian Springs.
4/24/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	This must be cpmsistant and carry from one Commissioner to the next and not be changed everytime a different person is "in the seat" with a new/better idea or an agenda to make major changes. Devleope this plan so it has 'Starying Power" and not be a 20 year plan with annual changes. We always seem to have to reinvent the wheel.
4/24/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	The very first principle is going to be driven by supply and demand. It is the basic principle of our system. The desire to "maintain a diverse economy" is just that, a desire as is the second principle. Perhaps if we were a socialistic governance system, these principles could be more rigidly controlled.
4/24/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	This was addressed by the TAAF group several years ago over here in Pierre's Hole. Lofty ideals, but not practactal with sparse population. I personally believe the automobile as a primary means of transportation will be with us for some time to come. Public transportation will work in densely populated areas, but not in the foreseeeable future outside of Jackson. Thus roads will unfortunatly be a major problem for years to come. Tourist travel to and from Jackson mostly by automobile as many have itenaries to include other attractions such as the Black Hills, Big Horns, Glacier, etc. Aviation is already discouraged by policies of the Jackson Hole Airport Board by the untillization of noise restrictions, curfews, and landing fees exorbitant fuel prices, all of which tend to discourage use by many aviation families. Thus the rapid growth of the Driggs Airport. Again a lofty idea but not practicable in general with present cultural changes of an automobile reliant society.
4/24/2009	Eliason, Annette Interested Public	We in Alta pay full Wyoming taxes but feel neglected and cut off from the rest of the state. We would like to have better access-- i.e. continuation of stateline road to 600 north so it is not necessary to make a long detour through Idaho to get to the school, library and ski resort. We would also like better maintenance of roads in the northern part of Alta and protection of sheriff services. Without the continuation of State Line Road, we have been denied these things. Please make this a high priority item. We have been waiting for years.
4/24/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	This is fine so long as Jackson recognizes they should expect to "share the wealth" in necessary services and infrastructure.

Date	Name	Comment
4/24/2009	Wang, Louis Save Historic JH	There is a marked difference between the draft Comp Plan now under review by the community and the data collected from the community over a prolonged period. It's perplexing; how did we get from a wildlife and open space focus to a thrust for growth and expansion? What changed? This Comp Plan Update effort has always been billed as an open process. The community input is readily available with the various surveys and much documented public comment. Where is the other input? When was it collected? Who provided it? The community deserves to know what planners considered in creating the Plan. Please assemble all the input so it can be independently reviewed. This is an official request made in the spirit of openness and full disclosure. The Plan is so very different from the public input it reminds one of the Wizard of Oz - "Toto, I've a feeling were not in Kansas anymore." We need and deserve process transparency.
4/24/2009	Morris, Bob Interested Public	I agree fervently with all that I've read in the new Plan. But it's written in bureaucratese. On page 3, column 1.9 – that is, nine-tenths of the way down column 1 -- it says that cars with no passengers produce more traffic, more pollution, and wider highways, dangerous for people and animals alike. But the actual words are: "Reliance on transportation by single occupancy vehicle results in negative ecological impacts of higher traffic volumes, increased carbon emissions, and wider roadways that are more dangerous for wildlife and human traffic." I had the pleasure of meeting with the nice young writer: he has lots of brains, but admitted that prose composition is not his forte. I pray that Planning Commissions and Joint Powers reject his draft and ask that a new draft be written by someone with a gift for sentences that are clear, simple, straight-forward, lively, and conversational in style. If she has no Planning background, the more likely that she'll avoid jargon and make the Plan clear to the rest of us. Ideally, she'll sit down with the Planners, listen to them, ask questions, show them her work, and make revisions to their satisfaction in her own hand. If the Plan is forward-looking, it'll last for decades, during which it'll be read by hundreds of officials, staffers, candidates, developers, and journalists. The briefer and more readable, the more thoroughly it'll be read, and the better understood. Self-evident thoughts should be omitted. For example, page 1 begins with the sentence, "Jackson/Teton County is a unique and special place." It's followed by fourteen self-evident lines. The draft is more than 1.5 inches thick! Readership dwindles.
4/24/2009	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	1) NO! NO!! NO!!! 2) "The foundation of the plan is based on the falsehood that the community's priority is for more growth".--Rich Bloom 3) Please read Johnathan Schechter's column in this week's News & Guide for a more representative picture of this community's hopes for its future. 4) PLEASE don't let this happen.
4/24/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	Lofty goal but should not be the first priority. It should be strongly considered with such items as #7. Quality community facilities, services and INFRASTRUCTURE are the real NEEDS of residents in your "satellite" communities. Jackson as the "Hub of The Universe" needs to recognize that it is not all that great in its attitude to those of us in the outlying areas. Jackson has all the amenities. Recreational facilities, fire, police, schools, library, are all in place which those of us living in the County pay for but do not have the ability to access them without an hour's travel. See #6
4/23/2009	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	Are you aware that no meeting has been scheduled for Wilson or the West Bank until May 5th at the Village? That leaves only 10 days left in the comment period. How could they not have a meeting scheduled in the areas that will be the most negatively impacted by the plan? Thus far the planners have ignored and disregarded the feedback provided by the citizens of Wilson and the citizens of Teton County during the mixed use village meetings/comp plan revision update. This is yet another example of the planners trying to shape the feedback and response to the plan. Their job is not to sell us their vision but to come up with a plan that enacts the vision of the citizens of Teton County. Please have them schedule a meeting at the Wilson school as soon as possible so that the citizens of Wilson will have a chance to be informed and comment on the plan before the deadline. Thanks for your attention to this matter.
4/23/2009	Nigro, Bob Interested Public	A north bridge is required and should be part of the plan. Jorgensen Engineering did a traffic study about 15 years ago and it was determined a north bridge was required. I dispute the finding that a north bridge will increase traffic on the town square. With all of the development north of town, approved development at Teton Village and the airport being where it is extremely difficult to see traffic being increased on the town square. Providing for additional growth and hoping enough people walk, bike, take the bus and carpool is irresponsible. Traffic is bad enough today, what about 20 years from now?

Date	Name	Comment
4/23/2009	Nigro, Bob Interested Public	Preserving open space is extremely important.I could not find a clear definition of open space in the plan.I looked for this becasue I understand that the Melody Ranch gravel pit is classified as "open space" and recall that Shooting Star proposed about 100,000 sf of development in "open space" several years ago.To me, open space should be defined as "undisturbed land or new park land".The community wants to preserve open space and there should be more restrictions on what can be done within an open space boundary.
4/23/2009	Galbraith, Alan F. Interested Public	My recommendation applies to the residentail low classification wherever, not just to East Jackson. I recommend that all lots be restricted to no more than 15% of the lot surface area for building construction. Furthermore, I recommend that no more than 2 buildings be permitted for each lot of 50ft. by 150ft. in size.My rational is this. These restrictions would allow for 85% of the lot to be in open space for a yard where children could safely play and not be forced to play in the adjacent street.
4/23/2009	Rossetter, Birdie Interested Public	I have been reading the Comp Plan and would like you to consider some of the following things. 1) Separate Wilson Meeting: As Wilson has been slated as one of the key "nodes" I think that it is very important that Wilson have its own meeting for a presentation and discussion of the plan IN THE TOWN OF WILSON. The Elementary School would be a good place. It would be great to have the meeting as soon as possible so Wilson residents would have time to respond before the plan goes into effect. (2) WILDLIFE PROTECTION SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 22, WILSON VILLAGE: I am very concerned with the proposed high density zoning that borders my immediate north boundary up to Hwy 22 and Wilson Village. High density development, as proposed, would potentially provide for hundreds of new housing units with impacts from humans, pets, cars, lighting, pollution and noise. These impacts could have serious negative consequences on the quality and health of the wildlife habitat and populations on my land. The Waldron Property that abuts my western boundary is also slated for high density development. That development would seriously effect the ability for moose to migrate from the Wilson bench eastward onto my land and their habitat area. The Waldron land is in crucial Moose Winter habit as defined by WY Game and Fish and deserves protection. As you know, Tom and I put conservation easements on our 38 acre property thru The Jackson Hole Land Trust because of its very important and unique year round wildlife habitat, especially for moose and Elk. Our land includes wetlands, willows, spring creeks, riparian zones, and extensive Fish Creek frontage (including a large oxbow). It is designated prime Crucial Winter Moose Habitat as mapped by Game and Fish. The last couple of years we have had twin moose born here. We also have deer, eagles, osprey, foxes, trumpeter swans, otters, cutthroat trout and an occasional bear. A small Elk herd winters here and last winter we even had two mountain lion cubs. Hank, I would love to show you this land so you can understand and appreciate its unique wildlife value. Would it be possible for you to come over some time soon for a short walkabout? I can't tell you how much I appreciate what you do and are doing for our community and valley!- It's a tough job!!
4/23/2009	Nigro, Bob Interested Public	I first move to Jackson Hole in 1978 and each year I have witness the degredation of our community. Negative to zero growth from our past comprehesive plan is required for a sustainable community. We have not adequately dealt with the current traffic and affordable housing problems. More growth will make these problems worse not sustainable.Employers should provide 75% of their employee housing needs. It should not be the responsility of the community to subsidise a local workforce for private businesses. The remaining 25% for employee housing should come exclusively from a lodging tax.The only affordable housing the community should provide would be for public servants, hospital and school workers, town and county employees, police and firefighters. These people are the backbone of our community.We need to get our heads above water before additional growth is approved. We can not grow our way out of our current growth related problems.
4/23/2009	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	I am writing to request that a County Neighborhood meeting be scheduled immediately in the Town of Wilson. The citizens of Wilson should have the opportunity to meet with the planning staff and hopefully planning commissioners and County Commissioners to discuss the new draft of the Comp. Plan. I am requesting that a meeting be scheduled at the Wilson school. The planning department has completely ignored the feedback they received during the many meetings held in Wilson regarding density and the "Mixed Use Village" concept. Just because it now has a different name, "county node" does not change the feelings of the citizens of Wilson. I request that this meeting be schedule before the end of April so that the citizens of Wilson have time to actually provide feedback before this short comment period expires.
4/23/2009	Spitzer, Austin Interested Public	I am in agreement with the guidelines listed for district 4. This is an important wildlife area that requires high priority protection.The continuation of the bike path from Moose to the southern end of Grand Teton Park or to town would be deserving of consideration.Also worthy of consideration is the establishment of minimal flow standards for the main channel of the Gros Ventre river to prevent diversion from "drying up" the river each summer and thus damaging the fish population.

Date	Name	Comment
4/22/2009	Leslie, Craig Interested Public	I believe in the market and not social engineering. I do not support deed restricted housing. I object to my tax dollars subsidising the destruction of our environment.
4/22/2009	Leslie, Craig Interested Public	I am opposed to your proposals for South Park. You have NOT listened to South Park residents. I do not want "managed growth". I want the jewel that is Jackson hole protected. I do not want green fieds turned into housing.I support a moratorium on new development, and only new building on sites that are already developed with existing structures.I do not see the growth envisaged as responsible; more houses= more people = more cars= less wildlife and a damaged ecosystem.
4/22/2009	Neal, Will Interested Public	I am going to be very dissapointed if this passes. Everyone convinced me that town and county electeds like Andy were not only "pro growth". Apparently I was duped
4/20/2009	Palfrey, Cheryl Interested Public	Traffic is a real issue. What about a bus that services Teton National Park with stops along the route within the park? They have this in the Grand Canyon and it is great. People could also use this for a loop backpack trip instead of taking 2 cars or hitching a ride.
4/20/2009	Friend, William D. Interested Public	I applaud the goals for the Town Square. But the tricky part will be implementation; we'll need tough standards that are mule strong, horse high and not subject to compromise. Witness the new building now being completed on the north end of Centre Street - a tall, red brick and glass monstrosity that blends in with the Town Square area about as well as a buffalo turd in a punchbowl. Our elected officials will need to learn to say no to developers if exacting standards for the Town Square are not fulfilled. They should practice in front of a mirror: "no, hell no, and by God we mean it".And let us forever strike from our lexicon the phrase "parking meters".

Date	Name	Comment
4/20/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Dear Planning Team, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Comp Plan Update. We appreciate your continued efforts on what is inevitably a very complex planning exercise for our community. At a future date, we will provide comments specific to the new draft released on April 13. However, this correspondence directly addresses the planning team's repeated assertions that our community did not voice support for a "no growth scenario". The team's conclusion is particularly concerning given that it appears to be used as such a strong basis for the direction of the new draft. The Conservation Alliance respectfully disagrees with this analysis of public comment regarding preferred overall development potential for Teton County and the Town of Jackson. Below are comments to clarify our position. 1. "No Growth" Scenario versus "Least Growth" Scenario First, based on our review, the public has never been asked questions regarding a "no growth" scenario during this public process. The title of the (assumed) scenario was "Scenario D: Least Growth Focus," and questions regarding a rating of preferences for different scenarios (A-D), to our knowledge, were asked only at one public meeting (January 2008). Also, since "no growth" and "least growth" have different meanings and consequences, it is important to distinguish between the two concepts. 2. Polling indicates strong community support for the "Least Growth" Scenario & Limiting Growth Inaccuracies in scenario wording aside, polling did not indicate "a lack of community support" for this scenario as has been described in community presentations. Our review of the different sources of public input data indicates strong community support for limiting overall growth. Following are some examples of data and resources that have led us to this conclusion. A. Public Meeting – St. John's Episcopal Church, January 2008: Scenario Preferences At the conclusion of the community presentation in January 2008, attendees were asked to rate their preferences for four scenarios. % Wildlife/ Conservation Compact Centers & Housing Jackson "Town as Heart" Least Growth Strongly like 50 21 40 40 like 32 21 34 13 neutral 5 9 12 11 dislike 7 19 12 17 Strongly dislike 6 30 2 19 Several conclusions can be drawn from this polling, particularly when looking at the assumptions of the various scenarios. However, in order to focus on the specific issue of this correspondence, the majority of the respondents (53%) either strongly liked or liked the "Least Growth" scenario. This is hardly "no support." And, given a substantial level of neutrality, only 36% of the public disliked this scenario. (In fact, a higher percentage of the

public (49%) disliked the “Compact Centers & Housing” scenario, which interestingly most strongly resembles the preferred land use pattern of the new draft.)

Notably, the “Wildlife/Conservation” scenario, which was either strongly liked or liked by 82% of respondents, was described as follows: “This scenario would result in lower potential growth in Teton County, with limited or no expansion of county nodes... No additional development would occur in the South Park area, beyond that allowable under current zoning.” While we recognize that a preferred scenario of the new draft may include different elements of various scenario descriptions, it appears misleading to imply that the public has voiced support for additional growth, rather than reduced or density-neutral land-use planning valley-wide. In general, to be successful, wildlife protection and habitat conservation would require “lower growth levels” as indicated in the “Wildlife/Conservation” scenario description.

B. Public Surveys – Public meeting, online, phone

Below are questions and responses from community polling that most specifically regard growth potentials.

- Which goal do you think is higher priority for Jackson and Teton County?

% online public meeting phone

Limit overall growth in

the valley

48.6 56.3 53.2

Build more deed

restricted

workforce/affordable

housing

33.9 23.2 36.5

equally important 15.1 20 10.3

The highest percentage of respondents, in all cases, supports limiting overall growth as the higher priority.

- Limit growth and development in the county overall, even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted workforce/affordable housing in the Valley.

% online public meeting phone

Strongly agree 27.3 40.7 20.4

agree 19.4 21.7 30.6

neutral 9.6 5.2 10.7

disagree 23.7 15.5 26.2

Strongly

disagree

19.4 16.0 12.0

Across all surveys, more people agree with this concept than disagree.

- Make zoning changes to eliminate all density bonus options (i.e., PUDs, ARUs,) to protect natural resources and rural character.

% online public meeting phone

Strongly agree 23.5 54.4 n/a

agree 21.3 15.4

neutral 16.7 7.1

disagree 18.3 11.5

Strongly

disagree

Date

Name

Comment

11.0 8.8

Don't know 9.2 2.8

A higher percentage of respondents support lowered development potential through the elimination of density bonus options.

- The county's total buildout should be increased (e.g., allow more development overall) as an affordable housing strategy.

% online Public meeting phone

Strongly agree 10.9 8.7 13.9

agree 15.5 10.3 37.2

neutral 11.4 6.0 12.8

disagree 22.2 21.2 23.8

Strongly

disagree

37.3 50.5 12.3

Don't know 2.8 3.3

Few respondents agree with this statement in two surveys and 51% of respondents agree in the phone survey. Notably, only 8.7 – 13.9% of respondents "strongly agree".

- Set a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed (e.g., 1 or 2% increase per year).

% online public meeting phone

Strongly agree 26.1 35.2 16.5

agree 27.9 23.3 31.5

neutral 16.4 3.8 13.3

disagree 16.9 18.9 28.7

Strongly

disagree

8.4 17.6 10.0

Don't know 4.4 1.3

Across all surveys, more respondents agree with this strategy than those that disagree.

- Limit development overall in rural parts of Teton County and limit redevelopment of Jackson.

% online public meeting phone

Strongly agree 20.3 32.0 19.9

agree 20.8 21.7 40.9

neutral 11.6 4.6 9.6

disagree 28.9 21.7 20.2

Strongly

disagree

16.2 18.6 9.4

Don't know 2.7 1.6

A significantly larger average of respondents support this concept (51.9 versus 38.3) across three surveys. Specifically, 41.1, 53.7, 60.8% agree and 45.1, 40.3, 29.6% disagree. In all cases, more respondents "strongly agree" than "strongly disagree".

- Increase the provision of deed-restricted workforce/affordable housing as a priority over additional commercial or resort development.

% online public meeting phone

Strongly agree 41.3 50.8 33.4

agree 31.5 26.4 37.6

Date

Name

Comment

neutral 10.3 7.3 12.2

disagree 7.7 4.7 11.1

Strongly

disagree

7.2 10.4 5.7

Don't know 2.4 0.5

Specific to commercial development potential, this polling suggests very low community support for additional commercial development (particularly within the context of workforce/affordable housing shortages).

C. Other Community Polling

A number of recent written comments and a recent community survey suggest similar findings to those in the Comp Plan Update polling. Below are a couple of examples:

- Summary of Public Comment Received Outside of Formalized Comment Processes

According to agenda documentation prepared for the September 2008 JIM meeting, which included a "summary of comments received outside of formalized comment processes", buildout was a top category in terms of frequency of submission. This frequency suggests a strong public concern about growth potentials. Recognition of the importance of this topic was confirmed in the planning team's October 2008 newspaper ad summarizing public comment. The ad stated, in the second bullet point, that "buildout should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation."

- Teton County Citizen Survey – October 2006 – National Research Center

The survey included the following relevant finding:

The rate of population growth in Teton County was viewed as "too fast" by 73% of respondents, while 2% thought it was "too slow."

In summary, based on our review, a sampling of which we have presented in this memo, we question the planning team's implication that citizens have voiced support for a new "growthbased" Comprehensive Plan. It appears that there is strong public support for limiting or reducing development potential; this support should be reflected in the foundation, direction, and language of the plan. If there is other data available, please let us know.

Many in our community strongly believe that the sustainability of Jackson Hole does not depend on continued expansion of development potential. As we have stated, and will continue to clarify in our future comments on the new draft, our community's top priority, to protect wildlife, will not be achieved through a focus on development pattern alone. We must be willing to address, in a meaningful way, how the amount of development (residential and commercial) will affect our ability to uphold community priorities.

Ultimately, we cannot grow our way out of growth-related problems.

Please contact us with any questions, and thank you again for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Franz Camenzind Kristy Bruner

Executive Director Community Planning Director

Date	Name	Comment
4/20/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Comp Plan Update. We appreciate your continued efforts on what is inevitably a very complex planning exercise for our community. At a future date, we will provide comments specific to the new draft released on April 13. However, this correspondence directly addresses the planning team's repeated assertions that our community did not voice support for a "no growth scenario". The team's conclusion is particularly concerning given that it appears to be used as such a strong basis for the direction of the new draft. The Conservation Alliance respectfully disagrees with this analysis of public comment regarding preferred overall development potential for Teton County and the Town of Jackson. Below are comments to clarify our position. 1. "No Growth" Scenario versus "Least Growth" Scenario First, based on our review, the public has never been asked questions regarding a "no growth" scenario during this public process. The title of the (assumed) scenario was "Scenario D: Least Growth Focus," and questions regarding a rating of preferences for different scenarios (A-D), to our knowledge, were asked only at one public meeting (January 2008). Also, since "no growth" and "least growth" have different meanings and consequences, it is important to distinguish between the two concepts. 2. Polling indicates strong community support for the "Least Growth" Scenario & Limiting Growth Inaccuracies in scenario wording aside, polling did not indicate "a lack of community support" for this scenario as has been described in community presentations. Our review of the different sources of public input data indicates strong community support for limiting overall growth. Following are some examples of data and resources that have led us to this conclusion. A. Public Meeting – St. John's Episcopal Church, January 2008: Scenario Preferences At the conclusion of the community presentation in January 2008, attendees were asked to rate their preferences for four scenarios. [see comment for tabular data] Several conclusions can be drawn from this polling, particularly when looking at the assumptions of the various scenarios. However, in order to focus on the specific issue of this correspondence, the majority of the respondents (53%) either strongly liked or liked the "Least Growth" scenario. This is hardly "no support." And, given a substantial level of neutrality, only 36% of the public disliked this scenario. (In fact, a higher percentage of the public (49%) disliked the "Compact Centers & Housing" scenario, which interestingly most strongly resembles the preferred land use pattern of the new draft.) Notably, the "Wildlife/Conservation" scenario, which was either strongly liked or liked by 82% of respondents, was described as follows: "This scenario would result in lower potential growth in Teton County, with limited or no expansion of county nodes... No additional development would occur in the South Park area, beyond that allowable under current zoning." While we recognize that a preferred scenario of the new draft may include different elements of various scenario descriptions, it appears misleading to imply that the public has voiced support for additional growth, rather than reduced or density-neutral land-use planning valley-wide. In general, to be successful, wildlife protection and habitat conservation would require "lower growth levels" as indicated in the "Wildlife/Conservation" scenario description. B. Public Surveys – Public meeting, online, phone Below are questions and responses from community polling that most specifically regard growth potentials. • Which goal do you think is higher priority for Jackson and Teton County? [see comment for tabular data] The highest percentage of respondents, in all cases, supports limiting overall growth as the higher priority. • Limit growth and development in the county overall, even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted workforce/affordable housing in the Valley. [see comment for tabular data] Across all surveys, more people agree with this concept than disagree. • Make zoning changes to eliminate all density bonus options (i.e., PUDs, ARUs,) to protect natural resources and rural character. [see comment for tabular data] A higher percentage of respondents support lowered development potential through the elimination of density bonus options. • The county's total buildout should be increased (e.g., allow more development overall) as an affordable housing strategy. [see comment for tabular data] Few respondents agree with this statement in two surveys and 51% of respondents agree in the phone survey. Notably, only 8.7 – 13.9% of respondents "strongly agree". • Set a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed (e.g., 1 or 2% increase per year).

Date	Name	Comment
		[see comment for tabular data] Across all surveys, more respondents agree with this strategy than those that disagree. • Limit development overall in rural parts of Teton County and limit redevelopment of Jackson. [see comment for tabular data] A significantly larger average of respondents support this concept (51.9 versus 38.3) across three surveys. Specifically, 41.1, 53.7, 60.8% agree and 45.1, 40.3, 29.6% disagree. In all cases, more respondents “strongly agree” than “strongly disagree”. • Increase the provision of deed-restricted workforce/affordable housing as a priority over additional commercial or resort development. [see comment for tabular data] Specific to commercial development potential, this polling suggests very low community support for additional commercial development (particularly within the context of workforce/affordable housing shortages). C. Other Community Polling A number of recent written comments and a recent community survey suggest similar findings to those in the Comp Plan Update polling. Below are a couple of examples: • Summary of Public Comment Received Outside of Formalized Comment Processes According to agenda documentation prepared for the September 2008 JIM meeting, which included a “summary of comments received outside of formalized comment processes”, buildout was a top category in terms of frequency of submission. This frequency suggests a strong public concern about growth potentials. Recognition of the importance of this topic was confirmed in the planning team’s October 2008 newspaper ad summarizing public comment. The ad stated, in the second bullet point, that “buildout should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation.” • Teton County Citizen Survey – October 2006 – National Research Center The survey included the following relevant finding: The rate of population growth in Teton County was viewed as “too fast” by 73% of respondents, while 2% thought it was “too slow.” In summary, based on our review, a sampling of which we have presented in this memo, we question the planning team’s implication that citizens have voiced support for a new “growthbased” Comprehensive Plan. It appears that there is strong public support for limiting or reducing development potential; this support should be reflected in the foundation, direction, and language of the plan. If there is other data available, please let us know. Many in our community strongly believe that the sustainability of Jackson Hole does not depend on continued expansion of development potential. As we have stated, and will continue to clarify in our future comments on the new draft, our community’s top priority, to protect wildlife, will not be achieved through a focus on development pattern alone. We must be willing to address, in a meaningful way, how the amount of development (residential and commercial) will affect our ability to uphold community priorities. Ultimately, we cannot grow our way out of growth-related problems. Please contact us with any questions, and thank you again for your efforts.
4/19/2009	Hunt, Lorelle Interested Public	I reside at 700 Lois Lane off Stateline Road on the Wyoming side, just south of where 500 N Road intersects Stateline. I am one of four lots in the Kiln Creek Subdivision. I have concerns about the status of my address - am I in Alta, WY? Silverstar Communications says I am not - that I am in Leigh Canyon. Leigh Canyon is not a real address - there is no zip code for it and even Silverstar in their published telephone book gives the (307) 576 prefix as 83452 zip code - which is actually the zip code for Teton, Idaho. It makes it extremely complicated to get deliveries - and companies are always calling to confirm my address because my telephone number tells them I am in Leigh Canyon. My main concern, though, is emergency services finding us and my neighbors on Lois Lane if they think we are up in Leigh Canyon - and we are not! You cannot get from Leigh Canyon or vice versa to Lois Lane directly on Stateline road. Stateline Road does not go through to Leigh Canyon because there is a creek that cuts off the road. Emergency services - if they head for Leigh Canyon thinking that is where we are - will have gone eight to 10 miles out of their way to Leigh Canyon and then will have to double back to Highway 33 going south and then east on 500 N Road to Stateline and then south to Lois Lane to find us. I would like to know how I can get us listed with the County of Teton, Wyoming and consequently with the telephone company as residing in Alta. I've talked with representatives at Silverstar and they said that Teton County, WY determined on a map that we were in the Leigh Canyon area. I don't know if this is the proper forum for addressing this issue. Any response or information would be appreciated.
4/17/2009	, Interested Public	Do not enlarge the airport. Enforce stricter policy of noise abatement close to airport
4/17/2009	Rausch, Mosey Interested Public	I feel affirmed in my conviction that special places need to be maintained. I am enlightened to see the vision for JH being maintained by the visionaries that govern it. I am behind you totally for God's gift to us that surrounds you everyday. Continue to be good stewards of this beautiful & pristine valley

Date	Name	Comment
4/17/2009	McElroy, Glenn Interested Public	The Plan states redesign of Hwy 22 and working to bury the power lines to enhance the scenic beauty. I am in favor of both but I strongly support moving the power lines to below ground. The route proceeding northward on Hwy 22 toward the Tetons provide spectacular views of the mountains and are downright breathtaking as evidenced by the many motorists that pull onto the hwy shoulder, leave their cars, and take photographs. Often motorists will walk to the fence east of the hwy to obtain a view free of the power poles. Often too, motorists will turn onto Pratt Road to obtain a vantage point. Commercial photographers are occasionally seen taking photos of the Tetons from Pratt Road. It would really be nice if a turnout(s) could be included in the redesign of Hwy 22, if only in apron size, to provide a stationary view of the mountains and valley.

Date	Name	Comment
4/16/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	I'd like to comment on a statement made by Planning Director Jeff Daugherty at the Comprehensive Plan release Monday, April 13: "We also heard that a no-growth plan was not a direction that the community wanted to go." I am very familiar with the public comment provided over the summer, as well as the 3 survey results (conducted around the time of Teton Meadows' consideration). Together, these inputs do not support Jeff Daugherty's claim, one I have heard him make several times in public forums. On the contrary, during the live sessions held over the summer, as well as in written form (as above), there has been substantial community feedback favoring reduced growth. As one example, when Planning staff presented four alternate scenarios to the public Jan 30, 2008, stating the purpose, to 'help you prioritize values' and 'lead to [a] preferred plan', the 182 diverse community members present answered a number of questions. This included their overall assessment of the four scenarios: [see email for tabular reference] Planning staff described the scenarios with the following key differences (listed in order of community preference): #1. Wildlife/conservation (82% favorable) Maximize wildlife habitat & resource protection above all other values Reduce growth in county Largest shift in population from county to town of all scenarios #2 Jackson 'Town as Heart' (73% favorable) Increase overall redevelopment and infill in town Less growth in county centers Concentrate affordable housing in town #3 Least Growth (53% favorable) Least amount of new growth overall in both town & county Eliminate zoning options, purchase development rights Develop in town at base levels only, less emphasis on affordable housing #4 Compact centers & housing (42% favorable) Emphasize locally-based 'centers' around the county and in town Emphasize workforce housing in centers Highest amount of residential growth in the county and overall Although the scenarios were intended to prompt thinking and discussion more than anything, it seems to me the least favored scenario (#4) is the one closest to Monday's Comprehensive Plan release. Even the least-growth scenario (#3) - the one Planning says we don't want - was preferred by us over scenario #4. 2 Subsequent surveys never asked the 'overall assessment' question, so we don't have these responses from the other surveys. However, community feedback has been consistent on the subject of growth across many inputs: it's not what we want. Growth is acceptable only if we HAVE to grow (to get affordable housing, or respect property rights). We don't WANT growth per se (even if it is responsible). Don't we all have a responsibility to call the Planners on this? Consequences We have reached the point where the community should be presented with concrete tradeoffs. For example, if wildlife and natural resources are our top priority, then how much degradation of these values are we willing to accept, in favor of others? What will be the consequences of growth decisions? Prioritizing the 'themes', as in the new release, is a start (although the priorities appear to be applied selectively). Transparency and directness are still lacking. We know it's hard to be specific. 'What-ifs' are still abundant. However, professional planners should be capable of spelling out the consequences of their own plan. Let me take a stab (this is my hypothetical example - we can argue the specifics, but the point is we should have a reasonable picture of what we are agreeing to): ...If we accept 30% growth (residential & commercial) in 10 years, are we OK with 50% more vehicles on the road, 10

Date

Name

Comment

minutes' wait time at the Y, construction of the Hwy 22-89 connector & another road through South Park to Hwy 89, at least 2 more lights on Hwy 89 and at least one more on Hwy 22, that road widened through Wilson, the Teton Village road widened to 4 lanes, even more pressure on workforce housing due to the job-creating commercial growth (a big one), more residents recreating up Cache Creek, heading to the Pass and Village on powder days, and as for wildlife & natural resources, severely reduced migratory activity and loss of habitat in South Park (as well as other targeted areas), loss of open space for agricultural uses and views (reducing our Western character), no more trumpeter swans in the valley, 50% reduction of elk & moose numbers, bald eagle nest reduction, escalating water & energy costs, and more? Or...if we make choices that limit growth, are there still ways to improve on two other important values: housing affordability and a balanced community/economy? Yes, there are. First, limited growth will over time reduce our continued workforce housing deficit (that arises from growth). There is community support for a permanent funding source, to address past housing shortfalls through purchase and preservation of existing housing. Despite how it may seem, we do not need to accept partnerships with private, for-profit interests, enticing them by increasing density beyond community standards (an approach that makes the problem worse, not better). The question then is: where will the money come from and who will provide it?

My questions to you as elected officials are:

Where do you stand on the issue of growth? Will you hold Planners accountable for telling the truth and spelling out consequences? Will you require the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the public's clearly stated desires, and prioritize reducing development potential (for less growth, not more)? Will you work directly to solve our pressing concerns (affordable housing, balanced community/economy), by identifying methods and funding sources that do not bring on the host of collateral impacts that growth does, and nobody wants?

Recommendations:

Let's be vivid. Let's know what we are agreeing to. Let's not misconstrue what the community wants.

Delete 'Responsible Growth' as a priority in the Comprehensive Plan. It isn't one. Our priorities are:

- Wildlife, Natural Resources, Open Space
- Workforce Housing
- Balanced Community/Economy

Achieve the above objectives while reducing build-out potential (both residential and commercial) and other forms of community growth. Call it:

3

- Reduced Build-Out/Growth Rate

(And prioritize it 2nd after Wildlife, Natural Resources, Open Space)

The rest of the named themes in the plan are strategies (possible ways to get there), so include Town as Heart, Community Facilities, and Transportation not as themes but as discussed options to help us achieve our top priorities as a community.

4/15/2009 Friend, William D. Interested Public Some of the area identified as MultiUse Visitor Orientation should perhaps instead be classified as MultiUse Local Orientation, since portions of this area consist of single family homes occupied year-round by local residents.

4/15/2009 Pratt, Warren Interested Public Regarding the future development of the Aspens on the Village Road (390): Is the expansion being planned for after the North Bridge on highway 390 is constructed or after the road has been expanded to 5 lanes with a half dozen traffic lights? We already have seen a significant increase in traffic volume with the Shooting Star area and the Millward affordable project having been added with no change in the road. Not to mention all the development in John Dodge, Teton Pines, and Teton which have all occurred without any change to the road system. The road is already considered over burdened and unsafe by current standards. Will the necessity of creating adequate infrastructure be realized before allowing further development? Is the governing body proactive or reactive? There may be sewer and water but there is certainly not an adequate road system. It will be interesting to see how traffic flows when WYDOT repairs the Snake River Bridge this summer.

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2009	Monson, Bart Interested Public	I strongly support this document. The vision and values reflect my own. Thanks,
4/14/2009	Irwin, Chuck Interested Public	I will be unable to attend the meeting in Alta (April 21) on the comprehensive plan update. I hope nothing new has been added to the draft that would restrict the "BC" designation for the 3.5 acres I own at the entrance of Teton Canyon which encompasses the Lost Horizon Restaurant. The District Boundary Amendment for commercial use was approved on 5 January 1984 ("VC" - visitor commercial). The attached letter of 20 July 2005 still reflects our thoughts on this matter. [see email for referenced attachment]
4/14/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	My name is Ken Koster. I reside in a small subdivision in Wyoming accessed from South Leigh Creek Road. Over the years, I have spoken with various County representatives, including Jan Friedlund, Craig Jackson, Don Varney, Bill Paddleford, Jim Darwich along with others, from Teton County Wyoming concerning the completion of the State Line Road project. This project goes back to the agreement between Idaho and Wyoming as to the responsibility of the road improvement and maintenance north and south of Ski Hill Road. At one of the Alta Community meetings circa 1997-98 a commitment was made by the then Teton County representatives at that meeting stating that funds had been committed to improving State Line Road over a five (5) year period. The "plan/commitment" was to improve sections of State Line Road moving from Ski Hill Road northward up to and including the section to cross over South Leigh Creek and to complete State Line Road tying into 600 North. I suspect Dick Steiger would have notes to this effect as he was conducting the Alta Community meeting. In addition, I have contacted Jay Pence of the Forest Service and a meeting was held in his offices with County representatives mentioned above, including myself as a representative of our homeowners association, to reach agreement on South Leigh Road improvement and maintenance. At that time, agreement was verbally made that maintenance would be completed up to the Forest Service Boundary when such time as State Line Road was completed. When maintenance was to be done, such as grading and dust control, on State Line, continuation would be then made on up South Leigh Road to the Forest Service parking lot at the boundary. Now, we find ourselves with newly elected Commissioners /representatives, new County Engineer, and still no completion of State Line Road to which prior commitments had been made. It would appear that these commitments made by predecessors are not valid when a change in governance is made. I find this very discouraging as a tax paying resident of Teton County Wyoming. Why should I/we have to continually "prod" every year to remind our County government to complete their commitment? A deal is a deal in my book. It appears it is not so with the present County Commissioners. Am I wrong? I hope not. The condition of South Leigh Road is deplorable and even to the state that an ambulance or other emergency equipment would have difficulty during certain periods of the year. The mention of sheriff services is a myth. These services are a part of what I would think could be expected in return for our tax dollars. Meanwhile, contact has been made with various Teton County Idaho officials to encourage completion to State Line Road as a part of Emergency Services needs including, but not limited to water access from South Leigh Creek for fire suppression, ambulance access to residents and so on. The School District may at some time in the near future, have need to provide school transportation services. At present, a bus routing could require travel from south of South Leigh Creek down to Highway 33, travel north, then back east up to State Line Road and South Leigh Creek Road which with present road conditions could again be difficult. At present, the residents here now have to travel to State Highway 33 to have any access to the Alta community, schools and proposed library. State Line Road must be completed as the increased growth will need this necessary infrastructure for the services already addressed. Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.
4/14/2009	Cedarholm, Todd Interested Public	I beleieve that you should include the area north of Kelly Ave, south of Simpson Ave, east of Glenwood and west of Millward in the multi-use district. That neighborhood (my neighborhood) has always been sandwiched between commercial and public/commercial areas, most of the visitors and parked cars belong to people at the Brew Pub or the Center for the Arts. It is not a quiet place. Since we are surrounded by commercial it would make sense to allow light commercial such as office and not restrict it to residential. Also, the lots on the south side of Hansen are only 110' long making re-development difficult under the current development regs. Any redevelopment would require some accomadation to the smaller lot size to avoid the variance mess.
4/14/2009	Hoff, JoAnn Interested Public	I think the east end of Aspen drive should not be included in the multi-family zoning. The east end of Aspen drive should be included in the 'Southern Hillside' district as that is what it is most compatible with. As homeowner and resident of Aspen drive I can state that this street cannot possible handle any more traffic and growth. Most of the east end of Aspen is condominium or townhome development which is unlikely to change. There are several parcels in the middle (between Cache and Millward) that could be developed under this zoning. I urge you to consider maintaining the NC-2 or something similar in this area rather than multi-family. All of Aspen drive is currently zoned NC-2 and should stay that way. This would be an ideal place for affordable single-family housing. Please consider maintaining the same zoning as the rest of Aspen drive. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
4/13/2009	Boynton, Beverly Interested Public	looks like no changes for kelly, gros ventre area, which seems both appropriate and lucky for us residents. my only other comment is to question if there is any way to have antelope flats road plowed during the winter. this would reduce the number of miles driven for anyone from kelly, gros ventre road, or science school going to the park and other points north. it would also reduce traffic at gros ventre junction, which is a somewhat dangerous intersection. i suppose that is in the hands of gtnp.

Phase: Surveying

4/9/2008	, Save Historic JH	Lake Research Partners conducted a survey of Teton County voters on behalf of Save Historic Jackson Hole in November 2007. This survey measured public opinion toward local growth and development issues in Teton County. LRP designed and administered this survey that was conducted by phone using professional interviewers. The survey reached 400 registered voters 18 years and older in Teton County, WY. The survey was conducted between November 15th and 19th, 2007. Telephone numbers for the sample were drawn randomly from a voter file in Teton County, WY. Data were weighted slightly by gender, party identification, age, education and region to reflect the attributes of the actual population of registered voters. The margin of error is +/- 4.9%. The survey questions were designed to accurately measure public opinion in Teton County. Our firm is known for conducting high-quality and unbiased research. Our surveys are conducted to the highest industry standards and we make every attempt possible to ensure that each survey we conduct is representative, unbiased, accurate, and straightforward. Lake Research Partners is a leading national public opinion and political strategy research firm. Our principals are leading political strategists, serving as tacticians and senior advisors to a wide range of advocacy groups, non-profits, and foundations. Our clients include: the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, the Afterschool Alliance, the Sierra Club, the California Breast Cancer Fund, American Lung Association, Public Education Network, Planned Parenthood, the AFL-CIO, the White House Project, and many others. Additionally, we have worked for a large number of political candidates where accurate and precise data is critically important. For further information on LRP or the methodology of this survey, please contact me at 202-776-9066. Sincerely, Alysia Snell Partner {results of survey referenced in this letter are available in the County Planning Office}