



## Technical Advisory Group Meeting #I Summary

---

Monday, September 10, 2007

4H Building, Miller Park

Time: 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

### Agenda

---

1. Welcome
2. Introductions (Committee members, Town and County staff, consultants)
3. Comprehensive Plan Update Process and Purpose
4. Role of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
5. Status of Plan Analysis, Existing Conditions and reports and discussion
6. Wrap-up (future meeting dates, etc.)

### Attendance

---

TAG: Terri Gregory, Mark Abtrobis, Rusty Palmer, Lindsay, Kevin Thibeault, Dail Barbour, Tom Campbell, Rachel Markko, Erika Edmiston, Bob Zimmer, Pete \_\_, Jennifer \_\_, Dan Zivkovich, Emily \_\_, Mary Martin, Rick \_\_.

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

### Meeting Summary

---

#### Issues/ Questions

Add to vision: Wildland Urban Interface.

#### 1994 Plan Analysis

##### Theme 1: Location of Development

- Consider implications of locations of residential near industrial and public health. We have been seeing “sick building syndrome” in one neighborhood because of exposure to industrial areas. Take into account locations and shape of mountains and climate.
- In Wilson, we hear comments to the effect that Hardeman Ranch was in character, but there is a disconnect between the 1994 Plan, which is saying increase density and mixed-use, and people of Wilson who think they have enough density.
- Open space preservation has been a lofty goal. We’ve had some successes, but we have lacked mechanisms to achieve the goal. Must rely on Jackson Hole Land Trust to acquire and Scenic Preserve Trust to secure easements. Specific mechanisms are necessary.

## **Theme 2: Development Patterns/Character**

- Fire is a strong consideration. Future density nodes should be placed to avoid fault lines, avalanche paths, wildland-urban interface and other naturally critical areas. .

## **Theme 3: Protection of Natural, Scenic, Agricultural Resources**

- Utilities section in LDRs is fairly broad. Rules governing the placement of utilities in natural areas are too vague.
- The resources sections should also address alternative fuels and sustainability.
- Wild land interface – should be in conservation of natural resources section.

## **Theme 4: Affordable Housing**

- Question: What percent of 819 units were not linked to new development? We need more affordable housing that is not simply mitigating new development and that reduces the backlog of demand.
- New plan should offer incentives for affordable housing. Some could be in the context of not being linked to new development, but should be stand-alone. Housing Authority could build rentals. Maybe the plan should address other ways to provide housing that don't require funding from agencies. (e.g., Aden model – Osprey developer-driven).
- Location important (e.g., fire, living outside, not available). Criteria for other sites may be missing (e.g., fire stations, ambulance).
- We should have assumption in plan that affordable housing provides for essential employees (emergency services).
- Locate housing where services need to be. Consider health and 1<sup>st</sup> responders. Service providers and all employees are having trouble with housing (e.g., police – only 30% live in the county or Jackson).
- Many projects are lacking character. There seems to be a disconnect between what we say we want and provision of professional affordable housing. This leads to a lot of turn over. Relatively new tenure affects community quality. This means we have county boards with no applicants.
- Housing goal should be "Affordable and desirable".

## **Theme 5: Transportation**

- The data is just looking at Teton Cty, Wyoming. Need to also consider the 7,000 houses in Driggs and 900 in Alpine.
- Is traffic just because of our population growth? Comparing it can be misleading. Population has actually grown more than 63%, because of residents outside (e.g., that reflects negative population growth).
- Housing development not here goes outside in other county – leading to traffic.
- Traffic is multi-faceted. It relates to inconvenience factor, but also safety service delivery and first responders.
- Road networks lack redundancy. We need alternatives to one road in and out.

- Carlos – Noted the importance of the transportation and land use relationship. We need the dialogue about how to expand roads, but also how to connect services and housing and recreation.
- Trip Counts: During the transportation plan, it was 8 trips a day, where only 2 are for work. It was 5 trips a day at the time the plan was done. Now it is more like 10-14 level trips (2001 now 2007). Is this because of more people or people driving home? What is the definition of a trip? (Carlos noted it is based on travel diary – linked trips, trip segments). (Note: need to double check figures. Were 2001/1996 measured similarly?)
- For alternative modes such as bikes and pedestrians on roads have not had great success. None of streets and roads have had these feature implemented, except WY 22 upgrade. Tobity Pass (arterial roads. Highway reconstruction). Within community, streets, roads, and highways, we have not achieved.
- A traffic contributor, from time-to-time, is schools. Schools this year tried to reorganize start and stop times. This was mildly successful. They are planning another change next year and could use some help. This helps manage traffic, but volume doesn't change. How much can go after in county market? What is school board willing to do and parents? Change has to be targeted and must balance safety.
- Complete streets important as well as alternative modes within streets. Active living – bicycling and walking. Safe kids to school (grant).

#### **Theme 6: Balance Between Resorts and Community**

- Perception is there is a large shift of balance of toward resorts and second homes, even if the numbers don't show that. Housing for seasonal workers (balanced tipped toward that for 2-3 years). Public health industry sees one side, where workers/resorts/hotels and second homes are increasing and community is decreasing.
- We may not have a good measure. What is definition of "community"? Many people are renting. We haven't captured with the numbers the concept that we've got more people trying to just "make it" here (e.g., seven families per home). How should we count? One home for every Teton Village unit?
- Is condo considered a residence (operationally it is a hotel)? The resort contains houses, condos, and hotels. And hotels are outside the resorts. Residential. Is starts since 1994?
- The 2020 figure represents buildout. It suggests we are building houses faster (doesn't look like that).
- Schools are seeing a mismatch in projections because year-round residents are moving to Teton Village. For instance, Teton Village projected 3 students and there are actually 31 kids. This raises concerns about impact of resort development on schools. Impact is not captured in numerical ratios. Targhee will likely have huge impacts on schools. Wilson School (2000) is at capacity. Enrollment projections (from school). Wondering if Resort Concept is changing? (Used to be sleepy). Park Visits peaked in 1995 and resorts have boomed and Forest Service activities have boomed. Somewhat driven by amenities. May be more simplistically stated Difficult to quantify.

## Other Topics for Refocus – Where do we go From Here?

- WYDOT – Road redundancy needs to be considered (roads that are bigger or new for capacity). Clusters add more trips to stressed system. With the Town-putting up stop signs (slowing local traffic), this leads to a highway system that is stressed.
- Weed and pest – “invasive species” are relevant in every category of the plan, even though it isn’t an area of focus. It is costing the county millions each year. It gets overlooked (address, for example, with bike paths, roads, and throughout life of facilities).
- Need to address public spaces and development in the community. Absolutely none are being built and development is too auto-oriented and not people friendly. Public spaces should be with commercial.
- Address the large increases seen on Forest Service lands.
- Nowhere is open space in communities. More density leads to more people needing space. Should address this lack of useable open space.
- Pathways can be transportation or recreation-oriented, but the same pathway can’t be both.
- Police. Need projections of population and socio-demographic profile to allow service providers to plan. How does it impact schools? Versus build out?
- Grand Teton National Park would like to encourage facilitating partnerships between the county and the park and other federal agencies and develop a transit system between park and town.
- What is the service population? From 2000 to 2006, growth slowed, but use of services is up (e.g., library). Library – part of commuter population (July/August, 1,000 people per day). Those card holders are us, but don’t necessarily live here. Tricky place to use the numbers. Not just looking at Teton County, but also beyond. Can’t have realistic idea by just looking at county numbers.
- Need better methods of creating open space - we’ve done well; we could do better.
- Affordable housing is a real trigger. Need to address how to develop affordable housing that is not development-dependent. Consider non-development housing goals. Affordable housing could be jointly owned city/county for services. Personnel (e.g., Police, fire -- if we can’t keep people, keep core of housing for essential services).
- Need better methods for protecting Natural Resources. Do we have a functional NRO? Don’t have data to answer accurately. Wildlife? What is its representation? We don’t have good baseline information. Is wildlife population the measure we’re looking for?
- Keep in mind this is a plan that deals with 3% of the county. (County is 97% public.)
- Schools – A big issue is how to accommodate day cares and centers.
- Consider regional impacts influences of other counties (i.e., Lincoln and Sublet County).
- Demographic switch – What will be the future demographic profile? We’re getting older. What will be the ratio of workers to population?
- Community character. We have the last of a “western” feel. We don’t want to look like everywhere else. Consider the appropriate mix of businesses on main street (e.g., the number of banks and real estate offices). Are we losing sight of old west?

- Do we need to adjust lot sizes in county to allow more density (e.g., some 1 acre lots)? Maybe smaller acreages in county planned wisely could help accommodate families and a multi-generational community (young people).