



Joint Town Council/County Commissioners Meeting – Plan Update

Thursday, January 31, 2008

Town Hall Chambers

Time: 3:00 – 5:00 PM

Agenda Topics

1. Reports from Events and update on projects
2. Present Scenarios and results from public meeting and STAG and TAG
3. Discussion
4. Wrap-up (future events, next meeting dates, etc.)

Summary of Discussion

The planning team presented the results from the public meeting along with the scenarios. The officials offered the following comments and ideas:

- Ask questions about “willingness” to pay. (e.g., what would be people’s commitment to pay for pathways, transit?)
- TDRs were discussed as a means of implementing the plan. Staff is researching that legality and applicability for the plan.
- Options, such as TDRs should not preclude workforce housing.
- “Buildout” needs to be in conversation about scenarios.
- A councilor noted that we should not be asking the public to pick “one” scenario and that line of questions asking people to rate each scenario should not be included in the on-line version of questioning.
- Recognize where we’ve started with buildout. We’ve had a decrease. Trade-offs: Allow tremendous zoning potential in town.
- We need dialogue about what kind of techniques to provide deed restricted housing, besides just new development.
- Strategies to shift density will need to be seen as density-neutral – make the toolbox function and achieve desired outcome.
- Buildout and consequences: Consider whether we need to include discussion about buildout and whether the public favors a certain number. (Response: TAG recommended some ideas about relative consequences). Need to better explain what it means to have “not one more” commercial or residential unit, versus approving 10,000 more, for example.
- Questions for on-line survey suggestions:
 - o Delete reference to “sending areas.” Such terminology is confusing.
 - o Define workforce/affordable housing.
 - o Define geographic areas better..
 - o Transportation – make it more personal and ask what people are willing to pay.
 - o Explain the “town density” definition and make it clear that it doesn’t necessarily entail annexation.

- Officials discussed the community survey and how it will be administered and who it will capture. One official noted that the survey should go to every property owner. A suggestion was to send out a postcard regarding the on-line web survey. Make paper copies available too, because not everyone is web-literate. It is partly a generational thing. Could use tax notices for outreach.
- The planning team presented the results from the Latino outreach and comments received. 20% of the county is now Latino, so that is an important voice to include in the planning effort.

Public Comments:

- Bob Culver, communications engineer suggested that the website could have misleading information and should use a key to respond to input.
- Jack Dennis: Offered good comments about the meeting with a lot of turn-out. Liked the voting process and saw the outreach as a positive step. Lower Valley Power could be a source of distributing information.