



Stakeholders Advisory Group Meeting #1 - Summary

Tuesday, September 11, 2007

4H Building, Miller Park

Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Introductions (Committee members, Town and County staff, consultants)
3. Comprehensive Plan Update Process and Purpose: (a) Purpose and goals, and (b) Project Work Plan
4. Role and Responsibilities of the Stakeholders Advisory Group (STAG)
5. Plan Issues – presentation and brief discussion
6. 1994 Plan – Presentation and Group Work Session: (a) 1994 Plan Draft Analysis report and (b) 1994 Plan Vision
7. Wrap-up (future meeting dates, etc.)

Attendance

CAC: Tim O'Donoughue, Deb Sprague, Pam Shea, Franz Camenzind, Greg Smith, Darrel Hoffman, Rob Cheek, Brad Mead, Kelly Lockhart, Bland Hoke, Anne Hayden, Aaron Pruzan, Jake Ankeny, Scott Pierson, Sean O'Malley

Staff: Blair Leist and Jeff Daugherty (County), Jeff Noffsinger (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), Bill Collins (Collins Planning), and Carlos Hernandez (Fehr & Peers).

Meeting Summary

Planning Process

The committee had several questions about the process:

- What has been direction from elected officials? (Note: they have emphasized that this is an update and that the process should be targeted and efficient.)
- How will the committee get public comments (Note: the planning team will provide summaries of blog and other comments for the group before meetings).
- How does this effort relate to LDRs? Discretionary zoning creates confusion (PUDs, PRs, resorts) (Note: the plan will be the foundation for recommended changes to LDRs, but it is not regulatory.)

Roles and Responsibilities

STAG discussed opportunities for public involvement suggested limiting it to the end of the meeting for 10 minutes.

Issues

- Note: Social and human services in the 1994 Plan were only a paragraph and should have more focus in the update.
- Recreation and BLM land management could use some direction. BLM is divesting themselves of several parcels of land in the county. (Could be a land management plan (TBD)).

- Cumulative affects of decisions and incremental development need consideration.

Vision

- **Agriculture:** Agriculture is not as important as it was in 1994. It is fine that not be a major component of the plan's vision—that reflects reality. However, some ranchers are still in business and if they would like to continue, they should be able to. Even if agriculture is not as big a part of the new update, it should not impinge on the ability of the existing operations to remain in business.
- The vision and goals create tension. The term community character can be manipulated. Stress the elements that can be helpful. Be very specific about what the plan is trying to do.
- Affordable housing: Where was it in 1994 Plan? In 1994 Plan, it wasn't as important an issue as now.
- New plan may have to compromise values important now to address needs. The updated plan can't accommodate every interest.
- Everything should be on the table (e.g., how much development, limited resources or agriculture, affordable housing). We need to make hard decisions about the degree of investments.
- We need to ask : "is it achievable?" not just make easy points in the vision.

Planning team asked: is it a balance or is it an ideal, listing each topic? Discussion followed:

- Can manipulate each one. In the end, it is not the best product. Eventually we need to define some sort of priority.
- **"Community character"** is a junk term. It doesn't serve anyone's purpose. Instead, we need to drill down... be very specific.
- Identify ideals. Refresh for each touchstone.
- Identify conflicts in the goals – so the community knows what they are getting and sacrificing (e.g., scenic vistas versus agriculture).
- Prioritize (e.g., transportation. It will have ripple effects into other categories). What are the priorities and the consequences of these priorities? Identify tradeoffs.
- Outdoor recreation and wildlife habitat: identify what goes where and how much?
- Consider the cumulative effects of decisions over a 15-year period. (e.g., School district – by 10 years it needs another school).
- Need to discuss choices and trade-offs.
- Need specifics (e.g., The plan might drive changes to LDRs and should provide specific ideas). A goal for the effort should be to get specific for ideas. Provide a basis to move away from discretionary zoning.
- If "it" can't happen, "it" should be stated in the plan. Get rid of ambiguities and streamline it.
- Provide choices (e.g., multiple potentials) and no "puffy stuff."
- We are planning an island here – with finite resources. Keep that in mind.
- Identify the "Vision," but we also need to look at consequences (e.g., put one of top of other). Maybe some particular statements will stand out. Refine the vision after we look at consequences. Use the vision to "test drive" scenarios as we get further along in the process.
- The advantage of stakeholders with different perspectives is to be able to have those conversations about trade-offs (e.g., scenic vistas are important, but lead to some competing values. How should we accommodate them? (e.g., schools, transportation, and affordable housing). We need to determine where it is worth spending money (e.g., affordable housing consequence on schools). Recognize what may be affected negatively and what to do when there's a conflict.
- Right now, arguments are based on vague terms and variances. We need more specific rules. If they turn out to be bad, then revise them (instead of using variances). The controversy starts with competing vision statements.
- Could elected officials operate in that environment with specificity (it should make their job easier, technically)?
- We need a "plan" instead of a "generalized list of principles."

- One goal for this effort is to develop “more predictability.”
- Is the community looking at a “build out cap”? (e.g., 40,000 in the 1990s).

Planning team will be doing capacity analysis, starting with current zoning and looking at trends because current zoning may not give an accurate picture of what could happen.

- It seems that the 1994 Plan downzoning had in mind a cap.
- What can land accommodate? Capacity?
- One of the challenges is that we don’t even really know our current population because we don’t have a good handle on how many 2nd homes.
- We need to consider the picture regionally (e.g., analyze how many people are living across the pass).
- Also, keep in mind that population fluctuates seasonally (e.g., 20,000 in November/April versus 100,000 in summer and winter). It is important to note the seasonal fluctuations. Also note skier versus visitor. The fluctuation is extremely relevant for services (i.e., it is a constant challenge for services to get and keep employees). We see amazing amounts of population change.

Other note: Some statistics show that Teton County is the wealthiest County in the USA. That’s a big change. And the middle and working class are getting smaller. Show this information in Snapshot reports.

1994 Plan Analysis (Discussion focused on Themes 5 and 6)

Theme 5: Transportation

National traffic growth is outpacing places like Phoenix. Daily traffic (lows and highs). Numbers are not relevant (trend relevant). Conclusions from data? (e.g., from Alpine) all corridors growing at some level. Data shows uniform growth.

- Is this mostly construction-oriented? (That is gut feel). They can’t use mass transit system. (note: WYDOT provides counts for heavy trucks and they show flat line growth.) That seems surprising because pick up trucks are a lot of the traffic.
- Can we get seasonal traffic information? Peak hour and time of year?

Theme 6: Resort Versus Community

- The entire community is a “lifestyle resort.” We have dark houses in every neighborhood. That trend seems to be accelerating—the way Aspen lost its native population. Normal houses are getting scraped. Those numbers should be in report. But, be careful of numbers (e.g., electric bills sent out of community may not be an accurate reflection of 2nd home ownership, because people register their address in Wyoming to avoid income tax, so there are more).
- Living structures and empty structures still have people caretakers. What are we now versus 1994?
- We are a tourist community, but we have “permanent tourists”—they’ve invested here. And we are seasonal, which overwhelms the local community.
- The loss of the middle class – or struggle of it – is significant. Before 1994, the community was pretty socially diverse. Now it is not, which makes it hard for the community to function (e.g., with lack of Little League coaches and nurses). That could be a goal – bring back the middle class.
- We didn’t accomplish social diversity (Since it is a “middle class” issue, maybe don’t bracket as “affordable housing.”)
- Techniques to help with affordable housing aren’t unique to this community (models have been tried in Aspen). Recognize the models that have been tried and that worked or not (e.g., Keys, FL or Aspen).

Wrap Up

- The planning team will notify the community when the next meeting date is set.